The Language of D.H. Lawrence: Repetition and Revision in The Rainbow

Susan Bain

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

University of Edinburgh, 1998.

I confirm that this thesis is entirely my own work, and has been composed by me.

Susan Bain

So she ground away at her work, never giving herself, never giving it up…Most tedious was the close study of English literature.

D.H. Lawrence, *The Rainbow*, p.310

ABSTRACT

Lawrence's repetition and revision in *The Rainbow* have not previously been studied in combination, and the creative effects of apparently small-scale lexical and syntactic revisions have not been fully considered. *The Language of D.H. Lawrence: Repetition and Revision in The Rainbow* combines examination of the original manuscripts, typescripts, and the first English edition of *The Rainbow* with modern linguistic and stylistics approaches to self-repetition in discourse. The author's linguistic specificity is revealed, as is the importance of repetition and revision to the evolving themes of the novel, and the close relationship between the novel's stylistic peculiarities and Lawrence's developing doctrine. It is shown, against Ross' *The Composition of the Rainbow and Women in Love: A History*, that Lawrence's revisions in proof are not the result of self-censorship, but creative revision. By returning to the original manuscripts, the thesis reveals revisions to the earliest stage of the fourth version of *The Rainbow*, obscured in the Cambridge edition by Kinkead-Weekes' decision to treat the revised manuscript, rather than the original manuscript, as the fourth stage of composition.

Chapter 1 identifies the problems which Lawrence had in finding a 'new language' for *The Rainbow*, and demonstrates his faith in his evolving new style. A critical overview is provided of work on both his repetition and revision processes, and the thesis is placed in the context of revisionist criticism of Lawrence's lexical and grammatical fluidity. The aims and methodology of the thesis are outlined.

Chapter 2 identifies Lawrence's linguistic specificity in an extract from *The Rainbow*, and demonstrates the importance of his repetitive style to his developing doctrine of creative, and destructive, opposition. *The Rainbow's* inversion of the quasi-gender attributions of *Study of Thomas Hardy* is demonstrated as operating at the level of lexical cohesion in the extract from *The Rainbow*, and also in the 1914 version of 'The White Stocking'. Similar repetitive presentation of oppositions is shown to occur, uninverted, in an extract from *Sons and Lovers*. It is argued that repetition reveals that Lawrence's move towards the language of *The Rainbow* was beginning before *Study of Thomas Hardy* and the *Prussian Officer* collection.

Chapter 3 reveals that the 'structural skeleton' which *Hardy* provides for *The Rainbow* occurs at a finer stylistic level than has previously been considered. Identification of Matching Relations and Biblical parallelism reveals that *The Rainbow's* repetitive structures provide an evaluative framework against which the deficiencies and achievements of each generation can be considered. This framework develops through the revision process, as the characteristics and themes of each generation evolve.

Chapter 4 examines *The Rainbow's* repetition in the light of *Hardy's* doctrine of 'Male' and 'Female'. Repetition is shown to characterise the specific nature and progress of the protagonists in each generation. The complex cross-hatching of 'Male' and 'Female' principles within and between individuals, and its proportional attribution to characters, is predictive of their achievements.

Chapter 5 examines repetition and revision in *The Rainbow* to counter Ross' assertion in *The Composition of The Rainbow and Women in Love: A History*, that Lawrence's proof revisions were made under pressure of self-censorship, and pressure from Methuen. It is shown that lexical specificity, cohesion and revisions reveal consistent patterns of creative revision and thematic development – and further inclusion of the language and ideas of *Hardy*.

Chapter 6 presents conclusions, and directions for further work.

CONTENTS

Cue Titles

CUE TITLES

The Rainbow

MS - University of Texas at Austin, holograph MS and corrected typescript, the latter retained from *The Wedding Ring*, E331a.

MSR - revisions to the above, identified as MS in Cambridge edition.

TS - typescript taken from MSR.

TSR - Universtity of Texas at Austin, corrected typescript and holograph manuscript, E331b.

E1 - University of Texas at Austin, English first edition, A7.

Sons and Lovers

MS - University of California at Berkeley, 530pp, E373e.

PP - University of Texas at Austin, Page proofs, 423pp. and two extra sets of pp.357-352, E373g

The Prussian Officer and Other Stories

PO - University of Texas at Austin, English first edition, A6.

HP - Nottingham County Library, corrected page proofs, 310pp, E326.6.

SS - University of Cambridge, 'The White Stocking' in *Smart Set* (44:97-108), October 1914, C34.5.

At each stage of composition and / or revision

<...D> - denotes deletion (e.g. <Anna (MSRD)> indicates "Anna", deleted in MSR)

[...I] - denotes insertion (e.g. [Anna (MSRI)] indicates "Anna", inserted in MSR)

<[...]> - denotes insertion later deleted

[<...>] - denotes deletion later re-inserted

CHAPTER 1: REPETITION, REVISION AND *THE RAINBOW*.

Repetition and *The Rainbow*

D.H. Lawrence's linguistic techniques in *The Rainbow*[1] have long been recognised as problematic. From the earliest point of its composition, as the first version of *The Sisters* (March - c. 4-5 June 1913), Lawrence himself identified the difficulties he was having in writing it in terms of language:

> I am doing a novel which I have never grasped. Damn its eyes, there I am at page 145, and I've no notion what it's about. I hate it. F. says it is good. But it's like a novel in a foreign language I don't know very well - I can only just make out what it is about. (To Arthur Macleod, 23 April 1913)[2]

The second version of *The Sisters* (August 1913 - January 1914), was described in similar terms in a letter to Edward Garnett of 30 December 1913, in which Lawrence also stressed the difference between his new and preceding work:

> It is *very* different from *Sons and Lovers*: written in another language almost. I shall be sorry if you don't like it, but am prepared. - I shan't write in the same manner as *Sons and Lovers* again, I think: in that hard, violent style full of sensation and presentation. You must see what you think of the new style.[3]

Lawrence's struggles with his new style, and his defence of it, are recurring themes in his correspondence during the period of *The Rainbow's* prolonged composition and revision. Between February and May 1914, he was working on a third version of the evolving novel, *The Wedding Ring*, and apparently intending to combine the preceding two drafts. In a letter to Garnett of 29 January 1914, just preceding the composition of the third draft, Lawrence replied to Garnett's criticisms of the earlier version of the novel. Garnett appears to have

---

[1]D.H. Lawrence, *The Rainbow*, edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, London, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1989).

[2]D.H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume i: September 1901 - May 1913*, edited by James T. Boulton, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1979), p. 544.

[3]D.H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume ii: June 1913 - October 1916*, edited by James T. Boulton and G.J. Zytaruk, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1981), p.132.

claimed of the plot and characters that Ella's character was 'incoherent', criticised her affair with Ben Templeman as 'wrong', and claimed, of Lawrence's 'exhaustive method', that the scenes were not sufficiently incorporated, and that the artistic side was 'in the background'.[4] Lawrence accepted the first two criticisms, but refused to accept those pertaining to his new mode. This, he claimed, was the result of a transition in his artistic development:

> Then about the artistic side being in the background. It is that which troubles me most. I have no longer the joy in creating vivid scenes, that I had in *Sons and Lovers*. I don't care much more about accumulating objects in the powerful light of emotion, and making a scene of them. I have to write differently...if...the second half, also disappoints you, I will, when I come to the end, leave this book altogether. - Then I should propose to write a story with a plot, and to abandon the exhaustive method entirely - write pure object and story.
>
> I am going through a transition stage myself...So that I do not much mind if I put all this novel in the fire, because it is the vaguer result of transition. I write with everything vague - plenty of fire underneath, but, like bulbs in the ground, only shadowy flowers that must be beaten and sustained, for another spring. - I feel that this second half of the Sisters is very beautiful, but it may not be sufficiently incorporated to please you. I do not try to incorporate it very much - I prefer the permeating beauty. It is my transition stage - but I must write to live, and it must produce its flowers, and if they be frail or shadowy, they will be all right if they are true to their hour.[5]

This 'transition stage', as Lawrence wrote to Arthur Macleod on 5 January 1915, resulted in him coming into his 'full feather', in a novel 'different from my other work'.[6] This novel, Lawrence recognised, was repetitive in style, and some of these repetitions at least were not considered by him to be necessary to the final form of the novel. On 2 March 1915, Lawrence wrote to Viola Meynell to ask her to type the MS of what was now *The Rainbow*. His concern was also with the removal of excessive repetition:

> You will type me the MS, won't you? - and tell me the repetitions and the things I can cross out. I must cross some things out.[7]

However, by 26 July, in a letter to J.B. Pinker, Lawrence refused to make further alterations to the novel. On 13th of that month, Pinker had begun to pass Methuen's

---

[4]pp.142-143.
[5]p.143.
[6]p.255.
[7]p.299.

requests for self-censorship to Lawrence. His reply was to claim that the passages objected to were offensive only in their substance, and that they could not be removed due to their intrinsic importance in the overall pattern of the book:

> I have cut out, as I said I would, all the *phrases* objected to. The passages and paragraphs marked I cannot alter. There is nothing offensive in them, beyond the very substance they contain, and that is no more offensive than that of all the rest of the novel. The libraries won't object to the book any less, or approve of it any more, if these passages are cut out. And I cant [sic] cut them out, because they are living parts of an organic whole. Those who object, will object to the book altogether. These bits won't affect them particularly.[8]

As Kinkead-Weekes observes in *D.H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile 1912-1922*, due to the partial disappearance of Pinker's files, and Lawrence's habit of never keeping letters, recovering what these objections might have been is not an easy task. He concludes:

> The thirteen expurgations that the American publisher was to make, without Lawrence's consent, are the most likely passages that Lawrence might have *refused* to cut; and suggest that the episode of the Nottingham girl and its aftermath (though not the anal suggestion); the relationship with Winifred Inger and the going away together of Ursula and Skrebensky were among the main areas of sensitivity. There seem to have been no objections, since there are no significant changes, to the treatment of Ursula's loss of virginity under the oak-tree, or her destruction of Skrebensky on the beach. That the American publisher was also not bothered by Tom's affair with the girl at Matlock, or by Anna's dancing in the nude, may on the other hand have been because Lawrence did make changes there - though it is not possible to be sure that these were simply the result of outside interference. For, in the vast majority of what seem the likeliest cases of self-censorship, there could have been other good reasons for the alteration. Or, to put it the other way round, if Lawrence did bowdlerise himself, as his letter to Pinker suggests he did in certain 'phrases', he nearly always did more than that, and rewrote with some fresh imaginative emphasis.[9]

Kinkead-Weekes' identification of potentially objectionable passages quite reasonably rests on the *substance* contained in them. However, what is interesting in Lawrence's reply to Pinker is his assertion that he could not alter the 'passages and paragraphs marked' *at all*, perhaps suggesting that there was something essential in their

---

[8]pp.369-370.
[9]Mark Kinkead-Weekes, *D.H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile, 1912-22*, The Cambridge Biography, Volume ii (Cambridge, 1996), p.251.

construction. Certainly, when he *did* alter them in proof, it was in a manner which suggested that the repetitiveness of these passages was far more important in some cases than in others, and far more important than those he had referred to in his letter to Viola Meynell. In the episode with the Nottingham girl,[10] Lawrence decreases some of the repetition in the passage in revision, removing two repetitions of 'sensual' and replacing them with one elsewhere, and removing two occurrences of 'pleasure', retaining one, and adding one.[11] However, in the same extract he also replaces the repeated construction of subject and verb 'liked' ('He liked...He liked...she liked') with a different type of repetition in TSR, in which increasing affectiveness is presented in a parallel construction; 'perceiving her, appreciating her, finding her out, gratifying himself with her'. This repetitive construction remains unchanged in E1, suggesting that it was unchanged in proof. The repetition of the phrase 'She would be small' in initial position in two adjacent sentences also remains unchanged, and the introduction of 'childishness' and 'his hands' in proof, cohesive with the phrases 'almost like a child' and 'his two hands' which are already present also results in increased repetitiveness. Equally significantly, in Will and Anna's 'Absolute Beauty' interaction, there is both a consistent failure to remove parallel constructions and repeated lexical items (particularly those cohesive with 'strange' and 'beauty'), and a distinct increase in the employment of lexical items cohesive with 'sensual', 'violent' and 'death'.[12] Lawrence's apparent awareness of redundant repetition in his letter to Viola Meynell, and his retention and introduction of repetition in proof revision, suggest that - at this stage - there were two sorts of repetition in *The Rainbow*, that which was necessary, and that which was not. In addition, following a suggestion made to Thomas Seltzer on 7 September 1919,[13] Lawrence wrote a 'Foreword to *Women in Love*', which was first printed in an advertising leaflet distributed by Seltzer in autumn 1920. It was in this foreword that Lawrence made his most famous comment regarding the repetitiveness of his style:

> In point of style, fault is often found with the continual, slightly modified repetition. The only answer is that it is natural to the author: and that every natural crisis in emotion or passion or understanding

[10]*Rainbow*, pp.210-216.
[11]pp.213, 212, 211.
[12]pp.217-222.
[13]D.H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume iii: October 1916 - June 1921*, edited by James T. Boulton and Andrew Robertson, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1984), pp.390-391.

comes from this pulsing, frictional to-and-fro, which works up to culmination.[14]

Lawrence's 'only answer' is perhaps misleading. The context in which the comment occurs is one in which Lawrence is defending the sacredness of the sensual passions and the desires of the creative soul, and arguing for the importance of the 'struggle for verbal consciousness in art' which is 'not superimposition of a theory', but *the passionate struggle into conscious being*.[15] He is linking the characteristic repetition with variation of his style with the doctrine he espouses. Repetitiveness may be a 'natural' manifestation of the way in which Lawrence's mind functioned artistically. However, as will be demonstrated in Chapters 2 and 3, the manner of Lawrence's repetitiveness varied throughout his career, and has differing stylistic, thematic and functional effects, developing as both his fiction and doctrine evolve, and increasingly indicating strong functional links between the two. Repetitive structures typical of the Bible are one of the characteristic hallmarks of Lawrence's prose in *The Rainbow*. In 'Hymns in a Man's Life', Lawrence identifies the influence of Nonconformist hymns as having 'penetrated through and through my childhood'. He claims:

> ...in my man's imagination it is just the same. It has been left untouched. With regard to the hymns which had such a profound influence on my childish consciousness, there has been no crystallising out, no dwindling into actuality, no hardening into the commonplace...Now the great and fatal fruit of our civilisation, which is a civilisation based on knowledge, and hostile to experience, is boredom...They are bored because they experience nothing. And they experience nothing because the wonder has gone out of them...Now we come back to the hymns. They live and glisten in the depths of the man's consciousness in undimmed wonder, because they have not been subjected to any criticism or analysis.[16]

Biblical influence on Lawrence's writing is obvious, and has been variously understood. Among the similarities identified are the parallels Julian Moynahan[17] and R.E.

---

[14]D.H. Lawrence, *Women in Love*, edited by David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen, Cambridge Edition of The Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1987), p.486.

[15]p.486.

[16]D.H. Lawrence, 'Hymns in a Man's Life', in *Phoenix II* (London, 1968), pp.597-601, (pp.597, 598, 599).

[17]Julian Moynahan, *The Deed of Life: The Novels and Tales of D.H. Lawrence* (Princeton, New Jersey and London, 1963), p.78.

Pritchard[18] note between the Brangwens and ancient Biblical families, and those Moynahan sees between the rhythms of *The Rainbow* and the King James Bible,[19] the gradual revelation of Biblical associations in 'England My England' identified by David Lodge,[20] Michael Bell's identification of the overlaying of the Bible and *The Rainbow*,[21] and Baldanza's recognition of patterns of Hebrew Old Testament parallelism in the novel.[22] As links between the parallelism of Hebrew verse and Lawrence's repetitive style in *The Rainbow* in Chapter 3 of this thesis will demonstrate, and the quasi-religious language of his philosophy suggests, Nonconformist influence on Lawrence may have begun as 'penetration', but by the time of *The Rainbow*, the influence of the Bible on his repetitive style had become part of his attempt to indicate the nature of the relationships between opposites inherent in *The Rainbow*. In this way, patterns inherent in the Bible become both one of many functional stylistic tools, and one of the characteristic modes in which Lawrence expresses his fictional, and moral, scheme. While repetition may have begun as 'natural to the author', an imprint confirmed by youthful influences, it developed into a variety of interlinked stylistic characteristics, creating a repetitive and functional 'structural skeleton'. In the light of these links, and the evidence of Lawrence's inclusion of repetition in proof revision, it appears that the repetitiveness of his style during this period, particularly in *The Rainbow*, could be of greater importance than has previously been recognised.

Early responses to the repetitiveness of *The Rainbow*

Despite these indications of the potential importance of *The Rainbow's* repetitiveness, early reviewers of the novel universally identified the repetitiveness of its style as a flaw. Lady Ottoline Morrell, to whom Lawrence began to send the typescript of the novel on 8 April 1915, recorded the following impressions of it in her memoirs:

> ...I was shocked in reading it by what seemed to me the slapdash amateurish style in which it was written, and the habit which he then first began of repeating the same word about ten times in a paragraph. I counted the word 'fecund', I think, twelve times on one page. Reading very loose, sloppy writing gives me always a feeling of great discomfort,

---

[18]R.E. Pritchard, *D.H. Lawrence: Body of Darkness* (London, 1971), p.70.

[19]Moynahan, p.70.

[20]David Lodge, *The Modes of Modern Writing: Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature* (Ithaca, 1977), pp.169-170, 170, 173.

[21]Michael Bell, *D.H. Lawrence: Language and Being* (Cambridge, 1992), p.54.

[22]Frank Baldanza, 'D.H. Lawrence's Song of Songs', *Modern Fiction Studies*, 7 (1961), pp.106-114.

almost shame; but there were also passages of such intensity and such passionate beauty that they never leave one's memory. I did not know then what I know now, that it is a description of Lawrence's own life and struggles with his wife, Frieda.[23]

Even the unnamed reviewer in *Standard* (1 October 1915, 3), who penned one of the few complimentary reviews of the novel, identified Lawrence's need for linguistic restraint:

> Not faultless in his choice of language, the author is, however, an artist with words, and he only needs to restrain a slight tendency to too emotional descriptions. Such a book as *The Rainbow* may cause offence and be condemned, for it takes more liberties than English novelists for many years past have claimed, but, whatever its reception, it is an important piece of work. Mr. Lawrence has enough genius to excuse his defiance of all conventions.[24]

Reviews contemporary with *The Rainbow's* publication and composition identify the novel's repetitive style as variously dull and meaningless, as stylistic overworking which mars the themes and otherwise effective style of the novel, as a vehicle invented for expressing the obscene, and as over-theoretical. Alfred Kuttner's letter to Kennerley of 10 November 1914 described the 'psychology' of *The Wedding Ring* as repetitive outwith its own textual boundaries, claiming that it contained 'chunks and chunks of psychological motivation almost literally transferred from "Sons and Lovers"...If you will take the time to reread pages 410 to 458 of the Ms. and compare to the chapter called Derelict in "Sons and Lovers" you will find repetitions almost word for word'.[25] However, as *The Rainbow* progresses, the repetitiveness of the novel's *style* becomes a topic of criticism. Galsworthy's letter of autumn 1915 to J.B. Pinker describes the novel's repetitiveness as both dull and vacuous, whereas Robert Lynd, in *Daily News* (5 October 1915, 6) links its 'prolixity' to an overdeveloped metaphysic:

> Frankly - I think it's aesthetically detestable. Its perfervid futuristic style revolts me. Its reiterations bore me to death. And - worse than all - at the back of its amazing fecundity - what is there?[26]

---

[23]Garthorne-Hardy, *Ottoline: The Early Memoirs of Lady Ottoline Morrell* (London, 1963), p.283.
[24]R.P. Draper, *D.H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage* (London, 1970), p.90.
[25]*Rainbow*, pp.483-484.
[26]Draper, p.108.

It is mainly a prolix account of three generations of sexual crises in the Brangwen family. It is the book of a theory, not a book either of life or of art.[27]

Catherine Carswell, reviewing the novel in the *Glasgow Herald* (4 November 1915, 4) does identify some of Lawrence's main themes and aims in the novel. However, she considers *The Rainbow's* repetitive style as an obstacle to, rather than a means of, their articulation:

> The modern world, according to Mr. Lawrence, is mad and sick and sad because it knows not how to love. Further, in this book at any rate, he does not go. There is no cure offered, nothing but a merciless, almost gloating description of the disease which will be strongly offensive to most readers. It is a pity too that the impassioned declaration is marred by the increasingly mannered idiom which Mr. Lawrence has acquired since the writing of *Sons and Lovers*. The worst manifestations of this at present are a distressing tendency to the repetition of certain words and a curiously vicious rhythm into which he constantly falls in the more emotional passages.[28]

H.M. Swanwick, too, in the *Manchester Guardian* (28 October 1915, 5) claims that *The Rainbow's* repetitive style, which she identifies with artistic overworking, is detrimental to its finer qualities:

> It is not possible to regard such a book as this with indifference. Even the *ennui* with which one reads many of its passages is a very passion of boredom; it is like the horrid *ennui* caused by fixed ideas in delirium; the obsessions of a fever clog, and its odd inconsequences dislocate the story and its telling. Yet there are innumerable fine things, and the style has individuality and poignancy, marred, one cannot but feel, utterly, by crazy iteration and benumbing violence...a passion so narrowed and exaggerated would grow tiresome in one individual; when it runs through three generations of one family and afflicts even persons outside that family, we cry for relief from such madness and long to turn to a world infinitely varied and bracingly sane.
>
> Some emotions and processes are so vividly and imaginatively and beautifully described that it is difficult to understand an artist such as Mr. Lawrence is not being content to leave them so, just done once. He is like the painter who must have his canvas forcibly wrenched from him lest he go on tormenting the paint till it becomes meaningless.[29]

---

[27]p.91.
[28]p.101.
[29]p.98.

In 'A Literary Letter' (*Sphere*, 23 October 1915, lxiii, 104), Clement Shorter similarly described *The Rainbow's* repetitive prose style as excessive, and obstructive to the telling of an otherwise potentially good story. However, he was also concerned with its content:

> There is all the material for a good story, but it is spoilt not only by the crude sex details but by endless repetitions. A girl has eyes 'bright, like shallow water', in one page, and 'pellucid eyes, like shallow water', in the next. We are told of a pair of lovers that a kiss 'knitted them into one fecund nucleus of the fluid darkness' in one sentence, and that it was 'bliss, the nucleolating of the fecund darkness', in the next.[30]

His concern with the novel's crudity (he called the whole novel 'an orgie of sexiness'[31]) is in concurrence with James Douglas's review in *Star* (22 October 1915, 4) which led to the banning of the novel. However, Douglas's criticisms of *The Rainbow's* repetitiveness does not concern its apparent *meaninglessness*, but its expression of offensive subject matter:

> There is not a gleam of humour in the thud of eloquent lubricity. The thud, thud, thud of the hectic phrases is so intolerably wearisome. They pound away like engines, grinding out a dull, monotonous tune of spiritless sensuality...There is no novel in English so utterly lacking in verbal reticence. The subtlety of phrase is enormous, but it is used to express the unspeakable and to hint at the unutterable. The morbidly perverted ingenuity of style is made the vehicle for saying things that ought to be left unthought, let alone unsaid. It is doubtful whether decadence could further go, for the achievements of mastery in the use of words is deliberately set to serve ignoble ends.[32]

Although Douglas recognises the subtlety of Lawrence's linguistic form in *The Rainbow*, he identifies it with the degeneracy which he sees as inherent in the novel as a whole. The repetition inherent in the novel's style, universally recognised by early reviewers, is universally condemned.

Scholarly responses to the repetitiveness of *The Rainbow*

More recent critics in Lawrence scholarship have also identified Lawrence's repetitiveness as a flaw. Indeed, Graham Hough, observing that Lawrence's language at

---

[30]p.97.
[31]p.96.
[32]p.93.

moments of intensity is 'often strained and frantic', dismisses repetitive passages in *The Rainbow* as follows:

> Anyone who wants to make the worst of Lawrence has plenty of material in passages like these. In fact, they do not matter much, for the real work has been done by quite other means - scraps of dialogue, the close imaginative following of changing trains of feeling, a fiery fidelity to the actual which transcends all conventional views of what men, women, and marriage are like. As for physical passion, Lawrence's equivalents for it are often factitious, tortured, and inflated; of course, no one has ever got so near the bone in presenting the experience of two people living together in one house.[33]

However, work on Lawrence's repetitiveness, particularly from the 1970s onwards, has demonstrated the depth of Hough's error. Peter Balbert acknowledges in *D.H. Lawrence and the Psychology of Rhythm* that since the mid-fifties, attempts to separate Lawrence's work into prophetic and aesthetic halves have virtually ceased.[34] This cessation was signalled by Mark Spilka's seminal work *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, in which Spilka argued that all of Lawrence's art was governed by religious ends, and thus should not be divided into 'secular' fiction and 'prophetic' didactic portions.[35] The forum has therefore been opened for debate concerning the relation between Lawrence's 'style' and his philosophy, and it is the recognition of this link which has resulted in the most intelligent criticism of Lawrence's repetitiveness. However, although the best of Lawrence criticism from the mid-fifties forwards stresses the interdependence of *The Rainbow's* substance and its form, the repetitiveness of the novel's style has remained problematic for critics, who generally find it necessary to applaud what Lawrence was attempting in the 'new language' of *The Rainbow*, while lamenting the artistic failures in which apparent prolixity results. Prior to this date, criticism of Lawrence's 'technique' was limited, although much of what was written identified effects of specific stylistic characteristics in a way which continued following the mid-fifties. These characteristics include a recognition of the rhythms of Lawrence's prose, a connection between this (and sometimes images, symbols and language) and the emotions of the characters being portrayed, and the enactment of propositional content.

---

[33]Graham Hough, *The Dark Sun: A Study of D.H. Lawrence*, reprint (Harmondsworth, 1961), p.81.
[34]Peter Balbert, *D.H. Lawrence and the Psychology of Rhythm: The Meaning of 'Form' in The Rainbow* (The Hague, 1974), p.11.
[35]Mark Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence* (London, 1955), p.3.

In 1933, Horace Gregory identified Lawrence's insistent repetition of 'darkness' as present in the early stages of Lawrence's development away from death and towards a more positive philosophy, tracing its development through its association with re-entry into the mother's womb, the sexual act, rebirth, to its emergence as a 'fully realised symbol' in *Look! We Have Come Through!*.[36] However, he did not trace the repetition of the word and its effects *within* any single work. Maud Bodkin (1934)[37] quotes E.M. Forster's description of Lawrence as 'the only living novelist in whom the song predominates', and Forster's identification of the 'irradiation' from within, which he describes as functioning so that 'every colour has a glow and every form a distinctness which could not otherwise be obtained'.[38] Bodkin agrees with Forster's observation that that which is symbolised is unimportant, arguing that such a process serves to illustrate Lawrence's presentation of a specific aspect of experience. She claims that the 'stress of description' present in Birkin's stoning of the moon in *Women in Love*, and in Ursula's salt dance in *The Rainbow*, has significant effects in what it achieves by repeating lexical items from *earlier* literature, thus evoking various associations.[39] Of the *Women in Love* passage, Bodkin argues that subconscious association of 'moon' imagery with woman, and man's anguish of passion which it evokes, perhaps suggested by Shakespearean use of the image, enters into personally gathered memories, 'visions of contending powers in nature that were, for us, magical'. Repetition is therefore not examined *within* the text, but as the effects of repeating *extra-textual* elements. However, Bodkin contrasts the 'quick pulse and rhythm' of Lawrence's sentences, functioning as cumulative description, and describing the 'waves of contending feeling' between the lovers, with the 'reticence' and contained language of similar imagery in *Othello*. Lawrence's rhythm, according to Bodkin, functions to present emotional states. She also argues that Lawrence employs 'reminiscent parody', although asserting that his 'over-emphasis in description' is stylistic self-parody.[40] However, this rather reductive reading is salvaged by Bodkin's observation that:

> ...at the times when the reader finds himself attuned to Lawrence's method, a new world is revealed by it whose distinctive character appears especially in the flow and conflicting play of opposite feelings

---

[36]Horace Gregory, *D.H. Lawrence: Pilgrim of the Apocalypse*, second edition (New York, 1957), pp.32-33.

[37]Maud Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry: Psychological Studies of Imagination*, reprint (London, 1978), p.290.

[38]E.M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (London, 1927), p.185.

[39]Bodkin, pp.290, 291.

[40]pp.291, 292.

shown within and between the characters - such dramas of attraction and repulsion, negation and reassertion of impulse as Lawrence conveys, indirectly, yet so vividly to the senses, through his episode of the lover's stoning of the moon image.[41]

Harry T. Moore (1951) claims that although Lawrence was 'aware that he had a "style"', he 'rarely discussed the technical side of literary matters', thus relegating the importance of the author's repetitiveness to a side issue. Moore claims that Lawrence's 'Foreword to *Women in Love*' explains a great deal about the 'chanting quality of Lawrence's prose that contributes so much to its effectiveness: the blending of syllables, the "slightly modified repetition"', and the resultant musical capture of the emotions', although he fails to develop this claim, preferring to let the Foreword speak for itself. Instead, Moore concentrates on contrasting Lawrence stylistically with Hardy, to demonstrate Lawrence's contemporaneity and Hardy's 'pastness', and argues that Lawrence employed the technique of *symbolisme* in both *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. Moore's important observation, anticipating much later Lawrence criticism, was that in these two novels, theme repeatedly 'matches' language.[42] In 1953, in the jointly edited collection with Hoffman *The Achievement of D.H. Lawrence*, he develops this claim, arguing that in *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, Lawrence's finest writing is a fusion of 'language and symbol, rhythm and image', which is not simply expression 'for its own sake: it is the very substance of experience as the characters involved go from one impassioned crisis to the next, in a swelling progression that takes the reader into new areas of response and understanding', thus extending Bodkin's identification of rhythm as enactive of emotional states. Moore also recognises, in very limited terms, the stylistic enactment of propositional content in the opening pages of *The Rainbow*, and the relationship of the novel's rhythms to the characters', and the empathetic reader's, consciousness.[43]

Spilka's contribution, in 1955, to the study of Lawrence's language did not focus on repetitiveness per se. However, he did identify the grammatical fluidity with which Lawrence employed lexical items, an observation later developed by Albright,[44] Ragussis,[45]

---

[41]p.293.

[42]Harry T. Moore, *The Life and Works of D.H. Lawrence* (New York, 1951), pp.151, 156.

[43]Harry T. Moore, 'The Rainbow', in *The Achievement of D.H. Lawrence*, edited by F.J. Hoffman and Harry T. Moore (Norman, 1953), pp.144-158 (pp.149, 151).

[44]Daniel Albright, *Personality and Impersonality: Lawrence, Woolf and Mann* (Chicago and London, 1978), pp.17-95.

[45]Michael Ragussis, *The Subterfuge of Art: Language and the Romantic Tradition* (Baltimore, 1978).

and Ingram[46] with specific reference to the repetitiveness of *The Rainbow*. Spilka's identification of such fluidity focused on the word 'theos' in *Apocalypse*. He argued that Lawrence's use of the word as 'noun, verb, adjective and adverb, with equal readiness'[47] was the result of the vagueness and impermanence of such a term. The term itself, taken from Cassirer,[48] was identified with the lower limit of language, a force which could appear in any guise before primitive man, and was to be contrasted with the upper limit of language which, Spilka argues, would correspond with 'the Christian version of the infinite, which is static, timeless, and absolute'. Both types of language, Spilka claims, are present in *The Rainbow*, the former traceable in the opening description of the Brangwens on the Marsh, the latter in Will's entry into Lincoln Cathedral.[49]

In *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist* (1955), F.R Leavis, one of Lawrence's earliest champions, recognised Lawrence's remarkable technical innovation, and linked the originality of Lawrence's style to the originality of what he had to convey, identifying the difficulty which readers had with *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* with the importance of the truths which they convey, and the resistance to them of minds clouded by habit. In spite of this, Leavis avoids speaking of Lawrence as a 'stylist', arguing instead that his technical originality was related to the organic wholeness of his vision, his words not used for 'eloquence', but as 'creative poetry' which established 'as an actual presence' that which was essential to Lawrence's theme. Leavis identifies the intensity of Lawrence's style as one of 'extraordinary sensuous immediacy' which is not *simply* sensuous. The organising principle of the novel, Leavis argues, is rhythmic, with 'recurrence along with newness' bringing 'continually a significant recall of what has gone before'.[50] Roger Sale (1959) continues in this vein, relating the form of *The Rainbow* to Lawrence's attempts to break down the 'old stable ego' which he discusses in the famous letter to Garnett of 5 June 1914. Sale identifies in the sentences and paragraphs of the novel the same rhythm as that present between generations, and claims that it is this unity which helps Lawrence reach the depths beneath the 'ego' which he was trying to transcend. Sale identifies the 'simplest declarative sentence', as one of the novelist's main tools in constructing identity, and by which character can be separated from character. In *The Rainbow*, he argues, Lawrence tried to

---

[46]Alan Ingram, *The Language of D.H. Lawrence* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London, 1990).
[47]Spilka, p.15.
[48]Ernst Cassirer, *Language and Myth* (New York, 1946).
[49]Spilka, pp.13, 14, 17-20.
[50]F.R. Leavis, *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist* (London, 1967), pp.21, 24, 27, 29, 112, 122.

break down this process, by methods including non-specificity of time and place (the use of ambiguous tense and metaphor respectively), and inconsistency of time and place. However, in an extraordinary reading of Ursula and Skrebensky's 'salt dance' Sale concludes that the repetitive constructions 'If he could have her, how he would enjoy her!', and 'even in his frenzy, he sought for her mouth with his mouth' were strident and of 'vulgar flatness' respectively, and the employment of 'subtly' and 'madly' in the passage of 'needless vagueness'. 'It is a blessing', Sale concludes, that Lawrence had to cut the (repetitive) construction 'Let me come, let me come', Anton's response, from the American and subsequent editions.[51] Vivas (1960) develops the trend for identifying the emotional and thematic rhythms of *The Rainbow*. He argues that Lawrence sought to present in language the felt quality of experience of the affective life, especially of erotic passion and religious emotion. The language of *The Rainbow*, according to Vivas, was an attempt to present pure experience, but disengaged from substantial individual life. Vivas's most important contribution in this work was the identification of the 'constitutive symbol' in *The Rainbow*, through which, he claims, experience as felt is successfully presented.[52] However, Vivas was less impressed with what he saw as the 'excessive immediacy' of Lawrence's language, claiming that Lawrence was 'obscene' when his linguistic skill betrayed him. Carried away by description, Lawrence's 'excessive immediacy' in *The Rainbow* spoiled what was otherwise a perfect work of art, resulting in the deprivation of the reader's 'proper intransitivity of attention'.[53] Anais Nin (1964) concurs that Lawrence's style is problematic, arguing that this is partly due to Lawrence's transferral of the qualities of poetry to prose, including rhythm. It is often this 'undercurrent of rhythm', she claims, which makes for *careless* writing, although she argues, somewhat impressionistically, that it is by imprecision of outline that Lawrence 'penetrated into the unknown'.[54] Nin asserts that Lawrence's repetitions function to suggest more in the words repeated than is usual:

---

[51]Roger Sale, 'The Narrative Technique of *The Rainbow*', *Modern Fiction Studies* 5 (1959), pp.29-38, (pp.29, 30, 30-32, 36).

[52]Eliseo Vivas, *D.H. Lawrence: The Failure and Triumph of Art* (London, 1960), pp.203, 204. Gavriel Ben-Ephraim, in 1981, concurs that *The Rainbow's* 'repetitive rhythm and metaphorical language...captures the agonisingly slow pace of emotional revelation'. He argues that the rhythm of Will and Anna's corn harvest scene establishes a relation to the animate 'unknown' underlying the events of the novel, and that scenes are repeated (with variation) between the generations. Gavriel Ben-Ephraim, *The Moon's Dominion: Narrative Dichotomy and Female Dominance in Lawrence's Earlier Novels* (London and Toronto, 1981), pp.140, 144, 170.

[53]Vivas, pp.61, 191-192, 61.

[54]Anais Nin, *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*, second edition (London, 1985), pp.61, 67.

> The words almost cease to have a meaning; they have a cadence, a flow, and Lawrence gives in to the cadence. That is why there are so many 'ands'' and *enchainements*, repetitions like choruses, words that are meant to suggest more than their own determinate, formal significance.[55]

Daleski (1965) also identifies this 'distension of language', but describes it as a technical innovation necessitated in order to give expression to the theme of 'carbon' which Lawrence identified in his famous letter to Edward Garnett of 5 June 1914.[56] Daleski views the distension from the opposite end from Nin, describing it along the lines of Edwin Muir's[57] observation that the instincts are concerned only with absolutes, recognising opposites. Thus Lawrence, he claims, must employ 'words like 'terror' and 'horror' and metaphors like 'his Gethsemane and his Triumphal Entry' in order to suggest equivalents for the obscure feelings he is describing'. This, he asserts, is counterproductive, for as soon as the terms employed evoke the strength of feeling intended by Lawrence, the usual associations of such terms are also evoked. *The Rainbow's* repetition, for Daleski, is part of what he called the 'stream of half-consciousness' developed by Lawrence in order to present 'man-being' and 'woman-being' according to his new conception of character. He considers among the successes of this method the evoking of an emotional reality of which characters are themselves, and we ourselves, are only half-aware,[58] and claims that repetition in the novel is a means of conveying the insistence of feelings. He concurs with Leavis' comment in *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist* that the organising principle of the novel is rhythmic.[59] However, although allowing that the novel's repetitive style is effective in isolated passages, he claims that it becomes a stylistic limitation 'the more clamorously it manifests itself as a stock technical device'.[60] Moynahan's slightly earlier book, published in 1963, also traces the originality and difficulty of *The Rainbow's* 'narrative art' to the author's experimentation, in this case, with narrative tone, and with the recurrent employment of three kinds of symbolism; expanding symbols, symbolic characters, and symbolic ritual

---

[55]p.61.
[56]H.M. Daleski, *The Forked Flame: A Study of D.H. Lawrence* (London, 1965), pp.77-78. Ben-Ephraim also identifies the unusual nature of *The Rainbow's* style as being related to the need for a 'carbon technique'. He argues that Lawrence developed a 'stream-of-unconsciousness' compounded of contradictory waves which suggested the 'mysterious inner movements of their instincts, impulses and emotions' while imposing 'neither an ethical nor an intellectual pattern on its characters' (Ben-Ephraim, pp.130-131).
[57]Quoted by Daleski, p.78.
[58]Daleski, pp.78, 77, 78.
[59]Leavis, p.122, Daleski, p.75.
[60]Daleski, p.78.

scenes.[61] Taking three passages from different points of the novel, Moynahan identifies the repetitive style of *The Rainbow* as an attempt to 'articulate the mystery of the inhuman self and the forces to which it responds in a language that can mediate between what is visibly going on, and what is going on "essentially"'. It also functions, in combination with imagery and 'deliberately imprecise metaphors', to indicate 'a larger meaning' in emotional experience, and with vivid imagery in Will and Anna's sheaf-stacking episode to 'enact in their sensual pursuit of and retreat from one another the larger rhythms of the "living cosmos"'. Moynahan identifies this style as having several major causes related to Lawrence's conception of life and art. These include the attempts to enact linguistically the condition which Lawrence describes, to evoke pre-conscious response in the reader, and an attempt to expand the meaning of emotional experiences described, necessarily imprecise due to the shadowiness of the realm being dealt with. This latter is compounded by the employment of the passive voice and word play, which transfers agency from the protagonists to some 'invisible, transcendant agency'. In addition, Lawrence's employment of religious similes and metaphors on page 158 of 'Anna Victrix' results in a lack of clarity regarding the two figures described, and, again, causality lies not with the characters, but with an invisible agent.[62] The effects on language of this experimentation, Moynahan argues, is extreme:

> The strain on language is considerable and the strain on the reader
> can be unconscionable when passages of this sort continue too long and
> are not played off against dramatic scenes.[63]

Moynahan identifies a parallel between the Brangwens and ancient Biblical families such as 'the clan of Noah or Abraham which carried God's promise in its table of genealogy'. He traces this parallel to three similarities, the 'succession of familial generations which the novel describes, its theme of continuity through change, its embodiment of the notion that in ordinary, everyday experience the individual is called to

---

[61]Moynahan, p.49. Moynahan identifies the 'expanding symbols' of the novel as the arch, the rainbow and the cathedral, which 'compose an elaborate structure of meanings in themselves' (p.53), and are related to the structural design of the novel. 'Symbolic characters', according to Moynahan, are those in the third generation of the novel who function 'almost as signposts pointing directions which the questing heroine must become aware of if she is to attain in her own way to "the perpetual wonder of transfiguration"' (p.59). 'Ritual scenes' are those in which the 'ultimate relation of the 'essential' man or woman - usually it is a woman - to what Lawrence calls the "unknown"' is dramatised, 'frequently in solemn ceremonial gesture and in a ceremonious prose' (p.63).
[62]pp.53, 52, 65, 51-52, 52, 52-53.
[63]p.53.

work out his salvation'. In addition, he claims that the rhythms of *The Rainbow's* prose recall those of the King James Bible,[64] and (quoting Auerbach on Biblical style), that there are similarities between the narrative quality of the novel and the Bible.[65] Like the narrative qualities of the Old Testament stories which Auerbach identified, Moynahan argues, the realms of the sublime and the everyday are inseparable and unseparated in *The Rainbow*. The former realm occurs in the setting of the latter, and daily life is undermined by the promise from the sublime realm. The characters in the Bible, according to Auerbach, are involved simultaneously in both the daily realm, and in evolving relationship to God, and are thus multi-layered, the style having both foregrounded and backgrounded qualities. However, Moynahan is careful not to develop the Biblical analogy too far, making a distinction between the 'will of life' inherent in Lawrence's doctrine and that of God in the Judaeo-Christian tradition.[66]

In 1966, Keith Sagar also identified Lawrence's 'new language' in *The Rainbow*, and the parallels between this work and the Bible. He claimed that *The Rainbow's* 'new language' was the result of Lawrence's rigorous attempts to 'come out of the snail-house of preconceived form; to refuse to imitate; to abandon all 'rules of construction' and let the content give birth to its own unique formal 'characteristics'', although Sagar observes that this 'new language sometimes degenerates into jargon'. The rhythm of *The Rainbow's* prose is not traced by Sagar to the King James Bible, but to the rhythms of nature which correspond to and interact with the Brangwens' blood. Sagar recognises the debt which the language in the novel owes to the Bible, and the associations from both the Bible and the rest of the novel which this language carries, while also vividly presenting:

> ...real life, together with his own deep perception of inner realities and subtle relationships, so that the total presentation of the courtship of Tom and Lydia, the childhood of Anna, her honeymoon, the childhood and adolescence of Ursula, is more real than anything we experience in the actual world except in the rarest moments.[67]

In 1971, Pritchard again acknowledges Lawrence's debt to the Bible, although in this case, in the parallels drawn between *The Rainbow's* characters, and those of the Old Testament. He identifies Lawrence's 'story-method' as one of 'repetition with variation', to

---

[64]pp.69, 70.
[65]E. Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, translated by Willard Trask (Princeton, 1953), pp.12-13, 22-23.
[66]Moynahan, p.70.
[67]Keith Sagar, *The Art of D.H. Lawrence* (Cambridge, 1966), pp.44, 43, 44, 45, 49, 71.

which Lawrence's justification of *Women in Love's* repetitiveness in the Foreword to that novel is equally relevant. The close relationship between style and content, he claims, following Sale, is one of the ways in which the 'old stable ego' is broken down, so that individual characters and experiences are dispersed 'in the analytic presentation of the central, recurrent experience'.[68] As will be demonstrated in Chapter 3, the employment of similar repetitive frameworks for all three generations indicates that all are subject to the same underlying forces. It is under pressure from these forces, like the carbon which Lawrence identifies in his letter to Garnett of 5 June 1914, that each character and generation differs, differences which are reflected in Lawrence's repetitive syntax. According to Pritchard, recurrent symbols and images, along with repeated phrases, function with inspecificity of time and place and their setting in passages which present impersonalised feelings to give a sense of the unconscious and impersonal nature of these forces. Objective, external reality is, in this way, submerged into the subjective. Pritchard, extending Vivas' work, identifies *The Rainbow's* repetitiveness as affective rather than informative, and claims that Lawrence's use of language in this way implies several thematically significant points. The apparently unnecessary repetition of connectives serves to imply relationship between otherwise unconnected events and experiences, and the ambiguous employment of conditionals and imperatives serves to blur the distinction between conscious volition, and impersonal, unconscious compulsion.[69]

Balbert's book *D.H. Lawrence and the Psychology of Rhythm* signalled a new direction in the examination of *The Rainbow's* repetitiveness by identifying Lawrence's lexical and syntactic repetition as functional. Balbert agrees that *The Rainbow* employs 'repetition with variation', although he associates this with its rhythm, claiming (like Leavis and Daleski) that this makes for a unifying order. He argues that implicit in the concern about a 'specific and integrated analysis of form and content in Lawrence's fiction' is 'the widespread belief that Lawrence at his most repetitious moments, in his moods of heated insistence on particular phrases, symbols, or advice, has lost control of his 'art'', a belief which, Balbert claimed, occasionally holds true. However, Balbert argues that if intelligent revisionist Lawrence criticism were to be taken to its conclusion, it should be possible to prove specific connections between Lawrence's vision of life and an individual novel, or between 'the principles of his psychology and the rhythmic patterns of verbal, symbolic and

---

[68]Pritchard, pp.70, 67.
[69]pp.67.

broadly structural repetition in the novel itself'.[70] Balbert argues, against Lawrence himself, and following Daleski,[71] that it is possible that Lawrence's doctrine antedates both fiction and essays, and is expressed in two different literary forms.[72] He claims that the repetitive rhythm of *The Rainbow* is part of Lawrence's vision of life, and is the form which must be taken if it is to remain true to it. There is repetition because Lawrence 'strives to recognise patterns in the creative flux', and:

> ...because certain patterns naturally appear in life with little variation, the rhythm of Lawrence's prose and psychology has the truthful, (and hence) frequently repetitive quality of similar sounds and similar truths in very similar situations.[73]

Unlike many of the preceding critics discussed, Balbert identifies Lawrence's lexical and syntactic repetition, and recognises it as *functional*. In the case of syntactic repetition, Balbert observes that the final sentence of 'Wedding at the Marsh' retains the syntactical rhythm of the description in the church when Anna and Will first meet, although he fails to identify the lexical cohesion also present:[74]

> And even as the hymn rolled on, they ceased to hear it.[75]
> ..still the hymn rolled on, and still she laughed.[76]

The function of this repetition, Balbert claims, is to indicate that Will and Anna's relationship has begun its circular motion. He also observes that syntactic repetition can function enactively, the repetitive style structured around increasing sentence length serving to pulse forward, increase the tempo, and work towards the climax of character experience. However, Balbert's identification of structural and lexical repetition only goes so far. He interprets Lawrence's repeated repetition of the lexical item 'free' following Tom's encounter with a prostitute[77] only in terms of the bondage Lawrence describes in his letter to Henry Savage of 2 December 1913, where Lawrence writes:

---

[70]Balbert, pp.13, 15, 12.
[71]Daleski, pp.18-19.
[72]Balbert, p.9.
[73]p.25.
[74]p.59.
[75]*Rainbow*, p.133.
[76]p.103.
[77]Balbert, pp.69, 32-35.

> ...it is the hardest thing in life to get one's soul and body satisfied
> from a woman so that one is free from oneself.[78]

Balbert also connects the reiteration of 'separate' in the third generation of the novel with metaphors of freedom, claiming that its frequency makes it a 'fixed symbol'. Even when identifying 'Anna Victrix' as the chapter which is the most sustained example of the rhythmic stylistic use of modified repetition, he concentrates rather on the episodes and themes reiterated than the words.[79] As will be demonstrated in this thesis, Lawrence's lexical repetitions in *The Rainbow* are infinitely more subtle, varied and functional than Balbert suggests, yet his examinations present an important stage in the growing recognition that Lawrence's stylistic repetitions, both syntactic and lexical, have more functional significance than has been generally recognised.

Some useful work in the area of functional lexical and syntactic repetition has already been done. In 1961, Frank Baldanza identified the influence of the Bible on Lawrence's style, 'particularly in his simple diction, in the short periods, and in the co-ordination of clauses, often simply with commas as connectives'.[80] Baldanza identifies in *The Rainbow* the sorts of parallelisms of construction which the Biblical scholars Bishop Lowth and George Buchanan Gray[81], and both James Kugel and Adele Berlin,[82] identified as present in the Old Testament. He claims that Lawrence, like many romantics [sic], came up with a 'polarised dichotomy' when given a subject for meditation, and argues that Lawrence's thought, influenced by the Biblical prosody which he absorbed in his youth, consisted of a 'rhythmic interplay between poles'. Thus the parallelism inherent in Hebrew poetry was exactly the stylistic vehicle Lawrence needed for the expression of his thought.[83] However, Baldanza does not develop his argument to include the effects achieved by Biblical, and non-Biblical, parallelism. In this thesis, the development of parallelism through the compositional process will be examined, and its relationship to similar developing structures

---

[78]*Letters ii*, p.115.
[79]Balbert, pp.84-91, 63-64.
[80]Baldanza, p.107.
[81]R. Lowth, *Isiaah, A New Translation, with a Preliminary Dissertation and Notes Critical, Philological and Explanatory* (Edinburgh, 1807), and George Buchanan Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry Considered with Special Reference to the Criticism and Interpretation of the Old Testament* (London, New York, Toronto, 1915). Baldanza does not mention the work of S.R. Driver, whose study, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York, 1920), is included in the discussion of Biblical parallelism scholarship in Chapter 3.
[82]J.L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*, (New Haven and London, 1981), Adele Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington, 1985).
[83]Baldanza, pp.113, 113-114.

in the essays of the period discussed. It will be demonstrated in Chapter 3 that such structures function, along with non-Biblical parallelism, to suggest the varying relationships between opposing forces and characters, which, in *The Rainbow*, provide a framework against which each generation can be evaluated. By tracing the development of Lawrence's parallel framework towards that employed in *The Rainbow*, it will be shown that *Study of Thomas Hardy* provided a more rigorous 'structural skeleton' than has previously been identified. Haruhide Mori, in 1964, concentrates more on *lexical* repetition in *The Rainbow*, arguing that the presence of verbal threads in the novel identifies not merely repetition with variation, but the cumulative overlap of repeated lexical items which evoke, then confirm associations, with imagery in the novel. Images in *The Rainbow*, Mori argues, by this process gradually change their connotation, and develop into other ones, with other meanings, thus 'going through an elastic and rhythmic expansion closely connected with the vicissitudes of the characters' lives'.[84] However, Mori takes no account of this phenomenon of development through the revision process, an omission which will be rectified in this thesis. David Lodge too, in 1977, presented what is, in parts, one of the most impressive recent accounts of the functionalism of Lawrence's repetitiveness, although his focus is on *Women in Love* and 'England My England'. He claims that Lawrence wrote 'throughout his career with unrestrained (and often uncontrolled) lyrical or prophetic exuberance' (a claim which can be refuted by examination of Lawrence's letters, or his revision processes) and he contrasts Lawrence with Joyce in terms of their style:

> Similarity (and contrast) never, in Lawrence, control the development of the discourse as in the 'mythical method' of *Ulysses* or *The Waste Land*. Continuity was more important to Lawrence than irony. 'Flow' was one of his favourite words to express the quality he looked for in authentic living and authentic writing.[85]

Lodge argues that Lawrence's concern with 'flow' meant that his style needed to be 'essentially metonymic in structure...though the meanings he groped for could only be expressed metaphorically', and claims that both rhythmical and lexical repetition is exploited by Lawrence 'to shift an ostensibly metonymic style in the direction of metaphor'. He identifies two kinds of repetition in *Women in Love*, which this thesis will demonstrate as also present, with differing effects, in *The Rainbow*; lexical repetition, and

---

[84]Haruhide Mori, 'Lawrence's Imagistic Development in *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*', *E.L.H.*, 31 (1964), pp.460-81 (pp.469-470).
[85]Lodge, p.160.

rhythmical repetition produced by 'syntactical parallelism'. Lodge extends Balbert's examination of repeated lexical items by tracing the employments of the lexical item 'soft' in the struggle between Gerald and his horse in *Women in Love*, demonstrating how the use of the word both referentially and metaphorically serves to imply equations between different relationships in the passage, and that its use in combination with other lexical items serves to evoke broader associations in the novel. The result is a style 'forwarded by contiguity', as 'each clause or phrase takes its impetus from an item in the preceding one, the repeated words knitting the units together on the pattern of Ab Bc Cd De etc.'. This, Lodge claims, does not result in the progressive inclusion of new facts, but the expansion of significance of the same facts, with the passage declining in referential presentation, and increasing in psychological, as metaphorical meaning accumulates. As this thesis will demonstrate, stylistic patterning in *The Rainbow* is far more complex, and more functional, than Lodge suggests. In Lawrence's 'England My England', Lodge also observes the gradual revelation of Biblical associations in the story, particularly in the juxtaposition of metaphors which evoke Biblical imagery by accumulated association. These, in the varying explicitness of Biblical reference which occurs in the story, serve to render as definite Biblical links previously suggested, through 'puns, clichés and progressive shifts of meaning'.[86]

From work on Lawrence's lexical fluidity, work concerned with his grammatical fluidity developed. Daniel Albright's impressive work on Lawrence's language in 1978 claimed that Lawrence's use of language was closely related to the downward search for the first world, or the first language. Although Albright asserts that Lawrence had a distrust of the verbal prior to *Women in Love*, he argues that in *The Rainbow* Lawrence addressed the problem of certain kinds of rhetoric (for example, passages of extreme intensity) for which ordinary syntax, divided into verbs and nouns etc., was not suitable. The focus of his examination was repetition. Albright demonstrates, using Ursula and Skrebensky's 'salt-dance' as evidence, that the lexical item 'salt' moves between both nominal and adjectival usage, acting as what he calls a 'magnetic verbal unit' which 'attaches itself and then whirls away'.[87] He observes:

> Ursula is salt, a salt-burning body that burns like a fierce salt, a brilliance and brilliant, a corroding corrosive that causes corrosion. Here we have English that is approaching the condition of the real language,

---

[86]pp.161, 163, 169-170, 170, 173.
[87]Albright, pp.55, 56.

homogenous, in which the interchangeability of all elements is proved by taking simple sentence forms and exhausting the permutations of a few words, in which the absolute uniqueness of the rhetorical subject is proved by the use of that haunting twentieth-century device, the reflexive simile: salt is like salt, Ursula is like Ursula, iron is like iron, Skrebensky is like Skrebensky. The classical apparatus of simile is used for the indication of resemblance, that is, difference; here, no definition of the thing is possible, except the thing itself. The structure is attenuating, vanishing, into simple identities, a double nexus. Almost the entire content of this paragraph, and the subsequent ones could be expressed as the following:

> Ursula-brilliant-cold-salt-burning-corrosive
> Skrebensky-iron-dissolved-burned-corroded

In the real grammar of the real language, the sole distinction is between present participle and past participle, the actor and the acted-upon; all other structures only represent the recalcitrance of fallen English. The participle is a favourite form of Lawrence's, and we can see its usefulness, straddling between noun and verb, dynamically linking presumed subject and presumed object without requiring close definition of either. Real language is of course highly dynamic, fluctuant, a speech reborn with each experience; as Ezra Pound says, In the beginning was the Verb.[88]

An equally impressive piece of work from the same year, which deals specifically with Lawrence's repetitiveness, is Michael Ragussis' *The Subterfuge of Art: Language and the Romantic Tradition*. Ragussis writes of *Women in Love*, and identifies as 'the basic ironic characteristic of language' in the novel its 'repetition of repetitions', by Birkin and Ursula despite their attempted avoidance of it, and by Gerald and Gudrun, Winifred and Loerke. Ragussis argues that a central, prominent new vocabulary is developed by Birkin in the novel, and that this vocabulary is repeatedly linked with its 'ironic counterparts', thus linking Birkin's attempts at escape with that which they *attempt* to escape. It is a vocabulary which, following Lodge's observations, accretes new meaning - this meaning sometimes being antithetical to that already established, and the discrimination between which becomes increasingly complex as consistent meanings are denied, and as clear distinctions between characters prevented.[89] It is, he argues:

> ...a perfect example of the pure contextuality of words, where each word helps define the other and where definition is defined by the word

---

[88]p.56.
[89]Ragussis, pp.178, 179-180.

it is defining. It is like looking up a word in the dictionary, and then having to look up a central word in the definition, ad infinitum.[90]

Ragussis also notes the contradictory and antithetical uses of words with the same etymology in the novel, and the manner in which words are defined both by their context and the associations raised by their combination. The language questioned is both that of conventional usage, and that specific to the world of *Women in Love*. The constant redefinition of words in the novel, Ragussis argues, is related to the theme of language as it is treated in the novel, setting up 'fluidity of meaning' between the lexical items 'will' and 'power', for example, which is itself related to Birkin's imagined reformulation of standard language usage, 'with nouns like verbs and verbs like nouns'. Lawrence, he argues, is identifying the difference between the theory and practice of language.[91] John Russell, also in 1978, identified several characteristics of Lawrence's stylistic repetitiveness in *The Lost Girl* and *Kangaroo*. These include the starting of new sentences with co-ordinate conjunctions and the employment of sentence fragments (usually originating from the repetition of key words), both of which function to connect sentences without disrupting paragraph rhythm and to either intensify content, or dismiss it. Russell acknowledges that Lawrence's lexical repetitions often involve a shifting in sense, with the repeated item building from its previous employment, and argues that the doubled conjunctions (particularly the use of conjunctive adverbs) which he tended to employ as headwords serve to 'suggest flow without retaining their logical properties of charting new direction', consonant with Lawrence's concern with the 'unstable ego'. Lawrence's repetitions, he argues, have two main opposing features; the continual shifting which maintains flow, and the establishment of fixed emphasis, often achieved by inversion, although modulation of diction also occurs to change the class or degree of a word. He also identifies the opposition Lawrence creates between 'a dialectical class of words...and their emotional counterparts' and Lawrence's 'deja vu' constructions - those which 'are esoteric and at the same time assumed to be recognisable' and which 'amount to a form of inveigling'.[92]

Also in 1978, Diane S. Bonds provided a deconstructive examination of Lawrence's language. She identified a tension between two different models of language (and of the self) in his work. The former, she claimed, was caused by the incongruity between an

---

[90]p.195.

[91]pp.182-183, 192.

[92]John Russell, *Style in Modern British Fiction: Studies in Joyce, Lawrence, Forster, Lewis and Green* (Baltimore and London, 1978), pp.43-48 (pp.44, 46-47,49, 44, 58-59, 62-69, 70, 76, 80-82.

organic view of language, and the recognition that the linguistic system of rules and signs can be restrictive and confining, resulting in the simultaneous liberation of the self from unconscious to conscious being, and its imprisonment.[93] With reference to repetition, Bonds argues that the word 'articulate' in *The Rainbow* assumes importance as its repetitions suggest a way of measuring the generations against each other, and that the word itself is divided to suggest contrasting interpretations.[94] Similarly, the equivocal employment of 'reality', and contradictions and paradoxes employed create instability and obscurity, while the succession of paradoxes at the end of Chapter 3 serve to undermine the triumphant assertions made regarding Tom and Lydia's achievement of an 'Absolute'.[95] She argues:

> We should not underestimate Lawrence's sensitivity to double or multiple meanings, nor should we ignore the force of punning in his text.[96]

Bonds recognises that in *The Rainbow*, metaphors introduced are either realised in the experiences of characters, or literalised in episodes.[97] Of *Women in Love*, she argues that Lawrence's episodic and lexical repetitions serve to reveal both the contrasts between characters by the different meanings that repetitions have in different contexts, and to oscillate between opposing poles.[98] These polarities tend to collapse when examined, revealing a series of meanings, and polarities, which shade into each other, while multiple meanings are accreted through repetition.[99] Verbal repetition serves both to identify the differential nature of language and the contextuality of words, and to link characters, either by shared vocabulary, or through characters' differing relations to the same word.[100]

In 1982, Walter Nash identifies in 'Odour of Chrysanthemums' the intermeshing of planes of articulation and information, described respectively as schemes of cohesion and design in the text more or less equivalent to the stanzaic scheme of a poem, and the superimposition of characterisation and symbolism on the articulatory frame. Nash argues that in this story, stylistic device is relevant to structural intention, and his examples of this include symmetries of plot (with the scene moving from the railway line to the house, to the

---

[93]Diane S. Bonds, *Language and the Self in D.H. Lawrence*, Studies in Modern Literature 68, reprint (London, 1987), p.7.
[94]p.54.
[95]p.66-70.
[96]p.55.
[97]pp.59, 61.
[98]pp.79-80, 93.
[99]p.81, 82.
[100]pp.93, 96-97, 99-100.

garden where the central encounter takes place, and from the garden back to the house and railway line), shifts in perspective (mainly marked by adjuncts indicating position and direction, whose position in respective sentences is relevant in the structure of the passage), and the intermeshing of description and direct speech, functioning to construct relationships between the characters and their environment. In addition, Nash argues, a series of shifts in syntax and vocabulary function to bring both characters and reader into closer proximity, and there is alternation of modifiers as carriers of evaluative description, the adjuncts interlocking three aspects of Elizabeth Bates' being, and being arranged in a patterned scheme punctuated by time adjuncts. Nash also identifies parallelism in descriptions, both grammatical, and between reflexive constructions and descriptive statements. In Chapter 2, I will identify this feature as present both in 'The White Stocking', collected with 'Odour of Chrysanthemums' in *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories* of 1914, and *Sons and Lovers*, anticipating the more complex functional parallelism which will be identified, in Chapter 3, as present in *The Rainbow*.[101] Patterns of collocation including metaphorical and non-metaphorical elements are also identified, similar to those identified in 'England My England' by Lodge. In Chapter 5 of this thesis, the complex and subtle lexical chains cohesive by collocation in *The Rainbow* will be identified, demonstrating that Lawrence's repetitiveness in this novel has even more subtle implications, simultaneously thematic and functional, than have previously been identified.

Allan Ingram (1990) has produced the most stylistically focused recent work on the effects achieved by Lawrence's idiosyncratic prose style(s), of which repetition is a part. Ingram follows and develops Sale and others by identifying the 'slightly modified repetition' which Lawrence speaks of in the 'Foreword to *Women in Love*' as characteristic of Lawrence's prose when he is writing of emotional excitement. He notes that phrases, single words and grammatical structures within sentences in *Women in Love* are repeated, moving from detached observation to character perception, and apparently excessive near-synonymy is employed. Ingram argues that repetition of lexical items in varying sentence constructions in *The Rainbow* can function to enact increasing emotional uplift, either by introducing sentences whose internal construction serves to identify stages of the experience, or by the promotion and demotion of lexical items between different grammatical categories between sentences. By the vocabulary selected, the variety of

---

[101]Walter Nash, 'On a Passage from Lawrence's 'Odour of Chrysanthemums', in *Language and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Stylistics*, edited by Ronald Carter, Aspects of English (London, 1982), pp.101-120 (pp.101, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109).

handling of nominal and verbal groups, including fluidity between nominal and verbal forms, and the prose rhythms resulting from such variety, Ingram claims, Lawrence could present greater focus on feelings involved in an action rather than the action itself, and reflect the sense of a passage in its construction. Repetition, he claims, serves to slow the pace of sentences, which themselves alternate in length, and have a variety of clauses and phrases, all of which combine to form characteristic prose rhythms. Such rhythmic variety, according to Ingram, sustains mood and emotion, and is achieved by the playing of nominal and verbal groups against each other in sentences, the retention of fluidity between nouns, verbs and adjectives, and balancing between short and long sentences. In his concentration on *The Rainbow* specifically, Ingram identifies Lawrence's use of language variously as identifying social position and character attitude through repetition, lexical selection and linguistic structures, as enacting through co-ordination the 'sense of a slow but relentless force gradually moving through the phases of its fulfilment' in the opening pages of the novel, and as enacting character experience, achieved most effectively when the character is reasonably articulate. Ingram notes that the novel is concerned largely with the issues of articulacy and inarticulacy, and that the truths which it tells can be told only through a language which has various modes, and which is told through various voices. Of repetition specifically in *The Rainbow*, Ingram made two assertions. The first of these is his assertion that the repetition in the flood scene of 'Tom' by Lydia is matched by the more varied repetition of 'water' which, he claims, is employed 'as if the swirling uncontrolled water will enter every sentence, occupy every grammatical position', leaving Lydia's cry as the only expression of articulacy, encompassing the emotions of a lifetime, and of the marriages of the first two generations. This observation is fine, as far as it goes, but as this thesis will demonstrate, the repetition of lexical items in the novel functions consistently to have much more specific effects which must be analysed far less impressionistically. Ingram's second observation, regarding the closing paragraph of the novel, is less flattering, claiming that the language here is laboured, with Lawrence articulating the experience of Ursula in language which she cannot yet aspire to.[102] Ingram's criticism of the passage is peculiar, particularly as it employs, rather successfully, many of the structures which he had praised elsewhere in the novel, and in Lawrence's other fictional work. However, what he has produced is a work which identifies, importantly, the grammatical mobility in Lawrence's lexical repetitions.

---

[102]Ingram, pp.113-114, 8-9, 63, 64, 65, 88-92, 120, 126, 125, 133, 136.

However, perhaps the most thorough, and complex, recent examination of Lawrence's language has been Michael Bell's (1992). Of the syntactic construction of *The Rainbow*, Bell writes:

> ...the longer sentences are commonly constructed on an additive, or paratactic, principle which refuses the organising implication of a complex, hierarchical syntax. In this way, short sense units are allowed to react directly upon each other in the way we expect individual words to do. This is the immediately stylistic correlative of that jostling of the absolute and the relative which lies at the heart of Lawrence's vision of human reality.[103]

Bell is correct in both identifying the functional effects of Lawrence's sentence construction, and the paratactic forms which this takes. He is correct also that such stylistic characteristics are directly related to Lawrence's idiosyncratic doctrine. However, as this thesis will demonstrate, the repetitiveness of *The Rainbow's* style(s) is more fine-grained than even Bell suggests, and all aspects of it can be related directly to Lawrence's developing philosophy. Bell observes that *The Rainbow* is the first of Lawrence's works in which his impersonal 'metaphysic' was given 'comprehensive and central expression', and argues that Lawrence recognised two problems in his formulation of a 'new language', that of getting it right for his purpose, and that of getting it understood. The language of *The Rainbow*, he argues, teaches the reader how it is to be read. Like preceding critics, Bell recognises the technical problems which Lawrence's 'new language' raised for the author; for example, the reaching of 'feeling', or the description of objects, through an opaque, second order system which has only an oblique relation to what it describes. Lawrence's 'new language', he argues, was suitable for both these purposes, concerned, as it was, with presenting movements of, rather than ideas about feeling (by 'deliberately dissolv[ing] semantic units into emotional encounters') and with giving the impersonal conception of the narrative an appropriate ontological grounding (presenting the world through 'contours of feeling', and dissolving distinctions between the personal and impersonal, self and the world[104]). In Lawrence's 'rhythmic prose', Bell claims:

> ...conceptual terms become fluid elements to be repeated, reversed, emphasised, and subjectivised until their 'meaning' can only be understood through the given moment of feeling.[105]

---

[103]Bell, p.63.
[104]pp.52, 53, 57, 53, 57.
[105]p.53.

In this thesis, it will be argued that the repetition and emphasis of lexical items (and conceptual terms) in *The Rainbow* also has specific effects with relation not to 'feeling', but to the ideas developing in Lawrence's doctrine. Bell identifies two main points regarding the language of *The Rainbow* which are relevant to the arguments advanced in this thesis, although his focus is more philosophical than the linguistic approach favoured here. He argues that the narrative language of the novel has an 'ontological subtlety', and that several terms in it are subjected to emotional and ontological pressure or dissolution, in a manner which is designed to make clear the 'ontological implication of the narrative'. Among these terms are 'reality', 'knowledge', and 'presence', which occur both in the contexts of particular episodes, and also in the larger discourse, focusing the significance of 'characteristic emotional structures'. Bell argues that the function of these terms is twofold; to 'focus ontological structure', and to 'invest these, in turn, with prophetic significance'. He observes, astutely, that Lawrence both repeatedly employs these terms in 'contradictory clusters', the result of which is the challenging, modification, or reversal of their 'normal' meaning, or uses them singly, but with an 'odd inflection which leads us to construct its significance anew' in the context, and argues that the effects of these techniques is 'progressively to impart a constitutively psychological factor into the existential claims of these terms'.[106] For example, in the two following extracts, taken from Bell, the repetition of 'know' in the first instance, and 'reality' in the second, has specific effects. In the first, Bell claims, a complex recognition about the *nature* of knowledge in human relationships is achieved by the apparent contradiction which the repeated employment of the lexical item presents:

> He did not know her any better, any more precisely, now that he knew her altogether.[107]

In the second, Bell claims, 'reality' is given two directly opposed meanings within a brief space:

> She had passed by. He felt as if he were walking again in a far world, not Cossethay, a far world, the fragile reality. He went on, quiet, suspended, rarefied. He could not bear to think or speak, nor make any sound or sign, nor changed his fixed notion. He could scarcely bear to

---

[106]pp.52, 54, 73.
[107]*Rainbow*, p.91.

think of her face. He moved within the knowledge of her, in the world that was beyond reality.[108]

The effect of Lawrence's threading of 'philosophical vocabulary in this way through the anti-analytic medium of his narrative language', he argues, is the clear focusing of the Brangwen experience as a 'specific mode of Being in the world'. The indeterminacy of language in *The Rainbow*, according to Bell, is a peculiar form of precision, in which there is a displacement of expected logical shapings. The 'action' of the novel is present 'enactively' in the language of the novel from the beginning; Bell also observes the heaviness of alliteration in the opening pages of the novel as suggesting the palpable effect of the oppressiveness which the Marsh women feel. However, this enactment functions not only as semantic *enforcement*, but can also run against it, allowing the words to be understood as more than they are 'saying'.[109] Bell, like Sagar, Pritchard and Baldanza, identifies the Biblical parallels with the novel. He claims that *The Rainbow* is 'fraught with background', that 'background' being the Bible, and that the novel defines itself as a specific *kind* of book which is to be read neither as the Bible is, nor as realist fiction. By overlaying the two, he asserted, Lawrence highlights 'significances' which would be lost if either were taken alone. By such a method, Bell argued, Lawrence presented the reader with an existential choice as to the whole order of significance on which the rhetoric of the book depends, and the language of religion employed serves to emphasise the participatory and responsive aspect of all utterance which is concerned with fundamental values, or fundamental meanings.[110] The examination of Biblical parallels in this thesis will be concerned more with the parallel*ism* which Baldanza identified as present than with Bell's approach. However, the significance of the novel's developing parallelism, its relationship to that of the essays of the period and the Bible, and the effects which this creates will be discussed in a way which Balbert did not attempt.

Revision and *The Rainbow*

Lawrence's processes of revision have also been a matter of some critical debate. In 1932, Aldous Huxley provided one of the earliest examples of the mistake which was to plague criticism of Lawrence's compositional process. Huxley claimed:

---

[108]p.29.
[109]Bell, pp.73-74, 64, 77-78, 87, 78.
[110]pp.54, 55.

It was characteristic of him that he hardly ever corrected or patched what he had written. I have often heard him say, indeed, that he was incapable of correcting. If he was dissatisfied with what he had written, he did not, as most authors do, file, clip, insert, transpose; he re-wrote. In other words, he gave the *daimon* another chance to say what it wanted to say...He was determined that all he wanted to say should spring direct from the mysterious, irrational source of power within him. The conscious intellect should never be allowed to come and impose, after the event, its abstract pattern of perfection.[111]

Twenty three years later, F.R. Leavis' claim regarding the composition of *The Rainbow* was similarly focused:

It is plain from the letters and other sources that he went forward rapidly once he had started on an enterprise, writing long stretches in remarkably little time as the creative flow carried him on. The first draft written, he revised, not by correcting locally or re-working parts, but by re-writing the whole with the same kind of creative *elan* as had gone to the earlier version (and this he habitually did yet again). His concern clearly was that the whole of himself should be engaged; that the book in its completeness should come from the living being.[112]

Unfortunately, almost all observations made in such a vein are not entirely accurate, and almost all have misled later scholars. It is true that Lawrence's rewritings are largely part of an organic whole. However, the letters which chart the composition of *The Rainbow* from its earliest stages to its publication present a catalogue of Lawrence's frustrations, slow work, and misleading optimism, and his working through of, or reference to, relevant themes in discussion with friends.[113]

Despite Lawrence's obvious struggles, his confidence in the importance of the work never wavers. Having begun *The Sisters* in mid-March 1913, by 22nd he had written forty six pages, by 5 April one hundred and ten, and by 23rd of the same month, one hundred and forty five. Already, his surprise at the strange form which the novel was taking was

---

[111]D.H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, edited by Aldous Huxley (Melbourne, London, Toronto, 1932), p. xvii. Horace Gregory makes the same mistake, claiming that Lawrence's 'attempts to reshape a single paragraph or a line were not successful' (p.17). In 'The Revisions to the Second Generation of *The Rainbow*', *Review of English Studies* 27 (1976), pp.277-295 (p.277), Charles Ross notes that although this may be true of works written contemporary with Huxley's friendship with Lawrence, it is not true of *The Rainbow*.

[112]Leavis, p.28.

[113]Particularly Edward Garnett (*Letters II*, pp.142-143, 164-166, 182-183), Henry Savage (pp.72-74, 94-96, 100-102, 113-117, 129-130, 137-138), Arthur MacLeod (pp.163, 180-181), Thomas Dunlop (pp.191-192) Gordon Campbell (pp.218-219, 246-250, 300-302), Lady Ottoline Morrell (pp.263, 296-299, 315, 319), E.M. Forster (pp.265-267, 275-276) and Bertrand Russell (pp.282-286, 294-295).

apparent. On 17 May, Lawrence wrote to Edward Garnett that this draft was merely 'the first crude fermenting of the book. I'll make it into art now',[114] and although on 1 June, at two hundred and eighty three pages, Lawrence claimed that he was 'nearly finished', it was to be over two years later that the novel, in a completely different form, would be published. By 24 August, Lawrence had made 'two false starts already' to the second version of *The Sisters*. Already, the novel appears to have been quite different from its predecessor, as do Lawrence's concerns in writing it. On 4 September, Lawrence wrote to Garnett that the new novel had a 'quite new beginning - a new basis altogether', and on 15 September, having written a hundred pages, he described it as 'queer. It is rather fine', and expressed his hope to have it completed in a month's time.[115] However, as Kinkead-Weekes notes, although the first version had 'come by itself', the second was proving more unco-operative, and in October, Lawrence made little progress.[116] In November, Lawrence had begun to work on the novel again, and on 2 December, was 'writing...slowly'.[117] By 6 January 1914, he considered the novel to be in its final form, bar minor revisions, and considered six to eight weeks the approximate time for its completion. However, Garnett's criticisms of the first half of the work, by the end of the month, confirmed Lawrence's own dissatisfactions with the novel, and by 7 February, the work was left unfinished, and the whole project begun again. Lawrence claimed, in a letter to Arthur MacLeod of 9 February:

> It was full of beautiful things, but it missed - I knew that it just missed being itself. So here I am, must sit down and write it out again. I know it is quite a lovely novel really - you know that the perfect statue is in the marble, the kernel of it. But the thing is the getting it out clean.[118]

This third version of the novel, *The Wedding Ring*, was to occupy Lawrence from February to May 1914, and was repeatedly to provide further frustrations. On 7 February, Lawrence had written to Kennerley that he had begun the novel again, but two days later, he had begun again 'for about the seventh time'. On 7 March, he had begun 'for about the eleventh time', and by 3 April, had written 'quite a thousand pages that I shall burn', and now, the work being of himself and Frieda, was two-thirds of the way through. From this point, *The Wedding Ring* appears to have progressed reasonably smoothly; on 22 April, he

---

[114]*Letters i*, p.550.
[115]*Letters ii*, pp.20, 66, 67, 74-75.
[116]*Letters i*, p.546, *Rainbow*, p.xxiii.
[117]*Letters ii*, p.118.
[118]p.146.

claimed to have eighty pages left to write, and would be finished in a fortnight, on 8 May, 'Four days and I shall have finished my novel, pray God', and on 9 May had 'about three thousand words left to write'.[119] On 16 May, it was finished, and Lawrence proposed the title *The Rainbow*, a title originally suggested by Frieda.[120] His confidence in the work is suggested in a letter to Edward Garnett of 22 April, in which Lawrence chastised him for his lack of faith in what was now being attempted in the novel:

> You know how willing I am to hear what you have to say, and to take your advice and act on it when I have taken it. But it is no good unless you will have patience and understand what I *want* to do. I am not after all a child working erratically. All the time, underneath, there is something deep evolving itself out in me. And it is *hard* to express a new thing, in sincerity. And you should understand, and help me to the new thing, not get angry and say it is *common*, and send me back to the tone of the old Sisters. In the Sisters was the germ of this novel: woman becoming individual, self-responsible, taking her own initiative. But the first Sisters was flippant and often vulgar and jeering. I had to get out of that attitude, and make my subject really worthy.[121]

This defence is developed in Lawrence's famous letter to Garnett of 5 June 1914, in which he attempts to articulate his new approach to character and 'psychology', still confident in his unusual vision and method:

> I don't think the psychology is wrong: it is only that I have a different attitude to my characters, and that necessitates a different attitude in you, which you are not yet prepared to give...that which is physic - non-human, in humanity, is more interesting to me than the old-fashioned human element - which causes one to conceive a character in a certain moral scheme and make him consistent...what is interesting in the laugh of the woman is the same as the binding of the molecules of steel or their action in heat: it is the inhuman will, call it physiology, or like Marinetti - physiology of matter, that fascinates me.[122]

However, despite Lawrence's confidence in his new imaginative and fictional mode, the novel was to undergo further, and radical, transformations before its publication. By 10 August, Methuen had returned the typescript of *The Wedding Ring*, and Lawrence's response was, in late November 1914, to begin rewriting the novel. Prior to these revisions,

---

[119]pp.144, 146, 153, 161, 164, 171, 173.
[120]p.174.
[121]p.165.
[122]pp.182-183.

Lawrence was working on two projects which were to influence the direction which the fourth version of the novel was to take. Before Methuen's return of the typescript of *The Wedding Ring*, from late June to mid-July 1914, Lawrence was extensively revising the short stories to be collected in *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*.[123] The revisions to these stories continued between c. 3-20 October, when Lawrence was busy with intensive revisions to the proofs. Keith Cushman argues, in *D.H. Lawrence at Work: The Emergence of the Prussian Officer Stories*, that these revisions demonstrate that Lawrence had already found 'most of the language and many of the ideas he needed' for *The Rainbow*, and the beginnings of his understanding of the impersonal forces operating within and between men and women, later developed in the theoretical framework of *Hardy*. He claims that the integration between the daily and the cosmic (identified by Moynahan) in the first half of *The Rainbow* is characteristic of the final versions of the best of the short stories.[124] The first generation of Brangwens, in which this integration is clearly visible, was, according to Kinkead-Weekes, not present before the fourth version of *The Rainbow*,[125] and as Cushman argues, must therefore have been written *after* the recasting of the *Prussian Officer* collection.[126] Lawrence's writing of *Study of Thomas Hardy*, between c. 5 September and c. 18 November was also to be of influence in the rewriting of the novel, as Kinkead-Weekes, following Daleski,[127] has recognised. Kinkead-Weekes argues:

> Through studying Hardy's art and Hardy's people Lawrence had found a language in which to conceive the impersonal forces he saw operating within and between human beings; involving a new clarification of what the novel he had been trying to write was really *about*; and the discovery of a "structural skeleton" on which to refound it in a new dimension. The full implications only dawned gradually, but that it was a new dimension is beyond doubt.[128]

Although Cushman's work has demonstrated that the strength of Kinkead-Weekes' claim is debatable, it is certainly true that the writing of *Hardy* must have reinforced

---

[123]D.H. Lawrence, *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*, edited by John Worthen, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence, Cambridge, London, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1983).

[124]Keith Cushman, *D.H. Lawrence at Work: The Emergence of the "Prussian Officer" Stories* (Hassocks, 1978), p.43.

[125]Mark Kinkead-Weekes, 'The Marble and the Statue: The Exploratory Imagination of D.H. Lawrence', in *Imagined Worlds: Essays on some English Novels and Novelists in Honour of John Butt*, edited by Maynard Mack and Ian Gregor (London, 1968), pp.371-418 (p.384).

[126]Cushman, p.43.

[127]Daleski, p. 80.

[128]'The Marble and the Statue', p.380.

Lawrence's understanding of his new style, and provided, to some degree, a 'structural skeleton' for the novel. *The Rainbow*, as Kinkead-Weekes argues, was Lawrence's attempt at the Supreme Art which he identifies in the final chapter of *Hardy*. This must contain the 'systole and diastole of poetry and analytic prose, exploration and understanding. Most of all, Supreme Art must move through thesis and antithesis to try to see beyond' without favouring one side of a conflict over the other.[129] Kinkead-Weekes argues that it was through *Hardy* that Lawrence achieved the 'structural language' of the opening pages, and the complex system of oppositions in the novel,[130] although this is a thesis which John Worthen considers misleading:

> In the 'Study', ideas fall into neat shapes and patterns; Male can be played off against Female, Law against Love. Even their reconciliation in some 'supreme art' sounds like a pattern. I would suggest that the problem of the 'Study' is both a problem of isolation, of ideas in a void; and of language, in that what can be absolute in the 'Study' is simply impossible for a novel. (What, fortunately, Hardy does for the 'Study' is recall Lawrence to the problem of lives where such a language would be absurd; and even when he is rewriting Hardy most obviously, Lawrence can still make more actual sense of him than when he is moving round the coloured blocks labelled Male and Female).[131]

Worthen argues, instead, that the writing of *Hardy* merely sharpened the problem of writing *The Rainbow*. The latter, he claims, had a very different form to the prose of *Hardy*, which, in itself, had wide variations of method and style.[132] This is true. However, as will be demonstrated in this thesis, the 'patterning' of syntactic and lexical repetition inherent in *The Rainbow* is closely linked to the syntactic and lexical patterning of 'Male' and 'Female' present in *Hardy*. Such patterning in either work has not previously been identified. As will be demonstrated, similar patterning is also present in 'The White Stocking' from the *Prussian Officer* collection, in *Sons and Lovers*, and in the writing and (particularly) revision of oppositions in the essays collected in *Twilight in Italy*. These revisions to *Twilight in Italy* were done during proof revision of *The Rainbow*. In demonstrating the development of this 'patterning', Kinkead-Weekes' argument in favour of *Hardy* as 'structural skeleton' will be extended by the identification of increasingly emphasised structural frameworks very similar to those in *Hardy* and *The Rainbow* in the developing

---

[129]pp.380, 384, 385.
[130]*Rainbow*, p.xxxiv.
[131]John Worthen, *D.H. Lawrence and the Idea of the Novel* (London and Basingstoke, 1979), p.61.
[132]p.60.

Italian essays. These structural frameworks are present to a small extent before *Hardy*, and to a far greater extent after *The Rainbow*. The inclusion of similar lexical and syntactic patterning in all three works will be examined to demonstrate that Lawrence's repetitive style is itself a structural framework. Worthen's challenging of the presence of *Hardy's* 'patterning' in *The Rainbow* will itself be challenged by the demonstration that such patterns *are* present in *The Rainbow*, and are developed through revision, as they also are in the Italian essays of 1913 and their 1915 revisions.

In common with recent criticism of Lawrence's language, Worthen recognises that the language of *The Rainbow* is 'innovative, experimental and deliberate', despite the lack of consistency in its success.[133] He argues that in the novel Lawrence:

> ...has continually to remake his own terms, so that words like 'unknown' or 'self' or 'darkness' are continually redefined by their context. This is natural; all language which strives to reach an extraordinary pitch of meaning has to redefine itself as it does so; there is no ready-made vocabulary to be used; words have to acquire peculiar pressures of sense which only their use, their context, their redefinition of context, and their context's redefinition of *them* can achieve.[134]

This language, he argues, is exclusive, being 'repetitive, ritual language' in which involvement is necessary for full appreciation. It 'is detached from the experience of living, and...tends to belong to ecstatic appreciation of it instead'. *The Rainbow*, he argues, uses the a terminology very different from *Hardy*, being 'peculiarly Biblical and mannered'.[135]

The fourth version of the novel, begun in late November 1914, was to cause Lawrence further problems, and necessitate further revisions. On 5 December, the same day that he sent S.S. Koteliansky the last of the *Hardy* MS, Lawrence sent Pinker the 'first hundred or so pages of my novel, which I am writing over'.[136] At this stage, Lawrence was again confident:

> It is a beautiful piece of work, really. It will be, when I have finished it: the body of it is so now.[137]

---

[133]p.61.
[134]p.61.
[135]pp.68, 69-70.
[136]*Letters ii*, p.240.
[137]p.240.

Pinker was sent another batch on 18 December,[138] and by 5 January 1915, in a letter to Arthur MacLeod, Lawrence revealed that his revisions, which were causing him great effort, had now reached page three hundred, and had resulted in a very different work:

> I am still revising the *Rainbow* - putting a great deal of work into it. I have done 300 pages. It'll be a new sort of me for you to get used to...I'm afraid, when Methuen gets the *Rainbow*, he'll wonder what changeling is foisted on him. For it *is* different from my other work. I am very glad with it. I am coming into my full feather at last, I think.[139]

Two days later, sending another hundred pages to Pinker, Lawrence announced his decision to split the novel into two volumes, a decision reached, according to Kinkead-Weekes, through the discoveries made in *Hardy*.[140] On 20th, Pinker was sent further pages, and Lawrence's enquiry as to the date of possible publication indicates, as Kinkead-Weekes observes, that he was not aware of any objections from Methuen.[141] Kinkead-Weekes also infers, probably correctly, from Lawrence's letter of 1 February, in which Lawrence claims that 'there shall be no very flagrant love-passages in it (at least, to my way of thinking)' that there had been requests for mutings.[142] Lawrence also indicated in this letter the laborious process of revision; 'I wish I had done that novel, I seem so long. But it will certainly be done by the end of this month, February. For I have done 450 pages out of 600 or so'. However, this version of the novel was not to be finished until March, and on 5 February, in a letter to Koteliansky, Lawrence conceded that 'I doubt I will be too late for spring publication', despite having 'got into the stride of my novel, and...working gallantly'.[143] Further problems surfaced in February, when Lawrence wrote to Barbara Low of the rumoured withdrawal from circulation of the *Prussian Officer* collection, and revealed his concern that *The Rainbow* would be considered impossible to publish in its present form by Methuen.[144] This worry is restated on 24 February, when Lawrence wrote to Pinker that he was 'very, very near the end of the novel' and enquired about the possibility of Spring publication.[145] He writes:

---

[138]p.245.
[139]p.255.
[140]p. 256, 'The Marble and the Statue', p.380.
[141]*Letters ii*, p.260, *Rainbow*, p.xxxvii.
[142]*Letters ii*, pp.270-271, *Rainbow*, p.xxxvii.
[143]*Letters ii*, p.276.
[144]p.280. Kinkead-Weekes notes that by this stage, Lawrence had almost certainly written the chapter 'Shame', which was singled out for criticism by the Bow Street magistrate who ordered the novel's destruction (*Rainbow*, p.xxxvii).
[145]*Letters ii*, p.293.

> Do you think Methuen is ready to back up this novel of mine? He
> must make some fight for it. It is worth it, and he must do it. It will
> never be popular. But he can make it known what it is, and prevent the
> mean little fry from pulling it down. Later, I think I must go and see him.
> There will be a bit of a fight before my novels are admitted, that I know.
> The fight will have to be made, that is all. The field is there to
> conquer.[146]

The novel was finished on 2 March, but Lawrence's comment regarding necessary revision to excessive repetition indicates that he was still aware that there was work, albeit minor, to be done.[147] However, this revision was, again, more extensive than Lawrence had supposed. Between mid-March and the end of May, he was revising the TS extensively, and between 9 July and mid-August, revising the page proofs still further. Lawrence's confidence in the work during TSR is clear. On 19 March, he tells Lady Ottoline Morrell:

> I have been revising my novel - but I've only got the first 71 typed
> pages. It is really very good. It really puts a new thing in the world,
> almost a new vision of life.[148]

On 31 May, he sent Pinker the final batch of MS, and indicated again that he did not consider the work in need of censorship:

> I hope you will like the book: also that it is not very improper. It
> did not seem to me very improper, as I went through it. But then I feel
> very incompetent to judge, on that point.[149]

Lawrence's revisions had been comprehensive, so comprehensive in fact, that he informed Pinker on 6 June:

> I haven't another copy of the novel, because this I sent you is so
> much altered from the original MS., that the latter is no good.[150]

As will be demonstrated in this thesis, Lawrence's revisions included further insertion and reworking through repetition of the ideas expressed in *Hardy*, in addition to the

---

[146]p.294.
[147]p.299.
[148]p.308.
[149]p.349.
[150]p.354.

sharpening and clarification of the oppositions which inform the novel which Kinkead-Weekes notes.[151] These revisions are traceable in minute stylistic reworkings not previously studied. Lawrence's major revisions included the cutting of an early scene in which Tom disturbs a peewit while ploughing,[152] and the insertion of two new autograph sections. These were in the Cathedral scene between Will and Anna, and the expansion of Will's episode with Jennie into half a chapter, which made possible the revisions to Will and Anna's 'Absolute Beauty' interaction in Chapter 8. Both of these insertions were further revised in both TSR and proof. Despite his expressed belief in the novel's lack of impropriety, Lawrence received requests for modification from Pinker,[153] and was at this stage 'at p.192 of the revised proofs, the final form'. Kinkead-Weekes notes that Lawrence's letters of March to May of 1915 'reveal a darkening sense of evil, disintegration and the savage violence of the heart',[154] and traces this, as do the letters of the period, to Lawrence's experiences in Cambridge, and to Worthing at the end of April. He observes that Lawrence's revisions with regard to this increasing sense of darkness and destructiveness are twofold, increasing the potential destructiveness in MS conflicts, and developing the possible freedoms which could be gained in 'dark' relationship, working backwards from the reworked section concerning Ursula and Skrebensky's 'dark' interaction into the recently introduced 'Absolute Beauty' interaction between Will and Anna. Conversely, he observes, Ursula's increased reaction against Skrebensky in the 'salt dance' is a result of revision at this stage.[155] The influence of Lawrence's experiences in Cambridge and Worthing develops in Littlehampton, as the following letter to Lady Cynthia Asquith on 3 August demonstrates:

> It is this mass of unclean world that we have super-imposed on the clean world that we cannot bear. When I looked back, out of the clearness of the open evening, at this Littlehampton dark and amorphous like a bad eruption on the edge of the land, I was so sick I felt I could not come back: all these little, amorphous houses like an eruption, a disease on the clean earth: and all of them full of such a diseased spirit, every landlady harping on her money, her furniture, every visitor harping on his latitude of escape from money and furniture: The whole thing is like an active disease, fighting out the health. One watches them on the sea-

---

[151]*Rainbow*, p.xxxviii.

[152]This passage would have been included in the chapter 'They Live at the Marsh' (p.57).

[153]Lawrence refers to his compliance with Pinker's requests for modification on 13 July (*Letters ii*, p.364), and returned the alterations, excepting the passages and paragraphs which he declared inalterable, on 22 July (p.369). These slips, he stressed, were not revised proofs.

[154]*Rainbow*, p.xxxix, *Triumph to Exile*, pp.208-216.

[155]*Rainbow*, p.xli.

shore, all the people: and there is something pathetic, almost wistful in them, as if they wished that their lives did *not* add up to this scaly nullity of possession, but as if they could not escape. It is a dragon that has devoured us all: these obscene, scaly houses, this insatiable struggle and desire to possess, to possess always and in spite of everything, this need to be an owner, lest one be owned.[156]

The language of this letter can also be felt in proof revision to the chapter 'The Man's World', where descriptions of Uncle Tom Brangwen and Wiggiston are revised to suggest the increase in their darkness, disintegration, and the beetle qualities which characterise the letters of March to May, and the skin disease suggested here. These similarities have been recognised by Kinkead-Weekes. In MS, Wiggiston was 'suddenly crystallised into finality', whereas in proof revision it was 'rapidly spreading, like a skin-disease'.[157] The men of the town are characterised as living 'within some utterly unliving shell', 'It was as if a hard, horny shell enclosed them all'. In proof, this beetle imagery – which is omitted from MS – is emphasised, as are the marshy qualities of Uncle Tom and the sterility of the town; 'All was grey, dry ash, cold and dead and ugly'.[158] Kinkead-Weekes argues that Lawrence's revisions in proof were not major alterations, although the changes made to 'The Man's World' which he does not discuss seem to be significant thematic revisions. Comparison of the revisions in TSR with the English first edition reveal the multitude of changes which prompted Methuen to charge Lawrence £9.3.9, much to his annoyance.[159] In proof revision, Kinkead-Weekes identifies a change in both Ursula and Lawrence's attitude to Skrebensky, tracing it to his opposition to war and Christian democracy, revealed in his letters to Bertrand Russell and Lady Ottoline Morrell.[160] As he argues, correctly, the question of Lawrence's possible self-censorship poses problems, although some revisions made are more likely to be the result of creative revisions than censorship.[161] Charles Ross, in *The*

---

[156]*Letters ii*, pp.375-6.

[157]*Rainbow*, p.320.

[158]p.325.

[159]Letter to J.B. Pinker, 5 October 1915. (*Letters ii*, p.406).

[160]pp.364-368, 370-371.

[161]Among these, Kinkead-Weekes includes the greater clarity of usage between the Christian God and the Bible, which are more consistently capitalised, and false gods and blasphemous usage (*Rainbow*, p.lxv). He also notes that the muting of the relationship between sex and religion, on the penultimate page of the novel, was already beginning in TSR, prior to proof revision. It was therefore probably Lawrence's chosen amendment (p.lxv). Anna's naked dance poses similar problems, which Kinkead-Weekes argues are potentially traceable to both censorship due to impropriety and blasphemy,

nif a 'significant change of imagination', coming down on the side of creative revision (p.lxvi). Ross, however, favours a pro-censorship argument in this case, due, in part, to the less smooth integration of the passage into its context in E1 than in MS (Charles Ross, *The Composition of the Rainbow and Women in Love: A History* (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1979), pp. 44-46.

Composition of The Rainbow and Women in Love: A History, argues in favour of censorship in several cases of apparent 'muting' of overt sexuality. However, as will be demonstrated in Chapter 5, many such revisions have more to do with creative revisions which follow the development and shifting emphasis of ideas expressed in *Hardy*, than with censorship. Yet some of the scenes almost certainly were amended under pressure, and these amendments pertain primarily to anatomical reference. They include Tom's implied erection,[162] the excision of Ursula putting her arms around Skrebensky's loins,[163] and the several excisions of references to bellies and thighs. The 'muting' of Will's 'tiger-cat' roughness towards Anna in their 'Absolute Beauty' interaction could also have been a likely target for censorship, but as Kinkead-Weekes argues, the cutting of a similar passage in 'The Bitterness of Ecstasy', which does not survive past MS stage, suggests that it is probably part of Lawrence's creative revision.[164]

Huxley's and Leavis' conceptions of Lawrence's compositional process are therefore misleading; there was considerably more creative struggle than they suppose. However, their pronouncements went relatively unquestioned until 1968, perhaps due to the absence of scholarly work concerned with the compositional stages of *The Rainbow*, or indeed, of Lawrence's other works.[165] As reference to the various stages of *The Rainbow* indicates, Lawrence was both a comprehensive and a painstaking reviser despite his typical failure to compare stages of composition, and his overlooking of copyists' or typists' errors. In 1968, Kinkead-Weekes' essay, which was to change the face of scholarship regarding Lawrence's revisions, characterised Lawrence's imaginative process as essentially 'exploratory', and traced the evolutionary process of *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, demonstrating from MS and TS evidence how far *Hardy* took *The Rainbow* beyond *The Wedding Ring*.

---

[162]*Rainbow*, p.46. Kinkead-Weekes suggests that this amendment was due rather to an imaginative shift of focus, with Lawrence having second thoughts about introducing sexual explicitness at this stage, and exploring the contradiction between Lydia's physical proximity and emotional distance (p.lxvii).

[163]p.421:38.

[164]Recorded as textual variant 409:6 (pp.655-656).

[165]Baldanza accepted the second hand evidence that Lawrence re-wrote passages rather than making minor revisions, taking Lawrence's words regarding his 'slightly modified repetition' in the 'Foreword to *Women in Love*' as confirmation of the author's 'impulsiveness' (Baldanza, p.107), whereas as late as 1977, Lodge claimed:

> Lawrence, as is well known, to revise a novel had to write it all out from the beginning; he had to reactivate the basic continuity and rhythm of the discourse in order to make any changes in it...Lawrence seems to have regarded [the text] as a *sound*, a 'tremulation on the ether' to use his own phrase: an utterance that, like the oral epic, could only be modified in the act of recitation. (Lodge p.161)

Kinkead-Weekes identifies the section from *The Wedding Ring* incorporated in *The Rainbow* as that which extends from Ella's (later Ursula's) first day as a teacher to her family's move to Beldover, arguing that the earlier version of these episodes were less thematically heightened than in the final novel.[166] Lawrence, contrary to Huxley's assertions, therefore did 'file, clip, insert, transpose',[167] in this case, and then subjected this insertion to creative revisions.

This technique is confirmed in Kinkead-Weekes' essay by his identification of the expansion of two pages into half a chapter in the final draft of the novel, the episode between Will and Jennie which allows for a new dark and impersonal dimension to be added to the relationship between Will and Anna.[168] An insertion, or expansion, has resulted in wholesale creative revision. Kinkead-Weekes examines the evolution of Chapter 7, 'The Cathedral', to demonstrate the influence of *Hardy* on Lawrence's 'exploratory imagination'. He demonstrates that this scene, not in *The Wedding Ring*, undergoes both creative and conceptual revision, which clarifies, condenses and tightens the scene. The balance between the lovers, and their reactions (particularly those of Anna) are recast in order to apportion achievement and flaws to both, rather than suggesting the superiority of Anna's reaction over Will's.

From this point onwards, Lawrence's compositional process, and his own position as an artist, became accepted by critics as being both more complex than had been previously supposed. Frank Kermode, in 1973, concurred with Kinkead-Weekes' thesis, claiming that Lawrence's typical method of work was one of confronting the text 'again and again' and comprehensive revision,[169] as does Cushman.[170] In 1976, Kinkead-Weekes' thesis was developed further in Ross' article 'The Revisions of the Second Generation in *The Rainbow*'. Ross argued that Kinkead-Weekes' analysis of the developing cathedral scene could be supplemented by the placing it 'in the perspective of the second generation's altered import',[171] that is, by the redressing of the balance of success and failure between Will and Anna. As he argues in 1979, reference to the surviving and (mostly) unpublished drafts of the novel disproves the daimonic theory of Lawrencian composition:

---

[166]'The Marble and the Statue,' pp.378-379.
[167]Huxley, p.xvii.
[168]'The Marble and the Statue', pp.391-392.
[169]Frank Kermode, *D.H. Lawrence* (New York, 1973), p.29.
[170]Cushman, pp.4-5, 5.
[171]Ross, 'Revisions', p.281.

> The Rainbow alone cost Lawrence a prodigious amount of labor (sic) over a period of two and one-half years. He made four novel-length drafts, revising heavily along the way. The extant manuscripts and typescripts show that, in the final creative effort, Lawrence extensively revised the autograph manuscript, the subsequent typescript, and even the proofsheets. One of the effects of the present study should be to establish that Lawrence was often painstaking, nurturing his insights and intuitions for months and years and allowing them to grow into their inevitable shapes.[172]

Aims

Despite the developments in Lawrence scholarship regarding both repetition and revision, no comprehensive account of the characteristics and effects of the two in combination has been produced, nor has work on Lawrence's revisions considered the possible creative effects of apparently small scale lexical and syntactic revisions. The continuing publication of the Cambridge editions of Lawrence's work has made examination of textual variation more accessible, and the tracing of lexical revisions slightly simpler. However, not all revisions are recorded, and editorial policy is bound by various constraints which affect the final form of the edition. The most serious flaws of the Cambridge edition are Kinkead-Weekes' collation of unrevised MS and MSR under the blanket term MS, which results in the omission of many stylistically and thematically vital features and effects, and the omission of several important textual variations. This thesis will combine detailed stylistic analyses of the characteristics and effects of repetition in *The Rainbow* with examination of textual variation throughout the revision process, and extend existing scholarship on *The Rainbow's* repetitiveness and revisions in several ways. The textual variation noted is taken from the MSS, TSS and first editions located at the HRHRC, University of Texas at Austin. The limitations of Kinkead-Weekes' otherwise brilliant edition are therefore transcended, and the pitfalls of using the Cambridge edition avoided, allowing the significance of MSD to overall stylistic and thematic development to be evaluated.

The Rainbow has been selected for analysis due to its crucial significance in Lawrence's artistic development. As has been discussed, he regarded the early stages of the work as 'transitional', and the period of the novel's composition marked not only enormous development for Lawrence both in his art and theory, but also the break between Lawrence and Garnett, his mentor at Duckworth, and the resulting move to Methuen, a move which

---

[172]Ross, *Composition*, pp.4-5.

signified Lawrence's growing confidence in the direction in which his work was taking him. In 1913, he identified 'the establishment of a new relation, or the re-adjustment of the old one' between men and women as '*the* problem of today'.[173] This remark was made with reference to *The Sisters*, which was still in its embryonic stages. During the period of *The Rainbow's* composition, Lawrence's concern with this issue is voiced repeatedly in both his correspondence, and his attempts to articulate these ideas in essay form. The issue of the relation between man and woman is also, of course, central to *The Rainbow*. As will be demonstrated, Lawrence's stylistic treatment of it can be seen in the repetitive (and revised) structures of the novel, and relates to the 'Male' and 'Female' relationship developing in the essays. On 31 October 1913, in a letter to Henry Savage, Lawrence criticised Middleton's attitude to women, and contradicts Savage on the issue of separation of the sexes, claiming that the only thing which is separate about men and women, their bodies, is the via medium for union again.[174] By 2 June 1914, in a letter to Arthur MacLeod, Lawrence had identified the relationship between man and woman as paramount to the revitalisation of both art and civilisation:

> I think the only re-sourcing of art, re-vivifying it, is to make it more the joint work of man and woman. I think *the* one thing to do, is for men to have courage to draw nearer to women, expose themselves to them, and be altered by them: and for women to accept and admit men. That is the only way for art and civilisation to get a new life, a new start - by bringing themselves together, men and women - revealing themselves each to the other, gaining great blind knowledge and suffering and joy, which it will take a big further lapse of civilisation to exploit and work out. Because the source of all life and knowledge is in man and woman, and the source of all living things is in the interchange and the meeting and mingling of these two: man-life and woman-life, man knowledge and woman-knowledge, man-being and woman-being.[175]

This concern was one which was to continue throughout the composition of the novel, and beyond. On 12 February 1915, at the height of his collaboration with Bertrand Russell, and towards the end of the novel's fourth stage, Lawrence identified the contemporary English sickness as a failure in the essential relationship between men and women, identifying it as

---

[173]To Edward Garnett, 2(?) May 1913 (*Letters i:* p.546). Lawrence was, as he mentions in this letter, already working on *The Sisters*; he had written 180 pages of a first draft, and the novel would, he claimed, only be 300, and would be finished in a month.
[174]*Letters ii*, pp.94-96.
[175]p.181.

essentially masturbatory. By the end of the month he had identified the struggle for revolution not as one between classes or nations, but between 'individual men and women', man having the ultimate passion to contain in himself the whole of mankind, and the desire to adventure into the woman.[176] However, as Lawrence explains to Gordon Campbell on 21 September 1914, in accordance with *Hardy*, the 'Female' impulse which he believed necessary to fertilise the man is 'not necessarily woman, but most obviously woman'.[177]

Lawrence's 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*',[178] sent to Garnett on 20 January 1914, when Lawrence was three hundred and forty pages into the second *Sisters*, was his first attempt to articulate these developing ideas in essay form. In the 'Foreword', Lawrence inverts St. John's description of the incarnation of Christ, rewriting it in terms of the relationship between man and woman, and identifying the tendency to value the Word (self-consciousness) over the Flesh. According to Lawrence, the Flesh is primary and infinite, an underlying life force, and is the Father of all that is finite - the Son. It is both unknowable and immensely powerful, and woman is more fundamentally related to it than man. Man continually comes to her for renewal, and the man who does not respect her affinity with the life principle will be cast out by her. Failure to find another partner will result in self-destruction.

Study of Thomas Hardy,[179] written between c.5 September and c.18 November 1914, develops the ideas and intuitions of the 'Foreword'', into what Mark Kinkead-Weekes calls a 'theology' of marriage.[180] It was almost finished by 18 November 1914, and in late November, Lawrence began his novel again - the fourth version of *The Rainbow*. Before *Hardy* was begun, Lawrence had already written his famous defence of his new psychology in *The Wedding Ring* in a letter to Garnett, demonstrating a significant shift in both style and conception from *Sons and Lovers*.[181] *Hardy* takes up again the idea of binary opposed forces articulated in the 'Foreword'. Lawrence conceives all life as consisting of conflict between two opposed impersonal and universal forces, 'Male' and 'Female', both of which are essential for creative growth, and exist within, as well as between, man and woman.

---

[176]p.294.

[177]p.218.

[178]D.H. Lawrence, 'Foreword to Sons and Lovers' in *Sons and Lovers*, edited by Helen and Carl Baron, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1992), pp.467-473.

[179]D.H. Lawrence, 'Study of Thomas Hardy' in *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*, edited by Bruce Steele, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1985) pp.7-128.

[180]'The Marble and the Statue', p.374.

[181]*Letters ii*, pp.182-184.

They are essentially one, but are separable for the process of understanding. As in the 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*', the 'Female' is Law, or God the Father, and the 'Male' is Love, or God the Son. However, in *Hardy*, the creative conflict between these forces is between the all-embracing unity of God the Father and the impulse to individuality as God the Son, and Lawrence's concern is with their creative consummation. The conflict between these forces is creative and eternal; beyond each clash is the timeless Holy Spirit, which opens the beyond. This Holy Spirit is a new development from the 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*'.

Throughout the period of *The Rainbow's* composition, Lawrence was composing and revising his travel essays about Germany and the Tyrol. Lawrence had met Frieda Weekley in March 1912. On 3 May, they left England together for Germany, and by 16 May Lawrence had sent four essays to Heinemann's reader, Walter de la Mare. These essays were 'How a Spy is Arrested', 'French Sons of Germany', 'Hail in the Rhineland' and 'The English and the Germans'.[182] This latter examines the split which Lawrence perceives in the English race between soul and senses, the crippling English excess of morality, and the English tendency for self-restraint which leads to the forgoing of life in favour of self-preservation - all topics which Lawrence was to return to in *Hardy* and *The Crown*. On 5 September, Lawrence sent de la Mare a further three articles, 'A Chapel Across the Mountains', 'A Hay-Hut Among the Mountains' and, probably, 'Christs in the Tirol', which was subsequently rewritten for publication in the *Westminster Gazette* and *Saturday Westminster Gazette* [183]and for *Twilight in Italy* (as 'The Crucifix Across the Mountains'). In each of these versions, the theme of the results of self-denial due to a spiritual ideal, dramatised in the Christs which he sees in the Alps, is addressed. The precise dating of the 1913 versions of the first three Italian essays, 'The Spinner and the Monks', 'The Lemon Gardens of the Signor de P' and 'The Theatre' is unclear, yet already Lawrence has a conception of the spinner, like flowers, representing the present[184] (an idea developed in *Hardy*), the distinction between the outside sunshine and the interior darkness of Signor de P's palozzo,[185] thematised in the later versions of the essays, the separation of sexes in Italy[186] (developed in the 'philosophical' insertions and new chapters of 1915, *Hardy* and

---

[182]The latter title supplied by Paul Eggert. D.H. Lawrence, *Twilight In Italy and Other Essays*, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence, edited by Paul Eggert (Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, 1994), p.xxvi.

[183]22 March 1913.

[184]'The Spinner and the Monks' (1913) *Twilight in Italy*, p.58.

[185]'The Lemon Gardens of the Signor di P' (1913) *Twilight in Italy*, p.60.

[186]'The Theatre' (1913) *Twilight in Italy*, p.70.

The Crown) and the distinction between mind and flesh, and north and south.[187] On 18 August 1914, Lawrence's article 'With the Guns', occasioned by the outbreak of the War was printed in the *Manchester Guardian*. In this article, Lawrence discusses man's subordination to the machine in modern warfare and the lack of individuality in which large-scale destruction results, claiming that the shedding of flesh, blood, soul and intelligence in favour of a mechanical principle is unnatural, particularly for the Italian nature. The link with the 1915 versions of the *Twilight in Italy* essays is unmistakable. These later essays develop the oppositions traced in the 1913 versions through the expression of polarity in three major pairings; mind and body (epitomised in the Churches of San Francesco and San Tomasso, respectively), North and South (especially English intellectuality affirming 'not-self' and Italian sensuality affirming 'self'), and past (natural and sensual) and future (mechanised and mentalised). Crucially, the revisions to the essays also introduce the idea of the Absolute relation which allows the admission and embracing of both polarities, an idea developed in both *Hardy* and *The Crown*.

The Crown,[188] written for the magazine project *The Signature*, which Lawrence conceived with Middleton Murry and Katherine Mansfield in 1915, provides further development of the theme of binary opposition developed from the 'Foreword' through *Hardy*. Mark Kinkead-Weekes argues[189] that the banning of *The Rainbow* on 13 November was a further example of the anti-life insanity which Lawrence saw all around him. Whereas the *Study* traces the forces of positive creation, *The Crown* focuses on disintegration. The binary oppositions of 'God the Father' and 'God the Son', present in the 'Foreword to *Sons and* Lovers' and *Hardy*, and the 'Holy Spirit' of *Hardy* are replaced, in the first two essays of *The Crown* by the Lion and the Unicorn, fighting beneath the Crown which is produced by the clashing of multiple opposites. This Crown is not a prize; rather, it is the *raison d'être* of the fight. The clash of opposites produce, like the 'Holy Spirit' in the *Study*, a third thing, beyond time. The ideas expressed in these opening chapters, otherwise so similar to those of *Hardy*, introduce two new ideas. Firstly, the idea that sometimes there are points where no creation takes place; there is no opposition, simply meaninglessness, and secondly, that the Lion and the Unicorn sometimes become destructive, triumphing in their own partiality and turning in on themselves. The third

---

[187]pp.71, 78.
[188]D.H. Lawrence, 'The Crown' in *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, edited by Michael Herbert, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1988), pp.253-306.
[189]*Letters ii*, pp. 395-396

essay, 'The Flux of Corruption', marks a departure from *Hardy*, examining Lawrence's new conception of the inevitable disintegration which must follow consummation. To us, caught in time, this seems terrible. However:

> Destruction and Creation are the two relative absolutes between the opposing infinities. Life is in both. Life may even, for a while, be almost entirely in one, or almost entirely in the other. The end of either oneness is death. For life is really the two, the absolute is the pure relation which is both.
> If we have our fill of destruction, then we shall turn again to creation.[190]

'Pure' corruption, like creativity, is divine. However, it can be distorted by the human will. The new idea is asserted that disintegration following consummation *must* be allowed to follow its natural course in order that the new creation, which begins following the flux of corruption, might begin again. If it is thwarted, rottenness results. In addition, if the will encloses itself within the flux of corruption, and deludes itself that it is absolute, then reduction occurs (either mental or physical), and no union is possible, mutual reduction being the result of any interactions. The culmination of this enclosure of the will in the flux of corruption is the death-wish.

In this thesis, it will be demonstrated that Lawrence's repetitiveness in *The Rainbow* is meaningful variation which has close associations with his developing doctrine. It will be shown that the characteristics of this repetition are extremely complex, and its effects extraordinarily subtle. Repetition will be shown to enact or reflect propositional content, and to provide a more syntactically and lexically rigorous 'structural skeleton' for the novel with regard to the ideas expressed in *Hardy* than has previously been supposed. The functional quality of *The Rainbow's* repetition will be identified with particular reference to *Hardy*, although reference will be made to the 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*', *The Crown*, and the developing *Twilight in Italy* in order that the extent of the structural influence of *Hardy* on *The Rainbow* can be evaluated. The associations accreted by the repetition of lexical items both within the novel, from *Hardy*, and from ordinary (dictionary) usage will be examined, demonstrating, against Daleski, and developing the work of Ragussis and Lodge, that multiple evocations of lexical interpretations function in the context of the novel to indicate specific characteristics and themes in the novel.

---

[190]*Crown*, p.294.

The development of repetition through revision, and the subtle modulations on specific characteristics in each generation which it identifies will also be examined, and the specificity of Lawrence's revisions to his developing themes and repetitive style examined. In this way, the thrust of revision scholarship which follows Kinkead-Weekes' 'The Marble and the Statue', will be continued, but extended to demonstrate the minute revisions to stylistic detail which contribute to the developing themes and patterns of the novel. Examination of revisions to *The Rainbow*, previously concentrated mainly on the second generation of the novel, will be extended to include all three generations, and minute lexical links between the generations, developed through revision, will be examined. In addition, the contrasts and comparisons between various employments of repetitive structures throughout the novel will be shown to highlight specific differences between the characters of each generation, and to suggest their different experiences of the central, recurrent experience of the novel.

The thesis is organised as follows. In Chapter 2, Lawrence's lexical specificity will be identified. Lawrence's 'style' in this period will be shown to enact or reflect propositional content, and to be closely related to his developing doctrine, although reference to doctrine will, at this stage be brief, as the focus of the chapter is primarily with linguistic specificity and the effects of repetition. These will be demonstrated by a series of stylistic analysis, including comparison with Lawrencian text and abridged text, the latter serving to indicate the essential and functional nature of Lawrence's lexical specificity. It will be demonstrated that the lexical and syntactic repetitiveness of *The Rainbow* is closely associated with the creative opposition inherent in his doctrine. Kinkead-Weekes identifies the 'quasi-gender attributions' of *Hardy* as being 'inverted' in *The Rainbow* in order to place emphasis not on gender opposition, but on a more complex system of opposites. [191] It will be shown that this 'inverted' form is traceable in *The Rainbow* and in the 1914 version of 'The White Stocking', and similar oppositions appear uninverted, in *Sons and Lovers*. This will suggest, following Cushman, that there has already begun a slow move towards the language of *The Rainbow* prior to the 'structural skeleton' which Kinkead-Weekes finds for *The Rainbow* in *Hardy*. However, it will be demonstrated that this move is present prior to

---

[191]Mark Kinkead-Weekes, 'The Marriage of Opposites in *The Rainbow*', in *D.H. Lawrence: Centenary Essays*, edited by Mara Kalnins (Bristol, 1986), pp.21-40 (p.39). Like Lawrence (*Letters ii* , p.218, *Hardy,* p.60) and Daleski (pp.23-24), Kinkead-Weekes acknowledges that these impulses are cross-hatched within each individual. ('Marriage of Opposites', p.24, 'The Marble and the Statue', p.382).

the revisions to the *Prussian Officer* collection in the stylistic enactment of propositional content in the presentation of a male / female interaction from *Sons and Lovers*. The complexity of lexical and syntactic repetition identified in *The Rainbow* will be show to be greater than that of 'The White Stocking', and in Chapter 3, Kinkead-Weekes' argument for the influence of *Hardy* on the language of *The Rainbow*, disputed by Worthen, will be supported and extended by the examination of the repeated parallelism of *The Rainbow's* style. The structural similarities between this language and that present (although not consistently) in *Hardy*, and, in differing forms in the 1913 and 1915 versions of *Twilight in Italy*, will also be examined, as will the development of this parallelism, and its relationship to the essays cited, through revision. Lawrence's repetitiveness will be demonstrated as employing both syntactic and lexical parallelism and repetition, and it will be demonstrated that *The Rainbow's* parallel structures function to provide a framework for the evolving relationships between characters *stylistically*, as the themes of the novel change and develop. This framework is itself evaluative, demonstrating through varied repetitive forms the characteristics of each interaction in each relationship through the generations. The similarity between the essays' and *The Rainbow's* parallelism, and that identified by Old Testament scholars will also be identified, as will its effects.

Chapter 4 will examine repetitiveness in intimate interactions between characters, and it will be shown that this repetitiveness functions in various complex ways to enact the cross hatching of 'Male' and 'Female' impulses in operation within and between individuals, thus demonstrating the influence of *Hardy* on a finer scale than has previously been identified. The increasing employment of the language and ideas of *Hardy* which this entails will be examined, as will the shifts in balance and attribution of impulses which occurs throughout the revision process. In addition, the characteristic features of each interaction which such repetition highlights will be discussed. Chapter 5 will have a double focus. It will be concerned both with an argument against Charles Ross concerning potential self-censorship in proof, which, it will be demonstrated, is in many cases creative revision. In addition, the complex lexical chains which Lawrence weaves through the generations by cohesion will be traced, and their effects examined. The themes which these chains encompass, as different definitions of words, both dictionary and accreted, are separated out then conjoined will be examined. Again, the development of these in revision, and the effects of these revisions, particularly in what they reveal about thematic changes, will be analysed.

Methods

The approach which will be taken in this thesis to evaluate the characteristics and effects of the repetitiveness of *The Rainbow* will utilise approaches from modern linguistics and stylistics with regard to self-repetition in written discourse. It is generally agreed that repetition is pattern, and that pattern is repetition, and that it is cultural bias which leads to some repetition being labelled as such, and some not. It is also agreed that repetition has varying effects in employment, including the looping back of interactions, the co-ordination of a group in ritual (particularly in liturgical usage)[192] facilitating both rhythm and group synchrony,[193] intensification,[194] iteration,[195] persuasion,[196] contrast,[197] and continuation,[198] unification,[199] elaboration,[200]and as a mode of focusing attention.[201] It also has different definitions according to its context. It has also been generally accepted that repeated items in discourse are not identical to those which precede them; context and the accumulated associations of a repeated item function to ensure that no two employments of it are identical. Repetition can be formal (grammatical and syntactic) or semantic,[202] immediate or delayed,[203] exact or non-exact,[204] be of almost any size of unit, and have varying degrees of

---

[192]Barbara Johnstone et al, 'Repetition in Discourse: A Dialogue', in *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Volume I*, edited by Barbara Johnstone, Advances in Discourse Processes Volume I (New Jersey, 1994), pp.1-20, (pp.3, 7, 8).

[193]Marilyn Merritt, 'Repetition in Situated Discourse - Exploring Its Forms and Functions' in *Repetition in Discourse*, pp.23-36 (p.27).

[194]Neal R. Norrick, 'One is None: Remarks on Repetition in Proverbs', *Proverbium* 8 (1991), pp.121-128 (pp.121, 123-124), Jean Aitchison, 'Say, Say it Again Sam: The Treatment of Repetition in Linguistics', in *Repetition*, Volume vii, edited by Andreas Fischer, Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature, (Tubigen, 1994), pp.15-34 (pp.19-20).

[195]Aitchison, p.19.

[196]Norrick, p.121.

[197]pp.123, 127

[198]Aitchison, p.19, Sally McLendon, 'Meaning, Rhetorical Structure, and Discourse Organisation in Myth', in *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*, edited by Deborah Tannen, Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics 1981 (Washington D.C., 1981), pp.284-305 (p.285).

[199]Peter Verdonk, 'Words, Words, Words: A Pragmatic and Socio-Cognitive View of Lexical Repetition', in *Twentieth-Century Fiction: From Text to Context*, edited by Peter Verdonk and Jean Jaques Weber, The Interface Series (London and New York, 1995), pp.7-31 (p.9).

[200]Walter Nash, *Our Experience of Language* (London, 1971) p.180 .

[201]Johnstone et al., p.13, Geoffrey Leech, *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry* (Essex, 1969), p.85, Mary Hiatt, *Artful Balance: The Parallel Structures of Style*, New Humanistic Research Volume ii (New York and London, 1975), pp.5-6.

[202]e.g. Johnstone et. al, p.14, Andrew H. Plaks, 'Where the Lines Meet: Parallelism in Chinese and Western Literatures', *Poetics Today* 11 (1990), pp.523-546 (pp.525-526), Berlin, pp.31-102. Berlin also identifies lexical and phonological aspects, pp.65-80, pp.103-126.

[203]e.g. Johnstone et. al, p.14, Deborah Tannen, 'What's in a Frame? Surface Evidence for Underlying Expectations' in *Framing in Discourse*, edited by Deborah Tannen (New York, Oxford, 1993), pp.14-56 (p.42).

freedom depending on its spontaneity or codification in ritual or habit. According to Hoey in *Patterns of Lexis in Text*, a distinction between chance repetition, in which the only 'common ground' is the selection of the same lexical item, and text-forming repetition can also be made. [205] The latter can be identified by either the common or related contexts of the repetitions, the sharing of common relationships between the repeated items and neighbouring lexical items, or whole or partial parallelism between the contexts of the items. Repetition may be identified by its foregrounding by deviation from canonical form,[206] and has varying levels of function.[207] It may also serve to show the relatedness of sentences, aiding comprehension.[208] There is also distinction made between 'intentional' and 'unintentional' repetition, although the former is problematic to identify, and between 'obligatory' repetition, strongly preferred when the normal deletion of a repetition would result in unacceptable ambiguity, and 'optional' repetition, where repetition is dispreferred, and, for example, pronominalisation is used, or repeated verbs are avoided if parsing difficulties would result.[209] The strategies for avoidance of repetition include ellipsis and proform, and reduction can be either mild or severe.[210]

However, a primary function of repetition in text is cohesion. Deborah Tannen, in 'Oral and Literate Strategies in Spoken and Written Narratives', [211] following Chafe, Cook-Gumperz, and Gumperz and Gumperz et al,[212] states the hypothesis that cohesion is established in writing through 'lexicalisation and complex syntactic structures which make

---

[204]e.g. Johnstone et. al, p.14, Deborah Tannen, *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*, Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 6 (Cambridge, 1989), p.38, *Framing in Discourse*, p.42, Leech, p.77.

[205]Michael Hoey, *Patterns of Lexis in Text*, (Oxford, 1991), p. 56.

[206]e.g. Merritt, p. 27, Leech, pp.1, 57.

[207]Norrick distinguishes between 'random repetition', explicable in terms of the speaker's task of production in face-to-face conversation, and 'significant repeats', repetition which perform some identifiable operation on their preceding occurrence(s). Obviously, some distinction is to be made between 'unplanned' and 'planned' discourse, generally accepted as spoken and written discourse respectively.

[208]Hoey, *Patterns of Lexis*, pp.43-48, 81-99, 100-161, Aitchison, p.20, Verdonk and Weber, p.9.

[209]Aitchison, pp.21-6.

[210]D.J. Allerton, 'Drop the verb if you can. Otherwise use proforms (in the same way other people do) but do it according to the rules', or the Non-Repetition of Lexical Verb Structures', in *Repetition*, pp.36-44 (pp.37-40).

[211]Deborah Tannen, 'Oral and Literate Strategies in Spoken and Written Narratives', *Language*, 58 (1982), pp.1-21 (p.3).

[212]Wallace L. Chafe, 'Integration and Involvement in Speaking, Writing, and Oral Literature', in *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*, edited by Deborah Tannen, Advances in Discourse Processes 4 (Norwood, New Jersey, 1981), pp.35-54, Jenny Cook-Gumperz and John J. Gumperz, 'From oral to written: The transition to literacy', in *Variation in Writing: Functional and Linguistic-Cultural Differences*, edited by Marcia Farr Whiteman, Writing 1 (Hillsdale, New Jersey, 1981),pp.12-27, and John J. Gumperz, Hannah Kaltman and Mary Catherine O'Connor, 'Cohesion in Spoken and Written Discourse', in *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse*, pp.3-19.

connectives explicit, and which show relationships between propositions through subordination and other foregrounding or backgrounding devices'. The types of repetition which will be central to the examination of *The Rainbow's* repetitiveness are those of lexical cohesion and parallelism. The central texts relating to the former are Halliday and Hasan's *Cohesion in English*,[213] and Hoey's *Patterns of Lexis in Text*, and it is the former which will provide the framework for analysis. Halliday and Hasan argue that textual coherence is ultimately dependent on the presence of patterns in the text. According to this school of thought, cohesive ties within the text, contributing to text coherence, are created by lexical repetition and related semantic items.[214] Lexical cohesion, according to Halliday and Hasan, is the cohesive effect achieved by vocabulary selection, although it is not necessary for two lexical items to have the same referent in order for them to be cohesive. Lexical cohesion is divided into two main classes which are distinct, but related; reiteration, and collocation. Reiteration, in which repeated items have the same referent, is defined as follows:

> ...a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical item, at one end of the scale; the use of a general word to refer back to a lexical item, at the other end of the scale; and a number of things in between - the use of a synonym, near-synonym, or superordinate.[215]

However, cohesion occurs even when there is no referential relation. Collocation, a more loosely defined group, embraces all lexical cohesion which is not covered by reiteration. It is 'cohesion that is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur', mutual expectancy existing between words arising from the fact that

---

[213]M.A.K. Halliday, and R. Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, English Language Series 9 (London, 1976). Hasan, in 'Coherence and Cohesive Harmony' in *Understanding Reading Comprehension: Cognition, Language and the Structure of Prose.*, edited by J. Flood (Delaware, 1984), pp.181-219, clarifies the categorisation of lexical cohesion presented in *Cohesion in English*. She also demonstrates that there is no easy correlation between the number of cohesive ties and the degree of coherence, arguing instead that a better explanation of the contribution of cohesion is that it forms chains which interact with each other. Hasan (1985) and Hasan and Halliday (1985) identify two classes of cohesive chain, which override distinctions which made up much of their 1976 work. These two chains are 'identity' and 'similarity', the former sharing the same referents, and the latter being non-identical, linked either by description, for example, or parallelism. The crucial aspect of these chains is how they interact; their presence alone is not a guarantee of coherence.

[214]Hasan demonstrates that cohesion does not equal coherence, and that either can exist without the other (R. Hasan, *Grammatical Parallelism in Spoken and Written English, Parts I and II* Programme in Linguistics and English Teaching Paper 7 (Harlow, 1968)). However, the implication of the work of Hasan, Philips, Winter, Halliday and Hasan, and Hoey is that cohesion does contribute to coherence, is directly relevant to the interpretation of pairs of sentences, and produces a form of text organisation.

[215]*Cohesion in English* p.278.

one occurs frequently in the environment of the other, or that the two occur in a range of environments common to both. [216] Collocation is therefore cohesion between any two lexical items which have a recognisable lexico-semantic relation, and includes synonyms and near synonyms, complementaries, converses and antonyms, and words drawn from the same ordered series. It also includes co-hyponyms of the same superordinate term. In general, Halliday and Hasan argue, any two lexical items which have similar patterns of collocation will generate a cohesive force if employed in adjacent sentences.[217] It is possible, and common, for long cohesive chains to weave through successive sentences. Hoey, in *Patterns of Lexis in Text*, agrees with Halliday and Hasan about the importance of lexical repetition to text-building. However, unlike Hasan, who regards all repetitions as contributing to the creation of text-building cohesive chains, he claims that the important repetitions which create coherence are those occurring across sentence boundaries. Hoey argues that sentences link in a text-forming way when they are 'bonded' by having three (or more) overlapping lexical items.[218] He claims that lexical cohesion does contribute to coherence, and that:

> ...sentences linked by repetition [will] be more closely related than those not so linked even if they are separated by a number of sentences. Some sentences [will] be seen to be linked to a variety of other sentences, while others [will] be linked to few or none; the former [will] be central to the text, the latter marginal.[219]

Hoey suggests that a marginal sentence (one with low levels of lexical repetition) could be expected to have 'low information value, to be metalinguistic in nature or to offer information that is not directly needed or made much use of within the text'.[220] He identifies several types of repetition. Those relevant to the argument advanced in this thesis are

---

[216] pp.287, 284, 319-320.
[217] p.286.
[218] *Patterns of Lexis*, p.91.
[219] p.34.
[220] p.43. As Andrea Tyler has argued, in 'Patterns of Lexis: How much can repetition tell us about discourse coherence?', *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics* (Washington D.C, 1995), pp.268-280, Hoey's argument is flawed because the textual material which his argument identifies as extraneous in one of his central examples is, in fact, important in the establishment of 'a reasonable interpretation of the text' (p.269). She also demonstrates flaws in Hoey's model regarding the analysis of two naturally-occurring English texts, and offers an interpretative-pragmatic analysis of repetition. Tyler concludes that lexical repetition can be considered neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for coherence, as coherent text can have low levels of lexical repetition, and less coherent text can have high levels. This, she claims, indicates that repetition is 'simply an attending reflex or epiphenomenon which often occurs with coherent text'' (p.279).

'simple' and 'complex' repetition. Simple repetition, according to Hoey, is repetition with no greater alteration than would be explicable in terms of a closed grammatical paradigm. Conversely, complex repetition occurs either when two lexical items are formally identical but have different grammatical functions, or when they are *not* formally identical but share a morpheme.[221]

Repetition as parallelism in *The Rainbow* will be identified and examined according to the terminologies of Leech, which were expanded by Hiatt. According to Jakobson:

> ...in poetry similarity is superimposed on contiguity, and hence "equivalence is promoted to the constitutive device of the sequence". Here any noticeable reiteration of the same grammatical concept becomes an effective poetic device...the traditional listener and the performer of folk poetry, which is based on a nearly constant parallelism, catches the deviations...[222]

Jakobson's concern is with parallelism alone rather than repetition. However, he recognises the functional aspects of parallelism, and the considerable scholarship regarding the parallelistic style of Hebrew verse in the Old Testament.[223] Parallelism in *The Rainbow* will be considered with reference to Biblical scholarship, and to conjoining relations as defined by Longacre[224] and in Hoey's Matching relation following Winter.[225] Leech contrasts parallelism with deviation, because, he claims, it introduces extra regularities, not irregularities into the language. The strength of parallelism, he argues, can be determined by the range of its extension, the manner and degree of its operation on different layers of structure, and the levels at which its patterning is present. However, in order for parallelism to be present, there must be elements both of identity and contrast, as parallelism necessarily requires variable elements. Leech argues that the assignment of significance to a parallelism is dependent on a principle of equivalence. He identifies eight main types of verbal parallelism, defining them as exact verbal repetitions in equivalent positions. His categories of identification relevant to the arguments advanced in this thesis regarding *The Rainbow's* lexical parallelism are as follows; anaphora (initial repetition), epistrophe (final repetition)

---

[221]*Patterns of Lexis*, pp.53, 55.

[222]Roman Jakobson, 'Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry', in Roman Jakobson: *Selected Writings, Volume iii, Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*, edited and with a preface by Stephen Rudy (The Hague, Paris, New York, 1981), pp.87-97 (pp.92-93).

[223]pp.91-92, 'Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet', pp.98-135.

[224]Robert E. Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, (New York and London, 1996), pp.80-90.

[225]Michael Hoey, *On the Surface of Discourse* (London, Boston, Sydney, 1983) pp.19-21, 24-25, 96, 112-129, 132-135, 154-155, 157-158, 200-201..

and symploce (initial combined with final repetition). It functions, he claims, as emphasis in the expression of deeply affecting matters (he makes an analogy with religious ritual), and to imitate the structure of the message and thus 'hammer home' content.[226] Hiatt also identifies parallelism as a repetitive pattern of symmetry which results in emphasis. Strict parallelism and deviations from it she classes as parallelism without, and with, variation respectively.[227] Her categories relevant to the arguments advanced here are as follows: anaphora (repetition of same word or words at the beginning of phrases or clauses in sequence), antithesis (juxtaposition of contrasting or opposing ideas),[228] epistrophe (ending of phrases or clauses with the same word or words, when the phrases or clauses are in a parallel sequence), and symploces (a combination of anaphora and epistrophe). To Hiatt and Leech's categories I add the category of 'medial', where repetition of a word or phrase occurs in the middle of a phrase or clause.

For clarity, categories of lexical parallelism examined in *The Rainbow* will be identified by their position in the sentence rather than their technical terms (e.g. 'final' rather than 'epistrophe').

With regard to Biblical studies of parallelism, Bishop Lowth, in 1778, identified three types of Biblical parallelism, based on the distinction between sense and grammatical construction. These were 'synonymous parallelism', in which two lines of text correspond by expressing the same sense in different but equivalent terms, 'antithetic parallelism', in which two lines correspond by opposition of terms or sentiments; when the second is contrasted with the first, sometimes in expressions, sometimes in sense only, and 'synthetic or constructive parallelism' where the parallelism consists only in the similar form of construction. This latter does not mean that words and sentences answer to each other as equivalent or opposite, but that a correspondence between different propositions is present in the shape of the sentence and its parts.

Since Lowth, work on Biblical parallelism, has been considerably refined and expanded, identifying various forms of parallelism which can often be traced in *The Rainbow* also. George Buchanan Gray (1915) argued that Lowth's category of 'synthetic parallelism' was too broad. He claimed that it included couplets in which the second term repeats by one or more synonymous terms the sense of the first, then by one or more terms

---

[226]Leech, pp.65, 79-83, 84, 85.

[227]Hiatt, pp.6, 18.

[228] Hiatt's 'antithesis' will be subsumed under Matching contrast.

adds something new to which nothing in the first line is parallel.[229] For such patterning, he proposed the term 'incomplete parallelism'. This, he argued, was really a subdivision of Lowth's other two categories of parallelism. More problematic for Gray were Lowth's 'synthetic parallels' in which no term in the second couplet was parallel to the first, the second term consisting entirely of fresh and additional material, and sometimes not even having grammatical correspondence. Gray's restatement of parallelism argued that when repetition and parallelism in its strictest sense occurred, the constant breaking of the narrative line was the necessary consequence. Unlike Genesis I, where the narrative line is (largely) single and unbroken, later chapters characterised by parallelism of narrative carried forward along two lines, and demonstrated independence of their successive clauses, or short sentences, and repetition of same thought or statement by means of corresponding terms in successive short clauses or sections. Parallelism was determined by the frequency and regularity with which such breaks occur. Couplets demonstrated 'complete parallelism' if every term in line one was parallel to a term, or corresponding group of terms in the other, and 'incomplete parallelism' if some of the terms in each corresponding line are parallel to one another, while the remaining terms express something stated once only in one of the terms. Each of these categories were capable of variety. In 'complete parallelism', this is possible by varying the position of correspondent terms in the parallel lines, or by using in the second line two or more terms which, taken together, are parallel in sense to a corresponding number of terms in the first line (although the separate terms of the combination are not parallel to the separate terms of the other combination).[230] This latter can also be varied by inversion, and, according to Gray, in its extreme form is completely parallel in sense, but no two terms taken separately are parallel to each other.

Driver, in 1920, also revised and extended Lowth's types, arguing that in 'synthetic parallelism', the second line contains neither a repetition nor a contrast to the thought of the first, but in different ways supplements and complements it. Driver's work also adds the category of 'climactic parallelism', in which the first line is itself incomplete, and the second line takes up words from it and completes them.[231] Driver therefore practically

---

[229]Hoey's observation regarding the function of repetition in the Matching relation has similarities to this. He argues that it:

> focus[es] attention on the new information in the sentence by putting it in the context of known information. In other words, the repetition is used to show what the information in one sentence has in common with that in previous sentences. (*On the Surface*, p.113).

[230]Gray, pp.49, 59, 64, 69.

[231]However, the distinction between semantic and grammatical parallelism which Lowth makes is less clear in Driver's work, with 'climactic parallelism' combining grammatical parallelism with semantic

removes the 'constructive' element of Lowth's distinctions. Kugel, in his influential book of 1981, claimed that Lowth's three types of parallelism could not be rigorously distinguished from one another, and stressed the supplementing or completing function of the second line (identified by Driver). Kugel demonstrated that 'synonymous parallelism' is rarely synonymous, and that there was no real difference between that and 'antithetic parallelism', calling into question Lowth's three categories, and the distinction between prose and poetry in the Bible. He argued that parallelism was the establishment through syntax, morphology and meaning, of a feeling of correspondence between two parts, A and B. B, he claimed,[232] will have emphatic character by virtue of coming after A, and he demonstrated that parallelism need not be merely repetition, but some kind of progression, in which B connects with and expands the meaning of the potential subtleties hidden within juxtaposed clauses.

More recently, Adele Berlin extended parallelism still further, claiming that it operates not only between consecutive lines, but also between smaller segments such as words, phrases and sounds. She emphasises that parallelism is both semantic and grammatical, and that there is a distinction between the two aspects. She also identifies lexical equivalence. The grammatical aspect of parallelism is, according to Berlin, grammatical equivalence and / or contrast, with syntactic parallelism being the syntactic equivalence of one line with another. The grammatical aspect includes morphological parallelism (morphological pairs from the same or different word class, the former including contrast in tense, conjugation, person, gender, number, definiteness and miscellaneous contrast). Syntactic parallelism is that in which the syntax of the lines is equivalent, and includes four main classes. Those relevant to English are positive-negative, in which a statement phrased in the positive is paired with one phrased in the negative, subject-object, in which the terms which are semantically parallel serve different syntactic functions in their respective lines, and contrast in grammatical mood,[233] in which a sentence is changed from one grammatical mood into another. The lexical and semantic aspects which Berlin identifies include, in the case of the latter, word pairs functioning according to a variety of rules. Berlin stresses that lexical and semantic equivalances are not to be confused, although the lexical and semantic aspects can be intertwined. The semantic aspect is the relationship between meaning of one line and its parallel line, and includes disambiguation

---

completion, and the supplementing and completing function of 'synthetic parallelism' having semantic as well as grammatical functions.
[232]Kugel, p.8.
[233]Berlin, pp.56, 57, 59.

of the first line by the second, and parallelism as metaphor. Norrick's work on repetition in proverbs also identifies the production of parallelism by repetition, suggesting that such an effect suggests conviction and enhances persuasive power, while also facilitating memorisation.[234]

The study of *The Rainbow's* parallelism in this thesis will also draw on Longacre's study of conjoining by comparison, coupling and contrast, and Winter / Hoey's Matching relation. Hoey identifies repetition as a key signal of the Matching relation,[235] and identifies Matching as occurring when two parts of a discourse are compared in respect of their detail. Matching compatability is concerned with similarities, Matching contrast with differences. Hoey argues that Matching relations are not only signalled by repetition, but by 'conjuncts, syntactic and semantic parallelism, lexical signals and parallelism of questions answered'. Conjuncts (or potential conjuncts), and what Winter calls the 'denial paraphrase', where an attribute or action of 'x' is denied for 'y' are also functional in the Matching relation, as are 'the presence of antonyms, negation and signalling in the immediate context'.[236] He also demonstrates that Matching by contrast and compatability can also occur in combination. Parallelism, both lexical and grammatical, can also function to signal Matching relations, and, in *The Rainbow*, typically forms the evaluative framework against which the characteristics of each intimate interaction is enacted by repetition, and by which the potential, limitations and achievements of each generation can be judged.

According to Longacre, conjoining includes coupling, contrast and comparison. Coupling, he claims, includes non-temporal 'and' relations, and conjoined predicates typically belong to the same semantic domain. They may have the same or different first terms, and the latter may imply reciprocity, while conjoining with differing first terms usually identifies contrast. One form of coupling which Longacre identifies, and which has particular relevance to repetition in *The Rainbow*, employs parallelism of predications, with the varying of one term (usually the noun slot) between each. Longacre deals with five categories of coupling; coupling with the same first term, coupling with different first terms with or without reciprocity, coupling with partial reciprocity, and parallel coupling, and asserts that the co-ordinate sentence, a major characteristic of Lawrence's style in *The Rainbow*, functions to 'encode' coupling. Conjoining by contrast, according to Longacre,

---

[234]Norrick, p.121.

[235]Repetition, Hoey argues, includes simple repetition, complex repetition, substitution (which he, against Halliday and Hasan, treats as a subclass of repetition), ellipsis or paraphrase (*On the Surface*, pp.108-110).

[236]pp.113, 116-117.

'includes notional <u>but</u> relations' , and requires 'paired lexical oppositions'. At least two opposed pairs must be involved, one of which has a greater role in establishing contrast than the other. Longacre includes the following in contrast; 'the negative / positive use of the same predicate from the use of a pair of antonyms...negation of a close synonym of a predicate rather than of the predicate itself' in addition to broadly construed antonyms.[237] He also includes the use of paired synonyms where the contrast is located in the positive and negative values attributed to these, rather than to the same predicate. Longacre concludes:

> There is a clear distinction in notional structure between coupling and contrast. Notice the role of items from the same semantic domain and the comparative unimportance of systematic negation in coupling, as opposed to the importance of negation, antonyms, and differing dramatis personae in the deep structure pattern of contrast.[238]

A third category of conjoining, which Longacre calls comparison, involves what he calls 'degree conjoining', in which comparison is a matter of degree. In English, Longacre claims, 'comparison is expressed within the domains of a single sentence with two rather closely associated clauses and with adjectives inflected for comparison'.[239]

In addition to the categories of repetition identified above, an aspect of *The Rainbow* which will also be considered is that of varying affectiveness. Affectiveness in linguistic and stylistic criticism tends to refer to the emotions of the writer or speaker, or to the responses of the reader or listener., although it is broadly defined and takes various forms. In *The Rainbow*, however, Lawrence's paratactic style results in subject action having varying effect on either the subject itself, or object, as emotional and physical encounters gather to a climax. It is in this way that affectiveness will be defined for the purposes of the argument. Throughout the thesis, differing fonts used to identify different stylistic characteristics will be identified clearly in the text accompanying each analysis, either as a key, or as introductory remarks. In passages quoted from Lawrence's works, the page numbers of the Cambridge editions will be quoted in footnotes. Due to the many stages of revision being examined, page references to the Cambridge edition of *The Rainbow* only will be employed.

---

[237]Longacre, pp.80, 81, 82, 83, 84.
[238]p.88.
[239]pp.89, 90.

CHAPTER 2: LAWRENCE'S LINGUISTIC SPECIFICITY

In this chapter, one passage from the English first edition of *The Rainbow*, one from 'The White Stocking' in the English first edition of *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*, and one from the English first edition of *Sons and Lovers* will be analysed. This will identify the linguistic specificity and developing repetitiveness of Lawrence's style, and its functional nature. The stylistic effects of lexical cohesion, varying verb affectiveness and parallelism will be identified, and their relevance to Lawrence's developing conception of the conflict between universal and impersonal opposites in his essays briefly shown. Significant revisions made during the composition process will be discussed. The presence of lexical and syntactic patterning in *Sons and Lovers prior* to the development of Lawrence's doctrine in the essays suggests that the stylistic patterns which characterise the fiction from this stage, and which will be shown in Chapter 3 to characterise the essays, initially developed independently of any explicit Lawrencian doctrine, perhaps as a 'natural' style, or under the influence of a Non-Conformist dualistic view of the universe. However, as Lawrence's career continues, this characteristic imprint becomes a complex functional aspect of his work in both essays and fiction, the repetitiveness typical of this developing style revealing crucial links between fiction and doctrine, as will be discussed in later chapters. Each passage under discussion will be reproduced immediately before its discussion, and revisions are marked by angled brackets for excisions, square brackets for insertions.

The reasons for the selection of the passages analysed are as follows. The texts from which the passages are taken span the period between the composition of *Sons and Lovers* and the completion of *The Rainbow,* crucial years for Lawrence, both personally and artistically. If Lawrence's linguistic specificity and repetitiveness can be shown to be important, examination of these features in works during this period is likely to reveal significant developments in his fictional style and artistic concerns. In December 1910, Lawrence had written a letter to Louie Burrows identifying the novel which was to grow into *Sons and Lovers* with his life with his now dying mother:

> What ever I wrote, it could not be so awful as to write a biography
> of my mother. But after this - which is enough - I am going to write
> romance - when I have finished Paul Morel, which belongs to this.[1]

---

[1]*Letters i*, p.195.

In March 1912, Lawrence met his future wife Frieda Weekley, and between July and November of that year, recast *Paul Morel* into *Sons and Lovers*, the fourth stage in the novel's development. By 22 April of the following year, Lawrence identified the composition of the third version of this work, *The Wedding Ring* not with his past life with his mother, but with what he had learnt in his new life with Frieda:

> I am sure of this now, this novel. It is a big and beautiful work. Before, I could not get my soul into it. That was because of the struggle and the resistance between Frieda and me. Now you will find her and me in the novel, I think, and the work is of both of us.[2]

This new life included not only the relationship with Frieda itself, but the development of a whole new approach to his work. While travelling with Frieda, he had sent seven essays which contained the germs of ideas later developed in *Hardy* and the 1915 versions of *Twilight in Italy* to de la Mare, and sent Garnett his 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*', the first formulation, in essay, of the philosophy which was to develop throughout his life. Prior to the publication of *Sons and Lovers* on 29 May, Lawrence had began, in March, *The Sisters*, which was to grow into *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. Significant changes were apparent to the author even at this early stage, and, on 29 January of the following year, Lawrence argues against Garnett's criticism of his new mode of writing, making his claims regarding the transitionary nature of his work at this point, a point restated on 5 June.[3]

In *D.H. Lawrence at Work: The Emergence of the Prussian Officer Stories*, Keith Cushman identifies Lawrence's 'transition stage' as being traceable in the 1914 revisions of the *Prussian Officer* collection. He criticises Kinkead-Weekes' failure to mention the collection in 'The Marble and the Statue', in which Kinkead-Weekes argues, after Daleski,[4] for the influence of *Hardy* on the composition of *The Rainbow*. Kinkead-Weekes argues that Lawrence's reading of Hardy must have 'reinforced his understanding of his own new style', and the new psychology which he had already defended to Garnett in his defence of *The Wedding Ring* on 5 June.[5] Close examination of the development of *The Rainbow* text, as both Kinkead-Weekes' comprehensive examination of the chapter 'The Cathedral',[6] and

---

[2]*Letters ii*, p.164.
[3]pp.143, 183.
[4]Daleski, p.80.
[5]'The Marble and the Statue', p.380.
[6]pp.386-390.

Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of this thesis demonstrate, reveals the extent of the influence of *Hardy* on the final form of the novel, although the influence of *Hardy* is shown here to be more rigorous and fine-grained than Kinkead-Weekes realises. Cushman argues that the *Prussian Officer* stories were revised comprehensively before Methuen's return of the typescript of *The Wedding Ring* by 10 August, and thus before the writing of *Hardy* and the beginning of the fourth version of *The Rainbow* in November. He argues that Kinkead-Weekes is correct in claiming that through the writing of *Hardy*, Lawrence found a 'structural skeleton'[7] on which to refound *The Rainbow*. However, he claims that Kinkead-Weekes' assertion that it was through studying Thomas Hardy's work that Lawrence found a language in which the impersonal forces operating within and between human beings could be conceived is less convincing. Cushman instead argues that the earlier extensive recasting of the *Prussian Officer* collection demonstrates that Lawrence had already found 'most of the language and many of the ideas he needed'[8] for *The Rainbow*, and the beginnings of his understanding of the impersonal forces operating within and between men and women. Certainly, as this chapter will demonstrate, the cross-hatching of 'Male' and 'Female' impulses within and between characters in 'The White Stocking', and the predominant attribution of the 'Male' characteristics later developed in *Hardy* to Mrs Whiston, and 'Female' to her husband anticipates the 'inversion' of *Hardy's* principles which Kinkead-Weekes identifies in *The Rainbow*.[9] However, as will be demonstrated, the passage from *Sons and Lovers* does not display the 'inversion' traceable in *The Rainbow* or 'The White Stocking', although it does employ repetition to identify 'Male' and 'Female' opposition stylistically. In addition, the cross-hatching in 'The White Stocking' is not as complex as that in *The Rainbow*, but is more complex than the comparatively straightforward opposition of 'Male' and 'Female' in the *Sons and Lovers* passage. The extract from 'The White Stocking' is therefore included to establish how far the 1914 revisions have taken Lawrence beyond *Sons and Lovers* and towards *The Rainbow*. The *Sons and Lovers* passage is included to demonstrate that Lawrence's linguistic specificity with regard to the 'Male' and 'Female' characteristics later developed in the 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*' and *Hardy* is traceable in stylistic details from a stage prior to the revisions of the *Prussian Officer* collection and the composition of *The Rainbow* in its various forms.

---

[7] p.380.
[8] Cushman, p.43.
[9] 'Marriage of Opposites', p.39.

The passages selected from the texts for examination are chosen because they all concern, to a greater or lesser degree, Lawrence's interest in the establishment of a new relation between men and women, an interest voiced at the inception of *The Sisters*,[10] and central to *The Rainbow*. In particular, they concern modern marriage. Each originates from the later stages of Lawrence's composition of each work, and from a point at which his creative intentions are well developed. None has undergone, after this stage, the major revisions or censorship which characterises much of Lawrence's writing career, although fine tuning does occur, and will be discussed. The extracts, and their revisions, therefore present good examples of Lawrence's creative retouchings, and the characteristics and effects of his lexical specificity and repetition can be clearly evaluated.

The passage selected which describes the meeting of Walter Morel and Gertrude Coppard in "The Early Married Life of the Morels", *Sons and Lovers*, has been selected from the fourth version of *Sons and Lovers*, written between July and November 1912.[11] The passage undergoes a small amount of MS and PP revision, which will be discussed. Although the characters are not married at this point, the characteristics of each which result in the conflict and opposition in their subsequent marriage are clearly stated. The passage selected from *The Rainbow* portrays a conflictual interaction between the newly married Anna and Will Brangwen in 'Anna Victrix'. It is also largely unchanged from MS (the fourth version of the novel, and the first version of *The Rainbow* as we know it), although revisions in TSR and the (lost) page proofs occur, and will be discussed. The passage from 'The White Stocking' is selected because the story deals with the issues of love and marriage explored in *The Rainbow*, and, as Cushman observes, the final version is 'striking for its revelation of the turbulence beneath the surface of middle-class marriage'.[12] The story was revised over a protracted period of time, being submitted to a Christmas story competition in the *Nottinghamshire Guardian* in 1907, revised in January 1910,[13] and again in April 1911[14]for inclusion in the October 1914 publication of *Smart Set*. This magazine text was revised in July 1914 to produce the version which Lawrence sent to Hopkins in lieu of a bound volume on 18 January 1915.[15] These were again revised to produce the version in the *Prussian*

---

[10]*Letters i*, p.546.
[11]This version has been published; D.H. Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers. A Facsimile of the Manuscript*, edited by Mark Schorer, (Berkeley, London, 1977).
[12]Cushman, p.149.
[13]Mentioned in a letter of 23 January 1910, to Louie Burrows (*Letters i*, p.152).
[14]Mentioned in a letter of 12 April 1911, to Louie Burrows (p.258).
[15]*Letters ii*, p.259.

Officer collection. It is therefore likely, and the quality of the final story suggests, that Lawrence had, from the Hopkins proofs onwards, a well developed grasp of both his material and its form. E1 is the base text chosen, as the 1914 revisions to the story for its inclusion in *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories* make the earlier versions too remote to be of use, although relevant revisions from the *Smart Set* version will be discussed, as will those from the Hopkins proofs. In addition, Margery Morris has written an abridged and simplified version of 'The White Stocking' for Collins English Library, which separates Lawrence's 'style' and 'content', and replaces the former with her own 'style' which follows Collins' guidelines. Comparative analysis of her version and Lawrence's will serve to demonstrate the linguistic specificity and functional repetitiveness of the Lawrence extract, and the crucial relationship between Lawrence's 'style' and 'content'.

The passages selected will be not be examined in chronological order. Instead, the passage from *The Rainbow* will be analysed first, followed by that from *Sons and Lovers*, and that followed by the comparative analysis of Lawrence and Morris versions of 'The White Stocking'. By this ordering, the stylistic characteristics and effects of repetitiveness and linguistic specificity in *The Rainbow* can be identified before their development from the earlier works is judged, and the significance of changes in Lawrence's repetitiveness between *Sons and Lovers* and 'The White Stocking' evaluated.

The Rainbow

The passage selected from 'Anna Victrix' describes a conflict between the recently married Will Brangwen and Anna Lensky. The pages in *The Rainbow* which precede the passage selected identify the relationship between Will and Anna as one between 'opposite' forces, both in the obvious gender opposition of male and female, and in the residence of Anna on the Marsh Farm and Will in the world beyond,[16] developing the opposition between the Marsh world and the world beyond in the opening pages of the novel.[17] However, it is important to remember Lawrence's assertion that 'Male' and 'Female' do not mean merely man and woman, but are impersonal forces inherent in and between all life.[18] Will is entirely different to everything with which Anna is familiar,[19] and in him she sees the potential to move beyond her own world and experiences, and gain independence from her parents and their world.

---

[16]*Rainbow*, p.100.
[17]pp.10-11.
[18]*Hardy*, p.60, *Letters ii*, p.218.
[19]*Rainbow*, p.103.

However, the opposite forces inherent both within and between Will and Anna are mismatched, and, unlike Ursula, they have not resolved the achievement of their own independent selfhood prior to their marriage. Even before their marriage, Will's attitude to Anna is one of possession, and he demonstrates a capacity for recoil into his own fixed will, indicating the difficulties he will face in achieving a creative relationship with Anna. He is not fully developed within himself, and neither is Anna, as the image of them as a shed and buried seed following their marriage suggests.[20] She only respects Will as far as he is related to herself. Uncomfortable with the shedding of the day world which his honeymoon with Anna involves, Will is sufficiently underdeveloped to place himself in Anna's hands in order to make this unfamiliar situation easier.[21] Equally importantly, in his desire to prolong his moments of connection with Anna, he anticipates the sin later identified in *The Crown* of asserting the relative as absolute, and not allowing disintegration to follow consummation in order to allow new creation to begin again.[22] Will's feeling of 'uncreation' when Anna will not prolong this moment past its natural point of cessation again suggests his incompletion. Anna's increasing perception of Will as a burden, and Will's consequent self-absorbed cruelty to her indicates that the opposition between man and woman at this point is not one in which the forces inherent in each are fully developed. Each is destructive of the other in their interactions. Will is incomplete and both relies on Anna and is cruel to her in his self-absorbed recoil, and Anna asserts herself supreme. The passage analysed follows Anna's rational destruction of Will's newly conceived soul, achieved in his mystical appreciation of the church, and Will's resulting recoil into himself and his anger as he storms off into the snow. The frozen snow is a crystallised form of the water imagery present throughout the novel, and indicates Will's non-interactive hardening against Anna. The passage selected for analysis is reproduced below:

Paragraph One
And she loved the intent, far look of his eyes when they rested on her: intent, yet far, not near, not with her. And she wanted to bring them near. She wanted his eyes to come to hers, to know her. And they would not. They remained intent, and far, and <haughtily (MS, TSRD)> proud, like a hawk's, <yet (MSD)> naive and <native (MS)> [inhuman (E1)] as a 5 hawk's. So she loved him, and caressed him, and roused him like a hawk, till he was keen and <eager (MS)> [instant (MSR)], but without

---

[20]p.135.
[21]p.139.
[22]*Crown*, pp.271-272.

tenderness. He came to her fierce and hard, like a hawk striking and taking her. [He was no mystic any more, she was his aim and object, his prey. (Om. MS, E11)] And she was carried off, and he was satisfied, or satiated at last. 10

Paragraph Two

Then immediately she began to retaliate on him. She too was a hawk. If she imitated the pathetic plover running plaintive to him, that was part of the game. When he, satisfied, moved with a proud, insolent slouch of the body and a half-contemptuous drop of the head, unaware of 15 her, ignoring her very existence[, (E11)] after taking his fill of her and getting his satisfaction of her, her soul roused, its pinions became like steel, and she struck at him. When he sat on his perch glancing sharply round with solitary pride, pride eminent and fierce, she dashed at him and threw him from his station savagely, she goaded him from his keen dignity 20 of a male, she harassed him from his <impeturbed (MS)> [unperturbed (TSR)] pride, till he was mad with rage, his light brown eyes burned with fury, they saw her now, like flames of anger they flared at her and recognised her as the enemy.

Paragraph Three

Very good, she was the enemy, very good. As he prowled round 25 her, she watched him. As he struck at her, <with a snarl, because she threw aside his tools, she struck back (MS)> [she struck back.

He was angry because she had carelessly pushed away his tools so that they got rusty (TSR)].[23]

In the extract under analysis, a markedly repeated recurrence of lexical items within a very narrow textual scope serves, in the immediate context, to foreground these items by their apparently unnecessary repetition:

...<u>intent</u>, <u>far</u> look of his eyes when they rested on <u>her</u>; <u>intent</u>, yet <u>far</u>, <u>not</u> near, <u>not</u> with <u>her</u>. (1.1-2)

Within a wider context, these lexical items are cohesive with further repetitions within the paragraph, 'They remained <u>intent</u>, and <u>far</u> and <haughtily> proud...' (1.4), and, with the case of the reference items, throughout the passage. The most obvious effect of this repetition is connection and coherence, creating lexical cohesion within the paragraph and the wider context of the passage. In addition, Will's aloofness and separation from Anna suggests his complex identification with both the 'Male' and 'Female' principles of *Hardy*. He is 'Male' in his separation from Anna rather than absorption in oneness with her, and the resting of his eyes on her suggests that he registers Anna as the 'not-self'. However, Will's 'intent' look is

---

[23]*Rainbow*, p.151.

not concerned with Anna. He is occupied, apparently, in self-feeling, a 'Female' characteristic, although the distance of his gaze recalls the 'Male' characteristics of the Marsh women at the beginning of *The Rainbow*:

> ...the women looked out from the heated, blind intercourse of farm-life, to the spoken world beyond.[24]

Broader and more complex stylistic effects of repetition can be observed through analysis of the contexts in which these repetitions occur. The stylistic effects of lexical cohesion by repetition, and those of other stylistic characteristics in the passage, can be most simply demonstrated by the identification of the patterns which they create. The following breakdown of the final version of lines 1-6, and the key to stylistic features and functions which follows it, together identify a variety of stylistic characteristics and their effects:

<u>And she</u> **loved** the [intent, <u>far</u> look] of <u>his eyes</u>
                              when <u>they</u> rested ON <u>HER</u>:
                              [intent, yet <u>far</u>,] (<u>not near</u>),
                                        NOT WITH <u>HER</u>.
<u>And she</u> **wanted** ((to bring))   them   (<u>near</u>).
<u>She</u> **wanted**   <u>his eyes</u> ((to come)) TO <u>HERS</u>,
                                        ((to know))   <u>HER</u>.
<u>And</u>   [[<u>they</u> would <u>not</u>]].
                              [[<u>They</u> remained]]
                              [intent, and <u>far</u>], and proud,
                                  [(like a <u>hawk's</u>...)],
                                  naive and inhuman
                                  [(as a <u>hawk's</u>)].

Key to Stylistic Features and Functions

<u>Underlining</u>: Lexical cohesion by repetition.

((..)): Infinitive form of verb, referring to volitional desire of subject upon object; 'to bring' (l.2), 'to come' (l.3), 'to know' (l.3). Indicates volitional progressive states of action upon object (motivated by external forces; 'to bring', (l.2) subject's volition for object to perform self-motivated action; 'to come' (l.3) / verb of state (suggesting a desire for the previous infinitive verb to be extended in order to be fulfilled by intimate recognition of the subject by the object; 'to know' (l.3)). The infinitive 'to know' can be considered a verb of intimate recognition when considered in this context, but has multiple other interpretations, as will be examined shortly).

---

[24]p.10.

[[...]]: Negative reaction to female's verbs of volitional increased proximity, revealing the refusal of the male character to comply with the female's desires; 'they would not' (1.3-4), 'They remained' (1.4).

[...]: Adjectival phrase describing 'eyes' as object; 'intent, far look' (1.1); ambiguous position of 'eyes' as deleted subject '*they were* intent, yet far' (1.2), and also confirmed as continuing object, by their description in an adjectival phrase which refers back to the female's perception of them in the verb 'she loved'; 'eyes' as subject of sentence, ('*They remained* intent, and far...' (1.4)). Although the subject 'eyes' may still be viewed through the female character's perception, it is no longer *grammatically* the object of her verb, but subject of its own.

(..): Location of object, actual in the first instance, 'not near' (1.2), volitional in the second, 'near' (1.3).

CAPITAL LETTERS: Location of object, explicitly in relation to female character; 'on her' (1.1-2), 'not with her' (1.2), 'to hers' (1.3), 'her', (1.3).

Bold: Verbs taking female character as subject. Increased volition between example one; 'And she **loved**' (1.1), and examples two and three; 'And she **wanted**' (1.2), 'She **wanted**' (1.3). Examples one and two have initial lexical parallelism (anaphora), two and three have medial-initial parallelism.

[(...)]: Simile; 'like a hawk's' (1.5), 'as a hawk's' (1.5-6).

My paraphrase, below, is an attempt to encapsulate the propositional content of the first five sentences (1.1-6) of the extract, in order that the stylistic effects of Lawrence's repetitiveness might be examined. However, it must be noted that the potential interpretations of the infinitive 'to know' (1.3) makes accurate paraphrase impossible. In the context of the passage under discussion, the infinitive 'to know' may be interpreted either in the Biblical sexual sense, or as a verb of intimate recognition. In addition, it can also be referred back to Lawrence's description of 'knowledge' in *Hardy*:

> *To know* is a force, like any other force. *Knowledge* is only one of the conditions of this force, as combustion is one of the conditions of heat...And this *knowing* is now an inevitable habit of life's developed late, it is a force active in the immediate rear of life, and the greater its activity, the greater the forward, unknown movement ahead of it.[25]

The condition of knowledge in *Hardy* is a more 'Male' characteristic, as opposed to the condition of being, which is 'Female', although both make up the dual motion of life.[26] Anna

---

[25] *Hardy*, pp.41-42.
[26] pp.40-41.

is therefore wanting, and later *impelling* Will into a 'Male' condition, but her very impulsion of him identifies him with the 'Female' principle of *Hardy*, her with the 'Male':

> ...the vital desire of every woman is that she shall be clasped as axle to the hub of the man, that his motion shall portray her motionlessness, convey her static being into movement, complete and radiating out into infinity, starting from her stable eternality, and reaching eternity again, after having covered the whole of time.[27]

My paraphrase is; 'She loved the look of his eyes when they rested on her, not with her. They were intent, yet far. She wanted to bring his eyes near to her, for them to come to her and know her, but they would not.' In the Lawrencian construction, the repetition of the lexical item ''intent'' (l.2), following the colon, is not syntactically supported. After the colon, it is simply taken up again. This repetition therefore cannot perform a purpose merely of conveying 'sense'; its repetition is apparently unnecessary, and, arguably, ungrammatical. What, then, might be the stylistic effects of such repetition, and of the lexical cohesion which it creates? The adjective 'intent' moves from being attributive, 'the intent, far look' (l.1), to a form poised ambivalently, 'intent' (l.2), to being predicative, 'They remained intent, and far, and <haughtily> proud' (l.4), thus counterpointing the lexical insistence. In addition, the third employment of 'intent' (l.4) presents it as a complement to the intensive verb 'remained', thus revealing that no progress has been made, despite Anna's desire for connection. The lexical items 'intent' and 'far' are cohesive by repetition within the extract, and this cohesion is unaffected in revision. In addition, the increasingly volitional verbs employed to describe Anna's desires, 'she loved' (l.1), 'she wanted' (l.2), 'she wanted' (l.3) reflect her increasing desire for connection with Will, thus conveying the progress of her volition syntactically, in addition to the description of her desires in the propositional content of the text. However, in spite of the lexical cohesion and volitional progression created, both the repetition of 'intent' and 'far', and the increasing volition of verbs describing Anna's desires also suggest stylistically the *lack* of connection between the characters. The repeated lexical item 'intent', although creating lexical cohesion by repetition within the passage, is also presented as a paradox from the start, being qualified by the repeated, and thus lexically cohesive 'far' ('*yet far*' (l.2), 'They remained intent, and far' (l.4)). What Anna 'loved' (l.1) about Will, and which prompts her desire for interaction with him, the 'intent, far' look of his eyes (l.1), is

---

[27]p.56.

that which precludes her desired connection with him, 'they would not. They remained intent and far and <haughtily> proud' (1.3-4). Therefore the repetition of the lexical items 'intent' and 'far', when coupled with Anna's increasingly volitional desires and Will's negative response identify stylistically the conflictual tension between the couple. Will and Anna do not want each other mutually and simultaneously. They are both absorbed in asserting their own selves, and are thus incapable of achieving the balanced 'Absolute' which is achieved, in a limited sense, by Tom and Lydia at the end of Chapter 3.[28] This imbalanced conflict is portrayed stylistically, through the effects of Lawrence's repetitiveness as well as described in the propositional content of the passage.

Significant stylistic effects can also be identified when the verbs employed with relation to Anna's desire for connection are examined. The increasing affectiveness of these verbs reflect the progression of action as it is described in the passage. The increasing volitional quality of verbs describing Anna's increasingly insistent desire is coupled with an increasing desire for interaction with their object, Will's eyes (1.3), or the perceived characteristics of Will's eyes (1.1). Anna's registering of herself in relationship with Will indicates 'Male' aspects of her behaviour. Her desire for his action, which later develops into her impulsion of him into action, anticipate this later aspect of 'Male' behaviour also. The verbs through which this varying affectiveness is traced are identified by Modern font:

(1.1) she loved [sentimental experiential stative verb, of which the object need not be aware] the look [direct object]...

(1.2) she wanted [verb of increased volition, of which the object need not be aware]
BUT: is coupled with:
 (1.2) to bring them [direct object is unwittingly subject to desire of the subject, which wants to increase connection through its own efforts].

(1.3) She wanted [verb of equal volition as previous example, of which the object need not be aware]
BUT: is coupled with:
(1.3) his eyes to come [connection is desired as being achieved through the efforts, or at least the involvement, of the direct object, in which direct object is required to participate]

(1.3) she wanted (implied) [verb of equal volition as previous two examples, of which object need not be aware]
BUT: is coupled with:

---

[28]*Rainbow*, pp.90-91.

(l.3) his eyes (implied) to know [verb of intimate interaction, of which subject need not be aware].

This increase in volition by the subject, and in action demanded of the object is abruptly subverted by the repetition of the lexical item 'intent' with the static verb 'remained' (l.4). No increased connection has been achieved. This stylistic effect, which confirms the explicit sense of the passage, although arresting Anna's volitional progress, is affirmed by the complex manipulation of distance achieved in the construction, 'yet far, not near, not with her...' (l.2), in which greater volitional proximity is accompanied by increasingly emphatic negativity. Lexical cohesion through repetition has resulted, both in its immediate employment ('They remained intent' (l.4)), and in its contextual use (the arresting of Anna's increase in volition and requirement of action from its object), in the exposure of the essential *non* -connection between the protagonists. The conflict and opposition between Will and Anna, and the absence of their coming together, is again portrayed stylistically.

In paragraph one, Anna's actions towards Will are presented in a paratactic co-ordinate construction; 'So she loved him and caressed him and roused him...' (l.6). The verbs employed are increasingly affective to their object, therefore presenting the progression of the action of the extract in the syntactic form in which it is presented, and identifying the success of Anna's 'Male' impulsion of Will into reaction. Removal of this stylistic characteristic, through paraphrasing of the sentence for example, could reduce the prolixity of the expression either by reduction in the number of conjunctions employed, or by the compression of these three verbs into one. However, if a broader, contextual view is taken, the stylistic effects of this prolixity become apparent. The affective and prolix patterning of 'loved / caressed / roused' (l.6) can be linked to Will's reaction to Anna's stimulus by the indirect 'echoing' of one syntactic construction by another. The triple employment of verbs which chart the progression of Anna's action is 'echoed' in the employment of two adjectives and an adjectival phrase in example two, which describes Will's reaction to her actions. Although Will is roused into reaction by Anna's 'Male' impulsion, his reaction is not wholly 'Female'. In his lack of tenderness, Will is more akin to the 'Male' refusal of sensation than the 'Female' submission to it. Again, the affective progression is indicated by Modern font:

Paragraph One she loved / caressed / roused...(l.6)
Paragraph One he was keen / instant / without tenderness (l.7-8)

This triplicate form, and the 'echoing' achieved by it, is retained through revision, although MSR replaces 'eager' with 'instant'. Through the repeated employment of triplicate form, created by apparent prolixity, the non-connection between the protagonists is again identified stylistically. The disparity between the potentially interactive verbs employed to describe Anna's actions, which indicate her desire for interaction with Will, contrasts sharply with the self-contained intensive verb, adjectives and adjectival phrase employed to describe Will's reaction, which offer no potential for interaction. Again, the separate, conflictual and this time *opposite* characteristics of the protagonists are reflected stylistically. In addition, the employment of increasingly affective verbs (identified by Modern font) in this triplicate pattern to describe Anna's actions, and the pronoun and sentence connective which follow (identified in the example by italics), provides a link, although not numerical, with her subsequent actions in paragraph two:

Paragraph One So she loved / caressed / roused him... *till he* (1.6)
Paragraph Two When he...she dashed / threw / goaded / harassed him...*till he* (1.16-20)

In each example, the verbs employed to describe Anna's actions towards Will are increasingly affective to him, physically in the first example, and physically and then psychologically in the second. In addition, in each, the pronoun and sentence connective which follow are the same, and, both employed in initial position, create lexical parallelism. The syntactic parallelism created by these stylistic similarities between the two constructions identify the fact that Anna's attempts to woo Will, and to achieve the reaction which she desires, become increasingly combative and violent. She progresses from attempting to be a lover, to being an aggressor; the relationship between them is one of non-connection and conflict. This progression is not only described, but the repeated pattern highlights, or echoes, the propositional content of the passage.

Lawrence's employment of imagery in the passage achieves similar and related effects to those already demonstrated. The typographical markings employed in the following dissection of stylistic characteristics in the final text are explained in the key to stylistic features and their functions which follows:

Paragraph One
...she loved the intent, far look of his eyes...She wanted them *TO COME* to hers, to know her. And they would not. They remained...proud

like a hawk's...as a hawk's . So she loved him and caressed him and [roused] him like a hawk, till he was keen and instant, but without tenderness. He *CAME* to her fierce and hard, like a hawk , {*STRIKING*} and taking her...he was satisfied

Paragraph Two

She too was a hawk...pathetic plover...When he, satisfied...after getting his satisfaction...her soul {roused}, its pinions became like steel, and she {*STRUCK*}...When he sat on his perch with solitary pride, pride...mad with rage...

Paragraph Three

As he {*STRUCK* } at her, she {*STRUCK* } back.

Key to Stylistic Features and Functions

ITALICISED UPPER CASE LETTERS: development of action, and character connection implied at plot-level through lexical cohesion created by repetition of verb in different form.

Roman Font: repetition of image to imply character connection at explicit plot-level through simile/metaphor.

{...}: verb applied to one gender applied to opposite gender to imply explicit plot-level connection.

Throughout the passage, imagery of birds is cohesive by collocation in cohesive chains, and by repetition of the noun 'hawk'; (hawk's (l.5)...hawk's (l.6)...hawk (l.6)...hawk (l.8)...hawk (l.13)...prey (cohesive by collocation with the 'hawk' as a bird of prey) (l.10)...plover (l.13)...pinions (l.17)...perch (l.18)). Like the repetition of the lexical items 'intent' and 'far' in the passage, although differing in the manner of its cohesion, this imagery creates lexical cohesion within the extract, and appears to connect Will and Anna, through the application of bird-related imagery to each; (his eyes 'like a hawk's' (l.5), his eyes 'as a hawk's' (l.5-6), she loved, caressed and roused him 'like a hawk' (l.6), he came to her 'like a hawk' (l.8), she imitated the 'pathetic plover' (l.13), her soul's 'pinions' (l.17), 'his perch' (l.18)). Kinkead-Weekes, in his explanatory notes to *The Rainbow*[29] observes that the images of serpents and captured birds in the novel are part of Lawrence's 'symbolism of the genesis of selfhood from the garden of 'God the Father'', suggesting their affiliation with the 'Male' principle. In Lawrence's later essay *Love* (c.1917), Lawrence identifies 'hawklike' qualities

---

[29]*Rainbow*, p.520.

as being characteristic of 'profane' love, which appears to be contrasted with 'sacred' love in a similar manner to that of 'Male' and 'Female' respectively in *Hardy*:

> There must be brotherly love, a wholeness of humanity. But there must also be pure, separate individuality, separate and proud as a lion or a hawk.[30]

However, 'profane' love, Lawrence argues, is distinct from 'sacred' love in the following ways:

> Sacred love is selfless, seeking not its own. The lover serves his beloved and seeks perfect communion of oneness with her. But whole love between man and woman is sacred and profane together. Profane love seeks its own. I seek my own in the beloved, I wrestle with her to wrest it from her. We are not clear, we are mixed and mingled. I am in the beloved also, and she is in me. Which should not be, for this is confusion and chaos. Therefore I will gather myself complete and free from the beloved, she shall single herself out in utter contradistinction to me. There is twilight in our souls, neither light nor dark. The light must draw itself together in purity, the dark must stand on the other hand; they must be two complete in opposition, neither one partaking of the other, but each single in its own stead.[31]

Lawrence's characterisation of 'sacred' love as seeking oneness identifies it with the 'Female' principle of *Hardy*. However, its identification with service of the loved one, and its recognition of the 'not-self' in 'seeking not its own' identifies it with the 'Male' principle's characteristics of self-subordination, multiplicity, and recognition of relationships. Profane love, similarly, both 'seeks its own' and, in its identification with the 'hawk' is pure, separate, and individual, suggesting the 'Male' principle. It is poised at the point of ambiguity between 'Male' and 'Female' principle which Daleski identifies, and belongs to both.[32] The employment of the 'hawk' image in the passage is therefore likely to reveal further cross-hatching between 'Male' and 'Female', and present ambiguities in interpretation. It is through

---

[30]D.H. Lawrence, 'Love' in *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, edited by Michael Herbert, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1988), pp.5-12 (p.12).

[31]p.9.

[32]Daleski, pp.28-30. Daleski argues that when Lawrence deals with the relationship between men and women, singleness (ostensibly a 'Male' quality) is viewed as a product of the union of 'Male' and 'Female'. He claims that this does not mean that it is characteristic of 'Female' qualities, but cannot usefully be categorised under either grouping, because it belongs to both.

the employment of bird imagery that increasing interaction between the characters is both described and achieved, although this connection is not that which Anna initially desires, but one of conflict, resulting in the identification of Anna as Will's 'enemy' (l.23, 24). This increasing interaction, traceable through the collocational cohesive chain of bird related imagery and the repetition of the noun 'hawk', is identified in the following extract by the use of Modern font:

Paragraph One
They remained intent, and far, and <haughtily> proud, like a hawk's, naive and <native> [inhuman] as a hawk's...she loved him, and caressed him, and roused him like a hawk, till he was keen and <eager> [instant], but without tenderness. He came to her fierce and hard, like a hawk striking and taking her...[she was his aim and object, his prey.]

Paragraph Two
...she began to retaliate on him. She too was a hawk...her soul roused, its pinions became like steel, and she struck at him. When he sat on his perch glancing sharply round with solitary pride, pride eminent and fierce, she dashed at him and threw him from his station savagely, she goaded him from his keen dignity of a male, she harassed him from his <im>[un]perturbed pride, till he was mad with rage, his light brown eyes burned with fury, they saw her now ...

Paragraph Three
...As he prowled round her, she watched him. As he struck at her, <with a snarl because she threw away his tools> [she struck back.

He was angry because she had carelessly pushed away his tools so that they got rusty.][33]

However, if the repetition of the lexical item 'hawk' as an image applied to both characters is examined, the lexical cohesion created by repetition can be demonstrated as performing the function of identifying the *non*-connection between Will and Anna. With each occurrence of the noun 'hawk' employed in relation to Will, it is employed in simile form; 'like a hawk's' (l.5), 'as a hawk's' (l.5-6), 'like a hawk' (l.6), 'like a hawk' (l.8). In the initial

---

[33]Lawrence's revisions in the context of this cohesive chain have slight effect on the 'bird' cohesive chain. The replacement in E1 of MS 'native' with 'inhuman' (l.5) emphasises both the non-human characteristics of Will (his 'hawklike' characteristics) and his cruel aloofness. The former characteristic was previously evoked in the employment of 'haughtily' (l.4), which was deleted in TSR. Although suggesting Will's aloofness, 'haughtily' does not have the non-human and cruel qualities suggested in 'inhuman', and is lexically cohesive by synonymy with the repeated employment of 'proud' and items cohesive with it in the passage (l.4,14,19, 19, 21, 22). The insertion of the phrase 'she was his aim and object, his prey' (l.9-10) has obvious connection with the 'bird' cohesive chain, Anna being presented as the potential victim of Will's 'hawklike' impulses.

occurrence, Will's 'hawklike' characteristics indicate both 'Male' and 'Female' attributes, as already discussed. However, in the final identification of Will with a hawk in paragraph one, his recognition of 'not-self' is more akin to a predatory form of the 'Male' impulse. The third occurrence of the simile has an ambiguous referent; 'she loved him and caressed him and roused him like a hawk' (l.6). This third occurrence could refer again to Will, to mean 'like the hawk that he was', or be an adverbial phrase, describing the manner of Anna's verb action, and therefore her attempt to achieve connection with Will by imitating him. However, the occurrence of the image as a metaphor, 'she too was a hawk' (l.12-13), in paragraph two, and its occurrence with Anna's sudden retaliation upon Will, indicates that it is at this point that Anna begins to be linked herself to the 'hawk' image, whether by her own adoption of the image in an attempt to create the connection which she desires with him, or by the narrator's attribution of it to her. If Anna has adopted the image herself, there are two possible implications of this with reference to the opposing principles of *Hardy*. Either Will's 'striking and taking' of her has provoked her response, although his action has itself been provoked by Anna's increasingly affective behaviour towards him, *or* her observation of Will's hawklike qualities has impelled her into a similar state to him. In the former case, Anna impels Will who impels Anna, creating a circular causal relation which makes it difficult to identify either as the initial impulsive force. In the latter case, it is not 'Male' Will who impels 'Female' Anna, but 'Female' Anna who impels herself, as a result of observing Will. The attribution of *Hardy's* 'quasi-gender attributions' is neither complete nor clear. Due to the third occurrence of the simile before Anna is linked to it in paragraph two, it is likely to be referential to the male, cohesive by repetition with the previous simile use of 'hawk' in relation to him. In paragraph two, Anna *does* adopt, or is awarded, description which utilises the hawk image. Lexical cohesion by repetition, which links her to the description of Will, is therefore provided, suggesting some form of connection between the protagonists. However, whereas the hawk image is employed in simile form with reference to Will, when it is used with reference to Anna, it is employed as a metaphor; 'She too was a hawk' (l.12-13). The ambiguous focalisation which pervades the passage functions to undermine the connection apparently created between Anna and Will through the lexical cohesion created by repetition of the 'hawk' image with reference to both characters.[34] Ambiguous focalisation allows for

---

[34]The clear establishment of focalisation is very difficult in *The Rainbow*. Lawrence's repetitive style, the incomplete sentences employed in this passage and many others, and his use of expressives all point to the establishment of a character source consciousness and voice. However, the similarity of language and structure employed in *The Rainbow* to portray all character consciousness

the possibility that the latter example is a deliberate attempt by Anna to ally herself to Will by identifying herself as a 'hawk', rendered in quasi-direct speech. Anna could be the filter, or the statement could be made from the narrator's position of zero focalisation, which Chatman includes in *slant*.[35] If the former is the case, then Anna's adoption in metaphor form of the image introduced as a simile with reference to Will does not connect her to him more closely, as she desires, but instead reveals the fundamental *lack of connection* between them. In her attempt to ape him, she has revealed a fundamental misunderstanding of his state. The ambiguous focalisation also allows for the fact that the *entire* employment of the 'hawk' image may merely be Anna's projection, and thus an invalid point of connection at all. Indeed, it is the description of Will as having 'hawklike' qualities which characterises Anna's lack of success in achieving the connection with Will which she desires; 'They remained intent, and far, and proud, like a hawk's , naive and inhuman as a hawk's . So she loved him, and caressed him, and roused him like a hawk, till he was keen and instant, but without tenderness. He came to her fierce and hard, like a hawk striking and taking her...she was... his prey' (l.4-10). Anna's desired interaction with Will has resulted in the attribution to her of the very characteristics in Will which precluded the interaction she desired, 'She too was a hawk' (l.12-13), and resulted in an increasingly conflictual interaction marked by 'hawk' imagery; 'He came to her fierce and hard, like a hawk striking and taking her (l.8-9)...Then immediately she began to retaliate on him. She too was a hawk (l.12-13)'. Stylistic characteristics in the passage again identify the essential separateness of the interacting characters, separateness which is also inherent in the opposing forces which make up Lawrence's 'metaphysic'.

The function of ambiguous focalisation and a variety of forms of lexical cohesion to 'enact' the singleness and conflict of the interaction between Will and Anna is reinforced

---

simultaneously suggests the differing possibilities that language used is that of a narrator, *and* that it functions to dissolve the 'stable ego' by suggesting that all characters are fundamentally motivated by the same pre-conscious experiences. Thus focalisation is ambiguously poised between psycho-narration and narrated monologue, constantly fluctuates between the two, and can also move between characters (Dorrit Cohn, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* (Princeton, 1978), pp.46-9, 100-39). In addition, even where there are topic shifts within the passage, referential linkage by topic, semantic connectors, anaphor and connectives allow represented speech and thought to continue across sentence and episode boundaries where there are no explicit markers of RST (Susan Ehrlich, *Point of View: a linguistic analysis of literary* style (London, 1990) pp.27-57).

[35]Seymour Chatman defines 'filter' as situation in which a story is told from or through a character's consciousness, and 'slant' as the attitudinal function, which may be either the character's or the narrator's (Seymour Chatman, 'Characters and Narrators: Filter, Slant and Interest-Focus', *Poetics Today*, 7 (1986), pp.189-204 (pp.196, 197). Genette characterises 'zero-focalisation' as corresponding to omniscient narration (Gerard Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, (Oxford, 1986), pp.188-189.

through verb and object use in the passage. The majority of verbs in the passage are finite, facilitating, and necessitating, the possibility of subject / object connection. In paragraph one, the majority of the verbs referring to Anna's actions take a direct object; 'she loved...*the*...*look*' (l.1), 'she wanted to bring *them*' (l.2), 'she loved *him*...caressed *him*...roused *him*' (l.6), whereas those employed in relation to Will generally take an indirect object, or treat her as *location*; 'they (his eyes) rested *on her*' (l.1); *direction*; 'He came *to her*' (l.8); 'he prowled *round her*' (l.24-25); are *self-referential intensive complements*; 'They remained intent' (l.4); 'he was keen and <eager> [instant]' (l.6-7); or are *elliptical*; 'they would not' (l.3-4). The syntax of the passage therefore reflects both Anna's desire for connection and response, and Will's aloofness. In the single instance where the employment of a verb taking Will as subject *does* appear to take a straightforward direct object; 'striking and taking her' (l.8-9), the verbs employed are both non-interactive and describe violent behaviour. Potential connection through similarity of verb / object use describes only conflict. However, as paragraph one reaches its conclusion, there is a shift in the male / female verb relations. The sentence, 'He was no mystic any more, she was his aim and object, his prey' (l.9-10), inserted in TSR, equates the description of Anna with Will's intention. The shifting and ambiguous focalisation of the passage allows the sentence to be interpreted as his narrated monologue. However, the sentence does not read, 'He was no mystic any more. He took her as his aim and object, his prey.' The employment of Anna as subject in the construction 'she was' suggests her autonomy. Again, the focalisation of the passage results in ambiguity. If the sentence is considered as *Anna's* narrated monologue, it can be viewed as her perception of her success, as can the sentence, 'Very good, she was the enemy, very good' (l.24). She may be viewed, therefore, not only as a projection of Will's intentions, but as the fulfilment of her own volition, and as such, very much in control of activities. Again, this suggests Anna's role in impelling Will into a 'Male' role according to her desires. Through its ambiguous position as attributable to *both* characters' focalisations, the sentence suggests a connection between Will and Anna. However, the characters are simultaneously kept separate by the fact that the sentence has different emphases, and thus different 'meanings' according to its focaliser. This connection / non-connection patterning both 'enacts' the action of the passage, and reflects Lawrence's belief in the singleness of 'Male' and 'Female', man and woman, within intimate interactions. It is developed as the passage continues. At the end of paragraph one, we learn, 'she was carried off, and he was satisfied, or satiated at last' (l.10-11). The verbs employed might be considered either interactive ('carried off <u>by him</u>', 'satiated <u>by her</u>')

or self-referential ('carried off <u>by her emotions</u>', 'was satisfied', 'was satiated'). In the latter case, these verbs indicate the occupation in self feeling which characterises the 'Female' impulse to a greater extent than in the former case. What could be regarded as interaction between Will and Anna could equally be an affirmation of their separation and singleness. In addition, although Will and Anna's activities occur in the same sentence, they are separated by the initial comma. Thus the activities appear as both *connected* (occurring in the same sentence), and potentially *independent and separate* (juxtaposed on either side of the comma, and self-referential).

The action / reaction patterning of paragraph two suggests that connection between the characters is more likely than in paragraph one. However, an examination of verb and object use reveals this not to be the case. Verb and object use employed in connection with Anna shifts to a more indirect form. The majority of verb action with Anna as subject takes an indirect object or is directional; 'she began to retaliate *on him*' (l.12), 'running plaintive *to him*' (l.13), 'she struck *at him*' (l.18), 'she dashed *at him*' (l.19), suggesting identification with the movement and registering of relationships of the 'Male' principle. When the direct object *is* taken, the verbs employed are non-interactive, although they are affective to their object; '[she] *threw* him' (l.20), 'she *goaded* him' (l.20), 'she *harassed* him' (l.21), or self-referential; '*She too* was a hawk' (l.12-13), '*if she* imitated' (l.13), as were those employed in relation to Will in paragraph one. Verb and object use in sentences in which Anna is subject shifts to reflect verb and object use previously employed when Will was subject. Thus a grammatical connection between the two characters is suggested as the action of the passage develops. However, this shift *also* results in Anna being taken a grammatical step *further away* from the object of her verb (Will). The continued employment of the indirect object form in paragraph two in constructions which take Will as subject, and the non-interactive state of his verbs which do take direct objects ('ignoring her very existence' (l.16)) also reveal this separation and distance. In addition, Lawrence employs adverbial phrases rather than verb referents at the end of paragraph two; 'he was mad *with rage*' (not 'with / at her') (l.22), 'his...eyes burned *with fury*' (not 'at her') (l.23). Although, in the context of the passage, the phrases suggest that Anna's behaviour, or the situation between the characters, is the cause of the 'rage' and 'fury' mentioned; 'she...till he was mad with rage' (l.19-22), the adverbial phrases refer directly back to their verbs. It is only by contextual connection that they are referred back to any external cause. Even *in* this context, they suggest conflict and opposition in a similar manner to the recognition of Anna as 'the enemy' in paragraphs two and three

(l.23, 24). Again, separation and opposition between the man and woman is identified stylistically, although the action of the passage suggests that this is one of the points at which Will breaks from his aloofness to respond to Anna's harassment, thus connecting the characters in action / reaction behaviour, however conflictual. Stylistic analysis confirms not only the conflict explicit in the passage, but reveals the separation and opposition implicit in that conflict, and, according to Lawrence, within and between man and woman.

This pattern is emphasised when a broader overview of the passage is taken. In the opening sentence of paragraph one, the object of the verb 'loved' taking 'Anna' as subject is also the subject of the verb 'rested' (l.1). However, 'Anna' is the *location* at which the verb taking 'Will' as subject occurs, not the object of it, thus precluding the connections of a direct subject / verb / object relationship. Similarly, the employment of the modifying phrase 'intent, far look of' (l.1) in the first half of the construction creates a distance between the verb taking Anna as subject and its object. She 'loves' not him, nor his eyes themselves, but an abstraction from them, compounding the non-interactive state which the minimally affective verb 'loved' suggests (Will need not be aware of being 'loved', and is not physically affected by it). This separation is supported when we recognise that the motivating force which attempts to achieve the connection is entirely one-sided. Anna's desire for interaction is described through the repeated employment of compound verbs, which have a progressive, volitional aspect; 'she *wanted to bring them near...*she *wanted his eyes to come* to hers, *to know* her' (l.2-3). The verbs which take Will, or Will's eyes, as subject, and which describe his response to these first overtures suggest a closed, non-interactive state; 'they *would not*' (l.3-4), 'They *remained*' (l.4) as does the adverbial phrase; 'till he was keen and <eager> [instant], but without tenderness' (l.7-8). The paradoxical lack of connection employed in the treatment of the verb 'loved' is affirmed. In addition, when the desired moment of visual connection *does* occur, in paragraph two; 'his light brown eyes burned with fury, *they saw her now...*they flared at her and recognised her as the enemy' (l.22-23), it is only a brief connection. The construction which follows returns to the indirect form; 'they flared *at* her' (l.23), and the moment of 'recognition' is modified by the fact that she is recognised not as a friend, but as 'the enemy' (l.23), again reflecting stylistically the separation and opposition described in the passage, and characteristic of Lawrence's developing dialectic. It is at this point that a narratological complication at the heart of the moment of connection, and the stylistic effects of this complication, can be identified; 'they saw her now' (l.23). It is impossible to establish whether the focalisation employed is an example of Genette's zero

focalisation / Chatman's narrator's slant, or of internal focalisation, with Anna as filter, making manifest her satisfaction that she has managed to 'bring them near'. If the latter situation is the case, the achieved visual connection in the passage may not, in fact, be a moment of connection at all, but simply a one-sided view of events, perceived not from the perspective of the character who is alleged to be doing the 'seeing', but from that of the character who wants the seeing *done* . The result of an inability to state categorically, from textual evidence, whose focalisation is employed at this point precludes the possibility of the statement 'they saw her now' (1.23) being simply an objective recognition of connection. The moment of apparent connection is therefore destabilised, and the essential separation between man and woman, in whom the oppositions of 'Male' and 'Female' are most obvious, is again suggested stylistically.

The action / reaction patterning within the extract under analysis reveals similar stylistic effects to those observed previously. The pattern of interactions between Anna and Will in the extract is traced in the following example. Double slashes indicate the end of a sentence, brackets indicate a non-connective employment of 'they':

Paragraph One
she...his...(they)...her...her // she...(them) // she...his...hers...her // (they) // (they) // she...him...him...him...he // He...her...her // [He...she...his...his (E1I)] // she...he //

Paragraph Two
she...him // She // she...him // he...her...her...his...her...his...her...her... its...she...him // he...his...she...him...him...his...she...him...his... she...him... his...he...his...(they)...her...(they)...her...her//

Paragraph Three
she // he...her...she...him // he...her...<she...she (MS)> [she...("back" suggests "at him')...He...she...his...(they)//

A stylistic characteristic with significant effect is the repeated occurrence of the pronouns 'they' or 'them' (1.1, 2, 3, 4, 23, 23, 29). These have been bracketed. 'They' differs from the other pronouns in the passage with respect to the noun for which it stands. In each but the final instance of its occurrence, the pronoun 'they' refers not to a connection between the 'he' and 'she' of the passage, but to Will's eyes. Throughout the passage, Will's eyes are described as being non-connective (1.1-6, 18-19), or, when connection is made (1.23), this connection is described in terms of opposition (1.23, 24). In romantic literature, eyes have long been the first point of mutual exchange between potential lovers. This idea takes on new

significance with Tom Brangwen and Lydia Lensky in *The Rainbow*, whose intrinsic connection, in accordance with Lawrence's theory of duality, does not necessitate personal knowledge of each other. The major part of Tom's recognition of Lydia, and her of him, as the perfect mate, occurs through the employment of eye imagery or themes of vision. Expectations raised by knowledge of traditional usage, and Lawrence's own usage earlier in the novel, of eyes in intimate exchanges are therefore subverted to express their opposite in the passage under analysis, while recalling their previous associations. In the example where 'they' is not employed as the pronoun standing for the noun 'eyes', it stands for Will's tools. Separation and conflict between the characters in the employment of the pronoun is again achieved, as it is Anna's pushing away of these tools which is revealed as having made Will angry. Again, stylistic characteristics of the extract serve to qualify potential connection between Will and Anna by revealing non-connection to be the case. Lawrence's repetitiveness in this passage, through various forms of lexical cohesion, and through syntactic and lexical parallelism, has served to 'enact' stylistically the non-connection and conflict which characterises the relationship of Will and Anna at this stage of their relationship. The 'Male' and 'Female' principles of *Hardy*, as has been demonstrated, are cross-hatched within and between both characters, and this cross-hatching can be traced through the repetitiveness of Lawrence's style.

Sons and Lovers

Sons and Lovers is less obviously repetitive than *The Rainbow*, and the philosophy which both informs and can be read into Lawrence's work is not comprehensively developed at this stage. Yet the repetitiveness of the novel has many similar effects to that of *The Rainbow*.[36] The opposite characteristics attributed to Walter Morel and Gertrude Coppard in the following passage anticipates both the relationship between man and woman which Lawrence describes in 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*', in which the man is the active partner, the woman the receptive and revitalising, and the Will to Motion and Will to Inertia developed in *Hardy*. However, the opposition between 'Male' and 'Female' in this passage is more straightforwardly that of man and woman than the complex cross-hatching employed throughout the later novel. The passage selected for analysis is reproduced below:

---

[36]In particular, the cohesive chains examined in this analysis of Walter and Gertrude Morel's meeting have obvious anticipatory relationship to the chain of lexical items cohesive by collocation with 'strange' in *The Rainbow*, discussed in Chapter 5 of this thesis.

Paragraph One

When she was twenty three years old she met, at a christmas [sic] party, a young man from the Erewash Valley. Morel was then twenty-seven years old. He was well-set-up, erect and very smart. He had wavy, black hair that shone again, and a vigorous black beard that had never been shaved. His cheeks were ruddy, and his red, [moist (MSI)] mouth 5 was noticeable because he laughed so often, and so heartily. He had that rare thing, a rich, ringing laugh <like the clapping of glad bells (MSD)>. <Gertrude (MS)> <[Elizabeth (first MSR)]> [Gertrude (MSR)] Coppard had watched him fascinated. He was so full of colour and animation, his voice ran so easily into comic grotesque, he was so ready and pleasant 10 with everybody. Her own father had a rich fund of humour, but it was satiric. This man's was different: soft, non-intellectual, warm, a kind of gambolling.

Paragraph Two

She herself was <so different (MS)> [opposite (MSR)]. She had a curious, receptive mind, which found much pleasure and amusement in 15 listening to other folk. She was clever in leading folk on to talk <being bright, sympathetic and of quick understanding (MS)> [. She loved ideas, and was considered very intellectual. (MSR)] What she <loved (MS)> [liked (MSR)] most of all was <a discussion (MS)> [an argument (MSR)] on religion or <non-technical (MS, MSRD)> philosophy or politics, with 20 some educated man. This she did not often enjoy. <So it was her constant habit to have people talk to her .(MS)> [So she always had people tell her about themselves, finding her <great> pleasure <in studying life> [so] (MSR)].

Paragraph Three

In her person, she was rather small and delicate, with a large brow, 25 and dropping bunches of silk curls. Her blue eyes were very <kind <and> [but] very seeing (MS)> [straight, honest and searching <and proud> (MSR)]. She had the beautiful hands of the Coppards. Her dress was always <very (MS, MSRD)> subdued. She wore <a (MS, MSRD)> dark blue silk <dress (MS, MSRD)>, with a peculiar silver chain, of silver 30 scallops. This, and a heavy brooch of twisted gold, was her only ornament. She was still perfectly <pure in soul (MS)> [intact (MSR)], deeply religious, and full of beautiful candour.

Paragraph Four

Walter Morel <was rather timid of (MS)> [seemed melted away before (PP)] her. She was to <him (MS)> [the miner (MSR)] that thing of 35 <delicate mystery (MS)> [mystery and fascination (PP)], a lady. When she spoke to him, it was with <that (MS)> [a (MSR)] southern pronunciation and <that (MS)> [a (MSR)] purity of English which thrilled him to hear. She watched him. He danced well, as if it were natural and joyous in him to dance. His grandfather was a French refugee who had 40 married an English barmaid - if it had been a marriage. Gertrude Coppard watched the young miner as he danced, <with (MS, MSRD)> a certain subtle exhalation like glamour in his movement, and his face the flower of

his body, ruddy, with tumbled black hair, and laughing alike, whatever partner he bowed above. She thought him rather wonderful, never having 45 met anyone like him. Her father was to her the type of all men. And George Coppard, <erect and dignified, of leisurely movement (MS)> [proud in his bearing, handsome, and rather bitter (PP)]; who preferred theology in reading, and who drew near in <deep (MS, MSRD)> sympathy only to one man, the Apostle Paul; who was <harsh and austere (MS)> 50 [harsh (PP)] in government, and in familiarity <even only playfully ironic (MS)> [ironic (PP)]; who <in his pride ignored (MS)> [ignored (PP)] all sensuous pleasure - he was very different from the miner. <Gertrude (MS)> <[Elizabeth (MSR)]> [Gertrude (MSR)] herself was rather contemptuous of dancing: she had not the slightest inclination towards that 55 accomplishment, and had never learned even a Roger de Coverley. She <herself lived mostly within the white light of her own consciousness (MS)> [was a puritan, <who considered everything one did should be useful, either towards improving this world, or increasing one's chances in the next (MSR)> (MSR)] [like her father, high-minded, and really stern 60 (PP)]. Therefore the dusky, golden softness of <his (MS)> [this man's (PP)] sensuous flame of life, that flowed <off (PP)> [from off (MS)] his flesh like the flame from a candle, not baffled and gripped <by <her> [the] spirit into incandescence (MS)> [into incandescence by thought and spirit as her life was (MSR)], seemed to her something wonderful, beyond her.[37] 65

The oppositional characteristics of the relationship between Walter Morel and Gertrude Coppard is identified explicitly in the propositional content at the moment in which they meet; 'She herself was opposite' (1.14). MSR emphasises the contrast, MS's weaker comparison 'so different' being replaced with 'opposite', which identifies a contrast of polarities, and suggests a movement towards the binary absolute oppositions which inform *Twilight in Italy* to a small extent in 1913, *Hardy* and, later, *The Crown* and the 1915 *Twilight in Italy* revisions. As with *Hardy*, where Lawrence claims that 'desire' (not necessarily sexual) is prompted by the realisation of what is lacked,[38] it is the difference between Walter and Gertrude which initially attracts them to each other. Opposite characteristics of class, attitude and dialect undergo no significant change in revision:

> She thought him rather wonderful, never having met anyone like him. Her father was to her the type of all men...he was very different from the miner. (1.45-46, 53-54)

> She watched him. He danced well, as if it were natural and joyous in him to dance...<Gertrude (MS)> <[Elizabeth (first MSR)]> [Gertrude (MSR)] herself was rather contemptuous of dancing: she had not the

---

[37] *Sons and Lovers*, pp.17-18.
[38] *Hardy*, p.58.

slightest inclination towards that accomplishment, and had never learned even a Roger de Coverley. (l.39-40, 54-57)

She was to <him (MS)> [the miner (MSR)] that thing of <delicate mystery (MS)> [mystery and fascination (PP)], a lady. When she spoke to him, it was with <that (MS)> [a (MSR)] southern pronunciation and <that (MS)> [a (MSR)] purity of English which thrilled him to hear. (l.35-39)

Morel's joyful dancing, and Gertrude's passivity both suggest the motion ('Male') and stability ('Female') of both the Foreword, and the later *Hardy*. The opposition between Walter and Gertrude is characterised in two ways; by lexical cohesion (most importantly for stylistic effect, this is achieved through collocation in cohesive chains and repetition) and through syntactic parallelism which anticipates that later employed in *The Rainbow*. The initial description of Walter Morel (l.3), is syntactically parallel with the contrasting description of Gertrude Coppard (l.26-28, 32-33). Morel is described in terms of his physical appearance, in a construction which comprises subject, verb, a series of three adjectival phrases, the second in apposition with the first (straight), and the third conjoined. All adjectival phrases function as subject predicatives; 'He was well-set-up, erect, and very smart' (l.3). This sentence is unchanged from MS. This syntactic pattern, or close to it, is repeated twice in the description of Gertrude Coppard's appearance: 'Her blue eyes were very straight, honest and searching' (l.26-28), 'She was still perfectly intact, deeply religious, and full of beautiful candour' (l.32-33). The former of these sentences undergoes significant revision before syntactic parallelism is achieved. It is revised from 'very kind <and> [but] very seeing' in MS, which employs two adjectival phrases, rather than the three needed for the final syntactic parallelism achieved. In addition, the simple repetition of 'very' creates lexical cohesion by repetition *within* the sentence, contrasting (in the replacement of 'and' with 'but') Gertrude's characteristics of 'kindness' and 'seeing' rather than the contrast with Walter which is achieved in the final version. MSR's 'straight, honest and searching <and proud>' which, with the final deletion creates syntactic parallelism with the description of Walter, allows contrast between male and female character to be portrayed syntactically, the parallelism of syntactic form drawing attention to what has been changed from the first parallel structure to the second. This syntactic parallelism serves to connect the characters stylistically within the passage. However, Morel is described purely in terms of his physical appearance, and Gertrude in terms of personality traits, a feature which, despite revisions, remains unchanged from MS. The repetition of the syntactic structure with altered subject

and adjectival phrases draws attention to the elements which are changed within the construction, and thus a contrast between external appearance and 'internal' nature can be discerned. Repetition, both by lexical cohesion and syntactic parallelism, functions to identify this opposition. In addition, the structure of the description of Walter Morel (pronoun subject + verb 'was' + three subject predicative adjectival phrases) is syntactically parallel again (and lexically cohesive by the repetition of 'was') with the description of Gertrude which follows the establishment of location 'in her person' (1.25). The syntactically parallel phrase, unchanged from MS, is as follows; '...she was rather small and delicate, with a large brow, and dropping bunches of brown silk curls' (1.25-26). Again, the syntactic parallelism draws our attention to what has changed, and Morel's impressive physical appearance is contrasted with the delicacy and implied intellectualism of Gertrude.[39] These contrasting descriptions, but syntactic parallelism, are developed as the passage continues. The description of Morel continues with a description of his hair and beard, unchanged from MS. This description is constructed by the employment of conjoined direct objects, or co-ordinated phrases; both noun phrases functioning as direct objects have subordinate clauses as modifiers; 'He had wavy, black hair that shone again, and a vigorous black beard that had never been shaved' (1.3-5). The adjectives 'wavy'[40] and 'vigorous'[41] and the verb 'shone'[42] suggest motion and dynamism rather than stability, again anticipating the 'Male' activity of the Foreword, and, later, of *Hardy*. Morel's dynamism is emphasised by his dancing, and his 'ringing' (1.7) laughter, which, in MS, is compared to the 'clapping of glad bells', indicating his festive characteristics. The description of Morel's humour, which is so different from that to which Gertrude is used (1.11-13) is also described in physical and dynamic terms; 'a kind of gambolling' (1.12-13). Although no direct syntactic parallelism with this exists in the description of Gertrude Morel, the descriptions of her which employ the verb 'to have', previously employed in the

---

[39] '...with a large brow', when considered with reference to the extensive references to Gertrude's intellectuality in the passage, suggests a physiological manifestation of her intelligence, just as Morel's 'vigorous' beard and shining hair suggest his physical vitality, as will be discussed shortly.

[40] wavy: **6.a** Forming an undulating line or series of wave-like curves. Also, having an undulating margin (*The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume XX*, edited by J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, second edition (Oxford, 1989), p.9).

[41] vigorous: **1.a.** Of persons or animals: strong and active in body; endowed with or possessed of physical strength and energy; robust in health or constitution; hard, lusty, strong. (*The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume XIX*, edited by J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, second edition (Oxford, 1989), p.626).

[42] shine: **1.a.** Of a heavenly body, or an object that is alight: shed beams of bright light; to give out light so as to illuminate; to be radiant (*The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume XV*, edited by J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, second edition, (Oxford, 1989), p.268).

description of the dynamic physicality of Walter's hair and beard, and thus lexically cohesive by repetition, emphasise her contrasting intellectuality and delicate repose. In the following example, the subordinate clause acts as modifier, as in the Walter Morel example, although conjoined direct objects do not occur: 'She had a curious, receptive mind, which found much pleasure and amusement in listening to other folk' (l.14-16). The description of her hands in the following example (the direct objects of the verb 'to have', again suggests her lack of physical dynamism; 'She had the beautiful hands of the Coppards' (l.28). The opposite characteristics of the characters, traceable in the syntactic parallelism of this passage, is supported by the effects of the lexical cohesion employed. Gertrude is attracted by Morel's vigorous and dynamic nature, as portrayed in the description of his beard, his dancing, and his humour. The abstract noun 'humour' is lexically cohesive by collocation or repetition with the underlined items in the following passage:

> His cheeks were ruddy, his red, [moist (MSRI)] mouth was noticeable because he laughed so often and so heartily. He had that rare thing, a rich, ringing laugh <like the clapping of glad bells (MSR)>. <Gertrude (MS)> <[Elizabeth (first MSR)]> [Gertrude (MSR)] Coppard had watched him fascinated. He was so full of colour and animation, his 5 voice rang so easily into comic grotesque, he was so ready and pleasant with everybody. Her own father had a rich fund of humour, but it was satiric. This man's was different: soft, non-intellectual, warm, a kind of gambolling.
> She herself was <so different (MS)> [opposite (MSR)]. She had a 10 curious, receptive mind, which found much pleasure and amusement in listening to other folk...he danced...laughing alike whatever partner he bowed above. (l.5-16, 42, 44-45)

This lexical cohesion is present from MS, and unchanged in revision. Whereas lexical items cohesive by collocation with humour, and employed with reference to Walter Morel emphasise his physicality (l.2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12) that employed with reference to Gertrude (l.11) identifies her non-physical and comparatively passive character. In addition, the lexical item 'pleasure' in this sentence (l.11) is cohesive (through etymological or derivational relationship) with 'pleasant', which describes Morel's interpersonal relationships in (l.6); '...he was so ready and pleasant with everybody'. These examples of lexical cohesion function to emphasise the contrast between the characters already revealed by the replacement of lexical items in syntactically parallel constructions. Whereas Morel's interpersonal skills are outward looking and animated, Gertrude's are receptive, again anticipating the Will to Motion

and the Will to Stability in *Hardy*, and the similar forces in the 'Foreword'. In addition, revisions to the descriptions of Gertrude in MS emphasise the contrast between the physical and dynamic Walter and the comparatively passive and intellectual Gertrude and her background. In the first of these revisions, Gertrude's interpersonal skills, and 'quick understanding', which is not explicitly identified as intellectual aptitude, is revised to identify her academic interest and aptitude:

> She was clever in leading folk on to talk <being bright, sympathetic and of quick understanding (MS)> [. She loved ideas, and was considered very intellectual. (MSR)] (l.16-18)

Similarly, revisions to the following sentences increase the characteristics of Gertrude which are opposite to Morel's. In the first example, Gertrude is described first in terms of mental consciousness. The initial revisions characterise her as religiously austere, but the final revisions identify her as both intellectual *and* austere, with the religious element toned down. These characteristics are both in sharp contrast to the characteristics of Walter Morel in the passage:

> She <herself lived mostly within the white light of her own consciousness (MS)> [was a puritan, <who considered everything one did should be useful, either towards improving this world, or increasing one's chances in the next (MSR)> (MSR)] [like her father, high-minded and really stern (PP)]. (l.57-61)

In the second example, Gertrude's intellectual characteristics are again emphasised, as are her reflective ones. This is achieved by the insertion of 'thought':

> ...not baffled and gripped <by <her> [the] spirit into incandescence (MS)> [into incandescence by thought and spirit as her life was (MSR)] (l.63-65)

Even the description of Gertude's father is revised to form further contrast with Walter. His 'leisurely movement' of MS, which contrasted with Walter's dynamic dancing, is replaced in page proofs with adjectival phrases which suggest, like the descriptions of Gertrude, his internal and restrained nature. The revisions are as follows:

> And George Coppard, <erect and dignified, of leisurely movement (MS)> [proud in his bearing, handsome, and rather bitter (PP)] (l.46-48)

The removal of the adjective 'playfully' in page proofs, which modifies 'ironic' in MS, removes more potential lexical cohesion with descriptions of Walter. Lawrence's revisions, and the repetitiveness created by syntactic parallelism and lexical cohesion, have functioned to 'enact' the opposites inherent in the relationship between Walter and Gertrude Morel, and anticipate the ideas developed in the essays, and in *The Rainbow*.

'The White Stocking'

Kinkead-Weekes claims that Lawrence inverts the 'quasi-gender attributions' of *Hardy* when he comes to write *The Rainbow*, thus ensuring that emphasis falls not on gender relations, but on the impersonal forces inherent in all life.[43] Cushman's recognition of the movement towards *The Rainbow* in the language of the 1914 *Prussian Officer* revisions identifies the significant broad and thematic changes which Lawrence makes. However, Lawrence's repetitiveness also functions to suggest this development. From the Hopkins proof stage of the story onwards, the relationship between Whiston and his wife repeatedly has characteristics of the terms later developed in *Hardy*, although these terms are inverted. These inverted terms also characterise the description of the Marsh men and women at the beginning of *The Rainbow*:

Hardy

As in my flower, the pistil, female, is the centre and swivel, the stamens, male, are close clasping the hub, and the blossom is the great movement outwards into the unknown, so in a man's life, the female is the swivel and centre on which he turns closely, producing his movement.[44]

'The White Stocking'

She was stimulated all the day. She did not think about her husband. He was the permanent basis from which she took these giddy little flights into nowhere. At night, like chickens and curses, she would come home to him, to roost. (Om.*SS*, HPI)[45]

---

[43]'Marriage of Opposites', p.39. For my examination of 'quasi-gender attribution' and repetitiveness in *The Rainbow*, see Chapter 4.
[44]*Hardy*, p.56.
[45]'White Stocking' in *Prussian Officer*, p.149.

> She liked the solid man he was. It made her feel irresponsible, free to enjoy her earrings and her little pleasures. (*SS*)[46]

> He was so <solid (HP)> [sure (*PO*)], so permanent, he had her so utterly in his power. It gave her a delightful, mischievous sense of liberty. Within his grasp, she could dart about <so (HP, Om. *PO*)>excitingly.[47]

The Rainbow

> Then the men sat by the fire in the house where the women moved about with surety, and the limbs and the body of the men were impregnated with the day, cattle and earth and vegetation and the sky, the men sat by the fire and their brains were inert, as their blood flowed heavy with the accumulation from the living day.
> The women were different. On them too was the drowse of blood-intimacy...But the women looked out from the heated, blind intercourse of farm-life, to the spoken world beyond. They were aware of the lips and the mind of the world speaking and giving utterance, they heard the sound in the distance, and they strained to listen.[48]

The cross-hatching inherent in Lawrence's portrayal of these forces ensures that the balance between 'Male' and 'Female' proportions in the characters of the story is never static. Whiston is predominantly 'Female', his wife predominantly 'Male' at the point at which the story begins, two years after their marriage. However, the attribution of 'Male' and 'Female' impulses between them does not always suggest this. In the early stages of their marriage, Mrs Whiston was the more predominantly 'Female' character, providing her husband with stability, and tempering his (previously 'Female') occupation in self-feeling so that he can engage with the matters of the outside world

> In a few weeks, she and Whiston were married. She loved him with passion and worship, a fierce little abandon of love that moved him to the depths of his being, and gave him a permanent surety and sense of realness in himself. He did not trouble about himself any more: he felt he was <accomplished (HP)> [fulfilled (*PO*)] and now he had only the many things in the world to busy himself about. Whatever troubled him, at the bottom was surety. He had found himself in <her (HP)> [this (*PO*)] love.[49]

---

[46]D.H. Lawrence, 'The White Stocking', *Smart Set*, (October 1914), pp.97-108 (p.99).
[47]'White Stocking' in *Prussian Officer*, pp.147-148. The equivalent, but not corresponding passage in *SS* reads:
> She scarcely noticed him, and yet something in his movements, even his wrists buttoned in the shirt cuffs, gave her a feeling of ease and liberty. He was there to look after her, so she could do as she liked. (p.100).
[48]*Rainbow*, p.10.
[49]'White Stocking' in *Prussian Officer*, p.158.

In her relationship with Sam Adams at the dance, the attribution of opposing 'Male' and 'Female' forces is more complex.[50] The following description of their dance seems to identify Sam with the stable and monistic 'Female' principle, Mrs Whiston with the active 'Male', although her apparently volitional swimming into him and away from the outside world is potentially a 'Female' activity unstimulated by him:

> She lay in the arm of the <large (HP)> [steady (PO)], close man with whom she was dancing, and she seemed to swim away out of contact with the room, [into him (Om. HP, POI)].[51]

However, Sam also seems to be poised ambiguously between both 'Female' stability and 'Male' motion. He provides the 'Female' support described as necessary for 'Male' activity in *Hardy*:

> Let a man walk alone on the face of the earth, and he feels himself like a loose speck blown at random. Let him have a woman to whom he belongs, and he will feel as though he had a wall to back up against, even though the woman be mentally a fool. No man can endure the sense of space, of chaos, on four sides of him. It drives him mad. He must be able to put his back to the wall. And this wall is his woman.[52]

Yet he also is the active 'Male' force who seems to impel her into motion. This combination of 'Male' and 'Female' attributions can be traced in the following extract:

> <And (HP)> [But (PO)] he bore her round the room in the dance, and he seemed to sustain all her body with his limbs, his body, and his <hand (HP)> [warmth (PO)] seemed to come closer into her, nearer, <nearer (HP)> [till it would fuse right through her, and she would be as liquid to him, as an intoxication only (PO)].[53]

In the passage from the beginning of the story which will be examined, the decision to place Whiston in bed and to characterise his wife as dynamic and active has significant effects. It accords with the inversion of opposing 'quasi-gender' principles which characterises this later stage of their marriage. The increasing dynamism of Mrs Whiston

---

[50]pp.152-153.
[51]p.153.
[52]*Hardy*, p.58.
[53]'White Stocking' in *Prussian Officer*, p.153.

through the revision process emphasises this inversion. A comparative analysis of the opening paragraphs of 'The White Stocking', and the same passage abridged and simplified by Margery Morris for Collins' English Library will demonstrate how significant Lawrence's linguistic specificity, of which repetition is a part, is to the characterisation of the passage in this respect. The passages for analysis are reproduced below:

Lawrence version

Paragraph One

"I'm <going to get (SS)> [getting (HP)] up, Teddilinks," said Mrs Whiston, and she <jumped out (SS)> [sprang out of bed (HP)] briskly.

"What <'s (SS)> [the Hanover's (HP)] got you?" asked Whiston.

"Nothing <, (SS)> [. Can't I get up?" (Om. SS, HPI)] she replied [animatedly. (Om. SS, HPI)]   5

Paragraph Two

It was about seven o'clock, <on a cold morning of grayish colour - forty years ago (SS)> [scarcely light yet in the cold bedroom. (Om. SS, HPI)]⁵⁴ Whiston <, not by nature inquisitive (SS)> lay <and watched her (SS)> [still and looked at his wife. (HP)] She was a pretty little thing, with her [fleecy, (Om. SS, HPI)] short <curly (SS, Om. HP and PO)> 10 black hair all tousled. <She got (SS)> [He watched her as she (HP)] dressed quickly, [flicking her small, delightful limbs, (Om. SS, HPI)] throwing her clothes <upon (SS)> [about (HP)] her. <Everything about her was untidy, but it only made Whiston smile and feel warm, even when he saw her tear off a torn end of lace from her petticoat and fling it on the 15 dressing table. (SS)> [Her slovenliness and untidiness did not trouble him. When she picked up the edge of her petticoat, ripped off a torn string of white lace, and flung it on the dressing-table, her careless abandon made his spirit glow (HP)] <and smile (HP, POD)>. She stood before the mirror <half dressed, (SS)> and roughly scrambled together her profuse <, 20 rather short (SS)> [little mane of (HP)] hair. He <loved (SS)> [watched (HP)] the <softness and quickness (SS)> [quickness and softness (HP)] of her young shoulders <. (SS)> [, calmly, like a husband, and appreciatively. (HPI)]

"Rise up," she <said, laughing, (SS)> [cried, turning (HP)] to him 25 <, (SS)> [with a quick wave of her arm - (Om. SS, HPI)] "and shine forth".

Paragraph Three

They had been married two years <, and yet (SS)> [. But still, (HP)] when she had gone [out of the room (Om. SS, HPI)], he felt as if all <the life (SS)> [his light (HP)] and warmth <and interest had passed out 30 of the room, and he knew it was a cold morning (SS)> [were taken away, he became aware of the raw, cold morning. (HP)]⁵⁵ <'What's got her now?' he wondered. She usually lay in bed till nigh on nine o'clock. Then

---

⁵⁴In *Smart Set*, there is a paragraph break at this point.
⁵⁵In *Smart Set*, there is a paragraph break at this point.

he rose himself. There was no longer any reason why he should stay (SS)> [So he rose himself, wondering casually what had roused her so 35 early. Usually she lay in bed as late as she could. (HP)]

Paragraph Four

<The house was a small seven-and-sixpenny dwelling in town. (SS)> Whiston fastened a belt round his <waist (*SS*) > [loins (*PO*)] <, and in his shirt and trousers, went down the steep, narrow stairs. (SS)> [and went downstairs in shirt and trousers. (HP)] He heard her singing <away 40 (SS)> in her snatchy fashion. Passing down the narrow hall, he stumped across the kitchen. (SS)> [The stairs creaked under his weight. He passed down the narrow little passage, which she called a hall, of the seven and sixpenny house which was his first home. (Om. SS, HPI)][56]

Morris version

Paragraph One

"I'm getting up, Teddy," said Mrs Whiston, and she jumped out of bed.

"What's the matter with you?" asked Whiston.

"Nothing," she said brightly. "Can't I get up?"

Paragraph Two

It was about seven o'clock, and hardly light yet, in the cold 5 bedroom. Whiston lay still and looked at his wife. She was a pretty little thing, with her short black hair. She dressed quickly, throwing on her clothes. She stood in front of the mirror and roughly combed her hair. He watched the quick movement of her soft young shoulders, quietly, like a husband. 10

"Get up," she said, turning to him. "Get up. Rise and shine!"

Paragraph Three

They had been married two years. But still, when she went out of the room, he felt-as if all his light and warmth went too. He began to notice the cold damp morning. He got up, wondering why she was so early. Usually she lay in bed as late as she could. 15

Paragraph Four

Whiston went downstairs in his shirt and trousers. He went down the narrow hall into the kitchen of their small cheap house, their first home.[57]

In the Lawrence passage, repetition of dynamic verbs characterise Mrs Whiston's actions. The resulting association of Mrs Whiston with motion rather than stability suggests the inversion of the wheel / axle relationship between 'Male' and 'Female' of *The Rainbow*. In addition, in the employment of the verbs 'sprang', 'flicking', 'picked', 'ripped', 'flung' and 'scrambled' (Lawrence 1.2, 12, 17, 17, 18, 20), which are employed to describe Mrs

---

[56]'White Stocking' in *Prussian Officer*, p.143.
[57]'White Stocking' in *Lovely Lady*, pp.52-53.

Whiston's actions, there is consistent repetition of a short vowel sound in the first or only syllable of these words.[58] This multiple employment of short vowelled lexical items within the first ten lines of the passage functions to 'enact' Mrs Whiston's dynamism, by foregrounding terse vowel sounds through repetition. This repeated pattern of short rather than long or dipthonged vowel sounds within these lines of the passage creates a phonetic reproduction of the speed of the character's actions. The effect of the employment of verbs with short first vowel sounds is emphasised by the employment of adverbs which themselves contain short vowels; 'briskly' (Lawrence l.2) and 'quickly' (Lawrence l.12). The repetition of the short first vowel 'i' in 'briskly', 'quickly', 'flicking', 'picked', 'ripped', 'quickness' and 'quick' (Lawrence l.2, 12, 12, 17, 17, 22, 26) again emphasises this dynamism through the assonant cohesion created by the repetition of a short vowelled 'i'. In addition, the employment of the verbs 'throwing' (Lawrence l.13) and 'scrambled' (Lawrence l.20) function to convey the vigorous and careless nature of Mrs Whiston's dynamism, a feature also emphasised by the employment of the lexical items 'tousled', 'slovenliness', 'untidiness' and 'careless abandon' (Lawrence l.11, 16, 16, 18-19), the middle two of which are cohesive by near synonymy. This repetition, not of single lexical items, but of words which repeatedly indicate Mrs Whiston's dynamism, is of significant stylistic effect, as comparison with Morris' passage will demonstrate. Morris' adaptation of Lawrence's text uses eleven verbs where Lawrence employs sixteen, and three adverbs where Lawrence uses six. The numerical discrepancy is not, large. However, Morris' choice of omissions, and the alterations which she makes to the vocabulary retained, are significant, and demonstrate that repeated characteristics in Lawrence's version are functional and not prolix. Morris' substitutions of verbs are the same syllabic length as the original lexical items employed by Lawrence. She substitutes Lawrence's onomatopoeic verb and adverb 'sprang...briskly' (Lawrence l.2) for the verb 'jumped' followed by no adverb (Morris l.1). Morris' replacement retains the short vowelled quality of the Lawrencian lexical item, and remains onomatopoeic, but omits the short vowelled, onomatopoeic adverb 'briskly' which forms part of the repetitive short vowel patterning in the Lawrence passage. The 'enacted' dynamism of Mrs Whiston in the Lawrencian construction is therefore decreased. In stylistic alterations which have similar weakening effect, Morris' replacement of 'scrambled' with 'combed' (Lawrence l.20, Morris

---

[58]Cushman observes that the opening paragraphs of the 1914 version of 'The White Stocking' presents a much livelier heroine than earlier versions. The phrases 'flicking...limbs' (l.12) and 'her careless...glow' (l.18-19) are added at this stage (Cushman, p.153). These insertions also serve to emphasise the contrasts between the Whistons examined here.

l.8), 'cried' with 'said' (Lawrence 1.25, Morris 1.11) and 'had gone' with 'went out' (Lawrence 1.29, Morris 1.12) all alter the stylistic effect of the lexical items employed in the Lawrence passage. The repetition of vocabulary which suggests dynamism is disrupted. 'Scrambled' is a verb of increased affectiveness on its object, and is of increased dynamism than 'combed', suggesting more vigorous activity by the subject, and of subject on object. Its employment therefore contributes to Lawrence's repeated stylistic portrayal of Mrs Whiston as swift moving and careless. In addition, the verb 'cried' in the Lawrence passage (Lawrence 1.25) also suggests the spontaneity and vivacity of Mrs Whiston as portrayed in this passage, unlike the pedestrian 'said' (1.11) with which Morris replaces it. Morris' omission of the assonance already identified compounds the stylistic misrepresentation of Mrs Whiston, and, more importantly, creates an imbalance in the contrast which the Lawrencian constructions provide with her husband.

As has been suggested, in the Lawrence passage, the 'enacted' dynamism of Mrs Whiston's actions is suggestive of the inversion of the wheel / axle metaphor of *Hardy*. Similarly, the verbs and adverbs which Lawrence employs to describe her husbands actions tend to be comparatively passive, again suggesting the same inversion. The verbs which describe Whiston's 'stasis' are as follows; Whiston 'lay still', 'looked at', 'watched', 'watched calmly and appreciatively', 'felt', and 'wonder[ed] casually' (Lawrence 1.8-9, 9, 11, 22--24, 29, 33, 35). As Mrs Whiston's actions are characterised by the repetition of short-vowelled vocabulary, her husband's are described by the repetition of (generally) long-vowelled words. Of the verbs employed to describe his behaviour, 'looked at', 'wondered' and 'watched' all take objects.[59] The remaining verbs in the list, 'lay' and 'felt' are non-interactive and affective only to their subject. Lawrence employs these verbs in constructions which link Whiston's 'stasis' with the activity of his wife. Lawrence's repetition of minimally or self-affective verbs is identified by Modern font:

> Whiston lay still and looked at his wife.(1.8-9)
> He watched her as she dressed.(1.11-12)
> He watched the quickness and softness of her young shoulders.(1.21-23)
> ...when she had gone out of the room, he felt as if...(1.29)
> ...wondering...what had roused her.(1.35)

---

[59]In the case of 'wondered', it is not a simple phrasal or verbal object which is taken, but a clausal object.

When Whiston does engage in an action which suggests a degree of dynamism or interaction, the verbs employed are repeatedly referred back to prompting actions by his wife. She gets up early and utters words which suggests that she encourages him to rise too (Lawrence l.25), 'so he rose himself' (Lawrence l.35) the simple repetition of the lexical item 'rise' in each case causing cohesion and suggesting a causal connection. Indeed, her encouragement prompts him to 'fasten' a belt and go downstairs (Lawrence l.38-39). More significantly, the stylistic presentation of Whiston's behaviour as reactions to his wife's actions rather than independent, self-motivated actions is reflected in Lawrence's syntactic structure, and disrupted in Morris' alterations. The immediate contexts in which personal pronouns are employed in the Lawrence text are as follows:

> [she] said...she sprang...asked Whiston. She replied... (l.1, 2, 3, 4)
> (Whiston's reaction 'asked he' is a response to his wife's dynamic action of getting up, and occurs in the same sentence as it. Mrs Whiston's answer to his question, although a response to his enquiry, is syntactically separated from it; it occurs in a separate sentence, thus indicating a degree of syntactic independence from her husband).

> [He] lay...and looked at his wife. (l.8-9)
> (Whiston's verb actions are contained within one sentence, and no action by Mrs Whiston is performed within this sentence. However, it is necessary for Mrs Whiston to be present in order for her husband to be able to 'look at' her.)

> She was...He watched her as she dressed...Her slovenliness and untidiness did not trouble him. (l.9, 11, 16-17)
> (Mrs Whiston is again described in the initial sentence in a construction which excludes her husband's pronoun. Again, her syntactic independence from her husband suggests her independence. The phrase 'He watched her' in the second sentence, and reaction in the third sentence to what he sees again reveals that he is responding to the actions of his wife. As with the previous example, Mrs Whiston performs no action in this sentence, but her presence is necessary for her husband's behaviour).

> When she...her...made his. (l.17-19)
> (Direct action / reaction relation).

> She stood...He watched...of her young shoulders. (l.19-23)
> (As previously, Mrs Whiston is syntactically independent of her husband in the first sentence. Mr Whiston's actions are, as previously, dependent on her presence).

> She cried...turning to him. (l.25)
> (Independent action which invites his interaction (Mr Whiston as indirect object), although his response does not occur until she has left the

room, confirming the syntactic independence of Mrs Whiston's actions from those of her husband).

Lawrence presents Whiston's reaction to his wife's departure in a single sentence. This demonstrates stylistically the continual referring of his activity back to prompting actions by his wife:

> ...when she had gone out of the room, he felt as if all of his light and warmth were taken away, he became aware of the raw, cold morning. (Lawrence 1.29-32)

However, Morris separates Lawrence's one sentence into two:

> ...when she went out of the room, he felt as if all of his light and warmth went too. He began to notice the cold, damp morning. (Morris 1.12-14)

Morris' new sentence construction disrupts the repeated pattern of back reference, thus upsetting the Lawrencian balance between Mrs Whiston's dynamism and independence in the passage, and her husband's passive reliance upon her, both syntactically and in the propositional content of the extract. However, Morris' construction *is* more grammatical, and it is Lawrence's *un*grammatical construction which functions to relate Whiston's awareness of the 'raw, cold morning' to his wife's departure. The newly created second sentence in Morris' construction provides Whiston with an entirely self-prompted action. This directly contradicts the dependence of Whiston implied in the Lawrence version, and disrupts the pattern of Whiston's 'Female' stasis and reliance on his wife's prompting actions to impel him into activity. 'He' is the only personal pronoun in the sentence, and is the subject to whom the actions refer. Morris' alteration of 'became aware' to 'began to notice' transforms the progressive, unconscious state of Whiston's behaviour to a level of increased visual awareness, rather than the abstract awareness which Lawrence provided. This effect is compounded by adjectival alterations. The adjectives 'raw, cold', which imply metaphorical, emotional connotations in addition to the explicit reference to external conditions, are replaced by 'cold, damp', which have a fixed and single meaning in the context. The implicit connection between Mrs Whiston's actions and their effect on her husband is therefore weakened. Morris' division of the Lawrencian single sentence into two compounds this corruption. Similarly, in lines 38-39, the Lawrencian construction describes how Whiston

'fastened' a belt 'round his loins' and followed his wife downstairs. As the analysis of affectiveness in Whiston's verbs demonstrated, 'fastened' is one of the few verbs employed in relation to Whiston which alter his state in any tangible sense. The verbs with which it is most closely related in the Lawrence passage are 'rose' and 'went' (Lawrence l.35, 39), all being reactions to the external stimulus of his wife's dressing, which he observes. His rising is not only a reaction to her behaviour, but an imitation of it, the brevity and nature of the description of his action again emphasising the differences between the characters. It is significant to notice that Whiston does not 'spring' out of bed like his wife (Lawrence l.2), yet nor does he leave his bed on his own terms. As has been observed, it is his wife's actions which prompt his responses. However, Whiston not only responds to his wife's instruction by getting out of bed in the Lawrence passage; he is portrayed through lexical cohesion by repetition as imitating her previous action in order to provide a link with her:

> "Rise up"...So he rose himself...[wondering] what had roused her.
> (Lawrence l.25, 35)

The repeated verb relates to Mrs Whiston's action of getting up, to Whiston's perception of it, and to his wife's instruction, and is therefore not an independent action. Through a complex pattern of lexical and syntactic specificity, Lawrence undermines what apparently independent and self-contained actions Whiston performs. Morris' construction:

> Whiston went downstairs in his shirt and trousers. (Morris l.16)

misses all these links, suggesting that Whiston 'went downstairs', but omitting the links which connect husband and wife, and thus corrupting the stylistic effects of Lawrence's lexical cohesion once more.

The tendency towards 'stasis' of the verbs Lawrence employs in relation to Whiston reveals the inverted wheel / axle relationship between the married couple. This contrast is emphasised when the affectiveness of the verbs employed with relation to each character is examined. Lawrence's repetition of dynamic verb actions characterise Mrs Whiston, and verbs taking her as subject display varying degrees of affectiveness:

> 'sprang out of'; physical action with effect on location of subject,
> performed by the subject; (l.2)

'dressed'; physical action with effect on external, physical self. Action by the subject, on the subject; (1.12)

'flicking...her limbs'; physical action by the subject, affective to the positioning of her own body; (1.12)

'throwing'; physical action by the subject which affects location of the object; (1.13)

'picked up'; physical action by the subject which affects the location of the object; (1.17)

'ripped'; physical action by the subject which permanently alters the form of the object; (1.17)

'flung'; physical action by the subject which affects the location of the object; (1.18)

'scrambled together'; physical action by the subject on the object, the object being her own hair. (1.20)

However, Whiston's verb actions have very little affective power, and any which occurs is entirely self-reflexive:

'lay'; passive, progressive state. No increasing effect by the subject on self or surroundings. (1.8)

'looked'; action performed by the subject on the object, with no effect on the object (except in that it is being "looked at"), and minimal effect on the subject; (1.9)

'watched'; passive, progressive state. No increasing effect by the subject on the self or the object (except in that it is being "watched"); (1.11)

'felt'; involuntary emotional action in reaction to an external stimulus. No effect on object; (1.29)

'became aware of'; state of emotional or mental transformation in reaction to external stimulus. Affective to subject, but no effect on the object; (1.32)

'rose' / 'rose himself'; dynamic action by the subject with effect on location of self. Both actions are a reaction to an external stimulus, linking him to it, and are also self-reflexive; (1.35)

'wondering'; passive, progressive state of the subject. Minimally affective to the mental state of the subject; (1.35)

'fastened'; dynamic action by the subject in response to external stimulus. Affects the state of the object with reference to the subject; (1.38)

'went'; dynamic action by the subject in response to external stimulus. Affects location of subject; (1.39)

The opposition between the dynamic Mrs Whiston and her comparatively static husband, occupied in self-referential activity, is emphasised. The contrast between them is, again, similar to the 'Male' and 'Female' opposites identified in *Hardy*, although these are inverted in their attribution. Whereas Mrs Whiston's behaviour is affective not only to

herself, but to that which is 'not-self', suggesting the 'Male' principle of *Hardy*, her husband's actions are not only passive, but reveal a far lesser differentiation between 'self' and 'not-self', more akin to the monistic 'Female' principle. The significance of the stylistic anticipation of the wheel / axle inversion can be demonstrated by an examination of the verbs which Morris employs with relation to each of the characters in her abridged version of the story. Morris' extensive excision of the verbs employed with Mrs Whiston as subject leaves only 'was', 'dressed' and 'throwing' (Lawrence l.6, 12, 13, Morris l.5, 7, 7) unchanged. The repetition of dynamic verbs which characterise her in the Lawrence passage is therefore decreased. A greater proportion of verbs which take Whiston as subject are retained; 'asked', 'lay', 'looked', one instance of 'watched', 'felt', 'wondering' and 'went' all remain (Lawrence l.3, 8, 9, 22, 29, 35, 39, Morris l.3, 6, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16). However, Morris alters the constructions in which these verbs are employed, and these alterations demonstrate the importance of linguistic specificity in the Lawrencian version. Morris' first alteration of a verb which takes Whiston as subject occurs in line 2:

> 'What the Hanover's got you?'' asked Whiston. (Lawrence l. 2)
> 'What's the matter with you?'' asked Whiston. (Morris l.2)

The Lawrencian employment of the euphemism 'What the Hanover's...', meaning 'What the hell' arguably implies an intimate relationship between the protagonists. Outwith the context of the passage, it would be unlikely to be spoken to an individual unknown to the speaker, except in anger, and Whiston, according to the context, is not angry but admiring. Certainly, Morris' replacement of Mrs Whiston's use of the pet-name 'Teddylinks' with 'Teddy' in line 1 removes any sense of intimacy between the characters beyond first name knowledge. This repeated implication of intimacy is functional. In Morris' adaptation, it is only the initial context of a male and female in bed together which establishes any sense of intimacy in their connection at the beginning of the passage. Similarly, Morris' alteration of the construction in which the verb 'watched' occurs (Lawrence l.22, Morris l.9) disrupts stylistic indications of the relationship between the characters. In the Lawrence version, Whiston watches 'the quickness and softness' (l.22-23) of his wife's shoulders. The employment of the attributed qualities 'quickness and softness' to Whiston's perception of his wife's shoulders suggests his observation of qualities *intrinsic* to her shoulders, rather than observations of actions or mere externality. By presenting Whiston as appreciating the intrinsic qualities of his wife's shoulders, Lawrence suggests that Whiston's appreciation of

his wife transcends appreciation of merely her physical actions, but recognises characteristics which are *essential* to her. In accordance with his passivity throughout the passage, Whiston is only able to 'watch' (Lawrence l.22) the characteristics of his wife's shoulders, passive, non-interactive behaviour which emphasises his stasis as opposed to his wife's 'quickness' and dynamism. Significantly, the lexical item 'quickness' can also mean 'rawness'.[60] This latter reading suggests that the 'quickness' of Mrs Whiston's shoulders is lexically cohesive by synonymy with the 'rawness' Whiston experiences in the following Lawrencian construction:

> But still, when she had gone out of the room, he felt as if all his light
> and warmth were taken away, he became aware of the raw, cold morning.
> (l.28-32)

The lexical selections in this sentence combine to produce the following stylistic effects. Mrs Whiston 'had gone' (Lawrence l.29), and as a result, Whiston's light and warmth are 'taken away' (l.31). The combined effect of Lawrence's lexical selections evokes a state of loss and of deprivation. Morris' alteration of the sentence is as follows:

> But still, when she went out of the room, he felt as if all of his light
> and warmth went too. He began to notice the cold, damp morning. (l.12-
> 14)

In the Morris version, Mrs Whiston's leaving ('she went' (l.12)) and the disappearance of her husband's 'light and warmth' , which 'went too' (l.13) are described by the simple repetition of the same verb. The lexical cohesion in which this repetition results does suggest a causal relationship between Mrs Whiston's exit, and the departure of her husband's 'light and warmth'. However, this cause and effect is already portrayed in each passage by the construction '...when she...he felt' (Lawrence l.29, Morris l.12-13). What effect, then, does Morris' repetition have? Her adaptation of Lawrence's text describes merely the physical action of Mrs Whiston, and the resulting effect on her husband. The lexical cohesion by simple repetition which occurs *may* emphasise the cause and effect relationship of the two departures in the sentence, but it has no stylistic function beyond that. What it *does not* do is

---

[60]quick: **4a.** The tender or sensitive flesh in any part of the body, as that under the nails or beneath callous parts...the tender part of a sore or wound. (*The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume XIII* , J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, second edition (Oxford, 1989), p.16).

take sufficient account of the emotional deprivation and loss which Whiston experiences in the Lawrence passage as a result of his wife's departure. This corruption of the effects of the Lawrencian sentence is compounded by Morris' further alterations in the sentence. Morris alters Lawrence's original lexical specificity 'raw, cold' (l.14) to 'cold, damp' (l.10). She thus retains the lexical cohesion in the Lawrence passage between the 'cold' of (l.14) and that in line 4, which describes the temperature conditions of the couple's surroundings. However, she disrupts the lexical cohesion which Lawrence creates between the 'quickness' of Mrs Whiston's shoulders (l.11) and the rawness which Whiston experiences (l.14). Morris also omits Lawrence's phrase, 'her careless abandon made his spirit glow' (l.9), in which the verb 'made glow', which takes Whiston's spirit as object and Mrs Whiston's 'careless abandon' as subject, not only emphasises her affective relation to her husband, but is lexically cohesive by collocation with the 'warmth' which Whiston feels he has lost in line 14, and Mrs Whiston's instruction 'shine forth' (l.12). Morris' omission excludes once more the metaphorical emotional undercurrents of the passage. In addition, where the combination of 'had gone', 'taken away', 'became aware of' and 'raw' (l.13, 14, 14, 14) in the Lawrence passage suggest Whiston's increasing recognition of the *emotional* void left by his wife's departure, Morris presents Whiston's recognition, and the description of his environment as referential only to the externally observable situation. Whiston does not 'become aware', he 'begins to notice', the verb 'to notice' suggesting visual rather than emotional registering of impressions (l.10). The day is not 'raw, cold' (Lawrence l.14), it is 'cold, damp' (Morris l.10), descriptive only of the weather conditions. These external conditions, in the Lawrence passage, are a metaphorical measure of Whiston's loss, lexically cohesive with the essence of Mrs Whiston in the 'quickness' (l.11) of her shoulders. Morris' alteration of this 'quickness and softness' (Lawrence l.11) to merely a 'quick movement' (Morris l.7) again achieves this consistent reduction of potentially metaphorical readings which emphasise the intrinsic and emotional connection which Whiston feels to his wife to mere observation of externals. Again, her alterations to Lawrence's text identify the specificity of Lawrence's repetition and related stylistic characteristics.

Examination of the development of Lawrence's stylistic repetitiveness from *Sons and Lovers* to *The Rainbow* reveals more similarity between the stylistic characteristics informing Lawrence's lexical specificity than might otherwise be suspected. Although the language of the three extracts is very distinct, repetitiveness in each demonstrates the stylistic 'enactment' of Lawrence's developing metaphysic. Syntactic parallelism, lexical cohesion and verb

affectiveness combine to achieve this effect. In the following chapter, developing employment of *multiple* parallelism in both *The Rainbow* and the essays of the period will demonstrate both the close relationship between Lawrence's repetitiveness and his developing metaphysic, and the organisational framework which he constructs against which the characteristics and deficiencies of each relationship in the novel can be evaluated and portrayed.

CHAPTER 3: LEXICAL PARALLELISM AND MATCHING RELATIONS: REPETITION, REVISION, AND THE INFLUENCE OF *HARDY'S* 'STRUCTURAL SKELETON'

Throughout *The Rainbow*, similar patterns of repetition and cohesion to those examined in the preceding chapter are employed, with similar stylistic effects. These are significant both in their immediate contexts, and with relation to Lawrence's developing doctrine. However, Worthen's argument against Kinkead-Weekes, downplaying the influence of *Hardy*, is partly right.[1] As Cushman has demonstrated, and as the examination of the language of *Sons and Lovers*, 'The White Stocking' and *The Rainbow* in the preceding chapter showed, Lawrence was already moving towards the language of *The Rainbow* prior to *Hardy*. In one fundamental aspect, however, Worthen's argument is misjudged. His claim that the new language which Lawrence sought to invent for experience in *The Rainbow* is not that of *Hardy* centres on the following premise:

> In the 'Study', ideas fall into neat shapes and patterns; Male can be played off against Female, Law against Love. Even their reconciliation in some 'supreme art' sounds like a pattern. I would suggest that the problem of the 'Study' is both a problem of isolation, of ideas in a void; and of language, in that what can be absolute in the 'Study' is simply impossible for a novel. (What, fortunately, Hardy does for the 'Study' is recall Lawrence to the problem of lives where such a language would be absurd; and even when he is rewriting Hardy most obviously, Lawrence can still make more actual sense of him than when he is moving round the coloured blocks labelled Male and Female).[2]

As will be demonstrated in this chapter, the repetitive language of *The Rainbow* owes a great deal to these 'neat shapes and patterns'. The presence of these in the novel can be directly traced to the influence of *Hardy* by demonstrating its structural and stylistic effects on *The Crown* and the 1915 versions of the *Twilight in Italy* essays when compared with the 1913 versions of the latter and the 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*'. Identical parallel structures will be shown to be present in *Hardy, The Rainbow* and the post-*Hardy* essays. Repetitive structures may be 'natural to the author',[3] but by this stage in his career a very

---

[1] p.34, Worthen, pp.60-61.
[2] p.61.
[3] *Women in Love*, p.486.

rigorous functional repetitive 'structural skeleton' had evolved. This has similarities to the parallel structures typical of the Old Testament which Lawrence would have absorbed as a young Non-Conformist. As will be demonstrated, the 'neat shapes and patterns' developed in *The Rainbow* from *Hardy* function as a 'structural skeleton' which identifies the likelihood each generation in the novel has of achieving the 'Absolute'. This is achieved by presenting them as all subject to the same underlying forces and structural patterns of comparison and contrast, and revealing which characters display the complementarity identified as the ideal in *Hardy*:

> This is complete movement: man upon woman, woman within man.
> This is the desire, the achieving of which, frictionless, is impossible, yet
> for which every man will try, with greater or less intensity, achieving more
> or less success.[4]

The categories of parallelism employed in the discussion will be those developed in various linguistic approaches to text and discourse analysis, and those of Biblical scholarship. The former includes Hoey's Matching relations, signalled by repetition, syntactic parallelism and conjuncts (or potential conjuncts) developed following Winter,[5] processes in the creation of parallelism,[6] Longacre's 'coupling' and 'contrast' categories of conjoining, and Leech and Hiatt's categories of lexical parallelism.[7] In *The Rainbow*, syntactic parallelism is repeatedly employed with lexical repetition, complementaries and antonyms (cohesive by collocation, according to Halliday and Hasan)[8] near-antonyms, or constructions presented as contrastive due to the parallel contexts in which they are placed. However, the effects achieved are not always 'antithetical', but sometimes achieve comparative and complementary rather than contrasting effects. In each case, specific characteristics of the main relationship of each

---

[4]*Hardy*, p.56.
[5]Hoey, *On the Surface*, p.113, E.O. Winter, 'Connection in science material: a proposition about the semantics of clause relations', in CILT Reports and Papers 7, *Science and Technology in a Second Language* (London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research, 1971), pp.41-52, E.O. Winter, 'Replacement as a function of repetition: a study of its principle features in the clause relations of contemporary English', PhD thesis, University of London, 1974, E.O. Winter, 'A clause-relational approach to English texts', *Instructional Science* (Amsterdam, 1977), vol. 6, no.1, special issue, E.O. Winter, 'Replacement as a fundamental function of the sentence in context', *Forum Linguisticum*, vol.4, no.2 (December 1979), pp.95-133, E.O. Winter, *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English: The Clause and its Place in the Definition of a Sentence*, (London, Boston, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1982), pp.67, 88, 89, 106.
[6]Hoey, *Patterns of Lexis*, pp.167-174.
[7]Longacre , pp.81-89, Leech, pp.79-83, Hiatt, p.59.
[8]*Cohesion in English*, p.285.

generation are revealed through these patterns. Syntactic parallelism also often involves Longacre's parallel coupling, which, in terms of surface structure, means the varying of one noun slot from base to base.[9] Biblical parallelism typically employed in *The Rainbow* includes Berlin's contrast of person and gender, and her 'syntactic parallelism', in which the syntax of the lines are equivalent. This form of complete parallelism, in which each term in phrase B is parallel to a term or corresponding set of terms in A, is present, *within* broader structures of incomplete parallelism. Lowth's antithetical parallelism, where lines are contrasted by opposition of terms in expression or sense, is also present, as is Kugel's supplementing and progressive functions of B. Development of *The Rainbow's* repetitiveness through multiple parallelism will be traced through the revision process, and its effects in producing an evaluative framework against which each succeeding generation of the novel can be measured will be examined.

The influence of *Hardy*: stylistic presentation of Lawrencian doctrine in the essays

In *Hardy*, *The Crown* and the 1915 versions of the *Twilight in Italy* essays, Lawrence's argument regarding the necessary conflict and opposition between the forces which make up life is present both in the propositional content of his work and its form. Opposing forces within his philosophy are portrayed stylistically in several ways, sometimes in combination, and their presentation functions to 'enact' or reflect the nature of the interaction being described. There are two characteristic Matching relations shared by both these essays and *The Rainbow* which most obviously counter Worthen's argument, and indicate *Hardy's* provision of a 'structural skeleton' for *The Rainbow*. The first of these is Matching compatability in respect of syntactic parallelism and repetition (Longacre's 'parallel coupling'), in which apparently identical verb action by agents is presented not by a plural personal pronoun and verb, but by two singular personal pronouns and the repetition of the verb. Other sentence components are also repeated. For example, were a sentence with the semantic content 'They went to the shops' present in *The Rainbow*, it would typically be presented as 'He went to the shops, and she went to the shops', thus avoiding a more rational generalisation. The noun or pronoun in the subject slot is altered, usually being replaced by its complementary or antonym, thus creating parallelism by syntactic and lexical repetition.

---

[9]Longacre, p.82.

The amount of repetition which this involves emphasises the essential separation between agents involved in the same action, by drawing attention to that which is changed in the context. Conversely, Lawrence also employs Matching contrast, in syntactically parallel constructions where there is the presence, or potential presence, of an appropriate conjunct, the presence of antonyms or appropriate negation, the presence of signalling in the immediate context, or the possibility of inserting a denial paraphrase. Hoey identifies denial paraphrase, following Winter in 1974, as the denying of an attribute or action of x for the compared y.[10] He claims:

> ...the denial paraphrase is placed between the two sentences in such a way as to spell out the relation that holds between them. The form of the denial paraphrase is not the same in each case, however.[11]

Hoey's examples, taken from Winter, are as follows. The denial paraphrase is identified by italics:

(i) She is nice. *He is not nice.* He is nasty.
(ii) She is nice. *The same is not true of him.* He is nasty.
(iii) She is nice. *The opposite is true of him.* He is nasty.[12]

In (i), Hoey claims, there is repetition of lexical items from the first sentence in the denial paraphrase with the addition of a negative element. In (ii) and (iii), the denial paraphrase is presented as a 'signalling sentence'.[13]

As will be demonstrated, in the essays under discussion and in *The Rainbow*, separation of agents is stressed through the Matching relation and Biblical parallelism, although the syntactic and lexical parallelism in which the oppositions are couched often function to suggest the *complementarity* of these oppositions, following *Hardy's* ideal. Due to the prevalence of various forms of parallelism in Lawrence's style of this period, only parallelisms significant to the argument will be identified.

---

[10]*On the Surface*, p.116.
[11]p.117.
[12]p.116.
[13]p.117. Hoey defines a 'signalling sentence' as one which 'does not itself enter directly into the pattern of organisation of the discourse but rather comments on that pattern'. Hoey's example is reproduced below, with the signalling sentence identified by italics:
> I was on sentry duty. I saw the enemy approaching. *This was a problem.* I opened fire. I beat off the attack. (p.54).

In the following examples, italics identify the Matching relation, and bold font marks antonyms, near antonyms, complementaries and contrasted pairs. Typical types of lexical parallelism are indicated by numbered brackets, and will be discussed following the examination of typical Matching relations. Each type of Matching relation is identified and described in a brief discussion following each example.

In the following examples from *Hardy*, *The Crown*, and the 1915 revisions to *Twilight in Italy*, similar patterns of Matching comparison are identifiable. In the following two examples, from *Hardy* and *The Crown*, there is straightforward Matching relation in respect of comparison. In the first example, parallel coupling (syntactic parallelism and simple repetition in each phrase) is employed with altered, antonymic and complementary subject nouns in each parallel phrase. This suggests that what is characteristic of the subject in phrase A is also characteristic of the subject in phrase B; they are identical in action, but are portrayed independently and as if contrasted, suggesting the dualistic nature of Lawrence's philosophy:

Hardy

...it is as if life were a double cycle, of **men** and **women**, facing (opposite ways (final-final-medial 1)), travelling (opposite ways (final-final-medial 1)), revolving upon (each other (final-final-medial-final 2)), *man* (*reaching forward with outstretched hand,* (final 3)) *woman* (*reaching forward with outstretched hand,* (final 3)) and neither able to 5
move till their hands have grasped (each other (final-final-medial-final 2)), when they (draw (medial 4)) **towards** (each other (final-final-medial-final 2)) from opposite directions, (draw (medial 4)) nearer and nearer, (each travelling (initial 5)) in his separate cycle, till the two are abreast, and side by side, until eventually they pass on again, **away from** (each other (final-final-medial-final 2)), travelling their (opposite ways (final-final-medial 1)) 10
to the same infinite goal.

(Each travelling (initial 5)) to the same goal of infinity, but entering it from the opposite ends of space.[14]

('...facing opposite ways, travelling opposite ways' (l.1-2)): Driver's and Kugel's supplementary and progressive function, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('...man...hand, woman...hand...' (l.4-5)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject noun. Berlin's syntactic parallelism and contrast of person and gender within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('...draw towards...from opposite directions...draw towards...nearer and nearer' (l.7-8)): Kugel's progressive function, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

---

[14]*Hardy*, p.61.

In the second example, from *The Crown*, the nouns and pronouns in both the subject and the object slots are altered, although, as in the *Hardy* example, what remains unchanged in the parallel constructions indicates that the Matching relation is one of comparison. Both characters are engaged in the same effort of resistance, and both are the objects of the same impersonal force. Again, they are portrayed separately, and counterbalanced, through repetition:

The Crown

> *I (resist, (final 6)) yet (initial 7)) I am (compelled (final 8)); the woman (resists, (final 6)) yet (initial 7)) she is (compelled (final 8)).* And we are the relative parts dominated by the strange compulsion of the absolute.[15]

('I resist...compelled, the woman resists...compelled...' (l.1-2)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject and object slots. Gray's complete parallelism, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism and contrast of person and (implicitly) gender.

In the following examples, Matching comparison is slightly more complex, as inversion from phrase A to phrase B occurs. This serves to emphasise not only the comparison being made between opposites, but also to suggest the reciprocal nature of their relationship, following the argument at the beginning of Chapter VII of *Hardy*. In the following extract, both subject and object slots are inverted from A to B, and the reciprocal nature of their actions stressed:

Hardy

> In marriage, **each party** fulfils a dual function with regard to **the other: exhaustive and enriching.** *The female (at the same time exhausts and invigorates (medial 9)) the male, the male (at the same time exhausts and invigorates (medial 9)) the female.* The **exhaustion and invigoration** is both temporary and relative.[16]   S

('The female...the female' (l.2-4)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject and object slots, inverted from A to B. Gray's complete parallelism, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism and contrast of person and gender.

---

[15]*Crown*, p.266.
[16]*Hardy*, p.112.

In the following example, from the 1915 version of *Twilight in Italy*, nouns in subject and object slots are also varied and inverted from A to B. However, this inversion is complicated by the inverted items not being inverted directly, but by inversion occurring by collocation. Again, the reciprocal nature of actions is emphasised:

'The Spinner and the Monks', *Twilight in Italy*

> *Night and day* (*are one* (final 10)), *light and dark* (*are one* (final 10)), (*both the same in the* (initial 11)) *origin and in the issue,* (*both the same in the* (initial 11)) *moment of ecstasy, light* (*fused in* (medial 12)) *darkness and darkness* (*fused in* (medial 12)) *light,* as in the rosy snow above the twilight...*The flesh* (*neutralising the* (medial 13)) *spirit, the* ⤐ *spirit* (*neutralising the* (medial 13)) *flesh,* the law of the average asserted, this was the monks as they paced **backward** and **forward**.[17]

('Night...day...are one, light...dark are one...' (l.1)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject slots, inverted (considering collocation relation) from A to B. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('...both...origin...issue...both...ecstasy...' (l.2-3): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with noun phrases within prepositional phrases varied. Noun phrases in apposition, both introduced by 'both', a pre-determiner. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('...light...darkness...darkness...light...' (l.3-4)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject and object slots, inverted from A to B. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('The flesh...spirit...spirit...the flesh...' (l.5-6)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic according to Lawrence's philosophy) subject and object slots, inverted from A to B. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

In each of the above examples, the Matching comparison by parallel coupling created by variation of the subject noun or pronoun, and / or the objects employed in equivalent slots has obvious effects. What is characteristic of the subject in phrase A is also characteristic of the subject in B; they are identical in action or attributes, but are portrayed independently and as if contrasted, even when inversion from phrase to phrase suggests that the actions are reciprocal. As has been suggested, this indicates stylistically the dualistic nature of Lawrence's doctrine. Many similarities between Lawrence's parallel style and Biblical parallelism can also be traced, particularly Berlin's syntactic parallelism with contrast in person and gender, and Gray's incomplete parallelism. However, the exact repetition of lexical items in Lawrence's work displays *more* specific lexical repetition than that identified

---

[17]'The Spinner and the Monks', *Twilight in Italy*, p.112.

by Gray as present in the parallelism of the Old Testament, and the replacement in the subject slot of the original item with its complement or antonym creates comparison rather than restatement. Biblical patterns, perhaps absorbed in his youth, have evolved into a 'structural skeleton' in which Lawrence's dualistic ideas can be presented.

Examples of Matching contrast are also present in *Hardy*, the 1915 versions of essays in *Twilight in Italy*, and *The Crown*. As before, lexical parallelism is indicated by numbered brackets, italics identify the Matching relation, and bold font marks antonyms, near-antonyms, complementaries or contrasts. In the following example from *Hardy*, and typical of contrastive structures in this essay, it can be seen that Matching contrast often occurs in contexts in which Matching comparison is also present, supporting *Hardy's* concern with the complementarity of opposites in Chapter VII. In the following example, contrast is presented by the varying of subject pronouns, and adverbial phrases of direction incorporating antonyms. Inversion of subject pronouns and objects occurs from A to B, and a denial paraphrase is implied. This denial paraphrase is identified below by italics:

> If we turn our faces west, towards nightfall and the unknown within the dark embrace of a wife, *the opposite is true of them*, they turn their faces east, towards the sunrise and the brilliant, bewildering, active embrace of a husband.

The passage from *Hardy* is reproduced below, followed by brief discussion:

> If *we* (*turn our faces* (medial 14)) *west*, (*towards* (initial 15)) **nightfall and the unknown within the dark** (*embrace of a* (medial 16)) **wife, they** (*turn their faces* (medial 14)) **east**, (*towards* (initial 15)) **the sunrise and the brilliant, bewildering, active** (*embrace of a* (medial 16)) **husband.** And ...*as we are* (*dazed with the unknown in* (final 17)) **her, so** *S is she* (*dazed with the unknown in* (final 17)) **us.** It is so. And **we** throw up our joy to heaven like towers and spires and fountains and leaping flowers, so glad **we** are.
> But always, **we** are divided within ourselves.[18]

('...we turn...wife, they turn...husband' (l.1-5)): Matching contrast, with varied (and antonymic) subject pronoun slots, and adverbial phrases of direction incorporating antonyms of 'west' and 'east', 'wife' and 'husband'. The syntactic parallelism and simple repetition of the extract also *implies* polar contrast between ideas in 'nightfall and the unknown within the dark' and 'the sunrise and the brilliant, bewildering active'. Denial paraphrase implied, and near-antonymic (according to context) subject pronouns and objects inverted from A to B.

---

[18]*Hardy*, p.105.

Gray's complete parallelism, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism and contrast of person and gender. Lowth's antithetical parallelism.

('...we...dazed...her...she...dazed...us...' (l.5-6)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject and object slots. Berlin's contrast of person and gender.

As was demonstrated in the examples of Matching comparison, both the 1915 versions of *Twilight in Italy* and *The Crown* show the same repetitive 'structural skeleton' as that found in *Hardy*. The same is true of Matching contrast. In the following example from 'San Gaudenzio', Matching comparison with inversion accompanies the dominant Matching contrast. Denial paraphrase is implied, identified by italics below:

> Hers was the primitive, crude, violent flux of the blood, emotional and undiscriminating, but wanting to mix and mingle. *The opposite is true of him.* His was the hard, clear, invulnerable passion of the bones, finely tempered and unchangeable.

The passage is reproduced below, with discussion:

Twilight in Italy

Paulo and **she** were the opposite sides of the universe, the **light** and the **dark**. Yet they lived together now without friction, detached, each subordinated in their common relationship. (*With regard to* (initial-medial 18)) *Maria, Paulo omitted himself; Maria omitted herself* (*with regard to* (initial-medial 18)) *Paulo.* Their souls were silent and detached, 5 completely apart, and silent, quite silent. They shared the physical relationship of marriage as if it were something beyond them, a third thing.

They had suffered very much in the earlier stages of their connection. Now the storm had gone by, leaving them, as it were, spent. They were both by nature passionate, vehement. But the lines of their 10 passion were opposite. *Hers* (*was the* (medial 19)) *primitive, crude, violent flux of the blood, emotional and undiscriminating, but wanting to mix and mingle. His* (*was the* (medial 19)) *hard, clear, invulnerable passion of the bones, finely tempered and unchangeable. She* (*was the* (medial 19)) *flint and* (*he the* (medial 19 (with ellipsis))) *steel.*[19] 15

('With...Maria...himself, Maria...herself....Paulo' (l.3-5)): Matching comparison, presented as inverted parallel coupling with varied (and, by gender, antonymic) subject and object in each phrase, inverted from A to B. Gray's complete parallelism, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism and contrast of person and gender.

('Hers...mingle. His...unchangeable' (l.12-15)): Matching contrast, with varied (and antonymic) subject pronouns and (by contextual implication, and according to Lawrence's

---

[19]'San Gaudenzio', *Twilight in Italy*, p.157.

philosophy) antonymic adjectival phrases. Denial paraphrase implied. Lowth's antithetical parallelism. Gray's complete parallelism, Berlin's syntactic parallelism.

('She...flint...he...steel' (l.15-16)): Matching contrast, presented as parallel coupling with ellipsis and varied (and antonymic) subject pronouns. Gray's complete parallelism, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism.

The following example from *The Crown* also demonstrates similarities to the characteristics of Matching contrast in *Hardy*. Matching comparison, both with and without inversion, accompanies Matching contrast. However, in this case, many denial paraphrases are implied, indicated below by italics:

> ...the one adhering to the infinite darkness of the beginning, *the opposite being true of the other*, the other adhering to the infinite light of the end.

> Darkness stands over against light, *the opposite is true of light*, light stands over against dark.

> The lion is reared against the unicorn, *the opposite is true of the unicorn*, the unicorn is reared against the lion.

> One says, 'Behold, the darkness which gave us birth is eternal and infinite: this we belong to.' *The opposite is true of the other.* The other says, 'We are of the light, which is everlasting and infinite.'

The passage from *The Crown* is reproduced below, followed by discussion:

The Crown
Then each has reached its maximum of self-assertion. *The flesh is (made perfect* (medial 20)) (*within the womb,*(final 21)) *the spirit is* at last (*made perfect* (medial 20)) also, (*within the womb.* (final 21)) They are (*equally* (medial 22)) *perfect,* (*equally* (medial 22)) *supreme, the one (adhering to the infinite* (medial 23)) (*darkness* (medial-initial-medial 24))   5
(*of the* (medial 25)) *beginning, the other (adhering to the infinite* (medial 23)) (*light* (medial-final-initial-final 26)) (*of the* (medial 25)) *end.*
Yet, within the womb, they are eternally opposite. (*Darkness* (medial-initial-medial 24)) (*stands over against* (medial 25)) (*light,* (medial-final-initial-final 26)) (*light* (medial-final-initial-final 26)) (*stands*   10
over against (medial 25)) *dark. The lion is reared against the unicorn, the unicorn is reared against the lion.* One says, 'Behold, the (*darkness* (medial-initial-medial 24)) *which gave us birth is eternal and infinite: this we belong to.'* The other says, 'We are of the (*light,* (medial-final-initial-final 26)) *which is everlasting and infinite.'*[20]   15

---

[20]*Crown*, p.258.

('The flesh...womb...the spirit...womb' (l.1-3)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic according to Lawrence's 'doctrine') subject noun. Added elements ('at last' and 'also') in B. Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('equally perfect, equally supreme' (l.4)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied adjectives. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('the one...the end' (l.4-7)): Matching contrast, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject nouns and object phrases. Denial paraphrase implied. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism. Lowth's antithetical parallelism.

('Darkness...dark' (l.8-11)): Matching contrast, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic, or near-antonymic) subject and object nouns. Denial paraphrase implied. Gray's complete parallelism, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism. Lowth's antithetical parallelism.

('The lion...the lion' (l.11-12)): Matching contrast, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic according to Lawrence's 'doctrine') subject and object nouns, inverted from A to B. Denial paraphrase implied. Gray's complete parallelism, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism with contrast in 'person'.

('One...everlasting and infinite' (l.12-15)): Matching contrast, presented as semantic parallelism with varied (and contrasting) subject and object slots, and near synonymous phrases ('eternal and infinite', 'everlasting and infinite'). Denial paraphrase implied. Gray's incomplete parallelism. Lowth's antithetical parallelism.

In these examples of Matching contrast, the separation between agents is further emphasised than in the examples of Matching comparison. The actions in which they are involved are not only separated, but contrasted. However, the syntactic parallelism and repetition often inherent in the contexts of Matching contrast suggest that the contrastive relation is equal and opposite, suggesting a considerable degree of compatability, as Chapter VII of *Hardy* argues. Again, the stylistic similarities between Matching contrast as it is employed in *Hardy*, and its employment in the later essays suggests that the repetitive 'structural skeleton' of *Hardy* could have influenced the structure of the later essays.

The considerable degree of lexical parallelism in each example from Lawrence's essays results in several different effects, which both complement and expand the Matching relations identified. In the case of Matching contrast, lexical parallelism contributes towards and functions to support the opposition created. In the following examples from *Hardy* and 'The Spinner and the Monks', the opposition created by the employment of varying subject (Berlin's contrast in person and gender) and opposing actions or descriptions is emphasised by lexical parallelism which functions to suggest that each contrast is equally balanced against its opposite. As discussed, this suggests the conflict and opposition inherent in Lawrence's philosophy, and by the employment of contrasts in parallel constructions, some degree of

correspondence or complementarity between them is suggested. In the following example from *Hardy*, the employment of complementaries in lexically parallel constructions function to balance one action exactly against its opposing one:

> If we (turn our faces (medial 14)) west, (towards (initial 15)) nightfall and the unknown within the dark embrace of a wife, they (turn their faces (medial 14)) east, (towards (initial 15)) the sunrise and the brilliant, bewildering, active embrace of a husband.

This complementariness is further suggested in an example from *Twilight in Italy*. Here, the inversion of items employed in the subject slots in the context of the lexical parallelisms indicates that the nouns employed are *so* equally balanced one against the other that they are interchangeable without fear of altering the 'meaning'. This inversion is actual in 12 and 13, and inversion of items cohesive by collocation in 10:

> Night and day (are one (final 10)), light and dark (are one (final 10)), (both the same in the (initial 11)) origin and in the issue, (both the same in the (initial 11)) moment of ecstasy, light (fused in (medial 12)) darkness, and darkness (fused in (medial 12)) light, as in the rosy snow above the twilight...the flesh (neutralising the (medial 13)) spirit, the spirit (neutralising the (medial 13)) flesh, the law of the average asserted, this was the monks as they paced backward and forward.

The functions of lexically parallel phrases in Matching comparison are less straightforward. In 1 and 2, reproduced below, and both from *Hardy*, succeeding lexically parallel phrases mark progression in the action of the extract, through varying affectiveness of the verbs employed in their context, similar to the progression that Kugel identifies between phrases in the Bible. In the following example, location in the context of the first lexical parallelism becomes direction in the second, and becomes direction to a specific location in the third:

> ...facing (opposite ways (final-final-medial 1)), travelling (opposite ways (final-final-medial 1))...travelling their (opposite ways (final-final-medial 1)) to the same infinite goal.

In the following example, from the same passage, similar variation in affectiveness and progression of action is traceable, but a temporal element is also introduced. Between the first and second lexical parallelisms, each character is increasingly physically affective upon the

other. In the third employment, direction *towards* each other is introduced, and in the fourth example, direction *away*, following a temporal lapse. Progression of action has been traced through what has been varied in the framework of lexical parallelism:

> revolving upon (each other (final-final-medial-final 2))...till their hands have grasped (each other (final-final-medial-final 2))...when they draw towards (each other (final-final-medial-final 2))...till they pass on again, away from (each other (final-final-medial-final 2))

Lexical parallelism as a stylistic feature does not demonstrate the expansion of subtleties in A by B which Kugel identifies in Biblical parallelism. However, what it *does* demonstrate is that the contexts in which lexical parallelism is employed in this passage allow for repetition not to be mere repetition alone, but to include some kind of progression, which Kugel stresses in his reformulation of Lowth's 'synthetic or constructive parallelism' category. Again, echoes of Biblical style have evolved into suitable forms for the expression of Lawrence's philosophy. Most importantly, the similarity between various forms of Matching relation and lexical parallelism in *Hardy* and the essays which succeeded it suggests that *Hardy* may have provided a rigorous repetitive 'structural skeleton' for the later essays, and that this 'skeleton' reflects propositional content.

Before an argument for the influence of *Hardy's* 'neat shapes and patterns' on the repetitiveness of *The Rainbow* can commence, and before the functions of this repetitive 'structural skeleton' can be identified, it must be determined how far *Hardy* took the 1913 versions of the essays collected in *Twilight in Italy* stylistically towards the 1915 post-*Hardy* versions. In this way, *Hardy* can be identified as the structurally influential work on both the later essays and on *The Rainbow*, indicating the importance of repetitive structures in the novel. The revisions to *Twilight in Italy* following *Hardy* have significant similarities to the Matching relation and parallelism already identified as present in *Hardy*.[21] In addition to the obvious inclusion of the 'philosophical' passages in 'The Theatre' and 'The Lemon Gardens' which share many of the ideas expressed in *Hardy*, and the inclusion of the new essays 'San Gaudenzio', 'Il Duro', 'Italians in Exile', 'The Return Journey' and 'John',[22] there can also

---

[21] They are developed particularly in 'The Spinner and the Monks', revised by 20 August 1915, 'The Theatre', revised by 6 September 1915, and 'The Lemon Gardens', revised by 24 August 1915.

[22] Written by 11 September 1915, 8 October 1915, 12 October 1915, 19 October 1915 and (?) October 1915 respectively.

be traced introduction of new oppositions, thematic heightening of the 1913 oppositions, and increasing emphasis in their stylistic presentation.

The 1913 versions of the Italian essays do sometimes demonstrate similar employment of the Matching relation and lexical parallelism to that found in *Hardy*, and incorporate antonyms, near-antonyms, complementaries and contrasts. This is to be expected; as the analyses in the preceding chapter demonstrated, the repetitive presentation of opposing forces is traceable as early as *Sons and Lovers*, although in less complex form than that employed in *The Rainbow*. Biblical influence on the presentation of Lawrence's dualistic theory is traceable as early as the language and parallel structures of the 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*'. In the following example from this essay, Kugel's expansion of subtleties from phrase to phrase is traceable in the contextual progression in which lexical items are repeated, and Gray's incomplete parallelism can also be seen. Antonyms, near-antonyms, contrasts and complementaries, according to Lawrence's doctrine, are also present, identified by bold font. Underlining identifies significant repetition, and italics mark the Matching relation:

> The **Father** was **Flesh** - and *the* **Son**, who in himself was finite and had form, *became* **Word**. For *form is the* **Uttered Word**, and *the* **Son** *is the* **Flesh** *as it* **utters** *the* **Word**, *but the* **unutterable Flesh** *is the* **Father**.[23]

('The Father...the Son...became Word' (l.1-2)): Matching contrast. Gray's incomplete parallelism incorporating contrast of subject and adjectival phrases and tense.
('...form...Word...Son....Word...Flesh...Father' (l.2-3)): Matching contrast. Kugel's expansion from phrase to phrase, and Gray's incomplete parallelism.

Unlike *Hardy* and the post-*Hardy* essays, and unlike *The Rainbow*, as will be seen, *incomplete* parallelism with few internal complete parallelisms is typical of the syntactic structures of the 'Foreword'. This is largely due to the comparatively small amount of close lexical and syntactic repetition in this essay, and is more typical of Old Testament parallelism than the more repetitive complete parallelism caused by parallel coupling which generally occurs within broader incomplete parallelism in *Hardy* and the texts it influenced. In addition, where contrast between phrases is implied, it is not different things which are contrasted, as in *Hardy*, but different aspects of the same thing. Notation is as before, with lexical parallelism marking progression and emphasis indicated by numbered brackets:

---

[23] *Sons and Lovers*, p.467.

So that if (*we love* (medial-initial 27)) (*our neighbour*, (final-initial/final-initial/final 28)) (*we love* (medial-initial 27)) *that Word*, (*our neighbour*, (final-initial/final-initial/final 28)) and *we hate that Lie*, (*our neighbour*, (final-initial/final-initial-final 28)) which is a deformity.[24]

('...we love our neighbour...we love...our neighbour...we hate...our neighbour...' (l.1-4)): Matching comparison (from A to B) and contrast (from B to C).

('...we love...a deformity' (l.1-4)): Gray's incomplete parallelism, Driver's and Kugel's supplementing function, and Kugel's progression from phrase to phrase.

However, in the 1913 Italian essays, the contrasts and comparisons which allow for the employment of the Matching relation exploited in *Hardy* and the 1915 revisions are not widely present. For example, in the opening paragraphs of the 1913 version of 'The Spinner and the Monks', the contrast between the Church of the Dove and the Church of the Eagle, so vividly presented in the 1915 version, is not present. In the 1913 version, there is only *one* church, and the characteristics of it, and the contrasting 'sunny' characteristics in the passage, are presented by lexical cohesion, identified here by underlining:

> The church of San Tommaso is not shy, it is *farouche*. I had as lief go looking for Pan among beechwoods, as set out for it. I know well enough if I go out by the back door, I shall find myself in the <u>labyrinth</u>, the <u>catacombs</u> of a village, somewhere over which perches the old church. I don't like these Italian villages. In them, I feel like a beetle crawling in the <u>dark</u> <u>deep</u> in <u>crevices</u> of some broken pavement. And it was <u>sunny</u>. Overhead was a tantalising strip of clear blue. And there was I nipped between the high, <u>dark</u> houses, as if I were in some <u>shaft</u> of an <u>underground</u> working. The Italians are supposed to be <u>sunny</u> people. Perhaps the men are, for they are always lounging in the piazza and on the quay. But the houses are forever <u>dark</u>, <u>dank</u>, and <u>sepulchral</u>, and the streets are more horrible than the <u>Valley of the Shadow of Death</u>: for no <u>sun</u> lights upon them, nor any heat, and the inhabitants, small and obscure, slide along by the walls, or stop, half-turning, half crouching, to stare.[25]

In this early version of the essay, there is contrast between the high location of the church and the catacomb-like village (l.3-4), between the clear, sunny weather and the dark houses (l.6-13), and between the sunny Italians and their houses (l.9-13). However, these oppositions are not presented by any obvious Matching relation or lexical parallelism. In the

---

[24]p.467.
[25]'The Spinner and the Monks', *Twilight in Italy*, p.51.

1915 version, however, following *Hardy*, the introduced opposition between the Churches of the Eagle and the Dove is presented by Matching relation in respect of contrast, accompanied by comparison, a pattern which has been shown to be typical of *Hardy* and the essays which soon followed it. In the following extract, bold font identifies antonyms, near-antonyms complementaries and contrasts, italics mark the Matching relation, and numbered brackets mark lexical parallelism. A brief discussion follows the example:

> *The Holy Spirit is a **Dove**,* or an **Eagle**. *(In the **Old Testament** it* (initial 29)) *was an **Eagle**; (in the **New Testament** it* (initial 29)) *is a **Dove**.*
>
> And there are, standing over the Christian world, *((the **Churches of the** (initial-medial-initial-medial-medial 30)) **Dove** (initial 31)) and the* **5** *((**Churches of the** (initial-medial-initial-medial-medial 30)) **Eagle** (final-medial 32)).* There are, moreover, the Churches which do not belong to the Holy Spirit at all, but which are built to pure fancy and logic; such as the Wren churches in London.
>
> *((The **Churches of the** (initial-medial-initial-medial-medial 30)) 10 **Dove** (initial 31) are shy and hidden: they nestle among trees, (and their bells (initial 33)) sound in the mellowness of Sunday; or they are gathered into a silence of their own in the very midst of the town, so that one passes them by without observing them; they are as if invisible, offering no resistance to the storming of the traffic.* 15
>
> *But ((the **Churches of the** (initial-medial-initial-medial-medial 30)) **Eagle** (final-medial 32)) stand high, with their heads to the skies,* as if they as if they challenged the world below. They are (the Churches of the (initial-medial-initial-medial-medial 30)) Spirit of David, *(and their bells (initial 33)) ring passionately, imperiously, falling on the subservient* 20 *world below.*[26]

('The Holy Spirit...Eagle' (l.1)): Matching contrast, with ellipsis in B. 'Dove' and 'Eagle' presented as opposites.

('In...Old...Eagle...in...New...Dove' (l.1-3)): Matching contrast, presented as parallel coupling with varied subjects and objects. 'Old' and 'New' Testaments, 'Dove' and 'Eagle' presented as opposites respectively. Temporal contrast also, from A ('was') to B ('is')). Gray's complete parallelism, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism.

('...the Churches...Dove...the Churches...Eagle' (l.4-6)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and, in the context, opposed) subject nouns. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism..

('The...Dove...among trees' / 'the...Eagle...to the skies' (l.10-11, 16-17)): Matching relation in respect of contrast, with varied (and opposed) nouns in subject slots, and contrasts in attitude.

('and their bells...of the traffic' / 'and their bells...world below' (l.11-15, 19-21)): Matching relation in respect of contrast, with varied (and opposed) adverbial phrases, referring to contrasting manners of sound and relationship to the wider world.

---

[26]p.103.

As with the examples from *Hardy* and the essays which followed it, lexical parallelism functions to support the Matching relation. In 29, contrast is emphasised by what has been changed in context. This is identified below by bold font:

> (In the **Old Testament** it (initial 29)) **was** an **Eagle**; (in the **New Testament** it (initial 29)) **is** a **Dove**.

In 30, comparison is initially emphasised by the varied elements being employed in the same action. This shared action is identified by italics, the varied elements by bold:

> *And there are, standing over the Christian world*, ((the Churches of the (initial-medial-initial-medial-medial 30)) **Dove** and the ((Churches of the (initial-medial-initial-medial-medial 30)) **Eagle**...

Contrast is then emphasised in 30, and in 33, by the contrasting descriptions of that which is changed in context. Again, bold font identifies these contrasts:

> (The Churches of the (initial-medial-initial-medial-medial 30)) **Dove are shy and hidden: they nestle among trees,** (and their bells (initial 33)) **sound in the mellowness of Sunday; or they are gathered into a silence of their own in the very midst of the town, so that one passes them by without observing them; they are as if invisible, offering no resistance to the storming of the traffic.**
> **But** the Churches of the (initial-medial-initial-medial-medial 30)) **Eagle stand high, with their heads to the skies, as if they as if they challenged the world below. They are** (the Churches of the (initial-medial-initial-medial-medial 30)) **Spirit of David,** (and their bells (initial 33)) **ring passionately, imperiously, falling on the subservient world below.**

In 31 and 32, below, the initial descriptions of where the churches are (l.1), then descriptions of their characteristics (l.3-7, 8-11) in the contexts of lexical parallelism serve to develop the topic of the passage. However, what is described in 31 and 32, and the similarities of presentation, despite contrasting content, serves to contrast them. Shared descriptions are indicated by italics, and contrast by bold font:

> *And there are, standing over the Christian world*, (the Churches of the **Dove** (initial 31)) and the (Churches of the **Eagle** (final-medial 32))...(The Churches of the **Dove** (initial 31)) *are shy and hidden: they*

nestle among trees, and their bells sound in the mellowness of Sunday;
or they are gathered into a silence of their own in the very midst of the
town, so that one passes them by without observing them; they are as if
invisible, offering no resistance to the storming of the traffic.
But (the Churches of the **Eagle** (final-medial 32)) *stand high, with*
their heads to the skies, as if they as if they challenged the world below.
They are the Churches of the Spirit of David, *and their bells ring*
passionately, imperiously, falling on the subservient world below.

The 1915 version of 'The Spinner and the Monks' therefore has been demonstrated as showing considerable structural similarity to *Hardy* and the essays which followed it, and it has been shown that these structural similarities were not present in the 1913 version. Similar introduction of the repetitive stylistic techniques of *Hardy* in the revised *Twilight in Italy* can be traced in the 1915 version of 'The Lemon Gardens'. In the 1913 version, like the 1913 version of 'The Spinner and the Monks', contrast between two elements present in the 1915 version cannot be seen in the earlier work. Only the interior is described, and lexical cohesion is present. This lexical cohesion is also cohesive by collocation with the cohesive elements identified by underlining in the early version of 'The Spinner and the Monks'. Again, significant lexical cohesion reiteration is identified by underlining:

> But only the hall pleases me. It is half-way between the open and
> the interior, and partakes of both. But the interior itself is like an
> upholstered tomb. The Italian likes to be impressed. When he enters his
> drawing-room, he does not want to be left uncertain as to whether this may
> or may not be a bit of nicely-arranged out-of-doors. It is interior with a
> vengeance: dark, gloomy, cold, with hearse-like windows, carved, cold
> furniture, grandeur to inspire awe. Here the red-brick floor seems dreary,
> like the floor of a vault, and the furniture stands in its grave. The air
> inside has been starved and darkened to death.[27]

In the 1915 revision, the position of the hall between the interior and exterior is retained, although the parallelism in description of this is emphasised:

> This is half-way between *the outer world* and *the interior world*, it
> partakes of both.

The general nature of the description of the red-brick floor is also retained. However, other revisions take this passage far beyond the 1913 version, via *Hardy*, both in stylistic

---

[27]'The Lemon Gardens of the Signor di P', *Twilight in Italy*, p.60.

characteristics, and in inserted content. As previously, bold font identifies antonyms, near-antonyms, contrasts and complementaries, italics identify the Matching relation, and underlining marks lexical cohesion. The vocabulary of this cohesion remains cohesive with that in the 1913 versions of this essay and in 'The Spinner and the Monks'. Significant lexical parallelism is marked by numbered brackets:

> This is half-way between *the outer world and the interior world*, it partakes of both.
>
> The other rooms are (**dark** (medial-final 34)) and ugly. There is no mistake about their being interior. They are like furnished <u>vaults</u>. The red-tiled, polished floor in the drawing-room seems <u>cold</u> and <u>clammy</u>, the carved, <u>cold</u> furniture stands in its <u>tomb</u>, the air has been **darkened** and <u>starved</u> to <u>death</u>, it is <u>perished</u>.   5
>
> **Outside**, the <u>**sunshine**</u> runs like birds singing. Up above, the grey rocks build the <u>**sun-substance**</u> in heaven. San Tommaso guards the terrace. But **inside** here is the immemorial <u>**shadow**</u>.   10
>
> Again, I had to think of the Italian soul, how it is (**dark**, medial-final 34)) cleaving to the eternal **night**. It seems to have become so, at the Renaissance, after the Renaissance.
>
> In the Middle Ages Christian Europe seems to have been striving, out of a **strong, <u>primitive</u>, <u>animal</u>** nature, towards the **self-abnegation and the abstraction of Christ**. This brought about by itself a great sense of completeness. The two halves were joined by the effort towards the one as yet unrealised. There was a triumphant joy in the Whole.   15
>
> But the movement all the time was in one direction, towards the elimination of the **flesh**...This has been the Italian position ever since. *The mind, that is the <u>**Light**</u>; the <u>senses</u>, they are the <u>**Darkness**</u>.*[28]   20

('...the outer...interior world' (l.1)): Matching relation in respect of comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and near-antonymic) adjectives. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('The mind...the Darkness' (l.21)): Matching relation in respect of contrast, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and, according to Lawrence's philosophy, antonymic) nouns in subject slots, and varied (and near-antonymic) elements in adjectival phrases. Gray's complete parallelism and Berlin's syntactic parallelism.

In addition to the introduced Matching relations, the lexical parallelism identified in the passage also indicates the influence of *Hardy*. The description of the interior as 'dark' is repeated, in a doctrinal insert, to describe the Italian soul, which Lawrence develops into a North / South, flesh and spirit divide, located in the Middle Ages:

---

[28]'The Lemon Gardens', *Twilight in Italy*, pp.115-116.

The other rooms are (<u>dark</u> (medial-final 34) and ugly...Again, I had to think of the Italian soul, how it is (<u>dark</u>, medial-final 34) cleaving to the eternal night. It seems to have become so, at the Renaissance, after the Renaissance.[29]

This inclusion of pseudo-historical division of the past into contrasting eras is typical of Chapter VII of *Hardy*:

During the mediaeval times, the God had been Christ on the Cross, the Body Crucified, the flesh destroyed, the Virgin, Chastity combating Desire. Such had been the God of the Aspiration. But the God of Knowledge, of that which they acknowledged as themselves, had been the Father, the God of the Ancient Jew.

But now, with the Renaissance, the God of Aspiration became in accord with the God of Knowledge, and there was a great outburst of joy, and the theme was not Christ Crucified, but Christ born of Woman, the Infant Saviour and the Virgin; or of the Annunciation, the Spirit embracing the flesh in pure embrace.[30]

Again, the 1915 revisions to *Twilight in Italy* demonstrate stylistic characteristics traceable in *Hardy* which were not present in the 1913 version. However, it would be misleading to suggest that the Matching relation never occurs in the 1913 version. As in *Sons and Lovers*, in the early version there is anticipation of the parallelism which is more comprehensively employed and developed following *Hardy*. Yet the effects of the Matching relation are quite different to those examined in *Hardy* and the post-*Hardy* essays. In the following example from the 1913 version of 'The Spinner and the Monks', simple Matching contrast is employed. Italics identify the Matching relation, bold font mark antonyms, near antonyms and contrasts, and numbered brackets show lexical parallelism:

(And (initial-medial 35) (initial 36)) still my monks were walking, **backwards** (and (initial-medial 35)) **forwards**, pacing, till they seemed like a see-saw. (And (initial-medial 35) (initial 36)) when it would be night, (and (initial-medial 33)) that moon's white, splendid body would shine on the dark-fringed olive woods, (*they would pray*, (final 37)) **5** *looking* (initial 38)) *forward to the white moonlight of eternity.* (And (initial-medial 35) (initial 36)) **this morning**, when the dawn had come rippling over the lake filling the sky with this sunlight, (*they had prayed*, (final 37)) *looking* (initial 38)) *backward to that frail, white body on the Cross, that was murdered.* (And (initial-medial 35) (initial 36)) **10**

---

[29]p.115.
[30]*Hardy*, p.66.

always they **were** **not** **here**, they **were** **there**: (*there away* (initial 39))
*back with the **murdered** body*, (*there away* (initial 39)) *in front with the*
*free **white** spirit,* either in the **past** or the **future**, (*in the death of the*
(initial 40)) *tortured body,* (*in the death of the* (initial 40)) *glorified soul,*
but never **here**. **They** were like a bridge that is built from either side of the |5‾
stream, that leaps out, but does not meet: ends in a gap in mid-air.[31]

('they...eternity' / 'they...murdered' (1.5-6, 8-10)): Matching relation in respect of
contrast of time and direction. Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('there away...body, there away...spirit...' (1.11-2, 12-13)): Matching relation in respect
of contrast of direction and object. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete
parallelism.

('in...body / in...soul' (1.13-14): Matching relation in respect of contrast, presented as
parallel coupling with varied (and, according to Lawrence's philosophy, antonymic)
premodifiers and contrasting nouns). Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete
parallelism.

The italicised phrases here reveal different employment, and different stylistic effects, to

the Matching relations identified following *Hardy*. Instead of the variation in noun slots from

predication to predication which characterises parallel coupling (and Berlin's contrast in

gender) the repetition of verbs in different forms and tenses, and the employment of antonyms,

near-antonyms and contrast all present the same actions being contrasted by their differences

in time and direction (37, 39), and in place (38). Verbs from the same root, but in different

formations are paired. This is the contrast in form (or as some would call it, conjugation)

which Berlin identifies as an element of the grammatical aspect.[32] In the revision, the

employment and function of parallelism has changed. Italics are employed to identify parallel

coupling, bold font marks antonyms, near antonyms or contrasts, and numbered brackets

identify lexical parallelism:

And still the monks were pacing (*backwards and forwards,* (final-
initial/final 41)) (*backwards and forwards,* (final-initial/final 41)) with a
strange, neutral regularity...This was the world of the monks, the rim of
pallor between **night** and **day**. Here they paced, (*backwards and
forwards,* (final-initial/final 41,)) (*backwards and forwards,* (final- 5
initial/final 41)) in the neutral, **shadowless** **light** of **shadow**.

(Neither *the* (initial 42)) *flare of day* (nor *the* (medial 43))
completeness of night reached them, they paced the narrow path of the
twilight, treading in the neutrality of the law. (Neither *the* (initial 42)
blood (nor *the* (medial 43)) *spirit* spoke in them, only the law, the |0
abstraction of the average. The infinite is **positive** and **negative**. But the

---

[31]'The Spinner and the Monks', *Twilight in Italy*, p. 57.
[32]Berlin, p.36.

average is only neutral. And the monks trod *backward and forward* down the line of neutrality...*Night and day* (*are one,* (final 44)) *light and dark* (*are one,* (final 44)) (*both the same in the* (initial 45)) *origin and in the issue,* (*both the same in the* (initial 45)) *moment of ecstasy, light* (*fused in* 15 (medial 46)) *darkness and darkness* (*fused in* (medial 46)) *light,* as in the rosy snow above the twilight...*The flesh* (*neutralising the* (medial 47)) *spirit, the spirit* (*neutralising the* (medial 47)) *flesh,* the law of the average asserted, this was the monks as they paced *backward and forward.*[33]

('...backward(s) and forward(s)' (l.1, 2, 4-5, 12, 19-20)): Free verbal repetition and Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('Neither...day, nor...night' (l.7-8)):   Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('Neither...blood...nor...spirit' (l.9-10)): Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('Night...day...are one, light...dark are one...' (l.13-14)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject slots, inverted (considering collocation relation) from A to B. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('...both...origin...issue...both...ecstasy...' (l.14-15)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with noun phrases within prepositional phrases varied. Noun phrases in apposition, both introduced by 'both', a predeterminer. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('...light...darkness...darkness...light...' (l.15-16)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject and object slots, inverted from A to B. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('The flesh...spirit...spirit...the flesh...' (l.17-18)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic according to Lawrence's philosophy) subject and object slots, inverted from A to B. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

As stated previously, Matching comparison presented as parallel coupling with varying nouns or pronouns in the subject slot identifies the characters as not only divided in their action, but as also *opposed*, suggesting the conflict and opposition inherent in Lawrence's philosophy. The complementary nature of such opposition is also indicated here, as in *Hardy.* As observed in examples from *Hardy* and the essays which followed it, the inversion of items employed in the subject slots in the context of lexical parallelisms suggests that the nouns employed are equally balanced one against the other. 41 retains the opposition in direction which was one of the oppositional characteristics of the original essay; indeed, the introduced repetition of 'backward(s) and forward(s)' indicates the constant oscillation of that process. However, Lawrence's employment of parallel structures has developed to 'enact' stylistically

[33]'The Spinner and the Monks', *Twilight in Italy*, pp.111-112.

the complementary as well as the oppositional nature of his developing ideas. There has been a move towards the 'structural skeleton' of *Hardy*, which, as will be observed in the following section, has much in common with the stylistically repetitive 'structural skeleton' of *The Rainbow*.

The Rainbow

In *The Rainbow*, such lexical and syntactic patterns become more pronounced. From the MS of *The Rainbow* onwards, the inherent separateness of opposing forces is characterised stylistically in three ways. The first of these is Matching comparison presented as parallel coupling with antonymic singular personal pronouns involved in identical verb action, and the second is Matching contrast, employing antonyms, near-antonyms, complementaries and phrases identified as contrasting by the syntactically parallel and repetitive contexts in which they occur. The third is lexical parallelism, which functions to confirm and expand the stylistic effects achieved by the Matching relation. This 'structural skeleton' is developed, and its emphases are changed, throughout revision, as the themes and concerns of each generation develop.

The employment of parallelism by the Matching relation and lexical parallelism is not found either in the remaining fragment of *The Sisters* (March-June 1913), or in *The Sisters II* (August 1913-January 1914), both written prior to *Hardy*. It is not present in the remaining fragment of *The Wedding Ring* either, although Lawrence's revisions to sections of this inserted into *The Rainbow* MS do demonstrate the inclusion of parallelism.[34] This suggests, against Worthen, that what have been shown to be the Matching relations and oppositional patterns employed in *Hardy*, which influenced the post-*Hardy* essays, had a direct effect on the form of the fourth version of the novel.[35] As was demonstrated in this and the preceding

---

[34]For example, 'She did not like **Violet Harby**, even though she did not dislike her. And **Mr. Harby** was in her eyes something she did not understand' is amended to 'From the very first moment *she set hard against him. She set against Violet Harby also*, even though she did not dislike her. **Mr. Harby** was however, too much for her, he was *something she did not understand, something she could not get in agreement with*'.

[35]Kinkead-Weekes suggests (personal correspondence, 17 May 1996) that the stylistic patterning of oppositions in *Women in Love* is clarified in the revision of the first TS into the second, where all the 'star-equilibrium' passages are written in, following Lawrence's discovery of the image in 'One Woman to All Women' ((?) 1914 or later) collected in *Look! We Have Come Through* (D.H. Lawrence, *Complete Poems* (New York, London, Victoria, Ontario, 1993), pp.251-252). As this chapter will demonstrate, the beginning of such patterning is present in the rewriting of *The Wedding Ring* into *The Rainbow* and subsequent revisions to it, and in the 1913 versions of the *Twilight in Italy* essays. As the last chapter demonstrated, this patterning is also anticipated in *Sons and Lovers*, 'The White Stocking' and the 1913 version of 'The Spinner and the Monks'.

chapter, Lawrence's earlier work had already begun to anticipate this move, albeit in less complex forms.

Functions of lexical parallelism and the Matching relation

The employment of multiple parallelism in *The Rainbow* provides the framework upon which the deficiencies and achievements of each generation can be identified and evaluated. The emphases achieved through the employment of the Matching relation and lexical parallelism develop and change according to the developing themes and concerns in each generation through the revision process, but the repetitive 'structural skeleton' is itself present from MS. An examination of this developing 'structural skeleton' in each generation will demonstrate, against Worthen, and extending Kinkead-Weekes, just how far *Hardy* influenced the repetitiveness of *The Rainbow*, and how the 'structural skeleton' identified functions to identify the characteristic relationship between the protagonists of each generation as they move through various intimate interactions.

Tom and Lydia

In the Tom and Lydia story, the syntactic and lexical patterns identified in *Hardy* and the post-*Hardy* essays are present from MS, but emphasised more at the stage of TSR than MSR, supporting Kinkead-Weekes' thesis that the novel was written chronologically backwards.[36] Examples of such patterning in the Tom and Lydia story are reproduced below, with italics again marking the Matching relation, bold font marking antonyms, near-antonyms, complementaries and contrast of gender and location, and numbered brackets marking lexical parallelism. Revisions are indicated with angled brackets for excisions, square brackets for insertions. In the early examples examined, the double aspect of Lydia's individualism is identified with reference to Tom, as are his problems with this, and his inability to trust himself fully to the unknown. These issues, the focus of problems in their early marriage, can be traced by syntactic and lexical parallelism, and develop through revision.

---

[36]'The Marble and the Statue', p.384. The significant revisions in the Will / Anna story occur at MSR stage. The Ursula / Skrebensky story also employs such patterning from MS stage, supplementing it in TSR by occasional insertions of the same pattern. However, the introduction of 'corrosive' vocabulary in 'First Love' at TSR stage, and the introduction of allotropic imagery in this interaction at E1 occurs much later, and reveals that Lawrence continued to make creative revisions to the Ursula / Skrebensky story (as he did with each generation) right up to proof stage.

In the following example, which occurs shortly following Tom and Lydia's marriage, Matching comparison is employed, with mutuality and complementarity being increased in revision, in accordance with the patterns identified in *Hardy* and the post-*Hardy* essays. This increasing complementarity will be discussed following the example:

> (*He realised* (initial 48)) *with a sharp pang that she belonged to him* <He felt beside himself. (MS)> [, and *he to her.* (TSR)] <He could not believe it. *He did not feel like a possessor* (MS)> [(*He realised* (initial 48)) *that he lived by her.* Did he own her? Was she here for ever? Or might she (go away? (final 49)) (TSR)] She was not really his, 5 it <was <only   pretence> [not established], this marriage of theirs (MS)> [was not a real marriage, this marriage between them. She might (go away. (final 49)) (TSR)] *He did not feel like a master*, husband, father of her children. She belonged elsewhere. Any moment, she might be gone.[37]

('...she...to him...he...to her' (l.1-2)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with ellipsis. Gray's incomplete parallelism.
        ('He...to him' / 'He...by her' (l.1, 3-4)): Matching comparison, Gray's incomplete parallelism.

Revisions to original Matching relations and lexical parallelism increases the mutuality of Tom and Lydia's relationship, in accordance with the increasing opposition and compatability pattern of *Hardy*. From MS to TSR, the ellipsis of parallel coupling with varied and antonymic subject and object slots in 'she belonged to him, and he to her' (l.1-2) replaces 'she belonged to him. He felt beside himself', thus indicating the complementary nature of their relationship rather than Tom's possession. The excision of 'He did not feel like a possessor' (l.3) supports such a reason for the revision, and its replacement with 'He did not feel like a master' (l.8) later in the passage, following the insertion of many more female personal pronouns than were present in the original, confirms the increased balance in their revised relationship. The lexical parallelism of 'He realised' (48), in the contexts in which it is employed produces a progression or expansion of Tom's realisation, similar to Kugel's supplementing and progressive functions (l.1, 3). In addition, the lexical parallelism in the context of the inserted phrases 'Or might she go away' and 'She might go away' (49) (l.5, 7-8) again suggests Lydia's increased independence; what is first phrased as a question becomes, in its second employment (and inversion) more of a possibility, and Tom's fear of the unknown emphasised. Tom and Lydia therefore are increasingly shown, stylistically, to

---

[37]*Rainbow*, p.58.

have the compatability necessary for the ideal relationship between opposites described in Chapter VII of Hardy, while the problems in their relationship are simultaneously emphasised.[38]

In the following example, in which Matching contrast is employed, the necessity for Tom to measure himself to Lydia's individuality is presented through this repetitive 'structural skeleton':

> (*She* (initial 50)) *had taken him* and *given him* <some (TSR)> fulfilment. (*She* (initial 50)) *still would do so*, in **her** own times and ways. But *he must control* (*himself*, (final-medial 51)) *measure* (*himself* (final-medial 51)) to **her**.[39]

('She...fulfilment / He...her' (l.1-2, 3-4)): Matching contrast. In both A and B, Kugel's progressive function, and Kugel's and Driver's supplementing function. Gray's incomplete parallelism.

The contexts of the lexical parallelism in which 'She' is employed in initial position (50), indicates temporal opposition of both past and future; 'She had taken him and given him...She would do so...' (l.1-3). Lydia's own actions are portrayed as contrasting and complementary, and are both outward looking (taking and giving), but Tom's are self-referential:[40]

> But *he must control* (*himself*, (final-medial 51)) *measure* (*himself* (final-medial 51)) to **her**.

In *Lawrence, Hardy and American Literature*, Swigg observes:

> On Tom falls the anguish of patient balancing on his side where Lydia is frail on hers, of restraining his own wants to measure with her own separate nature and her less powerful physical needs. Tom's long wait outside the vicarage, as he lets things slowly take their course, is a foretaste of the equalising restraint to come in the marriage, the gradual

---

[38] This complementarity in *Hardy* is as follows:
> This is complete movement: man upon woman, woman within man. This is the desire, the achievement of which, frictionless, is impossible, yet for which every man will try, with greater or less intensity, achieving more of less success. (p.56).

[39]*Rainbow*, p.79.

[40]The correspondence between the characteristics of each individual and each relationship with the 'quasi-gender attributions' of *Hardy* will be examined in Chapter 4.

leavening that forces him to recognise the different kinds of separateness in Lydia - both the autonomous, self-willed abstractness, with which he cannot grapple in its obscure danger, and the richer individualism in her which admits him, and for which he must wait while she is distant and abstracted. The self-curbing is bitter, and he would break from the discipline, but for 'a certain grace' in him, 'an instinct of gratitude and knowledge that she would receive him back again...prevented his straying very far'.[41]

Swigg is correct in his identification of Tom's need for self-curbing, and the repetitive 'structural skeleton' developed from *Hardy* functions to reflect this aspect of Tom and Lydia's relationship. However, in addition to the stylistic characteristics and effects already identified, the stylistic framework of multiple parallelism is employed in a context which recalls the definition of love which is not 'real love' in *Hardy*. The underlying characteristic of such love is fear of the female, and inability to lose oneself to the unknown:

> And under all this, there is, naturally, a sense of fear, transition, and the sadness of mortality. For, the female being herself an independent force, may she not withdraw, and leave a man empty, like ash, as one sees a Jew or Italian so often.[42]

The similarity of Tom's situation to this is clear, although he does not have the belief in his own supremacy and the necessity of the woman to administer herself to him which characterises such love in *Hardy*. Swigg argues that Tom diverges from Lydia when she casts him out during the birth of their first child, to the 'other aspect of separateness - the wilful, absolutist personality'[43] establishing a new centre first with Anna, which leads naturally to his admiration of the separateness which Alfred's mistress, Mrs. Forbes, embodies. This establishment of a new centre with Anna is characterised in two ways, both of which demonstrate similarities with the repetitive 'structural skeleton' of *Hardy*. The first of these is the use of the alternating employment of male and female subjects and pronouns in the scene where he undresses Anna. Italics identify the Matching relation, bold font marks antonyms, near-antonyms, complementaries and contrasts, and numbered brackets mark lexical parallelism. The noun phrases 'her small body' and 'her body', and the verbs and

---

[41]Richard Swigg, *Lawrence, Hardy and American* Literature (London, 1972), p.91.
[42]*Hardy*, p.103.
[43]Swigg, p.92.

adverbial phrases identified by bold font below are so marked due to their employment in contexts which imply contrast between Tom and Anna's actions:

> **He** began to unfasten her little apron. **She** would have shrunk from **him**, but could not. So *(her small body (medial-initial 52)) remained in his grasp, while he fumbled at the little buttons and tapes,* unthinking, intent, unaware of anything but the irritation of her. *(Her body (medial-initial 52)) was held taut and resistant, he pushed off the little dress* 5 *and the petticoats,* revealing   the white arms.   *She kept stiff, overpowered, violated, he went on with his task.* And   all the while, *she* sobbed, choking:
> "I want my mother."[44]

('...her...tapes' / 'Her...petticoats...' / 'She...task' (1.2-3, 4-6, 6-7)): Matching comparison, each compared phrases tending to indicate a progression in action, recalling Kugel. Gray's incomplete parallelism.

Berlin's contrast of gender, and the alternating employment of male and female, suggest the opposite, conflictual and complementary relationship between antonymic opposites inherent in Lawrence's philosophy. In this way, Tom's relationship with Anna recalls the following claim in *Hardy*:

> ...while, ideally, the soul of the woman possesses the soul of the man, procreates it and makes it big with new idea, motion, in the sexual act, yet, most commonly, it is not so...In this case, a man must seek elsewhere than in woman for the female to possess his soul, to fertilise him and make him big with increase.[45]

In addition, the lexical parallelism identified in the passage demonstrates Kugel's progression and expansion of A in B, as will be discussed following the example:

> So (her small body (medial-initial 52)) remained in his grasp, while he fumbled at the little buttons and tapes, unthinking, intent, unaware of anything but the irritation of her. (Her body (medial-initial 52)) was held taut and resistant,   he pushed off the little dress and the petticoats, revealing the white arms.

---

[44]*Rainbow*, p.73. This scene has a counterpart in Anna's undressing of the dead Tom Brangwen in 'The Marsh and the Flood' (pp.232-233). In this, Tom in death represents the Absolute of the monistic God the Father principle of *Hardy*. Anna resists the memory of her past life, and clings to the present, and as Tom is represented as a partial Absolute, thus admitting no opposite, the antonymy employed in the earlier scene does not occur.

[45]*Hardy*, p.57.

In the first sentence, 'her...body' is subject of the main clause, but is treated as inert object of Tom's action while he 'fumbles' at the fastenings of her clothes. In the second sentence, 'Her body', repeated with ellipsis of the adjective, has more autonomy, and Tom has apparently succeeded in unfastening her buttons; her dress is now 'pushed off'. Lexical parallelism functions as a framework against which progression of action can be portrayed and measured. This characteristic of Matching comparison was identified in both *Hardy* and the post-*Hardy* essays. The second bonding scene between Tom and Anna occurs is in the cattle feeding scene in the barn.[46] In this, similar antonymic employment of male and female subject occurs. However, in addition, the ebb and flow of Tom's movement, the language and imagery employed anticipates the sheaf-stacking episode with Will and Anna,[47] suggesting, through the Matching relation developed in *Hardy*, that just as Tom moves from his wife to bond with Anna, Anna moves beyond her father to bond with Will.[48]

When Tom returns to Lydia, Swigg identifies correctly that Lydia's counter-attack on Tom makes his separate absolutism distinct from joint endeavour, and separates the 'divergent wants' of their relationship from his main desires, 'making the ideal of joint sharing distinct from freelance absolutism'.[49] The development of the problematic individualism in the relationship can be traced in the repetitive 'structural skeleton'. The propositional content of Lydia's attack is again reflected in multiple parallelism, which is increased through revision. Matching contrast is accompanied by Matching comparison, as in *Hardy*, and the contrasts between past and present function to extend Lydia's problematic individualism. Italics again identify the Matching relation, bold font marks antonyms, near-antonyms, complementaries and contrasts, and numbered brackets show lexical parallelism:

> *"Why aren't you (satisfied* (medial 53)) *with me? - I'm not* *(satisfied* (medial 53)) *with you. Paul used to come to me and* <make **me** <quiver. [alive to him] (MS)> ([*take me like* (medial 54)) *a man* does. (MSR)] *You only leave me alone, or come to* ([*take*] *me* <as **you** come

---

[46]*Rainbow*, pp.75-76.

[47]pp.112-116.

[48]Balbert notes that although the rhythm of these scenes is similar, the psychology of rhythm of these scenes differs. He notes the similarity in 'dramatic situation and syntactical development' between the closing lines of the barn scene, and the pulse and purpose which enters Will's stacking of the sheaves (*Psychology of Rhythm*, pp.48-49). This scene with Tom and Anna is also an obvious counterpart to the love scenes in the dairy between Anna and Will (*Rainbow*, pp.109-110) and Ursula and Skrebensky in the shed (pp.280-281).

[49]Swigg, p.93.

to tea (MS)> [*like* (medial 54)) *your cattle*, quickly, to forget me again - 5
so that you can forget me again. (MSR)]"

    <"It's no good my coming to you". (MS)> <["Well what do you
want me to do?" (MSR)]> ["What am I to remember about you?"
(TSR)] said Brangwen.

    <"Why?" (MS)> ["I want you to know there is somebody there 10
besides yourself." (MSR)]

    <"**You** don't want **me**." (MS)> <["Well, don't I know it?"
(MSR)]

    "*You come to me* <so poorly (MS)> <[*as if it were for nothing,
for nothing. Paul* <used> [*came*] *for something, it was something* when 15
he came to *me* - a real man I had." (MSR)]> [*as if it was for nothing, as
if I was nothing* there. When *Paul came to me, I was something to him -
a woman, I was. To you I am nothing - it is like cattle - or nothing -*"
(TSR)][50]

('Why...you...me...I'm...you' (l.1)): Matching comparison, with varying (and
antonymic) subjects and objects. Gray's complete parallelism, and Berlin's syntactic
parallelism with contrast in person and gender.

('Paul...does' / 'You...cattle...' (l.2-4, 4-5)): Matching contrast, with varying and
contrasting (but not antonymic) subjects, and contrasting embedded adverbial phrases (one
phrasal, one clausal). Expansion in B with 'leave me alone' emphasises the contrast with Paul
in A who 'came'. Lowth's antithetical and synthetic parallelism. Berlin's syntactic
parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('You...something...' (l.14-15)): Matching contrast, with varying and contrasting
subject pronouns, and antonyms. Gray's incomplete parallelism and Lowth's antithetical and
synthetic parallelism.

('When...something...nothing' (l.17-18)): Matching contrast, with varying and
contrasting subjects, and antonymic adjectival phrases (either actual, or implied by context).
Lowth's antithetic parallelism, Gray's incomplete parallelism.

    Multiple oppositions are set up in Lydia's verbal assault on Tom. There is Berlin's

contrast of person in the repeated employment of 'you', 'me', and 'I', and the characters to

whom these personal pronouns refer also suggest contrast of gender. In MSR, the contrast

between Paul taking Lydia like a man, and Tom taking her like his cattle is introduced and

presented in lexically parallel terms (54), setting up a more striking contrast between man and

nature (and implicitly, the outside world and the world of the Marsh Farm identified in the

opening pages of the novel)[51] than that achieved in MS. This revision implies that Tom has

not embraced the unknown, but is loving Lydia in a way familiar to him rather than making a

movement into the beyond through their relationship. In addition, the insertion of the

---

[50]*Rainbow*, p.89.
[51]pp.10-11.

following in TSR sets up a contrast with the repeated employment of 'something' in the preceding lines:

> ...as if it was for nothing, as if I was nothing there. When Paul came to me, I was something to him - a woman I was. To you I am nothing - it is like cattle, or nothing.

'Something' and 'nothing' are contrasts. In the context of their employment in revision, Lydia's descriptions of Paul and Tom's different manner of coming to her again contrast with each other, and also with the contrast between Paul and Tom in the opening lines (l.2-5). Paul now is described as taking her as a woman, and Tom, again, is accused of taking her like his cattle. In addition, the contrast in person (and, by implication, gender) in the opening line, employed with the same lexically parallel negative verb (53) indicates the mutual yet separate opposition between the characters:

> "Why aren't you satisfied with me? - I'm not satisfied with you."

Tom and Lydia are both experiencing dissatisfaction, and their dissatisfaction separates them both emotionally and stylistically. The revisions to this passage reveal a further, and crucial, aspect to this relationship. Between the MS and MSR stages of *The Rainbow's* composition, Lydia's emphasis on Tom's absolutism is emphasised. However, in TSR, *memory* is introduced:

> <"It's no good my coming to you." (MS)> <["Well what do you want me to do?" (MSR)]> ["What am I to remember about you?" (TSR)] said Brangwen.

Tom, as Swigg observes, puts aside previous experience which may obstruct him in his keeping of faith with his purpose. This 'cancelling out', he argues, prevents the remembering in *Hardy* which breaks man and woman apart, resulting in 'tragic art'.[52] Tom

---

[52]*Hardy*, p.61. There is an increase in this 'cancelling out' from MS to E1, exemplified below by Brangwen's perception of Lydia's wedding ring:
> <And it stood for all that he must pass by on his way to the goal. It was not his, the wedding-ring, and (MS)> <[It stood for his denial and suffering. Her hands were silent and alien, remote from him. It bound her life, the wedding-ring, (TSR)] [It excluded him: It was a closed circle. It bound her life, the wedding-ring, (E1)] it stood for <a (MS)> [her (TSR)] life in which he could have no <part, but which was her life (MS)> [part (TSR)]. Nevertheless, beyond all this,

has made a vital step which will enable him to unite with Lydia in a limited 'Absolute'. As before, the essential characteristics of the relationship have been portrayed through the repetitive 'structural skeleton' provided by *Hardy*.

Eventually, Tom and Lydia do achieve a form of mutually 'Absolute' relation; Lydia reveals Tom to himself, and he, eventually, lets go of himself and moves beyond his fear to unite with her in the arch which forms over Anna. Their activity is now fully mutual and complementary, as Tom has given himself up to the unknown in Lydia,[53] and their achievement is marked by the pillar of fire and the pillar of cloud which led the Israelites to the Promised Land. Again, multiple parallelisms identify the characteristics of this interaction. The successful balance achieved between and within the individuals is presented both by Matching contrast and comparison, as was demonstrated as typical of *Hardy*. Crucially, in Matching contrast, the *complementarity* of opposites is stressed, as in the ideal described in *Hardy*. This will be discussed following the extract. As previously, italics mark the Matching relation, bold font identifies antonyms, near-antonyms and contrasts, and numbered brackets mark lexical parallelism:

> ***She** (was the doorway to (medial 55))* **him**, *he (to (medial (with ellipsis) 55))* **her**. At last they had thrown open the doors, each to the other, and had stood in the doorways facing each other, whilst the light flooded out from behind on to each of their faces, it was *the transfiguration, the glorification, the admission.*   5
>
> And always the light of the transfiguration burned on in their hearts. *He (went medial 56)) **his** (way, (final 57))* as before, *she (went (medial 56)) **her** (way, (final 57))* to the rest of the world, there seemed no change. But to the two of them, there was the perpetual wonder of the transfiguration...   10
>
> ...The days went on as before, *Brangwen went out to his work, **his** wife nursed her child* and attended in some measure to the farm. They did not think of each other - why should <they? One does not think of the **daylight** one lives by, nor of the **darkness** that nourishes one. (MS)> [they? (TSR)] Only when *she touched **him**, he knew **her*** instantly, that 15 **she** was <the life and the way (MS)> [with **him**, near **him**, that **she** was the gateway and the way out (MSR)], that **she** was beyond, and that **he** was travelling in **her** through the beyond. Whither? - What does it matter?

> there was himself and the point where he and she met and joined to make a new life. Had she not looked at him, a girl? (MS) > <[herself and himself which should meet and join to make one, joyfully. She had looked at him as a girl looks. (TSR)]> [herself which should meet. (E1)]

[53]c.f. *Hardy* 103: 'The other attitude of a man in love, besides this of "she is administered unto my maleness", is: "she is the unknown, the undiscovered, into which I plunge to discovery, losing myself."'

He responded always. *When she called, he answered, when he asked, her response*[54]*came at once, or at length* <and he knew whither to direct **20** his way (TSRD)>.

Anna's soul was put at peace between them. She looked from **one** to **the other**, and <as it were (*a* (*pillar* (medial 58)) *to the* (medial 59)) *east,* and (*a* (*pillar* (medial 58) *to the* (medial 59)) *west,* far away under the sky, she saw (MS)> [she saw (TSR)] them established to her safety, **25** and she was free. (TSR)] She played between (*the* (*pillar* (medial 58)) *of fire* (medial 60)) *and* (*the* (*pillar* (medial 58)) *of cloud* (medial 60)) in confidence, having (*the* <*sign...sign* (MS)> [*assurance on her* (medial 61)) **right hand** *and* (*the assurance* (TSR)] *on her* (medial 61)) *left.* She was no more called upon to uphold with her childish might the broken end **30** of the arch. Her **father** and **mother** now <like pillars supported fixedly (MS) > [met to (TSR)] the span of heavens, and she, the child, was free to play in the space beneath, between.[55]

('She...him...he...her' (l.1-2)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with ellipsis, and with varied (and antonymic) subject pronouns and objects. Gray's complete parallelism, and Berlin's syntactic parallelism with contrast of person and gender, both with ellipsis.

('He...way...she...way' (l.7-8)): Matching relation in respect of comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject and possessive pronouns. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('Brangwen...work...wife...child' (l.11-12)): Matching relation in respect of contrast (of place and activity), but compatability of these actions suggested by context. Berlin's syntactic parallelism with contrast in person and gender within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('...she...he...her...' (l.15)): Matching relation in respect of contrast, with varying (and antonymic) subject and object pronouns. Reciprocal verbs suggest complementarity of actions. Berlin's syntactic parallelism and contrast of person and gender within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('When she...length' (l.19-20)): Matching relation in respect of contrast, with near-synonymy between equivalent terms in A and B. Reciprocal verbs suggest complementarity of actions, and there is near-antonymy between 'at once' and 'at length'. Gray's incomplete parallelism, incorporating Berlin's syntactic parallelism.

('a pillar...west' / 'the pillar...cloud' / 'the assurance...left' (l.23-24, 26-27, 28-29)): Matching relations in respect of contrast, employing antonyms of direction, adjectival phrase and location. Syntactic parallelism and repetition suggest that the balanced and opposed nature of these antonyms are complementary. Gray's incomplete parallelism, incorporating Berlin's syntactic parallelism. Lowth's antithetical parallelism.

The oppositions of the passage are identified in several ways. Repeated contrasts in Berlin's person and gender ('she' / 'he' / 'her' / 'him') are employed, and the identification of Anna's 'father and mother' in line 31 characterises her parents not as a single parental unit, as

---

[54]Although 'he' is a noun phrase headed by a personal pronoun, and 'her response' is a noun phrase headed by a noun, the opposition remains between them because her action is portrayed as contrastive to his, and continues the pattern of reciprocity created by the coupling of the passage.
[55]*Rainbow*, pp.90-91.

'parents' would suggest, but as separate and contrasted by gender, although they are related by their parental role. The near-antonymy of 'daylight' and 'darkness' also contributes to the contrasting pattern of the extract, identifying the opposing nurturing influences on an individual. The equality of balance between oppositions (bold font) which allows the arch to be formed is identified stylistically by the Matching relation by parallel coupling (italics), lexical parallelism (numbered brackets) and the contexts in which it is employed, and are retained, although revised, from MS:

> ***She** was the doorway to **him**, **he** to **her**...* (lexical parallelism and Matching comparison with parallel coupling, in the second phrase with ellipsis. Parallel coupling has varied (and antonymic) subject and object pronouns). (l.1-2)

> ***He** went **his** way*, as before, ***she** went **her** way*...(lexical parallelism and Matching comparison with parallel coupling, with varied subject and possessive pronouns. In addition, 'as before' can be a modifier of either the preceding or succeeding clause, or, indeed, of both simultaneously) (l.7-8)

> <as it were *a pillar to the **east**,* and *a pillar to the **west*** (MS, TSRD)>...She played between *the pillar of **fire** and the pillar of **cloud*** in confidence, having *the* <*sign on **her right hand** and the sign* (MS)> [*assurance on **her right hand** and the assurance* (TSR)] *on **her** left.* (lexical parallelism, and Matching contrast incorporating antonyms) (l.23-24)

It is also identified by the complementary nature of their relationship, presented in syntactically and grammatically appositional constructions. These, as in *Hardy*, are Gray's incomplete parallelism, incorporating Berlin's syntactic parallelism (indicated by italics):

> *Brangwen went out to his work, his wife nursed her child* and attended in some measure to the farm...(l.11-12)

> when *she touched him, he knew her* instantly...(l.15)

> *When she called, he answered, when he asked, her response came* at once, or at length...(l.19-20)

In each of the above examples, the actions of male and female are balanced on either side of what Kugel calls the 'medial pause',[56] and more specifically, the 'mere comma'. This,

---

[56]Kugel, p.8.

in the parallel books of the Old Testament, separates two units of roughly equal length which are not semantically parallel. Again, balanced and complementary separation and opposition is implied, confirming the 'Absolute' nature of this interaction. The character's actions are also not opposed, except, possibly, in the final example, but are *complementary*. Yet this joint endeavour is only a beginning. Tom's continuing 'cancelling out' of the past, his positing of himself as the 'fulfilment' beyond the possibility of Paul Lensky, the characterisation of Lydia as the gateway beyond which he gets no further, and their remaining within the bounds of the Marsh Farm all indicate that the travelling beyond is still be worked through in the succeeding generations. However, their achievement of a limited 'Absolute', and its description in multiply parallel forms, provides a beginning which is developed in the succeeding generations.

Will and Anna

In the early days of their marriage, Will is incomplete in himself, and over-dependent on Anna. She consequently dominates him, asserting herself supreme in her naked pregnant dance,[57] her criticism of Will's Creation panel, and her desire to be the mother of sons. Conversely, Will recoils from Anna in self-absorbed rage. Throughout their conflicts and interactions, separability and partiality is emphasised. As Lawrence argues later in *The Crown*, no consummation or satisfaction can come of partiality, and the partial soul will seek to make itself 'Absolute' by devouring its opposite, preventing expulsion from the womb. As with the first generation, the Matching relation and lexical parallelism form a repetitive 'structural skeleton', developed from *Hardy*, against which the limitations and successes of this generation can be measured.

In the sheaf-stacking episode, after which Will proposes to Anna, his desire for interaction with her is initially frustrated by her constant drawing away from him, and, significantly, her turning to the moon.[58] In this episode, in Chapter 4, parallel coupling, lexical parallelism and opposition are present from the initial stage of composition, but come to be emphasised in MSR.[59] As previously, italics identify the Matching relation, bold font

---

[57]Anna's dance recalls David's dance before the Lord (I Samuel xviii. 1-4, xix 2-7, xx) and anticipates Lawrence's description of David's dance in *The Crown* (p.369). In accordance with Kinkead-Weekes' observations regarding *The Rainbow's* inversion of the 'quasi-gender attributions' of *Hardy*, it is rational Anna who is dancing in defiance of mystical Will.

[58]Diana, the moon goddess, is traditionally the destroyer of men.

[59]The significant revisions to this patterning occur at MSR stage.

marks antonyms, near-antonyms and contrasts, and numbered brackets indicate lexical parallelism. The Matching relation here serves not to indicate the complementarity of Will and Anna's actions, unlike the case in the first generation, but the dividing opposition between them. As in *Hardy*, Matching contrast and comparison are employed together, but function to indicate separation. This feature will be discussed following the example:

She took her new two sheaves <and started a new stook. And *as she turned away towards the moon* which always furrowed its hands in her bosom, (she (saw (medial 62) (initial 63)) *him rise from stooping over the earth*, (she (saw (medial 62) (initial 63)) *him coming towards her*. (He (was (initial 64)) inexperienced, it took him longer to make his 5 sheaves stand up (MS)> [and walked towards him, *as he rose from stooping over the earth*. (He was (initial 64)) coming out of the near distance. She set down her sheaves to make a new stook. They were unsure. Her hands fluttered. Yet she broke away, and *turned to the moon*, which laid bare her bosom, so she felt as if her bosom were the sea 10 heaving and panting with moonlight. - And he had to put up her two sheaves, which <fell (MSR)> [had fallen (TSR)] down. He worked in silence. The rhythm of the work carried him away again, as she was coming near. (MSR)]

They worked together, coming and going, in a rhythm, <till the 15 rhythm became a dream (MS)> [which carried their feet and their bodies in tune (MSR)]. She stooped, she <had (MS)> <[illeg. (MS)]> [lifted (MSR)] the burden of sheaves, <her face was in darkness (MS)> [*turned* her face *to the dimness* where *he* was, and went with her burden over the stubble (MSR)]. She hesitated, set down her sheaves, there was a swish 20 and hiss of mingling <tresses, there was his figure coming, (MS)> [oats, he was drawing near (MSR)], and she <*turned, her face* was *to the moon again* (MS)> [must turn, again. And there was the flaring moon laying bare her bosom again, making her drift and ebb like a wave. (MSR)].

<So they (MS)> [He (MSR)] worked steadily, engrossed, threading 25 backwards and forwards like a shuttle across the <space (MS)> [strip (MSR)] of cleared stubble, weaving the long line of riding shocks, nearer and nearer to the shadowy trees, threading his sheaves with hers.

And always, she was gone before (he (came (final 65) (final 66)). *As (he (came* (final 65) (final 66)), *she (drew away,* (final 67)) *as he* 30 *(drew away,* (final 67)) *she (came.* (final 65)) Were they never to meet. <A (MS)> [Gradually a (TSR)] low, deep-sounding will in him vibrated to her, (tried to (initial 68)) set her in accord, (tried to (initial 68)) bring her, gradually, at length, [to him (MSRI)], to a meeting, (till they (initial 69)) should be together, (till they (initial 69)) should [meet as the sheaves 35 that swished together (MSRI)]...

He waited for her, he fumbled at the stook. She (came. (final 65)) But she stood back till he (drew away. (final 65)) *He (saw (medial 62)) her in shadow, a dark column, [and spoke to her, and she answered (MSRI)]. (She (saw (medial 62) (initial 63)) the *moonlight* 40 flash question on his face. But <she stood motionless (MS)> [there was a

space between them (MSR)], and **he** went away, <and (MSD)> the work <went on (MS)> [carried them (MSR)] rhythmic.

Why was <**she** (MS)> [there (MSR)] always <beyond **him**, why? Why, (MS)> [a space between them, why were they apart? *Why* (MSR)] 45 as **she** came up from under the **moon**, *would she* halt and *stand off from him*? Why was *he* <*driven* (MS)> [*held* (MSR)] *away from her*?...

<till **he** wanted **her**. **He** wanted **her** exceedingly. They stood there enfolded, hanging in the balance. (MS)> [*He* (*kissed* (medial 65)) *her* again, and *she* (*kissed* (medial 65)) *him*. And again they were (kissing 50 (medial (by varied form) 65)) together. Till something happened in **him**, **he** was strange. **He** wanted **her**. (MSR)]...[The conflict had gone by (Om. MS, E11)][60]

('...as she...moon' / '...as he...earth' (l.1-2, 6-7)): Matching contrast. Repetition of structure ''as'' + antonymic subjects + verb + adjunct suggests that these actions are to be contrasted in respect of what differs between A and B. Gray's incomplete parallelism, incorporating Berlin's syntactic parallelism.

('...him...earth' / '...him...her' / 'him...her' (l.3-4, 4-5, 32-33)): Matching comparison, marking the progression of Will's action both affectively (A to B) and temporally (A to C). Parallel coupling with altered tense between A and C. Kugel's progressive function (A to C). Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('...she turned...moon...' / '...she...moon...' / 'she turned...was...' / '...(she) must...again' (l.2, 9-10, 18-19, 23)): Matching comparison, repetition functioning to present progression of action by identifying what has changed in the context. Kugel's progressive function, Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('As...he...she...came' (l.30-31)): Matching comparison, presented as parallel coupling with varied (and antonymic) subject slots between A and B. Actions of each subject inverted from A to B. Within A and B, Matching relation in respect of contrast. Gray's complete parallelism, Berlin's syntactic parallelism, Lowth's antithetical parallelism.

('He saw...column' / 'She saw...his face' (l.38-39, 40-41)): Matching contrast. Syntactic parallelism, repetition and antonymic pronoun subjects in 'She / He saw', employed with the near-antonyms 'shadow' / 'dark' and 'moonlight' suggest that what Will and Anna see is to be contrasted in respect of what differs between A and B. Lowth's antithetic parallelism, Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('and spoke...and answered' (l.39-40)): Matching contrast, with varying (and antonymic) subject pronouns. Reciprocal verbs suggest complementarity of actions. Berlin's syntactic parallelism, with ellipsis, within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

('Why...her?' (l.45-47)): Gray's incomplete Matching comparison, with information in A not repeated in B. Minimal simple repetition, but near-synonymy employed.

('He...her / she...him' (l.49-50)): Matching comparison. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

In contrast to Tom and Lydia's 'Absolute' interaction, the oppositions and parallelisms in this passage do not always identify complete complementarity or comparison between Will and Anna. Even in the following sentence, MSR inserts ensure that the rhythm of the work

---

[60]*Rainbow*, pp. 114-116.

which unites them does so while stressing the opposition which divides rather than unites them:

> [The rhythm of the work carried **him** away again, as **she** was
> coming near. (MSR)]   They worked together, coming and going in a
> rhythm, <till the rhythm became a dream (MS)> [which carried their feet
> and their bodies in tune (MSR)].

Berlin's contrast of person and gender (characteristic of the parallel books of the Old Testament) is again present in the personal pronouns and possessives employed in the passage. The oppositions of 'moonlight' and 'darkness',[61] 'earth' with 'moon' and 'sea', and Anna 'in shadow, a dark column' (l.39) with Will's face being illuminated by 'moonlight' also set up the oppositional patterning. Of these, those which are not antonyms are implied as contrasting by the parallelism of the contexts in which they are employed. The *lack* of complementariness of opposites is identified in the propositional content of the passage, in a sentence inserted in MSR, and revised in TSR:

> [Gradually a (TSR)] low, deep-sounding will in **him** vibrated to **her**,
> tried to set **her** in accord, tried to bring **her**, gradually <, at length,
> (TSR)> [to **him** (MSR)], to a meeting, till they should be together, till they
> should [meet as the sheaves that swished together (MSR)]...

In this insertion, the desire for interaction is not mutual; it is instigated by Will, indeed, by Will's will. Typically, he wants connection with his partner, whom he considers too distant and independent. The non-complementary nature of the parallelism employed is suggested by the lack of contact which it achieves. Unlike Tom and Lydia's 'Absolute' interaction, parallel constructions with altered verb slots do not tend to suggest contact or complementarity, but distance. In the following example, parallel coupling (Gray's complete parallelism and Berlin's syntactic parallelism) serves to indicate the separating motion of the couples actions by the employment of near-antonymic verbs employed in equivalent positions. The inversion of these verbs from A to B with regard to the subjects they take indicates that even in balanced and equivalent action, they are divided:

---

[61]This recalls and extends the contrasts between daylight and darkness in Tom and Lydia's relationship.

...she was gone before (he (came (final 65) (final 66)). *As (he
(came,* (final 65) (final 66)) *she (drew away,* (final 67)) *as he (drew
away,* (final 67)) *she (came* (final 65)) (1.29-31).

The separating nature of their similar actions is confirmed in the following example,
where near-synonymous phrases in Matching comparison serve only to describe the lack of
contact between the couple:

> Why (MSR)] as she came up from under the moon, would *she* halt
> and *stand off from him*? Why was *he* <driven> [*held* (MSR)] *away from
> her*?...(1.45-47)

In the constructions where parallelism *does* suggest complementarity, the contexts in
which it is employed soon qualify any connection which might be made. In the following
example, in which italics mark the relevant parallelism, Anna's reply to Will's call does not
result in any increasing proximity between them; indeed, Will goes away, and the breach
between them is mused upon:

> [*and spoke to her, and she answered* (MSR)].   She saw the
> moonlight flash question on his face. But <she stood motionless> [there
> was a space between them (MSR)], and he went away, <and (MSR)> the
> work <went on> [carried them (MSR)] rhythmic...Why was <she> [there
> (MSR)] always <beyond him, why? Why,> [a space between them, why
> were they apart? Why (MSR)] as she came up from under the moon,
> would she halt and stand off from him? Why was he <driven> [held
> (MSR)] away from her?...

Similarly, when Will and Anna kiss, the presentation of the action according to the
Matching relations identified is suggested stylistically as being mutual. However, it is soon
revealed to be affective upon Will rather than mutually affective, and as the close rather than
the opening of physical intimacy between the characters:[62]

> <till he wanted her. He wanted her exceedingly. They stood there
> enfolded, hanging in the balance. (MS)> [*He kissed her* again, and *she
> kissed him. And again they were kissing together*.   Till something

---

[62]Anna declares that she wants to go home. Physical intimacy occurs again briefly following Will's
proposal (immediately succeeding this passage), but it is brief intimacy which focuses on Will's lack
of understanding of Anna and her actions, and on his willingness to leave all to be resolved
following marriage.

happened in **him, he** was strange. He wanted **her**. (MSR)]...[The conflict
had gone by (Om. MS, E1I)][63]

('He...together' (l.2-3)): Matching comparison in first sentence, presented as parallel coupling with varied, complementary and antonymic subject and object pronouns within Gray's incomplete parallelism. Comparison confirmed in second sentence, in which the verb is cohesive by simple repetition, and a plural pronoun is employed.

Lexical parallelism in the passage is also functional, achieving similar effects to that shown to be operational in *Hardy*. In the following examples, it produces an increase of affectiveness, as in the first example, or progression of action, as in the second:

> [Gradually a (TSR)] low, deep-sounding will in **him** vibrated to **her**, (tried to (initial 68)) set **her** in accord, (tried to (initial 68)) bring **her**, gradually, at length, [to **him** (MSRI)], to a meeting, (till they (initial 69)) should be together, (till they (initial 69)) should [meet as the sheaves that swished together (MSRI)]...

> ...**(she** (saw (medial 62) (initial 63)) *him rise from stooping over the earth*, (she (saw (medial 62) (initial 63)) *him coming towards her*. (He (was (initial 64)) inexperienced, it took **him** longer to make **his** sheaves stand up (MS)> [and walked towards **him**, as **he** rose from stooping over the *earth*. (He was (initial 64)) coming out of the near distance...(*She* (*saw* (medial 62) (initial 63)) *the moonlight* flash question on **his** face. But <she stood motionless (MS)> [there was a space between them (MSR)], and he went away, <and (MSD)> the work <went on (MS)> [carried them (MSR)] rhythmic...

Again, the repetitive 'structural skeleton' of *The Rainbow* has been demonstrated to have significant stylistic similarities to *Hardy* and the post-*Hardy* essays, and this skeleton functions to indicate the fundamental characteristics of character interactions.

Similar non-complementary patterning can be observed throughout the second generation, although the nature of it develops as Will and Anna's relationship progresses. In the following examples from Chapters 6 and 7, MS is again the point to which such patterning can be traced, altered only to be emphasised. The revised example below is an example of Matching comparison presented as parallel coupling with ellipsis and varied (and complementary and antonymic) subject and object slots. What A does to B, B does to A, the employment of 'back' in the second phrase not only implying 'at him', which would be both grammatically and syntactically parallel with 'at her' in the preceding phrase, but also

---

[63]*Rainbow*, pp.114-116.

identifying the 'afterwards-ness' of repetition in the B phrase which Kugel identifies in Old Testament parallelism.[64] As with the preceding example, Matching comparison serves only to identify separation, and, in this case, opposition and conflict. The contexts in which lexical parallelism occurs have the same effect:

> *he* (*struck* (medial 70)) *at her* <with a snarl, because she threw aside his tools...(MS, TSRD)>, *she* (*struck* (medial 70)) *back*.[65]

The destructive imbalance of their interactions is typified in their 'striking' of each other, discussed above, and in the extract analysed in Chapter 2. In the following example from Chapter 7, the employment of the same verb with antonymic personal pronouns taking subject position appears in contexts which indicate *complete* opposition, not to mention incompatibility, between the lovers. The Matching relation is one of contrast, and Lowth's antithetical parallelism:

> **She (*wanted* (medial 71)) her own, old, sharp self, detached, detached, active but not absorbed, active for her own part, taking and giving, but never abstracted.** Whereas **he (*wanted* (medial 71)) this strange absorption with her,** which still she resisted. (Unchanged from MS)[66]

Will and Anna as subjects take the same verb, but their desires could hardly be more different, nor more incompatible. Will's over-dependent desire to absorb Anna is contrasted with her equally insistent desire to retain her independent self, both characters acting from their personal and *partial* desires rather than entering into the impersonal Whole which might unite them. Again, the characteristic multiple parallelisms of *The Rainbow's* language form a repetitive 'structural skeleton' by which the nature of the characters' relationship can be observed, and in this way, their actions are repeatedly exposed as being in contrast to the joint endeavour achieved by Tom and Lydia at the end of Chapter 3. The Matching relation in the

---

[64]Kugel identifies this 'afterwards-ness' of repetition as bringing associations from earlier usage of a phrase or lexical item with it. Kugel, p.8.
[65]*Rainbow*, p.151.
[66]*Rainbow*, p.186.

second generation therefore indicates that they will neither achieve nor transcend the 'Absolute' which the first generation achieves.

Like Tom, Will turns from his wife to another female prior to the maximum achievement of potential between them. In a passage inserted in TS, along with Will and Anna's 'Absolute Beauty' interaction, and which create the conditions for it, Will turns to Jennie, whom he meets in the cinema. As one would expect, the multiple parallelism already identified as present in *Hardy* and the post-*Hardy* essays is present from the introduction of the passage. Italics identify the Matching relation, bold font marks antonyms, near-antonyms, complementaries and contrasts, and numbered brackets show lexical parallelism. The Matching relation is one of comparison, but the compared actions are neither complementary nor do they create connection between the characters:

> **He** (*was aware of the* (medial 72)) *one* (*<next to (TS)>* (medial 73)) [*beside* (TSR)] **him**. **She** was rather small, common, with a fresh complexion and an upper lip that lifted from her teeth, so that, when **she** was not conscious, her mouth was slightly open and her lips pressed outwards in a kind of blind appeal. *She* (*was* strongly *aware of the* 5 (medial 72)) **man** (*next to* (medial 73)) **her**, so that all her body was still, very still. Her face watched the stage. Her arms went down into her lap, very self-conscious and still.[67]

('He...him' / 'She...her' (l.1-2, 5-6)): Matching comparison, presented as Berlin's contrast of person and gender within Gray's incomplete parallelism. Near synonymy and varied (and antonymic) complement and location slots. 'One' and 'man' are implied as near-antonyms due to context.

Will's concern for the girl is entirely impersonal; he wants only to achieve his sensual objective,[68] and the lack of complementarity in the Matching relation indicates that the achievement of 'Absoluteness' is not a possibility. The interaction is partial, and, like the 'Absolute Beauty' relation which follows it, it takes place in darkness, occupying only one half of the Lawrencian dialectic. The impersonality of relationship is present from the passage's insertion, but is emphasised in revision:

---

[67] pp.210-211.

[68] In addition, in revision Lawrence amends Will's intentions regarding Jennie's body to those of *discovery* rather than *enjoyment*, in line with the revisions to the 'Absolute Beauty' relation between Will and Anna, where 'discovery is present from TS, and emphasised in E1. The significance of these revisions with reference to the question of censorship will be examined in Chapter 5.

<But he made his sentences merely to ease the silence. (TS)> [He made his sentences in sheer, almost muscular pleasure of exercising himself with her. (TSR)] He was looking at her <. He liked her eyebrows, and her shining, shallow eyes, and her mouth that would open. He liked her mouth, that would open to him. She was goodly to his eye. 5 And he knew she liked his face. (TS)> [all the time, perceiving her, appreciating her, finding her out, gratifying himself with her. He could see <real beauties (TSR)> [distinct attractions (E1)] in her; in her eyebrows, with their particular curve, gave him <profound sensual (TSR)> [keen aesthetic (E1)] pleasure. Later on he would see her bright, 10 pellucid eyes, like shallow water, and <enjoy (TSR)> [know (E1)] those. And there remained the opened, exposed mouth, red and vulnerable. <Out of that he would get his chief pleasure (TSR)> [That he reserved as yet (E1)]. And all the while his eyes were on the girl, <feeling and handling with sensual pleasure her several features (TSR)> [estimating 15 and handling with pleasure her young softness (E1)]. About the girl herself, who or what she was, he cared nothing, he was quite <callous. But the features in which he felt an impersonal beauty he relished thoroughly. He wanted to come closer (TSR)>] [unaware that she was anybody. She was just the sensual object of his attention (E1)][69]   20

Will is subject, the girl is object. As with the preceding examples, the nature of Will and Jennie's relationship has been indicated by the manner of its stylistic presentation.[70]

In Will and Anna's 'Absolute Beauty' interaction, the impossibility of achieving full 'Absoluteness' which the Matching relation has demonstrated is again portrayed through the repetitive 'structural skeleton' developed from *Hardy*. Matching comparison presented with altered subject slots functions to identify the separate and similar, rather than mutual, relationship between them at this point, as will be discussed following the example:

He (was (medial 74)) *the [sensual* (Om TSR, E1I)] *male seeking his* <*satisfaction* (TSR)> [*pleasure* (E1)], *she* (was (medial 74)) *the female, ready to take hers:* but in her own way. *A man could turn into a free lance: so then could a woman.* <Goodbye moral responsibilities! (TSR)> [She adhered as little as he to the moral world. (E1)] All that had 5 gone before was <a feather (TSR)> [nothing (E1)] to her...<Down went the moral fortress, (*the good* (initial 75)) *knight was a free lance flying the banner of his own sensual desires,* (*the good* (initial 75)) *maiden was out in the wilderness enjoying herself* (TSR)> [They abandoned in one motion the moral position, *each was seeking gratification pure and* 10 *simple.* (E1)][71]

---

[69]*Rainbow*, pp.212-213.
[70]Lawrence's revisions to both this passage and the 'Absolute Beauty' interaction support Ross's thesis ('Revisions, p.289) that the earlier interactions were recast following the writing of Skrebensky and Ursula's love bouts in Chapter 15 (see Chapter 5).
[71]*Rainbow*, p.218.

('He was...hers' (l.1-3)): Matching comparison. Gray's incomplete parallelism, with semantic parallelism implied. Repetition with altered (antonymic) subject slots and possessive pronoun 'hers' in B.

('A man...a woman' (l.3-4)): Matching comparison, with varying (and antonymic) subject slots. Gray's incomplete parallelism, Berlin's ellided syntactic parallelism implied. Semantic parallelism.

('the good...herself' (l.7-9)): Matching contrast, incorporating Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism. Lexical parallelism of 'the good', and complementarity of 'knight' and 'maiden' (coming from the same lexical set) suggests that this contrast has complementary aspects.

Matching comparison with altered subject slot but otherwise the same semantic content emphasises the separateness of Will and Anna in identical actions. Even Matching relations in which contrast is introduced indicates their difference and, again, separateness rather than mutuality. In TSR, although there is potential complementarity between 'knight' and 'maiden', and lexical parallelism occurs in the repetition of 'the good' in initial position, each is pursuing *separately* his or her own goal of *self*-satisfaction. Similarly, in the contexts of the lexical parallelism 'was' (l.1, 2, 7, 9), altered and antonymic pronouns in the subject slots, and the corresponding actions attributed to 'male' and 'female' serve to identify that although both are engaged in similar actions, these actions are only *self*-assertive. As Kinkead-Weekes observes, such self-contained *non*-relative Beauty as the type achieved here, which occupies only one extreme of the Lawrencian dialectic, is 'in one sense infinite (since the opposed absolutes are outside time and change), and in another, deathly (since fullness of life comes from the clash of opposites in flux, momentary flowerings and consummations subject to mutability)'.[72] The manner in which Will and Anna's separability is presented stylistically through the repetitive 'structural skeleton' derived from *Hardy* again suggests that they will not achieve the 'Absoluteness' achieved by Tom and Lydia. Again, this 'structural skeleton' functions to indicate the fundamental characteristics of a generation.

Ursula and Skrebensky

The Ursula / Skrebensky story also demonstrates the inclusion of multiple parallelisms from the earliest stages of composition. As with the second generation, and unlike the first, the oppositions inherent in their relationship are not complementary, and the Matching relation and lexical parallelism indicate that their interactions cannot lead to any achievement of an

---

[72]p.513.

'Absolute' relation between them. Not only does each assert their own desires in intimate interactions, but they are each occupied in *self*-feeling, and the destructive nature of their relationship is indicated by the sterility of the imagery employed to describe their encounters.

Ursula's attraction to Skrebensky in 'First Love' follows her realisation of her own growing individuality, and the triumph of the weekday world over the mystical world of Sunday:

> As Ursula passed from girlhood towards womanhood, gradually the cloud of self-responsibility gathered upon her. She became aware of herself, that she was a separate entity in the midst of an unseparated obscurity, that she must go somewhere, she must become something. And she was afraid, troubled. Why, oh why must one grow up, why must one inherit this heavy, numbing responsibility of living an undiscovered life? Out of the nothingness and the undifferentiated mass, to make something of oneself! But what? In the obscurity and pathlessness, to take a direction! But whither? How take even one step? And yet, how stand still? This was torment indeed, to inherit the responsibility of one's own life...The religion which had been another world for her, a glorious sort of play-world...now fell away from reality, and became a tale, a myth, an illusion, which, however much one might assert it to be true in historical fact, one knew was not true - at least, for this present-day life of ours.[73]

It is Skrebensky's 'self-possession' and the sense of the 'outer world'[74] that seem to offer what she needs. However, Ursula has chosen a man who is not enough for her; his 'outer world' is merely the narrow world of weekday, and social, life. It is not 'another' world, which she later sees in and through Birkin.[75] Just as Ursula's individuality is at odds with the Cossethay community and Christ's teachings of 'selflessness', so it brings her into destructive conflict with Skrebensky. Spilka[76] astutely observes that Ursula's concept of 'self' at this point is that of the personal self which Lawrence had abandoned in his conception of *The Rainbow*, a development described in his famous letter to Garnett of 5 June 1914. He argues that it is this self, isolated from the rest of life, which Ursula tries to affirm in her relations with Skrebensky, and that her desire for consummation with the infinite is actually not conjunction *with* the rest of life but assertion of triumph over it. As Swigg observes,[77] Ursula reacts against Skrebensky's inadequacy 'with a self-assertiveness that is essentially

---

[73]*Rainbow*, p.263.
[74]p.269.
[75]*Women in Love*, p.312.
[76]Spilka, pp.111-113.
[77]Swigg, p.120.

different to her mother's'. She adheres to her father's rather than her mother's vision, and re-creates Skrebensky in an idealising image which *raises* him to be her aristocratic equal, whereas Anna had reduced Will to a subordinate. This manufactured balance cannot be maintained between them. Skrebensky believes, ultimately, that the individual is just part of the social fabric, and Ursula's elevation of him results in both the emergence of his corrupt suppressed individuality[78] and the rousing of Ursula's latent female supremacy, which she does not wish to assume in her search for a balanced opposition. This rousing of her Aphrodite self is not necessarily bad, as Lawrence argues in *The Crown*, written between 20 September and 10 October 1915, and thus between five to eight weeks after the revisions to *The Rainbow's* proofs were completed, and between ten days prior to and ten days following the publication of *The Rainbow*. He writes:

> The spirit of destruction is divine, when it breaks the ego and opens the soul to the wide heavens. In corruption there is divinity. Aphrodite is, on one side, the great goddess of destruction in sex, Dionysus in the spirit. Moloch and some gods of Egypt are gods also of the knowledge of death. In the soft and shiny voluptuousness of decay, in the marshy chill heat of reptiles, there is the sign of the Godhead. It is the activity of departure. And departure is the opposite equivalent of coming together; decay, corruption, destruction, breaking down is the opposite equivalent of creation. In infinite going-apart, there is revealed again the pure absolute, the absolute relation: this time truly as a Ghost: the ghost of what was.[79]

However, the breaking of egos during the relationship between Ursula and Skrebensky does not occur for Ursula until it has ended, and Ursula has miscarried their child. Instead, their relationship is characterised both by non-complementary opposition identified in the repetitive 'structural skeleton' formed by the Matching relation and lexical parallelism, and, increasingly as their relationship progresses, by newly sterile versions of the fertile imagery of opposition previously employed in the novel. Typically, these features are emphasised in revision.

In the following example, taken from the early stages of Ursula and Skrebensky's relationship, italics again identify the Matching relation, bold font marks antonyms or near-antonyms, and numbered brackets indicate lexical parallelism. The relation is one of both Matching contrast and comparison, as seen in *Hardy* and the post-*Hardy* essays, and it

---

[78] A point which Swigg also makes.
[79] *Crown*, p.292.

functions to identify the *self*-satisfaction being strived for, although reciprocity is included. These features will be discussed following the extract:

> *And he* (*kissed* (medial 76)) *her,* (*asserting* (initial-initial-medial-medial 77)) *his will over her, and she* (*kissed* (medial 76)) *him* back, (*asserting* (initial-initial-medial-medial 77)) *her deliberate* <*choice* (MS)> [*enjoyment* (TSR)] *of him*...Like a flower shaking and wide-opened in the sun, *she tempted him and challenged him,* and *he accepted her* 5 *challenge,* something went fixed in him. And under all her laughing, poignant, reckless, was the quiver of tears. That almost sent him mad, mad with desire, with pain, whose only issue was [through (MSR)] possession of her body...It intensified and heightened their senses, they were more vivid and powerful in their being. But under it all, was a 10 poignant sense of transience. It was a magnificent self-assertion on the part of both of them, *he* (*asserted* (initial-initial-medial 77)) (*himself* (medial 78)) (*before* (medial 79)) *her, he felt* (*himself* (medial 78)) (*infinitely* (medial 80)) *male and* (*infinitely* (medial 80)) *irresistible, she* (*asserted* (initial-initial-medial-medial 77)) (*herself* (medial 81)) (*before* 15 (medial 79)) *him, she knew* (*herself* (medial 81)) (*infinitely* (medial 80)) *desirable and hence* (*infinitely* (medial 80)) *strong.* And after all, what could either of them get [from such a passion (MSR)] but a sense of his or of **her** own maximum self, [in contradistinction to all the rest of life? (E1)][80]   20

('And...of him' (l.1-4)): Matching relation in respect of comparison, presented as parallel coupling with differing adverbial phrases. Berlin's syntactic parallelism and Gray's complete parallelism. Although the adverbial phrases are not identical, they each indicate the character's striving for *self*-satisfaction.

('...she...challenge' (l.5-6)): Matching relation in respect of contrast, although this contrast suggests reciprocity. Gray's incomplete parallelism. The adjectival phrase 'Like a flower...the sun', describing Ursula, also contrasts with 'something went fixed in him', applied to Skrebensky.

('...he asserted...strong' (l.12-17)): Matching relation in respect of comparison, presented as parallel coupling with differing and contrasting adjectival phrases. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism. Lowth's antithetical parallelism.[81]

Again, contrast in person (and, implicitly, in gender) in Matching relations serves to suggest the separation and contrast between the protagonists. As with Will and Anna, the oppositions inherent in their relationship are not complementary. In the repeated employment of the verbs 'kissed' and 'asserted' predicated of different (and antonymic by gender) subjects,

---

[80]*Rainbow*, pp.280-281.
[81]Chapter 4 of this thesis investigates Lawrence's cross-hatching of 'Male' and 'Female' characteristics within each individual, which serves to qualify apparent antonymic or near-antonymic contrasts.

Ursula and Skrebensky's apparent equal opposition is identified. Although the initial lexical parallelism of 'kissed' suggests reciprocity, the further lexical parallelism in the sentence (1.1-4), and indeed those throughout the passage, serve to indicate that these repetitions do not identify complementarity. In the contexts in which these oppositions are presented, it is suggested also that their opposition is one where each asserts his or her own specific desires or characteristics. Skrebensky asserts 'his will', Ursula asserts her '<choice> [enjoyment] of him' (1.1-4), his appreciation of his own 'infinite' characteristics is that of feeling his maleness and irresistibility, hers is of knowing her desirability and strength. Not only are they asserting their own desires, but they are occupied in *self*-feeling, and are thus incapable of making the necessary leap into the unknown which would allow potential attainment of the 'Absolute'.

In the 'salt dance' between the couple, the lack of creative opposition, and, indeed, its degeneration, is further traced in the Matching relations employed. The Matching relation is one of contrast, and the vocabulary of fruitful consummation has become sterile and destructive. Where Will, in his 'Absolute Beauty' encounter with Anna treated her as a resource, Ursula is now vampiric towards Skrebensky.[82] Italics again identify the Matching relation, bold font marks antonyms, near-antonyms and contrasts, and lexical parallelism is identified by numbered brackets:

> **She** <clung to **him** (MS)> [took **him** (TSR)] in the kiss, hard **her**
> kiss <came (MS)> [seized (TSR)] upon **him**, hard and fierce and <cold
> (MS)> [burning corrosive (TSR)] as the moonlight. **She** seemed to be
> destroying **him**. **He** was reeling, <gathering (MS)> [summoning (TSR)]
> all his strength to <place (MS)> [keep (TSR)] **his kiss** upon **her**, to <place 5
> **his kiss** (MS)> [keep **himself** in the kiss (TSR)].
> But hard and fierce **she** <cleaved (MS)> [had fastened (TSR)] upon
> **him**, cold as the moon and burning as [a (TSRI)] fierce salt. Till
> gradually his warm, <supple shadow (MS)> [soft iron (TSR)] yielded,
> yielded, and **she** was there fierce, <blazing fierce and hard and cold upon 10
> **him**, and his heart was gone, and his strength. Under her hard, open-
> mouthed, coldly fierce kiss **he** succumbed, and **she** held him there, the
> victim. (MS)> [corrosive, seething with his destruction, seething like some
> <horrible> [*cruel* (E1)], corrosive salt around the last substance of his
> being, destroying him, destroying **him** in the kiss. (*And* (initial 82)) **her** 15
> (*soul* (medial 83)) <*screamed*> [*crystallised* (E1)] (*with* (medial 84))
> *triumph,* (*and* (initial 82)) *his* (*soul* (medial 83)) *was* <*silent*> [*dissolved*
> (E1)] (*with* (medial 84)) *agony and annihilation.* [So she held him there,
> the victim, <shrivelled, bloodless, like an infinitely shrivelled corpse>

---

[82]The significant features of this relationship are discussed in Chapter 4.

[consumed, annihilated (E1)] (TSR)]. She had triumphed: he was not any 20 more. (TSR)][83]

('And...annihilation' (l.15-18)): Matching relation in respect of contrast. Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

The lexical parallelism of 'And' (initial 82), 'soul' (medial 83) and 'with' (medial 84), employed in context with each other, creates a situation in which not only the contrast in person and gender, and antonyms 'crystallised' (l.16) and 'dissolved' (l.17) employed in relation to each of them indicate contrast, but so do the phrases 'with triumph' and 'with agony and annihilation' (l.16-17, 18). Ursula is triumphing over, and destroying Skrebensky, a feature of their relationship portrayed through parallelism. Unlike the personal pronouns employed, and the contrasting verbs 'screamed' and 'was silent', which preceded 'crystallised' and 'destroyed' in revision, it is important to note that the verbs included in revision, and the phrases 'with triumph' and 'in agony and annihilation' are *not* naturally contrasting. However, in the parallel and contrasting context in which they are presented, almost antonymic contrast between them is implied, and the couple are again suggested stylistically as being separate, opposed and conflictual. Similarly, in the sentence 'She had triumphed: he was not any more', inserted in TSR, the medial pause and the balance of cause and effect between the first and second halves of the sentence suggest contrast between the two halves of the sentence, although no actual parallelism is present. The contrast presented is, again, one in which the non-complementary and destructive relationship between the lovers is suggested stylistically. As the reference to Lot's wife in the 'salt dance' extract suggests, and as Kinkead-Weekes observes, Ursula is looking backwards, not forwards, as a result of her egotism.[84] No achievement of the 'Absolute' is possible, and as the Matching relation and lexical parallelism in this extract demonstrates, none is achieved.

Like Tom with Anna, and Will with Jennie before her, Ursula engages in an additional relationship in the midst of her affair with Skrebensky. Ursula's affair is a lesbian one with her schoolmistress Winifred Inger. This relationship is the only one in the novel to almost completely omit the multiple parallelisms identified in *The Rainbow* and the major essays of the period. The single example which does occur is as follows:

---

[83]*Rainbow*, pp.299.

[84]p.521. Kinkead-Weekes makes the link with Genesis xix.26, and claims, correctly, that in this episode, the symbolism of earlier fertile opposition is transformed into sterile and destructive terms.

> (*Winifred Inger* (initial-medial 85)) (*felt* (medial 86)) *a hot delight*
> *in the lessons* (*when* (medial 87)) (*Ursula* (medial-initial 88)) *was*
> *present,* (*Ursula* (medial-initial 89)) (*felt* (medial 86)) *her whole life begin*
> (*when* (medial 87)) (*Miss Inger* (initial-medial 85)) *came into the room.*[85]

('Winifred...the room' (l.1-4)): Matching relation in respect of contrast, with correspondence implied by parallel structure. Berlin's syntactic parallelism, Gray's complete parallelism.

'Winifred / Miss Inger' and 'Ursula' cannot be presented as antonymic by gender through the employment of personal pronouns. However, as with the 'salt dance', their contrasting employment in a parallel structure presents them as contrasted and compared. If the letters A and B are substituted for the character names, the construction 'A felt...when B..., B felt...when A' implies correspondence between the two halves of the sentence, and between the characters. The difference between what A and B 'felt', and 'when' they felt it is the contrast and the link between the characters. Ursula responds to Winifred's active arrival, Winifred responds to Ursula's (more) passive presence. Contrast and correspondence is again indicated. Perhaps the general lack of multiple parallelism in the descriptions of Ursula and Winifred is due to the lack of gender contrast between them, in spite of Lawrence's insistence that 'Male' and 'Female' do not mean 'man' and 'woman', but are principles inherent in both, and in all things.[86] However, in *Women in Love*, which demonstrates very similar patterns of multiple parallelism and lexical cohesion to *The Rainbow*, the relationship between Birkin and Gerald repeatedly *does* employ these patterns.[87] Lawrence's (and Birkin's) insistence on the supplementary 'man to man' relationship to that between man and woman results, stylistically, in the employment of multiple parallelisms which more typically characterise heterosexual, and therefore gender contrasting relationships. Fruitful and creative 'man to man' relationships are, the syntax suggests, possible. 'Woman to woman' ones, apparently, are not.

Ursula's sterile and destructive behaviour towards Skrebensky continues following his return from Africa. On the Lincolnshire coast, parallelism functions to identify the increasing affectiveness of Ursula's behaviour towards Anton, and his increasingly powerless reaction, recalling the increasing affectiveness traceable in *Hardy's* Matching relations.[88] In the

---

[85] p.312.
[86] *Hardy*, pp.57-58, 54-55.
[87] For example, *Women in Love*, pp.269-270.
[88] The repetitive features of this interaction are discussed in Chapter 4.

following extract, it functions to reflect the non-complementary relationship between the couple at this stage:

> *She owned his (body* (medial 89)) *and enjoyed it with all the delight and <freedom* (MS)> *[carelessness* (MSR)] *of a possessor. But he had become gradually afraid of her (body* (medial 89)). *(He wanted her* (initial/final-initial 90)), *(he wanted her* (initial/final-initial 90)) **endlessly.** But there had come a tension into his desire, <an intensity 5 (MS)> [a constraint (MSR)] which prevented his enjoying the delicious approach and the loveable close of the endless embrace. He was afraid. His will was always tense, fixed.[89]

('She owned...her body' (l.1-3)): Matching relation in respect of contrast. Gray's incomplete parallelism, Lowth's antithetical parallelism.

('He wanted...endlessly' (l.3-5)): Matching relation in respect of comparison, with expansion in B. Free verbal repetition and Berlin's syntactic parallelism within Gray's incomplete parallelism.

The contexts in which the parallel employment of 'body' is used suggest the opposition between them stylistically. This contrast is emphasised by the contrasting form 'She...But he' in which it is couched. Similarly, in the following extract from the same chapter, the construction 'She...he...But she...she...she...Yet he...He' (l.12, 13-14, 15-16), in which Skrebensky is the savage and satisfied partner, Ursula the comparatively passive object of his desire indicates the different nature of their actions and experiences. The extract is reproduced below:

> *He would lead her* away to a pocket in the sand-hills, secret amid the grey thorn-bushes and the grey, glassy grass. *He held her close against him, felt* all *her firm, unutterably desirable mould of body through the fine fire of the silk that fell about her limbs.* The silk, slipping fierily on the hidden, yet revealed roundness and firmness of **her** 5 **body, her loins,** seemed to run in **him** like (fire, (final-medial 91)) make **his** brain burn like brimstone. **She** liked it, the (electric (medial-final 92)) (fire (final-medial 91)) of the silk under his hands upon **her** limbs, the fire flew over **her,** as **he** drew nearer and nearer to discovery. **She** vibrated like a jet of (electric, (medial-final 92)) firm fluid in response. Yet **she** did 10 not feel beautiful. All the time, **she** felt **she** was not beautiful to **him,** only exciting. **She** let **him** take **her,** and **he** seemed mad, mad with excited passion. But **she,** as **she** lay afterwards on the cold, soft sand, looking up at the blotted, faintly luminous sky, felt that **she** was as cold now as **she**

---

[89]*Rainbow,* p.426.

had been before. Yet **he**, breathing heavily, seemed almost savagely I5 satisfied. [**He** seemed revenged. (Om. MS, TSRI)]

Contrary to John Worthen's thesis,[90] it has been demonstrated that the language of *The Rainbow* is very much that of *Hardy*, and also of the developing *Twilight in Italy* essays. Lawrence's employment of antonymy and near-antonymy in the Matching relation, and of lexical parallelism, develop through the revision process. In each case, it is *towards* an emphasis on the 'neat shapes and patterns' and 'coloured blocks labelled 'Male' and 'Female' which Worthen considers so characteristic of *Hardy* in distinction from *The Rainbow*. This parallelism, so typical of Lawrence's prose style of this period, is also characteristic of the Hebrew verse patterns of the Old Testament. This makes the style of the novel consistent with the Biblical themes which occur throughout it, although *The Rainbow's* parallelism includes more lexical repetition than the Old Testament. In addition, the presence of such patterning in *The Rainbow* from its earliest stage of composition under that title, and its employment in contexts which highlight the characteristics of the relationships in each generation confirms not only the stylistic influence of *Hardy* on the novel, but also the complex effects of Lawrence's repetition. In the following chapter, further links between the 'repetitiveness' of The *Rainbow* will be explored, focusing on the 'quasi-gender attributions' of 'Male' and 'Female' from which Lawrence's dialectic is composed.

---

[90] Worthen, p.61.

CHAPTER 4: REPETITION AND REVISIONS, PROLIXITY, AMBIGUITY AND AFFECTIVENESS: 'QUASI-GENDER ATTRIBUTION' IN *THE RAINBOW*

The lexical specificity, lexical cohesion and parallelisms of *The Rainbow* examined in the preceding chapters are only part of Lawrence's repetitiveness in the novel. In this chapter, the novel's repetitive style will be examined with reference to the dualistic principles of Lawrence's 'theory' in *Hardy*, and its function in suggesting the nature of the relationships between characters will be discussed. The developing employment of *Hardy's* opposing principles in the novel through the processes of revision, and the importance of these revisions, will also be examined.

Kinkead-Weekes claims that Lawrence inverts the principles of *Hardy* in *The Rainbow*, arguing that this results in emphasis falling not on gender, but on the marriage of opposites with which the novel is concerned.[1] As previously stated, both Kinkead-Weekes and Daleski recognise, following Lawrence, that the impersonal and opposing principles of *Hardy* are inherent in and between all life, man and woman included. As Daleski notes, in relationships *between* man and woman there is a double reconciliation of opposition, that within and that between the characters involved.[2] In *Hardy*, Lawrence characterises as 'Female' the stable and all embracing force of Law (God the Father), and as 'Male' the opposite force of movement, change and individuation of the self; Love (God the Son):

> ...man, the male, is essentially a thing of movement and time and change. Until he is stirred into thought, he is complete in movement and change. But once he thinks, he must have the Absolute, the Eternal, Infinite, Unchanging...And these are the qualities man feels in woman, as a principle...From her he has a sense of stability. She supplies him with the feeling of Immutability, Permanence, Eternality. He himself is a raging activity, change potent within change. He dare not even conceive of himself, save when he is sure of the woman permanent beneath him, beside him. He dare not leap into the unknown save from the sure stability of the unyielding female. Like a wheel without an axle, his motion is wandering neutrality.[3]

---

[1] 'Marriage of Opposites', p.39, *Rainbow*, pp.497-498, n. 10:25.
[2] Daleski, pp. 23-24.
[3] *Hardy*, p.58.

The complementary and creative nature of the opposition between these principles, from which a third thing is made, is identified as follows:

> In life, then, no new thing has ever arisen, or can arise, save out of the impulse of the male upon the female, the female upon the male.[4]

The division of these inseparable principles is also arbitrary, as:

> The rapid motion of the rim of a wheel is the same as the perfect rest at the centre of the wheel. How can one divide them? Motion and rest are the same, when seen completely.[5]

Daleski has provided a summary of the attributions of both 'Male' and 'Female' principles as they are characterised in *Hardy*. His list runs as follows:

Male	Female
Movement	Stability
Change	Immutability
Activity	Permanence
Time	Eternality
Will to Motion	Will to Inertia
Registers Relationships	Occupied in Self-Feeling
Refusal of Sensation	Submission to Sensation
Multiplicity / Diversity	Oneness
Knowledge	Feeling
Love	Law
Spirit	Flesh
God the Son	God the Father
Service of Some Idea	Full Life in the Body
Doing	Being
Self-Subordination	Self-Establishment
Utterance	Gratification in the Senses
Abstraction	
Public Good	Enjoyment through the Senses
Community	
Mental Clarity	Sensation
Consciousness	Instinct
Spirit	Soul
Mind	Senses
Consciousness	Feeling

---

[4] p.56.
[5] p.60.

Knowledge	Nature
Condition of Knowledge	Condition of Being
Brain	Body
Stalk	Root
Light	Darkness
Movement towards Discovery	Movement towards the Origin[6]

As will be demonstrated in this chapter, *The Rainbow's* repetitiveness functions to identify both the 'inversion' of *Hardy's* principles which Kinkead-Weekes identifies, *non-*inversion of these principles, and the complex cross hatching of principles inherent in and between characters, varying from generation to generation. The significance of lexical cohesion and extension, varying verb affectiveness, and semantic ambiguity in *The Rainbow* will be demonstrated, and, where relevant, the development of these stylistic features in revision will be discussed.

Inversion and Revision; *Hardy* and *The Rainbow*

In the opening pages of *The Rainbow*, the inversion of the 'Male' and 'Female' principles of *Hardy* employed in the description of the Men of the Landscape, and the Women of the Prospect[7] appears to be fairly straightforward. It is the women, not the men, who look beyond the farm and the world of blood-intimacy to the world of utterance and movement, characteristics of the 'Male' principle as defined in *Hardy*. As with the revisions to the syntactic parallelism and lexical cohesion examined in the preceding chapter, the ideas of *Hardy* are present from MS stage, but emphasised in revision, in this case, in TSR. For example, in the description of the women, 'mouth' becomes 'mind',[8] 'obtaining obedience' becomes 'giving utterance',[9] and the woman's house 'faced out from' rather than 'stood midway between'[10] the farm buildings and fields 'on the one hand, and the village with church and hall on the other' (amended to 'looked out to the road and the village with church and Hall and the world beyond').[11] These revisions develop the 'Male' impulse of the women, favouring mentality over the body, and combining this with utterance, rather than identifying utterance alone. The women are also placed facing outwards to the world beyond rather than

---

[6]Daleski, pp.30-31.
[7]*Rainbow*, pp.10-11. These terms are Kinkead-Weekes', taken from 'Marriage of Opposites', p.22.
[8]*Rainbow*, p.10:30.
[9]p.10:30-1.
[10]p.11:5.
[11]p.11:6-7.

standing statically, or inert, *between* the Marsh world and the world beyond (inertia being a more 'Female' impulse, according to *Hardy*). In TSR, revisions made to the descriptions of the men demonstrate similar development of the *Hardy* ideas. 'They lived full and satisfied, <the men (MS)> [without knowledge (MSR)]' is replaced with 'they lived full and surcharged, their senses full fed, their faces always turned to the heat of the blood, staring into the sun, dazed with looking towards the source of generation, unable to turn round (TSR)', providing three aspects of the 'Female' in *Hardy* (senses / blood / source) where there had previously been one ('without knowledge'). Blood knowledge is also emphasised in the revision of 'take into their blood' to 'know in their blood'.[12] The employment of these 'Male' / 'Female' oppositions characteristic of *Hardy* from the MS stage through revision seem to support Kinkead-Weekes's argument for inversion. However, the multiple potential interpretations of 'utterance' allows for the situation to be more complex than inversion might suggest. 'Utterance', in *Hardy*, is also characteristic of what can be achieved through the interaction of 'Male' with 'Female'.[13] In *Hardy*, Lawrence also identifies 'Male' and 'Female' utterance, the former being the utterance of Christ,[14] and the latter the voice of the ten commandments.[15] In addition, utterance is also related to the artistic effort, 'the effort of utterance, the supreme effort of expressing knowledge'.[16] In the context of the passage under discussion, 'utterance' appears to refer to the 'Male' principle (it occurs with 'mind' and in the context of the 'active scope of man'[17]) or, perhaps, to what has been achieved in the world outside through the creative interaction of 'Male' and 'Female'. The ambiguity of Lawrence's terms indicates that the inversion which Kinkead-Weekes identifies in the opening pages is more specifically an inversion of the *predominant* characteristics of 'Male' and 'Female' in man and woman.. The cross-hatching of 'Male' and 'Female' within each individual remains an implication at this stage, Lawrence's terms carrying with them further associations than those which their immediate context suggests. Kinkead-Weekes argues that the opening pages of the novel identify two kinds of impulses which must be understood before individual 'character' can be discussed.[18] However, these impulses are *not* entirely inverted in the early pages of the novel,

---

[12]p.10:38.
[13]*Hardy*, p.40.
[14]p.65.
[15]p.62.
[16]p.59.
[17]*Rainbow*, p.11:8.
[18]'Marriage of Opposites',p.24.

and the ambiguities which are raised at this early stage of the novel, function to identify the cross-hatching of impulses more proper to the novel as a whole.

Revisions in TSR to the description of Alfred Brangwen's wife reveal similar complexity. Through the process of revision from MS to TSR, she is described as being:

> ...<curiously (MS)> [oddly (TSR)] a thing to herself, rather querulous in her manner, but <at bottom so amiable and tolerant (MS)> [intrinsically separate and indifferent. (TSR)][19]

As Daleski indicates, in *Hardy* Lawrence's attribution of singleness and separation to the 'Male' principle contrasts with the multiplicity and diversity normally associated with it. This separateness could be more properly attributed to the 'Female' principle, and the result of apparently opposing attributions is to suggest that singleness belongs to both the 'Male' and the 'Female' principles.[20] Is Alfred's wife both female and 'Female', or female and 'Male'? Is she a combination of the three? Similarly, and more explicitly, in the propositional content of the following extract, 'Male' and 'Female' are neither inverted, nor entirely clearly separated. This passage is unchanged from MS:

> The thing was something of a shock to him. In the close intimacy of the farm kitchen, the woman occupied the supreme position. The men deferred to her in the house, on all household points, on all points of morality and behaviour. The woman was the symbol for that further life which comprised religion and love and morality. The men placed in her hands their own conscience, they said to her 'Be my conscience-keeper, be the angel at the doorway guarding my outgoing and my incoming.'' And the woman fulfilled her trust, the men rested implicitly in her, receiving her praise or her blame with pleasure or with anger, rebelling and storming, but never for a moment really escaping in their own souls from her prerogative. They depended on her for their stability. Without her, they would have felt like straws in the wind, to be blown hither and thither at random. She was the anchor and the security, she was the restraining hand of God, at times highly to be execrated.[21]

Although the description of the woman of the farm kitchen is not inverted, neither is it a straightforward characterisation according to the 'Female' impulse. The woman occupies the 'Female' position in the household with regard to the principles of *Hardy*. In *Hardy*, man gets from woman a 'sense of stability' which prevents his motion from being mere 'wandering

---

[19]*Rainbow*, p.14.
[20]Daleski, pp.28-30.
[21]*Rainbow*, p.20.

neutrality'.[22] The similarity between this and the men's relationship to Tom's mother in the passage from *The Rainbow* is obvious. However, the identification of the woman as the symbol of further life recalls the 'Male' impulse which characterised the women in the opening pages of the novel, and what they see in the outer world, rather than the doorway to further life which can be opened and passed through in relationship.[23] In the extract under discussion, it is the *men* who look out to the beyond through her, not the women who look out to the men beyond. The predominant 'Femaleness' of the farm woman, yet her 'Male' aspects, indicates that the impersonal impulses identified in the opening scene are present in all characters of the novel in different proportions.[24] All are responding to the underlying impulses which govern them. Examination of the various forms of repetitiveness in *The Rainbow* will demonstrate how essential Lawrence's stylistic techniques are to the presentation of *Hardy's* opposing and complementary impulses in the novel and, ultimately, how they indicate the nature of the major relationship in each generation.

Hardy, The Rainbow, 'prolixity' and repetition

Throughout the stages of composition and revision of *The Rainbow*, Lawrence's fictional employment of the ideas of *Hardy* results in apparent prolixity. Most obviously, his replacement of *one* aspect of the 'Female' impulse with *three* in his description of the Brangwen men would be liable to charges of prolixity were the link with *Hardy* not made. Lawrence's apparent prolixity has other significant effects. One of these is the increasing employment of the characteristics inherent in the opposing forces of *Hardy*, which occurs through revision from MS to TSR as has already been examined. In addition, stylistic analysis of the repetitiveness of *The Rainbow's* style repeatedly reveals patterns in which lexical extension and varying affectiveness of verbs have specific effects with respect to the portrayal of 'Male' and 'Female' principles. For example, Lawrence's apparently prolix revision of the description of men in the wider world displays increasing affectiveness and lexical extension. They:

---

[22]*Hardy*, p.58.
[23]In the 'Foreword to Sons and Lovers', woman stands as the door for man's in-going and out-coming (*Sons and Lovers*, p.471).
[24]See 'Marriage of Opposites', p.24.

...were set out to discover what was beyond, to enlarge their own
scope and range and freedom...[25]

The propositional content of this construction has obvious thematic connections with the journey outwards from the Marsh farm which the Brangwen women wish to make, the journey theme which recurs throughout the novel, the 'Male' impulse of *Hardy*, and the ultimate responsibility of both man and woman in *Hardy*.[26] However, 'set out' also has connotations with being 'set *apart*', being assigned, and equipped, with a particular aptitude or purpose. Such differing forms of separateness also recall the separation and supremacy above the labourers which the women recognise in the vicar's children, and desire for their own.[27] The combination of the verb 'to discover' and its object 'what was beyond' unites the exploration of the unknown which the women desire, and the possibility of this journey as one beyond reach, farther out, superior (as the women crave superiority for their children). This combination encompasses many of the ideas of *Hardy* already introduced, and combines with them the spatial removal which, when occurring with temporal removal in the novel, indicates approaches towards, or achievement of the Absolute. The construction examined develops these ideas with further reference to the ideas expressed in *Hardy*.

The employment of three objects with the verb 'to enlarge', 'scope...range and freedom', combines the aspects of the 'Male' impulse and the ultimate responsibility of the individual which the preceding, apparently prolix constructions have identified. 'Scope' suggests an aim or terminal point, much like the aspirations the Marsh women experience at the beginning of the novel when looking towards the activities of the men of the outer world, and the purpose implied in the construction 'were set out', already examined. 'Range' suggests a sphere of operation or action, or traversing in various directions, thus being cohesive with 'what was beyond', and 'freedom' the liberation from restraining constraints, such as those which the Marsh women wish their children to transcend.

The increasing affectiveness and lexical extension and cohesion which result from the multiple or contradictory interpretations of lexical items employed in apparently prolix constructions repeatedly serves to unbalance any final distinction in attribution between 'Male' and 'Female' impulses. Such complex cross-hatching suggests the significance of Lawrence's stylistic technique to the 'theory' which informs the novel.

---

[25]*Rainbow*, p.11:12-3.
[26]*Hardy*, pp.52, 54.
[27]*Rainbow*, p.12.

Tom and Lydia

Throughout the relationship between Tom Brangwen and Lydia Lensky / Brangwen, Tom repeatedly reveals his 'inertia' due to his occupation in self-referential activity, a 'Female' rather than a 'Male' quality.[28] Conversely, he desires both a break from Cossethay, and a woman who can fulfil all his religious impulses. His desire to have 'something to get hold of, to pull himself out'[29] of the commonplace reality following his meeting with the monkey-faced foreigner and the girl in Matlock identifies him with the 'Male' impulse which characterises the Brangwen women in the opening chapter. Throughout Tom and Lydia's intimate interactions, an ambiguous and complex relationship between 'Male' 'motion' and 'Female' 'inertia' is traceable. This ambiguity is present both in the descriptions of each character relating to the terms of *Hardy*, and also in Lawrence's repetitive style. As will be demonstrated, Lawrence's repetition in the first generation identifies Tom as predominantly 'Female', and Lydia's behaviour as compensatory for his continual self-thwarting. However, Lawrence's repetitiveness in this portion of the novel itself functions to indicate the shifting balance of 'quasi-gender attribution' between the couple as they move towards their achievement of a limited 'Absolute' at the end of Chapter 3.

In the following extract, Lydia's behaviour appears to be ambiguously poised between 'Male' 'motion' and 'Female' 'inertia':

> He felt the tension breaking up in him, <and gripped his fists harder MS)> [his fists slackened, he was (TSR)] unable to move. He stood <rigid (MS, TSRD)> looking at her, helpless in his <[effort of (MSR)] resistance to himself. She came (MS)> <[vague collapse. For the moment she became unreal to him. She had not spoken to him. Then he saw her come (TSR)]> [vague collapse. For the moment she had become unreal to him. Then he saw her come (E1)] to him, curiously direct and as if without movement, in a sudden flow.[30]

While Tom is incapable of motion due to his self-thwarting occupation in self-feeling, a 'Female' characteristic which is present from MS through TSR, Lydia is the agent of activity, apparently without movement. Tom's 'inertia' and self-occupation is indicated by 'felt',

---

[28]The 'Female' impulse includes occupation in self-feeling. Tom's 'inertia' and self-feeling are also traceable in his brief liaison with the unnamed girl during his visit to Matlock (pp.22-23).
[29]p.26:35.
[30]p.44.

'unable to move' and 'helpless in his resistance to himself' (l.1, 2, 3-4), all present from MS. In the context of the passage, his eyes, 'Steady and intent and eternal, as if they would never change'[31] also suggest their predominant relation to the 'Female' impulse. In addition, the revision process indicates a decrease in any active or deliberate resistance on Tom's part (l.1-2, 3-4), and an increase in Lydia's 'other' or 'strange' qualities which indicate life beyond the Marsh farm to which the women of the early pages aspired (l.4-5, 6-7).

Lydia's ambiguous condition of apparently still movement is itself presented ambiguously as a result of the repetitive construction by which it is described. The construction is as follows:

> [Then he saw her come (E1)] to him, curiously direct and as if without movement, in a sudden flow.

It could be considered as two appositional adverbial phrases modifying 'come', or as 'curiously direct and as if without movement' functioning as adjectival post-posed modifiers of 'her'. Lydia's 'coming' is both direct and apparently motionless, *and* a movement of sudden flow. In addition, Lydia apparently goes straight to the point, which in this case is her movement from emotional distance to proximity, and her touching of him, yet she remains apparently motionless. This contradictoriness is unchanged in revision, although the alteration from MS to TSR of Lydia as subject of the verb 'to come' (l.4), to Lydia as object of Tom's minimally affective 'seeing' her approach (l.5-6, 7) again makes the nature of her 'motion' / 'inertia' ambiguous. Is she *actually* coming emotionally and physically nearer, while apparently not moving, or is this how Tom perceives her as coming? The ambiguous position of Lydia has parallels with Lawrence's identification of the relationship between motion and rest in *Hardy*:

> ...starting from any given degree of motion, and travelling forward in ever-increasing degree, one comes to a state of speed which covers the whole of space instantaneously, and is therefore rest, utter rest. And starting from the same speed and reducing the motion infinitely, one reaches the same condition of utter rest. And the direction or method of approach to this infinite rest is different to our conception. And only travelling upon the slower, does the swifter reach the infinite rest of speed. And only by travelling upon the swifter does the slower reach the infinite

---

[31]p.44:13-14. This is the E1 version. In MS, 'eternal' is 'blue', and there is a suffix of ', never'.

rest of inertia: which is the same as the infinite rest of speed, the two things having united to surpass our comprehension.[32]

In the extract under examination, Lawrence's repetitive style prevents the separation between 'Male' 'motion' and 'Female' 'inertia' from being either complete or clear. As shall be demonstrated, the portrayal of such a relationship between the opposing impulses of *Hardy* is a typical function of *The Rainbow's* repetitiveness.

The attribution of both 'Male' and 'Female' impulses to Lydia throughout her relationship with Tom is also indicated by the varying affectiveness of semantically ambiguous terms in repetitive constructions. In 'They Live at the Marsh', sexual interaction between Tom and Lydia reveals her performing an apparent *volte-face* in behaviour which allows her to adopt both 'Male' and 'Female' characteristics in the interaction:

> Her impulse was strong against him, because he was not of <noble family (MS)> <[higher degree (TSR)]> [her own sort. (E1)] But one blind instinct led her, to take him, to have him, and then to relinquish herself to him. It would be safety. She felt the rooted safety of him, and the <passion (MS)> [life (E1)] in him.[33]   5

Like Gertrude Coppard and Walter Morel in *Sons and Lovers*, Lydia's reaction to Tom is prompted by their difference, and her attraction towards him is both negative and positive. However, whereas the opposition between Gertrude's comparative passivity and intellectualism and Walter's dynamism and physicality in the extract examined in Chapter 2 is not inverted, in this example, Tom is characterised as the *axle* rather than the hub of the interaction (1.4-5). In addition, it is Lydia who performs, or instigates the dynamic action of the passage (1.2-4), thus identifying her with the 'Male' principle of 'motion' in Hardy which impels the 'Female's' stability into movement.[34] However, this apparent inversion is complicated by the semantic ambiguity of Lawrence's terms, resulting from lexical extension, and the varying affectiveness which this causes. The complex cross-hatching inherent in Lawrence's dialectic is in these ways again revealed by repetition. In lines 3-4, the construction 'to take him, to have him, and then to relinquish herself to him' could be considered prolix. It is unchanged from MS. The verb 'to take' (1.3) indicates Lydia's affective action towards Tom. It is she, not he, who will be performing a dynamic action, and

---

[32]*Hardy*, p.60.
[33]*Rainbow*, p.54.
[34]*Hardy*, p.58.

this will be affective towards him. The phrase 'to have him', which follows, is apparently prolix, being syntactically parallel with the construction 'to take him' which precedes it. Like the latter, and the construction 'and then to relinquish herself to him' which follows it, 'to have him' is dependent on the verb and object 'led her' (l.3). It is with the employment of the phrase 'to have her' that semantic ambiguity is introduced. The verb could be lexically cohesive by partial synonymy with the preceding 'to take', if each is considered in their immediate context of an (apparently) sexual interaction. Each verb can be considered as euphemistic for the sexual act, and thus no decrease in affectiveness of Lydia's action upon Tom occurs. Lydia remains the dynamic and active participant. However, the verb 'to have' may *also* identify a decrease in verb affectiveness of Lydia's action upon Tom. According to this interpretation, Lydia is no longer dynamic; this is a more passive state of oneness or receptivity, akin to that of the 'Female' impulse of *Hardy*, and of the 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*'. It is a state not *quite* of oneness, but it is certainly one in which Lydia is more closely related to the 'Female' principle of stability. In the employment of the final verb in the construction, 'relinquish' (l.3), Lydia's action is *self*-affective (therefore 'Female'), *and* is that of self-subordination which characterises the 'Male' impulse. This presents a complication of stylistic effects. Lydia is still active. It is she, after all, who is both the subject and the object of the verb. However, her 'relinquishing' of herself to Tom suggests that she is surrendering herself to him. This indicates, paradoxically, that she is *actively* pursuing a more *passive* or receptive, and therefore more 'Female' role. This complication is emphasised as the passage continues:

> Then she lapsed again to stupor and indifference. This, however, was bound to pass. The warmth flowed through her, she felt herself opening, unfolding, <unsheathing (MS)> [asking, as a (MSR)] flower opens in full request under the sun, as the <small (MSD)> beaks of tiny birds open flat to receive, to receive. And unfolded she turned to him, 5 straight to him. And he came, slowly, afraid, held back by <himself and driven by himself (MS)> [uncouth fear, and driven by a desire bigger than himself. (TSR)]
> When she opened and turned to him, then all that had been and all that was, was gone from her, she was as <blind (MS)> [new (TSR)] as a 10 flower that unsheathes itself and stands always ready, waiting, receptive.[35]

---

[35]*Rainbow*, p.54.

The apparently prolix employment of 'ready, waiting, receptive' which closes the final sentence indicates Lydia's varying degrees of invitation to an active 'Male' impulse by her 'Female' passive and receptive behaviour.[36] 'Ready' suggests a state of preparation and willingness to act when required, 'waiting' a deference of action until an expected event occurs, and 'receptive' the capacity for receiving. All anticipate, in varying degrees, the impulsion into motion of the axle's full stability by the hub, identified in *Hardy*.[37] Lydia is stable, yet encouraging. However, throughout the passage, it is Lydia who *actively* encourages Tom to act in order that she can play the 'Female' role. She 'turned to him' (1.5), 'opened and turned to him' (1.9), and her requests for Tom's action in the apparently prolix construction 'opening, unfolding, asking' (1.3) increasingly require his activity and interaction. Lydia's action moves from being self-affective ('opening', 'unfolding' (1.3)) to requiring increased interaction and reaction from Tom ('asking' (1.3)). In addition, there is a sense of increase of intention on Lydia's part from 'opening' to 'unfolding', so that the latter seems more reflexive grammatically than 'opening'. Lydia is therefore in this construction both increasingly self-affective (suggesting the 'Female' impulse of *Hardy*) and actively encouraging Tom into action (suggesting the 'Male'). Lydia's 'asking' of Tom is introduced in MSR. Previously, Lydia was 'unsheathing', suggesting a continuation in her 'Female' activity. Cross-hatching is therefore introduced in revision, and it emphasises the distinction already present between the impersonal forces operating in each character from MS. The insertion of 'asking' in MSR supports Lydia's 'turning...straight to' Tom, retained from MS, which prompts his action (1.6-8), while Tom's self-thwarting occupation in self-feeling is retained from MS, although slightly altered in TSR to suggest the impersonal forces in operation:

> ...held back by <himself and driven by himself (MS)> [uncouth fear,
> and driven by a desire bigger than himself (TSR)].

As the passage progresses, Tom's inability to play the active 'Male' role results in Lydia's closure of her 'receptive', 'Female' characteristics. The self-thwarting fear of self and its development to include impersonal forces now includes Tom's restricting preconceived idea of the relationship between man and woman. This restriction is present from MS:

---

[36]This receptivity is clear in the 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*' (*Sons and Lovers*, pp.471-472).
[37]*Hardy*, p.58.

> He forced <himself in the line of his understanding, his conception of (MS)> [himself, through lack of understanding, to <the (TSR)> [an (E1)] adherence to the line (TSR)] of honorable courtship and sanctioned, licensed marriage...He could not act, because <his conception of how a man married. So in torture he refused her silent demand and offer, and turned away, his bones all turned to water. (MS)> [of self-fear and because of his conception of honour towards her. So he remained in a state of chaos. (TSR)]...he was bewildered, he was tied up [as (MSRI)] with cords, and could not move to her.[38]

Tom *is* impelled into motion by Lydia's activity, as the inversion of *Hardy's* principles which Kinkead-Weekes identifies would suggest. His occupation in self-feeling is also 'Female'. However, at the same time, Lydia's impelling activity is repeatedly that of the receptive or stable 'Female', or develops into it. In the brief passage which precedes this extract, Lydia is characterised in terms which explicitly recall the sensuous and physical aspects of the 'Female' principle in *Hardy*. Such characteristics are identified here by italics:

> But she had *felt* Brangwen go by *almost as if he had brushed her*. She had *tingled in body* as she had gone on up the road. After she had been with him in the Marsh kitchen, *the voice of her body had risen strong and insistent.*[39]

Tom's lack of both understanding and action allies him too with the 'Female', while Lydia's *actual* behaviour and manner of impelling Tom remains 'Female'.[40] Italics again identify 'Female' characteristics:

> He *could not understand* this. He forced himself, through *lack of understanding*, to an adherence to the line of honorable courtship and sanctioned, licensed marriage. Thereafter, after he had gone to the vicarage and asked for her, she remained for some days held in this one spell, open, receptive to him, before him. He was roused to chaos. He spoke to the vicar and gave in the banns. Then he stood to wait.
> She remained attentive and instinctively *expectant before him, unfolded, ready to receive him*. He could not act, because of self-fear and because of his conception of honor towards her. So he remained in a state of chaos.[41]

---

[38]*Rainbow*, pp.54-55.

[39]p.54.

[40]Tom's attempt and failure to understand Lydia's behaviour is a development from his attempts at mental understanding in school (pp.17-18). His method of understanding is 'Female', through the senses, and his inability to grasp Lydia *mentally* confirms his 'Femaleness'.

[41]p.54.

Again, no clear distinction between the operation of the 'Male' and 'Female' principles in Lydia can be identified, although Tom remains the more predominantly 'Female' in each interaction examined.

However the characterisation of Tom and Lydia in *The Rainbow* does not always follow this recurring pattern exactly. Varying attributions of *Hardy's* impersonal impulses occur between Tom and Lydia, although the pattern of Lydia as ambiguously 'Male' / 'Female' and Tom as predominantly 'Female' tends to remain the framework for these variations. Following Tom's proposal to Lydia, the emphasis in both characters is on the 'Female':

> She was <so curiously unconcerned (MS)> <[so curiously concerned (TSR)]> [oddly concerned (E1)], even as if it pleased her a little. He sat and listened and wondered. It was rather splendid, to be so ignored by her, whilst she lay against him, and he lifted her with his breathing, and felt her weight upon his living, <like a wealth suddenly 5 come. He troubled with no questions, he (MS)> <[so he had a completeness and an inviolable power. He troubled with no questions, he (TSR)]> [so he had a completeness and an inviolable power. He (E1)] did not interfere with her. [He did not even know her. (Om. MS, TSRI)] It was <enough (MS)> [so strange (E1)] that she lay there with her weight 10 abandoned upon <his body, as he sat in the chair. (MS)> <[him, as he sat in the chair, it was enough that they two were one weight. (TSR)]> [him. (E1)] He was silent with delight. He felt strong, <triumphant (MS)> [physically, carrying her on his breathing (MSR)]. <And again (MS)> [The strange, inviolable completeness of the two of them made him feel as 15 sure and as stable as God. Amused, (TSR)] he wondered what the vicar would say if he knew...He was silent again at this. So close on him she lay, and yet she answered him from so far away. But he did not mind...He had not dared to move. He sat there with his arms round her, her lying motionless on his <strong (TSRD)> breathing, and for a long time he did 20 not stir.[42]

In the interaction which precedes this, Lydia's kiss has instigated Tom's oblivion and rebirth, and the dawn which blazes in them both.[43] Her characterisation, following the kiss, is that of a still and sleeping child. She has instigated the kiss, suggesting 'Male' dynamism, recognition of the 'not-self', and the impulsion of the 'Female' into motion, then has (typically) retreated to a more typically 'Female' inert, receptive, and renewing condition,

---

[42]p.46.
[43]p.44.

taking Tom's warmth, yet also giving back her weight and confidence. However, in the passage reproduced above, the presentation of the 'Male' and 'Female' impulses changes, and this shift in attribution is traceable in the repetitiveness and varying affectiveness of the style. The construction 'He sat and listened and wondered' (1.3) provides the subject 'He' with three syntactically parallel verbs. The first describes Tom's physical state, but the second two are more affective to him. Listening involves Tom's awareness of the external world and of Lydia's voice, therefore indicating that he, in accordance with the 'Male' impulse of *Hardy*, is registering relationships and the 'not-self'. However, Tom's 'wondering' which follows this indicates that the affectiveness of his behaviour is becoming increasingly self-referential, and therefore 'Female'. He feels it 'rather splendid' for *himself* to be ignored by Lydia, and his experience with her is continually referred back to his own actions. At the same time, the repetition caused by an insertion in TSR in the following has a converse effect:

> He did not interfere with her. [He did not even know her. (Om. MS, TSRI)]

In the initial context of 'He did not', Tom is not acting in a manner which is affective to Lydia. In the inserted construction, he is not only not acting affectively towards her, he has no knowledge of her at all. She is something entirely new to him, not something already revealed.[44] Tom, in the inserted construction, is occupied in the 'Female' condition of being. The repetition which the insertion creates has created a situation in which, with each employment, Lydia becomes increasingly affective to Tom, despite her position as object rather than subject of the sentence. Tom's 'Female' characteristics are emphasised again by two other insertions in TSR. The relevant simple repetitions are underlined:

> It was rather splendid to be so ignored by her, whilst she lay against him, and he lifted her with his breathing, and felt her weight upon his living, [so he had a <u>completeness</u> and an <u>inviolable</u> power...(TSRI)]

> He was silent with delight. He felt strong, <triumphant (MS)> [physically carrying her on his breathing. (MSR)] <And again (MS)> [The strange, <u>inviolable</u> <u>completeness</u> of the two of them made him feel as sure and as stable as God. (TSRI)]

---

[44]See *Hardy*, pp.40-41.

In the first insertion, 'completeness' and 'inviolable' refer to Tom. His (self-affective) appreciation of Lydia has led to his feeling of wholeness. However, in the second employment, the repeated items function to indicate that Tom's self-affective appreciation of her has led to his appropriation of both of them which makes him feel 'sure and...stable'. The denial of multiplicity which this entails, and the stability attributed to Tom again functions to indicate his 'Female' characteristics. The repetition in the passage therefore functions to indicate that the impersonal impulses operating in Tom are as ambiguous and complex as those already seen as operational in Lydia.

The action of the passage is, however, predominantly 'Female' if the verbs employed are examined. Lydia's physical proximity and motionlessness is characterised by the employment of the minimally affective verb 'lay' (1.4, 10, 18, 20) to describe her (lack of) activity, and suggest her identification with the 'Female' principle of *Hardy*. The verbs employed to describe the actions of both characters, excluding Tom's listening (1.3), tend to be either minimally and / or self-affective (suggesting the 'Female' principle of *Hardy*) or explicitly recall *Hardy's* 'Female' principle. Lydia 'lay' (1.4) and is lifted (1.4), and Tom 'sat' (1.3, 11) wondered' (1.3, 16), 'lifted' Lydia with his breathing rather than by dynamic activity, and 'felt' (1.5, 13, 15).

Despite the predomination of the 'Female' impulse in the relationship between Tom and Lydia, particularly in Tom himself, and despite the ambiguity of attribution of impersonal impulses resulting from *The Rainbow's* repetitive style, as Tom and Lydia move towards their limited achievement of 'Absoluteness' in 'Childhood of Anna Lensky', Tom becomes increasingly identified with the 'Male' impulse of *Hardy*. In the following example, 'Male' characteristics, or 'Male' characteristics required by Lydia, are identified by italics, and the varying affectiveness of Tom's behaviour by Modern font:

> <Oh, and the anguish that he must become *active* participant **(MS)**>
> [And it was torture to him that he must give himself to her *actively*,
> participate in her **(TSR)**], that he must meet and <mingle with **(MS)**>
> [*embrace* and *know* **(TSR)**] her, who was *other than himself*. There was
> that in him that <resisted **(MS)**> [*shrank from* **(TSR)**] *yielding to her,* **5**
> *resisted the relaxing towards her, opposed the mingling with her,* even whilst
> he most desired it. He was afraid, he wanted to save himself.
>
> There were a few moments of stillness. Then gradually, the tension,
> the withholding relaxed in him, and he *began to flow* towards her. She was
> beyond him, the unattainable. But he let go his hold on himself, he **10**
> *relinquished himself,* and *knew* the subterranean force of his desire *to come*
> *to her,* to be with her, to mingle with her, losing himself to find her, to find

himself in her. He < *would*(MS)> [*began to* (TSR)] *approach her,* <he *would draw near.* He *would draw near* her, in the way of love, nearer, as close as a man might come, *to see if he really* could *come* to her, *if he* could *reach* her *and at last* *embrace* her. She waited for him, and he trembled (MS)> [*to draw near.* (TSR)] His blood beat up in waves of <pure desire (MS)> <[absolute desire (TSR)]> [desire (E1)]. He wanted *to come* to her, *to* < *come* to (MS)> [meet (TSR)] her...he *pressed forward, nearer, nearer,* to receive the consummation of himself.[45]   20

The increasing affectiveness of Tom's behaviour indicates this time not 'Female' occupation in self-feeling, but increasing 'Male' movement towards Lydia. In the final version, Tom realises (self-referentially, and therefore in a 'Female' way), that he 'must give himself' to Lydia (1.2), and share in common action with her ('participate' (1.3)). The increasing 'Male' recognition of a 'not-self' is indicated in the repetitive construction which follows. Tom must 'meet and embrace and know her', the three verbs being increasingly affective to *Lydia*, not to Tom, and the final verb 'know' again recalling the 'Male' characteristics of knowledge in Hardy.[46] This repetitive construction is created in TSR. Previously, in MS, Tom was required to 'mingle' with Lydia, which is more suggestive both of the oneness of the 'Female' principle, and of Lawrence's own repeated insistence that the two opposing principles of his philosophy must remain forever separate in their relationship.[47] Tom's reaction to this necessary interaction is presented in another repetitive construction, which is linked, by its triplicate form, to the one just examined. 'Male' characteristics are identified by italics, and the varying affectiveness of Tom's behaviour by Modern font:

There was that in him that <resisted (MS)> [*shrank from* (TSR)] *yielding to her,* resisted *the relaxing towards her,* opposed *the mingling with her,* even whilst he most desired it.

The replacement of 'resisted' with 'shrank' in TSR results in increasing affectiveness in Tom's reaction. The deleted repetition of 'resisted' had no increase in affectiveness. However, the revision presents Tom as recoiling from Lydia in the first instance, then preventing any softening in his tenseness against her, and finally placing him in antagonistic relation to any mixing with her. The increasing proximity necessary, presented in the increasingly affective construction 'meet and embrace and know' (1.3-4) is therefore

---

[45] *Rainbow*, p.90.
[46] *Hardy*, pp.40-45.
[47] *Hardy*, pp.78, 80, *Crown*, p.256, 'Love', p.9.

counterpointed by this counter movement. Within Tom, then, are two conflicting and balanced impulses, stylistically counterpointed, and both of which are 'Male'. In addition, the major excision of the passage, that in which Tom's conditional increasing proximity to Lydia is presented, while she waits for him to draw near and he trembles (l.14-17) increases this tension by muting the conditional nature of Tom's drawing near to Lydia, and focusing attention rather on Tom's internal conflict. Throughout the revised passage, the increasing affectiveness of verbs taking Tom as subject repeatedly function to indicate his affiliation with the 'Male' principle of *Hardy*. Tom's initial anguish in MS at the necessity of becoming active and participant (<Oh, and the anguish that he must become *active* participant (MS)> (l.1)) is replaced in TSR by the necessity of his actively *giving himself* to the unknown in Lydia, demonstrating an increase in self-impulsion. As he draws closer to her, his recoil, non-softening and antagonism changes to allow for the loss of self necessary for real love previously identified as discussed in *Hardy*.[48] According to Lawrence's repetitive style in *The Rainbow*, the condition is presented as in the following extract. 'Male' characteristics are identified by italics, and the varying affectiveness of Tom's behaviour by Modern font, as before:

> **Then gradually,** the tension, the withholding relaxed in him, **and he** *began to flow* towards her. **She was beyond him, the unattainable. But** he let go his hold on himself, he *relinquished* himself, **and** *knew* the subterranean force of his desire *to come to her,* to be with her, to mingle with her, losing himself to find her, to find himself in her.   5

As Tom becomes identified with 'Male' characteristics in his move towards Lydia, the anticipation of the move itself involves increasing abandonment of himself. This is again indicated by increasingly affective verbs. This increasing affectiveness can be traced in the progression through 'come' (l.4), 'be' (l.4) and 'mingle' (l.4), where Tom's desired increasing proximity develops into a state of existence with Lydia, and then a merging with her. The repetitive structure which follows emphasises this effect:

> ...losing himself to find her, to find himself in her.

---

[48] *Hardy*, p.103.

Tom's surrender of himself to the unknown enables him to find Lydia, yet this very loss of self allows him to find himself truly in his relationship with her. In the 'Absolute' relationship in which this results, the 'Male' and 'Female' characteristics of *Hardy* which have been attributed to them both, the repetitive style in which these are presented, and the development of both through revision serve to indicate the progress which Tom and Lydia have made in their relationship. The passage under discussion is reproduced below:

> Their coming together now, after two years of married life, was much more wonderful to them <now (MSD)> than it had been before. It was the entry into another circle of existence, it was the baptism to another life, it was the complete confirmation. Their feet <were bright with (MS)> [trod strange ground of (TSR)] knowledge, their footsteps were lit-up 5 <with surety (MS)> [with discovery. (TSR)] Wherever they walked, it was well, the world <chimed (MS)> [re-echoed (TSR)] round them <in knowledge (MS)> [in discovery. (TSR)] They went <glad, like masters, along the road, like inheritors. Nothing (MS)> [gladly and forgetful. Everything (TSR)] was lost, and everything was found. <All was found, it 10 remained only to be discovered. The inheritance was indescribable, it was unfathomably rich, the wealth could never be told, neither in this generation nor in the next, nor in many that would come after. Could it ever be counted out? (MS)> [The new world was discovered, it remained only to be explored. (TSR)] 15
>
> They had passed through the doorway into the further space, where movement was so big, that it contained bonds and constraints and labours, and still was complete liberty. She was the doorway to him, he to her. At last they had thrown open the doors, each to the other, and had stood in the doorways facing each other, whilst the light flooded out from behind on to 20 each of their faces, it was the transfiguration, the glorification, the admission.[49]

The most obvious difference between this passage and those examined in this chapter and the preceding ones is the absence of counterpointed sentences taking 'he' or 'she' as subject, and the employment of the plural personal pronoun instead. Such a unification of 'Male' and 'Female' in a context of both spatial and temporal removal indicates the state of the 'Holy Ghost', the third thing created between consummated opposites which opens the beyond. Such a creative condition is identified in *Hardy*:

> ...my poppy gather his material and build his tissue till he has led the stream of life in him on and on to the end, to the whirlpool at the summit, where the male seethes and whirls in incredible speed upon the

---

[49]*Rainbow*, pp.90-91.

pivot of the female, where the two are one, as axle and wheel are one, and the motion travels out to infinity.[50]

In *The Crown*, this condition of 'Absoluteness' is specifically related to the move from counterpointed desires to a mutual desire which employs the plural personal pronoun:

> They embrace in opposition, only in their desire is their unanimity. There are two separate statements, the dark wants the light, and the light wants the dark. But these two statements are contained within the one: 'They want each other.' And this is the condition of absoluteness, this condition of their wanting each other, that which makes light and dark consummate even in opposition. The interrelation between them, this is constant and absolute, let it be called love or power or what it may. It is all the things that it can be called.[51]

Throughout Tom and Lydia's 'Absolute' interaction, the employment of the plural personal pronoun characterises the successful consummation of their relationship. Indeed, where the male and female personal pronouns are employed separately, they function to indicate the complementarity between the pair which allows for such consummation between opposites; they each offer the other the opportunity to travel into the unknown. Syntactic parallelism, with ellipsis, indicates the balanced complementarity of their relationship:

> She was the doorway to him, he to her. (l.18)

Revision to the passage does not alter the 'Absolute' balance of gendered personal pronouns, nor the prevalence of the plural personal pronoun indicating their successful achievement of a partial 'Absolute'. Indeed, the removal from the material world which such consummation entails is present from MS:

> It was the entry into another circle of existence, it was the baptism to another life, it was the complete confirmation. (l.2-4)

However, revisions do indicate a significant change to the nature of Tom and Lydia's achievement, and increased inclusion of the cross-hatching between *Hardy's* principles which has been shown to characterise the rest of their relationship. In TSR, 'discovery' becomes a

---

[50] *Hardy*, p.54.
[51] *Crown*, p.264.

major theme of the passage, as it does throughout the relationships of the novel with its introduction at this stage of composition.[52] In the following examples, 'discovery' or lexical items cohesive with it, are inserted in TSR:

> Their feet <were bright with (MS)> [trod strange ground of (TSR)] knowledge, their footsteps were lit-up <with surety (MS)> [with discovery. (TSR)] (l.4-6)

> ...the world <chimed (MS)> [re-echoed (TSR)] round them <in knowledge (MS)> [in discovery. (TSR)] (l.7-8)

> <Nothing (MS)>...[Everything (TSR)] was lost, and everything was found (TSR)]* <All was found, it remained only to be discovered. (MS)>...[The new world was discovered, it remained only to be explored. (TSR)] (l.9-11, 14-15)

Revisions in example three demonstrate the extent to which Tom and Lydia have moved beyond the material world into the unknown. Instead of having lost the MS 'Nothing', they have lost 'Everything'. The revisions to this example also indicate a significant shift in the nature of their achievement which is to resonate throughout the novel; although Tom and Lydia have discovered a new world, they do not enter it - and it is up to the later generations to move beyond this stage of achievement. The insertion of 'discovery' and lexical items cohesive with it in examples one and two indicate a more complex aspect of their achievement - one which is in keeping with the cross-hatching of opposing impulses which characterise their (and other) relationships. Although 'discovery' and 'strange' characteristics are inserted in these examples, they are counterbalanced by what is discovered. In example one, although the couples feet now tread 'strange ground', indicating their move into the unknown, this 'strange ground' is one of 'knowledge', a retrospective and predominantly 'Male' characteristic in *Hardy*. This counterpointing of the known with the unknown serves to qualify the removal of the known apparently effected by the replacement of MS's 'with surety' with 'with discovery' in TSR. Similarly, in example two, although 'in knowledge' is replaced with 'in discovery', this is counterpointed by the replacement of 'chimed' with 're-echoed', again suggesting the resonance of past actions rather than future, unknown ones. In their achievement of a limited 'Absolute', the cross-hatched impulses which have characterised Tom and Lydia's relationship, and which are the foundation of Lawrence's

---

[52]The insertion of a lexical chain cohesive with 'discovery' is examined in Chapter 5.

dialectic, are still visible, and are increasingly employed through revision. This is a pattern which, as will be seen, typifies all three generations of *The Rainbow*.

Will and Anna

Will and Anna's relationship in *The Rainbow* is the focus of further complexity in the stylistic presentation of *Hardy's* 'Male' and 'Female' principles. As with Tom and Lydia, this is caused by the presence of both principles both within and between the characters. These principles occur both as inverted and non-inverted according to the 'quasi-gender attributions' of *Hardy*, and are present in both propositional content and in *The Rainbow's* repetitive technique. This repetition includes the varying affectiveness of verbs employed in apparently prolix constructions, and the semantic ambiguity and lexical extension demonstrated as present in Tom and Lydia's relationship. In addition, the repeated employment of the 'hawk' image, and lexical items cohesive with it by collocation also function in the portrayal of cross-hatched impulses.

As was demonstrated in the analysis of Will and Anna's 'hawk' interaction from 'Anna Victrix' in Chapter 2, *Anna*, not Will, is initially the dynamic and motivational partner in this interaction, registering her relationship with Will, and provoking his response. In this, she displays characteristics of the 'Male' principle of *Hardy*, both in the propositional content and stylistic characteristics of the passage. Will is closed off in destructive separateness, a thematic development from Lydia's lapse into memory and Tom's absolutist separateness, and it is Anna's actions which motivate their coming together. 'Male' stimulating motion, which provokes Will into movement, is attributed to the female, recalling the inversion of the principles of *Hardy* in the initial description of the Marsh men and women, and Tom and Lydia's relationship. However, the couple's first intimate interaction, which occurs in the dairy, demonstrates at an earlier stage of the relationship that this inversion is not complete, and the manner in which *Hardy's* impulses are attributed to each indicates the nature of their relationship at this stage. In the dairy scene, like that preceding Tom and Lydia's achievement of a limited Absolute,[53] 'Male' motion and 'Female' inertia are predominantly *not* inverted:

> In the cool dairy the candle-light lit on the <great (MS)> [large (TSR)], white surfaces of the cream pans. He turned his head sharply. It was so cool and remote in there, [so remote. (MSRI)] His mouth was open in a little, strained laugh. She stood with her head bent, turned aside.

[53]*Rainbow*, pp.89-90.

He wanted to go near to her. He had kissed her once. Again his eye rested 5
on the round blocks of butter, where the [emblematic (MSRI)] bird lifted
its breast from the shadow cast by the candle flame. What was restraining
him? Her breast was <rounded <too> (MS)> [near him (TSR)]; his head
<was (MSD)> lifted like an eagle's. She did not move. Suddenly, with an
incredibly quick, delicate movement, he put his arms round her and drew 10
her to him. It was <so (MS, TSRD)> quick, <so (MS, TSRD)> cleanly
done, like a bird that swoops and sinks close, closer.

He was kissing her throat. She turned and looked at him. Her eyes
were dark and flowing with fire. His eyes were hard and <fierce (MS)>
[bright (MSR)] with a fierce purpose and gladness, like a hawk's. She felt 15
him flying into the dark space of her <burning (MS)> [flames (MSR)], like
a <golden (MS)> [brand (MSR)], like a [gleaming (MSRI)] hawk. <She
lifted her mouth and they kissed (MS, E1D)]

They had looked at each other and seen each other strange, yet near,
very near, like a <golden (MS, TSRD)> hawk stooping, swooping, 20
dropping into a flame of darkness. So she took the candle and went back
to the kitchen.

They went on in this way for some time, always coming together,
but rarely touching, very seldom did they kiss. And then, often, it was
merely a touch of the lips, a sign. But her eyes began to waken with a 25
<reddish (MS)> [constant (TSR)] fire, she paused often in the midst of her
transit, as if to recollect something, or to discover something.

And his face became sombre, intent, he did not readily hear what
was said to him. [54]

It is Will who is the volitional and active partner, and the verbs employed to describe

his actions are increasingly affective to their object (Anna), and, in accordance with *Hardy's*

'Male' impulse, impel her into action. Increasing affectiveness, in the following examples, is

indicated by Modern font: -

He turned his head sharply...(l.2) (self-affective dynamic verb,
affective to attitude of male subject's head);

He wanted to go near to her...(l.5) (volitional compound verb. The
fulfilment of the volition would result in self-affective effect on location of
male subject in relation to female object);

Suddenly, with an incredibly quick, delicate movement, he put his
arms around her...(l.10-11) (dynamic verb, self-affective to location of
male subject's arms, and physically affective to female object (Anna));

...and drew her to him...(l.11) (dynamic verb, affective to location of
female object in relation to male subject. She is moving as a result of his
controlling action);

[54]pp.109-110.

He was kissing her throat...(l.13) (progressive verb, describing male subject's temporally extended action upon female object, which prompts Anna's first dynamic actions of the passage; 'She turned and looked at him' (l.13))

Anna, in contrast, is described by the employment of verbs which suggest the more stable 'Female' principle of *Hardy*. The removal in TSR of the MS suffix 'She lifted her mouth and they kissed' (l.18) contributes to the distinction. Again, varying affectiveness is identified by Modern font:

She stood with her head bent, turned aside...(l.4) (stative verb describing female subject's physical state. Minimal physical and non-emotional affectiveness);

Her breast was near him...(l.8) (copulative verb describing physical location of female subject in relation to male object. Minimal physical affectiveness. Non-emotionally affective to female subject, although proximity of female subject's breast to male object (Will) and lexical cohesion by repetition of 'breast' (l.7, 8) (examined shortly) suggests possible influence on male object's actions);

She did not move. (l.9) (dynamic verb employed in negative form, describing absence of dynamic action by female subject);

She turned...(l.13) (dynamic verb affective to location of female subject, prompted by male subject's action upon female object in previous sentence);

...and looked at him...(l.13) (decrease in self-affectiveness of action upon female subject. The object of this verb is no longer potentially Anna, but Will; she looked 'at him'. In the case of the preceding verb, 'turned', Anna both turns *herself* (reflexive subject) and turns towards Will (indirect object). Anna's first action after her impulsion into motion, and the first indication of potential connection between female subject and male object)

Lawrence's revisions make no major difference to this contrastive pattern. *The Rainbow's* 'repetitive' style also functions to indicate the subtle modulations of relationship between the two. The simple repetition of the verb 'turned' serves to trace the impulsion of the 'Female' from inertia into motion by the 'Male'. Initially, Will 'turned' his head 'sharply' (l.2) indicating his dynamism, while the verb employed with Anna as subject has her standing 'with her head bent, turned aside' (l.4), inert and 'Female'. In the third and final employment of the verb, the contrast between Will's 'Male' and Anna's 'Female' relationship to it is

indicated by Will's impulsion of Anna into motion by his actions; she 'turned' and looked at him (1.13). The repeated employment of the verb has functioned to trace the relationship between 'Male' and 'Female' as it is characterised in *Hardy*.

However, although the active partner, Will, like Tom, is initially unable to act. He is restrained by himself, suggesting the occupation in self-feeling which is typical of the 'Female' principle, and Anna's acceptance of and experiencing of his actions (1.13-18, 25-27) suggests that, like Lydia, it is really she who is in control, despite her apparent inertia. Having been the more 'inert' partner in the interaction, Anna's propulsion into activity is portrayed in a manner which poises her ambiguously between 'Male' and 'Female'. Her activity is presented in the syntactically parallel construction identified below by italics:

> But her eyes began to waken with a constant fire, she paused often
> in the midst of her transit, as if *to recollect something* or *to discover*
> *something.* (1.25-27)

The result of Anna's impulsion into motion is, like that which occurs in Tom's limited achievement of the 'Absolute' with Lydia,[55] the counterpointing of contrary impulses, and these impulses are presented in 'repetitive' syntactically parallel constructions. The contrary motions attributed to Anna have close affinities with the experiences of man in the cycle dance which Lawrence describes in Chapter VII of *Hardy*. The phrases relevant to Anna's condition have been italicised:

> Each travelling to the same goal of infinity, but entering it from the
> opposite ends of space. And man *remembering what lies behind him*, how
> the hands met and grasped and tore apart, utters his tragic art. Then
> moreover, *facing the other way into the unknown*, conscious of the tug of
> the goal at his heart, he hails the woman coming from the place whither he
> is travelling, searches in her for signs, and makes his God from the
> suggestion he receives, as she advances.[56]

Lawrence's identification of 'knowledge' and 'discovery' with the 'Male' impulse at this point in *Hardy*, and the inverted attribution of it to the Brangwen women's desires and activities in Chapter One, confirms that the contrary impulses which Anna experiences can be considered as those of the 'Male' principle. Thus the contrary impulses attributed to Anna in the syntactic parallelism examined counterpoints her 'inertia', which had been suggested by

---

[55]*Rainbow*, p.90.
[56]*Hardy*, p.61.

the affectiveness of the verbs which take her as subject. In addition, each half of the syntactic parallelism also counterpoints the other. The counterpointing of recollection and discovery recalls that of the position of man described in Chapter V of *Hardy*, and serves to offer a further reformulation of the principles inherent in Anna at this stage:

> So, facing both ways, like Janus, face forward, in the quivering, glimmering fringe of the unresolved, facing the unknown, and looking backward over the vast, rolling tract of life which follows and repeats the initial movement, man is given up to his dual business, of being, in blindness and wonder and pure godliness, the living stuff of life itself, unrevealed; and of knowing, with unwearying labour and unceasing success, the manner of that which has been, which is revealed.[57]

The counterpointing of Anna's response by syntactic parallelism not only functions to qualify her apparent identification with the 'Female' principle throughout the interaction, but also to qualify her final identification with aspects of the 'Male'. Her response is not merely two differing aspects of the 'Male' impulse, but *also* the counterpointing of 'Male' and 'Female', in accordance with the cross-hatching of impulses which examination of repetition in the passage has already revealed. She is not only 'knowing', but 'being'.

Lawrence's employment of the 'hawk' image, and lexical items cohesive with it also contribute to the effects of repetitiveness on the cross-hatching of *Hardy's* 'Male' and 'Female' principles. The effects of the employment of the 'hawk' chain which will be examined are typical of their employment in Will and Anna's interactions. As previously discussed, serpents and captured birds in the novel are part of Lawrence's 'symbolism of the genesis of selfhood from the garden of 'God the Father',[58] suggesting their affiliation with the 'Male' principle. In 'Love', Lawrence identifies 'hawklike' qualities as being characteristic of 'profane' love, characterised by separate individuality, and thus ostensibly 'Male'.[59] Lawrence's characterisation of 'sacred' love seeking oneness identifies it with the 'Female' principle of *Hardy*. However, its identification with service of the loved one, and its recognition of the 'not-self' in 'seeking not its own' identifies it with the 'Male' principle's characteristics of self-subordination and multiplicity. Profane love, similarly, both 'seeks its own' and, in its identification with the 'hawk' is pure, separate, and individual, suggesting the

---

[57]pp.40-41.
[58]*Rainbow*, p.520, n.268:5.
[59] 'Love', p.12.

'Male' principle.[60] The employment of the 'hawk' image in the passage is therefore likely to reveal further cross-hatching between 'Male' and 'Female', and present ambiguities in interpretation.

Repetition by lexical cohesion of items cohesive with 'hawk' occurs in the passage and is identified below by underlining:

> Again his eye rested on the round blocks of butter, where [the emblematic bird (MSRI)] lifted its breast...his head was lifted like an eagle's...Suddenly, with an incredibly quick, delicate movement, he put his arms round her and drew her to him. It was<so (MD, TSRD)> quick, <so (MS, TSRD)> cleanly done, like a bird that swoops and sinks close, 5 closer...His eyes were hard and <fierce (MS)> [bright (MSR)] with a fierce purpose and gladness, like a hawk's. She felt him flying into the dark space of her <burning (MS)> [flames (MSR)], like a <golden (MS)> [brand (MSR)], like a [gleaming (MSRI)] hawk. They had looked at each other and seen each other strange, yet near, very near, like a <golden (MS, 10 TSRD)> hawk, swooping, swooping, dropping in a flame of darkness.

The lexical item 'hawk', and items cohesive with it, are referential to Will in all but the initial employment (in which it is referential to the butter stamp (l.1-2)), and in the final employment (in which it is referential to both Will and Anna, united by the plural personal pronoun 'they' and the shared (and lexically cohesive by near synonymy) verbs 'looked' and 'seen'(l.9-10)). However, the employment of the plural personal pronoun here identifies not the 'Absolute' condition which Tom and Lydia achieve, but a situation in which the characters are each acting from their own partial desires rather than giving themselves to the unknown and forming a rainbow together. The characteristic impulse of the hawklike 'profane' urge to seek your own in the beloved confirms this partiality. The contexts in which hawklike qualities are attributed to Will suggest that his love is 'profane' with respect to the 'Male' impulse; he recognises Anna as distinct from him (l.3-4), his eyes, in MSR, are 'bright' (l.6), and therefore light, a characteristic of the 'Male' impulse, as will be examined, and he is dynamic, 'flying' into her (l.7). His position as active participant in this interaction, as already suggested by the affectiveness of the verbs attributed to him, is confirmed. However, the final attribution of the image is problematic; there is no evidence to suggest that the final employment off the image is presented through Free Indirect Discourse, which would have indicated that the description was subjective. The paragraph break just before it even creates

---

[60] p.9.

an episode boundary, across which FID, were it present in the preceding paragraph, would be unable to cross.[61] Thus it appears that the image of the hawk swooping into a flame of darkness (an image employed in the preceding paragraph to describe Anna's experience of Will) is one which describes both characters, and, as the ambiguous characterisation of 'sacred' and 'profane' love in *Love* indicates, is attributable to both the 'Male' and the 'Female' principles of *Hardy*.

The employment of imagery lexically cohesive by collocation with 'light' and 'darkness' in the passage has a similar effect. In *Hardy*, darkness is characterised as 'Female', light as 'Male':

> Since the Renaissance there has been the striving for the Light, and the escape from the Flesh, from the Body, the Object. And sometimes there has been the antagonism to the Father, sometimes reconciliation with Him. In painting, The Spirit, the Word, the Love, all that was represented by John, has appeared as light. Light is the constant symbol of Christ in the New Testament. It is light, actual sunlight or the luminous quality of day which has infused more and more into the defined body, fusing away the outline, absolving the concrete reality, making a marriage, an embrace, between the two things, light and object.[62]

Throughout the full passage, light and darkness are employed in the context of fire as well as of each other. These images are largely unchanged from MS. The employment of the resulting cohesive chain with reference to Anna generally indicates her 'Female' inertia. Items belonging to this chain are first employed as an adjectival phrase to describe the appearance of her eyes ('Her eyes were dark and flowing with fire' (1.13-14)), and in the second instance as her passive experience of his actions ('She felt him flying into the dark space of her flames, like a brand, like a gleaming hawk' (1.15-17)). When such lexical items are employed with reference to Will, motion and individuation, the 'Male' principles, are indicated ('His eyes were hard and bright with a fierce purpose and gladness, like a hawk's' (1.14-15), 'She felt him flying into the dark space of her flames, like a brand, like a gleaming hawk' (1.15-17)). In addition, in the main passage the syntactic and lexical parallelism present in the descriptions of Will and Anna's eyes indicate the 'Male' / 'Female' contrast between them, through the difference in elements which have been replaced. Syntactic parallelism is identified by italics, lexical parallelism with varying and antonymic possessive pronoun slots by brackets:

---

[61] Ehrlich, pp.40-57.
[62] *Hardy*, p.82.

> (*Her eyes were* (initial)) *dark and flowing with fire.* (*His eyes were*
> (initial)) *hard and* <*fierce* (MS)> [*bright* (MSR)]*with a fierce purpose*
> and gladness, like a hawk's. (l.13-15)

Lawrence's revision creates this contrast, the replacement of 'fierce' with 'bright'
allowing the similarity between Will's eyes and the lightness of the 'Male' principle, Anna's
with the darkness of the 'Female' to be made.

In the interaction just examined, as with the examples examined with regard to Tom and
Lydia, the different elements of Lawrence's repetitive style in *The Rainbow* both function
separately, and combine to indicate the 'Male' and 'Female' impulses within and between
individuals, and their varying proportions and attribution in each interaction. In the
interaction between Will and Anna discussed, which occurs at the beginning of their
relationship, he is the more (although not exclusively) 'Male' character. However, as Will
and Anna's relationship progresses, it is typically characterised by Will's inability to bring the
characteristics of 'Male' motion, singleness and individuation, to the relationship, or the
'profane' characteristics of wresting one's own from the beloved, avoiding mingling, and
gathering oneself complete and free from him or her. Will's continuing desire for fusion, and
his inability to stand alone, are more characteristic both of the 'Female' aspects of 'sacred'
love and the 'Female' principle of *Hardy* than the 'Male'. His anxiety regarding separation
reveals his inadequacies, and exhausts and repels Anna. It is as destructive to him as it is
suffocating to her. In the following example, Lawrence's repetitiveness functions to 'enact'
stylistically the increase in separation and differentiation (a 'Male' desire) that Anna wants
from Will, and Will's contrasting dependence. This passage is unchanged from MS:

> For try as he might, he could not escape. She was everything to
> him, she was his life and his derivation. He depended on her. If she were
> taken away, he would collapse as a house from which the central pillar is
> removed.
> And she hated him, because he depended on her so utterly. He was 5
> horrible to her. She wanted to thrust him off, to set him apart. It was
> horrible that he should cleave to her, so close, so close, like a leopard that
> had leapt on her, and fastened.
> He went on from day to day in a blackness of rage and shame and
> frustration. How he tortured himself, to be able to get away from her. But 10
> he could not. She was as the rock on which he stood, with deep, heaving

water all round, and he unable to swim. He *must* take his stand on her, he
must depend on her.[63]

Will's desire for Anna is presented in a syntactically and lexically parallel construction
followed, in a separate sentence, by an apparently prolix summation. Again, syntactic
parallelism is indicated by italics, lexical parallelism by brackets:

> (*She was* (initial)) *everything* to him, (*she was* (initial)) *his life* and
> his derivation. He depended on her.

In the first part of the syntactic parallelism, Anna is *all* to Will, and is of supreme
importance to him. In the second part of the parallelism, Anna is characterised first as his
'life', suggesting that she is his purpose for living, his animating force (suggesting the 'Male'
principle), his vitality, and also, if lexical expansion to encompass Biblical connotations is
included, the divinely implanted power or principle by which this condition is produced, and
the condition of the souls of the blessed departed. This Biblical connotation therefore
encompasses both origin ('Female') and end ('Male'), introducing cross-hatching of *Hardy's*
impulses into interpretation of the construction. Anna is then described as Will's 'derivation',
suggesting that she is the source from which he has arisen, and thus suggesting his dependence
upon, and 'birth' from her. She is therefore again affiliated with the 'Female' principle,
creating cross-hatching in her importance to Will again. However, the reading of this sentence
is ambiguous. Anna could also be Will's 'derivation' in the sense that *she* is derived from
him, thus inverting the 'quasi-gender attribution' just established. Either way, Will is
dependant on Anna, and the sentence which follows, 'He depended on her' (1.2) does not add
any new information to what has already been presented in the parallel construction.
However, it does provide several significant lexically cohesive links through the passage.
Most obviously, the verb 'depended' (1.2) is cohesive by reiteration and simple repetition with
its occurrence in the sentence 'And she hated him, because he depended on her so utterly'
(1.5), and in the phrase 'he must depend on her' (1.13). In its first occurrence, 'depended'
merely states Will's relationship to Anna, in its second employment, Anna's reaction to this
relationship is identified, and in the third, the intrinsic necessity of Will's dependence on Anna
shown. This occurs despite the desires of both characters for separation being described in the
intervening period between the second and the third employment of the verb 'to depend'.

---

[63]*Rainbow*, pp.172-173.

Anna's hatred of Will's dependence in the sentence, 'And she hated him, because he depended on her so utterly' (l.5) is cohesive by topic continuance[64] with her attitude to Will in the sentence which follows; 'He was horrible to her' (l.5-6). This latter sentence is also syntactically parallel with the initial sentence identified; 'He depended on her', suggesting the cause of Anna's hatred *syntactically*, in addition to its identification in the propositional content of the passage, and in the contexts in which the verb 'depended' is repeated. 'Horrible' itself is also a member of a cohesive chain in the passage. It is cohesive by reiteration by its recurrence as simple repetition in the sentence 'It was horrible that he should cleave to her so close, so close, like a leopard that had leapt on her and fastened' (l.6-8). In its initial employment, Will is 'horrible' due to his dependence, in the second, the situation of his cleaving is 'horrible'; Anna has achieved a degree of separation from Will by making a grammatical move further away from him in the contexts in which 'horrible' is repeated.

The lexical items 'cleave', 'close', 'close' and 'fastened' employed in the second sentence in which 'horrible' is employed (l.7, 8) are cohesive by collocation. The construction is as follows, with the cohesive items under examination identified by underlining:

> It was horrible that he should <u>cleave</u> to her, <u>so close</u>, <u>so close</u>, like a leopard that had leapt on her and <u>fastened</u>.

The initial word in this chain, 'cleave' identifies Will as adhering and clinging to Anna, sticking steadfastly by her. The repeated second item 'close' indicates proximity, and suggests perhaps lesser adherence than 'cleave'. However, its repetition, in both instances with 'so' indicates that the extent of this proximity is to be stressed, and the 'closeness' of the encounter is duly emphasised. 'Fastened', however, again identifies the adherence inherent in 'cleave'. In addition, in its employment with the simile of the predatory leopard to which Will is compared, 'fastened' identifies a predatory element, and thus the danger inherent in such a relationship. Such destructive predatory characteristics, Charles Ross argues, are emphasised in Will and Anna's relationship in TSR to emphasise the potency necessary for the achievement of 'Absolute Beauty' between Will and Anna, which was expanded and developed in the TS and proof revisions to the novel.[65] However, here it is present from MS. The lexical items in this cohesive chain are also near antonyms of Anna's desire 'to thrust him off, to set him apart' (l.6), which are themselves presented in a repetitive, syntactically parallel

---

[64]Ehrlich, pp.27-57.
[65]'Revisions', p.284.

construction. In this construction, Anna's desire for separation results first in her proposed dynamic 'Male' action 'to thrust him off', and then in the increased separateness which she desires, 'to set him apart'. The first verb in this repetitive construction is more affective to its object than the second. However, it is with the second that Anna's 'Male' desire for separateness from Will is more clearly articulated. Anna's repetitive desire for separateness from Will is itself cohesive with Will's desire to 'get away from her' (l.10). Despite his 'Female' desire for oneness, his inadequacy makes him feel both the necessity for separation, and the impossibility of it. Will's 'Male' impulse is severely atrophied. Indeed, in the syntactically parallel phrase reproduced below, his experience and awareness of his inadequacies are stylistically 'enacted' by repetition. The parallel phrases are identified by italics:

> He went on from day to day in a blackness of *rage, and shame, and frustration.* (l.9-10)

Will's inability to be self-sufficient is portrayed as 'Female', in that he is occupied in self-feeling. His initial fury is directed *at* himself, his shame is *about* his inadequacies, and his frustration concerns his *inability* to 'get away' from Anna. Therefore the repetition involved in these syntactically parallel phrases identifies Will's progressive increasing involvement in his own, increasingly specific, characteristics. The repetitive characteristics of this construction therefore identify a 'Female' occupation with self. Will's inability to be self-sufficient, and his inability to recognise Anna as his separate complement, have similarities with Lawrence's argument in *Hardy* regarding the necessity of a relative relationship between opposites:

> It needs that a man shall know the natural law of his own being, then that he shall seek out the law of the female, with which to join himself as complement. He must know that he is half, and the woman is the other half: that they are two, but that they are two-in-one.[66]

As with the portrayal of Tom and Lydia's relationship, and the initial dairy scene between Will and Anna, the repetitive manner in which the interactions are presented serve to identify the proportion of 'Male' and 'Female' operative in this interaction, and the flaws in the relationship which prevent it from achieving true 'Absoluteness'.

---

[66]*Hardy*, pp.127-128.

So far, the flaws in Will and Anna's relationship have appeared all to have been on one side - Will's. However, as Kinkead-Weekes notes in his examination of the developing Cathedral scene in 'The Marble and the Statue',[67] Lawrence was keen to redress any imbalance which might suggest that Will was more to blame than Anna, or Anna more to praise than Will. One of the ways in which Lawrence redressed this balance was the insertion in TSR of Will's escapade with Jennie, and the 'Absolute Beauty' scene between Will and Anna which follows it. Will's 'strangeness' achieved through his dalliance with Jennie, and his 'Absolute Beauty' relation with Anna which follows it, achieve for him a limited separateness. However, the relationship which Will and Anna achieve at this point is entirely impersonal (anticipated by Will's impersonal liaison with Jennie), and occupies only one extreme of the Lawrentian dialectic. As with the preceding examples, the 'repetitive' style of *The Rainbow* contributes much to the portrayal of the 'Absolute Beauty' interaction:

> Strange his wife was to him. It was as if he were a perfect stranger, <and she a perfect stranger (TS)> [as if she were infinitely and essentially strange to him, the other half of the world, the dark half of the moon. (TSR)] She waited for his touch as if he were a <perfect stranger. And he discovered her. With a passion of (TS)> [marauder who had <carried her off (TSR)> [come in (E1)], infinitely unknown and desirable to her. And he began to discover her. He had an inkling of the vast store of delights she was. With a passion of (TSR)] voluptuousness that made him dwell on <her (TS)> [each tiny beauty (TSR)] in a kind of frenzy of enjoyment, he <discovered (TS)> [lit upon (TSR)] her: her beauty, the beauties, the separate, several beauties of her body.
>
> He was quite <strange to (TS)> [ousted from (TSR)] himself, and sensually transported by that which he discovered in her. [He was another man revelling over her. (TSRI)] There was no tenderness, no love between them [any more (TSRI)], only the maddening, <sensual discoveries (TS)> [sensuous lust for discovery (TSR)] and the insatiable <lust for more, the desire, the desire (TS)> [, exorbitant gratification in the sensual beauties of her body. And she was a store, a store of absolute beauties that it drove him mad to contemplate. There was such a feast to enjoy, and he with only one man's capacity. (TSR)]
>
> He lived in a passion of <sensuality (TS)> [sensual <gratification (TSR)> [discovery (E1)] with her for some time - it was a duel: no love, no words, no kisses even, only the maddening <sense (TS)> [perception (TSR)] of beauty <perceived (TSR)> [consummate, absolute (TSR)] through touch. He wanted to touch her, to discover her, maddeningly, he wanted to know her. [Yet he must not hurry, or he missed everything. He must enjoy one beauty at a time. (TSRI)] <The several beauties of her bodies, the many little (TS)> [And the multitudinous beauties of her body,

5

10

15

20

25

---

[67]'The Marble and the Statue', pp.386-390.

the many little rapturous (TSR)] places, sent him mad with <delight (TS)>
<[pleasure (TSR)]> [delight (TSR)], [and with desire to be able to know 30
more, to have strength to know more<. F (TSR)> [, f (E1)]or all was there
(TSR)]...He would go all the day waiting for the night to come, when he
could <go mad with (TS)> [give himself to (TSR)] the enjoyment of <this
luxury in her. The endless luxury (TS)> [some hidden, luxurious absolute
of beauty in her. The thought of the <endless wealth (TSR) [hidden 35
resources (E1)]] of her, the <inexhaustible (TS)> [undiscovered (E1)]
beauties and ecstatic places of <zest (TS)> [delight (TSR)] in her body,
<seemed to make (TS)> [waiting, only waiting for him to discover them,
sent (TSR)] him slightly insane. He was obsessed. <He wished he were a
cat, to lick her all over; and then a tiger-cat, to eat her, tear her with his 40
mouth: he wished to wallow in her, to bury himself in her flesh, cover
himself over with her flesh. (TS)> [If he did not discover and make known
to himself these delights, they might be lost for ever. He wished he had a
hundred men's energies, with which to enjoy her. He wished he were a
cat, to lick her with a rough, grating, lascivious tongue. He wanted to 45
wallow in her, bury himself in her flesh, cover himself over with her flesh.
(TSR)][68]

In the paragraphs preceding this extract, it is unclear which character provides the
initial impulsion in the more usual terms of the novel and *Hardy*. Anna is roused by Will's
failure to acknowledge her, and his new 'strangeness', and she replies to him with challenge,
although he has not deliberately offered her anything to reply to. Will is roused by Anna
before he touches her. However, in an abstract sense, it is Will's new 'strangeness' which
provides the 'Male' impetus for the relationship, and Anna's aloofness is a variation on
'Female' comparative passivity, although each is seeking *self*-gratification, and the
relationship between them is impersonal. Anna 'was out on her own adventure',[69] Will sees
Anna as 'a store of absolute beauties that it drove him mad to contemplate' (1.18-19). Despite
the increased aspects of the 'Male' principle in Will's actions, the employment of the 'Male'
and 'Female' impulses in the interaction are far from simple non-inversion. In a similar
manner to Lydia before her, Anna utters a challenge, then reverts to the 'Female' condition of
comparative 'inertia', occasionally provoking Will's activity again:

And she, separate, with a strange, dangerous, glistening look in her
eyes received all his activities upon her as if they were expected by her,
and provoked him when he was quiet to more, till sometimes he was ready
to perish for sheer inability to be satisfied of her, inability to have had
enough of her.[70]

---

[68]*Rainbow*, pp.218-219.
[69]p.217.
[70]p.219.

The repetitive phrase 'strange, dangerous, glistening', in which three adjectives are employed in a syntactically parallel construction functions to qualify Anna's apparent 'Female' passivity and receptivity at this point, and to indicate the nature of the relationship. 'Separate', which precedes it, already indicates Anna's affiliation with the singleness and separation of the 'Male' principle. In the repetitive construction, 'strange' indicates Anna's unfamiliar, alien qualities, suggesting that it is perhaps in this sense that Anna is 'separate' from Will. However, throughout the passage, 'strange' is cohesive with the qualities attributed both to Anna and her husband; she is 'strange' to him (1.1,3), he is a 'stranger' to her (1.1), and it is Will's strangeness which provokes the interaction on his return from Nottingham.[71] No clear attribution to either character is possible; this is a variation of the 'otherness' inherent in a Lawrentian relationship. Anna's look is then described as 'dangerous' (1.1), revealing that it is capable of causing peril, and is thus affective to parties other than herself. In this, the quality ascribed to Anna has similarities to Will's predatory 'fastening' on Anna in 'Anna Victrix'. It is a development from the leopard-like fastening which characterised Will there.[72] Will now is not dependent on Anna, but is exploiting her. The potential affectiveness on a 'not-self' which 'dangerous' suggests again affiliates Anna with the 'Male' principle, although in the earlier example with Will, his predatory action functioned to contribute towards the portrayal of his 'Female' desire for oneness. Anna here does not want oneness though; she keeps him 'at arms' length, whilst apparently ignoring him'.[73] However, the employment of 'dangerous' also anticipates the danger which Ursula later poses to Skrebensky in the stackyard, where her desire is to 'dissipate, destroy as the moonlight destroys a darkness, annihilate, have done with'[74] him as a result of the assertion of her 'Female' self supreme before the moon. This employment suggests that danger to an external party may also be the result of 'Female' assertion. In the context of the 'Absolute Beauty' relationship, the nature of this danger is somewhere poised between similar danger in the earlier and later scenes. It is Anna who is dangerous, yet it is Will who is active. Anna apparently plays the more 'Female' role, yet she offers not renewal and stability, but danger. The third adjective employed, 'glistening', serves to provide a further thematic stage in the

---

[71]pp.217:14, 26, 37, 218-16, 16, 18, 20, 21. The effects of the 'strange' cohesive chain in this passage, and in the broader repetitive pattern of the novel, will be examined in Chapter 5.
[72]p.173:7.
[73]p.218: 19-20.
[74]p.298:19-20.

adjectival chain. The sparkle and glitter which 'glisten' suggests indicates that Anna could be affiliated with the 'light' aspect of the 'Male' principle. However, in addition, 'glisten' has associations which serve to extend both backwards into the Tom and Lydia story, and forwards into that between Ursula and Skrebensky. 'Glisten' is cohesive by near-synonymy with the 'glittering'[75] of Ursula's amethyst, topaz, pearl and crystal necklace which she receives from Uncle Tom, and which, in her giving of it to the bargeman's child, indicates her rejection of Skrebensky. Where the necklace glittered, the hairs on the bargeman's hand 'glistened'.[76] In the Tom and Lydia story, the same vocabulary is used. Immediately before Lydia gives birth to her and Tom's first child, Tom ventures into a January day which is compared to 'crystal',[77] a gem on Ursula's later necklace. As the pains begin, Anna plays with glass beads,[78] and Tom takes her out to feed the animals, while the light from his lantern is 'flashing' on the wet pavement and wall.[79] The 'flashing' of light on water is cohesive by near-synonymy with 'glistening'. Anna's glistening eyes therefore relate her to the relationships which precede and succeed her relationship with Will in the novel, as 'dangerous' anticipates Ursula's relationship with Skrebensky, and 'strange' typifies the 'otherness' inherent in all the relationships. In addition, the 'glistening' of Anna's eyes associates them with the bright, hawklike fierceness of Will's eyes both in the dairy and following Will's storming off into the snow.[80] An allotropic hardening, suggested by all the associations which 'glistened' raises, has occurred.

Revisions in TSR to the description of Will's 'strangeness' emphasise both his predative characteristics ('perfect stranger', for example, is amended to 'marauder' (l.4-5)) and the extent of the distinction between the Will who left Anna, and the Will who returns. 'He was another man revelling over her' (l.13-14) is inserted in TSR, and Will's behaviour is shifted from the self-affective 'go mad with' to the leap towards the 'other' necessitated in the Lawrentian dialectic in 'give himself to' (l.33). In TSR, then, the 'Male' qualities of Will are emphasised, the 'Female' qualities reduced. The minimally affective verbs employed to characterise Anna's behaviour suggest that she is the 'Female' stability upon which Will acts. She 'waited' (l.4), was 'a vast store of delights' (l.7), 'was [a store of absolute beauties]' (l.18-19) and the hidden resources of her were 'waiting, only waiting' (l.38) for him to

---

[75]p.292:37.
[76]p.293:5.
[77]p.70: 12, 17.
[78]p.71: 16.
[79]p.75:11.
[80] pp.109-110, 151.

discover them. The revisions which these phrases undergo emphasise that she is (generally) the more 'inert' partner, with her increasingly (and consistently) being portrayed as a store for Will's explorations. However, the inserted passivity of her secret stores 'waiting' for Will's discovery (1.38) indicates, as with Will and Anna earlier, and with Tom and Lydia, that female 'stasis' can be the impelling role in many Lawrencian interactions, operating, apparently without contradiction, as an active passive force. In contrast, the verbs which take Will as subject tend to be dynamic and / or referential to characteristics typical of the 'Male' impulse of *Hardy*; 'come in' (1.6), 'began to discover' (1.7), 'lit upon' (1.10), 'ousted from himself' (1.12),[81] 'revelling' (1.14), 'discover' (1.25), 'know' (1.26), 'sent mad' (1.29), 'know' (1.30), 'know' (1.31), 'discover' (1.39), 'discover' (1.43), 'make known' (1.43). Revisions in TSR emphasise this 'Maleness'.

In this passage, the most obvious feature of *The Rainbow's* 'repetitive' style is that of lexical cohesion by cohesive chains of the verbs 'to discover' and 'to know', which take 'Will' as subject. Will's 'ousting' from himself and discovery in Anna in this interaction forms a contrast with Tom's experience with Lydia in Chapter 3 of *The Rainbow*.[82] Whereas Tom relinquishes himself in relationship with Lydia, and they both enter into a new circle of discovery and life (although they do not follow this discovery through), Will's discoveries in Anna are both self-affective rather than mutually enriching, and are destructive and sensual. This self-affectiveness is emphasised in revision. The revisions to the 'discovery' chain involve the replacement of 'he discovered her' (1.4-5) and 'he discovered her: her beauties...' (1.10) with 'he began to discover her' (1.7), and he 'lit upon her' (1.10). The excised phrases demonstrated no significant affective progression; Will merely performed the same act, first on Anna, then on aspects of Anna. However, in its revised form, the extract reveals significant cross-hatching of the 'quasi-gender attributions' of *Hardy*. Will's discoveries are increasingly progressive, and the word 'discovery' associated with the 'Male' impulse. However, the affectiveness of his discoveries does not affect Anna, but himself. He 'began to

---

[81] 'The other attitude of a man in love, besides this of 'she is administered unto my maleness', is: 'she is the unknown, the undiscovered, into which I plunge to discovery, losing myself.' And what we call real love has always this latter attitude.' (*Hardy*, p.103). Will's 'ousting' from himself and discovery in Anna in this interaction forms a contrast with Tom's experience with Lydia in Chapter 3 (*Rainbow*, pp.90-91). Whereas Tom relinquishes himself in relationship with Lydia, and they both enter into a new circle of discovery and life (although they do not follow this discovery through), Will's discoveries in Anna are both self-affective rather than mutually enriching, and are destructive and sensual. He wants to 'give himself to' the sensual enjoyment of Absolute Beauty in Anna, not lose himself in creative relationship.

[82] *Rainbow*, pp.90-91.

discover her' (l.7), is 'sensually transported' by what he discovered in her (l.13), and has a 'sensual lust for discovery' (l.16) which replaces 'sensual discoveries' and is more referential to Will's own feelings than the construction prior to revision. In addition, Will lives in a 'passion of discovery' with Anna in E1 (l.21-22), has increasingly affective volition in the syntactially parallel construction 'to touch her, to discover her...to know her' (l.25-26), and is sent insane by her 'undiscovered beauties' (l.37) awaiting his discovery (l.39). In this cohesive chain, the movement towards discovery which characterises the 'Male' impulse is continually referred back to Will. The couple do not achieve a mutual passing through to the beyond, and Will's discoveries are self-affective, and thus more akin to the 'Female' impulse. The repetition of the revised contructions in which 'sensual' appears also contributes to this effect. In addition, the transcendance achieved in this interaction is that of Will being 'ousted from himself' (l.12). In the two instances where the interaction has particular effect on Will, this self-affectiveness can be traced from one to the other. In the first instance, Will is 'sent...mad' (l.29) by the beauties of Anna's body, in the second, he is 'sent..slightly insane' (l.39) by the *thought* of her body waiting for *him* to discover it. Will wants to 'give himself to' (l.33) the sensual enjoyment of 'Absolute Beauty' in Anna, not lose himself in creative relationship with her, although this is an improvement on his attitude in TS, where he wanted 'to go mad with the enjoyment of this luxury in her', an entirely self-referential desire. Initially, in the cohesive chains identified, Anna sees Will as 'infinitely *unknown* and desirable to her' (l.6), yet it is he who 'began to discover her' (l.7). Will is the dynamic, 'Male' participant. Like Anna, Will is aware of the 'unknown' in her, in his case, of the store of delights which she is. In lines 14-18, the impersonal lust for 'discovery' between them is potentially mutual. However, the conjunction which begins the sentence which follows creates cohesion between the propositional content of this sentence, and the following, in which Will's madness as a result of Anna's beauties is described. Again, the 'discovery' of Anna is affective to Will. Similarly, in lines 22-23, the mutual nature of sensual 'discovery' is suggested. However, in the sentences which follow, the employments of 'discovery' and 'knowledge' in which Will's volition is described are again self-affective to him. As has been discussed, 'discovery' and 'knowledge' imply two contrary movements, similar to the cross-hatching of 'Male' and 'Female' impulses identified as occurring between the characters in the novel. The semantic ambiguity of 'know', embracing both Biblical and *Hardy*esque interpretations, makes the two terms both inseparable and opposing. Examples of their joint

usage in the passage, and lexical items cohesive with them, are identified below by underlining. The effects of their joint usage will be discussed:

> He wanted to touch her, to <u>discover</u> her, maddeningly he wanted to <u>know</u> her...And the multitudinous beauties of her body, the many little rapturous places, sent him mad with delight, and with desire to be able to <u>know</u> more, to have strength to <u>know</u> more.[83] For all was there (1.25-26, 28-32).

The repetitive syntax of the extract identifies Will's desire for contact with Anna ('touch') , then exploration of her ('discover'), and finally something ambiguously poised between carnal knowledge, intimate recognition, or, as in *Hardy*, a late developed aspect of life developed in the rearguard of it ('know'). Yet Will's desire for active 'discovery' and 'knowledge' is entirely self-referential, his desire for 'Male' activity indicating more typically 'Female' concerns. Similarly, in the final paragraph of the extract, Will is described as the (volitionally) active partner exploring his (comparatively inert) object, and again, the employment of 'discovery' and 'knowledge' are both self-affective, and referential to his own concerns:

> The thought of the hidden resources of her, the <u>undiscovered</u> beauties and ecstatic places of delight in her body, waiting, only waiting for him to <u>discover</u> them, sent him slightly insane. He was obsessed. If he did not <u>discover</u> and <u>make known</u> to himself these delights, they might be lost for ever (1.35-39, 42-44).

The interaction between Will and Anna is an impersonal one only of the senses and of sensuality, and the experience of the interaction is also apparently similarly partial, or at least, partially described. No mutually enriching interaction is being described; Will's dynamic actions upon Anna, and his desires, are merely self-affective, as the contexts of the lexically cohesive verbs 'discover' and 'know' indicate. Will and Anna's 'Absolute' interaction may only be partial, occupying only one part of the Lawrencian dialectic, but as with their other interactions, and as with Tom and Lydia's relationship, 'Male' and 'Female' impulses are inseparable and indicate the forces inherent both within and between characters in each

---

[83] Even the progression of 'to be able to know' to 'to have strength to know' indicates an increase in affectiveness in the effort required by Will.

interaction. This inseparability is 'enacted' in *The Rainbow*'s repetitive style, and increases through the revision process.

Ursula and Skrebensky

During Ursula and Skrenbensky's first intimacy, it is Skrebensky whose behaviour is more obviously 'Male' in the terms of *Hardy*, Ursula's the more 'Female':

> He sat close to her, touching her, and she was aware of his <trespass (MS)> [influence (E1)] upon her. But she was glad. It excited her to feel the press of him upon her, as if his being were <pressing for advantage <over (MS)> [upon (MSR)] her (MS)> [urging her to something (E1)].
>
> 5
>
> As they drove home, he sat near to her. And when he swayed to the cart, he swayed in a <wonderful (TSRD)> voluptuous, lingering way, against her, lingering as he <was drawn (MS)> [swung away (TSR)] to recover balance. Without speaking, he took her hand across, under <his coat (MS)> [the wrap (E1)], and with [his (Om. MS, TSRI)] unseeing face 10 lifted to the road, his soul intent, he began with his one hand to unfasten the buttons of her glove, to push <P (MS)> [back (MSR)] her glove from her hand, carefully, laying bare her hand. And the close-working, instinctive <labour of (MS)> [subtlety of (TSR)] his fingers upon her hand sent the young girl mad with voluptuous delight. His [hand (MSRI)] was 15 so wonderful, intent as a <mole (MS)> [living creature (TSR)] skilfully pushing and manipulating in <the earth (MS)> [dark underworld (TSR)], removing her glove and laying bare her palm, her fingers. Then his hand closed over hers, so firm, so close, as if the flesh knitted to one thing, his hand and hers. Meanwhile his face watched the road and the ears of the 20 horse, he drove with <acute (MS)> [steady (TSR)] attention through the villages, and she sat beside him, rapt, glowing, blinded with a new light. Neither of them spoke. In outward attention they were entirely separate. But between them was the compact of his flesh with hers, in the hand-clasp.[84]
>
> 25

The movement of the passage is predominantly one of Skrebensky's action, and Ursula's reaction, suggesting that the principles of *Hardy* have not been inverted. Indeed, the fact that Skrebensky is driving and looking to the road as he caresses Ursula allies him to the 'Male' women of the Marsh farm in the opening chapter of the novel. Changes in E1 and TSR confirm the 'Male' characteristics of Skrebensky's behaviour, which are increased or emphasised from MS. In MS, Ursula is 'aware of his trespass upon her' (l.1-2), and aware of him 'pressing for advantage <over> [upon] her' (l.3-4). E1R demonstrates an increase in the

---

[84]*Rainbow*, pp.275-276.

motivating force of Skrebensky which recalls *Hardy's* 'Male' impulse; Ursula is 'aware of his *influence* upon her' (1.1-2) and Skrebensky is '*urging* her to something' (1.4). In TSR, emphasis is shifted from Skrebensky as object of verb action to subject of it; 'was drawn' (1.7) is amended to 'swung away' (1.7), increasing the emphasis on his self-impelled action. The only exception to this increasing emphasis of the 'Male' impulse is in Lawrence's replacement of 'acute' with 'steady' in TSR to describe Skrebensky's driving. His verb actions which take Ursula's gloved hand as object are increasingly affective, 'began to unfasten...to push...carefully laying bare' (1.10-12), reflecting the progression of his activity. As he 'does', Ursula 'experiences', recalling *Hardy's* distinction between 'Male' 'doing' and 'Female' 'being'[85] and occupation in sensation. However, from MS, Ursula is involved in the 'Male' activity of registering relationships, although through revision, her awareness develops more 'Female' characteristics. In MS, Ursula is 'aware of his trespass upon her', in E1 of his 'influence' (1.1-2). The revision retains Ursula's registering of relationships, but the revision changes Skrebensky from being an intrusive figure to a motivating 'Male' one. This impelling influence of his is confirmed in the revised phrase 'urging her to something' (1.4), and in the phrase retained from MS 'his fingers upon her hand sent the young girl mad with voluptuous delight' (1.13-14).

The relationship between the lovers can be traced through lexical cohesion by repetition (identified by underlining), collocation (identified by roundhand font) and lexical parallelism (identified in numbered brackets):

> Without speaking, he took (her *hand* (medial-final-final-medial 1)) across, under the wrap, and with his *unseeing* face lifted to the world, his soul <u>intent</u>, he began with (<u>his</u> one *hand* (medial-initial 2)) to unfasten the buttons of her glove, to <u>push</u> back her glove from (her *hand* (medial-final-final-medial 1), carefully, (<u>laying</u> <u>bare</u> (initial 3)) (her *hand* (medial-final-   *5* final-medial 1)). And the close-working, instinctive subtlety of his fingers upon (her *hand* (medial-final-final-medial 1)) sent the young girl mad with voluptuous delight. (<u>His</u> *hand* (medial-initial 2)) was so wonderful, <u>intent</u> as a living creature skilfully <u>pushing</u> and manipulating in the dark underworld, removing her glove, (<u>laying</u> <u>bare</u> (initial 3)) *her palm, her*   10 *fingers*....and she sat beside him, rapt, glowing, *blinded* with a new light.

The context of repetition of 'her hand' traces the progression of Skrebensky's action on Ursula. He 'took' her hand (1.1), laid it bare (1.5), and the effect of his fingers upon it sent her

---

[85]*Hardy*, p.94.

'mad with voluptuous delight' (1.7-8). His action is therefore increasingly affective upon Ursula both physically and emotionally. 'Laying bare' is repeated again, with Ursula's 'palm, her fingers' (1.10-11), and the progression of action continues. Where Skrebensky's 'laying bare' had previously been the pushing back of her glove (1.4-5), it is now removal (1.10), and the repetition of 'pushing' also traces this development. The repetition of 'his hand' traces first the action of his hand (1.3, 8) and then Ursula's experience of it, confirming the 'Male' / 'Female' distinction already set up. This distinction is further confirmed in the cohesive relationship between 'unseeing' (1.2) and 'blinded' (1.11). Anton's behaviour has propelled Ursula into a condition which is similar to, though not identical with, his own. The relationship between the axle and the hub of *Hardy* is again recalled.[86]

The pattern of 'Male' activity attributed to Skrebensky, and 'Female' inertia / response to Ursula is repeated sporadically during their relationship.[87] However, in 'First Love', where Skrebensky and Ursula kiss in the shed, repetitiveness produces complex stylistic results with reference to the attribution and relevance of *Hardy's* 'Male' and 'Female' principles:

> In the shed they played at kisses, really played at kisses. It was a delicious, exciting game. She turned to him, her face all laughing, like a challenge. And he accepted the challenge at once. He twined his hand full of her hair, and <gradually (MS)> [gently (MSR)], with his hand [wrapped round with hair (MSRI)] behind her head, <wrapped round with S hair (MS)> [gradually brought her face nearer (MSR)] to his, whilst she laughed breathless with challenge, and his eyes gleamed with answer, <overbearing (MS)> [with enjoyment of the game (TSR)]. And he kissed her, asserting his will over her, and she kissed him back, asserting her deliberate <choice (MS)> [enjoyment (TSR)] of him. Daring and reckless 10 and dangerous they knew it was, <that (MS)> [their (TSR)] game, each playing with fire, not with love. A sort of defiance of all the world possessed her in it - she would kiss him <merely (MS)> [just (TSR)] because she wanted to. And a <bitter (MS)> <[rank (MSR, TSRD)]> dare-devilry in him, like a [cynicism, a (MSRI)] cut at everything he 15 pretended to serve, retaliated in him.
>
> She was very beautiful then, so wide opened, so radiant, so palpitating, exquisitely vulnerable and poignantly, wrongly <off-hand (MSRD)> throwing herself to risk. It roused a sort of madness in him. Like a flower shaking and wide opened in the sun, she tempted him and 20 challenged him, and he accepted her challenge, something went fixed in him. And under all her laughing, poignant, reckless, was the quiver of

---

[86]In addition, both 'unseeing' and 'blinded' also resonate with the pre-revision ' mole' (1.16) and Skrebensky's deflected gaze as he watches the road (1.20). Noted by Randall Stevenson in discussion.

[87] Similarities can also be seen on pages 412-3 and 418, the latter forming a contrastive counterpart to Tom and Lydia's interaction in 'They Live At The Marsh'' (*Rainbow*, p.60).

tears. That almost sent him mad, mad with desire, with pain, whose only issue was [through (MSRI)] possession of her body.

So, shaken, afraid, they went back to her parents in the kitchen, and 25 dissimulated. But something was roused in both of them that they could not now allay. It intensified and heightened their senses, they were more vivid and powerful in their being. But under it all, was a poignant sense of <sadness (MS)> <[hopelessness (TSR)]> [transience (E1)]. It was a magnificent self-assertion on the part of both of them, he asserted himself 30 before her, he felt himself infinitely male and infinitely irresistible, she asserted herself before him, she knew herself infinitely desirable and hence infinitely strong. And after all, what could either of them get [from such a passion (MSRI)] but a sense of his or of her own maximum self [, in contradistinction to all the rest of life (Om MS, E1I)]? Wherein was 35 something finite and sad, for the human soul at its maximum wants a sense of the infinite.[88]

In this interaction, Ursula is the motivating and originally active participant, whose activity stimulates Skrebensky into reaction, suggesting an inversion of the pattern observed in the preceding example. However, the mutual self-assertion apparent in the passage serves to complicate this inversion, and present another development in the novel of the cross-hatching of 'Male' and 'Female' impulses already observed. Lawrence's amendment in TSR of MS's 'overbearing' gleam in Skrebensky's eyes to their revealing of his 'enjoyment of the game' (l.8) indicates the increased potential for mutual and more equal interaction between the characters. No longer is Skrebensky described as the more forceful and controlling character (although it is Ursula who motivates the action of the passage); the insertion of 'game' suggests the possibility of mutual and balanced play, as is also suggested by the initial plural pronoun 'they'. However, the nature of this play is indicated by the 'play' chain, cohesive by both reiteration and collocation. Again, underlining identifies repetition, roundhand font identifies collocation:

...they *played* at kisses, really *played* at kisses. It was a delicious, exciting *game*...his eyes gleamed with answer, with enjoyment of the *game*...Daring and reckless and dangerous they knew it was, their *game*, each *playing* with fire, not with love.

In its initial and second employment, 'played' is referential to both lovers. However, by the employment of 'It was a delicious, exciting game', play is no longer mutual, but a condition outwith the characters. From this point, the game, and not the interaction becomes

---

[88]pp.280-281.

the focus of enjoyment, and the characters are increasingly separated. Skrebensky's eyes gleam 'with enjoyment of the game', not Ursula (l.8), and each is aware that the game is dangerous rather than loving (l.10-12). This decrease in mutuality is emphasised in a manner which also introduces 'Male' / 'Female' cross-hatching into the interaction. The contexts in which lexical cohesion by reiteration occurs, created by the repeated employment of 'challenge', reveals that Ursula is the challenger, Skrebensky the responder. However, the position soon becomes inverted. In a syntactically and lexically parallel construction, Skrebensky is described as kissing Ursula and asserting his will over her, while she kisses him back, and asserts her enjoyment of him. Italics identify syntactic parallelism, numbered brackets lexical parallelism, and underlining lexical repetition:

> *(And* he *kissed* her (initial 1)), *(asserting* (initial 2)) *his will over her, (and* she *kissed him* (initial 1)) back, *(asserting* (initial 2)) her deliberate *enjoyment of him.* (l.8-10)

The kissing which was introduced as mutual and shared in the opening lines has become separate and combative. At this stage, Skrebensky could be considered the motivator ('Male') who propels Ursula ('Female') into action. However, his action could be the result of Ursula's previous challenge, or the characters could be (and seem to be) engaged in equal and opposed self-assertion rather than the creative relationship of multiple opposites advocated in *Hardy.* The balance of 'Male' and 'Female' attribution, revealed by repetition, is shifting. Skrebensky's behaviour which prompts Ursula's almost identical response *is* described before hers, so hers appears to be an equal and opposite response to it. Thus there appears to be an inversion of the action / reaction patterning of Ursula's challenge and Skrebensky's acceptance presented in the simple repetition of 'challenge', and a shift in the predominant 'Male' / 'Female' relationship between the characters is suggested. This situation is again complicated in the lines which follow this extract. Again, italics identify syntactic parallelism, numbered brackets lexical parallelism, and underlining lexical repetition:

> It was a magnificent self-assertion on the part of both of them, *he (asserted* (medial 1)) *(himself* (medial 2)) *(before* (medial 3)) *her, he felt (himself* (medial 2)) *(infinitely* (medial 4)) *male and (infinitely* (medial 4)) *irresistible, she (asserted* (medial 1)) *(herself* (medial 5)) *(before* (medial 3)) *him, she knew (herself* (medial 5)) *(infinitely* (medial 4)) *desirable and* S hence *(infinitely* (medial 4)) *strong.*[89]

---

[89] p.281.

Skrebensky and Ursula are engaged in an interaction where each is self-assertive, and the initial sentence, which attributes self-assertion to *both* characters suggests no predominant motivator / responder. However, in the sentences which follow, Skrebensky is again the initial agent, suggesting that he is motivator, Ursula responder. This apparent attribution of 'Male' and 'Female' principles is complicated by the lexical items which are changed in the repeated, syntactically parallel construction. Skrebensky 'felt' himself 'male' and 'irresistible', while Ursula 'knew' herself 'desirable' and 'strong' (1.2-4, 5-6). The first, and most obvious observation to make is that 'feeling' in *Hardy* is a 'Female' impulse, 'knowledge' generally a 'Male'. While Skrebensky appears to be the 'Male' motivator of the action described in the propositional content of the sentence, here a 'Female' verb takes him as subject, while a 'Male' verb takes Ursula as subject. The initial attribution of 'Male' motivation to Ursula is therefore confirmed, and the inversion which followed it destabilised. The other changed constituents in the repeated construction add to the complexity. Skrebensky, feels himself both 'male' and 'irresistible', Ursula knows herself 'desirable' and 'strong'. Lexical cohesion by collocation links Skrebensky's maleness with Ursula's strength, and near-synonymy links his irresistibility with her desirability. The two former are, in conventional rather than Lawrentian usage, arguably 'male' characteristics, the two latter 'female'. Again, *Hardy's* impulses are revealed as cross-hatched both within and between individuals, and the non-creative nature of this interaction (indicated by mutual self-assertion and increasing separation between characters) suggests that the couple will not achieve an 'Absolute' relationship.

The employment of 'Male' motivation and 'Female' response in this interaction becomes still more complex, again indicating the nature of the developing relationship. The verbs which take each character as subject are not consistently identifiable with either principle, and in addition, Lawrence mixes their attribution in the description of Ursula as a flower.[90] In the following extract, the temporal deictic 'then', which identifies the time of Ursula's beauty, extends across the preceding episode boundary, placing it when she kisses Skrebensky defiantly and causes his retaliation:

> ...she would kiss him just because she wanted to. And a dare-
> devilry in him, like a cynicism, a cut at everything he pretended to serve,
> retaliated in him.
> She was very beautiful then...(1.13-17)

---

[90]This is achieved in a similar way to the description of Lydia in *Rainbow*, p.54.

In this case, Ursula's wide opened, flower-like beauty, normally identified with the 'Female' principle, is identified also with the active and motivating 'Male'.[91] The repetition caused by both the employment of multiple adjectival and adverbial constructions, and varyingly affective verbs in this paragraph results in similar cross-hatching of the *Hardy* principles. Ursula is first described by five adjectival phrases and one participle phrase in the function of an adverbial adjunct:

> She was very beautiful then, so wide opened, so radiant, so palpitating, exquisitely vulnerable and poignantly, wrongly, throwing herself to risk.

The description begins with the identification of Ursula's physical qualities ('she was very beautiful' (1.17)), then her receptive state ('so wide opened'(1.17)), both suggesting the 'Female' principle, then, again, her physical appearance ('so radiant'(1.17)), whose association with light evokes associations with the 'Male' principle. The adjectival phrase 'so palpitating' (1.18), which follows this, characterises Ursula as rapidly moving, without altering her position, and recalls Lydia and Anna's movement without motion, whuch has already been discussed. As was examined with reference to Lydia, such activity has similarities with the inseparability of 'motion' and 'rest' in *Hardy*. It describes Ursula's self-affective state, and is in this respect 'Female'. The following characterisation of her as 'vulnerable' (1.18) presents Ursula as potentially liable to the influence of external forces, but it is her *state* rather than her actions which are described, and the final description of her ('wrongly throwing herself to risk' (1.19)) is again self-affective, although the action described is dynamic. Ursula's description here is, therefore, predominantly consistent with the 'Female' principle, again qualifying her initial 'Male' impulsion in the passage. The description of her which follows results in further cross-hatching:

> Like a flower shaking and wide opened in the sun, she tempted him and challenged him, and he accepted her challenge, something went fixed in him. (1.20-22)

---

[91] An alternative reading of 'then' is 'in that case', or 'in conclusion', which might suggest the presence of Skrebensky as focaliser. However, there are no clear indications of FID in this passage, and Lawrence's continual use of evaluatives, repetition and intensifiers in what is apparently third person objective narration makes any identification of FID very difficult. See M. Fludernik, *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness* (London and New York, 1993).

Ursula is again characterised as 'flower-like', and the first two participial adjectives employed to describe her confirm her 'Female' characteristics. 'Shaking' is cohesive by near synonymy with 'palpitating' (1.18), and 'wide opened' (1.17) is lexically cohesive by repetition with 'wide opened' (1.20). However, Ursula's behaviour then becomes increasingly 'Male'; it is she who is the dynamic partner, and her actions in 'tempt[ing]' and 'challeng[ing]' Skrebensky involve both recognition of a 'not-self', and are affective to him, prompting him into response. Ursula's initial 'Male' impulsion in the passage has been confirmed, but through the repetition of the passage, it is revealed as operational cross-hatched with the 'Female'. Like Lydia and Anna, she is playing the active-passive role.

Similar cross-hatching of *Hardy's* principles, and indications of the nature of interaction occur during the wedding dance. Repetition of images and lexical items from earlier in the novel is employed with variation to indicate the differing nature of this interaction from those which have preceded it in earlier generations. Ursula and Skrebensky are again locked in a dual movement of self-assertion,[92] and again it is Ursula's action which prompts Anton's, although TSR amendments in the following extract increase Skrebensky's influential power:

> "Come," said Ursula to Skrebensky, laying her hand on his arm.
> At the touch of her hand on his arm, his consciousness melted away from him. He took her into his arms, <with (MS)> [as if into (TSR)] the sure, <near knowledge of the trance (MS)> [subtle power of his will, (TSR)] and they became one movement, one dual movement, dancing on the slippery grass.[93]

The symbolism of this episode presents a development from the fertile imagery presented earlier in the novel, and the creative marriage of opposition advocated in *Hardy*. The language employed in TSR to describe Ursula's desire for, and acceptance of the moon recalls and modifies the 'flower' imagery employed to describe both herself and Lydia in interaction with their partners. Not only is there a similarity (and thematic link) between the anemone image, used to describe Ursula in the following extract, to that of a flower (now

---

[92]The non- fusing, non-yielding interlocking of Ursula and Skrebensky's wills at 295: 25-8 was inserted in TSR, as was the imagery of Skrebensky as an inert weight.
[93]*Rainbow*, p.295.

given predatory connotations), but also a similarity between Ursula's 'quivering' to her previous 'palpitating', and Lydia's movement without movement:

> And her breast opened to it, <she wanted to cleave to its light. She stood offering herself to the full moon. (MS)> [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. (TSR)][94]

However, unlike Ursula and Lydia's earlier 'flower' exchanges with their partners, in this encounter the predatory 'anemone' Ursula does not want communion with her partner, but with the moon, identified in the novel as associated with Diana the huntress and rejection of men.[95] Ursula's desire for Diana-like self-assertion and fulfillment leads her to view all around her who prevent her liberty, including Skrebensky, as inert, weighing her down. There has been a significant shift here from the positive and creative potential of the 'Male' / 'Female' relationship, and that between man and woman. Skrebensky and Ursula are now destructive, *sterile* forces upon each other, he by inertia, she by 'Female' overbearing. At TSR stage, as Skrebensky's 'overbearing ' of Ursula was removed in their kissing game in the shed, Ursula's 'overbearing' is inserted here, resulting in a shift in 'Male' / 'Female' emphasis in the relationship. The apparent prolixity present in the description of their interaction contributes to this effect. The passage, and its revisions, are reproduced below:

> The music began again, and the dance. He appropriated her. There was a fierce, white, cold passion in her heart. But he held her close, and danced with her. <Supple, supple and insinuating (MS)> [Always present, like a soft weight upon her, bearing her down, (TSR)] was his body against her as they danced. He held her very close, so that she could feel 5 his body, <his breast, his belly, his legs running warm and insinuating upon her (MS)> [the weight of him sinking, settling upon her, overcoming her life and energy, making her inert along with him, (TSR)] she felt his hands pressing behind her, upon her. But <between him her body was firm with a fierce, cold passion. Only she liked the supple run of his 10

---

[94]p.296.

[95]In 'Shame', Winifred Inger is identified with Diana, the hunter goddess associated (as Kinkead-Weekes also observes (*Rainbow*, p.523)) with both the moon and rejection of men:

> A door opened, Miss Inger came out, dressed in a red-rust tunic like a Greek girl's, tied round the waist, and a red silk handkerchief round her head. How lovely she looked. Her knees were so white and strong and proud, she was firm-bodied as Diana.' (p.313).

movement upon her, warm and dark and attached like clothing to her. And
he exerted all his power to warm her to him. She liked him, but she
remained scarcely softened. (MS)> [still in her body was the subdued,
cold, indomitable passion. She liked the dance: it eased her, put her into a
sort of trance. But it was only a kind of waiting, of using up the time that 15
intervened between her and her pure being. She left herself against him,
she let him exert all his power over her, as if he would gain power over
her, to bear her down. She received all the force of his power. < She even
triumphed in it. (TSR)> [She even wished he might overcome her. (E1)]
She was cold and unmoved as a pillar of salt. (TSR)]   20
      <He was mad with passion for her firm, cool body, that was
compact of brilliance like the moon itself. His muscles set in tension upon
her, he could not relax. He must have her entirely, entirely. (MS)> [His
will was set and straining with all its tension to encompass her and compel
her. If he could only compel her. He seemed to be annihilated. She was 25
cold and hard and compact of brilliance as the moon itself, and beyond him
as the moonlight was beyond him, never to be grasped or known. If he
could only set a bond round her and compel her. (TSR)][96]

Skrebensky is initially apparently the predominantly 'Male' active force in the
interaction; it is he who is characterised as exerting power over Ursula, and she who
experiences the pressure which he exerts, a pressure which becomes increasingly deadening in
TSR. However, his action is non-creative; he is bearing Ursula down. As with the preceding
examples examined, Lawrence's repetitiveness has specific functions with reference to 'quasi-
gender attribution' which develop through revision. In MS, Skrebensky's behaviour towards
Ursula is described by the repetition of 'supple' and 'insinuating' (l.3, 6, 10). The repetition
of 'insinuating' is used to describe first his body *against* Ursula, then his legs *upon* her, and
thus a greater degree of affectiveness of his action upon her. The repetition of 'supple' has the
same effect; it is used with 'insinuating' to describe his body *against* her (l.3, 5), then to
describe his movement upon her (l.6-7). In TSR, however, repetition functions to make
varying affectiveness much more pronounced, in accordance with Skrebensky's new
deadening weight which now cannot compel Ursula into activity. His new actions demonstrate
increasing affectiveness upon Ursula; he 'bears her down' (l.4), then, in an apparently prolix
construction, 'sinks' and 'settles' upon her (l.7), 'overcomes' her life and energy (l.7-8), and
'makes her inert' (l.8), like him. 'Bearing down' describes Anton's overcoming of Ursula,
'sinking' his subsiding upon her, and 'settling' his establishment of himself upon her.
'Overcoming', is cohesive by collocation with Skrebensky's 'bearing down' of Ursula, which
itself is repeated (l.8), but in this usage, his weight does not merely overcome her, but is

---

[96]p.297.

affective to characteristics intrinsic to her, her 'life and her energy' (1.8), and the increasing affectiveness achieved is confirmed by the employment of the phrase 'making her inert along with him' (1.8). Skrebensky's weight is not only a *physical* burden to Ursula, but is now one which fundamentally alters her *state*. From MS, Skrebensky 'presses' behind and upon Ursula (1.9). However, his straining to 'encompass' and 'compel' her in TSR, cohesive with both aspects of the 'Male' impulse in *Hardy*, contribute to TSR's increasing affectiveness on Ursula. Yet although Skrebensky is increasingly affective to Ursula, she, like Lydia and Anna, appears to be the character in control of activities as she plays the more 'Female' role. Varying affectiveness is indicated by Modern font, and Ursula's control by italics:

> *She left herself* against him, *she let him* exert all his power over her, as if he would gain power over her, to bear her down. *She received* all the force of his power. *<She even triumphed* in it (TSR)> [*She even wished he might overcome her* (E1)] (TSR)]

Ursula's behaviour moves from passive to receptive to volitional. She is playing the ambiguously 'Male' / 'Female' active passive role typical of the main female characters in the novel, but to negative and sterile effect.

Ursula and Skrebensky's 'salt' episode, which Albright identified as exercising extreme grammatical fluidity of repeated elements,[97] is one of the two major episodes in the novel identifying Ursula's destructive self-assertiveness over Skrebensky. However, Albright does not recognise the effects that lexical cohesion has in this passage. The passage is reproduced below:

> She <clung to him (MS)> [took him (TSR)] in the kiss, hard her kiss <came (MS)> [seized (TSR)] upon him, hard and fierce and <cold (MS)> [burning corrosive (TSR)] as the moonlight. She seemed to be destroying him. He was reeling, <gathering (MS)> [summoning (TSR)] all his strength to <place (MS)> [keep (TSR)] his kiss upon her, to <place 5 his kiss (MS)> [keep himself in the kiss (TSR)].
> But hard and fierce she <cleaved (MS)> [had fastened (TSR)] upon him, cold as the moon and burning as [a (TSRI)] fierce salt. Till gradually his warm, <supple shadow (MS)> [soft iron (TSR)] yielded, yielded, and she was there fierce, <blazing fierce and hard and cold upon him, and his 10 heart was gone, and his strength. Under her hard, open-mouthed, coldly fierce kiss he succumbed, and she held him there, the victim. (MS)> [corrosive, seething with his destruction, seething like some <horrible> [cruel (E1)], corrosive salt around the last substance of his being,

---

[97]See Chapter 2.

destroying him, destroying him in the kiss. And her soul <screamed> 15
[crystallised (E1)] with triumph, and his soul was <silent with agony
annihilation> [dissolved with agony and annihilation (E1)]. So she held
him there, the victim, <shrivelled, bloodless, like an infinitely shrivelled
corpse> [consumed, annihilated (E1)] (TSR)]. She had triumphed: he was
not any more. (TSR)][98]   20

Ursula's over-developed 'Female' dominance over Skrebensky has become destructive
and vampiric, again suggesting a fundamental imbalance in 'Male' / 'Female' 'quasi-gender
attributions'.

The repetition in the passage, and its effects, are complex. Ursula asserts her 'Female'
self and her own desires through a series of increasingly affective verbs. She 'took' Anton in
the kiss (l.1), then her kiss 'seized' upon him (l.2), and *appears* to be 'destroying' him (l.4).
By this point, the repetition of the noun 'kiss', used first adverbially to describe her manner of
taking him, or to identify the location of action (l.1), then as subject (l.1-2), has functioned to
indicate that the physical connection between the couple has become increasingly separated.
Ursula kisses, then her kiss seizes. By line 15 in TSR, the repetition of 'kiss' has identified
the kiss, again adverbially, as the manner or location in which he is destroyed, confirming the
apparent destruction of Skrebensky as occurring in the kiss. In MS, he had merely
'succumbed'. The increasing autonomy of the kiss renders the interaction increasingly
impersonal, as Skrebensky becomes a victim rather than a contributor in the passage, and
Urslula's destructive 'Female' force dominates. This increasing impersonalisation recalls
Will's episode with Jennie and the 'Absolute Beauty' episode, both also introduced in TSR.
Repetition of 'destruction' and 'kiss' in TSR functions to trace the progress of Ursula's
destructive 'Female' assertive action, and repetition of 'kiss' develops the impersonal theme
which is being revised *into* TSR, both suggesting a fundamental imbalance in 'Male' 'Female'
relations, and the partial and sterile nature of the interactions which result.

The increase in affectiveness in the verbs employed is continued in the employment of
'fastened' (l.7). Although there is little affective progression between 'seized' and 'fastened',
the words 'cold', 'burning', salt and 'fierce' are part of several interlinked chains of lexical
cohesion, by repetition and collocation, which develop throughout the extract. The repeated
items under discussion are identifed by underlining below:

---

[98]*Rainbow*, p.299.

> But <u>hard</u> and <u>fierce</u> she <cleaved (MS)> [had fastened (TSR)] upon him, <u>cold</u> as the moon and <u>burning</u> as [a (TSRI)] <u>fierce</u> <u>salt</u>...she was there <u>fierce</u>, <<u>blazing</u> <u>fierce</u> and <u>hard</u> and <u>cold</u> upon him...Under her <u>hard</u>, open-mouthed, <u>coldly</u> <u>fierce</u> kiss he succumbed...(MS)> [corrosive, seething with his destruction, seething like some <horrible> [cruel (E1)], corrosive <u>salt</u> around the last substance of his being, destroying him, destroying him in the kiss. (TSR)] (l.7-15)

All are present from MS. However, in MS the repeated items function first to describe Ursula herself (l.1, 2), then the manner in which she acts towards him (l.3), and finally the increasingly impersonal kiss, abstracted from Ursula, under which he succumbs (l.3-4). In TSR, the initial emphases remain unchanged, but the final revision to the chain shifts the emphasis. The introduction of corrosion into this chain in TSR emphasises, and increases, the destructive affectiveness which Ursula's 'Female' self-assertion has. It replaces the cold and fierce aspects of her 'Female' power with a corrosive affectiveness which *eats away* at Skrebensky, in accordance with the confirmation of his destruction which TSR creates in the inserted repetition of the word. In addition, Ursula's 'seething' recalls the movement without movement which was observed in Lydia's behaviour with Tom, Anna's with Will, and Ursula's with Skrebensky. However, in this instance, self-agitation is *destructive* to her partner rather than an attempt to prompt interaction with him. The repetition of 'seething', in the context of the repetition of 'corrosive' and 'destroying', also contributes to the increasing destructive affectiveness of Ursula on Skrebensky:

> ...she was there fierce, [corrosive, seething with his destruction, seething like some <horrible> [cruel (E1)], corrosive salt around the last substance of his being, destroying him, destroying him in the kiss. (TSR)] (l.11, 14-16)

Ursula is first a corrosive element herself, agitated by her own destructive force, and therefore self-affective in a very 'negative' sense of the 'Female' principle of *Hardy*. However, her over-amplifed 'Female' assertiveness also leads her to assert her 'Female' self supreme over him. The verb 'seething' continues to describe Ursula's action in its repeated employment, but she is now not corrosive herself, but *like* corrosive salt, destroying him in the (increasingly impersonal) kiss.

The second episode to portray Ursula's destructive 'Female' self-assertiveness over Skrebensky occurs at the Lincolnshire coast. The passage is reproduced below:

And she seized hold of his arm, held him fast, as if captive, and walked him a little way by the edge of the dazzling, dazing water.

Then there, in the great flare of light, she clinched hold of him, hard, as if suddenly she had the strength of <an octopus (MS)> [destruction (El)], she fastened her arms round him and tightened him in her grip, 5 whilst her mouth sought his in a hard, <relentless (MS)> [rending (MSR)], ever-increasing kiss, till his body was powerless in her grip, his heart melted in fear from the fierce, <metallic (MS)> [beaked (MSR)], harpy's kiss. The water washed again over their feet, but she took no notice. She seemed unaware, she seemed to be pressing in her beaked mouth till she 10 had the heart of him. Then, at last, she drew away and looked at him - looked at him. He knew what she wanted. He took her by the hand and led her across the foreshore back to the sand-hills. She went silently. He felt as if the ordeal of proof was upon him, for life or death. He led her to a dark hollow. 15

"No, here," she said, going out to the slope full under the moonshine. She lay motionless, with wide-open eyes looking at the moon. he came direct to her, without preliminaries. She held him pinned down at the chest, awful. The fight, the struggle for consummation was terrible. It lasted till it was agony to his soul, till he succumbed, till he gave way as if 20 dead, and lay with his face buried partly in her hair, partly in the sand, motionless, as if he would be motionless now for ever, hidden away in the dark, buried, only buried, he only wanted to be buried in the goodly darkness, only that, no more.

He seemed to swoon. It was a long time before he came to himself. 25 He was aware of an unusual motion in her breast. He looked up. Her face lay like an image in the <da (MSD)> moonlight, the eyes wide open, rigid. But out of the eyes, slowly, there rolled a tear, that glittered in the moonlight as it ran down her cheek.

He felt as if the knife were being pushed into his already dead body. 30 With head strained back, he watched, drawn tense, for some minutes, watched the unaltering, rigid face like metal in the moonlight, the fixed, <staring (MS)> [unseeing (MSR)] eyes, in which slowly the water gathered, shook with glittering moonlight, then, surcharged, brimmed over and ran trickling, <glittering (MS)> [a tear (MSR)] with its burden of 35 moonlight, into the darkness, to fall in the sand.[99]

The passage undergoes comparatively little revision. There is, as is typical of *The Rainbow's* repetitiveness, increasingly affective progression of the verbs which describe Ursula's destructive 'Female' behaviour towards Skrebensky. This increase in affectiveness is also traceable in the descriptions of Skrebensky's reactions. Both descriptions of his reactions are introduced by 'till', and both, again, indicate the vampiric nature of Ursula's over-amplified destructive 'Femaleness'. In each, Ursula is the destructive motivating force,

[99]*Rainbow*, p.444-445.

Skrebensky is the 'passive' victim. Significant repetitions are underlined below, and significant lexical parallelism is identified by numbered brackets:

> ...<u>till</u> his body was powerless in her grip, his heart melted in fear from the fierce, <metallic (MS)> [beaked (MSR)], harpy's kiss. (l.7-9)

> ...<u>till</u> it was agony to his soul, <u>till</u> he succumbed, <u>till</u> he gave way as if <u>dead</u>, and lay with his face <u>buried</u> (<u>partly in</u> (medial-initial 1) her hair, (<u>partly in</u> (medial-initial 1) the sand, <u>motionless</u>, as if he would be <u>motionless</u> now for ever, <u>hidden</u> away in the dark, <u>buried</u>, only <u>buried</u>, he only wanted to be <u>buried</u> in the goodly darkness, only that, no more. (l.20-24)

In the first example, the effect of Ursula's vampiric behaviour is merely increased affectiveness. Skrebensky is physically powerless, then his heart is emotionally (metaphorically) melted. In the second example, however, the complex repetition functions to indicate the *nature* of Skrebensky's destruction by Ursula's 'Female' self. Again, the contexts in which the repetition of 'till' occurs function to trace the increasing affectiveness of actions. However, in the third repetition of 'till', the idea of death which Skrebensky had been aware of from lines 14-15 recurs. It is through items cohesive by simple repetition and collocation that the effects and relevance of this recurrence can be traced. Anton lies with his face 'buried', 'partly in' the sand, and 'partly in' Ursula's hair (l.21-22). The close textual proximity of this initial employment of 'buried' with 'dead', with which it is cohesive by collocation, serves to emphasise that Anton's sexual burial in Ursual, and literal burial in the sand is to be associated with the burial of the dead. The lexically parallel repetition of 'partly in' to introduce both types of burial indicates that sexual and literal burial are compared and of equal importance. Anton both is motionless and appears motionless (l.22), a repeated lexical item which is cohesive with Ursula's lying motionless on the slope under the moon and its 'Female' force (l.17).

> <u>motionless</u>, as if he would be <u>motionless</u> now for ever, <u>hidden</u> away in the dark, <u>buried</u>, only <u>buried</u>, he only wanted to be <u>buried</u> in the goodly darkness, only that, no more. (l.22-24)

Ursula's 'motionless' 'Female' moon-consummation has resulted in the destruction of any predominantly 'Male' impelling activity which Skrebensky displayed earler in their relationship, and has led to his metaphorical death.

Throughout the examples examined, and throughout the intimate interactions between men and women in *The Rainbow*, different 'repetitive' techniques function to 'enact' both the inversion of *Hardy's* 'Male' and 'Female' principles, and the complex cross-hatching which is present both within and between men and women in Lawrence's dialectic. This balance is not consistent either throughout a single relationship, or between generations, 'enacting' the developing nature within, and between, relationships as they progress both in the story and through revision. In the next chapter, Lawrence's repetition and revision in *The Rainbow* will be examined once more - this time to demonstrate both the functional effects of specific fine-grained modulations of lexical cohesion through the revision process, and to provide evidence to counteract Charles Ross' argument that Lawrence's proof revisions are self-censorship rather than creative revision.

CHAPTER 5: REPETITION AND REVISION: LEXICAL SPECIFICITY AND COHESION, CENSORSHIP OR CREATIVE REVISION?

As the preceding chapters have demonstrated, Lawrence's lexical specificity, and the cohesion and syntactic structures in which this results, have significant stylistic effects. These display similarities with the developing dialectical theories of Lawrence's essays. In this chapter, Mori's observations regarding the cohesion caused by expansion of images in the broad pattern of *The Rainbow* will be expanded.[1] It will be shown that lexical cohesion by reiteration and collocation in specific passages of the novel not only has particular stylistic effects in its immediate context, but also identifies specific issues in Lawrence's 'philosophy'. Moreover, expansion[2], contraction and development of lexical items by cohesion throughout the novel highlights specific characteristics of the relationships in each generation with reference to Lawrence's developing 'metaphysic'. Mori takes no account of textual variation through each stage of composition and revision. As this chapter will demonstrate, very subtle modulations of lexical cohesion through each stage of composition and revision have specific, and significant, effects. Through an examination of these, I will challenge Charles Ross's assertion that specific revisions to *The Rainbow* at proof stage were made under the pressure of self-censorship and pressure from Methuen,[3] and provide evidence which supports Kinkead-Weekes' speculation that in the majority of cases of supposed self-censorship, more creative forces were at work.[4] As comparative analysis will demonstrate, contrary to what Ross suggests, many of the revisions which he identifies as having been censored, or 'muted', are actually creative revisions made within a consistent pattern of thematic development, as the language and themes of *The Rainbow* develop with regard to the ideas expressed in *Hardy*.

The Rainbow proofs: Censorship or Revision?

Ross claims that cumulative changes in scenes which render human passion raise suspicions of pressure to censor or 'mute' the scenes, and that while such revisions retain a

---

[1]Mori, p.369. This is not a term which Mori uses.
[2]This is *not* that defined by Hoey (*Patterns of Lexis,* p.170), but a situation typical of *The Rainbow*, in which multiple definitions of a lexical item are employed separately, and then conjoined. The general word to which all cohesive items are referred back is resonant with *all* of these multiple definitions.
[3]Ross, *Composition*, pp.37-72.
[4] *Triumph to Exile*, p.251.

semblance of their original meaning, they lose their 'emotional force'.[5] The main passages from *The Rainbow* which he considers to have been revised under pressure of censorship, and those over which I take issue with his argument, will be reproduced and discussed separately, with the excised phrases contained within angled brackets and the replacement in square brackets. Where reference to passages discussed in Ross's argument is not made, my agreement with Kinkead-Weekes' argument against, and concurrence with Ross on various points is implicit.[6] What Ross, and Kinkead-Weekes, fail to notice, is that in each of the proof revisions with which issue will be taken, there is a consistent shift towards a new vocabulary, and this vocabulary is that of *Hardy*.

Ross claims that three cuts made to the first generation raise suspicions of textual muting, although taken separately, he claims, each cut has only a marginal claim with regard to censorship.[7] These proof cuts all occur in the episode of Tom's flirtation in Matlock, and are reproduced below, as are earlier stages of revision relevant to the argument:

> She was a handsome girl with a bosom, and dark hair, and blue eyes, a girl full of easy laughter, flushed from the sun, inclined to perspire and wipe her laughing face in a very natural and taking manner. <She was direct and forceful in her nature. It was dissatisfaction and anger that had led her to her form of life. Yet she had always seemed jolly. (TSR, E1D)]>[8]

> His heart thumped and he thought it the most glorious adventure, and was <not sure if he liked it or not (MS)> <[madly in love with the girl. By gad, she was a tanger. He admired her to extremity, he almost loved her. But he did admire her, and it *was* a success (TSR)]> [mad with desire for the girl (E1)].[9]

> She gave him an intimate smile, which made him feel <that what was between himself and her was the right sort of thing, and what was between the other man and her was not the right sort of thing. So he wanted her to come with him. But she was too fair, and she wanted her hard, brutal freedom. She would be no man's woman. She wanted her price only. He was dark with anger. (TSR)> [confused and gratified (E1)].[10]

---

[5]*Composition* , pp.42, 48.
[6]*Rainbow*, pp.lxiv-lxix.
[7]*Composition*, p.44.
[8]*Rainbow*, pp.22-23.
[9]p.24. MS to E1 revisions demonstrate increasingly unambiguous sexuality in Tom's response.
[10]p.24.

Ross claims that the proof revisions were made because the version in TSR made it too obvious that Tom had succeeded with the girl. However, in the context of Lawrence's revisions in proof, there is still little doubt of Tom's success:[11]

> But presently he had gone back to the hotel and given his horse into the charge of an ostler and gone off with the girl, into the woods, not quite knowing where he was or what he was doing. His heart thumped and he thought it the most glorious adventure, and was mad with desire for the girl.
> Afterwards he glowed with pleasure. By Jove, but that was something like! He stayed the afternoon with the girl, and wanted to stay the night.[12] She, however, told him this was impossible: her own man would be back by dark, and she must be with him. He, Brangwen, must not let on that there had been anything between them.[13]

Ross fails to notice the similarities between vocabulary included in example two, and excised in example one, with the vocabulary of *Hardy*, nor does he take account of the contexts in which these revisions occur. In the second example, the proof revision of Tom's feelings does not diminish the impression of his success with the girl, but it *does* introduce the lexical item 'desire'. In Chapter VII of *Hardy*, 'desire' is identified as a fundamental motivating characteristic in the relationship between opposite forces, identified below with italics:

> The supreme *desire* of every man is for mating with a woman, such that the sexual act be the closest, most concentrated motion in his life,

---

[11]Kinkead-Weekes (*Rainbow* pp.lxvi-lxvii) also makes this point. Kinkead-Weekes argues that the revisions from MS to TSR reveal Lawrence's uncertainty of how to handle this episode. He argues that both changes:
> ...avoid the whole question of 'love', about which the TSR is self-contradictory anyway; of any continuing relationship; and of the morality of the affair and the girl. None of these is wanted if the emphasis is to fall on a single exciting and liberating adventure, which appears to be what Lawrence finally decided.
Lawrence's revisions are also consistent with the revisions to the themes of Will and Anna's 'Absolute Beauty' interaction in Chapter 8, as will be examined in the next section.

[12]Ross's argument is further undermined by the fact that the first American edition cut the sentences 'By Jove...the night', and substituted 'That was a different experience. He wanted to see more of the girl'. Huebsch's expurgation of these sentences, which are similarly 'explicit' to the other twelve which he made, also without reference to Lawrence, suggests that the proof revisions for the English first edition of *The Rainbow* did *not* make the sexual content of the novel sufficiently ambiguous, and it is therefore unlikely that the proof revisions can be traced to solely this intention. For details of Huebsch's expurgations, see Kinkead-Weekes' explanatory notes to the Cambridge edition of *The Rainbow*, pp.24:21; 137:20; 219:26; 298:40; 314:1, 10; 316:4; 326:25; 421:4; 422:2; 428:32; 442:40; 444:6.

[13]p.24.

closest upon the axle, the prime movement of himself, of which all the rest of his motion is a continuance in the same kind. And the vital *desire* of every woman is that she shall be clasped as axle to the hub of the man, that his motion shall portray her motionlessness, convey her static being into movement, complete and radiating out into infinity, starting from her stable eternality, and reaching eternity again, after having covered the whole of time.

This is the complete movement: man upon woman, woman within man. This is the *desire*, the achieving of which, frictionless, is impossible, yet for which every man will try, with greater or lesser intensity, achieving more or less success.

This is the *desire* of every man, that his movement, the manner of his walk, and the supremest effort of his mind, shall be the pulsation outwards from stimulus received in the sex, in the sexual act, that the woman of his body shall be the begetter of his whole life, that she, in her female spirit, shall beget in him his idea, his motion, himself.[14]

If the relationship between opposite forces is flawed, 'desire' is refocused elsewhere:

Every man seeks in woman, for that which is stable, eternal. And if, under his motion, this break down in her, in the particular woman, so that she be no axle for his hub, but be driven away from herself, then he must seek elsewhere for his stability, for the centre to himself.

Then either he must seek another woman, or he must seek to make conscious his *desire* to find a symbol, to create and define in his consciousness the object of his *desire*, so that he may have it at will, for his own complete satisfaction.

In doing this latter, he seeks with his *desire* the female elsewhere than in the particular woman...man, the male, is essentially a thing of movement and time and change. Until he is stirred into thought, he is complete in movement and change. But once he thinks, he must have the Absolute, the Eternal, Infinite, unchanging.

And man is stirred into thought by dissatisfaction, or unsatisfaction, as heat is born of friction...And *desire* is the admitting of deficiency. And the embodiment of the object of *desire* reveals the original defect or the defaulture.[15]

Shortly before the revised extracts concerning Tom and the girl from Matlock which Ross considers 'censored', Tom is characterised as experiencing just such a deficiency. He has been drawn towards mating with a prostitute in the sexual act, but this sex is 'only functional, a matter of relief or sensation'.[16] As in *Hardy*, it is related to a strong desire, and

---

[14]*Hardy*, p.56.
[15]pp.57-58.
[16]p.57.

the whole extract set in the context of relationship between male and female. 'Desire', and its prompting, is italicised:

> The disillusion of his first carnal contact with woman, strengthened by his *innate desire to find in a woman the embodiment of all his [inarticulate, powerful,*(TSRI, Om. MS)] *religious impulses*, put a bit in his mouth. He had something to lose which he was afraid of losing, which he was not sure even of possessing. This first affair did not matter much: but the business of love was, at the bottom of his soul, the most serious <of all. (MS)> [and terrifying of all to him. (TSRI)][17]

This passage is little changed in revision. However, one significant amendment which is made is the insertion of 'inarticulate, powerful' (l.3) in TSR to describe Tom's impulses. These inserted adjectives identify Tom with the 'Female' principle of *Hardy*, developing the complex 'quasi-gender attribution' of the principles of *Hardy* identifiable from the MS stage of *The Rainbow*, and discussed in Chapter 4. Lawrence's continuing revision of *The Rainbow* from MS through TS and TSR, and the differences between TSR and E1, demonstrates continuing inclusion and development of the ideas in *Hardy*. When the similarity between Tom's situation in the passage which Ross identifies as 'censored' and that of opposing principles in *Hardy* is considered, plus the employment of 'desire', a lexical item employed in *Hardy* to describe precisely Tom's situation, then it seems certain that Lawrence's revisions to this passage concerning Tom and the girl from Matlock display not censorship, but a continuing creative process begun in the MS. This argument is supported by the *lack* of muting of Tom's success in the context of the passage which Ross discusses, and the subsequent excisions by Huebsch.

Lawrence's excision of vocabulary typical of *Hardy* in the first example is also due more to revision than to 'censorship'. The revised passage is reproduced again below:

> She was a handsome girl with a bosom, and dark hair, and blue eyes, a girl full of easy laughter, flushed from the sun, inclined to perspire and wipe her laughing face in a very natural and taking manner. <She was direct and forceful in her nature. It was dissatisfaction and anger that had led her to her form of life. Yet she had always seemed jolly. (TSR, E1D)>[18]

---

[17]*Rainbow*, p.21.
[18]pp.22-23.

The girl's 'dissatisfaction', removed in proof revisions, recalls the 'dissatisfaction' described in *Hardy* which stirs man into thought, and which prompted Tom's early sexual experiences. In the passage immediately preceding the problematic revision, the girl's dissatisfaction has been inserted in TSR. This insertion replaces the girl's 'throwing over' of her lover, which is also replaced at TSR stage in line 3:

> The Miss who made up to Tom Brangwen, then twenty four years old, was a handsome, <carry all before her (MS)> [reckless (MSR)] girl <just wanting to throw over (MS)> [neglected for an afternoon by (TSR)] the man who had brought her out. She saw Brangwen, and liked him, as all women did, for his warmth and his generous nature, and for <a certain 5 sense of delicacy innate (MS)> [the innate delicacy (TSR)] in him. But she saw he was one who would have to be <led. (MS)> [brought to the scratch. (MSR)] However, she was <throwing over a bully who <neglected (MS)> [outmatched (MSR)] her, (MS)> [so she dared to take on this one. (MS)> [roused and unsatisfied and made mischievous, so she 10 dared anything. (TSR)] It would be an easy interlude, restoring her pride. (MSRI)][19]

The result of these revisions is to shift the motivation for the girl's encounter with Tom from revenge to dissatisfaction which prompts her to seek for new connection with Tom, thus creating increasing inclusion of the ideas and vocabulary of *Hardy*. The sentences excised in the problematic proof revision are therefore not necessary; the girl's directness and dissatifaction are included in TSR to the passage which precedes it, in which the increased influence of *Hardy* can also be traced. It seems that the 'censored' portion is merely deleted as an extraneous repetition, the same ideas having been expressed earlier, and better, in the revised preceding paragraph.

The revision to the third extract which Ross finds problematic can also be traced to further changes made contemporary with it. The revised passage is reproduced below:

> She gave him an intimate smile, which made him feel <that what was between himself and her was the right sort of thing, and what was between the other man and her was not the right sort of thing. So he wanted her to come with him. But she was too fair, and she wanted her hard, brutal freedom. She would be no man's woman. She wanted her 5 price only. He was dark with anger. (TSR)> [confused and gratified (E1)].[20]

---

[19]p.22.
[20]p.24.

Ross argues that the girl's pride in the cut sentences is both plausible and consistent with her dissatisfaction and anger in the earlier revision, and also 'rings true' for the unworldly Tom.[21] However, as was demonstrated in the examination of the preceding passage which Ross considers censored, the excision of the girl's dissatisfaction and anger can be traced to more complex reasons than censorship alone. Consistency with the excised passage is therefore not a sufficient criterion for claiming that this passage is also censored. Lawrence's revision replaces the simple contrast between Tom's perception of the girl's relationship with him and with her lover, and the girl's pride, with a description of Tom's own reactions. Michael Bell argues that throughout *The Rainbow*, there is continual affirmation of opposing or contrasting truths in characters' experiences, each of which the narrative affirms separately without seeking 'to relate, or to qualify them, as part of some larger understanding', and the sense swings from one pole to the other.[22] The insertion of Tom's confusion and gratification in proof revision would seem to belong to just such a pattern. The likelihood of this being the reason for revision is confirmed in a passage briefly preceding the problematic passage, where exactly the same inclusion of contrasting experiences is included from MS, emphasised in TSR:

> Brangwen was <on tiptoe. (MS)> [in a state of wonder. (TSR)] He treated her with his chaffing deference, <warm with delight (MS)> [roused, (E1)] but very unsure of himself, afraid to death of being <clumsy or ugly (MS)> <[backward, or too forward (MSR)]> [too forward, ashamed lest he might be thought backward, (TSR)] mad with desire yet restrained by instinctive <high (MS, TSRD)> regard for women <altogether (MS, TSRD)> from making any definite approach, [feeling all the while that his attitude was ridiculous, (MSRI)] <that of a ninny (MS)> [and flushing deep with confusion. (TSR)] [She, (MSRI)] however, <sunned herself with him, and let him go on, giving him a little help. (MS)> [became hard and daring as he became confused, it amused her to see him come on. (TSR)][23]

In the third generation, the passage which Ross identifies as 'censored' in the attraction between Ursula and Anthony Schofield also demonstrates revisions to terms which occur in

---

[21] *Composition*, p.44.
[22] Bell, p.63.
[23] *Rainbow*, p.23.

Hardy. In one of the extracts which Ross identifies, the lexical item 'desire', which has been demonstrated as having been creatively revised in proof, is replaced with 'sensation':

> Her heart flamed with <desire for (MS)> [sensation of (E1)] him, [<for> [of (E1)] the fascinating thing he offered her, (Om. MS, TSRI)] and with sorrow, and with an inconsolable sense of loneliness.[24]

Ross observes[25] that when revising the final MS, Lawrence strengthened the sexual attractiveness of Anthony. He finds it odd therefore that Lawrence would have abridged Ursula's desire for him. However, the amendments made at this stage to Lawrence's text reveal not merely an *increase* in Ursula's desire, but a complete shift in the portrayal of Anthony:

> And she, <as (MS)> [while (MSR)] she talked, saw the golden-brown eyes of Anthony <dance (MS)> [gleam like the eyes of a faun (MSR)] as they watched her. <It was like wine to her (MS)> [He did not listen to her words, he listened to her. It excited her. (MSR)]
>
> He was <so pleased (MS)> [like a satyr, pleased (MSR)] when she **5** would go with him over his hot-houses...Yet she was really interested in what he did. [And he had the curious light in his face, like the light in the eyes of the goat that was tethered by the farm-yard gate. (MSRI)]
>
> She went down with him into the warmish cellar, where already, in the darkness, the little yellow knobs of rhubarb were coming. He held the **10** lantern down to the dark earth. She saw the shiny knob-end of the rhubarb thrusting upwards <. His (MS)>[, upon the thick, red stem, thrusting itself like <flame (MS)> a knob of flame through the soft soil. His (MSR)] face was turned up to her, the light glittered on his eyes and his teeth as he laughed [with a faint, musical neigh. (MSRI)] He looked <so (MS)> **15** handsome. And she <shrank back, afraid. She was not easy till she was out in the daylight again. And then even she could not rid her voice of a little subjected note, nor he his eyes of a little, dancing glitter like triumph (MS)> [heard a new sound in her ears, the faintly musical, neighing laugh of Anthony, whose moustache twisted up and whose eyes were <bright **20** (MS)> luminous with a cold, steady, arrogant-laughing glare.   There seemed a little prance of triumph in his movement, she could not rid herself of a movement of subjection, a touch of the slave. Yet he was so humble, his voice was so caressing. He held his hand for her to step on when she must climb a wall. And she stepped on the living firmness of **25** him, that quivered fiercely under her weight (MSR)].
>
> <She was too much aware of him, of his easy motion as he entered the house, and of the   inevitability of his turning his face to her. Unconsciously, he made himself handsome or debonair for her. He had

---

[24]p.386.
[25]*Composition*, p.54.

the sense to remain in old, easy clothes, like the gardener he was. When 30
she saw him with his brown face choked above a collar of a Sunday, she
did not love him any more (MS)> [She was aware of him as if in a
mesmeric state. In her ordinary sense, she had nothing to do with him.
But the peculiar ease and unnoticeableness of his entering the house, the
power of his cold, gleaming light on her when he looked at her, was like a 35
bewitchment. In his eyes, as in the pale grey eyes of a goat, there seemed
some of that steady, hard fire of moonlight which has nothing to do with
the day. It made her alert, and yet her mind went out like an extinguished
thing. She was all senses, all her senses were alive.

Then she saw him on Sunday, dressed up in Sunday clothes, trying 40
to impress her. And he looked ridiculous. She clung to the ridiculous
effect of his stiff Sunday clothes (MSR)].[26]

Lawrence's amendments introduce an animal aspect, specifically that of faun, satyr, or

goat, to the portrayal of Anthony (l.2, 5, 8, 15, 20, 36). This introduced description is

cohesive by collocation in its immediate context. It is also cohesive by collocation through

hyponymy with the superordinate 'animal' strangeness employed throughout the novel, of

which the 'animal' descriptions of Will Brangwen from the MS stage onwards are also

hyponymic. The instances of lexical cohesion in the immediate context of the passage are as

follows. The repetition of the lexical item 'goat' in lines 8 and 36, both of which are inserted

in MSR is an instance of simple repetition.[27] In each case, the lexical item is employed in

similes which equate Anthony's appearance with the light in the eyes of a goat. In the first

instance, it is his face which shines, in the second, his eyes. More importantly, despite the

similarities in the contexts of employment, the referential relation between the reiteration of

'goat' is either 'unrelated' or 'inclusive',[28] depending on whether 'a goat' refers to 'another

goat', or (more likely) goats generally. In its first employment, it refers specifically to 'the

goat that was tethered by the farm-yard gate'; in the second, non-specifically to 'a goat'.

Cohesion also occurs by synonymy between 'faun' (l.2) and 'satyr' (l.5). Again, both are

similes describing Anthony, and both are inserted in MSR. The insertion of 'faun' in revision,

which describes Anthony's eyes, is also cohesive in context with the contexts in which 'goats'

is repeated. In the case of 'faun', Anthony's eyes are 'faunlike'. In the first employment of

'goats' (l.8), the light in his face is like that in the eyes of the farm goat, in the second (l.36),

his eyes have the same light as any (or an) unspecified goat. Cohesive by collocation with

these reiterated lexical items (which themselves belong to a broader pattern of lexical

[26]*Rainbow*, pp.383-384.
[27]Hoey, *Patterns of Lexis*, pp.52-55.
[28]Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, p.288.

cohesion), are 'neigh' (l.15), 'neighing' (l.20), and 'prance' (l.22). Of these, 'neigh' and 'neighing' are cohesive with each other by reiteration, and also occur in contexts in which other lexical items are repeated:

> ...he laughed with a faint, music neigh. (l.15)
> ...the faintly musical, neighing laugh of Anthony...(l.20)

'Prance' (l.22) is also cohesive by near-synonymy with 'dancing' (l.18), which, again, describes the light in Anthony's eyes. In addition, Anthony is portrayed in revision as a 'Pan' figure in an Edenic setting, described in the essay 'Pan in America'[29] as the Oneness of all things, beyond speech, destroyed by the coming between man and all things of the idea and the engine. In Lawrence's revisions, Ursula identifies Anthony with pure sensuality, like the Italian portrayal of Ibsen in the developing *Twilight in Italy*.[30] Her awareness of Anthony, in revision, displays an increasing emphasis on sensuality, despite the excision of 'desire'. She steps 'on the living firmness of him, that quivered fiercely under her weight' (l.25-26) where previously she 'shrank back, afraid' (l.16). In addition, the distinction between his ordinary self, in which he made himself merely physically attractive ('handsome and debonair' (l.29)) in daytime terms for her, and its replacement in revision with Ursula's sensual appreciation of Anthony which has nothing to do with the day but is hypnotic and sensual and suggests an increase in Ursula's desire for him from the earlier stage of composition:

> She was aware of him as if in a mesmeric state. In her ordinary sense, she had nothing to do with him. But the peculiar ease and unnoticeableness of his entering the house, the power of his cold, gleaming light on her when he looked at her, was like a bewitchment. In his eyes, as in the pale grey eyes of a goat, there seemed some of that steady, hard fire of moonlight which has nothing to do with the day. It made her alert, and yet her mind went out like an extinguished thing. She was all senses, all her senses were alive. (l.32-39)

---

[29] D.H. Lawrence, 'Pan in America', in *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*, edited by Edward D. McDonald (Great Britain and U.S.A., 1936), pp.22-31.
[30] In addition, Anthony is described as a *chained* goat, perhaps suggesting the insulation from life caused by the increasing divide between man and life.

Ursula's realisation that this is too reductive a framework for her is also introduced in MSR, where emphasis on their mismatched, or differing sensuality is inserted, again emphasising the role(s) played by 'sensuality' in their relationship:[31]

> <Here she was being accused of doing something base, when she had only been herself. They wanted her to be nice, and then when she was just her ordinary, but nice self, it was as if she did horrid things. (MS)> [She did love Anthony, though. All her life the thought of Anthony stirred in her a strong, impersonal passion, made her feel strong. But she was a traveller, she was a traveller on the face of the earth, and he was <only (MSRD)> an aimless creature living in the fulfilment of his own sensuous life. (MSR)]
> [She could not help it, that she was a traveller. She loved Anthony, that he was not one. But oh, ultimately and finally, she must go on and on, seeking the goal that she knew she did draw nearer to (MSRI)].[32]

As Kinkead-Weekes recognises,[33] Ursula's realisation of the distance between herself as a new Brangwen woman and the Brangwen men of the Beginning, and the relationship between self-consciousness and separation from the natural world is measured in her realisation of Anthony's limitations. This realisation is introduced in MSR:

> <Ella[34] looked round, turning away. She saw the east flushed strangely rose, the moon coming lemon yellow (MS)> and [Her soul was an infant crying in the night. He had no soul. Oh, and why had she? He was the nobler. She turned away, she turned round from him, and saw the east flushed strangely rose, the moon coming yellow (MSR)] and lovely upon a rosy sky, above the darkening, bluish snow. All this so beautiful, all this so lovely! [He did not see it. He was one with it. But she saw it, and was one with it. Her seeing separated them infinitely. (MSRI)][35]

As will be demonstrated in this chapter, the employment of vocabulary lexically cohesive with the lexical item 'sensual' generally identifies a movement *beyond* in relationship. However, Ursula has realised that Anthony cannot offer her this. The increasing sexualisation of Anthony in MSR which Ross identifies is accompanied by an increasing

---

[31]MSR is the stage at which major thematic amendments relevant to the discussion are made to this passage. Amendments in TSR and E1 do not affect the overall thrust of earlier revisions, although E1 removes the impersonal and strengthening passion inspired in Ursula by Anthony.

[32]*Rainbow*, p.387.

[33]p.529.

[34]Ella is the name of Ursula's character until the fourth stage of composition (MS).

[35]*Rainbow*, p386.

picture of his limitations and one-sidedness, and his unsuitablity for Ursula which she realises through this. Ross's claims that 'sensation', the lexical item with which 'desire' is replaced, does not seem the correct word for the instinctive, yearning sensuality meant by the context, fails to recognise the thematic *function* of Lawrence's revision, concentrating merely on the sexual.

Ross observes that the inserted 'sensation' is employed directly below another employment of it which Lawrence cites in a completely different sense, to describe an outwardly induced response.[36] The passage in which this occurs is, again, an interaction between Ursula and Anthony. It follows Ursula's walk in the ice with Maggie (Anthony's instinctive enemy), and her climbing the icy tree, a recurring image which, as Kinkead-Weekes recognises, indicates the genesis of selfhood.[37] The repetition identified by Ross is marked in the following extract by italics, and both this repetition and a further one not noted by Ross are identified by underlining:

> She blenched with fear and with the intense <u>sensation</u> of proffered licence <took hold of (MS)> [suggested to (MSR)] her (MSR)].
> They had come to the gate. <He laughed rather shakily. (MS)>
> <"Perhaps it is not so easy to find a nice wife," he said, reaching out for the bar of the gate. (MS)> ["How?" she asked. "You aren't **5** alone here." (MSR)]
> <And she realised, with something like horror, that in his way, he was proposing to her. She stood still. He had not opened the gate.
> "Why," she stammered, "I should have thought - it would be ever so easy. - There are so <u>many</u> (Lawrence's underlining) nice girls," she **10** hastened to add. (MS)> "<[As my wife (MSR)]> [We could marry," he answered, in the strange, coldly-<passionate (MS)> [gleaming (MSR)], insinuating tone that melted[38] <the bones like (MS)> [the sunshine into (MSR)] moonlight. All substantial things seemed <unreal (MS)> [transformed (MSR)]. Shadows and dancing moonlight <seemed (MS)> **15** [were (MSR)] real, and all cold, inhuman, <illeg. (MS)> [gleaming (MSR)] *sensations*. She realised with something like horror[39] that she was going to accept this. She was going inevitably to accept [him (MSRI)]. His hand was reaching out to the gate before them. She stood still. His flesh was brown and hard and final.[40] (MSR)][41] **20**

---

[36]*Composition*, p.54.
[37]*Rainbow*, p.385.
[38]'chilled' (E1).
[39]'terror' (E1).
[40]'hard and brown' (TS).
[41]*Rainbow*, pp.385-386.

Ross's observation that the inserted lexical item 'sensation' is employed directly below a revision which Lawrence cites in a completely different sense misses an important thematic link between these two usages. Ursula no longer feels 'desire' for Anthony because he reveals to her no deficiency in herself. Instead, she feels 'sensation' at what he offers her, in both the revision which Ross cites as muting, in her experience of the shadows and moonlight which Ross notes, and in the 'sensation' which she experiences in the licence offered to her, which Ross does not note. There is no difference in what these employments of 'sensation' imply; Ursula is being tempted to deny her own consummation, to forget her goal, a sin which Lawrence is to explore in Chapter 3 of *The Crown*, 'The Flux of Corruption'. Her fear, prompted by the sight of the flaming stem of the rhubarb, like the poppy in Chapter I of *Hardy*, is of the leap necessary to her own attainment of fulfilment. What Anthony offers her in the revised passage is not potential fulfilment through desire, but the 'sensation' which Lawrence identifies in *The Crown* as the condition of friction between enclosed egos, or of reductive activity of a single ego. Both result in the death drive.

In his account of the revisions made to the second generation in *The Rainbow*,[42] Ross notes that Lawrence's revisions to the episode between Will and Jennie in TS and in proof demonstrate a consistent inclusion of the 'Absolute' in his vocabulary, and impersonality in theme, as Lawrence seeks to integrate the new qualities of 'Absolute Beauty' into the interactions between Will and the girl. This episode is not present either in *The Wedding Ring* or in the MS of *The Rainbow*, and identifies Will as absolved from the moral world. Instead of Will's increasing feeling that he is 'at last...doing something in the world, for the world' in setting up woodwork classes, as occurs in MS, the new episode with Jennie presents Will as separate from, and absolved from the moral ties of his position as husband and citizen:

> A gleam lit up in him: should he begin with her? Should he begin with her to live the other, the unadmitted life of his desire? Why not? He had always been so good. Save for his wife, he was virgin. And why, when all women were different? Why, when he would only live once? He wanted the other life. His own life was barren, not enough. He wanted the other...He felt strong and unshakeable in himself, set over against all the world. His soul was keen and watchful, glittering with a kind of amusement. He was perfectly self-contained. He was himself, the absolute, the rest of the world was the object that should contribute to his being.[43]

---

[42]*Revisions*, pp.284-286.
[43]*Rainbow*, p.211.

As Ross demonstrates, in revision, Lawrence emphasises Will's impersonal gratification repeatedly:

> He was looking at her <. He liked her eyebrows, and her shining, shallow eyes, and her mouth that would open. He liked her mouth, that would open to him. She was goodly to his eye. And he knew she liked his face. (TS)> [all the time, perceiving her, appreciating her, finding her out, gratifying himself with her. He could see real beauties in her; her 5 eyebrows, with their particular curve, gave him profound sensual pleasure. Later on he would see her bright, pellucid eyes, like shallow water, and enjoy those. And there remained the opened, exposed mouth, red and vulnerable. Out of that he would get his chief pleasure. And all the while his eyes were on the girl, feeling and handling with sensual 10 pleasure her several features. About the girl herself, who or what she was, he cared nothing, he was quite callous. But the features in which he felt an impersonal beauty he relished thoroughly. He wanted to come closer (TSR)].

In TS, Will's appreciation of the girl is purely physical, relying on *visual* appreciation; 'He liked her eyebrows and her mouth...goodly to his eye...she liked his face' (l.1-4). In TSR, the impersonality of their interaction is expressed explicitly in the propositional content of the passage ('About the girl herself, who or what she was, he cared nothing, he was quite callous' (l.11-12)), and in his increasingly impersonal attitude to visual appreciation ('...the features in which he felt an impersonal beauty he relished thoroughly' (l.12-13)). This visual appreciation is sensualised also; 'He could see real beauties in her, her eyebrows, with their particular curve, gave him profound sensual pleasure' (l.5-7), 'And all the while his eyes were on the girl, feeling and handling with sensual pleasure her several features' (l.9-11). In addition, the increasing affectiveness of verbs employed to describe Will's appreciation of Jennie all suggest the impersonality and non-interactive nature of this relationship, in the apparently prolix phrase 'perceiving her, appreciating her, finding her out, gratifying himself' (l.4-5). Ross's argument that the amendments in proof to this passage is due to pressure of censorship is unconvincing. He claims that the effect of revision is to 'blunt the immediacy of Will's sensuality' by a 'process of euphemism,' a process which does not appear consistent with 'Lawrence's intention to describe excessive, because frustrated, sensuality'.[44] If this were the case, such pressure *could* explain why the vocabulary of sensuality so thoroughly

---

[44]*Composition*, pp.47, 48.

introduced in the revisions to the typescript is excised. Yet Lawrence's revision process is more complex than this, as will be demonstrated. The amendments in proof are as follows:

> He could see <real beauties (TSR)> [distinct attractions (E1)] in her; in her eyebrows, with their particular curve, gave him <profound sensual (TSR)> [keen aesthetic (E1)] pleasure. Later on he would see her bright, pellucid eyes, like shallow water, and <enjoy (TSR)> [know (E1)] those. And there remained the opened, exposed mouth, red and 5 vulnerable. <Out of that he would get his chief pleasure (TSR)> [That he reserved as yet (E1)]. And all the while his eyes were on the girl, <feeling and handling with sensual pleasure her several features (TSR)> [estimating and handling with pleasure her young softness (E1)]. About the girl herself, who or what she was, he cared nothing, he was quite 10 <callous. But the features in which he felt an impersonal beauty he relished thoroughly. He wanted to come closer (TSR)> [unaware that she was anybody. She was just the sensual object of his attention (E1)].[45]

Lawrence's replacement of sensual with aesthetic appreciation in lines 2-3, removed from the context of Lawrence's other revisions, is one of the two indications of possible 'muting'. The other is the replacement of 'feeling and handling with sensual pleasure her several features' with 'estimating and handling with pleasure her young softness' (1.8-9). In the first case, the replacement of 'profound sensual' with 'keen aesthetic' could be considered a further development of the impersonal aspects of the interaction emphasised in TSR. This *non*-censorship reason for revision is further made credible when the other proof revisions are considered. The second possible instance of 'muting' cannot, when examined, be considered a 'muting' at all. The replacement of 'feeling' with 'estimating' confirms the continuing move from TSR onwards towards increasing impersonality. In addition, the excision of 'sensual' is counterbalanced by the increasing sexualisation of 'her young softness' which replaces 'her several features'. To further refute Ross's argument, Lawrence's replacement of 'enjoy' with 'know' (1.4), with the possibility of the latter being interpreted in the Biblical, sexual sense, allows the two lexical items to be near-synonymous. Also, the replacement of Will's relishing of Jennie's 'impersonal beauty' with 'She was just the sensual object of his attention' (1.11, 13) *introduces* a sensual element to the impersonal relationship, and thus could not be considered a 'muting' at all. Significantly, Ross also observes that Lawrence revised the proofs to stress that the exorbitant and sinful revels through which Will and Anna experience 'Absolute Beauty' are a passion of death, and that any question of them not being aware of

---

[45]*Rainbow*, pp.212-213.

the shameful nature of their desires has been removed.[46] Ross's awareness of the revisions to this passage is odd, because revisions to the proofs demonstrate a double movement of revision which refutes his analysis of the revisions in proof to the Jennie / Will episode. The 'sensual' vocabulary of the passage describing Will and Anna's attainment of 'Absolute Beauty' *is* amended in revision, but not by a process of muting. In the description of Will, the adjective 'sensual' is present in the first English edition, but not in the revisions to typescript, suggesting that it was inserted in proof:

> He was the [sensual (E1)] male seeking his pleasure, she was the female ready to take hers: but in her own way.[47]

Similarly, in the following extracts, the vocabulary of sensuality is retained in E1, although the introduction of the simple repetition of 'death' shifts its emphasis:

> This was what their love had become, <and this was what it remained: a sensual voluptuousness (TS)> [a sensuality violent and extreme as death (E1)]. They had no conscious intimacy, no tenderness of love. It was all the lust and the infinite, maddening intoxication of the <flesh (TS)> [senses, a passion of death (E1)].[48]

> But now he had given way, and with infinite sensual <delight (TS)> [violence (E1)] gave himself to the realisation of this supreme, immoral, Absolute Beauty.[49]

In some cases, the employment of the vocabulary which Ross argues it was necessary to mute in the interaction between Will and Jennie is left virtually unchanged in E1 in the 'Absolute Beauty' interaction. Much of this vocabulary is emphasised in TSR. It is identified here by italics:

> [He had an inkling of the vastness of the unknown *sensual* store of delights she was (TSRI)]...He was quite <strange to (TS)> [ousted from (TSR)] himself, and *sensually* transported by <the beauties he unfolded in her (TS)> [that which he discovered in her (E1)]. [He was another man revelling over her. (TSRI)] There was no tenderness, no love between them [any more (TSRI)], only the maddening, <*sensual* discoveries (TS)> [*sensuous* lust for discovery (TSR)] and the insatiable <*lust* for more, the

---

[46]*Composition*, p.51.
[47]*Rainbow*, p.218.
[48]p.220.
[49]p.220.

> *desire,* the *desire.* (TS)> [, exorbitant gratification in the *sensual* beauties
> of her body. (TSR)]...He lived in a passion of <*sensuality* (TS)> *sensual*
> <[gratification (TSR)]> [discovery (E1)] with her for some time - <pure
> *sensuality* (TS)> [it was a duel (E1)]...[50]

Only the final employment of 'sensuality' is removed, and in the light of the other revisions, 'muting' cannot be put forward as a credible reason for this. Lawrence's motivation for revising the 'sensual' vocabulary in the Will / Jennie scene is therefore unlikely to be as straightforward as Ross claims, as there is no muting, and in some cases definite enhancement of such vocabulary in the 'Absolute Beauty' interaction of Will and Anna. However, the passage does include the enhancement of two other cohesive chains in revision from revised typescript to E1. In the small number of instances in which the 'sensual' vocabulary *is* excised in this interaction, it is replaced with an emphasis on search and *discovery* in their interactions, identified below by italics:

> He lived in a passion of sensual <gratification (TSR)>
> [*discovery* (E1)] with her for some time - <pure sensuality (TS)> [it was a
> duel (E1)]: no love, no words, no kisses even, only the maddening <sense
> (TS)> [perception (TSR)] of beauty <perceived (TS)> [consummate,
> absolute (TSR)] through touch.[51]   ϛ

> <Down went the moral fortress, the good knight was a free lance
> flying the banner of his own sensual desires, the good maiden was out in
> the wilderness enjoying herself (TSR)> [They abandoned in one motion the
> moral position, each was *seeking* gratification pure and simple (E1)].[52]

In the first example, hedonistic sensual pleasure ('gratification' (l.1)) is replaced with 'discovery' (l.2), and the excised 'pure sensuality' (l.2), which similarly suggests pre-revision hedonistic gratification, is replaced with the idea of combat and conflict in relationship, an idea at this time developing in Lawrence's 'metaphysic', as already discussed[53]. In the second example, the effects of the revision are slightly different. The syntactic and lexical parallelism employed to 'enact' the conflict between Will and Anna is removed. It is replaced with their abandoning of any moral position, and hedonistic searching (part of the 'search' and 'discovery' cohesive chain) for individual gratification. In this case, despite the excision of

---

[50]p.218-219.
[51]p.219.
[52]p.218.
[53]See Chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis.

lexical items cohesive with 'sensual', the sensual aspect of the passage is not diminished in revision; indeed, the new emphasis on abandonment of moral position coupled with hedonistic seeking of gratification seems rather to emphasise the sensual in their interaction. The theme of discovery is not introduced in E1, but it is emphasised in the proof revisions. In addition, Will's appearance as a self-satisfying stranger is what makes him again attractive to Anna. This theme is emphasised in E1 by the inclusion of both Will and Anna in lack of adherence to the moral world, and in the excision of Anna's *interest* in Will as a stranger, the latter resulting in increased impersonality of interaction. Again, sensual gratification is emphasised in revision:

> He was the [sensual (E1)] male seeking his <satisfaction (TS)> [pleasure (E1)], she was the female ready to take hers: but in her own way. [A man could turn into a free lance: so then could a woman. <Goodbye moral responsibilities (E1D)> (TSRI)] [She adhered as little as he to the moral world (E1)]. All that had gone before was <as nothing (TS)> <[a 5 feather (TSR)]> [nothing (E1)] to her. She was another woman, under the instance of a strange man. He was a stranger to her, seeking his own ends. Very <good. She was far more interested in <illeg. (TS)> [him as a (TSR)] self-seeking stranger than in the aforetime good, responsible husband (TS)> [good (E1)]. She wanted to see what this stranger would 10 do [now (TSRI)], what he was.[54]

Will's lack of adherence to the moral world accords with his experience with Jennie. In the interaction between Will and Jennie which Ross claims is 'muted' by censorship pressures, as 'sensual' vocabulary is removed, impersonality, a theme developed to a small extent in the proof revisions to the Will / Anna episode, is increased. It is this impersonality in the Will / Jennie interaction which enables Will to come back to his wife as a 'stranger', and discover her in the 'Absolute Beauty' interaction. Thus the enhancement or inclusion of the 'discovery' cohesive chain and the impersonality theme in the 'Absolute Beauty' and Will and Jennie interactions respectively in the later stages of revision combine to create thematic coherence. Increasingly, as was demonstrated previously, Jennie is reduced to an object for Will's appreciation and gratification. However, whereas the theme of discovery in the Will / Anna episode is developed during revision, that between Will and Jennie is reduced, and Will's predatory nature, necessary for him to have the ability to lead Anna to 'Absolute Beauty', is emphasised:

---

[54]*Rainbow*, p.218.

Her open mouth, showing the small, irregular, white teeth, appealed to him. It was [open and (TSRI)] ready. [It was so vulnerable. (E1I)] Why should he not <take his pleasure of it (TS)> [go in and enjoy what was there? (TSR)] The slim arm that went down so still and motionless to the lap, it was pretty. She would be small, he would be able almost to 5 hold her in his two hands. She would be small, almost like a child, and pretty. <There would be pretty little places in his body, that he wanted to <enjoy (TS)> [discover (TSR)]. He wanted to <see (TS)> [know (TSR)] them and <know (TS)> [enjoy (TSR)] them. He wanted to <enjoy (TS)> [have his fill of (TSR)] them (TS)> [Her childishness whetted him keenly. 10 She would be helpless between his hands (E1I)].[55]

Lawrence's revisions to the Will / Jennie episode in proof do not, therefore, appear to be the 'mutings' which Ross suggests. Instead, the vocabulary excised demonstrates considerable similarity to that retained in the Will / Anna 'Absolute Beauty' interaction, and thematic revisions suggest, increasingly, that the 'little creature in Nottingham had but been leading up to' Will's 'Absolute Beauty' relation with his wife.[56]

Lexical Specificity and Cohesion, and their Stylistic effects in *The Rainbow:*

Lawrence's composition and revision processes have specific stylistic effects both in the immediate context of their employment and in the broader thematic patterns of the novel.

---

[55]p.211.

[56]p.218. In addition, Lawrence's other forms of revision, cited by Ross, provide interesting evidence for Michael Bell's claim (Bell, p.63) that *The Rainbow* demonstrates unresolved swinging from pole to pole. The example from Ross which will serve as evidence of this being developed in revision is as follows:

> She gave him an intimate smile, which made him feel <that nothing but himself and his own special quality of manliness would have won from her that interlude between her own proper affair. What was between him and her was *the* thing, the real thing, let her other man be what he might. (MS)> <[that what was between himself and her was the right sort of thing, and what was between the other man and her was not the right sort of thing. So he wanted her to come with him. But she was too fair, and she wanted her hard, brutal freedom. She would be no man's woman. She wanted her price only. He was dark with anger (TSR)]>. [confused and gratified (E1)]. (*Composition*, pp.43-44, *Rainbow*, p.24)

Bell does not examine textual variants, but the revisions to this passage which suggest that this passage is revised to *include* what Bell discovers, and the lack of revision to the following passage describing Skrebensky's reaction to Ursula, suggest both that Kinkead-Weekes is correct in arguing that *The Rainbow* was written chronologically backwards, and that Bell's analysis hits upon an idea discovered late in composition and reapplied to the earlier relationships:

> Again the confusion came over him, as if he were losing himself and becoming all vague, undefined, inchoate. Yet he wanted to be hard, manly, horsey. And he followed her. (pp.286-287)

The stages of composition to which I will be referring in this section are as follows: MS, the autograph manuscript (and fourth version) of *The Rainbow*, composed November 1914 to March 1915; the revised typescript of *The Rainbow*, March to August 1915; and E1, the first English edition of *The Rainbow* published 30th September 1915. The apparently prolix passage chosen from *The Rainbow* to begin the analysis is reproduced below. As consistent with the thematic issues examined in the preceding section, the lexical item 'strange' (l.1) and lexical items cohesive with it by collocation and reiteration are the focus of analysis. Tom and Lydia Brangwen are the characters being described:

> She was strange, from far off, yet so intimate. She was from far
> away, a presence, so close to his soul. She was not really there, sitting in
> Cossethay church beside her little girl. She was not living the apparent life
> of her days. She belonged to somewhere else. He felt it poignantly, as
> something real and natural. But a pang of fear for his own concrete life, *5*
> that was only Cossethay, hurt him, and gave him misgiving.[57]

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines the adjective 'strange' as follows:

1.a Of persons, language, customs etc.: Of or belonging to another country; foreign, alien (*Obs.*),

1.b Of a country or other geographical feature: Situated outside one's own land (*Obs.*),

2 Belonging to some other place or neighbourhood; unknown to the particular locality specified or implied. Of a place or locality: Other than one's own,

3 Belonging to others; not of one's own kin or family (*Obs.*),

4 *strange woman*: a harlot with *the*, as denoting the class),

5 Added or introduced from outside, not belonging to the place or person where it is found, adventitious, external,

6 With *from*: Alien, far removed; diverse, different (*Obs.*),

7 Unknown, unfamiliar; not known, met with, or experienced before. Const. *to*,

8 Of a kind that is unfamiliar or rare; unusual, uncommon, exceptional, singular, out of the way (*Obs.*) (merged in **10**),

9 Exceptionally great (in degree, intensity, amount, etc.), extreme (now tending to merge in **10**)

10 Unfamiliar, abnormal, or exceptional to a degree that excites wonder or astonishment; difficult to take in or account for; queer, surprising, unaccountable,

11 Of persons: **a** Unfriendly; having the feelings alienated. **b** Distant or cold in demeanour; reserved; not affable, familiar, or

---

[57] p.32.

encouraging; uncomplying, unwilling to accede to a request or desire (*Obs.*), **c** Sparing *of* one's favour (*Obs.*),

    12 Of a person: Unfamiliar or unacquainted with something (specified or implied); inexperienced or unversed *in*; fresh or unaccustomed *to*; unpractised or unskilled *at*.[58]

The definitions therefore include 'strange' as *foreign* (**1a, 2, 5, 6**), as *location of origin* (**1b, 2, 5**), as *kinship or familiarity* (**3, 7, 12**), as *peculiarity* (**6, 8, 9, 10**), and as *unfriendly* (**11a, 11b, 11c**). In addition, there is a connotation with harlotry (**4**). In the context of the extract under examination, the occurrence of the adjective 'strange' in the extract from *The Rainbow* (l.1) is followed by the apparently prolix phrases 'from far off' and 'yet so intimate' (l.1). Syntactically, these add nothing essential to the sentence. However, each phrase has significant stylistic effects. The phrase 'from far off' implies identification with the 'foreignness' connotations of 'strange', as defined by the *OED* (**1a, 2, 5, 6**), particularly when considered with reference to Lydia's Polish ancestry, and to the description of her as 'the stranger' two sentences previously:

        In the tiny place, with its mere dozen pews, he sat not far from the stranger.[59]

'From far off' (l.1) is therefore semantically cohesive with the phrases 'from far away' (l.1-2) and 'belonged to somewhere else' (l.4). However, in lines 2-4 of the extract under analysis, the description of Lydia's actual *geographical* foreignness is developed to suggest that it has further resonance:

        She was not really there, sitting in Cossethay church beside her little girl. She was not living the apparent life of her days. She belonged to somewhere else.

Lydia obviously *is* there geographically speaking, or Tom's observation of her could not occur. What is now recognised is not only her geographical foreignness, but also her emotional and mental distance (**11b**). This locational / emotional distance contrasts with the description of Tom Brangwen in the same passage. Tom's experience of 'real[ity]' and 'natural[ness]' (l.5) contrasts with the 'strangeness' ascribed to Lydia. Her emotional

---

[58]*The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume XVI*, edited by J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, second edition (Oxford, 1989), pp.841-842.
[59]*Rainbow*, p.32.

abstraction reinforces his perception of his own physical (and potentially mental / emotional) location:

> She belonged to somewhere else. He felt it poignantly, as something
> real and natural. But a pang of fear for his own concrete life that was only
> Cossethay, hurt him, and gave him misgiving. (l.4-6)

In this context, Lydia corresponds to the definitions of 'strange' which are referential to both spatial location and mental / emotional state, as well as the unknown essential in any Lawrencian relationship. Indeed, the correspondence of phrases in the passage to this definition adds a further dimension to the phrases 'from far off' (l.1), 'from far away' (l.1-2), and 'belonged to somewhere else' (l.4) which, for the purposes of this analysis, have until now been considered as referential to Lydia's *locational* foreignness. Two definitions of 'strange' are thus separated, developed, then conjoined to suggest both their interdependence and equal relevance. This comprehensive manipulation of lexical definitions is developed further through the lexical items employed in the apparently prolix phrases already identified in the first sentence ('from far off,' 'so intimate' (l.1)). The second apparently prolix phrase in the first sentence of the extract, 'yet so intimate' (l.1) implies closeness of relationship. Aspects of 'unfamiliarity' (3, 7, 12) in the definition of 'strange' are thus also included (and denied) and are semantically cohesive with the apparently prolix phrases in the second sentence, 'a presence, so close to his soul' (l.2), which are similarly referential to this definition. The inclusion of 'close' and 'soul' in the latter phrase emphasises the *intimacy* of this interpersonal connection rather than the idea of mere physical proximity. However, the juxtaposition of 'a presence' with 'soul' (l.2) raises some significant issues. The employment of the abstract noun 'presence' implies a state of being in the same place with a person or thing; yet 'presence' is employed with the indefinite article. This results in a situation in which Lydia could be considered as characterised not by *her* presence, or by being *in Tom's* presence, but by being an *abstract* presence, which, individually, or when considered with reference to her apparent closeness to Tom's 'soul' is again cohesive with the spatio-temporal removal already identified. Conversely, as Norman Macleod notes,[60] 'presence' without the article might usually have a possessive pronoun (e.g. 'his / her presence'), conveying the sense indicated, whereas *with* the article ('a presence'), there is a sense of an entity or personality, rather than simply the opposite of absence. In turn, such abstraction from the external world suggests the

---

[60]Discussion, 14 February 1997.

'strangeness' of the emotional or mental state as previously defined. Thus, a further definition of 'strange' is interwoven and proven interdependent with other definitions in the complex cohesion of the extract. In addition, the 'peculiarity' aspect of the definition of 'strange' (**6, 8, 9, 10**) is evoked by Tom's recognition of, and reaction to, what he perceives as the exceptional nature of Lydia, which occurs throughout his period of increasing acquaintance with her. In the passage under analysis, this is evidenced by his poignant recognition of her 'strangeness', which excites his curiosity and wonder, and triggers a realisation of his own, very different state (1.5-6). It is such exceptional qualities in Lydia, whether actual or projected by Tom, which have caused reactions in him which are apparently disproportionate to their stimuli, such as the following, which precedes the passage under analysis:

> ...the mother glanced at him again, almost vacantly. And the very vacancy of her look inflamed him. She had wide grey-brown eyes with very dark, fathomless pupils. He felt the fine flame running under his skin, as if all his veins had caught fire on the surface.[61]

Such vacant glances from Lydia, paradoxically, both recall the 'peculiarity' definitions of 'strange' which concern exceptional characteristics and extreme reaction (**9, 10**), while simultaneously triggering Tom's deeply self-affective reaction to her (real or perceived) exceptional qualities. In addition, the strength of his reaction, and its profound affectiveness upon Tom, recalls the intimacy aspect of 'strangeness' previously raised in the analysis of the passage. Yet Lawrence's lexical web is still more complex. The definition of 'strange' as 'unacquainted' and 'unpractised' (**12**) anticipates Lydia's confusion in Brangwen's kitchen due to her unfamiliarity with the lack of manners which she encounters, and Tilly's disapproval at Lydia's lack of etiquette in arriving unannounced on the doorstep to borrow butter.[62] In addition, the definition of 'strange woman' to mean 'harlot' (**4**) recalls Tom's unsatisfactory interlude with a prostitute,[63] a woman who is 'strange' in a very different sense to Lydia's foreignness and 'otherness', and Tom's father's turning after 'strange women'[64] and neglecting his wife when his children had grown up. However, the stylistic effects of Lawrence's fictional writing of this period are not restricted merely to *lexical* cohesion. Lawrence's syntactic patterning in the extract under examination organises such complex

---

[61] *Rainbow*, p.32.
[62] p.35.
[63] p.20.
[64] p.16.

layering largely around the repetition of the subject / verb construction 'she was', which is accompanied in the first two sentences by the apparently prolix employment of three phrases ('strange' (sentence one), 'from far off' (sentence one), 'so intimate' (sentence one), 'from far away' (sentence two), 'a presence' (sentence two), 'so close to his soul' (sentence two)) making the two sentences syntactically equivalent.[65] In the third sentence, these phrases are reduced to one, marking the explicit shift from an abstract state / location, suggesting spatio-temporal removal, to a description more explicitly concerned with Lydia's physical location, although still retaining abstract aspects. The fourth sentence confirms as valid the definition of 'strange' as referring to spatio-temporal removal. Sentence five marks the end of the 'she was' repetitive syntactic patterning, although in confirming that she 'belonged to somewhere else' (l.4) it also confirms the assertion in sentence three that she was 'not really there' (l.2). Sentences six and seven describe Tom Brangwen in relation to the 'strangeness' defined and redefined in the rest of the passage (l.4-6). Thus, the stylistic effects created by lexical cohesion are supported by the syntactic framework provided.

The complexity and significance of Lawrence's lexical specificity can be further demonstrated by an examination of the various stages of composition of this passage, and the resonance throughout the text of the lexical items employed. The final revisions of vocabulary lexically cohesive with 'strange' are apparent in E1, suggesting that they were among those made by Lawrence at final proof stage. The MS version of the passage omits 'She was strange, from far off, yet so intimate. She was from far away, a presence , so close to his soul' (l.1-2), stating instead 'Yet she was unaware'. All of the subtle linguistic variation in E1 is omitted, and only Lydia's 'unfamiliarity' referred to. In Lawrence's revisions to the typescript, this sentence is amended to 'She was so strange, yet so intimate. She was far away, like a ghost, a presence, so close to his soul'. Here, a marked shift towards the linguistic variation of E1 can be observed. However, the alien, foreign quality in Lydia is still omitted; the omission of 'from far off' in the first sentence, and 'from' in the second results in both the exclusion of any reference to her foreign nature, and the emphasis of her abstract presence , compounded by the employment of the simile 'like a ghost' which follows. Similarly, in line 4, the replacement in E1 with 'belonged to' of the MS 'was' shifts the emphasis towards Lydia's intrinsic and fundamental distance from and difference to Tom. She is not merely 'somewhere else' in a brief moment of reverie - she is profoundly 'other'. In

---

[65] This is a combination of adjectival phrases, noun phrases and prepositional phrases. They all function as subject predicatives - so while there is variation in *form*, there is repetition of *function*.

lines 5-6, Tom's fear for his own 'concrete life', inserted as autograph corrections by Lawrence in the typescript, replaces the MS 'jealousy for her own life, that was beyond'. Again, the emphasis is shifted from Lydia's distance and Tom's reaction to it to Tom's very profound awareness of the 'otherness' of his mate in relation to himself. The significance of these developing lexical patterns are not restricted merely to their immediate context, and Lawrence's revision process can shed valuable light not only on his lexical subtlety, but also on the developing resonance of repetition through the novel. In the MS of *The Rainbow*, the description of the relationship between male and female on the Marsh has no great emphasis on 'strangeness', except in the mention of the vicar's 'other' magic language and bearing:

> ...she strained her eyes to see what man would do when he revealed himself in liberty, she strained <her (MSD)> to hear how he uttered himself in his clarity, her deepest desire hung on the lips that uttered and the eyes that knew. She also wanted to know, and to be supreme. At home, even so near as Cossethay, was the vicar, who spoke the other, *5* magic language, and had the other, finer bearing, both of which she could perceive, but could never attain to. The vicar had being beyond where her own menfolk existed.

In Lawrence's autograph revisions to the typescript, the emphasis has changed:

> ...she strained her eyes to see what man had done in fighting outwards to knowledge, she strained to hear how he uttered himself in his conquest, her deepest desire hung on the battle that she heard, far off, being waged on the edge of the unknown. She also wanted to know, and to be of the fighting host. *5*
>
> At home, even so near as Cossethay, was the vicar, who spoke the other, magic language, and had the other, finer bearing, both of which she could perceive, but could never attain to. The vicar moved in worlds beyond where her own menfolk existed.[66]

Lawrence's revisions introduce the idea of battle, an idea which is to become important in *The Crown*, and which is introduced in the clash into consummation between 'Male' and 'Female' in *Hardy*. Significantly, they also introduce the idea of the 'unknown' (1.4) and of the vicar's movement 'in worlds beyond where her own menfolk existed' (1.8-9), two different aspects of 'strangeness'. The latter anticipates Lydia's difference and 'otherness' to Tom in her movement in a fundamentally different and other world to her mate. The contemporeneity

---

[66]p.11.

of this revision with the TS revision of Lydia as 'far away, like a ghost, a presence' in the main passage under analysis suggests that initially, the 'worlds' in which the vicar moved, and Lydia's ghostliness suggested a spiritual link. In the E1 revision of the passage describing Lydia and Tom, Lawrence's alterations have developed this link to develop a further subtle linguistic web. Similarly, the introduction of the 'unknown' into the descriptive passage in the first chapter in TSR by Lawrence is matched by Lawrence's amendment in typescript to Tom's growing acquaintance with Lydia. In MS, Tom feels in Lydia 'his desire made concrete'.[67] The lexical item 'concrete' is cohesive by simple repetition with its occurrence in the TSR version of the passage describing Lydia in the church, where it describes Tom's fear for his Cossethay life (1.5-6). In TSR, Brangwen feels that 'here was the unreality established at last',[68] emphasising the distinction between his experience of Lydia and his Cossethay life, now revised to read 'concrete life' (1.5-6). So the complex linguistic web which describes Lydia in the church demonstrates cohesive links with earlier revisions. Unsurprisingly, it also reaches forward towards later employments of lexical items cohesive by lexical expansion with 'strange'. Lydia's confusion in Brangwen's kitchen is, according to MS, due to Tom's deference, and in TSR, to his lack of formality. In E1, following the proof revisions which created the complex linguistic web observed in the description of Lydia in the church, it is Tom's 'intimacy'[69] which puzzles her; a similar intimacy which confused Tom in his view of the 'stranger' Lydia in the church (1.1). In E1 again, Lydia's feeling of disturbance can be traced to her recognition of his foreignness, and its effect is to create the same desire for knowledge already observed in the women on the Marsh in relation to the 'unknown':

> He looked down at her and met her look. It disturbed her. She did
> not know him. He was a foreigner, they had nothing to do with each other.
> Yet his look disturbed her to knowledge of him. He was so strangely
> confident and direct.[70]

Revisions in TSR, contemporary with the revisions to the women on the Marsh passage, includes all this bar the final sentence. The insertion in E1 of the final sentence

---

[67]p.32.
[68]p.32.
[69]p.36.
[70]p.37.

corresponds to the increasing portrayal of Tom as stable and secure throughout the El revisions of the Tom and Lydia story.

The revisions to and extension of the linguistic web of lexical items cohesive with 'strange' extends beyond the Tom and Lydia story, and the developing characterisation of the Marsh Farm in the early pages, to the story of Will and Anna. However, the fact that many of the revisions to the 'strange' web in the Anna and Will story occur at the MSR or TSR stages rather than in El, where they occur in the Tom and Lydia story, strongly supports Kinkead-Weekes' thesis that *The Rainbow* was written chronologically backwards.[71] Ross argues that Lawrence's revisions to the sheaf-stacking scene in Chapter 4 emphasise the initiation and unknown in Will and Anna's interaction, strengthening the role of the moon (which becomes for Anna, as for Tom and Ursula) a symbol of the unknown, in a ritual of self-discovery and the death of their former selves.[72] He is correct that the symbol of the moon is so emphasised, largely in MSR:

> She took her new two sheaves <and started a new stook. And as she turned away towards the moon which always furrowed its hands in her bosom, she saw him rise from stooping over the earth, she saw him coming towards her. He was inexperienced, it took him longer to make his sheaves stand up (MS)> [and walked towards him, as he rose from stooping over **5** the earth. He was coming out of the near distance. She set down her sheaves to make a new stook. They were unsure. Her hands fluttered. Yet she broke away, and turned to the moon, which laid bare her bosom, so she felt as if her bosom were <the sea heaving (TSD)> and panting with moonlight. - And he had to put up her two sheaves, which <fell (MS)> **10** [had fallen (TSR)] down. He worked in silence. The rhythm of the work carried him away again, as she was coming near (MSR)].
>
> They worked together coming and going, in a rhythm, <till the rhythm became a dream (MS)> [which carried their feet and their bodies in tune (MSR)]. She stooped, she <had (MS)> [<carried (MSR)>] [lifted **15** (MSR)] the burden of sheaves, <her face was in darkness (MS)> [turned her face to the dimness where he was, and went with her burden over the stubble (MSR)]. She hesitated, set down her sheaves, there was a swish and hiss of mingling <tresses, there was his figure coming (MS)> [oats, he was drawing near (MSR)], and she <turned her face, was to the moon **20** again (MS)> [must turn, again. And there was the flaring moon laying bare her bosom again, making her drift and ebb like a wave (MSR)].[73]

---

[71] 'The Marble and the Statue', p.384.
[72] *Composition*, pp.84-87.
[73] *Rainbow*, p.114.

In MSR, the moon has increasingly affective effect on Ursula. In MS, explicit references to the moon in the propositional content of the passage have it 'furrow[ing] its hands in her bosom' (l.2-3) and Ursula turning her face towards it (l.20-22). In MSR, Ursula turned to the moon which 'laid bare her bosom' (l.8-9), lexically parallel with 'laying bare her bosom' (l.22-23), marking increasing affectiveness of the moon on Ursula. In the second instance, it affects her movement (l.23) (it is not clear whether this is emotional, physical or both), rather than of her bosom only (l.9-10). Ross's claim that the revisions emphasise the aspects of initiation and the unknown, or 'strange' in their interaction is also accurate. However, Ross fails to note the prevalence of the 'strange' theme in the original MS version of the passage. Although elements of 'strangeness' are present from the MS stage of the novel, their significance is shifted and emphasised through revision. In the following example, the space between Will and Anna is emphasised in MSR:

> He waited for her, he fumbled at the stook. She came. But she stood back till he drew away. He saw her in shadow, a dark column, [and spoke to her, and she answered (MSRI)]. She saw the moonlight flash question on his face. But <she stood motionless (MS)> [there was a space between them (MSR)], and he went away, <and (MSD)> the work <went on (MS)> [carried them (MSR)], rhythmic.
>
> Why was <she (MS)> [there (MSR)] always <beyond him, why? Why, (MS)> [a space between them, why were they apart? Why (MSR)] as she came up from under the moon, would she halt and stand off from him? Why was he <driven (MS)> [held (MSR)] away from her? His will <hummed (MS)> [drummed (MSR)] persistently, <fiercely,(MS)> heavily[74], it drowned everything else.[75]

The insertion of this 'space between' vocabulary stresses both locational and emotional distance between Will and Anna. However, whereas the locational difference between Tom and Lydia was largely one of 'foreignness', based on Lydia's Polish ancestry, the locational difference between Will and Anna in this passage is one of immediate location, and is emphasised by the revisions to the ebb and flow pattern of the passage. From the original MS stage, Anna has been 'beyond' Will, and the revisions to the passage emphasise the locational and emotional connotations of this, while not emphasising further the lack of comprehension of Anna by Will which this phrase suggests. However, the 'distance' aspects of Will and

---

[74]In E1, 'darkly' replaces 'heavily', in accordance with Will and Anna's 'dark' relationship, developed in insertions to TS.
[75]*Rainbow*, p.115.

Anna's 'strange' relationship are present from the earliest stage of the MS. The underlining in the following passage, used to identify this cohesive chain, are mine:

> Trembling with <passionate (MS)> [keen (MSR)] triumph, his heart was white as a star as he drove his kisses nearer.
> "My love!" she <said (MS)> [called (MSR)], in a low voice, from afar.
> The low sound seemed to call him from far off, under the moon, [to him who was unaware (MSI)]. 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.
> "Anna," he said, as if he <hailed (MS)> [answered (MSR)] her from a distance, unsure...And they kissed on the mouth, in rapture and [in surprise (MSI)], long, real kisses. The kiss lasted, there among the moonlight...It was <strange (MS)> [pain (MSR)] to him that he wanted her. It was a new thing to him. He had never wanted her, he had never wanted any woman before. His wanting her seemed to separate them. It hurt him.
> They went home hand in hand. He brooded about wanting her. He did not want to be separated from her. He could bear it, so long as he held her hand. But when he had to leave her -.
> How difficult it had suddenly become! Every minute away from her now would <bleed him (MS)> [<waste unliving> (MSR)].[76]

The presence of these 'distance' aspects of 'strangeness,' which accord with the E1 revisions to Tom and Lydia's relationship, again support Kinkead-Weekes' assertion that *The Rainbow* was written chronologically backwards, with Tom and Lydia's story benefiting in revision from ideas developed in Will and Anna's relationship. However, beneficial to the Tom / Lydia story as this may be, in revision the emphasis on 'strangeness' in the sheaf-stacking passage shifts from being on aspects of distance, emotional and locational, to more complex senses of 'strangeness', which will be discussed following the example:

> [He kissed her again, and she kissed him. And again they were kissing together. Till something happened in him, he was strange. He wanted her. He wanted her exceedingly. She was something new. (MSR)] They stood there folded, suspended in the night. <The moment slowly ebbed. (MSRD)> And his whole being quivered with surprise, as ⟅5⟆ from a blow. He wanted her, and he wanted to tell her so. But the shock was too great to him. He had never realised before. <She had a face, she had hands and feet and soft dresses, but one could not want her. Yet now

---

[76] This passage is thoroughly reworked in further, later, revisions in MSR.

he did want her. (TSD)> He trembled with initiation (irritation (in TS)) and unusedness, he did not know what to do. He held her more gently, **10** gently, much more gently. [The conflict was gone by. (E1)] And he was glad, and breathless, and almost in tears. But he knew he wanted her. Something fixed in him for ever. <In his heart s> <[S (TSR)]he was his wife> [He was hers (E1)]. And he was very glad, and afraid. He did not know what to do, as they stood there in the open, moonlit fields (field **15** (TS)). He looked through her hair at the moon, which seemed to swim liquid-bright.

She sighed, and seemed to wake up. Then she kissed him again. Then she loosened herself away from him and took his hand. It hurt him when she drew away from his breast. It hurt him with a <bitter grief. In **20** his heart, she was his <wife, y> [own, y (TSR)]. Yet she drew away from him.> [chagrin. Why did she draw away from him? (E1)] But she held his hand.

"I want to go home," she said, <pathetically, [and (TSI)] (MSR, TSRD)> looking at him in a way he could not understand. **25**

He held close to her hand. He was <hurt> [dazed (TSR)] and he could not move, he did not know how to move. <He was neutralised with an irresoluteness (TSD)>. She drew him away.

He walked helplessly beside her, holding her hand. She went with bent head. Suddenly he said, as the simple solution stated itself to him: **30**

"We'll get married, Anna."

She was silent.

"We'll get married, <my love (MSR)> [Anna (E1)], shall we?"

She stopped in the field again and kissed him, clinging to him passionately, in a way he could not understand. He could not understand. **35** But he left it all now, to marriage. That was the solution now, fixed ahead. He wanted her, he wanted to be married to her, he wanted to have her altogether, as his <wife (MSR)> [own for ever (TSR)]. And he waited, intent, for the accomplishment. (MSR)][77]

The 'distance' aspects of 'strange' are present. However, in revision, Will himself becomes 'strange' (1.2) and Anna is 'new' (1.3), although the sense of such strangeness is abstract. The result of Will's 'strangeness' being from a change in himself suggests that perhaps he is 'strange' in comparison to his usual self. There has been a fundamental change *within* him, prompted by his realisation that Anna is something *unknown* to him, in the sense that she is 'new', and in his awakening sexuality. This 'strangeness' has resulting effects which, as Ross suggests, emphasise the 'unknown' in the passage, and, as he fails to notice, accords with the definitions of 'strangeness' as 'unknown', as manifested in the Tom / Lydia example.[78] The underlining in the following passage, identifying this chain, is mine:

---

[77]*Rainbow*, pp.116-117.
[78]*OED*, **7** and **10**.

He trembled with initiation (irritation (in TS)) and <u>unusedness</u>, he <u>did not know what to do</u>...<u>He did not know what to do</u>, as they stood there in the open, moonlit fields (field (TS)). He looked through her hair at the moon, which seemed to swim liquid-bright...He held close to her hand. He was <hurt> [dazed (TSR)] and he could not move, <u>he did not know how to move</u>. <He was neutralised with an irresoluteness (TSD)>. She drew him away... "We'll get married, my love, (MS, "Anna" in E1) shall we?"

She stopped in the field again and kissed him, clinging to him passionately, in a way <u>he could not understand</u>. <u>He could not understand</u>. But he left it all now, to marriage.[79] (l.9-36)

Lawrence presents the effects of the 'unknown' on Will not only as presenting new and unfamiliar elements to him, but as estranging him from his own established reality, recalling (or anticipating) Tom's fear for his concrete Cossethay life in his apprehension of Lydia. The 'unknown' elements of the 'strange' cohesive chain are again visible later in the passage, where Lawrence's insertion of a 'discovery' theme anticipates the increasing emphasis on 'discovery' in the E1 version of Will and Anna's 'Absolute Beauty' interaction. These revisions are visible below in the replacement of 'embrace' with 'unfold' (l.5), 'exploit' with 'venture within' (l.5) and 'lordship' with 'discovery' (l.6):

<Marvellous, the moonlight on her nose! (MS)> [He wondered over the moonlight on her nose! (E1)] All the moonlight upon her, all the darkness within her! (MS)> All the night in his arms, darkness and shine, he <master (MS)> [possessed (MSR)] of it all! All the night for him now, to <embrace (MS)> [unfold (MSR)], to <exploit (MS)> [venture within (MSR)], all the mystery to be entered, all the <lordship (MS)> [discovery (MSR)] to be <entered upon> [made (MSR)].[80]

The developing 'strange' cohesive chain which links the generations of *The Rainbow*, operates also to indicate the differences between each generation. When Anna first encounters Will, she is, according to the MS version, aware of, and surprised by, his *fur-like* moustache and hair, and 'nothing else'. In the TS revision, she is aware of 'something strange' in him,[81] and this, in E1, repels rather than surprises her. The linguistic web cohesive by reiteration and / or collocation with 'strangeness' therefore encompasses the idea of an *animal* 'other' in addition to the meanings presented in the (later) revisions to the Tom and Lydia story. Again,

---

[79]*Rainbow*, pp.116-117.
[80]p.116.
[81]p.100:36.

on page 102, the link between Will's 'strangeness' and the animal kingdom is made, the insertion of the 'strange' web being made in TSR, and fine tuned in E1, and the animal imagery present already in MS:

> Will Brangwen rose uncertainly. He had golden-brown, quick, steady eyes like a <free (MS)> <[wild creature's (MSR)]>, like a bird's [, like a hawk's (E1)] which <is never (MS)> [cannot (MSR)] look afraid.
>
> "Your cousin Will'll come with you," said the father.
>
> Anna glanced at <him (MS)> [the strange youth (MSR)] again. <He seemed to be (MS)> [She felt him (MSR)] waiting there for her to <look at (MS)> [notice (MSR)] him. He <seemed to be (MS)> [was (MSR)] hovering <there (MS)> on the edge of her consciousness, ready to <break (MS)> [come (MSR)] in. She did not want to look at him: she <did not want to be aware of him (MS)> <[was not ready to be aware of him (TSR)]> [was antagonistic to him (E1)].
>
> She waited <graciously (MS, E1D)> without speaking. Her cousin took his hat and joined her. It was summer outside. Her brother <Peter (MS)> [Fred (TSR)] was plucking a sprig of flowering currant to put in his coat, from the bush at the angle of the house. She took no notice. Her cousin followed just behind her.
>
> They were on the high-road. She was aware of <somebody walking beside her, (MS)> <expecting her to speak to him (TSRD)> <[a strangeness walking beside her (TSR)]> [a strangeness in her being (E1)] It <exasperated her (MS)> [made her uncertain (MSR)]. She caught sight of the flowering currant in her brother's button-hole.

Ross[82] recognises that Will's animal 'alienness' becomes increasingly sinister, and acknowledges that, in TSR, Lawrence brought out the destructive potential in Will's energies, thus emphasising in Will the potency necessary for the achievement of 'Absolute Beauty' which Lawrence expanded and developed in the final and proof revisions of the novel. Such an increase in destructive energies can be traced in the following example, in which angled brackets identify the earlier version, square brackets the revision:

> ...His hovering near her...<stung (MS)> [irritated (TSR)] her, <maddened her against him. He wouldn't do anything, he wouldn't go anywhere, he just hung on to her like an idiot. Her soul clinched against him. She would not have cared what became of him, so long as he were removed from her (MS)> [beyond bearing. She turned on him blindly and destructively, he became a mad creature, black and electric with fury. The dark storms rose in him, his eyes glowed black and evil, he was <the

---

[82]'Revisions', p.284.

devil to her. (TSR)> [fiendish in his thwarted soul. (E1)] ...She was afraid of him. [His will seemed grappled upon her (Om. MS, TSRI)].[83]

Ross argues, persuasively, that Lawrence's extension of the 'alien' quality of Will at this stage is added to the non-human imagery of animals (already present in MS), developing the theme of 'darkness' in the sense that animals are 'bestial, menacing presences outside the human camp-fire'.[84] Certainly, in order that Will is capable of motivating and independent action rather than dependence on his wife, the former being necessary for the achievement of 'Absolute Beauty', Will does become a predator, a characteristic emphasised not only in the new employment of animal imagery, but also in his flirtation with Jennie, an incident which does not occur in *The Wedding Ring* or MS, and which identifies his moral independence from his wife and society.   In 'The Child', when Anna and Will's 'dark' relationship is consummated, the 'strange' patterning is also developed in TSR.   The 'discovery' theme which suggests the exploration of the unknown, and thus expands the 'strange' web to include interaction with rather than merely awareness of the 'other', is developed in E1. The 'strange' web is expanded to include interaction with, rather than merely awareness of the 'other'. Here, the essential strangeness between Will and Anna, achieved following Will's visit to Nottingham and dalliance with the factory girl, is the mark of a new stage in their relationship,

---

[83]*Rainbow*, p.141.

[84] 'Revisions', p.284. He asserts that the threatening aspect of darkness (which accompanies this image of the predatory aspect of animal 'alienness') identifies the differences between generations. To Tom and Lydia, he claims, darkness is 'another world or plane of existence from which they return reborn', to Anna it is 'hostile and dangerous', and to Ursula it is 'attractive because it is fearful and hostile to mere humanity' (p.284). Pritchard observes (*Body of Darkness*, p.48) that the description of Anna's fear of Will's darkness in Chapter 6 of *The Rainbow*, and his threat to her daylight self is anticipated in the poem 'In the Dark', written in (?) June-August 1912, and collected in *Look! We Have Come Through*. However, the reasons for Anna's fear of Will are not the same as the fear of the husband for the wife in the poem. Will's desire for absorption differs from the sexual darkness which threatens to obliterate the daylight ego of the female lover in the poem, although it does anticipate their 'Absolute' interaction in Chapter 8. In addition, the presence of the phrases 'bitter fire corroded' (*Rainbow*, p172:40 - amended to 'fire went black' in TSR and 'fire went black in' in E1) and 'octopus' (p.174:8 - amended to 'grasping' in E1) from MS suggests the influence of the vocabulary in a different poem, 'She Looks Back', written in 1912 and collected in *Look! We Have Come Through*.   Ross attributes this vocabulary to the interactions between Ursula and Skrebensky on the latter's return from Africa, and neither he nor Kinkead-Weekes mentions the presence of similar vocabulary in 'She Looks Back'. Will's 'darkness' is slightly increased in E1 and TSR, making it contemporary with the revisions which combine 'strangeness' with 'animal' elements. Kinkead-Weekes notes that the exploration of Ursula and Skrebensky's new relationship, following the latter's return from Africa, includes a 'liberating potency, albeit limited, in the darkness outside the lighted area of human consciousness, where wild beasts prowl' (*Rainbow*, pp.xl-xli), the 'darkness' and predatory animal themes again being inextricable. As Ross recognises, the revised relation between Ursula and Skrebensky is re-read into that of Will and Anna.

and, indeed, a new relationship between them. The 'strangeness' and 'foreignness' which had been so important in the Tom and Lydia story, and the 'impersonality' of relationship which Lawrence had explored in *Hardy*, and which can be traced from the second *Sisters*, emphasises a new *kind* of otherness, which will be discussed following the extract. Underlining identifies the 'strange' cohesive chain:

Very good, if she could not influence him in the old way, she would be level with him in the <new. Very good, she too would take the new turn of affairs (TSR)> [new (E1)].   Her old defiant hostility came <up. She too absolved herself from her ''goodness'', from her connection with the Ten Commandments of our ordered life (TSR)> [up (E1)]. Very good, she 5 too was out on her own adventure. Her voice, her manner changed, she was ready for the game. Something was liberated in her. She liked him. She liked this strange man come home to her. He was very welcome, indeed. She was very glad to welcome a stranger. She had been bored by the old husband. To his latent, cruel <smile of gratification aforethought 10 (TSR)> [smile (E1)] she replied with brilliant <indifference (TSR)> [challenge (E1)]. He expected her to <play the moral game, to keep (TSR)> [keep (E1)] the moral fortress. Not she! It was much too dull a part. She challenged him back with a sort of radiance, very bright and free, opposite to him. He looked at her, and his eyes glinted. She too was 15 out in the field.

His senses pricked up and keenly attended to her. She laughed, perfectly indifferent and loose as he was. He came towards her. She neither rejected him nor responded to him. In a kind of radiance, superb in her <recklessness (TSR)> [inscrutability (E1)], she laughed before him. 20 She too could throw everything overboard, love, intimacy, responsibility. What were her four children to her now? What did it matter that this man was the father of her four children?

He was the [sensual (E1)] male seeking his <satisfaction (TSR)> [pleasure (E1)], she was the female ready to take hers: but in her own 25 way.   A man could turn into a free lance: so then could a woman. <Goodbye moral responsibilities! (TSR)> [She adhered as little as he to the moral world. (E1)] All that had gone before was <a feather (TSR)> [nothing (E1)] to her. She was another woman, under the instance of a strange man.   He was a stranger to her, seeking his own ends.   Very 30 <good. She was far more interested in him as a self-seeking stranger than in the aforetime good, responsible husband (TSR)> [good (E1)].   She wanted to see what this stranger would do, what he was.

She laughed, and kept him at arm's length, whilst apparently ignoring him. She watched him undress as if he were a stranger. Indeed, 35 he was a stranger to her.

And she roused him profoundly, violently, even before he touched her. The little creature in Nottingham had but been leading up to this. <Down went the moral fortress, the good knight was a free lance flying the banner of his own sensual desires, the good maiden was out in the 40

wilderness enjoying herself (TSR)> [They abandoned in one motion the moral position, each was seeking gratification pure and simple (E1)].

<u>Strange</u> his wife was to him. It was as if he were a perfect <u>stranger</u>, as if she were infinitely and essentially <u>strange</u> to him, <u>the other half of the world, the dark half of the moon.</u> She waited for his touch as if 45 he were a <u>marauder</u> who had <carried her off (TSR)> [come in (E1)], infinitely <u>unknown</u> and desirable to her. And he began to discover her. He had an inkling of the vastness of the <u>unknown</u> sensual store of delights she was. With a passion of voluptuousness that made him dwell on each tiny beauty in a kind of frenzy of enjoyment, he lit upon her: her beauty, the 50 beauties, the separate, several beauties of her body. He was quite <u>ousted from himself</u>, and <u>sensually transported</u> by < the beauties he unfolded (TSR)> [that which he discovered (E1)] in her. He was <u>another man</u> revelling over her. There was no tenderness, no love between them any more, only the maddening, sensuous lust for discovery and the insatiable, 55 exorbitant gratification in the sensual beauties <in (TSR)> [of (E1)] her body. And she was a store, a store of absolute beauties that it drove him mad to contemplate. There was such a feast to enjoy, and he with only one man's capacity.[85]

In this interaction, the lexical items cohesive with 'strange' identify several important aspects of Will and Anna's new relationship, and pick up several of the aspects of 'strangeness' introduced in the Tom / Lydia passage. Anna's keeping of Will at arm's length, and apparent ignoring of him (l.34) accords with the distant and unfriendly definition of

---

[85]*Rainbow*, pp.217-219. In Chapter 3, in the Tom / Lydia story (p.90), revisions made in typescript reflect the creative revisions made to the Will / Anna 'Absolute Beauty' interaction in Chapter 8. Where, in MS, Tom is portrayed as looking to find himself in Lydia, in TSR, his 'otherness' from her is emphasised, anticipating (or recalling, if the novel was written backwards) the results of Will's independence found through the interaction with Jennie:

...his desire to come to her, to be with her, to <mingle with> [embrace and know] her...

Although 'darkness' has been a characteristic of the Will / Anna interaction since MS, in MS it is not present in the Tom / Lydia interaction, and in TSR is introduced in combination with the theme of consummation to replace the 'light' and 'transfiguration' theme introduced to the interaction in MSR:

<Now he was afraid, he was afraid of her (MS)> <[The glistening reality of her who was shining just beyond him dazzled him, blinded him. The light of the transfiguration was on her face, he was blind and destroyed, <but> he pressed forward, nearer, nearer, to receive the transfiguration himself, [be] received within the incandescence which should destroy him and yield him up to himself. If he could come really within the blazing kernel <of glory>, if really he could be destroyed, burnt away into flame, till he lit with her in one radiance, that were supreme, supreme (MSR)]> [The reality of her who was just beyond him absorbed him. Blind and destroyed, he pressed forward, nearer, nearer, to receive the consummation of himself, be received within the darkness which would swallow him and yield him up to himself. If he could come really within the blazing kernel of darkness, if really he could be destroyed, burnt away till he lit with her in one consummation, that were supreme, supreme. (TSR)]

'strange' offered by the *OED* (11). In addition, many of the employments of 'strange' in the passage refer to the unknown or unfamiliar aspect of strangeness (7) identified in the Tom / Lydia interaction. Anna likes the 'strange man' (1.8) who comes home better than her husband, and she watches him undress as if he were a 'stranger' (1.35), and perceives him as a 'marauder who had come in, infinitely unknown and desirable to her' (1.46-47). Anna is 'strange' and unknown to Will (1.43-45), which prompts his voluptuous discoveries of her (1.47). However, this sensual exploration by Will raises another issue related to 'strangeness' in the passage. Will has an 'inkling of the vastness of the unknown sensual store of delights she was' (1.48-49). Anna is to Will, as he is to her:[86] 'unknown'. Yet, in E1R, she also becomes *unable to be known,* her 'recklessness' of the TSR being amended in E1 to her 'inscrutability'. It is suggested in the 'Absolute Beauty' interaction between Will and Anna that Will is unable to be entirely satisfied by 'discovering' Anna alone; satisfaction also comes from the anticipation and experience of his own sensual enjoyment:

> He lived in a passion of sensual discovery with her for some time - it was a duel: no love, no words, no kisses even, only the maddening perception of beauty consummate, absolute through touch. He wanted to touch her, to discover her, maddeningly he wanted to know her. Yet he must not hurry, or he missed everything. He must enjoy one beauty at a time. And the multitudinous beauties of her body, the many little rapturous places, sent him mad with delight, and with desire to be able to know more. For all was there...He would go all the day waiting for the night to come, when he could give himself to the enjoyment of some luxurious absolute of beauty in her. The thought of the hidden resources of her, the undiscovered beauties and ecstatic place of delight in her body, waiting, only waiting for him to discover them, sent him slightly insane. He was obsessed. If he did not discover and make known to himself these delights, they might be lost for ever. He wished he had a hundred men's energies with which to enjoy her. He wished he were a cat, to lick her with a rough, grating, lascivious tongue. He wanted to wallow in her, bury himself in her flesh, cover himself over with her flesh.
>
> And she, separate, with a strange, dangerous, glistening look in her eyes received all his activities upon her as if they were expected by her, and provoked him when he was quiet to more, till sometimes he was ready to perish for sheer inability to be satisfied of her, inability to have had enough of her.[87]

---

[87]*Rainbow*, p.219.

Kinkead-Weekes argues that while Will and Anna 'die' and are renewed by this interaction, it is both infinite and deathly, occupying only one extreme of the Lawrencian dialectic. It is, he claims, a relationship in darkness only, opposed to the relative relationship of opposites advocated in *Hardy* in that it is self-contained with no connection with anything outside itself.[88] Kinkead-Weekes' analysis highlights a related aspect of the 'strange' cohesive chain which is also apparent in the passage. In E1R, the conflictual relationship between Will and Anna is heightened. Anna's 'indifference' to Will is replaced by 'challenge' (l.12), the 'pure sensuality' of the relationship is replaced by 'It was a duel', and lines 27-28 are amended to suggest that each character is an equal player in this interaction, rather than Anna following Will's lead. Will's identification of Anna as 'the other half of the world, the dark side of the moon' (l.44-45) and the syntactically parallel presentation of male and female activity (l.24-25), emphasises this point. However, it is suggested that what Will discovers in Anna is not only restricted to discovery of 'Absolute Beauty' through her, but discovery of himself. Will is 'a stranger to her, seeking his own ends' (l.30). When 'ousted' from himself, Will is 'sensually transported' by that which he discovers in her. The following sentence suggests that what he finds in interaction with Anna is not simply the beauties of her body, but another self:

> He was quite ousted from himself, and sensually transported by that which he discovered in her. He was another man revelling over her. (l.51-54)

Similarly, Anna is 'another woman, under the instance of a strange man' (l.29-30). What the interaction in 'Absolute Beauty' has revealed is the *estrangement* of Will and Anna from their established selves in this interaction.

The vocabulary employed in the final version of the 'Absolute Beauty' interaction between Will and Anna, and in the revisions to the Will / Anna section of the novel, Ross argues, were inspired by the descriptions of Ursula and Skrebensky's love bouts, particularly drawing on the vocabulary employed following Skrebensky's return from the Boer War, and the final revisions to the Stackyard scene in Chapter 11.[89] From MS, the dark, African nature

---

[88] 'The Marble and the Statue', pp.391-393. Charles Ross ('Revisions', p.288) disagrees with Kinkead-Weekes on this point, arguing that the ending of Chapter 8 is more positive than Kinkead-Weekes' analysis suggests, Will again beginning to "struggle outwards to the expression that he had abandoned".

[89] 'Revisions', pp.283, 285-288. He argues (*Composition*, p.34) that it appears that it was when Lawrence was writing of Skrebensky's return from Africa, he hit upon the metal-corrosive

of Ursula and Skrebensky's relationship, and the 'fear' inherent in this darkness is present, as is the employment of 'sensual' and the 'strange' lexical chain which forms a cohesive chain throughout the novel. These elements will be identified by underlining in the following passage:

> Then [in a low, vibrating voice (TSRI)], he told her about Africa, the strange darkness, the strange, blood fear.
> "I am not afraid of the darkness in England," he said. "It is soft, and natural to me, <like the air (MS)> [it is my medium, especially when you are here (TSR)]. But in Africa it seems <to bristle with unknown (MS)> [massive and fluid with (TSR)] terror - not fear of anything - just fear. One breathes it, like a smell of blood. The blacks know it. <Their Gods (gods (TS)) are all fear, really (MS)> [They worship it, really, the darkness (TSR)]. One almost likes it - the fear - something sensual."
> She thrilled again to him. He was to her a voice out of the darkness. He talked to her all the while, in <a low voice (MS)> [low tones (MSR)], about Africa, conveying something strange and sensual to her: the negro, with his loose, soft passion that could envelop one like a bath. Gradually he transferred to her the <sense of (MSD)> hot, fecund darkness that possessed his own <world (MS)> [blood. (MSR)] He was strangely secret. The whole world must be abolished. He maddened her with his soft, cajoling, vibrating tones. He wanted her to answer, to understand. A turgid, teeming <earth, a heavy, moist quickness (MS)> [night, heavy with fecundity (TSR)] in which every molecule of matter grew big with increase, secretly urgent with fecund <desire (MS)> [desire, seemed to come to pass (TSR)]. She quivered, taut and vibrating, almost pained. And gradually, he ceased telling her of Africa, there came a silence, whilst they walked <in (MS, TSRD)> the darkness beside the <hidden MS)> [massive (TSR)] river. Her limbs were <drawn (MS)> [rich and (TSR)] tense, she felt they must be <plucked into (MS)> [vibrating with a low, profound (TSR)] vibration. She could scarcely walk. [The deep vibration of the <heavy (TSR)> darkness could only be felt, not heard. (E1I)]
> Suddenly, as they walked, she turned to him and held him fast, as if she were turned to steel.
> "*Do* you love me?" she cried in anguish.
> "Yes," he said, in a curious, lapping voice, unlike himself. "Yes, I love you."
> He seemed like the living darkness upon her, she was in the embrace of the <living (MS)> [strong (MSR)] darkness. He held her enclosed, soft, unutterably soft, and with the unrelaxing softness of fate, the relentless softness of fecundity. She quivered and quivered, like a tense thing that is

vocabulary employed in the revision of the love contests of Ursula and Skrebensky. However, Ross does not notice that such corrosive vocabulary (particularly the salt corrosion of Ursula at the wedding dance) is present in 'She Looks Back', a poem composed in 1912 and collected in *Look! We Have Come Through*. This vocabulary (in the example from Chapter 15) is present from the MS stage of composition, but developed in TSR and proof.

struck. But he held her all the time, soft, unending, like <u>darkness</u> closed
upon her, omnipresent as the <u>night</u>. He kissed her, and she quivered as if
she were being destroyed, shattered. The lighted vessel vibrated, and 40
broke in her soul, the light fell, struggled, and went <u>dark</u>. She was all
<u>dark,</u> will-less, having only the receptive will.

He kissed her, with his soft, enveloping kisses, and she <replied
(MS)> (responded (E1)] to them <spontaneously MS)> [completely [E1],
her mind, her soul <u>gone out</u>. <u>Darkness</u> cleaving to <u>darkness</u>, she hung 45
close to him, pressed herself into <u>soft flow</u> of his kiss, pressed herself
down, pressed herself down, down to the <u>source and core</u> of his kiss,
herself covered and enveloped in the <u>warm, fecund</u> flow of his kiss, that
travelled over her, flowed over her, covered her, flowed over the last fibre
of her, so that they [were <laved in (MS)> (TSR)] one stream, one <bath 50
(MS)> [<u>dark fecundity</u> (TSR)], and she clung at the <u>core</u> of him, with her
lips holding open the very <u>bottommost source</u> of him.

So they <stood enveloped (MS)> [stood (TSR)] in the utter, <u>dark</u>
kiss, that triumphed over them both, subjected them, <blotted them out
(MS)> [knitted them (TSR)] in one <u>fecund nucleus</u> of the [fluid (TSR)] 55
<u>darkness</u>.

It was bliss, it was the <drenching, complete torrent (MS)>
[<u>nucleolating of the fecund darkness</u> (TSR)]. Once the <vessel of light
(MS)> (Om. TSR) [vessel (E1)] had vibrated till it was shattered, the
light <of the (MS)> [of E1)] consciousness gone, then the   <u>darkness</u> 60
reigned, and the <u>unutterable</u> <bliss (MS)> [satisfaction. (E1)]

They stood <enfolded in (MS)> [enjoying (E1)] the unmitigated
kiss, taking it, <taking (MS)> [given to (TSR)] it endlessly, and still it
was not exhausted. Their veins fluttered, their blood ran together as one
stream.[90]
 65

In revision, the thematic relevance of these images is subtly changed. Lawrence
emphasises only slightly the link between fear, danger and the African darkness in TSR.
These elements are indicated by underlining:

"I am not <u>afraid</u> of the <u>darkness</u> in England," he said. "It is soft,
and natural to me, <like the air (MS)> [it is my medium, especially when
you are here (TSR)]. But in Africa it seems <to <u>bristle with unknown</u>
(MS)> [<u>massive and fluid with</u> (TSR)] <u>terror</u> - not <u>fear</u> of anything - just
<u>fear</u>. One breathes it, like a smell of blood. The blacks know it. <Their
Gods (gods (TS)) are all <u>fear,</u> really (MS)> [They worship it, really, the
<u>darkness</u> (TSR)]. One almost likes it - the <u>fear</u> - something sensual."
(1.3-9)

Lawrence's excision of the adjective 'unknown' (1.3), which is cohesive with the
'strange' chain in the novel places increases slightly the 'terrible' aspect of the African

---

[90]*Rainbow,* pp.413-414.

darkness. This emphasis ties in with the violence and darkness of their interaction as portrayed from as early as MS, identified below by underlining:

> But he held her all the time, soft, unending, like <u>darkness</u> <u>closed upon her</u>, omnipresent as the <u>night</u>. He kissed her, and she quivered as if she were being <u>destroyed, shattered</u>. The lighted vessel vibrated, and <u>broke</u> in her soul, the light fell, <u>struggled</u>, and <u>went dark</u>. She was all <u>dark</u>, will-less, having only the receptive will.
>
> He kissed her, with his soft, enveloping kisses, and she <replied (MS)> (responded (E1)] to them <spontaneously MS)> [completely (E1)], her mind, her soul gone out. <u>Darkness</u> cleaving to <u>darkness</u>, she hung close to him, pressed herself into soft flow of his kiss, pressed herself down... (1.38-47)[91]

In the revised 'Absolute Beauty' interaction between Will and Anna, the explicit link between darkness, violence, fear and death is obvious in E1, but the emphasis falls more on the sensual in TSR. Again, these chains will be identified by underlining:

> Their children became mere <swarming animals (TSR)> [offspring (E1)] to them, they lived in the <extravagances (TSR)> [<u>darkness</u> and <u>death</u> (E1)] of their own <u>sensual</u> activities. Sometimes he felt he was going mad with a <u>sense</u> of Absolute Beauty, perceived by him in her <u>through his senses</u>. It was something too much for him. And in everything, was this same, almost <u>sinister, terrifying</u> beauty. But in <u>the revelations of her body through contact with his body</u>, was the ultimate beauty, to know which was <u>almost death in itself</u>, and yet for the knowledge of which he would have undergone <u>endless torture</u>. He would have forfeited anything, anything rather than forego his <right, for example (TSR)> [right even (E1)] to the instep of her foot, and the place from which the toes radiated out, the little, miraculous white plain from which ran the little hillocks of the toes and the <delirious, folded (TSR)> [folded (E1)], dimpling hollows between the toes. He felt he would have <u>died</u> rather than forfeit this.

---

[91]This dangerous aspect of Ursula and Skrebensky's relationship is also identified in the manuscript version of their kissing game in the shed:

> In the shed they played at kisses, really played at kisses. It was a delicious, exciting game. She turned to him, her face all laughing, like a challenge. And he accepted the challenge at once. He twined his hand full of her hair, and gently, with his hand wrapped round with hair behind her head, gradually brought her face nearer to his, whilst she laughed breathless with challenge, and his eyes gleamed with answer, <overbearing (MS)> [with enjoyment of the game. (TSR)] And he kissed her, asserting his will over her, and she kissed him back, asserting her deliberate enjoyment of him. Daring and reckless and dangerous [they knew (TSR)] it was, their game, each playing with fire, not with love. (p.280)

This was what their love had become, <and this was what it
remained: a <u>sensual   voluptuousness</u> (TSR)> [a <u>sensuality violent and
extreme as death</u>. (E1)] They had no conscious intimacy, no tenderness
of love. It was all the <u>lust</u> and the infinite, maddening <u>intoxication of the</u>
<u><flesh (TSR)></u> [<u>senses, a passion of death</u>. (E1)]

He had always, all his life, had a secret <u>dread</u> of <a (TSR)> [A
(E1)]bsolute Beauty. It had always been like a <u>fetish</u> to him, something to
<hate (TSR)> [<u>fear</u> (E1)],   really.   For it was <u>immoral</u> and against
mankind. So he had turned to the Gothic form, which always asserted
the <will (TSR)> [broken desire (E1)] of mankind in its pointed arches,
escaping the rolling, absolute beauty of the round arch.

But now he had given way, and with <u>infinite sensual <delight</u>
(TSR)> [<u>violence</u> (E1)] gave himself to the realisation of this supreme,
<u>immoral</u>, Absolute Beauty, <u>in the body of a woman, under his touch</u>.
<u>Under his touch, even under his sight</u>, it was there. But when he neither
saw nor touched the perfect place, it was not perfect, it was not there. And
he must make it exist.

But still the thing <u>terrified</u> him.   <u>Awful</u> and <u>threatening</u> it was,
<u>dangerous</u> to a degree, even whilst he gave himself to it. <And shameful
(TSR)> [It was pure <u>darkness</u>, (E1)] also. All the shameful things of the
body revealed themselves to him now with a sort of <u>sinister</u>,   tropical
beauty.   All the shameful, <u>natural and unnatural acts of sensual</u>
<u>voluptuousness</u> which <u>he and the woman partook of together, created</u>
<u>together</u>, they had their <u>heavy beauty and their delight</u>.   Shame, what was
it? It was part of <<u>rich</u> (TSR)> [extreme (E1)] delight. It was that part
of delight of which man is usually <u>afraid</u>.   Why <u>afraid</u>? The secret,
shameful things are most <u>terribly</u> beautiful.

They <blotted out (TSR)> [accepted (E1)] shame, and were <free of
it, even (TSR)> [one with it (E1)] in their most unlicensed pleasures.
<The shame simply did not exist (TSR)> [It was incorporated (E1)]. It
was a bud that blossomed into beauty and <u>heavy, fundamental</u>
<u>gratification</u>.[92]   ↩

It appears, supporting Ross, that Lawrence's description of Skrebensky's African
strangeness in 'The Bitterness of Ecstasy' has an effect on Lawrence's revisions of 'darkness'
'fear' and 'violence' into the Will / Anna 'Absolute Beauty' interaction. In addition, the
'strange' cohesive chain which has been demonstrated as being developed in the Will / Anna
interaction at TS and beyond is present in MS of the Ursula / Skrebensky interaction,
suggesting the influence of the latter on the former. The influence of the necessity for
destruction of the established order in the MS version of the Ursula / Skrebensky scene can be
demonstrated both in TSR and in E1 (suggesting amendments in proof) of Will and Anna's
'Absolute Beauty' relationship:

---

[92]*Rainbow*, pp.219-220.

<Goodbye moral responsibilities! (TSR)> [She adhered as little as he to the moral world. (E1)] All that had gone before was <a feather (TSR)> [nothing (E1)] to her...<Down went the moral fortress, the good knight was a free lance flying the banner of his own sensual desires, the good maiden was out in the wilderness enjoying herself (TSR)> [They abandoned in one motion the moral position, each was seeking gratification pure and simple. (E1)]

Ross argues[93] that Ursula responds to Skrebensky's new potency following his return from Africa partly because she recognises that there is a part of his nature that she has previously ignored, and which gives lie to the conventional life which she has found unfulfilling. Certainly, between the beginning of Chapter 11 and the end of Chapter 15, there has been a significant shift in the portrayal of Skrebensky's 'strangeness'. Ursula and Skrebensky's early relationship continues the articulation of the 'strangeness' cohesive chain present throughout the novel. However, Skrebensky is initially characterised predominantly by 'strangeness' in the sense that he belongs to the outer world, similar to the geographical foreignness of Lydia (**1.a, 2, 5**), and similar to Ursula's yearning for Christ 'in week-day terms'.[94] In the extract below, the MS adjective 'strange' is replaced in revisions to the typescript by 'strong', thus minimising potential connotations of 'strange', and making it referential only to the 'outer world':

> He brought her a strong sense of the outer world.[95]

The reference to the 'outer world' only is emphasised three pages later, in a brief passage which is unrevised from MS:

> He seemed more and more to give her a sense of the vast world, a sense of distances and large masses of humanity. It drew her as a scent draws a bee from afar. But also it hurt her.[96]

This outer world 'strangeness' is very different to that which Skrebensky presents to Ursula in Chapter 15, where, like Will and Anna in their 'Absolute Beauty' interaction, the

---

[93]'Revisions', p.283.
[94]*Rainbow*, p.266.
[95]p.269.
[96]p.272.

necessity of a *break from* the outer world is established.[97] In the first phase of their relationship, before Skrebensky leaves for Africa, Ursula soon realises that he cannot offer the 'strangeness' which she desires and needs, nor open the unknown to her. Following her experience of 'the world tumbling into ruins' in St. Peter's church,[98] Ursula's desire for something other than the everyday world begins to become a feature of their relationship. She is aware of the 'unknown' for which she yearns, and that Anton cannot provide it for her. However, at this stage, her desire is not acted upon. Anticipating the introduction of Anna and Will's 'Absolute Beauty' encounter, Ursula longs for the putting off of the 'dull, customary self'. The following passage undergoes no revision to affect the employment of 'strangeness' in the early Ursula / Skrebensky relationship. Cohesion with the 'strange' chain is indicated by underlining:

> She saw the familiar country racing by. But now, it was no familiar country, it was <u>wonderland</u>. There was the Hemlock Stone standing on its grassy hill. <u>Strange</u>, it looked, on this wet, early summer evening, remote, in a <u>magic land</u>. Some rooks were flying out of the trees.
>
> Ah, if only she and Skrebensky could get out, dismount into this <u>enchanted land where nobody had ever been before!</u> Then they would be <u>enchanted people</u>, they would put off the dull, customary self. If she were wandering there, on that hill-slope under a silvery, changing sky, in which many rooks melted like hurrying showers of blots! If they could walk past the wetted hay-swaths, smelling the early evening, and pass in to the wood where the honeysuckle scent was sweet on the cold tang of the air, and showers of drops fell when one brushed a bough, cold and lovely on the face!
>
> But she was here with him in the car, close to him, and the wind was rushing on her lifted, eager face, blowing back the hair. He turned and looked at her, at her face clean as a chiselled thing, her hair chiselled back by the wind, her fine nose keen and lifted.
>
> It was agony to him, seeing her swift and clean-cut and virgin. He wanted to kill himself, and throw his detested carcase at her feet. His desire to turn round on himself and rend himself was agony to him.[99]

Ursula's attraction to a 'strange', more mystical world is hampered and prevented by the presence of Skrebensky. Indeed, at the moments when Skrebensky *does* seem to embody

---

[97] This is a theme which is further developed in the relationship between Ursula and Birkin in *Women in Love*, most clearly articulated by Birkin's insistence that he and Ursula write letters of resignation from their jobs (pp.315-317).

[98] *Rainbow*, p.275.

[99] p.283.

more than superficial foreignness, the effect is both illusive and elusive, in a passage in which 'strangeness' is inserted in MSRI. Again, items cohesive in the 'strange' chain are underlined:

> But when she met Skrebensky, everything vanished. She saw only the slender, unchangeable youth waiting there inscrutable, like her fate. [He was <u>beyond</u> her, with his loose, slightly <u>horsey</u> appearance, that made him seem very manly and <u>foreign</u>. Yet his face was smooth and soft and impressionable. (MSRI)] She shook hands with him, and her voice was like the <wild calling (MS)> [rousing (MSR)] of a bird startled by the dawn.
> "Isn't it nice," she cried, "to have a wedding!"
> There were bits of coloured confetti lodged in her dark hair.
> Again the confusion came over him, as if he were losing himself and becoming all vague, undefined, inchoate. [Yet he wanted to be hard, manly, <u>horsey</u>. (MSRI)] And he followed her.[100]

However, the early stages of Ursula and Skrebensky's relationship do demonstrate the potentials developed in their later relationship, and themes developed in Will and Anna's story. When Skrebensky kisses Ursula after their visit to the devastated St. Peter's church,[101] she is aware of both a new kind of 'strangeness' in him, which has a profound effect on her, in a passage unchanged from MS:

> She heard him breathing heavily, <u>strangely</u>, beside her. A terrible and magnificent sense of his <u>strangeness</u> possessed her. But she shrank a little now, within herself...He would kiss her again - but not again that night with the same, deep-reaching kiss. She was aware now, aware of what a kiss might be. And so, it was more difficult to come to him.[102]

---

[100]pp.286-287.

[101]The devastation of the church, and the related effects which Skrebensky has upon Ursula in the church both anticipates their abandoning of the established world in chapter 15, and Will and Anna's abandonment of established morality at the end of chapter 8. It also forms a contrast with Will and Anna's visit to Lincoln Cathedral, another heavily revised scene, in chapter 6:

> Passing the large church, Ursula must look in. But the whole interior was filled with scaffolding, fallen stone and rubbish were heaped on the floor, bits of plaster <ground (MS)> [crunched (TSR)] underfoot, and the place re-echoed to the calling of secular voices and to blows of the hammer...Skrebensky sat close to her. Everything seemed wonderful, if dreadful, to her, the world tumbling into ruins, and she and he clambering unhurt, lawless over the face of it all. He sat close to her, touching her, and she was aware of his <trespass (MS)> [influence (E1)] upon her. But she was glad. It excited her to feel the press of him upon her, as if his being were <pressing for advantage upon hers (MS)> [urging her to something. (E1)] (p.275)

[102]p.278.

In the church, Anton has seemed to Ursula like a '<mole (MS)> [living creature (TSR)]' in the '<earth (MS)> [dark underworld (TSR)]', in line with Will's developing animal alien qualities, emphasised from MS. His 'strangeness' now incorporates both the animal alienness discovered in the church, and the increasing impersonality which Ursula experiences in their relationship, introduced in TSR:

> In the warm of the early night, with the shadows new about them, she felt in another, <more personal (MS)> [harder, more beautiful, less personal (TSR)]. Now, a new state should come to pass.[103]

As with their later relationship, and that between Will and Anna in the final version of their story, their intimacy leads to a breach between the lover and the established world:

> But the two friends were hostile. It was as if Ursula *wanted* to divide herself from her acquaintances, in asserting her acquaintance with Anton, as she now called him.[104]

> A sort of defiance of all the world possessed her in it - she would kiss him just because she wanted to. And a dare-devilry in him, like a cynicism, a cut at everything he pretended to serve, retaliated in him.[105]

Yet Skrebensky is not enough for Ursula, and he cannot provide a strong enough oppositional force to balance her. As early as their kissing game in the shed and Ursula's vampiric love scene in the church, she is using Skrebensky in order to attain her 'maximum self'.[106] Their encounter with the barge-dwellers makes Ursula realise the inadequacy of Skrebensky as a partner for her.[107] The world seems to be 'ashes' around her, and at the wedding dance which follows, she indulges in a competitive and destructive interaction with him which is reductive to him. This passage is one of the most heavily revised interactions in the TS version of *The Rainbow*, and the final version demonstrates Ursula attempting to attain her 'maximum self' at the expense of Skrebensky, in competitive sex which is reductive to him. This feature of their relationship is best illustrated by Ursula's 'salt' destructiveness at the wedding dance, the metal-corrosive vocabulary introduced in TSR, and the 'salt' nature

---

[103] p.277.
[104] p.279.
[105] pp.280-281.
[106] pp.281:27, 282:5.
[107] pp.289-294.

of her destructiveness, included in E1, supporting Ross's thesis that these revisions were inspired by the vocabulary of Chapter 15. In MS, the opposition between Ursula and Skrebensky had been between light and dark; in TSR, it is the moon provides the focus for 'strangeness':

> Out of the great distance, and yet imminent, the powerful, overwhelming watch was kept upon her.[108]

The distance and imminence of the moon recalls (or anticipates, if we are right that the novel was recast backwards) aspects of the characterisation of Lydia in the church; she is from far away, yet she is intimately close. This link with the Tom / Lydia story is emphasised in Ursula's *own* 'strangeness', and the contrast of this with the 'concrete' world, as introduced in TSR. The italics in the following extract are mine:

> <And she wanted to run, she wanted to run. She wanted to fling away her cloak and her shoes and run barefoot, fleetfoot, to the trees and the hill and the moon. But Skrebensky, dark like a shadow beside her, kept her. He wanted to draw closer to her. She felt him, like a black shadow, wanting to draw close to her. Whilst she wanted the brightness and the brilliance of the moon. Ah, with the moon on her, she could <kill him> (MS) [make him nothing, as a light makes a shadow into nothing (TSR)] if she wanted to. She knew it. But he was bending nearer to her. (MS)> [*She was not there.* Patiently she sat, under the cloak, with Skrebensky holding her hand. *But her naked self was away there* <breasting> [beating upon] the moonlight, <taking> [dashing] the moonlight <on> [with] her breasts and her belly and her thighs and her knees, in meeting, in communion. *She half started, to go in actuality,* to fling away her clothing and flee away, away from this dark confusion and nothingness[109] of people to the hill and the moon. *But the people stood round her like stones, like* <heavy> [dead (TSR, E1D)] *magnetic stones, and she could not go in actuality.* Skrebensky, *like a* <barren stone (TSR)> [loadstone (E1)] *weighed on her, the weight of his presence*[110] *detained her. She felt the burden of him, the blind, persistent, inert burden. He was inert, and he weighed upon her.* She sighed in pain. Oh for the coolness and entire liberty and brightness of the moon. Oh for the cold liberty to be herself, to do entirely as she liked. *She wanted to get right away.* She felt like bright metal weighted down <with (TSR)> [by (E1)] dark, impure <dross (TSR)> [(E1)]. He was the dross, people were

---

[108]p.296.

[109] Kinkead-Weekes substitutes 'chaos' for 'nothingness' (p.625).

[110]Contrast also the abstract nature of Lydia's 'presence' in the extract describing her in Cossethay church, and the deadening weight of Skrebensky's presence, which identifies him with the 'outer' world.

the dross. *If she could but get away to the clean <limbed> free moonlight.* (TSR)][111]

Ursula's moon, however, is not merely intimately close. Although she is aware in TSR that it is 'looking right into her, not upon her, but right at her', and in the MS 'at her, but through the very core of her', the moon in this scene is *impending* suggesting its destructive nature, and thus consistent with the increasing destructiveness of, for example, the flood, the description of which is amended in TSR to 'one great flood heaving slowly backwards to the verge of oblivion' from 'one great flood rocking slowly backwards to the verge of equilibrium',[112] and Ursula's increasingly corrosive behaviour towards Skrebensky. Ursula and Skrebensky's 'other' world, unlike those portrayed earlier in the novel, is not a 'beyond'. It is symbolised by the metaphor of the flood, an image which, throughout *The Rainbow* has been used to signify the male's tendency to disintegration, and to show that those who lack the self-definition to maintain themselves against it are engulfed. Ursula looks to the moon for her independence. However, Skrebensky is not capable of embodying the opposite strength necessary for Ursula's fulfilment, and the moon has a dual negative effect. Skrebensky's secret lack of self is revealed, and Ursula's response is excessive self-assertion. The result of this is the lack of a counter-force against Ursula, and her transformation of nature into an extension of herself. The linguistic web of 'strangeness' has now been expanded to suggest not only otherness, foreignness, abstraction, identity with an animal 'other' and discovery, but potential destruction, themes which are expanded and developed through Lawrence's creative revisions at every stage of composition, and under the influence of ideas and themes developed in the later relationships. Ross's examination of Lawrence's revisions fails to take into account the complexity and thoroughness of the latter's creative revisions, and the developing thematic whole of which they are part.

---

[111] *Rainbow*, p.296.
[112] p.295.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

As this thesis has demonstrated, both repetition and revision are functionally intrinsic to *The Rainbow*. Examination of both in combination, never before attempted, provides comprehensive evidence of Lawrence's informative lexical and syntactic specificity and its importance, the complexity and extreme subtlety of meaningful lexical variation in the novel, and the consistent development of this lexical variation and of syntactic parallelism through the revision process. The composition and revision process itself reveals both broad and minute linguistic modulations introduced into *The Wedding Ring*, and developed to E1, demonstrating that Lawrence's thematic revisions occur at the most fine-grained level, and that multiple repetitive techniques in the novel operate both singly and in combination to 'enact' the developing themes of the work. Accurate paraphrase of Lawrencian fiction of this period, such as that attempted by Morris, is therefore both impossible and semantically corruptive. Equally importantly, by extending revisionist criticism of Lawrence's 'style' to combine modern linguistic and stylistic approaches regarding self-repetition in written discourse, Biblical parallelism scholarship, original archive work on revision, and biographical evidence provided by Lawrence's correspondence, it has been demonstrated that, as Balbert suggested, specific connections can be made between Lawrence's developing 'philosophy' and repetition in an individual novel. However, the functional stylistic effects discovered during my research has revealed that Lawrence's repetition operates at a much more minute level than Balbert anticipates. The 'new language' which Lawrence had so much difficulty creating reveals far closer links between *The Rainbow* and Lawrence's developing 'philosophy' than has previously been considered.

This thesis has extended study of Lawrence's repetition in several crucial ways. Following on from the new wave of work on Lawrence's stylistic repetitiveness which was begun in the 1970s, it has been demonstrated that, as Lodge, Bonds and Ragussis suggest, Lawrence's repetitions accrete meaning and, as Bell also recognises, operate in a semantically ambiguous manner. This thesis demonstrates that *The Rainbow's* repetitive style is more complex than the mere forwarding by contiguity which Lodge identified in *Women in Love*, where each clause takes its impetus from an item in the preceding one, and more intricate than the additive and paratactic principle that Bell identifies in Lawrence's sentence construction. Instead, Lawrence's lexical web is far more elaborate and subtle, with the separation and conjoining of different connotations of repeated lexical items extending throughout the novel, developing through the revision process in line with thematic alterations, and providing a

structural and evaluative framework for each generation by which their successes and failures can be identified. Crucially, the identification of such a framework as present at the level of lexical and syntactic repetition in both *The Rainbow* and *Hardy* and the post-*Hardy* essays confirms that Worthen is mistaken in claiming that the 'neat shapes and patterns' of *Hardy* are different in form to the prose of *The Rainbow*. Instead, it has been shown that that the 'structural skeleton' which Kinkead-Weekes identifies as being provided by *Hardy* for *The Rainbow* operates subtly and intricately at an additional level of lexical and syntactic repetition to the broader levels which Kinkead-Weekes identifies.[1] In addition, the Biblical parallelism of *The Rainbow* which Baldanza identifies has been extended to reveal the functional nature of this and similar parallelism, and its crucial relationship to Lawrence's developing 'philosophy', confirming and extending the extent of the influence which *Hardy* had on the novel. Mori's examination of the elasticity of imagery in the novel has been extended by the demonstration that similar elasticity and accretion is present in lexical repetition, and that this repetition and its effects are comprehensively and consistently developed throughout all three generations through all stages of the revision process. As Ragussis observes with reference to *Women in Love*, words in *The Rainbow* are defined both by their context and the associations raised by their combination. However, this thesis has demonstrated that the subtle modulations of meaning which Lawrence exploits in his repetitions means that different repeated words become semantically, and thematically intertwined. In addition to the main issues regarding *The Rainbow's* repetition which the thesis has highlighted, a surprising side issue was also raised. Examination of Lawrence's developing repetition in Chapter 2 reveals that Lawrence was indeed moving towards the language of *The Rainbow* in the *Prussian Officer* collection as Cushman suggests, although at a more detailed level than he examines. However, it is also revealed that Lawrence's movement towards such a language occurs at an earlier stage than Cushman identifies; it is already traceable in Lawrence's syntax and repetition in *Sons and Lovers*.

This thesis has also significantly extended revision scholarship of Lawrence's texts. Following Kinkead-Weekes' comprehensive trashing of the 'daimonic' theory of Lawrence's composition process in 'The Marble and the Statue', this thesis has demonstrated that the insertion and reworking in *The Rainbow* of ideas developed in *Hardy* reveals that Lawrence's revision process included minute and subtle stylistic reworkings not previously studied or considered. The evolution of complex cohesive chains which are revised to incorporate

---

[1] 'The Marble and the Statue'.

increasingly subtle modulations of meaning in accordance with the increasing inclusion of *Hardy's* ideas shows that Lawrence revised far more comprehensively than has previously been thought. In addition, the shifting emphasis of these cohesive chains through composition and revision proves that *The Rainbow's* thematic development extended to subtle linguistic manipulations and modulations. These discoveries have been made possible both by the manner of analysis in this thesis, and its inclusion of all three generations for comprehensive study, both of which have never before been attempted. As a side issue to these major discoveries, examination of Lawrence's linguistic manipulations and re-emphases through revision has confirmed Kinkead-Weekes' thesis in 'The Marble and the Statue' that *The Rainbow* was written chronologically backwards.

Crucially, examination of repetition and revision in combination in this thesis has provided comprehensive textual evidence to challenge Charles Ross' argument that Lawrence's proof revisions were carried out under pressure of self-censorship and publisher's pressure. Instead, it has been demonstrated that many of these revisions were part of a comprehensive scheme of creative revision, carried out to incorporate the increasing influence of *Hardy*, and to develop evolving themes and shifting emphases. This thesis has provided evidence to counter Ross' thesis, and to give weight to Kinkead-Weekes' surmise that Ross is wrong, and that more complex creative revisions in proof are possible. Again, the fine-grained nature of the stylistic and linguistic techniques employed in this thesis have allowed Lawrence's reworkings to be studied more closely than previously attempted, and have provided more detailed evidence of Lawrence's composition process than has previously been studied.

In addition to the main issues concerning repetition and revision in *The Rainbow* which this thesis sought to address, several significant side issues were highlighted, all of which are fruitful for further research. Most obviously, examination of the complexity of Lawrence's stylistic achievements and its development opens the door for examination of the evolution of Lawrence's style(s) throughout his career. If Lawrence's themes are so comprehensively developed in *The Rainbow*, and his 'style' so closely reflects these themes and their developments, then any future study of Lawrence's revision process should be able to shed light on his developing methods of work, and the differing relationship between his fiction and 'philosophy' as his career progressed. Lawrence's stylistic achievements and artistic development should then be able to be fully addressed at last. With the publication of the Cambridge editions of Lawrence's letters and works incorporating textual variants, such research is more possible than ever before. The publication of the Cambridge editions is both

a significant landmark in Lawrence studies, and a huge editorial achievement. However, the identification in this thesis of Kinkead-Weekes' collation of MS and MSR, and the inclusion of significant revisions which his approach omits, indicates that the Cambridge editions cannot long remain the definitive editions as which they are currently lauded. They are not a comprehensive resource for those interested in Lawrence's composition process, although they are a significant aid.

In addition, the discovery made in this thesis that Lawrence's move towards the language of *The Rainbow* begins not merely pre-*Hardy*, as Cushman states, but pre-*Prussian Officer*, suggests that a re-evaluation of the significance of *Sons and Lovers*, and particularly its development through composition from the original *Paul Morel* might be both important and revealing. Close textual examination of the repetition and revision process in *Women in Love* is also overdue. Despite Ragussis' and Lodge's impressive examinations of repetition in the novel, examination of how far *Women in Love's* repetition moves beyond that typical of *The Rainbow* remains to be done, and a comprehensive study of its composition and revision process, which differs greatly from *The Rainbow's*, remains to be attempted. Like Kinkead-Weekes' edition of *The Rainbow*, the Cambridge edition of *Women in Love* also omits many significant revisions, not least the insertion of 'electrical' imagery, so crucial in the developing portrayal of Gerald and of relationships in the novel. The multiple connotations, manipulations and accreted meanings of repeated lexical items in the novel, which extend the cohesive chains of *Women in Love* beyond *Hardy* and towards *The Crown* are particularly worthy of study, as is the stylistic manifestation of Lawrencian 'dualism' and 'Absoluteness' in the novel.

Finally, although this thesis has merely touched on the presence and effects of Free Indirect Discourse in *The Rainbow*, the complexity of Lawrence's linguistic techniques in the novel, and the ambiguity of focus which is often present due to complex stylistic techniques, suggests that a full length linguistic approach to FID in *The Rainbow* would be fruitful, particularly one including the approaches of Ehrlich, Fludernik and Cohn.

In examining repetition and revision in *The Rainbow* by drawing on diverse approaches and resources, this thesis has offered a comprehensive picture of both *The Rainbow's* evolution, and the functional significance of its repetitive style, with particular reference to Lawrence's developing 'philosophy'. The combination of repetition and revision studied, and recent approaches concerned with Lawrence's complex and ingenious stylistic techniques, achievements, and compositional process signals the beginning of Lawrence's appreciation as

the innovative and acute stylist and reviser which he so obviously is. It is an appreciation which has been a long time in coming, and has further still to go.

WORKS CITED

Jean Aitchison, 'Say, Say it Again Sam: The Treatment of Repetition in Linguistics', in *Repetition*, Volume vii, edited by Andreas Fischer, Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature, (Tubigen, 1994), pp.15-34.

Daniel Albright, *Personality and Impersonality: Lawrence, Woolf and Mann* (Chicago and London, 1978).

D.J. Allerton, 'Drop the verb if you can. Otherwise use proforms (in the same way other people do) but do it according to the rules', or the Non-Repetition of Lexical Verb Structures', in *Repetition*, pp.36-44.

E. Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, translated by Willard Trask (Princeton, 1953).

Peter Balbert, *D.H. Lawrence and the Psychology of Rhythm: The Meaning of 'Form' in The Rainbow* (The Hague, 1974).

Frank Baldanza, 'D.H. Lawrence's Song of Songs', *Modern Fiction Studies*, 7 (1961), pp.106-114.

Michael Bell, *D.H. Lawrence: Language and Being* (Cambridge, 1992).

Gavriel Ben-Ephraim, *The Moon's Dominion: Narrative Dichotomy and Female Dominance in Lawrence's Earlier Novels* (London and Toronto, 1981).

Adele Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington, 1985).

Maud Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry: Psychological Studies of Imagination*, reprint (London, 1978).

Diane S. Bonds, *Language and the Self in D.H. Lawrence*, Studies in Modern Literature 68, reprint (London, 1987).

Ernst Cassirer, *Language and Myth* (New York, 1946).

Wallace L. Chafe, 'Integration and Involvement in Speaking, Writing, and Oral Literature', in *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy*, edited by Deborah Tannen, Advances in Discourse Processes 4 (Norwood, New Jersey, 1981), pp.35-54.

Seymour Chatman, 'Characters and Narrators: Filter, Slant and Interest-Focus', *Poetics Today*, 7 (1986), pp.189-204.

Dorrit Cohn, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* (Princeton, 1978).

Jenny Cook-Gumperz and John J. Gumperz, 'From oral to written: The transition to literacy', in *Variation in Writing: Functional and Linguistic-Cultural Differences*, edited by Marcia Farr Whiteman, Writing 1 (Hillsdale, New Jersey, 1981), pp.12-27.

Keith Cushman, *D.H. Lawrence at Work: The Emergence of the "Prussian Officer" Stories* (Hassocks, 1978).

H.M. Daleski, *The Forked Flame: A Study of D.H. Lawrence* (London, 1965).

R.P. Draper, *D.H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage* (London, 1970).

S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York, 1920).

Susan Ehrlich, *Point of View: a linguistic analysis of literary style* (London, 1990).

M. Fludernik, *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness* (London and New York, 1993).

E.M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (London, 1927).

Garthorne-Hardy, *Ottoline: The Early Memoirs of Lady Ottoline Morrell* (London, 1963).

Gerard Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, (Oxford, 1986).

George Buchanan Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry Considered with Special Reference to the Criticism and Interpretation of the Old Testament* (London, New York, Toronto, 1915).

Horace Gregory, *D.H. Lawrence: Pilgrim of the Apocalypse*, second edition (New York, 1957).

John J. Gumperz, Hannah Kaltman and Mary Catherine O'Connor, 'Cohesion in Spoken and Written Discourse', in *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse*, pp.3-19.

M.A.K. Halliday, and R. Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, English Language Series 9 (London, 1976).

R. Hasan, in 'Coherence and Cohesive Harmony' in *Understanding Reading Comprehension: Cognition, Language and the Structure of Prose.*, edited by J. Flood (Delaware, 1984), pp.181-219.

R. Hasan, *Grammatical Parallelism in Spoken and Written English, Parts I and II* Programme in Linguistics and English Teaching Paper 7 (Harlow, 1968).

Mary Hiatt, *Artful Balance: The Parallel Structures of Style*, New Humanistic Research Volume ii (New York and London, 1975).

Michael Hoey, *On the Surface of Discourse* (London, Boston, Sydney, 1983).

Michael Hoey, *Patterns of Lexis in Text*, (Oxford, 1991).

Graham Hough, *The Dark Sun: A Study of D.H. Lawrence*, reprint (Harmondsworth, 1961).

Alan Ingram, *The Language of D.H. Lawrence* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London, 1990).

Roman Jakobson, 'Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet', in Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings, Volume iii, Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*, edited and with a preface by Stephen Rudy (The Hague, Paris, New York, 1981), pp.98-135.

Roman Jakobson, 'Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry', in Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings, Volume iii, Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*, edited and with a preface by Stephen Rudy (The Hague, Paris, New York, 1981), pp.87-97.

Barbara Johnstone et al, 'Repetition in Discourse: A Dialogue', in *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Volume I*, edited by Barbara Johnstone, Advances in Discourse Processes Volume I (New Jersey, 1994), pp.1-20.

Frank Kermode, *D.H. Lawrence* (New York, 1973).

Mark Kinkead-Weekes, *D.H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile, 1912-22*, The Cambridge Biography, Volume ii (Cambridge, 1996).

Mark Kinkead-Weekes, 'The Marble and the Statue: The Exploratory Imagination of D.H. Lawrence', in *Imagined Worlds: Essays on some English Novels and Novelists in Honour of John Butt*, edited by Maynard Mack and Ian Gregor (London, 1968), pp.371-418.

Mark Kinkead-Weekes, 'The Marriage of Opposites in *The Rainbow*', in *D.H. Lawrence: Centenary Essays*, edited by Mara Kalnins (Bristol, 1986), pp.21-40.

J.L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*, (New Haven and London, 1981).

D.H. Lawrence, *Complete Poems* (New York, London, Victoria, Ontario, 1993).

D.H. Lawrence, 'Hymns in a Man's Life', in *Phoenix II* (London, 1968), pp.597-601.

D.H. Lawrence, 'Love' in *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, edited by Michael Herbert, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1988), pp.5-12.

D.H. Lawrence, 'Pan in America', in *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence,* edited by Edward D. McDonald (Great Britain and U.S.A., 1936), pp.22-31.

D.H. Lawrence, 'Study of Thomas Hardy' in *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*, edited by Bruce Steele, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1985).

D.H. Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers*, edited by Helen and Carl Baron, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1992).

D.H. Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers. A Facsimile of the Manuscript*, edited by Mark Schorer, (Berkeley, London, 1977).

D.H. Lawrence, 'The Crown' in *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, edited by Michael Herbert, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1988).

D.H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, edited by Aldous Huxley (Melbourne, London, Toronto, 1932).

D.H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume i: September 1901 - May 1913*, edited by James T. Boulton, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1979).

D.H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume ii: June 1913 - October 1916*, edited by James T. Boulton and G.J. Zytaruk, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1981).

D.H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume iii: October 1916 - June 1921*, edited by James T. Boulton and Andrew Robertson, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1984).

D.H. Lawrence, *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*, edited by John Worthen, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence, Cambridge, London, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1983).

D.H. Lawrence, *The Rainbow*, edited by Mark Kinkead-Weekes, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, London, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1989).

D.H. Lawrence, *Twilight In Italy and Other Essays*, Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence, edited by Paul Eggert (Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, 1994).

D.H. Lawrence, *Women in Love*, edited by David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen, Cambridge Edition of The Letters and Works of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1987).

F.R. Leavis, *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist* (London, 1967).

Geoffrey Leech, *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry* (Essex, 1969).

David Lodge, *The Modes of Modern Writing: Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature* (Ithaca, 1977).

Robert E. Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, (New York and London, 1996).

R. Lowth, *Isiaah, A New Translation, with a Preliminary Dissertation and Notes Critical, Philological and Explanatory* (Edinburgh, 1807).

Sally McLendon, 'Meaning, Rhetorical Structure, and Discourse Organisation in Myth', in *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*, edited by Deborah Tannen, Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics 1981 (Washington D.C., 1981), pp.284-305.

Marilyn Merritt, 'Repetition in Situated Discourse - Exploring Its Forms and Functions' in *Repetition in Discourse*, pp.23-36.

Harry T. Moore, *The Life and Works of D.H. Lawrence* (New York, 1951).

Harry T. Moore, 'The Rainbow', in *The Achievement of D.H. Lawrence*, edited by F.J. Hoffman and Harry T. Moore (Norman, 1953), pp.144-158.

Haruhide Mori, 'Lawrence's Imagistic Development in *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*', *E.L.H.*, 31 (1964), pp.460-81.

Julian Moynahan, *The Deed of Life: The Novels and Tales of D.H. Lawrence* (Princeton, New Jersey and London, 1963).

Walter Nash, 'On a Passage from Lawrence's 'Odour of Chrysanthemums', in *Language and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Stylistics*, edited by Ronald Carter, Aspects of English (London, 1982), pp.101-120.

Anais Nin, *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*, second edition (London, 1985).

Walter Nash, *Our Experience of Language* (London, 1971).

Neal R. Norrick, 'One is None: Remarks on Repetition in Proverbs', *Proverbium* 8 (1991), pp.121-128.

Andrew H. Plaks, 'Where the Lines Meet: Parallelism in Chinese and Western Literatures', *Poetics Today* 11 (1990), pp.523-546.

R.E. Pritchard, *D.H. Lawrence: Body of Darkness* (London, 1971).

Michael Ragussis, *The Subterfuge of Art: Language and the Romantic Tradition* (Baltimore, 1978).

Charles Ross, *The Composition of the Rainbow and Women in Love: A History* (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1979).

Charles Ross, 'The Revisions to the Second Generation of *The Rainbow*', *Review of English Studies* 27 (1976), pp.277-295.

John Russell, *Style in Modern British Fiction: Studies in Joyce, Lawrence, Forster, Lewis and Green* (Baltimore and London, 1978).

Keith Sagar, *The Art of D.H. Lawrence* (Cambridge, 1966).

Roger Sale, 'The Narrative Technique of *The Rainbow*', *Modern Fiction Studies* 5 (1959), pp.29-38.

(eds.) J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, *The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume XIII*, second edition (Oxford, 1989).

(eds.) J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, *The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume XV*, second edition, (Oxford, 1989).

(eds.) J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, *The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume XVI*, edited by J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, second edition (Oxford, 1989).

(eds.) J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, *The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume XIX*, second edition (Oxford, 1989).

(eds.) J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, *The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume XX*, second edition (Oxford, 1989).

Mark Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence* (London, 1955).

Richard Swigg, *Lawrence, Hardy and American Literature* (London, 1972).

Deborah Tannen, 'Oral and Literate Strategies in Spoken and Written Narratives', *Language*, 58 (1982), pp.1-21.

Deborah Tannen, *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*, Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 6 (Cambridge, 1989).

Deborah Tannen, 'What's in a Frame? Surface Evidence for Underlying Expectations' in *Framing in Discourse*, edited by Deborah Tannen (New York, Oxford, 1993), pp.14-56.

Andrea Tyler, 'Patterns of Lexis: How much can repetition tell us about discourse coherence?', *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics* (Washington D.C, 1995), pp.268-280.

Peter Verdonk, 'Words, Words, Words: A Pragmatic and Socio-Cognitive View of Lexical Repetition', in *Twentieth-Century Fiction: From Text to Context*, edited by Peter Verdonk and Jean Jaques Weber, The Interface Series (London and New York, 1995), pp.7-31.

Eliseo Vivas, *D.H. Lawrence: The Failure and Triumph of Art* (London, 1960).

E.O. Winter, 'A clause-relational approach to English texts', *Instructional Science* (Amsterdam, 1977), vol. 6, no.1, special issue.

E.O. Winter, 'Connection in science material: a proposition about the semantics of clause relations', in CILT Reports and Papers 7, *Science and Technology in a Second Language* (London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research, 1971), pp.41-52.

E.O. Winter, 'Replacement as a function of repetition: a study of its principle features in the clause relations of contemporary English', PhD thesis, University of London, 1974.

E.O. Winter, 'Replacement as a fundamental function of the sentence in context', *Forum Linguisticum*, vol.4, no.2 (December 1979), pp.95-133.

E.O. Winter, *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English: The Clause and its Place in the Definition of a Sentence*, (London, Boston, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1982).

John Worthen, *D.H. Lawrence and the Idea of the Novel* (London and Basingstoke, 1979).

MANUSCRIPTS CITED

The Rainbow

University of Texas at Austin, holograph MS and corrected typescript, the latter retained from *The Wedding Ring*, E331a.

University of Texas at Austin, corrected typescript and holograph manuscript, E331b.

University of Texas at Austin, English first edition, A7.

Sons and Lovers

University of California at Berkeley, 530pp, E373e.

University of Texas at Austin, Page proofs, 423pp, and two extra sets of pp.357-352, E373g.

The Prussian Officer and Other Stories

University of Texas at Austin, English first edition, A6.

Nottingham County Library, corrected page proofs, 310pp, E326.6.

University of Cambridge, 'The White Stocking' in *Smart Set* (44:97-108), October 1914, C34.5.