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INTRODUCTION

D.H. Lawrence writes with a distinct palette of words. He consciously selects specific words, which act as his brushstrokes, to illustrate his novels. His novels are dabbed repeatedly with these same words, but the verbal brushstrokes blend differently in each of his works to produce different aesthetic effects. I have discovered that Lawrence most likes to create his images and their impressions with the words ‘beauty’, ‘ugly’, ‘quiver’, ‘ecstasy’, and ‘abstract’. In each of Lawrence’s literary canvases, these words are repeated frequently; but they smear together in different consistencies to depict different character relationships. In order to accent each new literary coloring, formed through the interplay of these verbal brushstrokes, Lawrence repeats novel-specific words in each of his narratives; these words are aesthetically dependent on the type of human relationships Lawrence seeks to explore in his novelistic canvas. *Sons and Lovers* repeats the word ‘intimate’; the relationships in *Sons and Lovers* seek ‘all-beautiful intimacy’ and the result is ‘counterfeit intimacy’. In *The Rainbow*, Lawrence illustrates generational relationships through the words ‘wonder’ and ‘transfiguration’. But when ‘ecstasy’ is sought through inhuman ‘wonder’, these character relationships struggle. *Women in Love* praises ‘savage’ human instincts; Lawrence often writes the word ‘savage’ in moments when a Hegelian dialectic of ‘beauty’ and ‘ugliness’ functions. And, in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, ‘mechanical’ ‘abstraction’ blots out the ‘quivering’ human instincts that Lawrence emphasizes in satisfying human relationships. By stroking these words into his writing, Lawrence develops his own aesthetic. Lawrence’s aesthetic is vital, deeply human, and it not coincidentally paints the life charged by human relationships. For Lawrence, true art and true human relationships must accept the presence of, and oscillation between, ‘beauty’ and ‘ugliness’. Through detailed study of the words of D.H. Lawrence, the importance of his human
aesthetic becomes visible. Further, Lawrence believes in the phosphorescence of words; he believes that words do not signify one ‘thing’ but instead convey a phosphorescence of meanings. Through my study of Lawrence’s aesthetic, a phosphorescent, multi-linguistic, understanding of the words ‘beauty’ and ‘ugly’ is illuminated. For Lawrence, the word ‘beauty’ can signify tender, violent, or sacred, while the word ‘ugly’ can signify profane, delight, and frustration. Beauty and ugliness are phosphorescent sensations, emotions, and impressions.

Historicizing Lawrence Studies

Contemporary Modernist fiction studies tend to invoke D.H. Lawrence as an aside, a figure for comparison with Woolf or with Joyce. In fact, most Modernist studies forget to mention Lawrence at all. When D.H Lawrence does become the primary figure of study today, his novels are most commonly analyzed for their curiously Christian or for their gender-study undertones. In order to resurface the importance of Lawrence in our academic endeavors, I deliberately want to leave out discussions of Lawrence’s Christian beliefs and I deliberately do not use to the word ‘erotic’; instead, I want to highlight his status as a writer-painter in an analysis of the aesthetics of his novels. I believe that Lawrence’s 1929 observation is still relevant in 2016: “Our aesthetic education is become immensely important, since it is so immensely neglected” (Lawrence, Pictures on the Walls). In this thesis, I offer a new reading of an author who has been neglected.

In Pictures on the Walls Lawrence mourns the neglect of 20th century aesthetic education. Lawrence believes that the museum emphasis on the academic study of only particular works of art limits aesthetic education; Lawrence believes all pictures, including wall pictures, need to be studied for their visualizations of human relations. Like Lawrence, I too believe the study of aesthetics has been immensely neglected in the Humanities. I believe
close-reading Lawrence’s phosphorescent written and visual aesthetics generates a more holistic study of Lawrence. Through my attention to Lawrence’s aesthetics, I am able study multiple components of Lawrence’s novels, gender, eroticism, spirituality, without limiting Lawrence’s unconscious writing to one of these categories. Lawrence’s language is phosphorescent, thus studying his aesthetic words uncovers a phosphorescence of Lawrence’s ideas. Lawrence’s paintings more consciously focus on the human. I pair Lawrence’s unconscious phosphorescent language with his conscious painterly depictions of the human in order to study Lawrence’s conception of human relationships.

To begin, I would like to acknowledge major research that has already been conducted on D.H. Lawrence. The discourse on Lawrence as a writer-painter began in the 1960s thanks to Lawrence scholar, Keith Sagar. Robert Millett, an American Lawrence scholar, Jack Stewart, professor at the University of British Columbia who specializes in the interrelations of literature and painting in the Modern period, and Andrew Harrison, professor at the University of Nottingham who specializes in late 19th and 20th century literature and specifically Lawrence’s literature, have since continued Sagar’s mode of Lawrence study. By comparing Lawrence’s various novels to different art movements, all of these critics wanted to discover the visual art that most influenced Lawrence’s writing. Sagar’s *D.H. Lawrence’s Paintings* (2003), and his earlier *The Art of D.H. Lawrence* (1966), prove that art movements contemporary to Lawrence’s time influence Lawrence’s writing. Sagar finds much influence from Van Gogh in Lawrence’s writing. For example, Sagar compares Van Gogh’s *Starry Night* to a description of the sky in *The Rainbow*. Sagar’s narrative is important to my study because it details the various artists with whom Lawrence conversed, including Gotzsche, O’Keeffe, and of course Cezanne. It is especially important in Lawrence studies because Sagar was the
first scholar to describe Lawrence’s art as ‘art for life’s sake’. This phrase is effective in explaining Lawrence’s art preference. Sagar compares Lawrence to his American artist friends, Earl and Achsah Brewster, in order to articulate this ‘art for life’s sake’ approach. Sagar writes: “The art which interested Lawrence was art for life’s sake. The art which interested the Brewster’s, it seemed to him, reduced life to mere composition” (Sagar, 2003, 19). ‘Art for life’s sake’ is Sagar’s definition of Lawrence’s artistic worldview; Lawrence believed art should always be painted with the intent to portray life, not to merely create a formal composition. In order to depict life, the artist must paint organically rather than academically; the Brewster’s reduce depictions of life to mere ideas and impressions. Sagar’s writer-painter narrative, and his decision to name Lawrence’s painterly aesthetic ‘art for life’s sake’, has been an important resource for my own analysis of Lawrence’s writing; however, Sagar focuses heavily on descriptions of Lawrence’s writer-painter journey, and his writer-painter influences, rather than on arguments about Lawrence’s aesthetic goals.

Likewise, Jack Stewart has written numerous accounts on Lawrence’s art movement influences. Jack Stewart published an essay in the 1980 edition of Twentieth Century Literature in which he compares Lawrence’s writing to Gauguin’s Primitivist style paintings. Stewart writes, “Gauguin was a writing painter, Lawrence a painting writer…it was natural for Lawrence at the outset of his career, to describe his writing in metaphors drawn from painting” (Stewart, “Lawrence and Gauguin” 385). Stewart compares the primitive anima in the paintings of Gauguin to the primitive moments in Lawrence’s novels, particularly in Women in Love. Stewart’s book on Lawrence’s art, The Vital Art of D.H. Lawrence (1999), traces fifteen years of Lawrence’s writing, from The White Peacock to The Plumed Serpent. Stewart concludes his book by associating each Lawrence novel to an art movement influence. He considers The
White Peacock heavily influenced by English landscape painting and by Pre-Raphaelite portraiture\(^1\). He considers Sons and Lovers a novel indebted to Realism, but aided by Symbolism, Impressionism, and Expressionism\(^2\). He finds The Rainbow Expressionistic, but also thinks the novel is influenced by Futurism\(^3\). Stewart, like many critics, considers Women in Love to be Lawrence’s most complex novel; in Women in Love Stewart analyzes the influences of Primitivism, Expressionism, and Futurism\(^4\). And lastly, Stewart relates Lawrence’s Kangaroo and The Plumed Serpent to Japanese woodcuts. While fascinating, I aim to move beyond discussions of the similarities between Lawrence’s writing and the 20\(^{th}\) century art

\(^1\) English Landscape painters and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood of the mid 19\(^{th}\) century urged for art to return to ‘the natural’; they denounced art that was too idealized.

\(^2\) Realism was an art movement that became popular in the 1840s. Realist artists championed depictions of the observable, unembellished world; they commonly painted images of the lower classes. By contrast, Symbolist works tended to depict the decadence of the imagination therefore they were often inspired by literary and romantic sources. Impressionists of the late 19\(^{th}\) century painted images that captured the likeness of life, particularly the atmospheric impression of moments. In reaction to WWI, Expressionists painted deliberately harsh contrasts of color into their equally deliberate non-naturalistic images. Expressionism witnessed a resurgence of religiosity, objective study, and nationalism.

\(^3\) In The Vital Art of D.H. Lawrence Stewart writes, “Motifs of animalization, vibration, and darkness strike a strongly expressionist note in The Rainbow, in which Lawrence seeks empathy with ‘the blood of nature’ in the ebb and flow of human relationships. Stewart believes that the sex between Ursula and Skrebensky, after he returns from Africa, is primitive, yet it is through this primitive act that Ursula expands her being; “this expansion of being is a hallmark of expressionism (69). Lawrence writes, “Gradually he transferred to her the hot, fecund darkness that possessed his own blood” (413). Stewart compares this writing to Expressionism by commenting, “The language modulates into pure expressionism, as darkness, vibration, and fecundity become the true subject. Lawrence sets off the expressionistic world of darkness and desire against the ‘realistic’ world of trains, trams, and city lights” (70).

\(^4\) In great detail Stewart discusses the African statue in Halliday’s Paris apartment in Women in Love. In fact he argues that, “The fact that the decadent Halliday possesses an African carving allows Lawrence to satirize the inherent contradictions and presumptions of self-conscious primitivism” (109). Stewart writes, “The fetish fulfills the goal of African art, in which an object embodies a force, rather than signifying anything outside itself” (108). Stewart goes on to explain the effect of Birkin and Gerald’s ‘primitivizing’ of the statue: “The fetish, perceived as barbarous by Gerald and as expressing a complete truth by Birkin, has a profound and disturbing impact on both of them. It is the essential catalyst of several degrees of initiation, dialectically revealing the entropic tendency of all high culture” (109).
movements because I find these comparisons unproductive in discovering Lawrence’s aesthetic intention; Lawrence is unable to be categorized in this manner. However, Stewart’s work is important for his use of the terms ‘Vitalism’, ‘verbal brushstrokes’, and ‘art-speech’. After Stewart these terms become more common in analyses of Lawrence’s language. Stewart articulates Lawrence’s Vitalism through the assertion that Lawrence’s writing stimulates readers into an awareness of the living world. Stewart includes a definition of Vitalism: “Vital art, in text or painting, communicates a state of being, by doubling and integrating the powers of language,” and “in Lawrence’s ethically charged aesthetic, vitality and wholeness are prime values” (Stewart, 1999, 199, 169). It seems that Sagar’s aesthetic of ‘art for life’s sake’ is similar to Stewart’s understanding of Lawrence’s ‘Vitalism’; they both term Lawrence’s philosophy of life, a philosophy rooted in human instinct. I aim to push these terms further to analyze how and why Lawrence develops this deliberate aesthetic. Stewart’s most recent study on Modernism, Color, Space, and Creativity: Art and Ontology in Five British Writers (2008), accentuates Lawrence’s writing style, a style I have termed ‘painterly’. I have termed moments in Lawrence’s writing ‘painterly’ because of his written description of pigments, his spatial configurations, his use of studio art language, and because of the luminous vivacity of these scenes. Stewart believes that Lawrence writes in an ababa / ba / bn pattern. Stewart conceives that a is an abstract idea, b is a concrete image, and n is an epiphany; Stewart equates this writing rhythm to Lawrence’s verbal brushstrokes. Stewart believes Lawrence’s language moves in this rhythm because Lawrence’s, “language is motivated by a desire for truth that leaves deep imprints on text and subtext” (Stewart, 2008, 98-99). In this discussion Stewart again uses the term ‘art-speech.’ He writes that Lawrence uses ‘art-speech’ because it is more flexible than the terms of philosophy, and because ‘art-speech’ “preserves the motion of living”
(Stewart, 2008, 102). In a similar manner to Stewart’s more general discussion of Lawrence’s ‘art-speech’, I analyze the words that Lawrence specifically repeats throughout his novels and essays in order to study Lawrence’s aesthetic. Lawrence’s dialectical writing, his art-speech, unveils the humanistic, vital, importance of both beauty and ugliness.

Robert Millett’s 1983 The Vultures and the Phoenix successfully compares Lawrence’s Mandrake Press paintings to specific passages in his novels, a technique that I employ as well. The purpose of Millett’s study was purely to enhance the scholarly understanding of Lawrence as not only novelist, but also as artist and thinker. Like Millett, I feel that Lawrence’s paintings visualize his writer’s aesthetic goal to expose the vital dialectic between beauty and ugliness in human relationships. In Lawrence’s essay Making Pictures (1929), he writes, “All my life I have from time to time gone back to paint, because it gave me a form of delight that words can never give. Perhaps the joy in words goes deeper and is for that reason more unconscious. The conscious delight is certainly stronger in paint” (Lawrence, 1929, 142). Lawrence’s paintings visually depict Lawrence’s unconscious, written aesthetic because Lawrence consciously paints the dialectic of beauty and ugliness that he considers essential in human relations. It is for this reason that I believe studying Lawrence’s painterly writing is essential; his paintings consciously emphasize the human, while the phosphorescence of his writing explores the human alongside Lawrence’s unconscious ideas. This pairing of his painting with his writing secures this study as one on the human condition. It is certainly not a coincidence that in Edward Nehls D.H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography, Lawrence is remembered as an art teacher in Croydon; Lawrence is particularly remembered for his botany class which was infused with drawing instruction (Nehls 91). Though Lawrence did not begin painting until 1926, art was clearly of a vital importance to Lawrence throughout his life. For this reason,
studies like Millett’s, that directly incorporate Lawrence’s paintings into close-readings of his novels, are effective; visual analysis is a facet to further examine Lawrence’s unconscious.

It is with Andrew Harrison that I diverge most strongly. In Harrison’s essay “Electricity and the Place of Futurism in Women in Love” (2000), Harrison argues that Lawrence’s novel is deeply Futurist. He makes known that in the summer of 1914 Lawrence read Marinetti’s collection of poetry, I Poeti, Soffici’s Cubismo e Futurismo, and Umberto Boccioni’s Pittura Scultura Futuriste. He argues that Lawrence’s textual inclusion of electrical devices and electrical power in Women in Love is an indication of Lawrence’s interest in the Futurists, who almost named their movement ‘Electricism’. Harrison goes on to analyze textual moments in which he believes Women in Love embodies the principles of Futurism; he also tries to apply this Futurist reading to The Rainbow. Harrison claims that Ursula’s boredom with school and her analogous-dependent statement, “If I were the moon, I know where I would fall down” (Lawrence, 1915, 355), embodies the Futurist urge to, “replace syntax and punctuation with scattered nouns, doubled nouns, and mathematical symbols” (Harrison, 2001, 48). Harrison argues that Ursula’s analogy between her longing for Skrebensky and the moon is reminiscent of an analogy Marinetti would praise. Though Lawrence was intrigued by the Futurist manifests, I do not agree with the critics who highlight Futurist moments in his writing. Lawrence is often nostalgic for the past, which is in opposition to the Futurist’s future-seeking ideas. Also, though Lawrence’s aesthetic often incorporates violent emotions, he never praises mechanical warfare, as the Futurists do. Further, Lawrence’s paintings embody none of the Futurist principles. I actually think Ursula’s journal entry sheds light on Lawrence’s ‘art for life’s sake’ aesthetic. Ursula looks at the beautiful moon, but because of her characteristically human sadness, due to her break-up with Skrebensky, she imagines an ugly, dark world where
the moon, rather than rising, violently falls down; this is the emotional violence of Lawrence’s aesthetic.

More recent notable Lawrence critics include David Trotter who incorporates Lawrence into his study of the Modernist novel. He uses Stewart’s term ‘Vitalist’ to describe Lawrence’s philosophy, as he believes that Lawrence judged art based on its capacity to “intensify or diminish the will to life” (Trotter, “The Modernist Novel”). Both of the terms, ‘Vitalist’ and ‘will to life’ are not Trotter’s; rather, Trotter’s contribution to Lawrence studies is in his argument that these terms make Lawrence’s writing, particularly The Rainbow, Modernist. Later, in 2011, Trotter expands his understanding of Lawrence’s Modernism to include Lady Chatterley’s Lover, which he discusses for its primitivism. Most importantly, in “Techno-Primitivism: A Propos of Lady Chatterley’s Lover”, Trotter notes that Lady Chatterley’s Lover is rarely studied in literary contexts as it is only analyzed for its presentation of sexual expression (Trotter 151). I seek to change this stigma by studying the aesthetics of Lady Chatterley’s Lover not its eroticism. In Paul Poplawski’s Writing the Body in D.H. Lawrence: Essays on Language, Representation, and Sexuality (2001), he expands Stewart’s term ‘art-speech’ to engage with 20th century gender debates. Poplawski defines art-speech as a style of writing that is similar to symbolism; but, in symbolism the written language of symbols represents thoughts and ideas, while, “the art-symbol or art-term stands for a pure experience, emotional and passion, spiritual and perceptual, all at one. Art communicates, a state of being-whereas the symbol at best only communicates a whole thought, an emotional idea”

David Trotter argues that Lady Chatterley’s Lover is a product of Lawrence’s post-WWI belief that England was destroying itself. He cites instances of Connie’s ‘modernism’, most notably her attire of synthetic tennis shoes. In contrast to Connie’s status as a ‘modern woman’ he argues that Connie’s connection to the primitive hut, and her appreciation for Mellors’ colloquial language, exhibit her desire for the primitive past, a desire that is reminiscent of Lawrence’s own desire.
Poplawski successfully moves Lawrence studies beyond mere discussions of Lawrence’s ‘symbols’, but he does not examine Lawrence’s art-speech to explore topics other than human sexuality. Poplawski includes Stefania Michelucci’s essay, “D.H. Lawrence’s Representation of the Body and the Visual Arts” (2001), which relates sexuality in Lawrence’s paintings, to its presence in his writing. Michelucci observes the paradoxical case between bodily shame and bodily eroticism in Lawrence’s written descriptions of his characters, as well as in his Christian and myth-based paintings. Michelucci’s ultimate aim, like most recent Lawrence scholars, is to make a claim about Lawrence’s faith, a faith in the human body instead of God. In the 2006 publication of the Journal of Speculative Philosophy, Michael Lackey starts to recognize the importance of aesthetic readings of Lawrence and he writes on the aesthetics of Lawrence’s Women in Love. Lackey situates Lawrence’s novel in relation to the 20th century disciplinary division between philosophy and psychology. Lackey equates Lawrence with Nietzsche, while he emphasizes Lawrence’s aesthetic distance from Bell and Fry; Lackey’s ultimate claim is that Lawrence does not believe that art can be reduced to a ‘reality’. Lackey’s philosophical reading of Women in Love is one of the only attempts to focus on Lawrence’s aesthetic. In Kimberly Coates’, “Eros in the Sickroom: Phosphorescent Form and Aesthetic Ecstasy in D.H Lawrence’s Sons and Lovers” (2008), Coates aims to

6 Lackey equates Lawrence, Birkin, and Ursula with Nietzsche, a psychosemiotic modernist. By contrast, he equates Loerke with metaphysical modernists like Bell, Fry, and Hulme. Lackey articulates the differences between these worldviews. Psychosemiotic modernists, like Lawrence and Nietzsche, do not believe the world can be decoded; they believe life and the world are mind-independent and thus cannot be reduced to the ‘essential reality’ that metaphysical modernists aim to decipher. Lackey writes that Bell, who coins the phrase ‘essential reality’, and Hulme, who writes of ‘the nature of reality’, worked in the Modernist period to construct aesthetics in a manner that would map the “pre-given concept of the world” (280). Lackey argues: “For Lawrence, the art object cannot signify, represent, or embody ‘essential reality’ or ‘the nature of reality’ because there is no such thing as reality…indefinable presence can never be reduced to an idea, since it is prior to conceptual categories like substance, truth, reality, and form” (277).
analyze Lawrence’s aesthetic vision for the future of the novel. However, she too laments that many Lawrence readings primarily focus on either his relation to psychoanalysis, even though Lawrence refutes Freud, or they focus on Lawrence’s writing in relation to gender theory.

Coates’ observation on the current Lawrence discourse reinforces the need for my new reading of Lawrence; like Coates, I believe that categorizing Lawrence studies in these manners limits the ways his novels can be read. I choose to read Lawrence’s novels within the framework of aesthetics because it allows me to focus on Lawrence’s phosphorescent words rather than limiting his language to only study psychoanalysis or gender.

I acknowledge the importance of the Lawrence studies conducted by Sagar, Stewart, and Millett. I am especially grateful for their illumination of Lawrence’s relationship with the visual arts through their use of such terms as ‘art for life’s sake’ and ‘Vitalism’. I also acknowledge the progression made by philosophy-minded scholars Lackey and Coates, who seek to describe Lawrence’s aesthetic without making an argument about Lawrence’s religion or his sexuality. Here, I illuminate a new reading of Lawrence’s Vitalist aesthetic through close-readings of the Hegelian dialectic between beauty and ugliness in his four novels: *Sons and Lovers* (1913), *The Rainbow* (1915), *Women in Love* (1920), and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* (1928). I argue that D.H. Lawrence’s opposition to his contemporary art theorists allows his writing to incorporate painterly images and painterly moments that teeter between beauty and ugliness. Lawrence’s deliberate aesthetic of oscillation explores the Vitalism of human relationships. My study of Lawrence’s aesthetic contributes to current studies of beauty and ugliness; thus I pair my work with 21st century aestheticians to prove Lawrence’s relevancy. The best method to study Lawrence’s aesthetic of intertwined beauty and ugliness is through the language of his novels. In each novel, Lawrence repeats the words ‘beauty’, ‘ugly’,
‘ecstasy’, ‘abstraction’, and ‘quiver’. These words become the verbal brushstrokes of Lawrence’s novels and they enable Lawrence to explore the Vitalism of human relationships through the language of aesthetics. My analysis of Lawrence’s verbal brushstrokes brings to light Lawrence’s belief that a dialectic between beauty and ugliness is vital in human relationships.

**Historicizing Aesthetics**

Lawrence’s writing exhibits reactionary aesthetics to a wide aesthetic history; thus, in order to articulate Lawrence’s opposition to his contemporary aesthetic theorists and his contemporary art critics, it is necessary to provide a brief overview of the theories from which Lawrence consciously diverges. Immanuel Kant is usually considered the first aesthetic theorist because he created the concept of “free beauty;” that is, beauty that is considered beautiful without a preformed concept of functionality. Kant distinguished beauty judgments from cognitive judgments; he claimed the judgment of beauty does not rely on prior knowledge about the beautiful object, rather it stems from feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Osborne 174). To explain his concept of emotional pleasure as a catalyst for a beauty judgment Kant writes on the rose. He argues that most writers consider “all roses beautiful” because of the pleasure in the sight of roses; however, this emotional beauty does not connote all men ought to judge roses as beautiful (Osborne 176). Contemporary to Kant, Georg W.F. Hegel’s dialectic contributes largely to this thesis on aesthetics and specifically to Lawrence’s aesthetic. Hegel’s application of dialectic to aesthetics praises that “what vanishes is the determinate element, or moment of difference, which, whatever its mode of being and whatever its source, sets itself up as something fixed and immutable…the ‘different’ is just this, that to lie in possession of itself, but to have its essential being only in the other” (Hegel 124). For
Hegel, the dialectic explains how ‘others’ do not represent distinct truths, but rather have their ‘essential being only in the other’. The dialectic “makes this ‘other’ which claims to be real, vanish” (Hegel 124). When applied to Lawrence, Hegel’s dialectic articulates how beauty and ugliness find their essence in the other. A century later, Charles Baudelaire and John Ruskin worked to secure the place of “truth” in the visual arts; however Baudelaire and Ruskin did not share an understanding of “truth”. Baudelaire detested the trend towards realism; instead, he advocated for works that conveyed the realism of the mind or imaginary realism (Trachtenberg 83). By contrast, Ruskin’s understanding of the imagination is equivalent to an intuitive understanding of natural forms; imaginative beauty according to Ruskin comes from nature. Ruskin’s aesthetic theory claimed that visual truth was the criteria for a work of art; Ruskin writes, “art is valuable…only as it expresses the personality, activity, and living perception of a good and great human soul” (Fishman 16). In Modern Painters Ruskin provides an anecdote of three portraits to decipher the criteria for true art. The first portrait depicts a man who possesses “accuracy of feature” (Ruskin 31). The second misrepresents some of his physical features but depicts the sitter’s radiance in a moment of “highest mental excitement” (Ruskin 31). And the third presents none of the man’s ordinary expressions but rather “has caught the trace of all that was most hidden and most mighty, when all hypocrisy and habit…were shivered;” here, Ruskin describes the portrait of the spirit (Ruskin 31). Ruskin concludes that all three of these portraits represent artistic “truth”, yet he seems to praise the third portrait for its divine goodness. Ruskin’s equation of morality and art was revolutionary in his Victorian time, as it differed from Kant’s earlier notion of aesthetics; Kant would judge the beauty of these portraits in relation to the emotions they evoke not for their adherence to truth. For Walter Pater and Oscar Wilde fin de siècle aestheticism, or ‘art for art’s sake’, became not just a visual art theory, but
also a mode of living. For Pater and Wilde, ‘art for art’s sake’ provided a mode to balance society and feeling. The aesthetic theory of Pater and Wilde implied that art “requires no justification other than its own existence” (Fishman 47). Pater and Wilde did not believe pleasurable emotion or visual truth were necessary concepts in the judgment of art.

The aesthetic theories of the 20th century, most notably those of Clive Bell, Roger Fry, and D. H. Lawrence, inherently respond to this history of beauty judgment theory. Clive Bell’s *Art* (1914) argues that the one quality innate in all works of art is significant form; significant form is the lines and colors combined to stir aesthetic emotion. Clive Bell praises Post-Impressionism and Primitivism for their employment of significant form. He compares the works of Post-Impressionists and those artists of the Primitivist style to the contemporary Futurist artists. He labels the Italian Futurist works “descriptive painting” because they “use form, not to provoke aesthetic emotions, but to convey information and ideas” (Bell *Art*). In contrast, he praises the Post-Impressionists because they strive to create significant form, and thus art, as opposed to descriptive representation. Interestingly, like Lawrence, in *Art* Bell incorporates the words ‘ecstasy’ and ‘abstract’ into his aesthetic theory. Bell writes that, “a good work of visual art carries a person who is capable of appreciating it out of life into ecstasy” (Bell 29). Bell equates ecstasy with an otherworldly, inhuman experience; and, art has the ability to provoke this form of ecstasy. For Lawrence, ecstasy is always a physical emotion inherent in life and in human relationships; Lawrence does not equate ecstasy with the inhuman. Bell also writes that, “a realistic form may be as significant, in its place as part of the design, as an abstract. But if a representative form has value, it is as form, not as representation” (Bell 25). Bell believes that artistic form is valuable to academic study not for the ways the form relates to the image in life, but rather for its pure form. It will become clear
in the close-readings to come that Lawrence is directly responding to, and opposing, Bell’s understanding of ecstasy and Bell’s praise of abstract form; Lawrence believes appreciating art for abstract form removes the life, and thus the value, from the art. Roger Fry collaborated with Clive Bell on this theory of significant form. Fry’s theory asserts that aesthetic emotion derives from plastic form: “Plastic form is achieved by the transformation of volumes in space…not imposed by a reality external to the works themselves” (Fishman 120). For Fry, the reality of a piece of art is the abstract canvas of the art; unlike Lawrence, Fry did not believe that the form of a painting needed to portray life. For this reason, Fry often praised ugliness as a positive aesthetic trait (Henderson 145). Fry believed that ugliness and beauty existed in complete binary opposition, while Lawrence understood that ugliness and beauty existed in a dialectic.

As members of the Bloomsbury group, Bell and Fry were acquaintances of Lawrence; however, Lawrence’s reactionary aesthetic is directly opposed to Bell and Fry. Just as literary critics have been unable to agree on an art movement influence for Lawrence’s painterly writing, Lawrence similarly does not adhere to any one of these aesthetic theories; he creates his own. I argue that this opposition is central to Lawrence’s own aesthetic.

D.H. Lawrence’s essays provide explicit evidence of his opposition to his contemporary art theorists. *Introduction to these Paintings* is Lawrence’s introduction to the Mandrake Press publication that reproduced, in color, twenty-six of Lawrence’s paintings. This essay was published at the same time that Lawrence exhibited these paintings at the Warren Gallery in London. On July 5, 1929 the London police confiscated thirteen of his exhibited paintings on the charge of obscenity. In *Introduction to these Paintings*, Lawrence critiques convention: “the convention says, for example, we must admire Botticelli or Giorgione” (Lawrence 93). Lawrence is critiquing the academic art tradition, which praises the Classical, idealized works
of Botticelli over his confiscated paintings. He considers the Impressionist paintings delicious, but too delicious; Lawrence’s term ‘too delicious’ signifies overly pleasing and overly satisfying. Lawrence feels that the Impressionist intellectual drive to study atmospheric qualities and light transforms delicious paintings into too delicious works that are merely emblematic of Impressionist theories; the Impressionist pictures no longer depict life in their attempts to theorize the colors and thin paint techniques needed to paint outdoor scenes. And most enthusiastically, he mocks Bell and Fry’s theory of significant form: “I am Significant Form, and my unutterable name is Reality. Lo, I am Form and I am Pure, behold I am Pure Form…So the prophets of the new era in art cry aloud to the multitudes in exactly the jargon of the revivalists” (Lawrence, Introduction to These Paintings 108). Lawrence reduces Bell’s and Fry’s abstract art theories to jargon. Despite these many refutations in the essay, he does praise Cezanne’s apples; Cezanne impresses Lawrence because Cezanne sought to understand the world through human instincts and human intuitions. In Making Pictures Lawrence goes on to conclude that “the modern theories of art make pictures impossible” (Lawrence 139). This conclusion exhibits Lawrence’s belief that academic theorizing of art removes the organic life from the art; theorizing art transforms Vitalist art into art that can only be Formally studied. In contrast to the abstract theorizing of Bell and Fry, D.H. Lawrence believes that, “a picture lives with the life you put into it. If you put no life into it- no thrill, no concentration of delight or exaltation of visual discovery- then the picture is dead” (Lawrence, Making Pictures 138). For Lawrence, art is not created for the purpose of formal intellectual study, but rather art re-imagines life. Lawrence’s writing is inspired by art and thus by the physical experiences of life; due to this inspiration, his writing contains both beautiful and ugly elements. Lawrence writes:

To me, a picture has delight in it, or it isn’t a picture. The saddest pictures of Piero della Francesca or Sodoma or Goya, have still that indescribable delight that goes with the
real picture. Modern critics talk a lot about ugliness, but I never saw a real picture that seemed to me ugly. The theme may be ugly, there may be a terrifying, distressing, almost repulsive quality, as in El Greco. Yet it is all, in some strange way, swept up in the delight of a picture. No artist, even the gloomiest, ever painted a picture without the curious delight in image making. (Lawrence, *Making Pictures* 144)

For Lawrence, art must contain delight, and delight arises from the dialectics of beauty and ugliness. Unlike Fry who praises ugliness in art, Lawrence feels that ugliness in a piece of art teeters between ugliness and delight; true art is never just ugly. Pictures of life as recognizably real provoke a pleasing thrill, a delight in the viewer, because the viewer sees a familiar human experience; this delight includes the ugly, terrifying, distressing, and repulsive aspects of the human experience as represented in the re-imaging of life via painting. Likewise, in Lawrence’s understanding of human relationships, ugliness and beauty are intertwined. Lawrence’s characters are developed through their relationships, and they often feel extreme violence, or look ‘ugly’, before moments of beautiful ecstasy; these textual incidences of teetering between beauty and ugliness usually occur between parents and their children or between two lovers. In Lawrence’s 1922 *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, he makes it clear that his aim in art is intricately related to aesthetics: “it seems to me that even art is utterly dependent on philosophy” (Lawrence 15). So for Lawrence, art, writing, and painting, all present a realm in which to explore aesthetics, the study of beauty. And his art is Vitalist; it visualizes a philosophy of life. His aesthetic is a dialectic that relies on the oscillation from beauty to ugliness and ugliness to beauty. The purpose of this aesthetic philosophy is to explore his doctrine that, “one is one, but one is not all alone” (Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*). The human relationships in *Sons and Lovers, The Rainbow, Women in Love,* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover,* all represent different explorations of ‘one is one, but one is not all alone’; and, all of these Vitalist relationships dialectically function through ugliness and
beauty. I suggest a new Lawrencian equation: ugliness is ugly, but ugliness is not all alone; beauty is beauty, but beauty is not all alone.

To reiterate and revive the vital importance of Lawrence’s aesthetic today, I discuss his textual moments of beauty and ugliness alongside the ideas of 21st century aesthetic theorists: Roger Scruton, Elaine Scarry, and Gretchen Henderson. In Roger Scruton’s *Beauty* (2015), Scruton argues the importance of beauty in perceiving the human in our 21st century world. He writes that, “our favorite works of art seem to guide us to the truth of the human condition and, by presenting completed instances of human actions and passions, freed from the contingencies of everyday life, to show the worthwhileness of being human” (Scruton 129). Roger Scruton obviously believes aesthetics can be a means to study the human condition. In Scruton’s 2009 documentary he, like Lawrence, ciphers beauty to comprehend human relationships: “The experience of falling in love is a human universal. The face and body of the beloved are imbued with an incredible life. The need for beauty is deep in our nature” (Scruton, *Why Beauty Matters*). Scruton and Lawrence both articulate the need for beauty as an inherent human craving.

Elaine Scarry’s *On Beauty and Being Just* (1999) disproves the political arguments against beauty. She refutes political claims that beauty prohibits justice from occurring and claims that staring at beauty is destructive to the beautiful because it makes the beautiful vulnerable. Scarry instead argues, “beauty assists justice” (Scarry 96). The justice to which Scarry refers is fairness in human relationships; again like Lawrence and Scruton, Scarry discusses the place of beauty in human interactions.

Gretchen Henderson’s *Ugliness: A Cultural History* (2015) nicely intersects with these studies on beauty and is of special importance to my thesis. Since Henderson teaches at
Georgetown University, it is my hope that the combination of Henderson’s scholarship and my inclusion of her theories will begin to cultivate a discourse on the need to study ugliness, and beauty, in Georgetown Humanities classrooms. While Henderson notes that ugliness has long posed a threat to aesthetics and taste, her cultural history contemplates the historical malleability of ugliness. Most pertinent to the way in which Lawrence illustrates ugliness in his novels is Henderson’s description of ugly human senses. Henderson writes, “Negotiated through our senses, ugliness engages and transgresses cultural boundaries that define us in relation to ugliness and, in turn, may allow us to reduce ugliness and even ourselves” (Henderson 129). For Henderson, ugliness, through ugly senses, provides a new lens through which to examine human relationships. In fact Henderson discovers that “by transgressing distinctions between ugliness and beauty through olfactory and other senses, the border between these classifications started to erode and encourage new associations” (Henderson 150). This is like Lawrence’s dialectic of beauty and ugliness. Like Lawrence, Henderson notes that deconstructing notions of beauty and ugliness as oppositions uncovers new methods to study human relationships, relationships that vitally teeter between beauty and ugliness. In this way, I see Henderson’s finding reminiscent of Lawrence’s theory: ‘one is one, but one is not all alone’. Ugly senses may be ugly but seeking to understand the relationship between ugly senses and the human, or ugly senses and beautiful human features, allows new relationships emerge; ugly is not all alone. In accordance with Lawrence, Scruton, Scarry, and Henderson all prove that beauty and ugliness function in human relationships; their aesthetic theories serve to connect the significance of Lawrence’s Hegelian dialectic to 21st century contexts. It is useful to include these 21st century aesthetic worldviews in my study of Lawrence’s 20th century aesthetic in order to prove that Lawrence’s novels need to reclaim a position in today’s
academic study. Lawrence has fallen out of academic study because of the categorization of
Lawrence’s writing and the simultaneous categorization of literature studies. My study of
aesthetics brings back Lawrence holistically. I focus on the dialectic of beauty and ugliness in
the human relationships of Lawrence’s novels. But, this study allows Lawrence to re-enter
multifarious classrooms, Modernist, gender-study, Feminist, and spiritual, because human
relationships are at the core of all of these studies. This is why Lawrence’s human-focused
aesthetic is so vital to today.
CHAPTER I: INTIMATE

D.H. Lawrence’s 1913 *Sons and Lovers* is considered Lawrence’s most intimately autobiographical novel. However, I agree with Keith Sagar’s assertion that when readers solely focus on the autobiographical narrative in the novel, the “visualistic significance” of the work is overlooked (Sagar, 1966, 19). For instance, Kimberley Coates notes that it is important that “Paul is an aspiring painter rather than a writer; by designating him as such, Lawrence indicates his own desire to bend language away from the literal ‘thing’ towards a ‘shape’ or ‘form’” (Coates 146). Coates is referring to Lawrence’s understanding of the phosphorescence of language; the ability for words to signify ideas and images greater than the literal meaning of the word, the ‘thing’. Like Sagar and Coates, I believe Lawrence’s deliberate decision to write Paul as a painter, was Lawrence’s first attempt to write about his aesthetic worldview. And like Coates, I recognize that the study of Lawrence’s words provides a way to analyze the aesthetic of Lawrence’s ideas and painterly images; his words are never just a ‘thing’. In *Sons and Lovers* Paul loves, “to paint large figures, full of light, but not merely made up of lights and cast shadows, like the impressionists; rather, definite figures that had a certain luminous quality, like some of Michelangelo’s people” (264). Paul’s painterly preference is reminiscent of Lawrence’s later oil paintings; all of Lawrence’s landscape paintings include human figures, and Lawrence tends to highlight the luminosity of the human skin. In studio art language, luminous paintings evoke the essence of light. Because Paul’s luminous people are compared to Michelangelo’s their skin can be assumed to be full of light with minimal shading. The connection to Michelangelo seems to further suggest a certain Renaissance divinity found in Lawrence’s paintings; for Lawrence, this divinity is found in the painting of realistic, luminous human skin rather than by painting biblical figures. For example in Lawrence’s oil painting *A*
Holy Family [Figure 1], the skin of the child, in his condition of blessedness⁷, is luminous.

Through Paul, Lawrence also describes the life that needs to imbue paintings in order to make the painting a picture of reality: “A man said he’d give me five pounds if I’d paint him and his misses and the dog and the cottage. And I went and put fowls in instead of the dog, and he was so waxy…I was sick of it, and I didn’t like the dog. I made a picture of it” (299). Paul is sick of painting images that are posed, so he makes a picture out of a posed situation⁸. For Paul and for Lawrence, this portrait is only a real picture if it depicts life as it is lived. For this reason, Paul paints the fowls into the family portrait because the fowls are roaming around this countryside home; the fowls are running around the posed picture of this family in front of their cottage.

Paul makes his painting an image of tender, true life. Not coincidentally in The Rainbow and in Lady Chatterley’s Lover chickens come to represent tenderness and wholeness of life.⁹

Throughout Sons and Lovers, painting and life are directly correlated: “His painting went well, and life went well enough” (143). In Paul’s three most vital relationships, painting becomes a central feature of his relationships. With Miriam, “he gained insight; his vision went deeper,”

---

⁷ In D.H. Lawrence’s Paintings Keith Sagar writes of Lawrence’s A Holy Family painting: “It is a holy family because a proper natural balance of relationships, between men and women, parents and children, people and their environment, is what constitutes for Lawrence a ‘condition of blessedness’” (Sagar 29). The child in the painting observes the balance of love in his parent’s relationship; therefore, the child represents a luminous ‘condition of blessedness.’

⁸ Paul is like Lawrence in this instance. Lawrence only painted using a model once. To paint his oil painting Contadini [Figure 7] he used Peitro delgi Innocenti as a model. Though Lawrence believed that his lack of anatomy study spoiled some of his painted nudes, Lawrence preferred to paint humans from his mind and memory. Lawrence felt that posed models like Innocenti did not present actual images of life because in life no one poses in the nude for the amount of time it takes to paint an oil painting (Sagar, 2003, 51).

⁹ In The Rainbow Tom Brangwen intimately wraps Anna in a shawl in his arms, and shows Anna, his adopted daughter, his chickens in order to make her feel welcome in his life: “He was easy with her, talking to her to see the live creatures, bringing her the first chickens in his cap, taking her to gather the eggs” (66). This moment with the chickens stimulates Anna’s growing love for her new father. Likewise in Lady Chatterley’s Lover, Connie and Mellors watch a mother hen and her baby chickens; the moment becomes intimately beautiful in its promise of new life.
because Miriam reverentially observes Paul’s sketches and his paintings (139). Paul even says, “I must thank you for your sympathy with my painting and drawing. Many a sketch is dedicated to you” (221). Miriam encourages Paul to produce his life-art because of her intellectual, almost spiritual, appreciation for his work. The role of art in Clara and Paul’s relationship is less reverential and more passionate: “She loved his artist’s paraphernalia, and the books, and the photos of people” (282). Clara is excited by Paul’s art world but she does not seek to understand it. Though Clara is aesthetically excited by Paul’s art, a rather Kantian pleasure, Clara does not want to study the techniques of Paul’s art. And finally, for Paul’s mother, art becomes a reason for life: “Mrs. Morel clung now to Paul. He was quiet and not brilliant. But still he stuck to his painting” (100). Mrs. Morel is overjoyed when Paul’s paintings win first prize in the winter exhibition at Nottingham Castle; her son’s art success gives her own life meaning and satisfaction. Mrs. Morel clings to Paul’s status as an artist. Despite their engagement with Paul’s painterly aesthetic, Paul’s relationships with these three women fail. These relationships are most fulfilling when Paul’s emotions for these women oscillate between beauty and ugliness. However, Paul’s obsessive search for all-beautiful intimacy, a relationship without a blend of beauty and ugliness, causes these relationships to end. Through analysis of the way in which Lawrence incorporates the words ‘beauty’, ‘ugly’, ‘quiver’, ‘ecstasy’, ‘abstract’ and ‘intimate’ into Paul’s relationships with Miriam, Clara, and his mother, Lawrence aesthetically illustrates the vital need for dialectic of beauty and ugliness. When Paul’s relationship teeters between beauty and ugliness, the relationship is satisfying; but when Paul suppresses the dialectic and strives for intimacy that is only beautiful, the relationship fails and this failure haunts Paul. All three of Paul’s relationships come to haunt him; this haunting is represented in Lawrence’s repeated visualizations of the mouths of
Miriam, Clara, and Mrs. Morel. In Lawrence’s later *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, he writes:

“So, the mouth is the great sensual gate to the lower body. But let us not forget it is also a gate by which we breathe, the gate through which we speak and go impalpably forth to our object, the gate at which we can kiss the pinched, delicate, spiritual kiss” (Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious* 62). It seems that in 1922 Lawrence is still haunted by mouths, but he has come to understand why human mouths are so intimately haunting. The gateway of the mouth haunts Lawrence; through the mouth the body can be penetrated and entered. Gretchen Henderson similarly notes the intimacy of human faces, “Faces are the most identifiable of human features. Intimates can recognize each other’s hands, toes, and moles, but public recognition comes most visibly from the face” (Henderson 41). As an antithesis to the mouth, which allows ‘other’ substances to enter the human, the face projects the inner emotions of the human and makes these emotional secrets visible. The mouth and the face are intimately haunting because they disintegrate the barriers between one human with another, one intimate with another. The repeated descriptions of the facial features and mouths of Miriam, Clara, and Mrs. Morel, suggest that Paul is haunted by these failed attempts at vital, life-fulfilling, relationships. In these relationships Lawrence’s dialectic does not function properly, thus the mouths and faces in these relationships still act as barriers; with these barriers, the relationships are not vital but haunting. These attempts at relationships according to Lawrence’s Vitalism fail because Paul does not accept the oscillation between beauty and ugliness that accompanies real human relationships; instead, he strives for all-beautiful intimacy.

Paul’s most fulfilling relationship is with his sister Annie; and not coincidentally this relationship is founded on a Hegelian dialectic of ugliness and beauty. After accidentally destroying Annie’s doll, Paul suggests; “Let’s make a sacrifice of Arabella...he watched with
wicked satisfaction the drops of wax melt off the broken forehead of Arabella, and sweat into
the flame” (51). Both Annie and Paul accept this ‘wicked satisfaction’; in fact, the ugliness of
this wickedness becomes a rather satisfying delight. This is reminiscent of Lawrence’s claim in
Making Pictures that in true art ugliness is never solely ugly, it always contains a strain of this
‘wicked’ delight. This moment is emblematic of Lawrence’s understanding of human life in the
novel; Annie and Paul accept the ugly destruction of the doll, while they are also satisfied by
the aesthetics of the melting doll. In this moment of intimacy, Annie and Paul are able to accept
the ugliness and the delight, the beauty, of the melting Arabella.

At the outset of their relationship, Paul and Miriam experience Hegelian dialectic of
beauty and ugliness; their emotions, facial expressions, and worldviews teeter between beauty
and ugliness. Not coincidentally, at the beginning of their relationship, their relationship is most
successful. When Paul is tutoring Miriam he feels that, “She was ruddy and beautiful. Yet her
soul seemed to be intensely supplicating...he was angered, and at the same instant he grew
gentle seeing her hurt because she did not understand” (137). Paul feels that Miriam is
physically beautiful, but while tutoring her in algebra he is frustrated into an ugly anger. Paul
realizes that his mood frequently oscillates when he is with Miriam: “He was always either in a
rage or very gentle” (138). In this particular tutoring lesson, “She reassured him in her beautiful
tones” and Paul’s ugly frustration ceases (138). Paul is ugly when he is angered by Miriam’s
algebraic confusion; he is not patient with Miriam despite her physical beauty and her desire to
learn. Yet, Paul is able to teeter from this ugliness to serenity because Miriam remains calm,
beautiful. For Lawrence this harmonic ability to fluctuate from ugliness to beauty signifies a
ture, relationship because it is mimetic of the cohabitation of beauty and ugliness in life.
However, Paul diverges from this Lawrencian ideal because Paul does not acknowledge the
Vitalism of Lawrence’s oscillating worldview; instead Paul feels “it was strange that no one else made him in such a fury” (138). Paul does not realize that this fury, according to Lawrence, is inherent and vital in human relationships. In Lawrence’s dialectic aesthetic, chaos and trouble, like this fury, actually signify a true human connection; Lawrence praises relationships whose essence encompasses fury, chaos, and instability alongside beauty and harmony. Twice Paul breaks up with Miriam and rekindles his relationship with her, because he searches for unattainable, all-beautiful intimacy. This yearning for the all-beautiful in his relationship with Miriam leads to unsatisfying intimacy; in his obsessive longing for unattainable, all-beautiful intimacy, Paul subverts the Hegelian dialectic in his relationship with Miriam. The subversion of the beautiful in moments of ugliness and the subversion of ugliness in moments of beauty generates dissatisfaction; in Paul’s obsession for the all-beautiful he resists the human changes in his intimacy. In their ‘break-up’ letter exchange, Paul and Miriam conclude: “Our intimacy would have been all-beautiful but for one little mistake” (221). For Paul, the mistake in their relationship is their lack of sexual intimacy. When Miriam relinquishes her religious belief that sexual intimacy should come after marriage, Paul discovers Miriam’s physical beauty: “He never forgot seeing her as she lay there on the bed, when he was unfastening his collar. First, he saw only her beauty, and was blind with it. She had the most beautiful body he ever imagined” (254). Paul misinterprets Miriam’s physical, sexual beauty, for supreme satisfaction in their relationship. Miriam too mistakes this intimacy for love: “She lay to be sacrificed to him because she loved him so much” (254). Both Paul and Miriam subvert the dialectic of beauty and ugliness in their intimacy; because they do not acknowledge their human oscillation between beauty and ugliness, their relationship becomes doomed. Paul deliberately desires to only acknowledge the beauty of Miriam’s sacrifice so after
their intercourse, he feels that, “he loved her. But he wanted, somehow, to cry” (254). Despite his attempts to only see beauty in their sexual intimacy, Miriam’s all-beautiful sacrifice is unsatisfying to him. Because Paul does not consider the ugliness in his persistent desire for sexual intercourse with Miriam, and because Miriam does not feel beauty in her sacrifice to Paul, their sexual intimacy is unsatisfying; their connection is weakened because Paul and Miriam refuse to admit the dialectic of beauty and ugliness in their making love.

When Paul and Miriam do attempt to discuss the sex act, they discuss sexual intimacy using the word ‘ugly’ rather than ‘beautiful.’ Before Miriam’s sacrifice Paul asks, “You don’t think it ugly?” (248). Once again, Paul does not accept that their physical intimacy can realize both his appreciation for the beauty of Miriam’s body and the ugly emotions that she feels; because he does not understand that this intimate act can be dialectic of both beauty and ugliness he is not compassionate nor at one with Miriam. Lawrence suggests that ideological rigidity prohibits an awareness of and trust in human copulation. Lawrence believes that the sacred and the profane are not absolute but should be experienced as dialectic. For Miriam their lovemaking, “was a sacrifice in which she felt something of horror,” perhaps exacerbated by her inability to explain this feeling to Paul (251). Afterwards, “he realized that she had not been with him all the time, that her soul had stood apart in a sort of horror” (251). Paul only recognizes their ugly disconnect, after their intimate sex act. As a result, “he was physically at rest, but no more. Very dreary at heart, very sad, and very tender, his fingers wandered over her face pitifully. Now again, she loved him deeply. He was tender and beautiful” (251). Ironically, it is when Paul feels morally ugly, profane, that Miriam recognizes a sacred beauty in their intimacy. Paul and Miriam each do not allow the sacred and the profane to cohabit. Because they do not possess Lawrence’s understanding that human relationships should harmonize
sacred beauty and ugly profanity in their sexual intimacy, their relationship fails. After their attempt at an all-beautiful, intimate relationship, Paul “hated her violently,” as he is deeply angered by her attempts to make “herself look beautiful and fresh for him” (257, 259). Paul and Miriam end their relationship feeling the distinct extremes of ugliness and beauty; Paul feels ugly hatred for Miriam, and Miriam’s love for Paul encourages her to exaggerate her physical beauty for Paul. In Paul’s attempt to satiate their connection through beautiful, sexual intimacy, their intimacy turns wholly ugly. In Miriam’s attempt to satiate Paul through profane intimacy, their sacred care for each other turns phony. Through their sexual intimacy, Lawrence equates beauty with the sacred and ugly with the profane; like beauty and ugliness, the sacred and profane must be dialectic.

In the relationship between Paul and Miriam, the words ‘quiver’, ‘ecstasy’, and ‘abstract’ signify their failed attempt at all-beautiful intimacy. When Miriam wants to show Paul her wild-rose bush, Miriam misunderstands the moment as one of spiritual intimacy: “His look seemed to travel down into her. Her soul quivered. It was the communion she wanted. He turned aside, as if pained” (141). Miriam considers their mutual appreciation for botany a kind of communion between their souls. In this moment of intimacy she quivers, a vibration of sacred attraction echoes through her body, while Paul feels pain. In fact, Miriam’s quivering spirituality seems to hinder Paul’s attraction for Miriam’s physical beauty: “Then her eyes blazed naked in a kind of ecstasy that frightened him” (135). The quiver of attraction that Miriam experiences when she shares her sacred rose bush with Paul is visible in her ecstatic eyes; this visible, facial, ecstasy is a disunity in their relationship because Paul does not feel, nor want to feel, the communion that Miriam perceives. Paul and Miriam consistently represent absolutes instead of dialectic oscillations. When Miriam feels sacred ecstasy in her relationship
with Paul, Paul experiences pain. For Lawrence, in human relationships lovers should dialectically experience emotions; Paul and Miriam should be able to cohabitate the sacred ecstasy and the ugly pain in their relationship, but their obsessions prevent this dialectic: “With Miriam he was always on the high plane of abstraction…she had him all to herself. But he must be made abstract first” (152). Abstraction becomes the final sever between Miriam and Paul; Miriam obsessively must make Paul abstract, exert sacred theories onto Paul rather than profane instinct, in order to experience sacred harmony in their relationship. Paul rejects this plane of abstraction because the abstract resists human instinct and praises the theorization of instinct; this rejection of abstraction is Lawrence’s initial rebuke of the new, contemporary abstract art theories. Paul laments that in order to understand Miriam’s spiritual quivering and religious ecstasy, he must be made abstract, academic and lifeless. Paul and Miriam seem to differ fundamentally on their notions and appreciations of abstract art. Miriam at first praises Paul’s paintings because they seem “so true” (134). Paul expresses his ability to paint truth in terms directly related to Lawrence’s ‘art for life’s sake’ aesthetic: “It’s because there is scarcely any shadow in it; it’s more shimmery, as if I’d painted the shimmering protoplasm in the leaves and everywhere, and not the stiffness of the shape. That seems dead to me. Only this shimmeriness is the real living. The shape is a dead crust. The shimmer is inside really” (134). Paul, like Lawrence, is opposed to Clive Bell and Roger Fry’s abstract art theories. Paul believes that his painting represents truth not because of its shape, the formalist and significant form rendering of truth, but rather because of the life his painting depicts. Paul’s painting evokes truth because of the shimmer inside his figures, the luminescence of his figures; Paul’s painting is not true because of its form, but rather because of its mimesis of life. Paul paints the shimmeriness of life; the living shimmer depends on the harmony of ugliness and beauty.
However, Miriam posits Paul as more similar to Bell and Fry’s theory of significant form: “She managed to find some meaning in his struggling, abstract speeches. And they were the medium through which she came distinctly at her beloved objects” (134). Like Bell and Fry, Miriam believes that abstract form creates aesthetic emotion in art via Formalist theorizing. For Miriam, the abstractness of Paul’s explanation helps her to see truth, only if she reads his painting herself. Rather than Paul’s adherence to life, Miriam finds meaning in abstractness, a Formalist understanding of art that is in accordance with Bell and Fry’s perception that the Formal reading of art is the only quality needed to interpret art. The reliance on art as representative of truth is an aspect of both Paul and Miriam’s aesthetic; this suggests that in this early attempt to discredit Formalism, Lawrence finds he needs to allude to Ruskin, who believes art aesthetically serves to depict truth, especially moral truth.

Ultimately Paul’s relationship with Miriam fails because both of their visions of life are extreme and do not dialectically teeter; images of Miriam’s mouth come to haunt Paul throughout their failed relationship. Paul constantly notes how Miriam stands, “sucking her finger” (136), and this passive habit continually angers Paul because Miriam is displaying the abject self: “It made his blood rouse to see her there, as it were, at his mercy, her mouth open, her eyes dilated with laughter that was afraid, apologetic, ashamed” (137). Miriam’s mouth comes to represent an intimacy that Paul does not want; the intimacy of Miriam’s mouth is the intimacy of Julia Kristeva’s abject self10. Paul understands that in this moment Miriam’s open

10 In *Powers of Horror*, Julia Kristeva writes that the abject self is not an object but rather a state of opposition to I; the abject self is not recognized as a concrete thing. The abject self is a state of opposition to self: “I abject myself within the same motion through which “I” claim to establish myself” (231). So, through the repulsion, the abjection of self, the self is created. The abject self becomes, “something rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself as from an object. Imaginary uncanniness and real threat, it beckons to us and ends up engulfing us” (232). Miriam’s sucking finger comes to represent this experience.
mouth is afraid, apologetic, and ashamed, and he does not want this knowledge of Miriam’s emotions. In this way Paul comes to abject his connection with Miriam. Lawrence writes, “As Miriam sang her mouth seemed hopeless. She sang like a nun singing to heaven. It reminded him so much of the mouth and eyes of one who sings beside a Botticelli Madonna, so spiritual” (245); Miriam’s mouth is too abject, and Paul rejects her abstract, religious abjection of her sexuality. Later, when Miriam learns that Clara has been accepted by Paul’s family, “Miriam put her finger in her mouth” (277); and when Paul ends his relationship with Miriam, she brings a flower to “her mouth and cheeks and brow…then continued slowly to stroke her lips against a ruffled flower. Their scent, as she smelled it, was so much kinder than he; it almost made her cry” (191). Paul is haunted by these images of Miriam’s exposed abjection. He feels sadness and guilt for her vulnerable abjection, which is conveyed through her sad mouth. Roger Scruton asserts, “The message of the flower is flower” (Scruton, Why Beauty Matters).

Similarly, the message of Miriam’s mouth is Miriam’s mouth; for Paul, this mouth represents Miriam’s hopeless abject self. Scruton’s message of the flower as flower imagines an intimacy of self; the flower signifies self because it does not abject its self. But the intimacy of Miriam’s mouth is more dissatisfying because of its instability; Miriam’s mouth is understood through its abjection of the self. The early conversation between Paul and Miriam about love foreshadows the haunting of Miriam’s mouth. Paul declares, “If one person loves, the other does” (146). And Miriam responds, “Like mother said to me when I was little, ‘love begets love’” (146).

Miriam rejects her human attraction to Paul; she wants her attraction for Paul to be purely, sacrdedly abstract. In her rejection of her sexual being she rejects her self. She becomes a representation of the abject self, and her abjection is observed in her afraid, ashamed mouth sucking her finger abjectly. Though she rejects her human self, Miriam cannot part from her self. This makes her sucking, longing for sacred purity, despite her human attraction for Paul, an observance of the abject self. Miriam’s abject self angers Paul because Paul lives in accordance to human desires; unlike Miriam, Paul does not reject his sensual being in order to understand himself.
Paul concludes, “I think it must be” (146). And Miriam agrees, “I hope so, because if it were not, love might be a very terrible thing” (146). Paul and Miriam represent Lawrence’s youthful, too idealistic, conception of human relationships. Paul and Miriam cultivate their relationship with emotions that swing between beauty and ugliness. But soon, both Paul and Miriam search for an all-beautiful, intimate love, the love of their early conversation. Paul misbelieves that sexual intimacy will satisfy this obsessive yearning for all-beautiful intimacy and Miriam feels that in her abjection of human desires, in her exertion of the abstract on the human, she will discover satisfaction. However, in their search they become too extreme and unable to appreciate a dialectic of beauty and ugliness. The divide between the physical and the spiritual is too permanent; Paul and Miriam are unable to oscillate between the two intimacies. Their relationship ends and haunts Paul through Miriam’s hopeless abject mouth.

Paul’s relationship with Clara, a married suffragette, thrives more often through a Hegelian dialectic of beauty and ugliness; and thus, through Paul and Clara, Lawrence comes closer to writing a relationship according to his aesthetic. However, this relationship does not come to fruition because the love between Paul and Clara becomes the love of counterfeit emotion, the love that is displayed in Lawrence’s later painting, Close-Up (Kiss) [Figure 2]. The oil painting portrays a posed man and a woman embracing, about to kiss. Their bodies are cropped so that only their heads and necks are in the picture frame; the woman’s arms are wrapped around the man’s neck. The man is looking beyond the woman presumably at the camera or audience capturing this scene. This painting is meant to depict the passionate scenes on display at the theater. The passion is not real just as this pose is completely staged in order to evoke an aura of passion. Their lips are not locked in an actual kiss of love but instead they are simply touching just enough to prove they are kissing. Lawrence did not appreciate these
limelight scenes of passion; the limelight is represented by the fluorescent yellow tones of this painting. Lawrence considered these posed scenes of passion, counterfeit.

When Paul decides to take Clara to the theater he is at first able to oscillate between his own ugly and beautiful perceptions: “She wore an old long coat, which did not suit her, and had a little wrap over head, which he hated” (290). When Paul first meets Clara before the show, he observes that Clara looks ugly. But he is quickly able to acknowledge the beauty in her modernity: “Clara took off her coat on the stairs, and he discovered she was in a sort of semi-evening dress, that left her arms and neck and part of her breast bare. Her hair was done fashionably. The dress, a simple thing of green crape suited her. She looked quite grand, he thought” (290). Paul is able to disregard Clara’s ugly outerwear and appreciate the beauty of her daring evening dress. Suddenly, Paul becomes enamored with the intimacy of Clara’s proximate physicality: “He had to sit all the evening beside her beautiful naked arm, watching the strong throat rise from the strong chest, watching the breasts under the green stuff, the curve of her limbs in the tight dress” (290). This development of Clara is painterly because Lawrence not only includes the formal coloring and shape of Clara, but also because Lawrence is able to illustrate the dynamic life of Clara’s beauty. Clara’s sensual beauty makes Paul vulnerable, but because of Clara’s own unawareness of Paul’s desire for her, he is bereft; so, the moment oscillates again: “Something in him hated her again for submitting him to this torture of nearness” (290). But again he changes: “And he loved her as she balanced her head and stared straight in front of her” (290). These trivial fluctuations are vitally human. He first considers Clara’s attire ugly and then beautiful. He then becomes obsessed with her physical, living beauty. And suddenly Paul’s appreciation for Clara’s beauty violently becomes hatred, before transforming into love.
Lawrence is almost able to demonstrate the aesthetic of a dialectic human relationship, but then Paul disregards this successful dialectic in his fixation on Clara’s sensuality: “But he was obsessed by the desire to kiss the tiny blue vein that nestled in the bend of her arm. He could feel it. His whole life seemed suspended till he had put his lips there. It must be done…I love you! You look beautiful in that dress” (291). Paul mistakes his obsessive desire to kiss Clara with an experience of love. Paul loves Clara because of her physical, appealing beauty. He does not understand that experiences of love may dialectically shift from recognition of appealing beauty to ugliness. Because Paul disregards his fluctuating emotions, this instance of desire is an example of counterfeit emotion, like Close-Up (Kiss) [Figure 2]. Scholar, Robert Millett believes that this painting is a depiction of “wild passion” (Millett 55). However, while viewing this painting at Dorothy Warren’s 1929 exhibition, Lawrence’s friend Phillip Trotter believed this painting represented the counterfeit emotion that Lawrence rejects (Millett 55). Counterfeit emotion is love that is only physical, and even worse, it displays physical passion solely to provoke public attention; Lawrence believed counterfeit emotion was represented in the displays of passion that Paul and Clara would have witnessed on stage at the theater. It seems that Paul is affected by the counterfeit emotion in the theater; this aura of passion instigates this obsession with Clara’s physical beauty and his premature proclamation of love for her. Arriving at home, Clara is persuaded by Paul’s counterfeit love to surrender sexually to him: “It was as if her beauty and his taking it hurt him, made him sorrowful” (297). After their intimacy, Paul realizes that the all-beautiful intimacy he craves cannot be satisfied by counterfeit emotion because counterfeit emotion is not holistic. Counterfeit emotion is unsatisfying because it is founded on beauty, passion, and desire, rather than the complicated dialectic emotions of whole human relationships: “She kissed him fervently on the eyes…it
was a moment intense almost to agony” (297). Clara’s kiss becomes counterfeit and it hurts Paul; her display of fervent affection is not holistic and real because she still has feelings for her husband. Further, it becomes clear that Paul’s obsession with Clara’s beauty is only because of his physical passion: “He was madly in love with her; every movement she made, every crease in her garments, sent a hot flash through him and seemed adorable” (274). Paul considers Miriam’s physicality, her movements, abstractly spiritual; in contrast, Paul absorbs Clara’s movements as purely and desirably physical. For Lawrence, the physical and sensual exist in dialectic; Miriam and Clara are absolutes rather than dialectics. Because Paul narrowly understands Miriam as spiritual and Clara as sensual, Paul is unable to reconcile the dialectic in his relationships with these women. He considers Clara as neither physically ugly nor as spiritually beautiful, and for this reason she becomes just woman, the result of counterfeit emotion: “And soon the struggle went down in his soul, and he forgot. But then Clara was not there for him, only a woman, warm, something he loved and almost worshipped, there in the dark. But it was not Clara, and she submitted to him” (310). Because of Paul’s purely physical obsession for Clara, she becomes just any woman, like the woman in Close-Up (Kiss) [Figure 2]. She is any woman because Paul denies her anything, ideas, spirituality, other than physical beauty. Initially in this moment, Clara also seems similar to the submissive woman in Lawrence’s 1929, Renascence of Men [Figure 3]. According to Robert Millett, Lawrence’s Renascence of Men watercolor is a celebration of a woman who feels a positive passivity toward her man, “with whom she will remain linked at all times” (Millett 123). However, Clara does not want to remain linked to Paul, therefore Clara’s submission to Paul is not a celebration of union, as in Lawrence’s Renascence of Men, but rather a weakness to counterfeit emotion. After their evening at the theater, both Paul and Clara are unsatisfied: “After such an evening
they both were very still, having known the immensity of passion. They felt small, half afraid, childish, and wondering, like Adam and Eve when they lost their innocence” (310). At this moment, the relationship between Paul and Clara permanently congeals as a relationship only founded on passion; both Paul and Clara disregard the dialectic of beauty and ugliness in their relationship and only focus on their ‘immensity of passion.’ The focus on passion prohibits a holistic relationship because the dialectic of beautiful passion and ugly passion, which is essential in human relationships, is neglected; this makes the passion in their relationship counterfeit. Usually Lawrence considers Adam and Eve powerful artistic figures, as in his later painting *Throwing Back the Apple* [Figure 4]11; but here, he uses Adam and Eve to describe Paul and Clara’s ‘loss of innocence.’ This reinforces the inevitable, deep failure of this relationship, because it is only founded only on counterfeit passion.

The words ‘quiver’, ‘ecstasy’, and ‘abstract’ reinforce the presence of counterfeit passion in the relationship of Clara and Paul; these words highlight how Clara and Paul do not allow their relationship to move fluently from beauty to ugliness, and ugliness to beauty, because they succumb to counterfeit passion. Immediately after ending his relationship with Miriam, Paul begins to flirt with Miriam’s friend, Clara: “He had touched her. His whole body was quivering with the sensation” (265). Paul is attracted to Clara physically, so when he touches her shirt, he quivers with pleasure; that is, vibrations of pleasure resonate through his body. Unlike the quivering pleasure Miriam feels when she believes Paul shares her appreciation for the abstract spirituality of her rose bush, Paul quivers with pleasure because of physical, profane desire. Not coincidentally, after describing this quivering sensation, Lawrence
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11 Robert Millett explains that *Throwing Back the Apple* is meant to represent Lawrence’s rejection of sin. Lawrence believes the idea of sin hinders vitality; through this painting he praises Adam and Eve as humans who reject the notion of sin (Millett 76).
writes, “The next evening he went to the cinematograph with her for a few minutes before train-time. As they sat, he saw her hand lying near him. For some moments he dared not touch it” (265). Robert Millet makes known that the counterfeit emotion Lawrence rejects through his *Close-Up (Kiss)* caricature is the, “counterfeit emotion, which was and is still being portrayed in the various media of communication and entertainment” (Millett 55). The cinematograph is a cipher of counterfeit emotion and Paul is weakly enticed by the displayed sensuality. It is not surprising that Lawrence considers the mechanical art of the cinematograph counterfeit because the use of machine to capture an image removes the human touch from the creation of the art. Later, Lawrence’s words ‘ecstasy’ and ‘abstract’ make explicit the counterfeit feelings that come to prominence in Paul’s relationship with Clara. When Paul informs Dawes that Clara wants him back, Dawes’ response is “soft, satirical, abstract” (355). Dawes responds abstractly because he does not know the details of Paul’s relationship with his wife. If abstract is understood to reference Bell and Fry’s theories of abstraction this suggests that Dawes responds based on his observation of the form of Clara and Paul’s relationship; he responds abstractly because he has witnessed Clara and Paul’s counterfeit passion while walking down the street. The Formalist rendering of this scene posits a couple attracted to each other physically, desiring one another physically after the theater; Dawes interprets their relationship as one of physical passion but he is soft and satirical because this image it is not a mental, emotional attraction. By contrast when Clara asserts that she wants to reunite with her husband, “she whispered ecstatic” (359). Because Clara wants to reunite with her husband in ecstasy, her passion for Paul is nothing more than counterfeit emotion. Clara ecstatically wants to reunite with Dawes because she feels not only a physically passionate, but also an emotionally dialectic relationship with him. As evidenced by their separation and subsequent coming
together again, Dawes and Clara are able to feel beautiful desire as well as ugly anger; the dialectics in their relationship make Clara ecstatically desire union with Dawes once more. The words ‘abstract’ and ‘ecstasy’ highlight moments where Dawes perceives Paul and Clara’s counterfeit intimacy.

Clara’s mouth taunts Paul in different ways than Miriam’s abject mouth. When Paul first observes Clara, Lawrence writes: “She had scornful gray eyes, a skin like white honey, and a full mouth, with a slightly lifted upper lip that did not know whether it was raised in scorn of all men or out of eagerness to be kissed, but which believed the former” (162). After this observation Paul concludes, “Look at her mouth-made for passion (164). Immediately Paul’s attraction for Clara is sexual. He does not want to seek a relationship embodying both beauty and ugliness; rather Paul just wants to enjoy Clara’s passionate mouth. From this moment, Paul’s relationship with Clara is solely based on passion and this passion is portrayed through Paul and Clara’s kisses. In particular, one kiss between Paul and Clara seems to have influenced Lawrence’s later Close-Up (Kiss) [Figure 2]. Lawrence writes: “Her mouth was offered him, and her throat, her eyes were half-shut; her breast was tilted as if it asked for him. He flashed with a small laugh, shut his eyes and met her in a long, whole kiss. Her mouth fused with his, their bodies were sealed and annealed” (227). Like the man and woman in Lawrence’s oil painting, Paul and Clara do not look at each other in this kiss; they shut their eyes but their bodies meld together physically. The annealing of their bodies is reminiscent of the totality of skin tones in Lawrence’s painting. Paul and Clara misinterpret this ‘whole kiss’ as a kiss of love, rather than just “wild passion” (Millett 55). In a second kiss, Paul is violently frustrated by their partial and dissatisfying intimacy. Paul realizes the intimacy he has he with Clara is not wholly satisfying, but instead of attempting to appreciate the dialectics of their relationship he
violently desires more physical intimacy with Clara: “He suddenly caught her in his arms, stretched forward, and put his mouth on her face in a kiss of rage. She turned frantically to avoid him. He held her fast. Hard and relentless his mouth came for her. Her breasts hurt against the wall of his chest. Helpless, she went loose in his arms, and he kissed her and kissed her” (287). In this moment Paul is confused between his feelings for the spiritual Miriam and the passionate Clara; in efforts to make his relationship with Clara more satisfying, he tries to kiss satisfying intimacy into the relationship. Instead of creating a moment of teetering between beauty and ugliness, the moment becomes ugly passion. Though with Clara, Paul experiences passion, he does not experience the dialectics of beauty and ugly frustration as he does when he tutors Miriam. His experience of beauty and frustration when he tutors Miriam can be summed in his Baudelaire lesson: “He made her copy Baudelaire’s ‘Le Balcon.’ Then he read it for her. His voice soft and caressing, but growing almost brutal. He had a way of lifting his lips and showing his teeth, passionately and bitterly, when he was much moved…She did not like Baudelaire” (184). Through the external and internal description of Paul’s mouth it is clear that Paul is moved by Baudelaire’s aesthetics. Paul is at once passionate and soft while also barbaric and bitter; when Paul reads Baudelaire he experiences Hegelian dialectic between passion and repulsion and as result, he is much moved. In contrast Miriam finds the lesson ugly and oppressive; his voice and his visible teeth anger her. It can be assumed that Paul is moved by Baudelaire’s praise of the imagination, while Miriam does not consider Baudelaire’s aesthetic doctrines in constancy with her spiritually abstract beliefs. In their passion-filled relationship, Paul and Clara do not experience ideological tension, like the tension felt by Paul and Miriam during his lesson on Baudelaire. Without ideological debates, Paul and Clara become all-passionate, and this is counterfeit. Ultimately, both Miriam and Clara are unable to wholly
satisfy Paul because Paul cannot relinquish himself to experience simultaneous beauty and ugliness in these relationships; rather he searches endlessly for all-beautiful or all-passionate intimacy.

Paul’s relationship with his mother comes closest to exemplifying Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation; but this relationship also fails because Paul is unable to consummate a romantic passion with his mother. Lawrence often uses the word ‘beauty’ to convey the mother son relationship between Paul and Mrs. Morel. When Mrs. Morel and her son are riding on the train to apply for Paul’s job at Mr. Jordan’s, Lawrence writes: “Suddenly their eyes met, and she smiled to him- a rare, intimate smile, beautiful with brightness and love. Then each looked out of the window” (81). This moment is beautiful even though Paul “would have suffered much physical pain rather than this unreasonable suffering at being exposed to strangers, to be accepted or rejected” (81). Though Paul is nervous and unhappy about this trip, he finds beauty in the moment because he is with his mother; this wrestle between ugly anxiety over the situation and beautiful love for his mother is the aesthetic of oscillation that Lawrence considers essential for human relationships. Paul is able to dialectically appreciate the beauty and the ugly when he is with his mother thus Lawrence situates this relationship as vital. On their outing to the Lincoln Cathedral Paul experiences this same vacillation. Mrs. Morel exclaims, “Now this is better than I thought it could be!” yet Paul, “hated it” (212). Paul only sees ugliness in the beautiful Cathedral because he notices that his mother is ill and aging: “her face seemed to shine again with joy and peace during the service. And all the time he was wanting to rage and smash things and cry” (212). Paul is able to recognize that his mother is luminescent during the Cathedral mass, while he is also able to understand that his ugly emotions arise because he is angry at her sickness; Paul appreciates the dialectic of
luminescence and sickness. Despite her ill health during the trip, this memory of their outing to the Lincoln Cathedral later becomes a supremely positive memory of beauty for Mrs. Morel. When she is near death, Mrs. Morel proclaims: “Not everybody has seen those beautiful places. And wasn’t it beautiful! I try to think of that, not other things” (339). Significantly, Mrs. Morel refuses to accept the ugly in their trip to the Lincoln Cathedral; Mrs. Morel is unable to appreciate the dialectics of their trip. Paul however is able to comprehend the simultaneity of ugliness and beauty in one of his most treasured memories; he is able to remember that the trip with his mother was filled with both beauty and ugliness.

Lawrence exposes Paul’s recognition of the teetering between beauty and ugliness through Mrs. Morel’s slow death. When on her deathbed, Paul’s sister Annie provides Mrs. Morel with new clothes; Paul tells his mother, “You look quite pretty in that” (327). In reality Paul notices that, “Her face looked as if she were death, with the blue lips shut tight. Her eyes opened- the blue, unfailing eyes” (327). Paul is able to offer a comforting comment to his mother, while also understand that she is dying; in this moment Paul recognizes the dialectic between ‘pretty’ and death. In his ability to acknowledge the cohabitation of ‘pretty’ and death, Paul proves his love for his mother. When his mother dies, Paul finds beauty in her portrait of the dying: “She lay like a girl asleep and dreaming of her love. The mouth was a little open…she was young again. Only the hair as it arched so beautiful from her temples was mixed with silver” (351). Even though stricken with grief, Paul considers the end of his mother’s suffering, and her curiously youthful death portrait, as beautiful. Lawrence describes Mrs. Morel as a girl dreaming of her lover to emphasize the beauty in the humanity of this death; Paul euphemistically imagines his dead mother as a young girl. Despite his understanding of the beauty in the conclusion of Mrs. Morel’s suffering, Paul “never forgot that
hard, utterly lonely and stubborn clenching of her mouth, which persisted for weeks” (339). Paul also simultaneously recognizes the ugliness in his mother’s suffering and in her death. Paul is able to appreciate the dialectics of her death; he recognizes that her youthful peace can exist alongside ugly, decrepit decline. Like in his relationships with Miriam and Clara, Mrs. Morel’s mouth haunts Paul. He never forgets the stubborn hardness of her mouth. Earlier he notices the illness that haunts his mother because of the coloring of her mouth: “Certainly she looked bluish around the mouth,” and, “his mother was deadly pale, dark at the mouth” (185, 188). These images haunt Paul because they represent Mrs. Morel’s suffering and Paul’s loss of his mother, the loss of the only relationship in which he allowed the dialectic of beauty and ugliness to flourish. However his mother’s mouth also haunts him because it symbolizes Paul’s inability to fully, passionately, enjoy the teetering between beauty and ugliness in his relationship with his mother. Paul cannot kiss his mother as he sensually kisses Clara and Miriam and this lack of sexual intimacy is a detriment to his one dialectic relationship: “He strokes his mother’s hair, and his mouth was on her throat,” and, “his mother kissed him a long, fervent kiss” (187, 197). Moments like these are often uncomfortable for the contemporary reader of Sons and Lovers. However, they signify the ultimate failure of Paul’s most successful human relationship; he cannot love his mother as a lover. In Lawrence’s 1922 Fantasia of the Unconscious, he explores the relationship between mother and child in more depth. Lawrence comes to an awareness of the relationship between mother and child as a location of the forbidden intimate; the forbidden intimate embodies a desire for the beauty of consummation alongside the ugly, inevitable suffering of never consummating this desire. Lawrence is intrigued by the dialectics of desire in the forbidden intimate, but nevertheless relationships founded on forbidden intimacy inevitably end tragically. Lawrence writes, “Look at the
pictures of Madonna and Child, and you will even see it. It is from this centre that it draws all things unto itself, winningly, drawing love for the soul, and actively drawing in milk. The same centre controls the great intake of love and milk, of psychic and nourishment” (Lawrence, Fantasia of the Unconscious 36). In summation, the mother’s centre, her love for her child, teaches the child that he craves love in any guise, including that which he cannot experience. It seems that Paul’s relationship with his mother is just this; it is the most successful because she teaches him how to appreciate the beautiful and the ugliness of life; but it tragically ends because Paul cannot be sensually intimate with his mother, an intimacy that is essential in Vitalistic relationships. In a letter to Jessie Chambers after his mother’s funeral, Lawrence wrote: “I’ve loved her, like a lover. That’s why I could never love you” (Nehls 141). Like Lawrence, Paul is haunted by his mother’s mouth; he wants to love her like a lover. He cannot love her in this way, but he also cannot restrain himself from longing for this form of love. This inability to act on his romantic love for his mother, transforms the only relationship in which Paul understands that beauty and ugliness can both exist, into a relationship devoid of Lawrence’s human Vitalism.

In Sons and Lovers, Paul’s brother William most upholds Lawrence’s aesthetic of teetering between beauty and ugliness. When William’s fiancée Lily, nicknamed Gyp, comes to visit the Morel family, the day is beautiful with “a beautiful quivering screen of poplars” (113). But, when William looks at his lover “her beauty seemed to hurt him” (113). William recognizes the beauty of this moment when Lily meets his family, but he simultaneously feels
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12 Additionally, both Mrs. Morel and Mrs. Lawrence feed their sons love in their insistence that their sons create art. Mrs. Morel’s loving nourishment can be understood as her insistence on his status as painter and Mrs. Lawrence’s love was her insistence that Lawrence write. Mrs. Morel and Mrs. Lawrence’s deliberate creation of son as artist uncannily shapes the Vitalism in their dialectic mother son relationship.
ugly anxiety about the introduction of Gyp. He feels especially ugly in catching a, “glimpse of his sweetheart’s attitude towards his sister [;] he hated her” (114). Lily’s physical beauty is hated because of her ugly attitude. But then, on the following Sunday morning, “She looked very beautiful in a dress of foulard, silky and sweeping” (114). William’s perception of Lily is once again one of pride for her beauty. Yet “in the evening, after supper, he stood on the hearthrug whilst she sat on the sofa, and he seemed to hate her” (114). William’s emotions for his lover constantly teeter between ugly hatred and beautiful devotion. Because of William’s early death, the outcome of this oscillating relationship is unknown. Mrs. Morel does not believe in the relationship, but it seems that Lawrence may challenge Mrs. Morel’s lack of faith in the intimacy between Gyp and William.

Lawrence believes that human relationships should contain the struggle between beauty and ugliness. Through *Sons and Lovers*, he shows that this beauty and ugliness should also be intimate, but not so intimate that the beauty and ugliness are lost to counterfeit passion. Lawrence concludes the novel with an image of Paul’s soul: “Always alone, his soul oscillated” (362). The oscillation of Paul’s soul suggests Paul’s allegiance to Hegel’s dialectic. Though Paul is alone, and not in a human relationship at the conclusion of the novel, Lawrence suggests there is hope for his future relationships through this connection to dialectics. His soul now understands the vital need to fluctuate; Paul now understands the vital adherence to the dialectic relationship between beauty and ugliness.
CHAPTER II: WONDER

In Lawrence’s 1915 *The Rainbow*, Lawrence’s aesthetic of teetering between beauty and ugliness illustrates the similarities in generational relationships. This aesthetic of oscillation is especially apparent in the father-daughter relationships between Tom and Anna, and Will and Ursula. This aesthetic continues when the daughters, Anna and Ursula, develop lovers; thus Lawrence also explores the relationships between Anna and Will, and Ursula and Skrebensky. In this novel, Lawrence intermingles the language of ‘transfiguration’ and ‘wonder’ into his verbal palette of ‘beauty’, ‘ugly’, ‘quiver’, ‘ecstasy’, and ‘abstract.’ He repeats ‘transfiguration’ and ‘wonder’ because the relationships in *The Rainbow* seek transfiguring wonder, instead of all-beautiful intimacy. Lawrence manipulates the Biblical understanding of the Transfiguration, the baptismal bond between Jesus on Earth and God in Heaven. For Lawrence, a Transfiguration can be achieved on Earth through the condition of blessed union between two humans. Lawrence’s oil painting *A Holy Family* (Figure 1) visualizes the balance required in an Earthly blessed union. In the painting, the parents are meant to depict a dialectically harmonious relationship. The effect of the many curves and circles in the painting, the chair, the window, the head of the child, and the breasts of the mother, are meant to evoke this sensation of harmony and balance; the curves are reminiscent of Lawrence’s motif of the rainbow which signifies the balance of opposites. The parents represent a blessed union because they are balanced in their physical and mental love for one another; further, they appreciate the humanity in each other, the beauty and ugliness of one another. Lawrence gives them halos to prove that their relationship is blessed and divine because of its humanness. The child is the wonder, the product of their love. The parents in this painting have achieved a Transfiguration, a blessed union, through their acceptance of their dialectic human relationship;
they produced wonder without an otherworldly intervention. The otherworldly may be Christianity, The Holy Spirit, or religion more generally, but more importantly Lawrence is accenting the Earthly. In *The Rainbow*, when the search for a ‘Transfiguration’ and ‘wonder’ disregards the vital human need for intertwined beauty and ugliness, the father- daughter and lover- lover relationships fail; the relationships fail when the characters search for a blessed bond, a Transfiguration, that is not between two humans but between the human and the otherworldly.

*The Rainbow* begins with the urge for wonder: “The woman wanted another form of life than this, something that was not blood-intimacy” (7). Tom Brangwen’s mother craves a union that is beyond the human, beyond human relations. However, as her generation comprises only a few, brief pages in the novel, her search is glanced over and Lawrence chooses to focus on Tom Brangwen’s continuation of his familial blood-intimacy. Before Tom Brangwen proposes to Lydia, “he sat there, all mused and wondering,” reminiscent of his mother (46). It seems that he begins to muse on wonder beyond human union, but his love for Lydia breaks this trance. When Tom Brangwen proposes to his wife he is attracted to her humanness, to her beauty and her ugliness: “But her ugly-beautiful mouth was still unmoved and sad. He was afraid” (46). He is continuously attracted to her ‘ugly-beautiful’ mouth; Lydia’s ‘ugly-beautiful’ mouth is a concrete image of Lawrence’s aesthetic as it is an incredibly human
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13 In this instance Lawrence is playing with the phrase ‘blood-intimate’. He recognizes that the popular connotation of the phrase refers to the family line; ironically, Tom marries a Polish woman, which taints the English blood of his family. However, through this sever with traditional ‘blood-intimacy’, Tom attains Lawrence’s understanding of blood-intimacy. In January 1913, Lawrence writes: “my great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect” (Sagar, *D.H. Lawrence’s Paintings* 17). The blood in blood-intimacy refers to human instinct. For Lawrence, blood-intimacy is the sacred intimacy between humans. A component of this intimacy is sexual intercourse, but for Lawrence complete blood-intimacy is even deeper, more human; it is ugly, beautiful, and passionate.
image. Lydia’s mouth presents a dialectic intimacy, rather than the haunting of mouths in *Sons and Lovers*; this is because Tom is deeply attracted to Lydia’s humanness: “What was agony to him, with one hand lightly resting on his arm, she learned forward a little, and with a strange, primeval suggest of embrace, held him her mouth. It was ugly-beautiful, and he could not bear it. He put his mouth on hers, and slowly, slowly the response came, gathering force and passion” (46). For Tom, Lydia’s mouth generates fear, agony, and passion. Lydia’s ugly-beautiful humanness causes Tom to feel very human emotions. Unlike his mother, Tom does not search for the wondrous when he marries Lydia. Ironically, after Tom’s wedding, “very wonderful she was, as she bade farewell, her ugly wide mouth smiling with pride and recognition” (55-56). Because Tom does not search for a Transfiguration apart from human union, he recognizes the wonder and the beauty alongside Lydia’s human ugliness. Tom’s satisfaction with his wife continues even when Lydia gives birth to her first son with Tom: “He saw the way her hair went loose over her temples, her mouth was shut with suffering in a sort of grin. She was beautiful to him- but it was not human” (79). Again, Tom finds beauty in Lydia’s human features. And again, Tom does not search for inhuman wonder but finds the otherworldly, the divine, in his wife. Lydia’s appearance during childbirth, which “was not human”, is reminiscent of Lawrence’s haloed woman in *A Holy Family* [Figure 1]. Lydia is not human, but divinely human, because her relationship with Tom is founded on dual beauty and ugliness, a divinely dialectic union. Tom and Lydia’s relationship is arguably the most stable and loving relationship in *The Rainbow*. Keith Sagar notices a similar difference between the relationships of the earlier generation in *The Rainbow*, as compared with Ursula’s later search for wonder. Sagar believes that Ursula’s, “struggle against the confines of life” begins before marriage, and therefore this differentiates her generation from the generation of her parents and
grandparents (Sagar, *The Art of D.H Lawrence* 55). I argue that even in marriage Tom does not search for an escape from the confines of life, and for this reason his marriage is wonderful, blessed. Lawrence’s aesthetic of teetering between beauty and ugliness is central to Tom and Lydia’s marriage; Tom loves Lydia for her ‘ugly-beautiful’ mouth. When Tom and Anna, and Will and Ursula, embrace this oscillation, their father-daughter relationships are transfiguring. And when Anna and Will, and then Ursula and Skrebensky, also embrace this human Vitalism of teetering, their relationships similarly thrive blessedly. But when these fathers and daughters actively seek a Transfiguration and wonder, and disregard their human vitality, they are left unsatisfied.

Tom is patient in his relationship with Anna; he respects her child desires and even though she is not his child by blood, he develops a deep love for Anna. When Lydia is in childbirth Anna cries her usual lament: “I want my mother,” while, “her little face quivering, and the great tears of childish, utter anguish” fall from her eyes (73). Here Lawrence uses his verbal brush stroke ‘quivering’ to illustrate Anna’s very human, very child-like emotion; she misses her mother’s comfort before bed time. Tom crosses the room and undresses the child for bed: “The child had become a little, mechanical thing of fixed will. She wept, her body convulsed, her voice repeating the same cry” (75). And Tom “lifted the stiff, denying body between his hands. Its still blindness made a flash of rage go through him. He would like to break it” (75). As Anna cries for her mother, Tom is angry at her disregard for his presence. Tom exhibits an emotional violence that is typical in moments where Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation is present; Tom feels like he could break Anna’s arm that resists his attempts to clothe it. Suddenly, this ugly, mechanical moment teeters to beauty and wonder as Tom takes Anna outside to feed the animals during the rainstorm: “The child, all wonder, watched what he
did. A new being was created in her for the new conditions. Sometimes, a little spasm, eddying from the bygone storm of sobbing shook her small body. Her eyes were wide and wondering, pathetic. She was silent, quite still” (77). Tom successfully calms Anna; and, the moment represents a Transfiguration in their relationship because their father-daughter union is harmonized. Significantly, the wonder produced through this Transfiguration, this condition of blessedness, is natural wonder, the wonder of the natural, Earthly world. Tom does not search for this production of wonder; instead, he embraces his human emotions of ugly anger, and subsequent beautiful awe, and therefore wonder is produced: “He looked down at the silky folds of the paisley shawl. It reminded him of his mother. She used to go to church in it…a quivering little shudder, re-echoing from her sobbing went down her limbs. He held her closer” (77). When Tom looks at his daughter’s quivering body, he is reminded of his mother through the image of her shawl; this memory resurfaces his mother’s search for wonder over blood-intimacy. It seems that Tom has found wonder and blood-intimacy in Anna, without the need to search for it. Tom is satisfied, holding his daughter as he embraces his ugly-beautiful emotions. When Anna is older and wants to marry Will, Tom feels the emotions of a father: “She was so natural, and he was ugly, unnatural, in his inability to yield place. How hideous, this greedy middle-age, which must stand in the way of life, like a large demon” (127). Tom feels ugly, sad, because he does not want Anna to marry and move away from home; Tom thinks Lydia is more “natural.” In actuality Tom’s feelings are completely ‘natural’ and rather beautiful; he feels such love for Anna that he does not want her to leave home to marry another man. Lawrence’s aesthetic makes this moment of Tom’s ugly, sadness, and beautiful, love, balanced. On Anna’s wedding day, “her father notices her slim ankle and foot as she steps up: a child’s foot. His heart is hard with tenderness. But she is in ecstasies with herself for making such a
lovely spectacle” (132). Lawrence writes this moment in the present tense to highlight the Vitalism of this scene; Tom is hard and tender, ugly and beautiful, at the sight of Anna on her wedding day. The fatherly emotion in this scene is wonder-ful without any search for wonder; and, the scene that follows is Tom’s beautiful, vulnerably sentimental, father of the bride toast: “For a man to be a man, it takes a woman… for a woman to be a woman, it takes a man… therefore we have marriage… there is no marriage in heaven… but on earth there is marriage… then it seems to me as a married couple makes one Angel… so I say, an Angel is the soul of man and woman in one” (136). Even though Tom is sad that his daughter marries Will, he wishes the best for Anna’s marriage; he hopes Anna will have a blessed union with Will, just as Tom and Anna have experienced transfiguring wonder in their own relationship. Tom’s belief that man and woman form one angel expresses Tom’s reverence for Earthly human relationships. Lawrence shows that Tom’s full embrace of dialectic emotions, in his human relationships, produces wonder, like the wonder of this wedding speech.

The father-child relationship between Will and Ursula is similarly defined by moments of beauty and moments of ugliness; however, this third-generation Brangwen relationship is not as satisfying as Tom’s relationships because of Will’s obsessive search for a Transfiguration. Will searches for all-beautiful, exquisite Transfiguration, which is inhuman, instead of accepting that a Transfiguration in human relationships must balance ugliness and beauty. Will’s obsession for this otherworldly condition of blessedness gradually consumes his relationships. However, Will is at first able to find transfiguring wonder in the human condition of fatherhood: “The baby had a beautiful, rounded head that moved him passionately. He would have fought to the last drop to defend that exquisite, perfect round head” (209). Immediately the relationship between Will and Ursula is characterized by both beauty and violence, typical
of Lawrence’s aesthetic. Will is mystified by the beauty of his first daughter and feels violently protective of her: “It knew its mother better, it wanted its mother more. But the brightest, sharpest little ecstasy was for the father” (210). Lawrence’s brushstroke of ‘ecstasy’ enhances the bond between father and daughter; the baby senses her father’s love for her and feels a human ecstasy in return. As Ursula ages, the ecstasy for her father is visualized when she runs to greet him after work: “As soon as she saw him, would come running in tiny, wild, windmill fashion, lifting her arms up and down to him…his heart leapt up, he ran his fastest to her, to catch her, because he knew she would fall” (211). The ecstasy in this harmonious father-daughter bond is an instance of wonder produced via a human relationship; this wonder is represented by human running, speed. Andrew Harrison considers this speed an influence of Futurism, but I consider this speed an assertion of human longing for a beloved: “Once she fell as she came flying to him…when he picked her up, her mouth was bleeding. He could never bear to think of it, he always wanted to cry” (212). The memory of this ugly fall erupts Will’s sadness, which translates as beautiful love for his daughter. Again the mouth in this novel presents a haunting memory of a dialectically balanced human relationship, rather than a failed intimacy. Will further exemplifies his love for his little Ursula through his carpentry: “It was he who made her cradle, her little chair, her little stool, her high chair…who would make for her a doll out of an old table-leg” (212). Roger Scruton writes on the role of carpentry, such as Will’s woodwork, in aesthetics; carpentry, handiwork, and decoration become ways “in which we make choices as to how our surroundings should look” (Scruton, Beauty, 82). Will wants his surroundings, evidenced through his carpentry, to be an environment for his daughter, an environment that evokes Ursula’s childish happiness: “The child ran about absorbed in life…yet his life was based on her” (217-218). Through Will’s carpentry, Lawrence reinforces
the importance of ‘art for life’s sake.’ When Ursula is born Will is contented by her child pleasures and creates art for his daughter’s sake, her wooden cradle, chair, stool and dolls. Their ecstatic running toward each other is not a plea toward speed, Futurism, and escape, but rather a dynamic embrace of life, that releases sensations of such soulful joy that their ecstasy is at one with the beautiful.

Scruton further explains that a “child’s pure delight is in creation and sharing what they feel. This child’s delight exists in true art” (Scruton, *Why Beauty Matters*). Lawrence would agree with Scruton, but Lawrence would add that this child’s delight involves both ugliness and beauty. When Will takes Ursula to the swing boats and vulgarly pushes her too high, “His face [was] evil and beautiful to her” (224). And then, “the child clung to his hand, pale and mute. In a while she was violently sick” (224). This moment involves the dizzying oscillation between beauty and ugliness that Lawrence writes in moments of satisfying human relations. Ursula admires her father and enjoys riding the swing boats with him; Will enjoys when Ursula is happy, but this vital desire to make her happy overcomes his common sense. This scene contains the beauty of their desires and pleasures, but also the ugliness of Will’s violent pushes and Ursula’s violent dizziness. The potato-planting scene is another instance of this father-daughter teetering between beauty and ugliness: “She was excited, and unused. She put in one potato, then rearranged it, to make it sit nicely. Some of the spirits were broken, and she was afraid…she was overcome by her responsibility”(220). Ursula is excited to plant potatoes with her father; but she is unsure how to properly plant the potatoes in the ground. As her father observes her planting he says, “Not so close,” and he stoops, “over her potatoes, taking some out and rearranging the others”(220). With the knowledge that she mis-planted the potatoes and disappointed her father, “she stood by with the painful terrified helplessness of childhood”
This moment is beautiful because Ursula cares so deeply about her father’s opinion of her planting; but the painful helplessness of childhood invokes an ugly, human emotion. As the scene continues, this dual beauty and ugliness pervades: “He took no notice of her, only worked on. He had another world from hers. She stood helplessly stranded on his world…she ran down the garden, away from him, as fast as she could go away from him” (220-221). Again the speed of running represents the overabundance of human emotion; here it is an overabundance of shame. Ursula is so ecstatically ashamed by her mistake that she must run quickly away. However, the ugliness of Ursula’s helpless run is intercepted by the beauty that, “[Her father] missed her presence, her face in her red woolen bonnet, her blue overall fluttering” (221). Ursula feels ashamed while Will feels love for his little girl; the combination of the emotions of Ursula and Will makes the moment dialectically balanced. The potato-planting scene is one of a Transfiguration and wonder because of this harmony between ugly shame and beautiful love. At this time Will is content in his fatherly role; but, when Will obsessively searches for inhuman wonder, his relationship with Ursula suffers: “After twenty years, he had come back to his wood-carving, almost to the point where he left off his Adam and Eve panel…but now he had knowledge and skill without vision” (353). After twenty years, Will loses his human, fatherly vision; indirectly, Lawrence references the influence of the new, abstract art movements. The influence of the knowledge and the skill of Formalism, the notion that wonder is achieved through significant form, impairs Will’s ability to recognize the wonder that is produced through fatherhood. Fatherhood produces wonder through dialectic sensations of vulgarity and love; abstract knowledge endangers the production of wonder in this way because it theorizes, and stifles, these vital sensations. Due to his obsession for abstract transfiguring wonder, Will is no longer able to attain wonder: “But there was about
him an abstraction, a sort of instrumental detachment from human things” (357). Ursula immediately notices the negative influence of this abstract vision; and sure enough, Will’s abstract vision hurts his tender relationship with Ursula: “He watched his daughter’s hard, expressionless face. A hot anger came over his breast and belly” (357). When Ursula asks her father if she can leave home for work, Will is immediately ugly and angry; in this moment, he feels no balance of vulgarity and beautiful love. He is unable to sympathize with Ursula’s human desire because he has been subsumed by abstractions; her face is expressionless, formless, so he is unable to read it. Critics usually connect Will with Ruskin; however, I believe as Will continues to obsessively seek wonder, Bell and Fry negatively impair his harmony as a father. When Will is fatherly he appreciates the beautiful and ugly sensations in his relationship with Ursula; wonder is produced via the Transfiguration of fatherhood. When twenty-years pass, Will’s abstraction makes him unable to produce any wonder; his search is hopeless, and thus his previous satisfying relationship with Ursula, becomes entirely ugly.

In his marriage with Anna, Will consistently struggles with his addiction for wonder and Transfiguration. In this marital struggle Will is like Ruskin because he searches for moral truth in his relationship with his wife. Through Will’s relationship with Anna Lawrence critiques Ruskin’s aesthetic; Will adheres to Ruskin’s search for morality in art and thus Will’s marriage struggles. At the outset of their relationship, Will feels a Transfiguration, a blessed union, with Anna: “He worked swiftly and mechanically, and he produced some beautiful things. His favourite work was wood-carving. The first thing he made for her was a butter-stamper” (114). Initially Will embraces Lawrence’s vital dialectic of beauty and ugliness in human relations; he works mechanically, which Lawrence always considers ugly, but he produces beauty, a gift for Anna. Because of the harmony of the moment, Anna moans: “I love
you, Will, I love you” (117). In the memory of her moaning, “he dared not think of her face, of her eyes which shone, and of her strange, transfigured face” (118). Anna’s face and eyes become an image of their blessed union, a Transfiguration. Will craves these moments of Transfiguration, so he marries Anna after this wondrous vision; instead of recognizing that this wonder is produced because of their dialectic relationship, Will, like Ruskin, tries to impose a moral truth on the aesthetics of this Transfiguration. Will soon discovers he is not satisfied with Anna as his sole source of wonder; so instead, he searches for a Transfiguration through his relationship with his Adam and Eve woodcarving and in his relationship with the Lincoln Cathedral: “He sat thinking of his carving of Eve. He loved to go over his carving in his mind, dwelling on every stroke, every line. How he loved it now!” (147). The Eve in his Creation panel stirs Will because he thinks that his relationship with his art, his Eve, is a condition of blessedness. Ironically, Will carves her in the, “throes and torture and ecstasy of her creation” (119). Eve is human in her experience of simultaneous torture and ecstasy, yet Will misconceives that through Eve he can experience an otherworldly Transfiguration, an otherworldly union. When Anna asks Will, “What are you thinking about…he found it difficult to say…he could not tell her anymore. Why could he not tell her any more… She felt a pang of disconsolate sadness” (147). Will is unable to explain his love for Eve to his wife because he no longer acknowledges the wonder produced in his relationship with Anna; his obsession for a Transfiguration beyond his human relationship makes him blind to his wife’s wonder. Throughout their marriage, Will’s Adam and Eve carving causes tension in their union: “She did not care for the Adam and Eve, and he never put another stroke to it,” and, “she beseeched him to work again, to do his word-carving. But his soul was too black” (172, 180). Will’s anger that his wife does not, unlike himself, search for an otherworldly union, prompts Will to believe
that Anna considers his woodcarving worthless and thereby, ugly. Anna’s beseeching is similarly devoid of beauty. This imbalance convinces Will that his desire to finish his carving is ugly. The Adam and Eve carving highlights the tension in Will and Anna’s marriage that arises because of Will’s obsession for an inhuman Transfiguration. This tension is perhaps more explicit in the scene in which Will and Anna discuss images of the *Pieta* [Figure 5]. Anna asserts: “‘I do think they’re loathsome…I don’t want to see your chest slit, nor to eat your dead body, even if you offer it me. Can’t you see it’s horrible’” (159). In immediate response, Will “was in a state of violent irritation against her. Partly he was ashamed of his love for these things; he hid his passion for them. He was ashamed of the ecstasy into which he could throw himself with these symbols” (160). Again, the tension in their marriage arises because there is no beauty in this ugly moment; the moment is not dialectically harmonious. There is a lack of beauty because Will is unable to explain his ecstasy to Anna. Will does not share his aesthetic ecstasy with Anna so there is no chance of dialectically producing wonder via their aesthetic discourse. Eventually the ugliness evaporates but only because, “At length he was glad to forfeit from his soul all his symbols, to have her making love to him” (160). In order to find satisfaction with Anna, Will forfeits his Ruskin-like search for wonder, ecstasy, and truth. Though he does love her, in the experience of this forfeit he is unable to find the Transfiguration he seeks in his relationship with his wife, the condition of blessedness that first prompted Will to marry Anna: “He loved her when she put her arms round him and made bold love to him, and he did not make love to her” (160). Though in this moment Will experiences ugliness become complacency, he does not experience the full oscillation from ugliness to beauty that Lawrence privileges; thus this moment, like the moments in which Anna and Will
discuss his Adam and Eve carving, is unsatisfying and lacks the human wonder produced when their marriage is dialectic.

Though, like Ruskin, Will demands morality in his aesthetic aspiration of a Transfigured relationship, he is never content with the human realm, which Elaine Scarry eloquently describes in *On Beauty and Being Just*: “What happens when there is no immortal realm behind the beautiful person or thing is just what happens when there is an immortal realm behind the beautiful person or thing: the perceiver is led to a more capacious regard for the world” (47). In his anguished search for an immortal quality in his relationship with Anna, Will neglects the dialectic of beauty and ugliness in their mortal, human relationship. Instead, Will turns to the Lincoln Cathedral in an attempt to search for otherworldly wonder and beauty in the sacred space of the celestial: “He turned his glowing, ecstatic face to her, his mouth opened with a strange, ecstatic grin…‘there she is,’ he said” (198). Again, Will experiences human ecstasy when he looks at the beauty of the Cathedral, but he is unable to share this experience with Anna. Immediately for Anna, “the ‘she’ irritated her” (198). This moment turns ugly. Anna is annoyed by Will’s feminization and personification of the inhuman building. Simultaneously, Will does not recognize that, “the cathedral roused her too” (201), so the conversation dissolves into a discussion of the putti carvings in the cathedral. Anna remarks, “‘Hasn’t he made her hideous to a degree’” (202); the experience at the Cathedral ends in ugly, hideousness, without an oscillation to beauty. This moment is unsatisfying because both Anna and Will do not share their aesthetic ecstasy for the Cathedral with each other; in this scene, there is no teetering between beauty and ugliness because they do not share their human emotions. The retention of their aesthetic sensations stifles their ability to attain wonder through their relationship because the retention of their emotions prohibits Lawrence’s
dialectic. Anna and Will do not allow their different human emotions to dialectically produce wonder at the Cathedral’s aesthetic; instead, Anna and Will retain their utterly distinct emotions of sacred reverence and profane disgust.

Ironically, beauty enters fully into their relationship after Will cheats on Anna. Will is attracted to the woman he has a brief affair with because of her curved eyebrows; presumably the curve of her eyebrows reminds Will of the moralistic pointed curve of a Gothic church, a Ruskin-like appreciation: “Her eyebrows, with their particular curve, gave him keen aesthetic pleasure” (227). Will thinks he can find aesthetic fulfillment and wonder in this affair because this woman adheres to Ruskin’s sense that beauty resides in moral truth, the morality of the Gothic form. When he discovers he cannot produce wonder or create a Transfigured union with a woman other than Anna, he returns to Anna and obsesses over his wife’s physical beauty: “He had an inkling of the vastness of the unknown 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 beauties, the separate, several beauties of her body” (233). Though Will finally finds beauty in his wife instead of ugly opposition, there is no balance. This relationship does not teeter between beauty and ugliness in this moment, it is entirely physical obsession; so once again the relationship between Anna and Will is unsatisfying. Lawrence explains the problematic, negative aesthetic of this scene even more explicitly:

He had always, all his life, had a secret dread of Absolute Beauty. It had always been like a fetish to him, something to fear really. For it was immoral and against mankind. So he had turned to the Gothic form, which always asserted the broken desire of mankind in its pointed arches, escaping the rolling, absolute beauty of the round arch. But now he had given way, and with infinite sensual violence gave himself to the realization of this supreme, immoral, Absolute Beauty, in the body of woman. (235)
Before his affair, Will sought beauty and wonder in morality. He employed a Ruskin aesthetic and wanted beauty to represent moral truth, the truth found in the Gothic arch. Will attempts to read morality in his affair because the woman of his affair has Gothic-arched eyebrows. Will discovers that this formal reading of Ruskin’s morality does not produce wonder, but Will does not realize this relationship is devoid of wonder because there is no dialectic union in the affair. Then, Will finds absolute beauty in Anna’s curved sensual body. This obsessive ecstasy for Anna’s body is no different than his ecstasy for the Lincoln Cathedral. He previously finds the Lincoln Cathedral solely beautiful and cannot accept Anna’s ugly critiques. Now again, he disregards his ecstasy for Ruskin aesthetics and considers the female body, the Norman curve, the ultimate beauty; his search for a Transfiguration and wonder becomes a search for sensual pleasure via Anna. Will is unable to comingle beauty and ugliness, just as he is unable to comingle his appreciation for Ruskin’s moral Gothic form and his appreciation for the female, human body. Will is not dialectically harmonious because he is obsessed with the need to attain a morally satisfying Transfiguration; he does not embrace Lawrence’s vital aesthetic, which is the means to achieve this blessed union.

Anna practices Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation better than her husband. When Anna visits the Marsh she feels relief from Will’s world of wonder searching: “Then she regained another, lighter world, that had never known the gloom and the stained glass and the ecstasy of chanting” (167). The lighter world that Anna appreciates is the world of family, the human. However, she suddenly realizes that she misses her husband; she experiences an ugly, vulnerable desire for him: “Then she was afraid. She wanted him. When he was so oblivious of her, she almost went mad with fear. For she had become so vulnerable, so exposed” (167). Anna is able to teeter between the experience of beauty at her childhood home, and the ugly
craving to be with her husband in her new home. When she rejoins Will, Lawrence writes:

“And ever and again, the pure love came in sunbeams between them” (168). And immediately after this statement of their love, Lawrence repeats the phrase ‘and ever and again’ to reinforce Anna’s fulfillment of Lawrence’s human aesthetic: “And ever and again, he appeared to her as the dread flame of power” (168). In Anna’s circular aesthetic Anna is able to appreciate her shifting emotions. The repeated phrase ‘and ever and again’ shows that Anna embraces the continual cycle of beauty and ugliness in her marriage; for Anna, their relationship continuously teeters from the love of beautiful sunbeams, their Transfiguration, to the vulgar power of Will’s search for something more than Anna, the dread flame of power. Will once again does not understand this human cycle. In this same moment Will, “loved her for her childishness and for her strangeness to him, for the wonder of her soul which was different from his soul” (168-169). Sadly, Will loves Anna when he thinks their marriage will produce wonder, rather than for the human beauty and human ugliness of their union. Again Scarry can help to make sense of Will’s deficit: “One who pursues beauty does not necessarily become beautiful” (Scarry 88). Will’s constant search for wonder through Transfiguration, beautiful union, leaves his understanding of his marital relationship devoid of the ability to oscillate between beauty and ugliness. Will’s obsession with wonder makes him critical of Anna’s different aesthetic emotions; he considers these differences too disparate instead of allowing them to oscillate, fester, and produce wonder. Will’s obsession with a Ruskin-like moral Transfiguration, leads Will to disregard Lawrence’s human dialectic, which first generated the Transfiguration in his marriage with Anna.

In general, most critics consider Ursula most like Lawrence. While I agree that Ursula represents many of the aesthetic viewpoints that Lawrence champions, I find significance in the
failed relationship between Ursula and Anton Skrebensky. Nevertheless, through Ursula, Lawrence is able to concretely describe some of his perceptions about love. When Ursula talks about love with her friend Maggie Schofield, Ursula “believed that love was a way, a means, not an end in itself, as Maggie seemed to think” (409). And when Maggie urges Ursula that she must distinguish between love and passion, Ursula claims that: “Passion is only a part of love. And it seems so much because it can’t last. That is why passion is never happy” (409). When Ursula refers to love as a means in life, this suggests Lawrence’s aesthetic of teetering between beauty and ugliness as means to Earthly Transfiguration. And when she rightly claims that passion is only one component of love, she acknowledges that beautiful passion, ugly, violent passion, and sensual passion, are all intricately connected in love. Later when Ursula discusses love with her college friend Dorothy, again Lawrence’s aesthetic beliefs are made apparent: “I don’t care about love. I don’t value it…love-love-love- what does it mean- what does it amount to? So much personal gratification. It doesn’t lead anywhere” (473). Lawrence prefers to write about love using his verbal brushstrokes: ‘beauty’, ‘ugly’, ‘quiver’, ‘ecstasy’, ‘abstract’, ‘intimate’, and ‘wonder.’ He prefers to describe love without writing the word ‘love’ directly, but rather by invoking love through the language of aesthetics. This is because the word love does not adequately describe the teetering between beauty and ugliness that is necessary in a loving human relationship; he needs the phosphorescence of his verbal brushstrokes to illustrate love.

When Ursula and Skrebensky first meet, the moment promises a blend of beauty and ugliness: “She broke into a confused, rather beautiful laugh as she gave him her hand, catching her breath like an excited child” (287). As Ursula nervously, yet simultaneously beautifully, laughs upon meeting Skrebensky she is able to acknowledge Skrebensky’s beauty in his
physical flaws: “His face was irregular, almost ugly, fattish, with a rather thick nose. But his eyes were pellucid, strangely clear, his brown hair was soft and thick as silt, he had a slight moustache. His skin was fine, figure slight, beautiful” (289). Ursula’s initial rendering of Skrebensky adheres to Lawrence’s dialectic aesthetic; Ursula recognizes that Skrebensky’s ugly, thick nose, exists alongside his fine skin and beautiful figure. Ursula does not force wonder on Skrebensky’s appearance; rather, she recognizes that he is a human. When Skrebensky praises Ursula’s dress, her own self-perception even oscillates: “For the first time she was in love with a vision of herself: she saw as it were a fine little reflection of herself in his eyes. And she must act up to this: she must be beautiful” (291). Lawrence is able to capture the emotions of a teenage girl. Ursula feels ugly and unsure of herself, but when Skrebensky praises her appearance, she feels beautiful; Ursula’s ability to fluctuate her emotions is in accordance with Lawrence’s aesthetic. After this scene of harmonious teetering between beauty and ugliness, Lawrence includes the word ‘quivering’ to illustrate the emotions of their first kiss: “And then in the darkness, he bent to her mouth, softly, and touched her mouth with his mouth. She was afraid, she lay still on his arm, feeling his lips on her lips…hesitating they continued to walk on, quivering like shadows under the ash-trees of the hill”(297-298). The emotions of the first kiss between Ursula and Skrebensky beautifully fluctuate between soft tenderness, uncertain fear, and quivering wonder; like this moment, the beginning of the relationship between Ursula and Skrebensky is aesthetically satisfying.

Before Skrebensky leaves England to fight in the Boer War in Africa, the relationship between Ursula and Skrebensky begins to be threatened:

He asked her for a photograph when he was going away. She went in great excitement to the photographer with five shillings. The result was an ugly little picture of herself with her mouth on one side. She wondered over it and admired it. He saw only the live
face of the girl. The picture hurt him. He kept it, he always remembered it, but he could scarcely bear to see it. There was a hurt to his soul in the clear, fearless face that was touched with abstraction. Its abstraction was certainly away from him. (324)

Ursula continues to champion Lawrence’s worldview. She notices that her photographed portrait is ugly, but she still finds it wonderful, beautiful. However, Skrebensky is hurt by the abstraction in the photo; Skrebensky chooses to read the photo abstractly like Bell and Fry. Because Skrebensky focuses on the singular forms in the photograph he is unable to oscillate from sad ugliness to beauty. For Lawrence, the abstract art theories block the ability to holistically read the photo; Skrebensky’s abstract rendering of the photo blocks his ability to admire and appreciate Ursula’s ugly-beauty. Again, on the night before Skrebensky is scheduled to leave, abstraction blocks his ability to enjoy his final hours with Ursula: “She kissed him…he walked down to the Marsh abstracted. The contact with her hurt him, and threatened him” (329). Lawrence proves that abstract, Formalist readings do not appeal to human emotions because they are too one-dimensional; there is no dialectic. Skrebensky is unable to cope with the ugly sadness of their parting because his abstraction blocks the beauty of the moment; his abstraction subverts the Hegelian dialectic of beauty and ugliness in the photograph and in their tender goodbye.

After Anton returns from Africa, their relationship is immensely strained; but, Ursula is able to maintain a dialectic in their relationship and thus salvage the harmony of their relationship for some time. Ursula and Anton argue over the benefits of an aristocracy as opposed to a democracy: “Only the greedy and ugly people come to the top in a democracy,’ she said, ‘because they’re the only people who will push themselves there. Only degenerate races are democratic” (459). Ursula’s opposition to Skrebensky’s praise of democracy puts Skrebensky in a mode of rage: “In this state he neither heard nor saw nor felt, only the
mechanism of his life continued...he hated her, as far as, in his state, he could hate...he left her and did not write to her. He flirted with other women, with Gudrun” (460). Lawrence writes that Skrebensky has not escaped from his ‘state’ of abstraction; Skrebensky’s abstract thinking limits his ability to shift from rage back to serenity. Both Ursula and Skrebensky feel extreme violence after their disagreement. When Anton flirts with other women, “this last made her fierce. She was still fiercely jealous of his body” (460). And Skrebensky “felt he would kill her” (461). Ursula and Skrebensky become fierce and animalistic in their frustration; but suddenly, Ursula is able to oscillate from angry violence to love: “When she had roused him to a pitch of madness, when she saw his eyes all dark and mad with suffering, then a great suffering overcame her soul, a great inconquerable suffering. For oh, she wanted to love him. Stronger than life or death was her craving to be able to love him” (461). Ursula’s ability to completely shift from ugly rage to emotions of tender love saves their relationship and ends their fight; Ursula preserves the dialectic of their relationship. After this fight Ursula and Skrebensky experience a Transfiguration, a condition of blessedness, in their relationship; the Transfiguration occurs because neither Ursula nor Skrebensky searches for this wonder they just live their dialectic emotions. Ursula and Skrebensky spend the night outside together and then they watch the sun rise:

The dawn came. They stood together on a high place, an earthwork of the stone-age men, watching for the light...a flush of rose, and then yellow, pale, new-created yellow, the whole quivering and poising momentarily over the fountain on the sky’s rim...the sun was coming. There was a quivering...‘It’s so beautiful,’ she said, looking at the glowing, beautiful land. It was so beautiful, so perfect, and so unsullied...He looked at Ursula. Her face was wet with tears, very bright like a transfiguration in the refulgent light. (463)
Lawrence writes this Transfiguration using beautiful, painterly language; he gives attention to the pigments of the scene, the spatial dimensions, and the living movement of the image. This painterly writing illustrates the outcome of Lawrence’s aesthetic; after their ugly fight, Ursula still finds beauty in the pale-yellow sunrise; she dialectically appreciates the quivering beauty of the unsullied land. Likewise, Skrebensky is able to comprehend Ursula’s beautiful, human reverence for the land, after feeling vulgar anger towards her. Because Ursula and Skrebensky are able to appreciate the beauty of the land and the beauty of this moment after their ugly fight, a Transfiguration in their relationship is achieved, a moment of understanding their union.

Unfortunately this Transfiguration marks the conclusion of Ursula and Skrebensky’s aesthetic union: “In the evening, her practical examination being over, he went with her to dinner at one of the hotels down the river, near Richmond. It was golden and beautiful, with yellow water and white and scarlet-striped boat awnings, and blue shadows under the trees” (465). To begin this scene, Lawrence mimics his painterly language from the sunrise Transfiguration; however, this painterly moment does not produce wonder or a Transfiguration. When Skrebensky asks Ursula, “When shall we be married,” Ursula retorts, “I don’t think I want to be married”’ (465). Suddenly:

His drawn, strangled face watched her blankly for a few moments, then a strange sound took place in his throat. She started, came to herself, and horrified, saw him. His head made a queer motion, the chin jerked back against the throat, the curious crowing, hiccupping sound came again, his face twisted like insanity, and he was crying, crying blind and twisted as if something were broken which kept him in control. (465) Ursula is horrified by Skrebensky’s ugly reaction. Like a mother for her child, she wipes away his tears and he remains silent. In the morning, Ursula is able to oscillate but Skrebensky is utterly hurt:
Skrebensky was beautiful to her this morning, his face soft and transfused with suffering and with love, his movements very still and gentle. He was beautiful to her, but she was detached from him by a chill distance…this morning he was transfused and beautiful…his body was beautiful…He seemed completed now… He seemed added up, finished. (471-472)

The relationship between Ursula and Skrebensky is finished. While Ursula is able to notice the beauty of Skrebensky’s body after his horrible, ugly crying, Lawrence does not write any of Skrebensky’s oscillating emotions, because he has none. Skrebensky is too far abstracted to teeter back to beauty after Ursula’s second marriage refusal. For him the relationship is ugly, and without the prospect of marriage Skrebensky believes there is no further chance of wonder via his relationship with Ursula. Ursula treats their union as a means to wonder; marriage is not an absolute prerequisite for the production of wonder. For this reason, she retains the ability to find beauty in this final moment with Skrebensky. It seems Ursula, like her grandfather, is able to dialectically appreciate ugliness and beauty in her relationship; but, because Skrebensky reads wonder abstractly, he believes their relationship must end after her ugly marriage refusal. Skrebensky no longer understands that after Ursula’s ugly refusal their relationship can oscillate back to beauty.

Lawrence uses the biblical language of Transfiguration in *The Rainbow* to illustrate relationships that strive for other worldly happiness and satisfaction. After an ugly, angry fight between Lydia and Tom, their reconciliation and their beautiful coming together through sex, is written as a Transfiguration: “It was the transfiguration, the glorification, the admission, and always the light of the transfiguration burned on in their hearts…but to the two of them, there was the perpetual wonder of the transfiguration” (94). After two years of disconnect, the coming together of Lydia and Tom is described as Raphael’s *Transfiguration* [Figure 6]; not
coincidentally, Lawrence much admired Raphael\textsuperscript{14}. In Raphael’s painting Jesus is illuminated above a dark mountaintop, and above crowds of chaotic people. The painting depicts Jesus in union with His Father in Heaven; the Transfiguration in their relationship is represented through Raphael’s bright, light tones at the top of his canvas. To further emphasize the union between Jesus, God, and the Holy Spirit, Raphael paints an angel on either side of Jesus, a trio. The chaotic frenzy of dark pigments in the bottom of the canvas starkly contrasts with the wonder of the trio at the top. The light of the Transfiguration in Lydia and Tom’s union alludes to the light behind Christ in Raphael’s painting. Lydia and Tom are able to leave their emotions of disconnect, chaos, and dissatisfaction, as portrayed in the bottom of Raphael’s canvas, in order to feel the illuminated, Transfigured feelings present at the top of the painting. Lawrence uses this heightened language to praise a relationship that embraces his aesthetic of oscillation; Lydia and Tom are able to come beautifully together after ugly, disconnected disagreement. Importantly, Lydia and Tom are only able to experience this Transfiguration because they do not search for this blessedness. Because Lydia and Tom are able to accept the beauty and the ugly in their relationship, they experience this Transfiguration. Roger Scruton explains why the language of sex and the language of Transfiguration so easily meld for Lawrence: “The beautiful and the sacred are connected in our emotions, and that both have their origin in the experience of embodiment, which is at its most intense in our sexual desires” (Scruton 57). By this logic, it seems that Lawrence portrays Lydia and Tom’s relationship through the language of Transfiguration in order to describe the emotions of embodiment that are experienced during beautiful oneness, in a Transfiguration.

\textsuperscript{14} In Robert Millett’s \textit{The Vultures and the Phoenix}, Millett writes that Lawrence admired artists like Raphael, Fra Angelico, and Veronese because they all depicted the consummation of life (Millett 32). Lawrence appreciates Raphael’s \textit{Transfiguration} because of its depiction of life and the living in the bottom of the canvas.
I have chosen to describe Lawrence’s Transfiguration in relation to Raphael’s painting rather than in relation to the Christian Bible. I feel that the light behind Raphael’s Jesus and the orange of the far distant sunrise relate intimately to Lawrence’s painterly descriptions of the Transfiguration. Lawrence’s Transfiguration is a condition of union. While, Lawrence finds the union of Jesus and God an otherworldly union, the light of the sunrise in the distance of Raphael’s painting presents an Earthly union in the painting; the union of the chaotic frenzy and the natural world. Like Lawrence, Raphael paints a dialectic of chaos and peace into his Transfiguration. By contrast, many Lawrence critics read these moments of Transfiguration only in relation to Christianity; for example, Jack Stewart writes that, “Lawrence’s use of biblical metaphor to spiritualize marital sexuality has an expressionist edge” (Stewart, The Vital Art of D.H. Lawrence 57). Keith Sagar connects this biblical language to the symbol of the rainbow. For Sagar, the Gothic horizontal arch represents spiritual aspiration and the Norman arch, the rainbow shape, represents an unknown beyond which offers fulfillment and blessedness (Sagar, The Art of D.H. Lawrence 45). While both of these understandings of the transfiguring rainbow are compelling, I note this human Transfiguration only occurs when Lawrence’s characters do not specifically seek the rainbow. Lydia and Tom experience this fulfillment and blessedness when they accept life’s beauty and life’s ugliness. Likewise, at the conclusion of the novel, Ursula sees the transfiguring rainbow after her ugly, and dangerous encounter with the horse stampede; Ursula is not living in hopes of experiencing a Transfiguration, rather she values life’s ugliness and simultaneous beauty.

At the Renwick Gallery in Washington, DC there is currently a six-month exhibition titled Wonder. At the outset of the exhibition experience, a museum plaque notes that for over two thousand years, people have debated the meaning and value of wonder; however, the
exhibition seems to promote the search for wonder, particularly wonder that is beautiful. In *The Rainbow*, Lawrence challenges this notion. Lawrence seems influenced by Baudelaire’s claim that, “because beauty always contains an element of wonder, it would be absurd to assume that what is wonderful is beautiful” (Baudelaire 86). For Baudelaire, beauty contains an element of the satisfaction of wonder, however he believes wonder can be ugly. Similarly, Gretchen Henderson remembers the Renaissance Wunderkammer and Kunstkammer collections, or the Renaissance cabinets of wonder, which were filled with unknown, ugly, specimens from European explorations (Henderson 54). Lawrence too recognizes that wonder can be ugly. Lawrence writes that Will “loved the early Italian painters, but particularly Giotto and Fra Angelico and Filippo Lippi. The great compositions cast a spell over him. How many times had he turned to Raphael’s ‘Dispute of the Sacrament’ or Fra Angelico’s ‘Last Judgment’ or the beautiful, complicated renderings of the Adoration of the Magi” (276). These Renaissance paintings cast a spell over Will because he looks on their beauty to experience transfiguring wonder. Will actively searches for wonder and Will wrongly equates wonder with beauty; he does not acknowledge Baudelaire’s belief that beauty contains an element of wonder. He disregards Lawrence’s illumination that wonder can be dialectically beautiful and ugly. By contrast Ursula adores, “Fra Angelico’s flowers and light and angels she liked the demons and enjoyed the hell” (276). Ursula can appreciate the beautiful wonder and the ugly, hellish wonder, of Fra Angelico’s paintings. Ursula does not actively search for wonder and for this reason Ursula, and not her father, experiences the final transfiguring rainbow.
CHAPTER III: SAVAGE

Women in Love begins with an immediate connection to the visual arts. At the outset of the novel Gudrun is “drawing upon a board which she held on her knee,” and “almost angrily, took up her rubber and began to rub out part of her drawing” (1). Not only is Gudrun introduced as an artist just arrived to Beldover from her London art-school and studio life, but the connection between art and violence is introduced immediately. Gudrun “almost” violently erases some of her creation. Throughout the novel, Gudrun struggles to maintain and make sense of her artist identity. When Birkin discovers that Gudrun will teach Winifred Crich how to draw and sculpt, he proclaims, in favor of the arrangement, “Every true artist is the salvation of every other” because, “only artists produce for each other the world that is fit to live in” (172). Through Birkin Lawrence attempts to articulate his ‘art for life’s sake’ mantra; Lawrence and Birkin believe that humans should create art as a way to represent life and understand the earthly world. The theory of significant form deters this vision. When Birkin and Gerald are in Paris, Maxim asserts, “I’m sure life is all wrong because it has become too visual- we can neither hear nor feel nor understand, we can only see. I’m sure this is entirely wrong” (61). Maxim laments the abstract art world because abstraction reduces the multi-sensory affect of art to just appreciation of the visual; here, Maxim considers seeing art without considering olfactory components and physical touch, exhausting, because Formal, sight-based interpretations of art do not present a holistic picture of the human nature in the art. Lawrence believes that if art is true to life, it can be heard, felt, and seen; but Clive Bell’s theory of significant form reduces art to aesthetic lines, colors, and forms in space. Lawrence’s praise of ‘art for life’s sake’ and his dismissal of Formalism become apparent throughout Women in Love; it becomes especially apparent through analysis of Lawrence’s verbal brush strokes and
through analysis of Lawrence’s heightened use of ekphrasis in this novel. This mode of close-reading reveals how *Women in Love* only praises the savage oscillation between ugliness and beauty in the relationship of Ursula and Birkin. In *Fantasia of the Unconscious* Lawrence writes, “The savage in a state of nature is one of the most conventional creatures. So is a child” (Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious* 68). In this essay, Lawrence reverentially writes on the child and the child’s capacity to absorb love; thus, this statement appears to praise the savage conventional state. This offers a new understanding of the word ‘savage’; it does not refer to savage as ‘primitive’, or ‘violent’, or ‘barbaric’, but rather, ‘savage’ as vital and true to human instinct. The relationship between Ursula and Birkin most successfully embraces Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation, and therefore this relationship is fulfilling. Both Ursula and Birkin understand the necessity of ‘art for life’s sake’ and the need to be able to fluctuate between emotions of savage anger and savage love in their relationship. This mutual understanding makes their relationship solely successful in *Women in Love* and in the corpus I analyze in this thesis. By contrast, the relationships between Birkin and Hermione and Gudrun and Gerald do not adhere to this savage understanding; therefore these relationships struggle and ultimately end in suffering.

---

15 Wendy Steiner writes on ekphrasis in *The Colors of Rhetoric*. She describes ekphrastic art, textual art, as energy: “the concentration of action in a single moment of energy, and it is a direct borrowing from the visual arts” (Steiner 41). She continues to explain that it is, “rather strange that literature should try to mimic the stillness of painting, when it has the property of movement and temporal flow that painters yearn for” (Steiner 41). However, the presence of this still, energy in Lawrence’s writing provides the reader with an opportunity to pause and visualize his aesthetic. Steiner writes further about the value of ekphrasis; she explains that the ekphrastic moment connects writing with the visual arts, but that ekphrasis also provides a way to connect the mind with reality (Steiner 189). The ekphrastic moments in *Women in Love* inevitably hinge on the tension between the beauty of the imagination and ugliness of visible presence.
In *Women in Love* Lawrence often writes the portraits of his characters using the word “beauty;” these portraits provide insight into Lawrence’s understanding of beauty. For the opening Crich wedding Hermione, “made herself beautiful, she strove so hard to come to that degree of made beauty and advantage” (10). This implies that a certain physical beauty, perhaps fashion, can be donned to give the appearance of beauty. Hermione puts on this fraudulent beauty for Birkin: “He would be there, surely he would see how beautiful her dress was, surely he would see how she made herself beautiful for him” (10). Of course for Lawrence, this forced beauty is not real, and thus Hermione can never capture the love of Birkin. By contrast to this “made beauty”, Birkin is described as truly beautiful: “There was a great physical attractiveness in him- a curious hidden richness, that came through his thinness and his pallor like another voice, conveying another knowledge of him. It was the curves of his brows and his chin, rich, fine, exquisite curves, the powerful beauty of life itself” (33). In this portrait of Birkin, Lawrence delicately contrasts the aesthetics of significant form with the aesthetics of life. Birkin possesses exquisite curves, but these lines do not produce Birkin’s beauty; Birkin’s attractiveness is “in him” because it is the “beauty of life itself.” Scholars like Robert Millett, have argued that Lawrence’s 1928 oil painting, *Contadini* [Figure 7] is an image of Birkin. As in the description of Birkin’s “beauty of life itself”, this painting proves that Formalist lines do not alone provoke the aesthetic emotion of the art. Lawrence uses shading to paint wrinkled, rather flabby, skin on Contadini’s stomach; the skin is mirrored on the naked man in the background who has a similarly wrinkled, saggy back. These dark lines evoke age and ugliness, yet Contadini’s arms are muscled and the sun appears to shine on his naked shoulder, another instance of Lawrence’s luminosity of the human skin. His face turns away from the sun; this creates a shadow on his toned right shoulder and accents his left collarbone.
The emotion of the painting is not conceived by the color of Contadini’s dark hair or the curved contours of his arms; rather, the emotion of the piece comes from Contadini’s turned face and reflective eyes. Contadini looks away from the portrait-artist, Lawrence, and instead casts his eyes on the earthen ground. It seems that Contadini does not want to be crafted into a piece of art, a compilation of lines and colors to convey a “made beauty”; he wants to reflect life, like the faceless, naked man in the background. I argue that Lawrence paints this naked man in the background of his portrait of Contadini to incorporate movement into the painting; the naked man presents an image of living by instinct because he is not posed. Lawrence’s Contadini helps to illuminate the tension in Lawrence’s verbal portrait of Birkin’s “exquisite curves” and “beauty of life.” Unlike Hermione, Birkin champions Lawrence’s emphasis on humanness. Halliday’s portrait can similarly be compared to visual art, beauty, and more importantly to life: “Halliday was different. He had a rather heavy, slack, broken beauty, white and firm. He was like a Christ in Pieta. The animal was not there at all, only the heavy, broken beauty” (61). Halliday’s beauty is broken as compared to Maxim’s, “human animal, golden skinned and bare” (61). Halliday is equated with a statue, lifeless, as compared to Maxim’s human, luminous physique; because Halliday lacks this ‘human animal’ quality, his beauty is lifeless and broken. It is interesting that Lawrence resurfaces the allusion to the Pieta [Figure 5]. This same image causes brokenness in The Rainbow when Anna does not appreciate Will’s wonder.

16 In Michael Lackey’s “D.H. Lawrence’s Women in Love: A Tale of the Modernist Psyche, the Continental ‘Concept’, and the Aesthetic Experience”, Lackey equates Birkin with Nietzsche. He believes that Birkin is a psychosemantic modernist rather than a metaphysical modernist like Bell, Fry, and Hume: “For Nietzsche and Lawrence…life and the world are mind-independent, but there are no mind-independent concepts that are best suited to signify the world aright” (Lackey 281). I find this argument interesting but I prefer to think of Birkin as embracing the savage, human oscillations of life. Instead of adopting a Nietzschean perspective, Birkin embraces an all-life, an all-savage, approach to aesthetics; in Birkin’s praise of savage instincts he refutes the metaphysical modernists. Unlike the metaphysical modernists, Birkin believes there is no way to conceptualize life; humans can only live life.
for the sculpture. Now in *Women in Love*, Lawrence equates Halliday’s lifeless nature with the *Pieta* sculpture, while praising Maxim’s savagery. These portraits show that Lawrence finds true art in human, animal instincts; the most vital instinct for Lawrence is the ability to oscillate between feelings of beauty and feelings of ugliness.

Lawrence uses the word “ugly” to develop the landscape of Beldover. When Gudrun first returns to her childhood home she shrinks “cruelly from this amorphous ugliness of a small colliery town in the Midlands. Yet forward she went, through the whole sordid gamut of pettiness, the long amorphous, gritty street” (4). Gudrun, attuned to the contemporary theories of Bell and Fry, shrinks from the amorphous quality of the landscape. Her shrinking is cruel because she disregards the landscape of her origins, where she was raised; but she nevertheless shrinks, for she is unable to find beauty in the scene because it lacks form, and she therefore renders her home landscape sordid. Internally she feels, “strange that she should have chosen to come back and test the full effect of this shapeless, barren ugliness upon herself” (5). However, it is important that Gudrun chooses to test this landscape. Gudrun leaves her former significant form world of London and Paris; this suggests the abstract art world, which is antithetical to the formless Beldover landscape, was temporarily unsatisfying for Gudrun and an impetus to leave the abstraction and return to nature. Ironically, though repulsed by the amorphous ugliness:

She felt herself drawn out at evening into the main street of the town, that was uncreated and ugly, and yet surcharged with this same potent atmosphere of intense, dark callousness. There were always miners about. They moved with their strange, distorted dignity, a certain beauty, and unnatural stillness in their bearing, a look of abstraction and half resignation in their pale, often gaunt faces. (94)

Gudrun becomes compelled by the landscape because in the landscape Gudrun finds human figures. Keith Sagar notes, “The real subject, for [Lawrence] was always the human body, which most English landscape painting seemed to him an escape from” (*D.H. Lawrence’s
Paintings 36). Like Lawrence, in the ugly landscape of Beldover Gudrun is attracted to the human figures with their distorted dignity, certain beauty, and intense callousness; she is attracted to the dialectic physicality of the miners who are at once distorted and beautiful. However, unlike Lawrence, Gudrun is also attracted to their abstraction. Here, Gudrun struggles between her aesthetic appreciation for Lawrence’s aesthetic and the contemporary theories. Because of the presence of human bodies, she even considers the landscape to have a “foul kind of beauty,” and, “there came over her a nostalgia for the place” (93, 94). Gudrun further feels, “The heavy gold glamour of approaching sunset lay over all the colliery district, and the ugliness overlaid with beauty was like a narcotic to the senses…over all the amorphous squalor a kind of magic was cast, from the glowing close of day” (93). In this moment Gudrun is able to relinquish her appreciation for abstract art and the theorizing of art; and instead, she appreciates the magic in the humanity of the landscape, the living non-theorized world. Though amorphous and ugly, the colliery district becomes beautiful because it is mimetic of life; Gudrun realizes she craves this life like a narcotic. Though not a direct depiction of this Beldover town, Lawrence’s 1927 oil painting Red Willow Trees [Figure 8] triumphs the same quality that Gudrun tries to appreciate. The aesthetic emotion of Red Willow Trees is not gleaned from the curved strokes of the landscape, nor is it gleaned from the burst of red pigment that travels diagonally from foreground to background on the canvas. The aesthetic emotion perceives the human figures at one with the landscape. The man on the left becomes part of the red willow tree, just as Gudrun realizes that the “gaunt faces of the miners” create the essence of “ugliness overlaid with beauty” in Beldover. Unfortunately, moments when Gudrun’s aesthetic philosophy nears Lawrence’s ‘art for life’s sake’ view are few in the novel; Gudrun ultimately fails to embrace Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation, and as a result her
relationship with Gerald savagely shatters. But in this initial scene, Lawrence shows Gudrun’s potential to fulfill his aesthetic worldview.

As in the colliery landscape, ugliness and beauty are combined in instances of ekphrasis, that is, visual art that exists only in the literary description of the art. Ekphrasis is most apparent in *Women in Love* because Lawrence wants to emphasize that this novel most strongly illuminates his visual art opinions and qualms: “It was a grotesque little diagram of a grotesque little animal, so wicked and so comical” (196). Winifred’s drawing of her dog Loozie is an example of ekphrasis, a tangible piece of art that exists only in *Women in Love*. Though Gudrun, the artist, considers the drawing comical and grotesque, Winifred is gleeful and she treasures her drawing exclaiming, “He’s so beautiful” (196). Winifred instinctually finds beauty in the drawing not because of her technique, but because of the living creature her drawing represents. In another example of Winifred’s ekphrasis, Lawrence establishes the wrong interpretation of the role of an artist. Winifred writes to Gudrun, “Dear Miss Brangwen, are you coming back soon, you are very much missed here. I enclose a drawing of father sitting up in bed…do come back and draw the ferrets, they are the most lovely noble darlings in the world. We might carve them in holly-wood” (231). Winifred’s drawing of her sick father is another instance of ekphrasis, and Winifred’s ambition to draw and carve the ferrets is a potential future ekphrasis. Winifred writes:

Father says we might have a studio. Gerald says we could easily have a beautiful one over the stables…we could live in the studio, like two real artists, like the man in the picture in the hall, with the frying-pan and the walls all covered with drawings. I long to be free, to live the free life of an artist. Even Gerald told father that only an artist is free, because he lives in a creative world of his own. (231)

Again, the picture in the Crich home becomes a third ekphrastic object. Winifred’s misconception mocks the notion of the free artist. First, Lawrence sets up Winifred’s naivety in
her description of the picture in her hallway; presumably the man is not holding a frying pan but a paint palette. By first showing that Winifred does not perceive art correctly, it becomes clear that her notion that artists are free to live and create as they please is equally incorrect by Lawrence’s standards. Lawrence feels that the duty of the artist is to create ‘art for life’s sake’, art that evokes the emotions of life, art that visualizes the ugliness and beauty inherent in life.

The heightened role of ekphrasis in this novel suggests that in *Women in Love*, Lawrence most adamantly wants to present his aesthetic visually. It is also significant that ekphrasis is most present in the novel in which a relationship fully succeeds, the relationship between Birkin and Ursula.

The word “ecstasy” appears less frequently in *Women in Love* as compared to *The Rainbow*. Most critics argue that this is because Lawrence equates the language of “ecstasy” with religious and sexual experiences, experiences that are often simultaneous in *The Rainbow*. These critics may note that these religiously intimate moments appear more often in *The Rainbow*. I argue that these moments are less frequent in *Women in Love* because in the relationships in *Women in Love*, Lawrence does not critique the search for a Transfiguration and wonder; instead Lawrence analyzes how relationships can be true to or diverge from the savagery of life. I argue further that the verbal brushstroke ‘ecstasy’ is less frequent in *Women in Love* because of the theorists Lawrence works against in each novel. *The Rainbow* is more focused on examining and opposing aspects of Ruskin’s ecstatic “truth to nature” aesthetic philosophy, while *Women in Love* deliberately works against the abstract art theories of Clive Bell and Roger Fry, specifically their theory of significant form. For this reason, the word ‘abstraction’ is more frequent in *Women in Love*. Lawrence uses forms of the word ‘abstraction’ ironically as a way to discredit abstract academic theorizing of art. Lawrence
understands the definition of ‘abstraction’ as the act of secluding oneself from worldly or sensual things; but he knows that the more obvious twentieth century definition relates to the consideration of an object in the abstract, as Bell and Fry recommend. Lawrence’s verbal brushstroke ‘abstraction’ conveys those moments when his characters seclude themselves from the appropriate vision of a situation; they abstract from the view of life. Generally the word ‘abstraction’ in relation to Lawrence’s beauty and ugliness signifies a harmful understanding of the beauty and ugliness. In a moment of both ecstasy and abstraction in *Women in Love*, ‘ecstasy’ is directly related to beauty and ugliness, and ‘abstract’ signifies a drastically miscalculated reading of the moment. After the argument that finally ends the doomed relationship between Hermione and Birkin, “she lifted her face abstractly when he entered, watched him go to the sofa, and sit down” (84). Then:

Her arms quivered and were strong, immeasurably and irresistibly strong. What delight, what delight in strength, what delirium of pleasure! She was going to have her consummation of voluptuous ecstasy at last. It was coming! In utmost terror and agony, she knew it was open to her now, in extremity of bliss. Her hand closed on a blue, beautiful ball of lapis lazuli that stood on her desk for a paperweight. She rolled it round in her hand as she rose silently. Her heart was a pure flame in her breast, she was purely unconscious in ecstasy. She moved towards him and stood behind him a moment in ecstasy…she brought down the ball of jewel stone with all her force crash on his head…a thousand lives, a thousand deaths mattered nothing now, only the fulfillment of this perfect ecstasy. (85)

First, Hermione abstractly watches Birkin enter her boudoir; because she looks at him abstractly she does not apprehend that he enters the boudoir to apologize to her. In an ecstasy, Hermione violently slams Birkin’s head with beautiful ball of lapis lazuli. The beautiful paperweight becomes an ekphrastic image because it is an art artifact that exists in the text. Further, it is described as beautiful, yet it is used for such an ugly, harmful act. Even worse, the
ugly act with the beautiful object, fuels Hermione’s perfect ecstasy. Lawrence proves that abstract sight causes inappropriate ecstasy; though Lawrence’s aesthetic is often paired with violence Lawrence never condones violence that fulfills physical harm, rather he associates his aesthetic with violent emotions. Hermione feels ultimate ecstasy at physically injuring Birkin, rather than the ecstasy Birkin hoped to achieve in forgiveness. Interestingly this moment, like many in *Women in Love*, incorporates the language of Lawrence’s *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. In *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, Lawrence discusses his thoughts on the human instinct to bully, particularly to bully another into love\(^\text{17}\), a concept explored throughout *Women in Love* and in this instance. In the Introduction to *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, published two years after *Women in Love*, Lawrence writes, “We have no future; neither for our hopes nor our aims nor our art. It has all gone grey and opaque. We’ve got to rip the old veil of vision across, and find what the heart really believes in after all” (Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious* 16). Hermione’s abstract vision, the vision of Bell’s 1914 significant form, is here referred to as this “old veil of vision.” In this moment of ecstasy through injury, and in his 1922 essay, Lawrence makes the claim that the abstract manner of studying art prohibits a future for art; it reduces life-filled art to opaque abstraction. It also prohibits successful human relationships. In this moment, Hermione ends her relationship with Birkin because she theorizes her emotions,

---

\(^{17}\) In *Fantasia of the Unconscious* Lawrence writes, “Love is, in all, generous impulse” (Lawrence 52). He then contrasts this impulse, this instinct, with bullying: “Most fatal, most hateful of all things is bullying. But what is bullying? It is a desire to superimpose my own will upon another person. Sensual bullying of course is fairly easily detected. What is more dangerous is ideal bullying. Bullying people into what is ideally good for them” (Lawrence 52). Essentially bullying is antithetical to human instinct, and thus bullying can never produce healthy, successful human relationships. In contrast to bullying in *Women in Love* is the wrestling scene between Birkin and Gerald. For Lawrence, there is beauty in this moment because of the natural, instinctual, yet also brutal, fighting; however, there is also choreography. This wrestling is instinctual and choreographed, ugly and beautiful; bullying is only ugly because it diminishes this dialectic of instinctual choreography.
and Birkin’s actions, with an abstract lens. Due to her abstract vision, Hermione is unable to humanly understand the situation as savagely ugly and savagely beautiful; rather, she only feels abstract ecstasy at causing Birkin physical injury. This moment harkens back to an earlier argument between Hermione and Birkin about the savage: “Even your animalism, you want it in your own head. You don’t want to be an animal, you want to observe your own animal functions…you want to go back and be like a savage, without knowledge. You want a life of pure sensation and ‘passion’” (30). Birkin mocks Hermione’s abstract understanding of the savage; Stewart calls this “Hermione’s self-conscious civilized primitivism” (Stewart, *The Vital Art of D.H. Lawrence* 97). I argue that Hermione feels that to become savage, which she considers primitive, she must observe and theorize how to act savagely, before actually living a life of sensation and passion. By contrast, Birkin rebukes this need to theorize, and instead embraces his savage instincts humanly; Birkin equates the savage with impulse and desire, not the primitive.

Like the words ‘ecstasy’ and ‘abstraction’, Lawrence’s verbal brushstroke ‘quiver’ distinguishes savage human relationships from those relationships that struggle. ‘Quiver’ develops the vital savagery in the relationship between Ursula and Birkin: “Her eyes were round and wondering, bewildered, her mouth quivered slightly. She looked like one who is suddenly wakened. There was a living, tender beauty, like a tender light of dawn shining from her face” (25). When Birkin visits Ursula at school, while she is teaching elementary botany, her mouth quivers and thus produces a tenderness that is beautiful. This quivering is beautiful because it is living; it is also another instance of Lawrence’s fascination with the human mouth.

---

18 Birkin later explains, to Ursula, his understanding of the necessity for savage beauty and savage ugliness more explicitly: “One can only follow the impulse, taking that which lies in front, and responsible for nothing, asked for nothing, giving nothing, only each taking according to the primal desire” (119).
In this moment, much is living. Ursula and Birkin examine living catkins, while their affection for each other grows, like a plant. The quivering of Ursula’s mouth is alive, just as her love for Birkin blossoms to life in this moment of a beauty that is at once fragile and exquisite. Again Lawrence equates beauty with life via a successful human relationship. By contrast, Gudrun’s mockery often produces a “quiver” in Gerald. When Gudrun calls the Crich rabbit a “sickening fool”, “the vindictive mockery in her voice made his brain quiver. Glancing up at him, into his eyes, she revealed again the mocking, white-cruel recognition. There was a league between them, abhorrent to them both” (201). The attraction between Gudrun and Gerald is abhorrent, ugly; yet, the mocking tone of Gudrun’s voice sends a quiver, presumably a confusing quiver, to Gerald’s brain. Gerald’s quiver is stifling and not life-producing like the quiver in the relationship between Birkin and Ursula. Later in Basle, this same quivering sensation is provoked in Gerald by Gudrun’s mockery: “Her mockery quivered through his muscles with curious re-echoes” (350). Gudrun’s mockery of the professor’s daughter’s affection for Gerald sends quivers through Gerald. This quivering moment is a catalyst in the destruction of the relationship between Gerald and Gudrun. In this ill-founded relationship, the word “quiver” is associated with confusion and frustration. Gerald quivers not when Gudrun is true to life, but rather when she mocks life. Through these antithetical relationships, one successful and the other utter failure, Lawrence reasserts the importance of “art for life’s sake”.

Now I would like to specifically analyze the teetering between beauty and ugliness in *Women in Love*. These close-readings of this teetering further emphasize that Lawrence believes true art and true human relationships must incorporate both beauty and ugliness, because life is savagely wedded to beauty and ugliness. I hope these close-readings further exemplify Lawrence’s “painterly” mode of writing: his use of repetition of his verbal brush
stroke words, his detailed colors, and his studio art language. His painterly writing is important in these instances, as is ekphrasis, because these close-readings reinforce that art cannot be abstractly theorized, that art must replicate life; when these textual, painterly moments become art artifacts in themselves, Lawrence’s claim has more clout. Finally, these close-readings exhibit Lawrence’s notion of the savage; Lawrence’s savage moments are moments of vulnerable ugliness that transform into beautiful awakenings, as opposed to sordidness. It becomes clear that Ursula and Birkin are able to oscillate between savage ugliness and savage beauty with more ease than Gudrun and Gerald; for this reason, Ursula and Birkin’s relationship is successful and Gudrun and Gerald’s relationship fails.

The night of the Crich family lantern festival begins with beauty. Ursula holds an ekphrastic lantern with, “a flight of storks streaming through a turquoise sky of light, over a dark earth” (143), and then Ursula declares, “This is beautiful.” When Gudrun lights her own ekphrastic lantern she too exclaims with delight, “Isn’t it beautiful!” (143). Their lanterns are both somewhat reminiscent of Etruscan art, a style highly revered by Lawrence. Like Ursula, Gudrun’s lantern is naturalistic: “It was primrose yellow, with tall straight flowers growing darkly from their dark leaves, lifting their heads into the primrose day, while butterflies hovered about them, in the pure clear light” (143). This scene of painterly language and painterly impressions continues with the budding romance between Gudrun and Gerald. As Gudrun and Gerald disembark in their canoe, Gudrun feels that Gerald possesses an “inexpressible beauty” (145). Lawrence goes on to illustrate the inexpressible beauty of Gerald:

Isn’t it beautiful!’ she said softly, as if reverently. She looked at him, as he leaned back against the faint crystal of the lantern-light. She could see his face, although it was a pure shadow. But, it was a piece of twilight. And her breast was keen with passion for him, he was so beautiful in his male stillness and mystery. It was a certain pure
effluence of maleness, like an aroma from his softly, firmly moulded contours, a certain rich perfection of his presence, that touched her with ecstasy, a thrill of pure intoxication... ‘Yes,’ he said vaguely. ‘It is very beautiful. (146)

This moment is wedged between two declarations of beauty. Both Gudrun and Gerald assert that the lantern-lit sky, an example of ekphrastic art, is beautiful. However, Gudrun struggles to articulate the inexpressible beauty of Gerald within this frame of natural beauty. Gudrun, the contemporary artist, is constrained by the language of Bell and Fry. She thinks that her aesthetic assertion that Gerald is beautiful derives from his shadows and contours; but, it is not significant form that actually makes him beautiful, it is his likeness to twilight and his male physique that create an aesthetic feeling of ecstasy within Gudrun. Gudrun is not in tune with her human aesthetic emotions because she has been indoctrinated into the worldview of significant form. When Gerald is described in terms associated with life, his beauty should become more expressible; yet Gudrun’s academic art theory terms make her unable to express and articulate this beauty. Immediately this scene of beauty is shattered with ugliness; Diana Crich drowns. The moment of beauty teeters to the savagely ugly:

He had dropped clean down, soft and plumb, into the water...then he clambered into the boat. Oh, and the beauty of the subjection of his loins, white and dimly luminous as he climbed over the side of the boat, made her want to die, to die. The beauty of his dim and luminous loins as he climbed into the boat, his back rounded and soft- ah, this was too much for her, too final a vision. She knew it, and it was fatal. The terrible hopelessness of fate, and of beauty, such beauty! (149)

This moment of lantern-light beauty becomes embalmed with ugliness as Gerald keeps plumbing into the water in search of his drowned sister. Yet Gerald’s loins, which glisten from the water and the moon, are described as beautiful, luminous. Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation drives the scene. However once again, Gudrun struggles to rid herself of academic, Formal theorizing. She considers the color and shape of his loins as the reason for her aesthetic
emotion of hopelessness. She has difficulty recognizing that in actuality, it is the love she has for Gerald, and thus the consideration of his handsome, male likeness to twilight, that spurs these ‘art for life’s sake’ emotions. Gudrun’s Formalist rendering of her relationship stifles her relationship even when Lawrence’s aesthetic is present. In this moment, Lawrence also describes Gerald as an animal: “He was breathing hoarsely too, like an animal that is suffering” (151). This recalls Henderson’s research that human and animal blends are often deemed ugly beasts; “Each bears connotations of what is feared or dreaded in their respective periods” (Henderson 25). However, Lawrence disregards this notion of the ugly beast because Gerald in this moment is a heroic, beautiful savage; Lawrence praises the savage, animal instincts of Gerald. After this scene of ugliness Gerald becomes enamored with Gudrun and her sympathy visits to his house: “An excess of appreciation came over his mind, she was the all-desirable, the all-beautiful” (198). Gerald’s grief leads him to believe a relationship with Gudrun would be all-beautiful; but as in Sons and Lovers, the search for the all-beautiful is never fulfilling. Gerald’s consideration that a relationship with Gudrun would be all-beautiful further clouds his inability to perceive her Formalist flaws. Their relationship is doomed because Gudrun tries to academically conceive Gerald’s brute, primitive, instinct, his beauty; while, Gerald is blinded from his innate savagery by the conception of Gudrun as all-beautiful.

By contrast, the entire “Excurse” chapter teeters between beauty and ugliness and presents a successful, vital relationship. Birkin presents Ursula with a gift of three rings; the
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19 The word ‘excurse’ resurfaces in Lady Chatterley’s Lover. Before Connie meets Mellors, during her brief affair with Michaelis, she believes: “Love was somehow only an excursion from her marriage with Clifford; the long, slow habit of intimacy, formed through years of suffering and patience. Perhaps the human soul needs excursions, and must not be denied them. But the point of an excursion is that you come home again” (46). Connie equates ‘love’ with ‘excurse’. ‘Excursions’, her affairs, become Connie’s escape, her temporary departure, from the mechanical world of Wragby. Here in Women in Love, the word ‘excurse’ signifies a moment
rings become textual art, ekphrasis. Lawrence creates the rings using deliberate painterly language through his use of color, shape, material and living presence. One ring is, “a round opal, red and fiery, set in a circle of tiny rubies,” another is, “a rose-shaped, beautiful sapphire, with small brilliants,” and the third is, “a squarish topaz set in a frame of steel, or some other similar mineral, finely wrought” (253). In all three descriptions Lawrence invokes color, shape, and material, in order to generate the verbal representation of visual representation. When Ursula examines her gift she exclaims, “I think they are beautiful” (253). Interestingly, it is not the significant form descriptions of the rings that prompt this aesthetic declaration. Ursula feels, “such pleasure, as they lay, the three circles, with their knotted jewels, entangled in her palm,” because of what these rings signify in relation to life (254). The beauty of these rings is intrinsically related to the beauty of marriage, the beauty of love and commitment: “She knew that, in accepting the rings, she was accepting a pledge. Yet fate seemed more than herself. She looked again at the jewels. They were very beautiful to her eyes- not as ornament, or wealth, but as tiny fragments of loveliness” (254). The three circles are beautiful because they artistically convey Birkin’s love for Ursula. Lawrence’s 1926 oil painting *Holy Family* [Figure 1] depicts the beauty Lawrence conceives in union. Sagar explains that *Holy Family* depicts a “condition of blessedness” because the child is able to behold and learn from the love of his parents (Sagar, *D.H. Lawrence’s Paintings* 29). Often Lawrence describes children as savages; this painted child is savagely innocent, but on the threshold of understanding oneness. Robert Millett believes the effect of the many circles in the painting evokes harmony and a balance of opposites, just as Lawrence uses the motif of the curved Rainbow, and these rings, to portray of pure, loving fluctuation from ugliness to beauty in Birkin and Ursula’s relationship. Lawrence seems to praise the ‘excursus’, the departure from mechanical structure, because in both *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* and *Women in Love*, Lawrence’s characters embark on excursions founded on their instinctual desires.
this harmony in his writing (Sagar, *D.H. Lawrence’s Paintings* 30). However, this quasi-significant form rendering of the painting only works because the painting depicts a haloed husband and wife embracing before their smiling savage child. Likewise, the rings produce aesthetic beauty for Ursula not only because of their harmonious circular shape, but because they symbolize the condition of blessedness that Birkin and Ursula can achieve through union. Lawrence writes on this condition of blessedness, when parents raise a child, in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. However, the beauty of these rings and Ursula’s acceptance of Birkin’s pledge is quickly shattered by ugliness, a frustrated argument. Birkin and Ursula fight because Birkin wishes to say good-bye to his former lover, Hermione. In a jealous rage, Ursula savagely yells about Hermione’s conceited character: “Is that spiritual, her bullying, her conceit, her sordid materialism?” (257). In a very human way Ursula feels threatened by, while also superior to, Hermione’s bullying, a term from *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. For Birkin, “a wonderful tenderness burned in him, at he sight of her quivering, so sensitive fingers” (257). Birkin feels tenderness at the sight of Ursula’s savage, quivering passion for him. He feels this tenderness until “an ugly, malevolent look came over her face, she pulled the rings off her fingers, and tossed them at him” (258). Then, “he stood motionless, watching her sullen, rather ugly walk” (259). Ursula looks ugly and walks away uglily in this moment. Birkin oscillates from
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20 D.H. Lawrence writes in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, which was first published in 1922: “A family, if you like, is a group of wireless stations, all adjusted to the same, or very much the same, vibration. All the time they quiver with the interchange, there is one long endless flow of vitalistic communication between members of one family, a long, strange rapport, a sort of life-unison” (32). In this statement about family, Lawrence’s verbal brushstroke ‘quiver’ emphasizes the human intimacy of a family. He also explains the importance of this quivering through the word ‘vitalistic’; the quivering of family connection is life producing. And he continues with: “To an infant the mother is the whole universe. Yet the child needs more than the mother. It needs as well the presence of men, the vibration of the present body of the man” (32). In this way Lawrence explains the Vitalism of parental union, which produces family union.
tenderness to ugliness because the moment is so innocently human. Through Birkin, Lawrence starts to bring beauty back into the moment: “He could not bear to see the rings lying in the pale mud of the road. He picked them up, and wiped them unconsciously on his hands. They were the little tokens of the reality of beauty, the reality of happiness in warm creation” (259). Lawrence starts to conclude this moment of teetering between beauty and ugliness with an assertion of his ‘art for life’s sake’ aesthetic. Birkin feels aesthetic pain at the rings lying in the mud because they signify his relationship with Ursula. The beauty of the rings, the art, is the beauty of Lawrence’s condition of blessedness in life, “the reality of beauty” (259). Lawrence fully circles back to beauty, out of the ugliness of this scene, when Ursula returns to Birkin with a flower. “‘Pretty!’ he said” (259). Both Birkin and Ursula are able to fluctuate between savage, angry ugliness and tender beauty; because they accept this emotional oscillation, their relationship continues blessedly.

The chair that Birkin and Ursula almost buy at the jumble market induces a scene that proves Birkin and Ursula share Lawrence’s same aesthetic disregard for significant form; it is not coincidental that Birkin and Ursula have a vital, life-filled relationship and they share Lawrence’s aesthetic Vitalism. Birkin first considers the chair, “a pretty chair,” and Ursula thinks it is, “charming!” (298). Then, Birkin makes the mistake of considering this aesthetic understanding of the chair through significant form: “Look, here is a trifle of the red that underlay the gilt. The rest is all black, except where the wood is worn pure and glossy! It is the fine unity of the lines that is so attractive” (298). Birkin believes it is simply the unity of lines that produces an aesthetically attractive quality in the chair. However very quickly, both Birkin and Ursula change their opinion of the art, the ekphrastic chair. Ursula asserts, “I believe I even hate that old chair, though it is beautiful. It isn’t my sort of beauty;” and Birkin counters her
with, “I’m sick of it all, too. At any rate one can’t go on living on the old bones of beauty” (299). Birkin and Ursula mistakenly apply significant form to an art form of the past; they soon realize that the 1914 aesthetic theory does not work on an object of another aesthetic time. In this subtle moment, they disprove Bell’s theory that significant form is the indicator of aesthetic emotion in all art, even past art. Further, Ursula and Birkin find disgust in their significant form rendering of the chair because this abstract vision limits their possible aesthetic reactions toward the chair:

And if you have a perfect modern house done for you by Poiret, it is something else perpetuated on top of you. It is all horrible. It is all possession, possessions, bullying you and turning you into a generalization. You have to be like Rodin, Michelangelo, and leave a piece of raw rock unfinished to your figure. You must leave your surroundings sketchy, unfinished, so that you are never contained, never confined, never dominated from the outside. (300)

The trend in Lawrence studies is to consider assertions like this literally. Critics like Sagar, would note Lawrence’s knowledge of contemporary French art, but perhaps more emphatically his Ruskin-esque preference for Renaissance sculpture. Michelucci would find the direct influence of Cezanne in Lawrence’s praise of the unfinished canvas. I think most important is Birkin’s statement, “It is all horrible…bullying you and turning you into a generalization” (300). Michelangelo, Poiret, Rodin, and Cezanne may influence Lawrence, but Lawrence adheres to none of their aesthetic theories directly; like Birkin and Ursula, Lawrence will not be bullied into categorization.

Immediately following their refusal of significant form and their rejection of art theory bullying at large, Ursula rebukes the bulling of her family, particularly from her father. Ursula abruptly announces to her parents that she plans to marry Birkin the following day. Will is deeply injured by his eldest daughter’s disregard for her family: “You and yourself, you’re of
some importance, aren’t you?” (307). Ursula rudely retorts: “You only wanted to bully me- you never cared for my happiness” (307). Again Lawrence resurfaces the language of Fantasia of the Unconscious with the word “bully”, while he simultaneously resurfaces the language of real human emotions. Will is pushed to hit Ursula, and consequentially Ursula flees to Birkin in distress. Birkin is quick to notice, “there was a pitiful redness about her sensitive nostrils, and her quivering lips” (309). Lawrence paints the depiction of Ursula’s savage distress using his verbal brush stroke “quiver” and the image of Ursula’s mouth. Immediately the scene intertwines ugliness and beauty. Birkin remarks, “I wish there hadn’t been the violence- so much ugliness- but perhaps it was inevitable” (310). The ugliness of Ursula’s separation from her family is inevitable; she is the oldest Brangwen daughter and Will’s favorite child, but she must marry. Lawrence shows that the natural progression from child to adult is linked to inevitable ugliness; this scene of savage ugliness is inevitable in life. Ursula cuts this revelation with the question, “Do I look ugly?” (310). Because she has been crying, Ursula feels self-conscious about her physical appearance. Birkin, who is going to marry his lover tomorrow, of course responds no: “And he went across to her, and gathered her like a belonging in his arms. She was so tenderly beautiful” (310). Again, Lawrence teeters between beauty and ugliness. Ursula does look ugly in this moment; she has been crying and blowing her nose. But to Birkin, she is beautiful: “She had the perfect candour of creation, something translucent and simple, like a radiant, shining flower that moment unfolded in primal blessedness” (300). It is in this moment of entangled beauty and ugliness that Birkin says, “I love you” to Ursula. He is in love with her regardless of, and in fact because of, her ugly, radiant red nose; he wants to marry Ursula because of her ugly, savage bravery in announcing her independence from her family. Ursula and Birkin’s marriage is founded on a deep practice of Lawrence’s aesthetic of
oscillation; thus, Lawrence praises their relationship as ideally and savagely human, a condition of ‘primal blessedness’. Birkin struggles to describe in words Ursula’s beauty: “How could he tell her of the immanence of her beauty, that was not form, or weight, or colour, but something like a strange, golden light! How could he know himself what her beauty lay in, for him. He said, ‘Your nose is beautiful, your chin is adorable’” (311). Lawrence brilliantly provides us with the conundrum of beauty. For Lawrence, beauty cannot be described by significant form: “form”, “weight”, and “color”. The aesthetic emotion of beauty is intimately related to qualities of life; Birkin feels Ursula is beautiful because he loves her. Though he tries, Birkin cannot articulate fully Ursula’s beauty, but in attempts to describe the beauty he locates in her physical features that are “beautiful” and “adorable”. Birkin cannot find the academic terms to describe Ursula’s beauty; Ursula’s beauty cannot be articulated through Formalist words because her beauty is the beauty of oneness, the luminosity of the knowledge of union with the woman he loves. Through free indirect discourse, Lawrence morphs with Birkin briefly: “In the new, superfine bliss, a peace superseding knowledge, there was no I and you, there was only the third, unrealized wonder, the wonder of existing not as oneself, but in a consummation of my being and her being in a new one, a new paradisal unit regained from the duality” (311). The image of Holy Family [Figure 1] immediately resurfaces. The man and woman in Holy Family are beautiful because they represent this “paradisal unit”, this “wonder of existing not as oneself” (311). Birkin cannot articulate the beauty of Ursula because the beauty of union supersedes knowledge; it supersedes the academic theories of aesthetics and beauty. The notion of wonder from The Rainbow re-emerges in Women in Love. Birkin and Ursula do not search
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21 Scholars have noted the similarity between the relationship of Birkin and Ursula and Lawrence’s own relationship with Frieda. Specifically, Robert Millett discusses this connection in The Vultures and The Phoenix: A Study of the Mandrake Press Edition of the Paintings of D.H. Lawrence.
for wonder, but in their loving acceptance of the beauty and the ugly in their relationship, they achieve the wonder of union.

At the end of *Women in Love*, Lawrence introduces another artist, Loerke. The inclusion of Loerke highlights why Ursula’s aesthetic worldview is like, and Gudrun’s worldview is not like, Lawrence’s aesthetic. Loerke’s art is ekphrastic. First Lawrence writes of Loerke’s frieze for a granite factory in Cologne:

> It was very interesting to Gudrun to think of his making the great granite frieze for a great granite factory in Cologne. She got from him some notion of the design. It was a representation of a fair, with peasants and artisans in an orgy of enjoyment, drunk and absurd in their modern dress, whirling ridiculously in roundabouts, gaping at shows, kissing and staggering and rolling in knots, swinging in swing-boats and firing down shooting galleries, a frenzy of chaotic motion. (356-357)

This written art of frenzy, chaos, and motion often leads scholars, like Andrew Harrison, to note the influence of Futurism in Lawrence’s writing. Yet Loerke is not Lawrence’s artistic champion. Loerke believes “sculpture and architecture must go together. The day for irrelevant statues, as for wall pictures, is over” (357). Loerke’s aesthetic worldview seems quite opposite to Lawrence’s view in his essay *Pictures on the Walls*. Lawrence writes in this essay, “There are thousands of quite lovely pictures, not masterpieces, of course, but with real beauty, which belong to today, and which remain stacked dustily and hopelessly in corners of artist’s studios, going stale…our aesthetic education is become immensely important, since it is so immensely neglected” (Lawrence, *Pictures on the Walls* 156). It seems that Lawrence respects the wall pictures that Loerke finds irrelevant because, though not the pictures that are praised by museums or the salons for their technical skills, wall pictures are images of life; further, Lawrence finds these works essential to aesthetic education because they depict the human life
that is not on display in the art of masterpieces. After dismissing wall pictures, Loerke launches into a speech on ugliness and beauty in the workplace:

> There is not only no need for our places of work to be ugly, but their ugliness ruins the work, in the end. Men will go on submitting to such intolerable ugliness…And this will wither the work as well. They will think the work itself is ugly…whereas the machinery and the acts of labour are extremely, maddeningly beautiful. But this will be the end of our civilization, when people will not work because work has become so intolerable to their senses…we have the opportunity to make beautiful factories, beautiful machine-houses. (357)

Though Loerke is German, in his praise of maddeningly beautiful machinery, he seems once again deeply influenced by the jargon of the Italian Futurists. However, Lawrence once again does not triumph Loerke’s aesthetic theory because Loerke is unable to comprehend a blend of beauty and ugliness. Loerke feels that places of work are considered ugly, but that machine-houses should be beautiful; he resists recognizing that places of work may be both ugly and beautiful simultaneously. Likewise Loerke, unlike Birkin and unlike Lawrence, is unable to consider humans both ugly and beautiful. In a second example of Loerkean art, Lawrence develops a “photogravure reproduction of a statuette signed F. Loerke” (361). Immediately this signature calls to mind Duchamp’s ready-made *Fountain* signed R. Mutt. Duchamp’s *Fountain* [Figure 9] was a direct result of the abstract theorizing of art by Bell and Fry; thus, Lawrence’s alignment of Loerke with Duchamp’s challenge to art is a negative attribute in Loerke’s aesthetic theory. Though not a ready-made like Duchamp’s *Fountain*, Loerke’s green bronze sculpture is similarly not revered art, according to Lawrence:

> The statuette was of a naked girl, small, finely made, sitting on a great naked horse. The girl was young and tender, a mere bud. She was sitting sideways on the horse, her face in her hands, as if in shame and grief, in a little abandon. Her hair, which was short and must be flaxen, fell forward, divided, half covering her hands. Her limbs were young
and tender. Her legs scarcely formed yet, the legs of a maiden just passing towards cruel womanhood, dangled childishly over the side of the powerful horse, pathetically the small feet folded one over the other, as if to hide. But there was no hiding. There she was exposed naked on the naked flank of the horse. The horse stood stock still, stretched in a kind of start. It was a massive, magnificent stallion, rigid with pent-up power. (361)

Gudrun feels that this naked, exposed girl is beautiful because Gudrun is impressed that the creator, Loerke, could produce a tender effect in the medium of green bronze. By contrast, Ursula is quite offended by the stiffness of the bronze horse. Loerke retorts that “it is a part of a work of art, it has no relation to anything outside that work of art” (362). Immediately, Loerke is set up as an oppositional figure to Ursula and to Lawrence. Loerke’s horse is rigid; and according to Ursula, it is not attuned to the sensitivity of live horses. Loerke’s horse is not true to life because Loerke is more interested in fetishizing the naked girl. Further Ursula intimately knows the savage movement of horses because of her ugly, yet dialectically ecstatic, experience with horses in *The Rainbow*; horses drive the ugly, violent moment before she witnesses the beautiful, transfiguring rainbow. Ursula pushes Loerke further in arguing, “I have just as much right to say that your horse isn’t a horse, that is a falsity of your own make-up…I know it is a picture of himself, really” (363). Ursula adheres to ‘art for life’s sake’ therefore she argues that because Loerke’s stiff horse is nothing like an actual living horse, that it is representative of Loerke’s own stiff nature; she believes art is made to represent life so the horse must represent some facet of life. Loerke rebukes Ursula’s reading of his art: “It is a work of art, it is a picture of nothing, of absolutely nothing. It has nothing do with anything but itself, it has no relation with the everyday world of this and other, there is no connection between them, absolutely none, they are two different and distinct planes of existence, and to translate one into the other is worse than foolish” (363). Loerke uses the language of Bell and Fry to
argue against Ursula, and against Lawrence’s ‘art for life’s sake’ understanding of art. He claims that art is in a different “plane” than life; the word “plane” is intrinsic to Fry’s Formalism and Bell’s significant form. Gudrun, as typical of her relentless weakness to these theories, agrees with Loerke: “I and my art, they have nothing to do with each other. My art stands in another world, I am in this world” (363). Lawrence, like Ursula, is disappointed by Gudrun’s weakness to academic theorizing of art. Ursula champions Lawrence’s view of art: “As for your world of art and your world of reality…you have to separate the two, because you can’t bear to know what you are. You can’t bear to realize what a stock, stiff, hide-bound brutality you are really, so you say ‘it’s the world of art.’ The world of art is only the truth of the real word, that’s all- but you are too far gone to see it” (363). It is as if Lawrence writes this directly to his contemporaries, like Duchamp, who have removed the depiction of human life and earthly landscape from art. It becomes quite clear after this assertion that Lawrence aligns himself with the aesthetics of Ursula and Birkin, rather than Gudrun and Loerke. Ursula’s rebuke of Loerke proves why her relationship with Birkin thrives. Gudrun’s acceptance of Loerke marks the undoing of Gudrun’s capacity love, specifically her capacity to love Gerald; and, her relationship with Gerald dies. It is interesting that the importance of the dialectic of beauty and ugliness is portrayed through the two teachers, rather than the two studio artists. Perhaps, Lawrence subconsciously writes the dialectic in the relationship between Birkin and Ursula because he was more confident in his teaching of art, than in his own skill at painting.\footnote{In \textit{D.H. Lawrence’s Paintings} Keith Sagar notes, “Though well aware of his deficiencies in technique particularly anatomy, Lawrence declined to use either models or photographs for his paintings, because that would have encouraged tyranny of the eye over imagination” (Sagar 67). Though Lawrence even writes to the Brewsters acknowledging his lack of technical painting skill, Lawrence prefers to verbally paint images from his minds, images he remembers from life experiences. Models suggest staged life, thus they do not allow a painting to portray real life. In \textit{D.H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography} by Edward Nehls, Nehls includes an}
Gerald is the result of misused academic theorizing. Gerald is hurt by an ‘art for art’s sake’ approach, Gudrun’s final aesthetic worldview. Gudrun proves that in her Formalist mindset she is sympathetic to ‘art for art’s sake’ enthusiasts; she asserts that her art portrays a different world than the world she lives in. In her ‘art for art’s sake’ sympathy Gudrun chooses Loerke over Gerald. She appreciates Loerke despite his aesthetic opinion that women over the age of twenty are no longer interesting or beautiful: “They are no good to me, for my work” (365). Gudrun ignores the concept that art should replicate life; she disregards the fact that a woman over twenty can be just as beautiful, and just as simultaneously ugly, as a young girl. Unfortunately Gudrun’s ultimate allegiance to Loerke’s aesthetic theory, the theorizing method of Lawrence’s contemporary art critics, leads to the death of Gerald because she does not appreciate Gerald’s savage life. Gerald savagely “took the throat of Gudrun between his hands, that were hard and indomitably powerful. And her throat was beautifully, so beautifully, soft, save that, within, he could feel the slippery chords of her life…He was watching the unconsciousness come unto her swollen face, watching the eyes roll back. How ugly she was!” (399). In a moment of utter violence, Gerald shows that he understands that art dialectically includes both beauty and ugliness; even this savage moment of violent ugliness, retains a quality of beauty. Gerald recognizes that Gudrun’s soft, beautiful neck can exist alongside the ugliness of her face while it is depleted of oxygen. Gerald embraces Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation, but Gudrun’s Formalist, abstract theorizing kills him. Gudrun chooses Loerke, the excerpt from Lawrence’s student Frank W. Turner, that gives a glimpse into his art teaching: “I remember particularly his botany lessons with sketch illustrations, showing for instance, the similarity between a sweet pea bloom and a runner bean flower, and his art lessons…his demonstrations of perspective, making lines stretch away into nothing, still live in my memory. He also taught us water-colour painting” (91). Lawrence teaches botany through visual art; it seems that visual art was always a means for Lawrence to memorialize as he explains and teaches his ideas.
man who feels art, like the workplace, can either be ugly or beautiful, not both. Because Gudrun ultimately does not value or validate Gerald’s ‘art for life’s sake’ understanding of love, he loses a sense of purpose and dies a tragic death. But, Lawrence reaffirms that Gerald, not Gudrun, upholds his aesthetic worldview: “The dead face was beautiful” (406).

Gerald understands Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation because he embraces his human, savage instincts: “In his boyhood he wanted a sort of savagedom…he rebelled against all authority. Life was a condition of savage freedom” (184). Even as a boy Gerald is intrigued by the life of human instinct. And in his travels abroad he discovers, “humanity very much alike everywhere” (184). Gerald embodies the ideas Lawrence writes on in *Pictures on the Walls*: “The human race loves pictures. Barbarians or civilized, we are all alike, we straightaway go to look at a picture if there is a picture to look at” (Lawrence, *Pictures on the Walls* 147). Lawrence believes that a picture is only a picture if it depicts life, and is painted with the life, the dialectic touch, of the artist. Through reference to the savage, Lawrence asserts that all humans love pictures that are mimetic of the dialectics in life because of the human, savage instinct therein to teeter between beauty and ugliness. Gerald understands and proves that “the savage is all in all in himself” (Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious* 63). But when Gerald is scrutinized by the academic, abstract theorizing of Gudrun and Loerke, he is no longer able to live the savage impulses of ugliness and beauty in his relationship with Gudrun; the dialectics of a healthy human relationship are theorized by Gudrun and thus unable to flourish in the relationship.

Robert Millett argues that Lawrence and Frieda were the prototypes for Birkin and Ursula (35). This is not surprising given the relationship between Birkin and Ursula is the only relationship that fully adheres to Lawrence’s belief that human relationships must be able to
teeter between instinctual beauty, desire, and savage ugliness, frustration. Amazingly, in Frieda’s writing about her relationship with Lawrence, this aesthetic seems apparent.

According to Frieda, upon their first meeting:

He had finished with his attempts at knowing women. I was amazed at the way he fiercely denounced them…soon afterwards he wrote to me: ‘you are the most wonderful woman in all England’…Yet Lawrence really understood me. From the first he saw through me like glass, saw how hard I was trying to keep up a cheerful front. I thought it was despicable and unproud and unclean to be miserable but he saw through my hard and bright shell…My real self was frightened and shrunk from contact like a wild thing. (Nehls 160)

In Frieda’s account, her first encounter with Lawrence is filled with savage, ugly anger because Lawrence is frustrated with his past failed relationships; he uglily denounces all women. But then, he instinctually oscillates to feelings of beauty and wonder because of his newfound love for Frieda. Then again, this description teeters to the ugly in Frieda’s description of her own well being before Lawrence; she was ugly and self-conscious in her search to fulfill her instinctual, wild desires. Frieda also recorded a later, vital, exchange with Lawrence. Frieda asks her new husband, “What do I give you, that you didn’t get from others?” Lawrence’s response to this honest questions is, “You make me sure of myself, whole.” And Frieda continues, “I knew he loved the essence of me…whatever faults I had. It was life to me” (Nehls 167). Through this exchange it becomes clear that Lawrence loves the ugly-beauty in Frieda. It also becomes clear that Lawrence feels whole because he has found a woman who also embraces the human fluctuations of life. Like the relationship between Lawrence and Frieda, the relationship between Birkin and Ursula succeeds because both Birkin and Ursula live by their human instincts. Birkin and Ursula appreciate that their relationship, their Vitalism,
should contain both beauty and ugliness; and further, they understand that this beauty and ugliness should not be theorized it should be savagely lived.
In Lady Chatterley’s Lover, Connie’s relationship with Clifford Chatterley is incontestably an utter failure in its complete abandonment of Lawrence’s vital aesthetic. Lawrence continually describes Clifford in this relationship as lacking intimate instinct: “He was at once too intimate with her and not intimate enough. He was so very much at one with her, in his mind and hers, but bodily they were nonexistent to one another” (16). Clifford receives pleasure from his mental, mechanical, conversations with his wife, but his relationship with Connie is devoid of physical intimacy; the mechanical is a structured mode of living that is devoid of instinct, desire, and savage impulses. Clifford is antithetical to Paul Morel in his relationship with Clara; instead of possessing the instinct to love and touch his wife, Clifford wants to become famous for his mind: “Connie wondered a little over Clifford’s blind, imperious instinct, to become known’ (19). Connie does not appreciate Clifford’s desire to become a modern writer. In fact, Connie feels that Clifford’s preference of mind over body diminishes the vitality in their relationship; it transforms human instinct into imperious, mechanical living. At Wragby, Connie experiences restlessness and feels as if she loses “touch with the substantial and vital world” (18). Again, when the doctor examines Connie, Lawrence uses the word vitality to illustrate the failure of this marriage: “You’re spending your vitality without making any” (83). It becomes clear that Lawrence proves this relationship is doomed because it lacks human vitality; the relationship between Connie and Clifford has no beauty, ugliness, or vitality, because it is not alive, it is mechanical. However, Lawrence praises Connie’s instincts: “Connie had adopted the standard of the young: what there was in the moment was everything” (15). Connie embraces mental and physical intimacy, but Clifford’s consistent denial of the physical and intense assertion of mental mechanical love causes Connie
to suffer in her relationship with her husband. Clifford continually claims, “It’s the life-long companionship that matters. It’s the living together from day to day, not the sleeping together once or twice” (45). While Lawrence agrees that in marriage, the life-long acceptance of the beautiful and the ugly is essential to the relationship, he considers sensuality an aspect of the beautiful and the ugliness of marriage. As a result, Connie’s sensual body becomes wholly ugly in her relationship with Clifford; Connie loses her vitality because Clifford adheres to mechanical mentality in their relationship, instead of a blend of the mental and the physical, the beautiful and the ugly. In this 1928 novel Lawrence incorporates even more painterly descriptions, because he begins oil painting in 1926. His description of Connie’s ugly, loss of vitality is painterly: “Her body was going meaningless, going dull and opaque, so much insignificant substance” (75). The terms ‘dull’ and ‘opaque’ are studio art terms; Lawrence deliberately uses these words in connection with the word ‘insignificant’ to further indicate the reason for Connie’s loss of sensuality and life. For Lawrence, these Formalist terms are not ‘significant’ but ‘insignificant’; once again, Lawrence is connecting loss of life with mechanical, abstract, interpretations of art. Connie’s painterly physicality is lifeless when it is subjected to mechanical abstraction. Lawrence continues, “But the front of her body made her miserable. It was already beginning to slacken with a slack sort of thinness, almost withered, going old before it had ever really lived” (75). Unlike Lawrence and Connie, Clifford wants to achieve meaning through the mechanical; because of this, in her relationship with Clifford Connie’s body becomes ‘meaningless’ and ‘miserable.’ By contrast, the relationship between Connie and Mellors thrives when it is naturally instinctual; this affair, this excursion, thrives when the relationship embraces both the beauty and the ugly of the human mind and the human body. The moments of teetering between beauty and ugliness, in the relationship between
Connie and Mellors, tend to occur when chickens are present or when the word quiver is used. But when Connie allows the mechanical to pervade this relationship, their future becomes hopeless.

When Connie first stumbles upon Mellors, she emotionally and organically feels Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation. Lawrence writes his aesthetic using incredibly painterly language:

In some curious way it was a visionary experience…she saw the clumsy white breeches slipping down over the pure, delicate, white loins…the sense of aloneness, of a creature purely alone overwhelmed her…and beyond that, a certain beauty of a pure creature. Not the stuff of beauty, not even the body of beauty, but a lambency, the warm, white flame of a single life, revealing itself in contours that one might touch: a body! (70)

Connie comes across Mellors bathing in his backyard and instinctually feels an overwhelming attraction for Mellors. Lawrence describes Mellors’ bathing body as lambent; lambency is the quality of life that Lawrence imbues in his own oil paintings. For example, the luminous skin of Contadini [Figure 7] can be considered lambent. Thus, immediately Lawrence sets up the vitality of Mellors; and further, Connie is attracted to his vitality. Connie is not attracted to Mellors because his body is beautiful, but rather because his body is alive. Literary critic Stefania Michelucci would consider this moment a “re-discovery of a natural, religious acceptance of the body” (Michelucci 20), but I consider this moment intimately related to Lawrence’s praise of human beauty and human ugliness. Following Connie’s discovery of Mellors’ beautiful, contoured life, “her mind was inclined to ridicule. A man washing himself in a backyard! No doubt with evil-smelling soap!” (70). Her emotion of reverence dialectically teeters to ugly disgust. Her human mind causes her to uglily review this animalistic, uncivilized situation. But in typical moments of successful Lawrencian relations, Lawrence reintroduces beauty into the scene: “He thought her comely, almost beautiful, in her shyness” (71).
Lawrence describes Mellors’ reaction to Connie’s intrusion; Mellors finds Connie comely, almost-beautiful, which makes the moment of ugliness vacillate again to beautiful attraction. This same speedy fluctuation between beauty and ugliness is present after Connie and Mellors first have intercourse. After their moment of physical intimacy, Lawrence writes that a “brilliant little moon” is in the sky, a beautiful image of life (127). This image is furthered by Mellors’ statement: “I thought I’d done with it all. Now I’ve begun again” (128). When Connie asks what he has begun again, Mellors responds, “life” and Connie retorts, “it’s just love” (128). Throughout the novel Mellors consistently represents Lawrence’s ideal attitude; Mellors recognizes this moment is beautiful because it is filled with life. Connie too acknowledges the moment is beautiful, but she does not immediately connect the beauty of the moment with its life, but rather she believes the beauty is love; in this later novel, Lawrence coheres his concepts of beauty, to present the beauty of human vitality and love as dialectics:

She wondered over the sort of rapture it was to him. She did not understand the beauty he found in her, through touch upon her living secret body, almost the ecstasy of beauty. For passion alone is awake to it. And when passion is dead, or absent, then the magnificent throb of beauty is incomprehensible and even a little despicable, warm, live beauty of contact, so much deeper than the beauty of wisdom. (136)

Lawrence’s verbal brushstrokes ‘wonder’, ‘beauty’, and ‘ecstasy’ illustrate his important aesthetic of dialectic beauty, which finds its essence in ugliness, tenderness, and emotions of the human. Connie at first wonders over the ecstasy Mellors appreciates in their moment of intimacy; at first Connie associates this ecstasy with love. But, she quickly realizes that her ecstasy, the ecstasy of beauty, is because of their live passion; she realizes that the beauty of contact is more alive than the beauty of wisdom. The beauty of wisdom refers to the mechanical theorizing and mechanical manipulation of human instinct. This moment contains beauty because it is alive and instinctual. Even further, this moment is able to oscillate from
this beauty to subsequent ugliness when Connie feels vulnerable: “She lay there inert, and was gazing up at him thinking. Stranger! Stranger! She even resented him a little” (137). Though Connie recognizes the beauty of their shared, living, passion, she now feels self-conscious and ugly. Despite these ugly feelings Connie pleads, “kiss me,” and Mellors, “bent over her indistinguishable and kissed her on the left eye. She held her mouth and he softly kissed it, but at once drew away. He hated mouth kisses” (139). The ugliness of Connie’s self-conscious mentality oscillates to the beauty of Mellors’ eye kiss and then again to the ugly, hate of his mouth kiss. In 1928, Lawrence is still haunted by the intimacy of human mouths. Mellors hates mouth kisses because he abhors mechanical motions of love; for Mellors, the mouth kiss is just a counterfeit mechanical motion in a relationship. However, this moment involves Lawrence’s vital aesthetic of beauty and ugliness and for this reason it is a supremely successful moment in their relationship. Lawrence’s inclusion of the word ‘indistinguishable’ is yet another instance when he criticizes the abstract, mechanical, renderings of life in promotion of his own Vitalism. This moment is both beautiful and ugly because it is a wholly human moment. It is indistinguishable and therefore cannot be read by significant form; it can only be read through Lawrence’s aesthetic.

The hut that Modernist literary critic David Trotter argues represents a yearning for “a return to the primeval, precivilized, preindustrial” is similarly presented through teetering descriptions of beauty and ugliness (Trotter, “Techno-Primitivism” 152). For this reason, I argue that the cottage is an emblem of natural, instinctive human life, as opposed to mentally and mechanically dictated life. When Connie first discovers the hut in the woods she finds herself, “in a dream, utterly unaware of time” (95). Lawrence initially writes the hut as a beautiful refuge. But, “he hated her presence there” (95). Mellors feels violently ugly at
Connie’s intrusion of his refuge. Suddenly, Connie’s beautiful dream is shattered by ugly animosity: “Their eyes met. His had a cold, ugly, look of dislike and contempt, and indifference to what would happen. Hers were hot with rebuff” (96). When Connie asks for a duplicate key to the hut, both Mellors and Connie experience ugly, anger. Yet, this ugliness produces life: “She had wakened the sleeping dogs of old voracious anger” (96). Mellors is angry because Connie re-stimulates his life and his passion; he realizes that this hut will no longer be his idle, solitary refuge, because it will be a shared refuge. The cottage in the woods later becomes beautiful again, and in this manner of oscillation it comes to represent success in the relationship between the hut’s occupants: “But it’s lovely here…such a beautiful stillness, everything alive and still” (182). The hut is beautiful and alive, but still. This deliberate juxtaposition between the life of the hut’s inhabitants and the stillness of the woods proves the dialectic presence of Lawrence’s aesthetic. The hut’s inhabitants are alive but find the essence of their vitality in the still, natural refuge from the mechanical world. In the hut, Connie and Mellors are able to be human; they are able to experience both beautiful aliveness as well as ugly anger. In likeness to Women in Love, at the hut, in the woods, and away from mechanization, Connie and Mellors are also able to embrace their savage instincts; Lawrence wants this accompaniment to his aesthetic: “Her pointed keen animal breasts tipped and stirred as she moved…he took her, short and sharp and finished, like an animal…he ran straight and swift: he didn’t like the rain” (243). When Connie and Mellors have intercourse on the rainy, earthen floor outside the hut, Lawrence describes them as animals. Lawrence praises their embrace of their ugly-beautiful instincts. In Introduction to these Paintings Lawrence writes, “Very elementary in man is his sexual and procreative being, and on his sexual and procreative being depend many of his deepest instincts and the flow of intuition…and by intuition alone
can he bring forth again images of magic awareness which we call art” (Lawrence, *Introduction to These Paintings* 91-92). Lawrence frankly writes that passionate sexual desire is instinctual, and only when this human instinct is acknowledged can true art be generated. This moment of savage, animalistic embrace of their ugly-beautiful instincts is a moment of true art.

Roger Scruton writes on this same instinct: “But the desire of one person for another is simply that- a desire for that person. It is a desire for an individual, which is expressed in, but not fulfilled by, still less cancelled by sexual intimacy…beauty invites us to focus on the individual object, so as to relish his or her presence. And this focusing on the individual fills the mind and perceptions of the lover” (Scruton, *Beauty* 46). Like Lawrence, Scruton believes that sexual intimacy is a natural instinct and thereby a component in the dialectic beauty and ugliness of savage human relationships. Also like Lawrence, he realizes that sexual intimacy is not the ultimate fulfillment of desire. In this moment of *en plein air*\(^{23}\) intimacy, Mellors’ desire for Connie is not only sexual, though his desire is expressed through sexual instinct. Mellors is able to disregard his ugly distaste for the rain because he is so attracted to Connie’s beautiful persona. This moment involves the beauty of their intimacy as well as his ugly distaste of the rain. Therefore this artistic moment portrays Lawrence’s aesthetic through human, animalistic instinct.

Strangely, Clifford’s relationship with Mrs. Bolton is more satisfying than his relationship with Connie because the relationship between Clifford and Mrs. Bolton is perversely instinctual. Mrs. Bolton is attracted to Clifford because of her desire to know, her desire for mentality: “In truth, the very fact that there could be no love affair left her free to

---

\(^{23}\) *En plein air* is a French phrase connoting, in full air. It is usually associated with French Impressionist painters who painted outside, in full air. The Impressionists felt they were more equipped to paint the atmospheric qualities of their canvases when they painted outside in the air, in nature.
thrill to her very marrow with this other passion, the peculiar passion of knowing, knowing as
he knew” (108). And Clifford is attracted to Mrs. Bolton because of the way she tenderly cares
for him: “And he let her shave him and sponge all his body as if he were a child, really as if he
were a child” (118). Mrs. Bolton is all physical tenderness, so she desires Clifford’s
mechanized mind. Clifford is all mind, thus he desires Mrs. Bolton’s physicality. Though this
relationship is by no means championed by Lawrence, together Clifford and Mrs. Bolton
represent a perverse union of mind and body. As Connie further distances herself from these
Wragby relations: “Clifford became like a child with Mrs. Bolton…and he would put his hand
into her bosom and feel her breasts, and kiss them in exaltation, the exaltation of perversity of
being a child when he was a man” (320). Lawrence uses the word ‘perverse’ to illustrate
Clifford’s attraction to Mrs. Bolton. Clifford’s attraction is instinctual, but according to
Lawrence it is perverse because there is no acknowledgement of beauty or ugliness in his
attraction: “And in this Mrs. Bolton triumphed…at the same time, in some corner of her weird
female soul, she despised him and hated him…she despised him with a savage contempt that
knew no bounds” (321). Mrs. Bolton is equally perverse because she experiences the instinct of
triumph with simultaneous contempt. Mrs. Bolton also does not experience dialectic beauty and
ugliness in her desire for Clifford; therefore, her savage instincts are equally askew.

In the most nakedly human moments between Connie and Mellors chickens squawk and
strut alongside their intimacy. As in *Sons and Lovers* and *The Rainbow* chickens indicate
moments of tender, wholeness of life. In the budding relationship between Connie and Mellors
Lawrence writes a painterly moment in which they observe five mother hens and their newborn
chicks:

> Then all the five coops were occupied by hens, three brown and a gray and a black. All
> alike they clustered themselves down on the eggs in soft nestling ponderosity of the
female urge, the female nature, fluffing out feathers. And with brilliant eyes they watched Connie, as she crouched before them, and they gave short sharp clicks of anger and alarm, but chiefly female anger at being approached...the slim little chick was grayish-brown with dark markings, and it was the most alive little spark of a creature in seven kingdoms at the moment. Connie crouched to watch in a sort of ecstasy. Life, life! Pure, sparky, fearless, new life! New life! So tiny and so utterly without fear! Even when it scampered a little scramblingly into the coop again, and disappeared under the hen’s feathers in answer to the mother hen’s wild alarm cries. (122-123)

Lawrence uses his verbal brushstroke ‘ecstasy’ to indicate Connie’s instinctual passion in this moment. Connie wants a baby; therefore, this scene of motherhood produces, within Connie, an ecstatic instinctual desire to be a mother. These mother hens represent the animal instinct to procreate and uglily protect, while the chicks represent beautiful new life. More important is the interaction between Connie and Mellors during this moment: “The man standing above her laughed, and crouched down beside her, knees apart, and put his hand with quiet confidence slowly into the coop. The old hen pecked at him but not so savagely. And slowly, slowly with sure gentle fingers, he felt among the old bird’s feathers and drew out a faintly-peeping chick” (125). Mellors perceives both Connie’s desire to be near the chicks, as well as Connie’s observance of the mother hen’s savage instinct to protect her chicks. Mellors gently retrieves a chick for Connie, symbolizing his nurturing fatherly instincts. Connie considers the “adorable” but a tear falls from her eye; she is saddened by her lack of a child (125). Then, “holding her two hands slowly forward, blindly, so that the chicken should run in to the mother hen again…compassion flamed in his bowels for her” (125). Mellors observes Connie’s instinctual, ugly sadness and feels instinctual, beautiful compassion for her. Intuitively and “without knowing, he came quickly towards her and crouched beside her again, taking the chick from her hands, because she was afraid of the hen, and putting it back in the coop” (125). To appease
Connie’s sadness, Mellors puts the chick back into the coop. Mellors removes the image of life and procreation in order to prevent Connie’s suffering. This moment foreshadows that Mellors will fully replace Connie’s ugly, barren sadness, with beautiful new life; Mellors will tenderly give Connie’s life wholeness because Mellors and Connie will have a baby. The chickens vitalize Connie’s understanding of the hut: “The wood was silent, still and secret in the evening drizzle of rain, full of the mystery of eggs and half-open buds, half-unsheathed flowers…the chicks had nearly all gone under the mother hens, only one or two lost adventurous ones still dibbed about in the dryness” (133). The presence of these mother hens and these adventurous chicks imbues the hut with life. The hut is isolated in the woods away from mechanical living; it signifies an area where ugliness and beauty, life, can flourish. In another moment between Connie and Mellors, mother hens represent instinctual devotion: “When she came to the clearing she was terribly uneasy. But there he was again, in his shirtsleeves, stooping, letting the hens out of the coops, among the chicks that were now growing a little gawky, but were much more trim than hen-chickens” (187). Connie walks to the hut in uncertainty; but she hopes to find her lover at the hut. When Connie finds him tenderly releasing the mother hens she asks, “Do you let the hens out now?” (187). And Mellors responds, “Yes, they’ve sat themselves to skin and bone…an’ now they’re not all that anxious to come out an’ feed. There’s no self in a sitting hen; she’s all in the eggs or the chickens” (187). Mellors claims that a hen’s life is characterized by motherhood and intimacy. Connie exclaims, “‘The poor mother hens; such blind devotion! Even to eggs not their own!’ Connie looked at them in compassion. A helpless silence fell between the man and the woman” (187). Ironically, Connie also exhibits blind devotion in this moment; she walks to the wood blindly, devotedly, with the hopes of discovering Mellors. Similarly, Connie lives according to instinct. Connie instinctually wants a
child and Connie instinctually is attracted to the passion of Mellors’ mind and body, his tender physicality. By this logic, Lawrence seems to equate Connie with a mother hen; and Mellors seems to appreciate Connie’s instinctual similarities to his hens.

Mirroring his references to chickens, Lawrence’s verbal brushstroke ‘quiver’ functions in moments when Connie and Mellors embrace their human instincts; and thus, the word ‘quiver’ also highlights moments when Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation is fulfilled: “Something in her quivered, and something in her spirit stiffened in resistance: stiffened from the terribly physical intimacy” (188). While still that the beginning of their affair, Connie quivers and hesitates at their physical intimacy; this very intimate scene of quivering begins with the oscillation between physical desire and mental resistance: “Yet, this was love, this ridiculous bouncing of the buttocks, and the wilting of the poor insignificant, moist little penis. This was the divine love… ‘I want to love you, and I can’t’” (189). Connie realizes that her love for Mellors is the reason why she instinctually takes part in this profane, physical intimacy. Again, Lawrence uses the word ‘insignificant’ to signify that this terribly, intimate moment cannot be read through significant form; this moment is purely human and vitally instinctual.

This moment of physical awakening and mental musing teeters to ugliness when Connie professes that she is unable to love Mellors: “She hated the dialect” (189). While Connie is experiencing ugly hatred, Mellors feels supreme beauty: “As she melted small and wonderful in his arms, she became infinitely desirable to him, all his blood-vessels seemed to scald with intense yet tender desire, for her, for her softness, for the penetrating beauty of her in his arms” (190). In response to Mellors’ intense yet tender, instinctual desire Connie, “yielded with a quiver that was like death, she went all open to him. And oh, if he were not tender to her now, how cruel, for she was all open to him and helpless!” (190). Connie’s quiver signifies another
change in her disposition. She is no longer uglily angry, but rather self-consciously vulnerable. Out of this quivering moment of uncertainty Lawrence writes that Connie is reborn: “She was gone, she was not, and she was born: a woman” (191). This scene of quivering is an example of an extremely slow teetering from ugliness to beauty. Connie first feels quivering resistance, then she experiences frustration and anger, and with another quiver she is reborn. Suddenly, “How beautiful he felt, how pure in tissue! How lovely, how lovely, strong, and yet pure and delicate, such stillness of the sensitive body!...How beautiful! How beautiful!...How was it possible, this beauty here, where she had previously only been repelled” (192). Connie experiences an outpouring of beauty, while she also acknowledges her previous ugly emotions; through her quivering, Connie is humanly able to fluctuate from ugliness to beauty. The moment is dialectic because the outcome of immense beauty finds its essence in prior ugliness. As this moment of pure success in their relationship continues to teeter, “She clung to him, with a hiss of wonder that was almost awe, terror…her whole self quivered unconscious and alive” (192). Like in *The Rainbow*, without searching for wonder Connie experiences wonder. And through her quivering, Connie feels alive. Connie begs for Mellors to assure her that he will always love her, and Mellors responds, “‘Ay, tha knows…’asn’t ter felt it?’” (193). Mellors believes that human, instinctual feeling is enough to assure Connie of his love. Connie relentlessly continues her begging and because of her persistence Mellors is pushed to the abstract, “‘Ay!’ he said, abstractly” (193). Mellors does not think that he needs to explain, theorize, his love for Connie; Mellors understands that the fluctuations between ugliness and beauty in this moment signify their loving, human relationship. Without letting the moment slip into the abstract Lawrence writes, “To him too she was beautiful, the soft, marvelous thing…he went out to shut up the hens…and she lay and wondered at the wonder of life, and of
being…she got up and kissed him between the eyes, that looked at her so dark and soft and unspeakably warm, so unbearably beautiful” (193-195). Through Mellors’ experience of beauty, beauty re-enters this intimate moment. Not coincidentally, Mellors cares for the hens in this moment; this action highlights that he cares deeply for Connie. The scene concludes with Connie experiencing wonder, the wonder of vitality. Connie experiences wonder because this moment is ripe with Lawrence’s aesthetic of oscillation; she does not search for wonder but rather reflects on the ugliness and beauty that has just passed. Mellors is the embodiment of dialectics in this post-coital state of wonder; he is dark and soft, beautiful and unbearable. Both Connie and Mellors fluctuate in their feelings of self-conscious ugliness and supreme, instinctual beauty. The result of this vitalistic aesthetic is tenderness, as represented through the chickens, as well as through wonder; the result of this aesthetic is unbearably beautiful. In a final instance of quivering, Lawrence describes Mellors’ affection for Connie through the word ‘quiver’. When Connie reassures Mellors of the beauty of bringing a child into the ugly world, he quivers: “He quivered, because it was true. ‘Be tender to it, and that will be its future.’ And at that moment he felt a sheer love for the woman” (306). Once again the word ‘quiver’ signifies a supremely satisfying moment in the relationship between Connie and Mellors. Though both Connie and Mellors acknowledge that the mechanization and industrialization of England is ugly, they beautifully recognize that parental tenderness and love will save their child in their future. At this quick oscillation from ugly hopelessness to beautiful hope, Mellors quivers.

Despite these ugly-beautiful moments that fully embody Lawrence’s aesthetic, Lawrence hints throughout *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* that mechanism will ultimately inhibit the relationship between Connie and Mellors. At the start of their relationship, Connie is weary of
her instincts: “It was not the passion that was new to her, it was the yearning adoration. She knew she had always feared it, for it left her helpless; she feared it still, lest if she adored him too much, then she would lose herself, become effaced, and she did not want to be effaced, a slave, like a savage woman” (147). Unlike Ursula, Connie is afraid of her savage instincts. This suggests that early in their relationship, Connie is still attuned to mechanical, regimented understandings of lover relations. Connie’s mechanized understanding of instincts is no doubt a result of the Tevershall environment: “Constance and her sister Hilda had what might be called an aesthetically unconventional upbringing. They had been taken to Paris and Florence and Rome to breathe in art…the two girls went from an early age not the least daunted by either art or ideal politics” (2). Lawrence suggests that Connie’s aesthetic upbringing is not the reason for her tendency to embrace the mechanical. I think Lawrence’s continuous descriptions of the ugly, mechanical Tevershall are more plausibly the reason for Connie’s fear of embracing her savage instincts. During a drive through Tevershall Connie notes, “no wonder these people were ugly and tough” (165). And Lawrence continues with a description of the mechanical, mining village:

It was as if dismalness had soaked through and through everything. The utter negation of natural beauty, the utter negation of the gladness of life, the utter absence of the instinct for shapely beauty which every bird and beast has, the utter death of the human intuitive faculty was appalling…all went by ugly, ugly, ugly, followed by the plaster-and gilt horror of the cinema with its wet picture announcement. (166)

As Connie passes through Tevershall she notices utter ugliness and lifelessness in the town. There is no beauty and there is especially no natural, instinctive life. The horror of the cinema references the tendency for films to promote counterfeit emotion, the overtly passionate emotion for public consumption that Lawrence rebukes in Sons and Lovers. When Connie hears a group of Tevershall children singing, “It was not like savages: savages have subtle
rhythms. It was not like animals: animals mean something when they yell. It was like nothing on earth, and it was called singing” (166). The singing of the Tevershall children is not like the singing of savages or the singing of animals because the singing is forced. The Tevershall song is not like anything on earth because it is mechanized and dead. After this trip through Tevershall, “Connie was absolutely afraid of the industrial masses. They seemed so weird to her. A life with utterly no beauty in it, no intuition, always ‘in the pit’” (174). Like Lawrence, Connie recognizes the deadly ugliness of this mechanized life. Because of this recognition Connie seems to absorb a sense of inherent doom and hopelessness: “All the great words, it seemed to Connie, were cancelled by her generation: love, joy, happiness, home, mother, father, husband, all those great dynamic words were half dead now, and dying from day to day” (65). Connie feels that the relationships of her mechanized generation are hopeless. She also attributes this sense of hopelessness to the art movements of her generation: “How she hated words, always coming between her and life: they did the ravishing if anything did: ready-made words and phrases, sucking all the life-span out of living things…how ravished one could be without ever being touched” (99-100). Through Connie’s hatred of Clifford’s ready-made words Lawrence references the ready-made abstract artists. Lawrence firmly believes that in order for art to be true art, it needs to be touched by the artist’s life; ready-made art is not imbued with this life because it is devoid of the artist’s instinctual touch. Roger Scruton also considers the ready-made abstract movement, initiated by Duchamp, the death of true art: “20th century originality trumped beauty.” Scruton feels that the 20th century desire for personal profit and pleasure transformed art into a “cult of ugliness” with a primary aim to “disturb.” Scruton considers Duchamp’s *Fountain* [Figure 9] the beginning of this “cult of ugliness” (Scruton, *Why Beauty Matters*). In *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* Lawrence uses the words ‘abstract’
and ‘mechanical’ to illustrate how the mechanized, lifeless, ready-made, world dooms Connie’s hope at a true, aesthetically fulfilled relationship with Mellors.

When Clifford gathers with his Cambridge friends to discuss the life of the mind, one of his male counterparts audaciously claims that intercourse is just, “an interchange of sensations instead of ideas” (32). This abstract notion references Lawrence’s annoyance with the thinkers of his day; Lawrence feels that abstract, Formalist thinkers strip life of instinctual beauty and instinctual ugliness. Clifford is subsumed by these abstract, mechanized ideas. His abstraction is especially apparent when he tries to stifle Connie with his scientific religious book: “There remains the inexhaustive realm of abstract forms, and creativity with its shifting character ever determined afresh by its own creatures, and God, upon whose wisdom all forms of order depend” (257). Clifford reads Genesis through a Formalist lens; he believes that God created abstract forms. Connie is disgusted by Clifford’s abstraction: “Is that sort of idiocy the supreme pleasure of the life of the mind? No thank you! Give me the body. I believe the life of the body is a greater reality than the life of the mind: when the body is really wakened to life. But so many people, like your famous wind-machine, have only got minds tacked on to their physical corpses” (258). Connie tries desperately to resist Clifford’s abstract thinking because she believes in Lawrence’s Vitalism and his aesthetic, as opposed to Bell and Fry’s Formalism.

Despite Connie’s active attempts to resist the abstraction of the industrial, mechanized England, Connie succumbs to abstraction and the mechanical in her attempts to preserve her relationship with Mellors. In Venice Connie reunites with her abstract artist friend, Duncan: “His art was all tubes and valves and spirals and strange colours, ultra modern, yet with a certain power, ever a certain purity of form and tone: only Mellors thought it cruel and repellant. He did not venture to say so, for Duncan was almost insane on the point of his art; it was a personal cult, a
personal religion with him” (315). Duncan is reminiscent of Loerke; however, in Lawrence’s description of Duncan’s art his canvas seems Cubist. Mellors, the embodiment of Lawrence’s aesthetic, rejects Duncan’s ‘pure form.’ Mellors even critiques: “It’s like a pure bit of murder” (315). Mellors considers Duncan’s art murder because it kills life; Duncan’s art reduces the life of the canvas to only form. Hilda, like Gudrun, is sympathetic to Duncan and challenges Mellors to explain who is murdered. Mellors responds, “‘Me! It murders all the bowels of compassion in a man’” (315). Even though Mellors strongly dislikes the lifeless abstraction of Duncan’s art, Connie is overcome by mechanized living; Connie heeds Hilda’s advice to publicly name Duncan as father of her child instead of Mellors. I believe this moment marks the end of their successful relationship. Though Connie does want to raise her child with Mellors, her mechanized planning and acceptance of Duncan as the public father of her child reveals that she is lost to the machine. Connie agrees to pose for Duncan if he will be publicly named as father of her child, an instance of counterfeit emotion: “I don’t really mind any more. He won’t touch me. And I don’t mind anything, if it paves the way to a life together for you and me” (316). Connie relinquishes her previous distaste for Duncan’s abstractions in order to mechanically plan her future with Mellors. Mellors protests, “‘He’ll only shit on you on canvas,’” and Connie responds, “‘I don’t care. He’ll only be painting his own feelings for me’” (316). I think it should be read that Connie’s agreement to be painted abstractly kills her relationship with Mellors. Connie does not find beauty or ugliness in Duncan’s Cubism; she misperceives a counterfeit way to achieve her future relationship with Mellors.

Sadly, through her agreement with Duncan, Lawrence shows that Connie never escaped the mechanized mentality of her surroundings. It is useful to analyze the persistence of the mechanized world throughout the novel; this persistence is visualized through Lawrence’s use
of the words ‘mechanized’, ‘mechanical’, and ‘machine’. While living at Wragby, Wragby is the embodiment of the mechanical world: “All these endless rooms that nobody used, all the Midlands routine, the mechanical cleanliness and the mechanical order!” (14). Wragby is not alive because it is too orderly and mechanical. When Connie comes to realize that she does not love her Wragby-born husband she experiences a mechanical understanding: “When the emotional soul receives a wounding shock, which does not kill the body, the soul seems to recover as the body recovers. But this is only appearance. It is really only the mechanism of the re-assumed habit” (51). Connie realizes that her acceptance of her Wragby life and her Wragby husband has only been a mechanical habit. When Connie observes the miners in Tevershall she senses the hopelessness of the mechanized world: “What would become of such a people, a people in whom the living intuitive faculty was dead as nails, and only queer mechanical yells and uncanny will power remained?...she felt in a way of terror the grey, gritty hopelessness of it all…there was no hope, no hope anymore” (167). Instances of Connie’s hopelessness can be easily overlooked because of her simultaneous budding relationship with Mellors; however, it is important to recognize that she does experience hopelessness because of her mechanized surroundings. When she is with Mellors she deeply wishes, “If only she could stay! If only there weren’t the other ghastly world of smoke and iron! If only he would make her a world” (233). Connie does love Mellors; and she loves the dialectical aliveness of their relationship. Connie is able to appreciate the instinctual teetering between beauty and ugliness that exists only in her relationship with Mellors. However, she does not believe that this vital, loving relationship with Mellors can exist in the mechanized world. In a line that can be missed in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, Connie realizes that the industrial, mechanized mode of living is too engrained in her being; she is unable to fully live the life of beauty and ugliness that Mellors
offers her: “The human existence is a good deal controlled by the machine of external circumstance. She was in the power of the machine. She couldn’t extricate herself all in five minutes. She didn’t even want to” (261). Before Connie leaves for Venice with Hilda, it seems that Lawrence suggests inevitable defeat for the savage relationship between Connie and Mellors. Connie’s agreement that Duncan should pose as the father of her child solidifies her defeat to the mechanical. The conclusion of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* can be read as utter defeat or it can be read to contain a glimmer of hope; I read it as defeat. Clifford will never divorce Connie; therefore Connie will forever be chained to the mechanical, abstract order of society. Though Connie and Mellors love each other dialectically and instinctually, they appreciate the beauty, ugliness, and sensuality of their love, Connie’s inability to relinquish all ties to mechanical abstraction, particularly her ties to Duncan and Clifford, renders it impossible for a life-filled relationship, of both beauty and ugliness, to ever fully come to fruition between Connie and Mellors.
Due to the criticism he received after the publication of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, Lawrence wrote and published his *A Propos of Lady Chatterley’s Lover* in 1929 to justify his novel: “I put forth this novel as an honest, healthy book, necessary for us today” (336). I am sympathetic to Lawrence’s claim and agree that *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is an honest and aesthetically pertinent book for our academic and humanistic studies. In his *A Propos* to this necessary book, Lawrence also references the beliefs he articulates in full in his novels, particularly the novels I have analyzed. He discusses counterfeit emotion, the failing of Paul’s relationship with Clara: “Above all things love is a counterfeit feeling today…but especially in love, only counterfeit emotions exist nowadays” (342-343). In 1929 Lawrence still laments counterfeit passion; Lawrence believes that counterfeit love is the reason for failed human relations. In his *A Propos*, Lawrence explains the result of counterfeit love, hatred: “The peculiar hatred of people who have not loved one another, but who have pretended to, even perhaps have imagined they really did love, is one of the phenomena of our time” (343). Unfortunately this peculiar hatred still applies to our world today. Lawrence is discussing the hatred that results in divorce; this is the hatred that leads Connie and Mellors to want to divorce their spouses. Lawrence uses his understanding of counterfeit love to explain this failure in human relationships. As mentioned in *The Rainbow*, Lawrence writes about blood-intimacy in his *A Propos*: “For the new impulse to life will never come without blood-contact; the true, positive blood-contact, not the nervous negative reaction” (360). Here Lawrence explains that blood-contact is his way to articulate the instinctual sexual connection between lovers; Lawrence believes that love cannot be counterfeit, it must be instinctual and thus involve blood-contact. This notion of instinctual loving is central in the Brangwen blood-intimacy and
also in the savage relationship between Birkin and Ursula. In his *A Propos of Lady Chatterley’s Lover* he writes about his Vitalism. Lawrence acknowledges that, “Vitally, the human race is dying” (362). Lawrence believes that humanity is dying because humans are not embracing the Vitalism of blood-intimacy nor the simultaneous beauty and ugliness in their relationships. He further writes, “Life is only bearable when the mind and the body are in harmony, and there is a natural balance between them, and each has a natural respect for the other” (340). This natural balance between mind and body is exemplified in Birkin and Ursula’s constant teetering between ugliness and beauty. This natural balance is what Connie and Mellors strive for, but fail to ultimately attain. Clifford and Mrs. Bolton represent opposites in this balance; Clifford is all mind and Mrs. Bolton is all body. Interestingly in his *A Propos* Lawrence does acknowledge perversion: “Keep your perversions if you like them- your perversion of Protestantism, your perversion of smart licentiousness, your perversion of a dirty mind. But I stick to my book and my position: Life is only bearable when the mind and the body are in harmony” (340). But for Lawrence these perversions should not overtake the natural balance of body and mind, ugliness and beauty; it is when these perversions smother Lawrence’s aesthetic that they become problematic. As a way to conclude this discussion on Lawrence’s fascinating *A Propos* it is worthwhile to recognize his discussion of Christianity. Though critics like to read Lawrence’s novels as constantly alluding to Christianity, here Lawrence writes: “The greatest contribution to the social life of man made by Christianity is- marriage. Christianity brought marriage into the world: marriage as we know it” (352). This claim relates to Lawrence’s emphasis on the human; Lawrence appreciates Christianity’s contribution of human marriage because it makes sacred his aesthetic of oscillation: “Marriage sacred and inviolable, the great way of earthly fulfillment for man and woman, in unison, under the great spiritual rule of the Church. This is
Christianity’s great contribution to the life of man and it is only too easily overlooked” (353).

For Lawrence, marriage is fulfilling if man and woman embrace both the ugliness and the beauty in their Earthly union. Lawrence believes in the secular sacredness of human union; Earthly union, a Transfiguration, is a relationship of dialectic balance. This statement inevitably relates back to Tom Brangwen’s wedding speech, marriage produces angels. It becomes clear that Lawrence uses his allusions to Christianity and to aesthetics to honestly explore human relationships. Lawrence wants humans to attain this earthly fulfillment, marriage; but, Lawrence knows that this fulfillment will not occur if counterfeit emotion is privileged, if blood-intimacy is disregarded, and mostly if the balance of mind and body is not attained. Lawrence praises the marriage of ugliness and beauty. In his novelistic relationships he uses his aesthetic of teetering between beauty and ugliness to praise moments when the relationship is close to attaining this sacred, Earthly fulfillment.

Just as Lawrence uses the curved arch to visualize his condition of blessedness, the harmonious balance of ugliness and beauty, my thesis takes the shape of a rainbow. It begins with *Sons and Lovers* where a relationship is all-passion, all-profanity, and therefore counterfeit. Likewise a relationship strives to be all-beautiful and all-sacred and it is equally counterfeit. My work progresses to *The Rainbow* where a Transfiguration becomes possible because of the dialectics of human beauty and ugliness; only when a Transfiguration is not actively sought can this blessed Earthly union, and production of wonder, be achieved. My thesis peaks with my discussion of *Women in Love*, specifically in the fulfilling, instinctual relationship of Birkin and Ursula. And it concludes, and curves downward once more, at the failing of Connie’s mechanical life. The curve of this rainbow-shaped thesis, visualizes
Lawrence’s belief that human relationships must balance physical intimacy and passion alongside the beauty and ugliness of life.

My deep appreciation for D.H. Lawrence began in 2011 when I was first introduced to The Rainbow. My first short paper on Lawrence was titled, “Nakedly Close: A Look At Fatherhood in D.H. Lawrence’s The Rainbow.” Upon re-reading this five-page paper, I believe that my current study of Lawrence’s aesthetic, his emphasis on the necessary fluctuation between beauty and ugliness in relationships, would further strengthen my writing on nakedness. In my earlier writing I argue that nakedness in these father-daughter relationships cultivated comforting secure bonds. However, it was difficult to explain the violent vulnerability that accompanies these naked moments. I now realize that the moments of naked intimacy in The Rainbow teeter between ugly, vulnerability and beautiful, comfort.

I have studied most intently the fatherhood of Lawrence’s novels. However, I would like to extend my research to focus on Lawrence’s incredible depictions of motherhood. When I presented my current research at the Georgetown University Graduate Student Conference on February 20, 2016, I received a question on Lawrence’s depiction of women; as Lawrence has been criticized for misogynistic writing, is this a reason he has fallen out of the Academic Canon? While I recognize that this criticism exists, I would like my future Lawrence research to dispel this notion through a study of Lawrence’s depictions of motherhood. I find it breathtaking that Lawrence, without ever having children of his own, so truthfully captures the emotions of fatherhood; while he also adeptly illustrates the sensations of motherhood. I think that through this lens I will be able to prove that Lawrence is not misogynistic, but rather empowering. His wife Frieda wrote to their mutual friend Garnett in September 1912: “That’s what I love Lawrence for, that he is plucky and honest in his work, he dares to come out into
the open and plants his stuff down bald and naked; really he is the only revolutionary worthy of the name, that I know; any new thing must find a new shape, then afterwards one can call it ‘art’” (Sagar, *The Art of D.H. Lawrence* 43). I believe that through further study of Lawrence’s novels and collections of Lawrence letters, Lawrence’s honest, revolutionary, and artistic rendering of women can be revealed. In this realm of study, Keith Sagar briefly compares Lawrence to Brontë: “Emily Brontë and Lawrence both care less about analyzing what a woman feels than about grasping what she is” (Sagar, *The Art of D.H. Lawrence* 44). It seems that a discussion of Brontë and Lawrence will be my starting point. I will then expand my comparison to Modernist depictions of mothers and fathers, perhaps in Woolf and Joyce. It is my hope that further research on Lawrence’s revolutionary writing will invite Lawrence back into Academic study and University classrooms. Through the lens of aesthetics and human relations Lawrence’s writing becomes central to gender-study, Victorian, and Modernist courses. Lawrence proves that beauty and ugliness are vital for both men and women, fathers and mothers; in this way, he unifies humans. It is my hope that a resurgence of scholarship on Lawrence will prove that his ideas are still valuable in our 21st century world. On September 23, 2015, the BBC published an article stating that, due to town funding, the D.H. Lawrence Heritage Centre in Eastwood is set to close. The result of this action will “deprive Eastwood of their association with Lawrence” (BBC News). It is my hope that research like mine, on Lawrence’s aesthetics and his depictions of fatherhood and motherhood, will re-excite studies on Lawrence’s vital presence in academia, and in understandings of humanity as the confluence of the beautiful and the ugly.
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