



RESEARCHARTICLE

Vol. 3. Issue 1.,2016 (Jan-Mar.)

ISSN INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA
2395-2628(Print):2349-9451(online)

D.H LAWRENCE'S CANDID TREATMENT OF SEXUAL PSYCHOLOGY IN "WOMEN IN LOVE"

TYAGI PALLAVI

Research Scholar, Department Of English Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut Uttar Pradesh,
India

ABSTRACT



D.H Lawrence found excessive nineteenth century repression of impulses and twentieth century intellectuality were leading to destruction of man's instinctive nature and intuitive faculty. He observed the modern man floating on the currents of doubts and disbeliefs, uncertainty and depression. He witnessed an age where a frightening change from the world of apparent order and contentment, balance and complacency to the hollow world of chaos and sickness, conflict and tensions, inhabited by schizoids surfaced up. The disintegration of traditional, moral and social values generated a crisis in every sphere of life leading to despoliation and mutilation of social consciousness. All these circumstances of his age and his personal experiences directed his flow of thoughts into a kind of psychological philosophy of his own. It is in this self-created psychodynamic theory which Lawrence applies in almost all of his creative works, themes, characters and situations.

Lawrence influenced by Freud's psychology and his psychology of man-woman relationship, more accurately, his psychology of sexual relations. Though Lawrence has been censured for sensual overtones in man-woman relationship but Lawrence said that sexual instinct is natural and one should not feel ashamed in talking freely about sexual matters. Moreover, he believed in the true vein of a psychologist that suppression or repression of these natural instincts leads to deterioration of personality. The split personality is a result of suppression and it is a serious disorder, and one could overcome from it by giving natural vent to his feelings of sex. But his sexual psychology does not at all advocate wrong or inhuman pursuits of sex.

Key Words: Sexual Psychology, Unconsciousness, Death and Life, Death-in-Life, Will and Being, Separateness-In-Union.

©KY PUBLICATIONS

Women in Love known chiefly for Lawrence's candid treatment of sexual psychology is among the famous novels of the twentieth century. The theme of *Women in Love* is the psychodynamics of man-woman relationship, which exercised great influence on Lawrence's mind all his life and which often gives rise to baffling situations. The chief merit of the novel lies not in the story which is rather thin, but in its acute

portrayal of the subtle psychological aspects of human character and its merciless probing of the inner consciousness of the various persons who form the center of our interest.

His constant object is what may broadly be called sex psychology as this manifests itself in every human relationship that of men and women, parents and children, and more obscurely that existing -between persons of the same sex. Quite close to Freud's thoughts, Lawrence invented his own 'mechanisms', his own Fantastic physiology of the emotions in "*Psychoanalysis and the unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious*".

Lawrence's treatment of sexual psychology in *Women in Love* is often criticized and sometimes called very frank and bold, since such open discussions of sexual behavior and man-woman relationship were not completely acceptable social taboos then Lawrence's main and persistent purpose in *Women in Love* was to revolutionize modern attitude towards sex, and male female relationship.

Lawrence undertook writing *Women in Love* as *The Sisters* in April 1916 and after having executed the projected version in the spring season, he brought out its revised version by November 1916. *Women in Love*, a sequel to *The Rainbow* which was thought very highly of by its creator, germinated out of the same material as *The Rainbow* and aimed at portraying the involved characters struggling against the ubiquitous disintegrating ethos and values in order to carry out their fulfillment in the individual as well as social relationships.

It is highly significant that at the very outset of the novel the two sisters, twenty-six-year old Ursula and a year younger, Gudrun are presented discussing marriage, a tie which, it can be suggested, reflects the socio-cultural values of the society. Assuming it to be the inevitable nextstep, Gudrun asks Ursula if she didn't "really want" to get married and if "one needs the experience of having been married." Ursula replied that marriage was more, "*likely to be the end of experience*". In *The Train*, the fifth chapter of *Women in Love*, the major male characters are also found engaged discussing similar problem. Gerald, having rejected the notion that woman's love could make his life and help him grow wholesomely, asserted that love was not the centrality of human life and the world was not centered in it or something vital but was "*artificially held together by the social mechanism*" Consequently, love was nothing but passing episode and not the be-all and end-all of life. Birkin, on the contrary, held the beliefs that love between man and woman was the core of life and human experience in its totality and that only a perfect union of man with a woman could help salvaging a man from the world of crumbling ideals. Gerald failed to realize the ultimate marriage with a woman could lead to purposive being and enable him to comprehend the incomprehensible, while Birkin, in his attempt to do so, attained a satisfactory "tie" with Ursula, though he felt the necessity of having a union with a man too for making him complete and socially useful.

Birkin-Ursula relationship is an exposition of D.H. Lawrence's psychological norm of love, the way in which satisfactory human relationships can be established and fulfillment achieved by recognizing the '*otherness*' of other individuals. The long drama of Birkin's relations with Ursula, illustrates the astonishing originality of the novelist's genius. The drama begins in the early chapter called '*Classroom*'. In this scene, Ursula is busy in school, teaching in the late afternoon. The room is wrapped in a golden haze and Birkin's presence and Ursula's realization of it is sudden. They converse normally but the spell is broken by the sudden entrance of Hermione.

F.R. Leavis comments upon the scene: "*Upon the scene comes the threat of electric violence as first Birkin and then Hermione arrive, and the embarrassed triangle fills the school-room with odd tensions*".

After the class-room scene, all hopes of Birkin are centered on Ursula. He wants to win her to an acceptance and understanding of the norm of love he propounds to her, as to what, in the relation of man and woman, is to be realized. The exposition involves some violent offence against her ideas of love. He wants his relationship with Ursula to be a permanent and irrevocable one, irrespective of its nature. He tells her that he is not offering her love; neither does he want love from her. His feelings are far more impersonal and hard than love, because love weakens in the long run. He feels that he has an impersonal individuality, which is beyond any emotional relationship. Love is merely a branch, not the root. He does not want to delude himself by considering love as the root. There is something beyond love, a stage where there is no

love. The relationship to which Birkin aspires with Ursula can be best described in Ursula's words, *as a mutual union in separateness*. Though both phrases suggest a coming together in a union, which does not obliterate singleness, in the earlier phrase the emphasis is on union, whereas in the latter it is on separateness. Birkin, certainly, is markedly preoccupied with the idea of separate self. It is the idea of difference in spite of union, dissimilarity in spite of harmony, and loneliness in company.

Before their marriage, both Birkin and Ursula are frustrated. They both sail in the same boat, i.e. frustration in life. In the chapter 'Moony', Ursula tells Birkin, "*My life is unfulfilled. And I feel as if nobody could ever love me*". Birkin wants close connection and irrevocable relationship with Ursula. He says to her:

"If we are going to know each other we must pledge ourselves forever. If we are going to make a relationship, there must be something final and irrevocable about it. I can't say it is love I have to offer and it is not love I want. It is something much more impersonal and harder and rarer. So, there is a final you — not in the emotional, loving plane but there beyond, where there is no speech and no terms of agreement. There we are two stark, unknown beings two utterly strange creatures. I would want to approach you and you me. And there could be no obligation because there is no standard for action there, because no understanding has been reaped from the plane... One can 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. I want to find you, where you don't know your existence, the you that your good looks, your womanly feelings, your thoughts nor opinions, nor ideas — they are all bagatelles to me-what I want is a strange conjunction with you, not meeting and mingling but an equilibrium, a pure balance of two single beings as the stars balance each other. Adam kept Eve in the indestructible paradise when he kept her single with himself, like a star in orbit... the world is only held together by the mystic conjunction, the ultimate union between people- a bond. And the immediate bond is between man and woman".

The Ursula-Birkin relationship is mainly concerned with Birkin's choice of Ursula as the woman with whom he is to try this way of 'freedom' in love, and to whom he preaches against her understandable resistance — a curious doctrine of, "sexual apartheid" that goes with it. Birkin thinks he must educate Ursula out of the sentimental and romantic love-ideal which she wants to impose on their relationship. Ursula says, '*why should love be a bond.... love is freedom....Love includes everything*'. Birkin replies, "*Love is a direction which excludes all other directions... It is freedom together, if you like*".

There is a description of their physical contact as psychological fulfillment: "*And he was smiling finally as if there were no speech in the world, save the silent delight of flowers in each other. Smilingly they delighted in each other's presence, pure presence, not to be thought of even known. But his eyes had a faintly ironical contraction. And she was drawn to him strangely, as in a spell. Kneeling on the hearth-rug before him, she put her arms round his joins, and put her face against his thighs. Riches! Riches! She was over-whelmed with a sense of a heavenful of riches. 'We love each other', she said in delight. 'More than that', he answered, looking down at her*".

According to Lawrence, fulfillment results from an established polarity with the outer universe, human and non-human, but in this respect the whole of modern life is a shrieking failure. Nobody can achieve such a polarity within the confines of the contemporary, decadent civilization, and that is why even Ursula and Birkin have to cut themselves adrift from society and become social outcasts. They have to resign their jobs and go to some foreign country before this stage of blessedness is reached.

There are thus three stages in the achievement of successful human relationship:

- (1) The isolated self in proud, singleness of being.
- (2) The polarity, the equipoise of an achieved sexual harmony.
- (3) A conscious purpose in life, a coordinated effort towards a society which will embody life values- *A number of people united — to fulfill collectively the highest truth known to them*. Ursula is satisfied to have Birkin, but Birkin gropes for some further bearings, for a social context in which to struggle for something beyond their marriage, for a purpose for which the sexual achievement is merely a precondition. In other

words, Birkin, at least, tries to reach the third stage in the establishment of creative human relationship. On the relationship of Ursula and Birkin, Keith Sagar comments: *"It is essential to the budding relationship between Birkin and Ursula that it should not be a fixed thing, that they should never finally 'know' each other, as Hermione had wanted to 'know' Birkin. Each acknowledges the mystery and uniqueness of the other. Each has an 'odd mobility and changeableness'. Each can fly away from himself in real, indifferent gaiety"*.

As in *'Sons & Lovers'*, here also Lawrence emphasizes on respects for *'divine otherness'* for a complete emotional and psychological fulfillment in a male-female relationship.

The relationship of Gerald and Gudrun is of self-destructive type. Both try to impose his or her will on the other. Their relationship is well contrasted with that of Birkin and Ursula. It is not creative. There is an attempt at domination and possession. They strain for knowledge of each other, also power over each other and hence they move back towards inanimate matter. Gudrun first sees Gerald, at the wedding of his sister. She is attracted towards him in their very first meeting. She finds something northern about him that magnetizes her. His looks are new, pure as an arctic thing. Gudrun experience *'a keen paroxysm, a transport'* on meeting Gerald. Chaman Nahal describes Gudrun's state thus: *Gudrun shows that at the time she meets Gerald, she had formed a certain preconceived notion of the type of man she would like to be wooed by, and of his characteristics. Gerald fulfilled that self-projected image of the lover, Gudrun has in mind. Their intensity thus is the result of their ego, and hence is deceptive and unreliable. And as the succeeding events show, their relationship comes to a sad end.*

As in *'Sons in Lovers'* Mr. and Mrs. Morel's fascination for each other shatters so in Gudrun- Gerald's relationship love in first meeting will annihilate in the most psycho dynamical way.

Gerald's malice, his domineering will and almost sadistic sexual pride, reveal themselves in his treatment of the Arab mare and later in that of the rabbit. It is the sight of blood which dawns Gudrun and Gerald together. Gerald's mere presence sent a shock of anticipation through her veins. Both Gerald and Gudrun feel strongly, but unconsciously, attracted towards each other. There is a bond established between them from the start. Gudrun is conscious of her power over him. The chapter *'Water party'* brings forth their strange relationship with each other. Gudrun's taunting of the Highland cattle at the water party terrifies the cattle and they turn and run off. Gerald tells her that she has been doing something dangerous but she points out that he expects her to be afraid of him and his cattle. She then slaps Gerald, carried away by a strong psychological impulse and says that she is not angry with him but in love with him.

Ronald Grey comments upon their relationship thus: *"The love between Gerald and Gudrun is always one of self-assertion on the one hand and self-surrender on the other, now the man, now the woman being dominant. There is never fulfillment for both together, but always for one only, while the other lays awake and conscious, hatred growing within"*.

The equilibrium which Gerald seeks is the opposite of the star-polarity of the Birkin-Ursula love. It is a separate need, dependence. Gerald has nothing to set against death. He is in danger of caving in unless he can 'use' Gudrun as a support. As Lawrence writes that Gerald wanted to put his arm round her. If he could put his arm round her and draw her against him as they walked, he would equilibrate himself. For now he felt like a pair of scales, the half of which tips down into an indefinite void. He must recover some sort of balance. So that, in a literal upon her. This complete defense later proves suicidal for him because one should never let his/her psychological instincts go astray. These psychological instincts, motivations and impulses should be harnessed in proper balance.

Gerald has no individual singleness; when he loves and yields, he forgets himself as an individual. Without his singleness of being he is unable to have successful relationship with Gudrun. Though Gudrun and Gerald never go through any formal ceremony, what we are given is, in effect, two marriages, one sacramental, and the other licentious. Gudrun, on the other hand, advocates marriage as *'an experience'*. She has been *'living a studio life'* for several years, and has come to feel that *'everything withers in the bud'*. Her desire to force some sort of blossoming- to pull open the bud before it withers- manifests itself in her craving for a man *'a highly attractive individual of suffice means'*. Her stridency at this point betrays her failure to *'lay hold on life'*,

and contrasts with Ursula's 'sensitive expectancy', her ability to hold herself in reserve until some man elicits a natural response. The moral ambiguity of Gudrun's desire is hinted at by her strange grimace, half-sly smiling, half anguished, her long, slow look of knowledge which is frightful.

Gerald seeks relief with women. He suffers from an inner void a sense of inner emptiness, and so seeks momentary pleasure in passing relationships with women of easy virtue, like Minette. He likes to dominate and impose his will on the women he loves; he wants to exploit Gudrun too. But when finally Gudrun breaks his will, Gerald himself drifts towards annihilation. Even 'a debauch with some desperate woman' can no longer give him the illusion of being alive. He wants his mind to be stimulated too. He needs to bring into full consciousness the obscenity of his desires and to share with a woman this recognition. He wants somebody with whom he can talk sympathetically. But Gudrun's knowledge of Gerald is like a sharp inoculation that changes her blood. 'Blood' carries association of both lust and death. It is revealed that Gerald had killed his brother. And Gerald and Gudrun, despite their initial magnetic association and relationship, are separate like opposite poles of fierce energy. When they go to the continent as Lovers, they both feel alone, in spite of each other's company.

Gudrun fails to establish eternal relationship with Gerald. In this connection D.H. Lawrence comments: "*Gudrun, after feeling every moment in all her veins, conscious of Gerald, connected even physically with him, was now almost indifferent to the thought of him. All the time there was something in her urging her to avoid the final establishing of relationship with Gerald, She felt it would be wiser to have no more than a casual acquaintance with him*".

After such experience, Gudrun now thinks and could only respond to a different person as Loerke. She feels drawn towards the German sculptor. She has a curious sort of allegiance to Loerke. Gerald feels in Gudrun's veins, in her feelings, Loerke's presence, the influence of the little Virmin because he thinks that they play a curious game of infinite suggestively with each other, as if they have some esoteric understanding of life. Loerke is a sort of a catalytic agent who precipitates the dissolution of Gerald-Gudrun relationship and hastens the doom of Gerald in the ice-bound Alps. Gerald cannot account for Gudrun's subjection to Loerke. He questions Gudrun:

"What is it that fascinates you in him, what is it that subjugates you to that little scum of a sculptor? What is it that brings you down like a humble maggot in worship of him? I want to know what you creep after. With her hatred of Gerald, Gudrun replies, 'Do you want to know what it is in him? It is because he has some understanding of woman because he is not stupid. That's why it is'".

George H. Ford comments on the above passage: "*The passage consists of reflections on the difference between what Gerald offer as a lover of Gudrun and the kind of experience that Loerke could give her. Gerald's lovemaking has many qualities of perversity, but because he still has some attachment to moral virtues, goodness and righteousness, he cannot provide the special sexual thrills that Loerke promises*".

Gudrun is unable to endure Gerald's love any longer and falls in love with the sculptor. Gerald now becomes for Gudrun a symbol of the brute and the mechanical. Gerald, on his part, becomes obsessed with a desire for sexual self-obliteration in her. She turns to Loerke: "To Gudrun, there was in Loerke the rock-bottom of life. Gerald was not capable. He could not touch the quick offer. But where his ruder blows could not penetrate, the fine insinuating blade of Loerke's insect-like comprehension could". The language here is suggestive of anal intercourse, that is diabolic opening into no new world, but into the house of Gudrun's soul "where there was a pungent atmosphere of corrosion, an inflamed darkness of sensation, and a vivid, subtle, critical consciousness, that saw the world distorted, horrific". Loerke and Gudrun share a freedom that is a parody of that Birkin and Ursula.

The novel concludes with the destruction of Gerald, once proud Dionysiac figure. His attempt at self-obliteration in extreme sensation with Gudrun blasts and shrivels him, making him look like a mask used in ghastly religious of the barbarians. He has been reduced, made more intense and less human. In his attempt to strangle Gudrun, sexuality and murder fuse in supreme assertion of his power over the body of life.

Leaving her still alive, he climbs up into the moon-lit icy mountains to easeful death, with which he has always been in love. At the top, he sees a small carving of Christ—the spirit crucified by the flesh.

Gerald is the tragic figure of *Women in Love*, representing the totality of his civilization torn apart and destroyed by unrecognized contradictions within his unconscious.

'*Women in Love*' is an exploration not only of love between men and women, but also of male relationships. In Lawrence's view, for complete fulfillment, man-woman relationship, even when satisfactory polarity has been achieved, is not sufficient. It must be complemented and perfected by man to man relationship for some purposive activity. Birkin, tries to enter into a pure relationship of brotherhood and friendship with Gerald and offers him a '*blood-pact*' as was the custom of the knights in the past. But, Gerald rejects this offer and thus drifts towards disintegration and death.

Birkin has a profound love for Gerald. They are mentally and spiritually intimate but Birkin wants to be more or less physically intimate too. In his opinion, this would make them one complete whole. Gerald, however, is not prepared for such intimacy, because he is a symbol of a mechanical principle which is not only destructive but also self-destructive. Gerald ultimately dies an icy death. Birkin is greatly moved by his death. He really loved him. Seeing his dead body, he breaks into uncontrollable sobs. Ursula tries to console him. She asks,

"Aren't I enough for you?" Birkin replies, 'No. you are enough for me as far as a woman is concerned, you are all women to me. But I want a man, a friend as eternal as you and I are', Ursula says, 'why aren't I enough?' Birkin replies, 'You are enough for me. I do not want anybody else but you. Having, you, I can live all my life without anybody else, any other sheer intimacy, But to make it complete, really happy I wanted eternal union with a man too, another kind of love' Ursula says 'You can't have two kinds of love because, it is false, impossible'. Birkin emphatically replied, I do not believe it".

Thus Ursula also cannot shake off the belief of Birkin that such an intimacy must have been healing and wholesome for Gerald. But Gerald is not able to establish pure relationship with any other soul. He wants to, but he cannot. Lawrence writes about his state,

"The other way was to accept Birkin's offer of alliance, to enter into the bond, of pure trust and love with the other man, and then subsequently with the woman. If he pledged himself with the man he would later be able to pledge himself with the women: not merely in legal marriage, but in absolute mystic marriage. Yet he could not accept the offer".

Birkin and Gerald have a curious love for each other. It is a love that is ultimately death, a love which is complemented by hatred for woman... It tears man from woman, and woman from man. The two halves get divided and separated, each drawing away to itself. Many critics have condemned Birkin-Gerald relationship as obscene, immoral and homosexual.

Lawrence believed the only way of true relationship between men is for them to meet in some common belief but Lawrence wished this belief could also be physical and not merely mental. He wanted the expansion of friendship and brotherhood into a full relationship where there could also be physical and passionate meeting 'on some third holy ground'.

In fact Lawrence was himself not clear about this man to man relationship. Graham Hough suggested that Lawrence, "*never.....seems to have understood man-to-man relationships at all well*" Perhaps this is right and the significance of his attempts at some sort of ritualized brotherhood, both in life and fiction, is not made as clear as one wishes it had been.

Next we observe Hermione-Birkin relationship is a failure because of the dominant will of the woman. Woman's lust for possession, a greed for self-importance in love, fills Birkin with insane fury Hermione Roddice, daughter of a Derbyshire Baronet, is a cold, power-loving, intellectual, spirited woman. She loves Birkin and wants to form an abiding connection with him, so that she should be safe during the fretful journey of human life. In fact, she wants a physically strong, soldierly, strong-willed, bullying man. There is a horrible desire in her to prostrate herself before a man who worships her and admits her as a supreme being. Thus she cannot give to Birkin a woman's love. She has an abstract, spiritual intimacy and

that is why he reacts away from her. The more she strives to bring him to her, the more he repels, fights her back because he knows that she has an obsessive and possessive will. She wants to impose her will over all she comes into contact with. Birkin says to her:

"You must have everything. You want to go back and be like a savage without knowledge. You want a life of pure sensation and passion. But your passion is a lie. It isn't passion at all. It is your will. You want to clutch things and have them in your power, because you have not got any real body, any dark sensual body of life. You have no sensuality. You have only your will and your conceit of your consciousness and your power to know".

Hermione finds that the greatest thing in life is to know. Her love of 'knowledge' is to desperate sense of insufficiency that determines also her attachment to Birkin makes him, that is, so terribly necessary to her, and the sense of insufficiency is indistinguishable from the unrelaxed, insistence of her will. Both Birkin and Hermione cannot tolerate each other. Hermione wants to break Birkin down before her. She considers him a treacherous man. She hates him in despair and to quote Lawrence once again,

"She knew the split was coming and her hatred of him was sub-conscious and intense....She could feel dissolution setting in her body. She suffered the ghastliness of dissolution, broken and gone in a horrible corruption. She was like a corpse that has no presence, no connection".

Hermione wants to know everything. It is a dreadful tyranny, an obsession in her to know all he knew. Lawrence despises the emancipated, intelligent, cultured, apparently independent woman whose life is hollow because she cannot accept an unselfconscious emotion and Hermione Roddice is this type of woman.

Of all the relationships in 'Women in Love' Ursula-Birkin's relationship is a success. When finally Ursula and Birkin arrive at a complete acceptance of each other and have the initiation into the reality beyond, we are told, this was realized at last. She had lovers, she had known passions. But this was neither love nor passion. Ursula and Birkin take a long time to accept each other in marriage, partly because of the conditioning of their minds by education and partly because Birkin wants Ursula to see the 'negative' acceptance that a union with him would imply. Ursula in the end sees that the union with Birkin has to be not on the basis of love or of passion, that there are depths of passion when one becomes impersonal and indifferent, unemotional. Ursula discovers something more wonderful than life itself. H.M. Daleski comments:

"I do not wish to suggest, of course, that the experience is represented as a substitute for sexual intercourse, on the contrary, once supreme value is attached to it and not to intercourse, sex so to speak, is put safely in its place and ceases to be a menace".

In the end, they reach a fulfillment which is in any case only felt intensely for a moment, to become after that a source of life, a sense of having the pulse *beating direct from the mystery*. There is nothing that can lead to such a dialogue as that at the end of the novel after Gerald's death. The novel ends not with bold answers but with painful questioning.

'It's a better thing to me' (Birkin) said, 'What-that he's dead?' She said. His eyes just met hers. He did not answer. 'You've got me', she said. He smiled and kissed her'. If I die, he said, you will know I haven't left you'. 'And me?' she cried. 'And you won't have left me', he said, 'we shan't have any need to despair, in death'.

In the end Birkin realizes that marriage is the basis of community, held together by the bonds of feeling between man and woman and man and man. Marriage is the first step, friendship is the second. As soon as his relationship with Ursula is securely established, his thoughts turn to the inclusion in their *separate world* of a few other people.

Birkin's fear of love is related to all the symbolic themes of the novel, particularly, the episode at Willey Pond, at the beginning of the Chapter 'Moony', Birkin has gone off to the south of France to recuperate from his illness and Ursula has been left alone. It seems to her there is no hope for her in the world. One evening, she walks on into the woods, unafraid, delighted by the loneliness, all human contacts nullified. The moon suddenly appears, it startles and terrifies her. The bare moon unshielded by shadows frightens her. At the same time, Birkin who has returned unexpectedly from France also comes there and sits by the lake. Both

are unaware of each other's presence. Birkin begins throwing stones into the lake, deliberately breaking up the moon's reflection on the water, scattering the intense white light into flashes of lightening. It seems as if Birkin's mind holds the wish to destroy the moon's reflection. The scene symbolizes Birkin's hatred of the Magna Mater in hurling stones at the image of moon, he is reacting in fury against female arrogance, or tyranny, or possessiveness.

Birkin's stone throwing also symbolizes an attack on that deathly supremacy of the ego that makes for mere separateness and indifference. But to quote F.R. Leavis,

"The possessiveness he divines in Ursula is what he sees in the reflected moon".

And Graham Hough is of the view that *"the moon is the white goddess, the primal woman image, by whom Birkin is obviously haunted"*

The autobiographical note is somewhat vague in *Women in Love*. Birkin is somewhat a Lawrence-like figure who is an inspector of schools. But first Birkin has to escape from the toils of Hermione and her will. This is perhaps unconsciously a reflection of Lawrence's will drive mother and of Jessie Chambers. Gerald Crich and Gudrun are based on his friend Murry and Katherine Mansfield. Ursula is obviously Frieda with whom Lawrence had a successful conjugal relationship.

Women in Love is an amazing book. It is the imperishable monument of one of the strangest moments of Lawrence's strange destiny. To say that the main argument of the novel is the distinction between the love of Birkin and Ursula, on the one hand, and of Gerald and Gudrun, on the other, is not wholly justified. Birkin and Ursula are represented as on the way to salvation and Gerald and Gudrun as on the way to damnation, and this is superficially plausible for the simple reason that Rupert and Ursula are in the main real people, while Gerald and Gudrun are not. The real difference between them is that Birkin and Ursula are a whole stage further on in the process of damnations, for Gerald and Gudrun simply represent the earlier stage of Birkin- Ursula sensual self-destruction.

The different relationships in the novel are founded on the psychodynamics of opposition, on the idea of death and life, and death-in-life, and the characters move entirely in terms of these two impulses, their conflicts and their embraces developing out of their allegiance to one or the other. Psychology of love is, of course, Lawrence's focus, for he wishes to say that in modern life we use love for death-purpose more frequently than we do for life-purpose. The psychology is further dramatized in the theme of a struggle between Will and Being. Will is the integration of the drive of ego toward power, toward domination. Being is the integration of life forces in total and complete self-responsibility. Its historical embodiment lives in the future.

The psychological relationship between men and women in *Women in Love* is more like a fight than a friendship. Birkin finds the old ideals, dead as nails. There only remains this perfect union with a woman, in man-woman relationship, a sort of ultimate marriage. It is a relationship of separateness-in-union. It is a permanent bond which leaves the individual eternally independent. One must forget and turn one's eyes away from the world. He must live quite apart in a world of isolation to which he is wedded by birth.

REFERENCES:

Leavis, F.R. *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist*. Chatto and Windus: London, 1962. Print. Lawrence, D.H. *Women in Love*. London: Heinemann Ltd., 1966. Print.

Clarke, Colin. *D.H. Lawrence: "The Rainbow and Women in Love"*, In *A Selection of Critical Essays*. Macmillan Press, 1969. Print.

Hough, Graham Hough. *The Dark Sun: A Study of D.H. Lawrence*. London: 1956. Print.

Lawrence, D.H. *Fantasia of the unconscious Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*. London: 1961. Print.
