Connecting D. H. Lawrence to Emily Brontë: Adoration for Nature and the Shadow of "Death"

山内，理恵

(Degree)
博士（学術）

(Date of Degree)
2022-03-25

(Date of Publication)
2023-03-01

(Resource Type)
doctoral thesis

(Report Number)
甲第8232号

(URL)
https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/D1008232

博士論文

Connecting D. H. Lawrence to Emily Brontë: Adoration for Nature and the Shadow of "Death"

（D. H. ロレンスとエミリー・ブロンテを
つなぐ自然愛と「死」の影）

令和 4 年 1 月
神戸大学大学院国際文化学研究科
YAMANOUCHI Rie
山内　理恵

Contents

Introduction 1

1. Diverse Criticisms on Lawrence's Works and the Approach Chosen for This Study 2
2. The Definition of "Intertextuality" and "Influence" in Modern Literary Criticism 4
3. D. H. Lawrence and Emily Brontë 7
4. Love of Nature Connecting Two Authors 10
5. Analytical Framework 11

Chapter 1: Overall Critical Tendencies 14

1. The Receptions by Early Reviewers and Critics . . . 14
2. The Shared Keywords 23
3. Critiques Which Connect D. H. Lawrence and Brontë 43

Chapter 2: Gender and Feminism 48

1. Masculine Brontë and Feminine Lawrence 48
2. Feminists' Views on Emily Brontë and Lawrence . . . 56

Chapter 3: Love of Nature and Fear of Death 85

1. Identifying Biographical Connection between Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence. 85
2. Shared Love of Nature between Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence 86
3. Interpretation of Emily Brontë's and D. H. Lawrence's Love of Nature 102

Chapter 4: The Influence of *Wuthering Heights* on D. H. Lawrence's Works 137

1. *Wuthering Heights* and *Kangaroo* 138
2. *Wuthering Heights* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" 153
3. Treatments of Death 187

Conclusion 191

1. Looking Back the Arguments 191
2. Lawrence's Adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* and Other Works 194
3. Absence of an Essay on Emily Brontë 197

Notes 199

Bibliography 201

Introduction

This study first aims to verify the connections between Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence by comparing their letters and literary works, as well as biographies and reviews of the authors, and demonstrating their similarities, both within and outside of their work. "Connection" here means "being related with" in some way. Some connections exist because of the two authors' innate closeness; that is, because of the similarities in how they felt about life, society, and literature. Other connections imply the influence of Brontë on Lawrence that formed when he read her novel and biography. The term "influence" here refers to the conceptual and implicit power Brontë and her literary work had over Lawrence, regardless of the power being recognised by Lawrence. To indicate their connections, the study focusses on their similar or shared characteristics in various aspects for analysis and explores the reasons for these similarities.

The study demonstrates that the two authors are connected in various ways in the sense that their similarities are not only in terms of life values and literary preferences but can also be detected in some of their life experiences. Previous critiques have, often briefly, referred to the similarities between Lawrence's works and Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*. This study, therefore, starts from where the previous research has pointed out but investigates more thoroughly the two authors' manifold similarities to signify the strength of their connections.

The study then suggests that their shared love of nature, which is one of their significant connections, is a key to understanding their specific relationship. This is because behind their shared love of nature lies another powerful and emotional

shared experience, that is, the fear of death. The biographical materials of these two authors record their lives in the vicinity of death. The strong emotional experience that they shared possibly explains their many strong connections.

1. Diverse Criticisms on Lawrence's Works and the Approach Chosen for This Study

The range of approaches applied to research on Lawrence broadened after his death, as critics employed various literary theories. This section begins with a brief overview of posthumous critiques of Lawrence's works to show the diversity of their approaches. It then explains the approach chosen for this study and provides the reasons for this choice.

In 1930, Lawrence died with a poor reputation owing to controversial works, including *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. However, his artistry was re-evaluated in the late 1940s, especially when F. R. Leavis included him on the list of exemplary authors of English literature in *The Great Tradition* (1948). Leavis also credited him as a defender of life against modern industrialisation in *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist* (1955). Leavis's defence boosted research on Lawrence from the viewpoint of moral formalism.

In the 1960s, with Lawrence's rise in popularity, publications of books both about him and by him increased. Penguin Books sold fifteen volumes of his works in 1960, and many critical essays about Lawrence were published, including *D. H. Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays (Twentieth Century Views)* by Mark Spilka in 1963 and *D. H. Lawrence: The Rainbow and Women in Love (Casebooks Series)* by Colin Clarke in 1969. The majority of critics from 1960 to the early 1970s

treated Lawrence as an heir of the great English literary tradition. They highly valued his free spirit and rebellious attitude toward industrialism and bourgeois values, as well as his talent for exposing the corrupt and dissolving aspects of the twentieth century. Critics also highlighted the imagery, symbolism, and stylistic features in his works.

In the 1970s, feminists including Kate Millett in *Sexual Politics* (1970) labelled Lawrence a male supremacist. Marxists' attack on Lawrence existed as early as the 1930s when Christopher Caudwell criticised his bourgeois attitude in *Studies in a Dying Culture* (1938). It resurged in the 1970s, when another major Marxist, Terry Eagleton criticised him in *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory* (1976). Eagleton called him a fascist and wrote that "Lawrence's particular mode of relation to the dominant ideology . . . was in the first place a contradictory combination of proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements" (160). He also regarded Oliver Mellors in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* as "a combination of working-class roughness with petty bourgeois awareness" (160). Conversely, the view of Lawrence as an advocate of humanistic individualism was maintained among other critics.

In the 1980s and onward, critics' views of Lawrence were highly diverse. While some feminists and Marxists continued their attacks, other critics used literary theories including post-structuralism, new historicism, and postcolonial criticism in their literary analysis of Lawrence and his works. This variety of approaches is reflected in collections of essays, including *The Challenge of D. H. Lawrence* (1990) edited by Michael Squires and Keith Cushman, *Rethinking Lawrence* (1990) edited by Keith Brown, *D. H. Lawrence* (1992) edited by Peter Widdowson, *D. H.*

Lawrence and New Theories (1999), edited by Masazumi Araki, Saburo Kuramochi, and Hiromichi Tateishi, and *The Cambridge Companion to D. H. Lawrence* (2001) edited by Anne Fernihough. Some essays in the collections employed feminist, Marxist, or Freudian approaches, while others applied the theories of Gaston Bachelard, Mikhail Bakhtin, Gilles Deleuze, Paul de Man, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Julia Kristeva, Jacques Lacan, Edward Said, and others.

Despite the current trend of actively incorporating literary theories in literary analysis, this study employs a rather conventional research style of looking closely at reviews of the two authors and their biographical information and then comparing their texts for analysis. This style is chosen because it is appropriate for demonstrating the similarities between the authors' life values and experiences, as well as of their literary preferences and characteristics, and the consequent influence of one author on another. The study also makes use of scientific research to support its argument.

2. The Definition of "Intertextuality" and "Influence" in Modern Literary Criticism

The definitions of the terms "intertextuality" and "influence" have been often debated in modern literary criticism. As the influence of one author on another is the primary theme of this study, an overview of the main arguments about intertextuality and influence in recent literary studies is first presented, followed by the definition of the term "influence" used in this study.

In her 1996 essay "Word, Dialogue and Novel", Julia Kristeva coined the term "intertextuality". Her explanation of the term

can be summed up in this quotation:

> Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. (66)

Thus, according to Kristeva, words in texts not only absorb but also transform their prior meanings in previous texts. Consequently, a literary work is not an autonomous and unified product created by a single author but rather an assembly of words that exist in relation to other texts and ongoing cultural and social movements. Intertextuality is complex and anonymous; the sources of influence are difficult to identify. Roland Barthes developed Kristeva's concept of intertextuality in "The Death of the Author", in which he concluded

> ...a text is made of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation, but there is one place where this multiplicity is focused, and that place is the reader, not, as was hitherto said, the author. (148)

These arguments emphasised that authors do not have power or control over their own texts as was traditionally believed. Once words and expressions are chosen, assembled, and arranged into a text, they begin to trace and transform other texts from the past regardless of the authors' intentions. Kristeva wrote that the literary word is "an intersection of textual surface rather than a point (a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings". (65)

A related and significant argument about influence is "the anxiety of influence", a theory of literary inheritance proposed by Harold Bloom in his 1973 book *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Bloom noticed the "melancholy of the creative mind's desperate insistence upon priority" (13) and questioned why Romantic poets such as William Blake, William Wordsworth, and Percy Bysshe Shelley, who believed in the power of imagination and the uniqueness of its visions, consistently returned to John Milton as a figure of poetic authority. Bloom called Milton a *strong* poet because of his extraordinary talent and influence, and the poets who appeared after him as *belated*, coming after the event. He analogised young poets' struggles to overcome strong father-figure poets with Sigmund Freud's Oedipus complex. The Oedipus complex theory describes a son's desire to replace his father by murdering his father and sexually possessing his mother. Bloom explained how a son-poet, or *ephebe*, fought against the dead father-poet, or *precursor,* in six revisionary ratios: *Clinamen, Tessera, Kenosis, Daemonization, Askesis,* and *Apophrades*. These ratios suggest, more or less, the following: a son-poet strategically misreads the father-poet's work to stand in a superior position and correct or improve the work; he refuses the father-poet's divinity or sublimity and separates himself from the rest to return to the father-poet in a renewed and stronger state; the situation makes the father-poet's work seem as if the son-poet had written it. As the analogy of the Oedipus complex suggests, Bloom's interpretation of influence involved not only anxiety but also the antagonism of a son-poet against a father-poet.

In modern literary studies, the terms "intertextuality" and "influence" are specific concepts when they refer to

Kristeva's or Bloom's theories. Since this study aims to demonstrate the influence of one particular author (Emily Brontë) on another particular author (Lawrence), Kristeva's concept of anonymous intertextuality does not suit it. Additionally, Lawrence's references to Brontë lacked the jealous anger or hostility that Bloom proposed. For these reasons, this study uses neither Kristeva's nor Bloom's theory in discussing influence. Considering the depth of influence Brontë had on Lawrence, his avoidance of mentioning her is rather unnatural; it is as if he refused to associate himself with her publicly. Thus, it is possible to apply Bloom's theory here, to assert that this avoidance reflected Lawrence's anxiety about Brontë's influence. However, this study uses the term "influence" in a more general sense. *The Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*) defines the noun "influence" as "[a] thing (or person) that exercises action or power of a non-material or unexpressed kind". (940) In this study, the term indicates that a literary work, or an author, exercises conceptual and implicit power over another author, regardless of whether the power is recognised by the influenced author.

3. D. H. Lawrence and Emily Brontë

Emily Brontë lived between 1818 and 1848, primarily in Yorkshire as the daughter of a clergyman. In her short life, she published twenty-one poems with her sisters Charlotte Brontë and Anne Brontë and the novel *Wuthering Heights*, under the pseudonym Ellis Bell. After her death, Emily Brontë's unpublished poems were collected by C. W. Hatfield in *The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë* (1941); later, updated collections followed.

D. H. Lawrence lived between 1885 and 1930. He was the son

of a coal miner in Nottinghamshire and a voracious reader due to the influence of his mother who valued education. Lawrence did not have the opportunity to read Brontë's unpublished poems, as Hatfield's collection was published after Lawrence's death. He did not mention Brontë's published poems in his works or letters, despite that, having read Elizabeth Gaskell's *The Life of Charlotte Brontë,* he likely knew of their existence. For these reasons, this study focuses on *Wuthering Heights* as the primary source of Brontë's influence over Lawrence.

Lawrence did not explain his thoughts on Brontë and her works in detail, as he did in the case of Thomas Hardy, John Galsworthy, Edgar Allan Poe, and other authors. He mentioned Emily Brontë and *Wuthering Heights* sporadically in his novels, including *The Rainbow* and *John Thomas and Lady Jane*, and in essays including "Blessed are the Powerful", the Introduction to *Mother* by Grazia Deledda, "Introduction to These Paintings", and "*Fantasia of the Unconscious*". However, there is no essay dedicated to Brontë, nor any substantial analysis of *Wuthering Heights*. Most of Lawrence's references to Brontë, both her work and her personality, are positive, suggesting his affinity with her passionate view of life.

It should be noted here that Lawrence's understanding of Brontë was not limited to her writings but the person as a whole. His biographers record that Brontë and *Wuthering Heights* were a part of Lawrence's life. He reportedly forbade his girlfriend Jessie Chambers from reading *Wuthering Heights* as it might upset her (Chambers 102) and told her that she was like Emily Brontë (Nehls 63). Chambers also wrote that Lawrence's mother, Lydia Lawrence, talked about having read *Wuthering Heights* (Chambers 102). Lawrence's act of forbidding Chambers from

reading *Wuthering Heights* and calling her "like Emily Brontë" implies that he was not only attracted to but also had anxiety about Brontë's (and Chambers's) female passion. His complex feelings towards both Chambers and Brontë seem to project that he had a fear of women.

Multiple critics, including Michael Black, Sandra Gilbert, and John Worthen, have previously highlighted striking similarities and possible connections between Brontë and Lawrence. Raymond Williams defined both Brontë and Lawrence in the same "English tradition" (63–4) and Bloom called Lawrence one of "the heirs of the Brontës", (1) pointing to the similarities in the two authors' plots, images, and characters. However, these critics wrote briefly about the connectedness; the question of why Lawrence was drawn to Brontë is only rarely under focus or examined in detail. In her book *Lawrence among the Women,* Carol Siegel argued over more than ten pages about the unique relationship between Lawrence and Brontë. She maintained that Lawrence was "above all responding to *Wuthering Height*"' (55) and that his connections to female literary traditions and consistent efforts to represent the "female voice" could be detected in the way he dealt with *Wuthering Heights* and Brontë as "the medium of purely female discourse". (55) Another of her essays, "Border Disturbances: D. H. Lawrence's Fiction and the Feminism of *Wuthering Heights*" focussed on Lawrence's attitude toward *Wuthering Heights*. Siegel contended that Lawrence moved back and forth across the border between gendered texts and evaluated female passion highly but, at the same time, claimed that the interpreters of female passion needed to be men.

This study aims to add new perspectives to these arguments,

by placing the primary focus on the connections between Brontë and Lawrence. It demonstrates not only the two authors' similar choices of literary genres and Lawrence's adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* in his own work but also how and why Brontë and her novel influenced Lawrence.

4. Love of Nature Connecting Two Authors

This study argues that Brontë and Lawrence shared a love of nature. Although humans have been attracted to nature since ancient times, often finding enjoyment in depicting plants and animals in poems and paintings, this love became more conscious in the latter half of the eighteenth century. It was a reactionary response to the Enlightenment, which scientifically rationalised nature, and against industrialisation and the expansion of cities that polluted and damaged the environment. Romantics such as Wordsworth proposed that readers go back to nature for spiritual renewal. With this, travel to the countryside for romantic scenery became popular. The notion of *sublime*, an aesthetic theory proposed by Edmund Burke in *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757), also became popular in the same period. Burke defined "sublime" as feelings of awe mixed with terror. The experience of the sublime is, therefore, emotional and subjective and accords with romantic values, in contrast to the scientific objectivity of the Enlightenment. The Romantics brought the concept of the sublime into their works, including Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* in which Victor walks alone in the Alps, the Alpine stanzas in the third canto of George Gordon Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, and Percy Bysshe Shelley's "Mont Blanc: Lines Written in the Vale of Chamouni" in which the narrator feels

sensations in his mind as he gazes on the Ravine of Arve "in a trance sublime" (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature Fifth Edition*, 686).

Both Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence were influenced by Romanticism, as will be discussed in Chapter 1. Their shared love of nature may partly be explained as a characteristic of Romanticism. However, their agreement means more than belonging to the same literary and aesthetic genre. As Chapter 3 of this thesis will demonstrate, the two authors' fascinations with nature derived from their close life experiences; each felt a constant fear of death. The fascination stemmed from a desire to escape from the fear of death by staying close to nature and identifying with its eternal vitality. This connection between Brontë and Lawrence through their shared love of nature was unique, and Lawrence's sense of affinity with Brontë was personal. Chapter 4 establishes that in *Kangaroo* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman", Lawrence adapted the plot, character, and image patterns from *Wuthering Heights*. This adaptation reveals that, at least in these works, it was specifically Emily Brontë who strongly influenced Lawrence.

5. Analytical Framework

This study's approach is based on a close reading of texts, as well as biographies and reviews, to develop arguments. Although the New Criticism movement emphasised focusing on texts as autonomous and closed, and although Barthes announced 'the death of the author', a literary work naturally reflects the author's life experiences and life values. When an author tries to express messages through fiction, his or her personal experiences such as struggles; emotions such as desire, fear,

anger, and sorrow; and firm beliefs and philosophies are interwoven in the author's creative work, as pieces of physical or emotional experiences in real life or fiction are reshaped. If understanding a literary work deepens insight into human nature, then the author's biographical study in literary research should be a valid approach, as the author's life and individualism contain essential clues to his or her work.

This study started several years ago by noting striking similarities between *Wuthering Heights* and Lawrence's works: *Kangaroo* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman". Considering the infrequency of Lawrence's comments about Brontë, the research of this study depends mainly on investigating and analysing various materials on both authors to establish their connections. Among these connections, love of nature is the most dominant, both in their work and in their lives; each transformed the natural environment into a paradise free from daily stress. Although many Romantic authors share similar characteristics in their works, the distinct reflection of *Wuthering Heights* in *Kangaroo* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" makes the relation unique, as it implies Brontë's immense influence on Lawrence. The study found that, among many similarities in their life values, experiences, and works, the fear of death explains each author's strong attachment to nature and its destructive as well as regenerative power. Based on this finding, the study concluded that Lawrence had a special affinity with Brontë, sensing instinctively that, behind her love of nature, Brontë shared with him powerful emotional experiences related to the fear of death.

The argument of this thesis is organised to shift from outside Lawrence's and Brontë's works to inside their writing. Chapter

1 examines past reviews of Lawrence and Brontë to demonstrate objectively the connections between the two authors. These reviews, which discuss the two writers separately, pointed out similar qualities or characteristics in their works. Chapter 2 focusses on the connections in relation to gender and argues that both authors were outsiders in contemporary society because they did not fit the gender stereotype of the time. The chapter also refutes the feminist claim that Lawrence was a male supremacist. In Chapter 3, the focus shifts from past reviews and critiques to biographical resources. The chapter contends that the two writers were connected in both life and work by their shared love of nature as a place of escape and as a symbol of rebirth and hope, as well as by their fear of death behind that love of nature. Finally, Chapter 4 presents connections by closely comparing Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* with Lawrence's *Kangaroo* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman". The comparison focusses not only on the similarities of the plots, characters, images and choices of expressions but also on the way nature and death are treated in these works.

This study thus verifies the connections that existed between Brontë and Lawrence on multiple levels, and by doing so, it validates its research purpose. It demonstrates that the connections had at least partial roots in the shared emotion, the fear of death, which strengthened both authors' attachment to nature as an escape from daily struggles.

Chapter 1.
The Overall Critical Tendencies

1. The Receptions by Early Reviewers and Critics

Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence are in common in the sense that they both shocked their contemporary readers with unconventional content: the former with the level of violence, and the latter with the straightforward descriptions of sexuality. In that way, they tried to expand the literary possibilities. Many of their reviewers and critics recognised their undeniable talents as writers, but were uncomfortable appreciating them straight away because of their radical content. After the initial shock, gradually they were admitted into the canon of English Literature. This section summarises the reactions of early reviewers and critics to Brontë and Lawrence, and argues that, those past reviews and critiques indicate the similarities of their positions as outsiders in the contemporary literary circles, and of their literary characteristics.

(1) Emily Brontë

The first publication by Emily Brontë was a book of poetry she wrote with her sisters, Charlotte and Anne, under the androgynous pseudonyms of Currer (i. e. Charlotte), Ellis (i. e. Emily), and Acton (i. e. Anne) Bell. The book failed to get any attentions and only two copies were sold. When *Wuthering Heights* was published, still under the pseudonym of Ellis Bell, the work gathered great attention as it was mysteriously connected with Currer Bell, the author of the sensationally popular novel at the time, *Jane Eyre*. However, *Wuthering Heights* was not as celebrated then as it is now, because the

contemporary critics were perplexed with its unorthodox level of violence and lack of moral guidance. *The Spectator* on 18 December 1847 admitted Brontë's execution good and delineation "forcible and truthful", but complained that "the incidents are too coarse and disagreeable to be attractive, the very best being improbable, with a moral taint about them, and the villainy not leading to results sufficient to justify the elaborate pains taken in depicting it" (Allott, 39). Similarly, *The Athenaeum* on 25 December 1847 called the work "disagreeable", even though it was "truth to life in the remote nooks and corners of England" (Allott, 39). *Wuthering Heights* was thus notorious for its disagreeable violence and lack of morality at the beginning of its publication, despite its power and realism. Emily knew about such contemporary critical feedback. Charlotte wrote to her publisher in November 1848 that she had read a review of *Wuthering Heights* to dying Emily, trying to amuse her. The review by E. Whipple in October 1848 on *The North American Review* (Allott, 52) said: "Nightmares and dreams, through which devils dance and wolves howl, make bad novels" (Barker, 575). Listening to it, Emily "smiled half-amused and half in scorn" (Barker, 575). Before contemporary critics could fully appreciate her work, Emily died.

After her death, the real name and sex of the author was revealed, and with time, the novel became recognised of its high artistic quality. A. C. Swinburne in *The Athenaeum* in 1883, wrote that *Wuthering Heights* has attained "the impression of logical and moral certitude" (Allott, 88) perfectly and triumphantly as *King Lear*. Mrs Humphry Ward refuted both critics' attacks on *Wuthering Heights* and Charlotte's defence as "irrelevant". W. C. Roscoe, in 1857, wrote that Emily surpassed

Charlotte “in force of genius, in the power of conceiving and uttering intensity of passion” (Allott, 71), and Virginia Woolf in 1916 called her “a greater poet than Charlotte” (Allott, 108).

(2) D. H. Lawrence

Compared with Emily Brontë, the works of D. H. Lawrence were relatively well received at the beginning of his career, even though his critics pointed out problems such as loose structures and too much focus on sexuality. However, the publication of *The Rainbow* brought vicious attacks on him by his contemporary critics. According to R. P. Draper in *D. H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage,* “[a]fter the suppression of *The Rainbow* in 1915 he rapidly acquired a certain notoriety to which he responded by being defiant and often contemptuous of his critics” (1) and that “[t]owards the end of his life he ran into further notoriety through *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* and *Pansies*, his paintings met with outright hostility, and at his death the obituarists wrote about him with an animosity rarely displayed on such occasions” (1). His frustration with the critics must have been severer than Brontë’s mainly because his writing career was longer and he had to face such criticism more often than she did, but also partly because, different from self-contained Emily who did not concern much about what others think about her, Lawrence wanted to be accepted in the world so as to influence and educate his readers with his messages.

Lawrence’s publication started with a short story “A Prelude”, which won the first prize in *The Nottinghamshire Guardian* Christmas competition in 1907. Then, some of his poems his girlfriend Jessie Chambers sent to *The English Review*, attracted the attention of its editor, Ford Madox Ford, and some

critics. Henry Yoxall, in *The Schoolmaster* on 25 December 1909, called Lawrence "the true poet" and declared "I congratulate Mr. Lawrence, not only on the prominent publication of some of his poems, but on the fine quality of them" (Draper, 31). *The White Peacock* was published in 1911, *The Trespasser* in 1912, *Love Poems and Others, Sons and Lovers* in 1913, and *The Prussian Officer* in 1914. Even though some weakness were pointed out by reviewers and critics, in general, they were well-received. Allan Monkhouse in *The Manchester Guardian* on 8 February 1911, wrote about *The White Peacock* " . . . Mr. Lawrence can write. There are some fine rhapsodies in the book inspired by the country round Nottingham and by the impressions of a sensitive young man new to London" (Draper, 35). *The Athenaeum* on 1 June 1912, wrote about *The Trespasser*, "[f]rom the opening chapter we are struck by the author's skill in catching shades of social atmosphere" (Draper, 44).

On *Love Poems and Others*, Ezra Pound in *The New Freewoman* on 1 September 1913 claimed that "Mr. Lawrence, almost alone among the younger poets, has realized that contemporary poetry must be as good as contemporary prose if it is to justify its publication" (Draper, 53). *The Standard* on 30 May 1913 declared on *Sons and Lovers*, "[w]ith this third novel Mr. D. H. Lawrence has come to full maturity as a writer" (Draper, 58), and Lascelles Abercrombie in *The Manchester Guardian* on 2 July 1913 called the novel "an achievement of the first quality" (Draper, 68). The twelve short stories in *The Prussian Officer* were, according to *The Outlook* on 19 December 1914, "all brilliant" (Draper, 81). In this way, critics in general admitted Lawrence's excellence as a writer.

However, the publication of *The Rainbow* significantly

changed his public image, as, in the novel, he openly challenged the contemporary morals. Before the publication, he was aware of its risk as a writer. He wrote to Edward Garnett on 11 March 1913 that "I've written rather more than half of a most fascinating (to me) novel. But nobody will ever dare to publish it" (Draper, 84). Despite that, he was determined to adhere to his new style, as other letters to Garnett reveal: "I shall be sorry if you don't like it, but am prepared. I shan't write in the same manner as *Sons and Lovers* again, I think" (30 December 1913, Draper, 85) and "I have no longer the joy in creating vivid scenes, that I had in *Sons and Lovers* . . . . I have to write differently" (29 January 1914, Draper, 85). He explained his new ideas in his famous letter to Garnett as follows:

> I don't so much care about what the woman *feel*—in the ordinary usage of the word. That presumes an *ego* to feel with. I only care about what the woman *is* — what she IS — inhumanly, physiologically, materially—according to the use of the word: but for me, what she *is* as a phenomenon . . . instead of what she feels according to the human conception . . . . You mustn't look in my novel for the old stable *ego*—of the character. There is another ego, according to whose action the individual is unrecognizable, and passes through, as it were, allotropic states which it needs a deeper sense than any we've been used to exercise, to discover are states of the same single radically unchanged element. (5 June 1914, Draper, original emphases, 87)

He thus ventured a new way to present the very essential core of his characters from further depth. The letter reveals his self-confidence in the method by saying " . . . it is the real thing, say what you like. And I shall get my reception, if not now, then before long" (Draper, 87).

The Rainbow was published on 30 September 1915. The review in *The Standard* on 1 October 1915 was a mixture of positive and negative comments. It praised that his construction has "no flaw", that he is "a writer of exceptional strength" (Draper, 90), and that "Mr. Lawrence has enough genius to excuse his defiance of all conventions" (Draper, 90), but also pointed out rightly that "[s]uch a book as *The Rainbow* may cause offence and be condemned, for it takes more liberties than English novelists for many years past have claimed" (Draper, 90). Other reviews were more blatantly negative. Robert Lynd in *The Daily News* on 5 October 1915 denounced the novel as lacking the marks of good literature such as humanity, imaginative intensity, or humour, and advised ordinary readers to "leave the book alone" as "they would be sure to dislike it intensely" (Draper, 92). James Douglas in *The Star* on 22 October 1915 went as far as to say "[t]here is no doubt that a book of this kind has no right to exist" (Draper, 93) and gave Lawrence advice that "[i]f Mr. Lawrence desires to save his genius from destruction . . . [h]e must discover or rediscover the oldest truth in the world—that man is a moral being with a conscience and an aim, with responsibility to himself and to others." (Draper, 95). Thus, even though Lawrence's exceptional talent was recognised in general, his unconventional content was spurned by many critics as inappropriate. The situation was in a way similar to the one Emily Brontë was in, in that they were both severely criticised

despite their distinguished talents. Considering the fact that Lawrence read, in Gaskell's *The Life of Charlotte Brontë,* about the publication of *Wuthering Height* and the negative reviews it faced, he might have felt sympathy and affinity with Emily.

On 13th November, *The Rainbow* was prosecuted under the Obscene Publication Act, and the court ordered the publisher to destroy the copies and pay ten pounds ten shillings (Draper, 9, 102). The censorship and negative reviews affected Lawrence's position in the literary world. John Gould Fletcher, in *The Poetry* in August 1918, conveys the contemporary reviewers' treatments of Lawrence:

> The reviewers of the English press know perfectly well that Mr. Lawrence is supposed to be a dangerous man, writing too frankly on certain subjects which are politely considered taboo in good society, and therefore they do their best to prevent Mr. Lawrence from writing at all, by tacitly ignoring him. (Draper, 121)

On the other hand, Lawrence always had supporters, friends and fans who believed in his talent, such as Edward Garnett, John Middleton Murry, and Katherine Mansfield, to name a few.

Some critics, especially towards the end of Lawrence's career, considered his talent wasted and his works not worth reading because of his obsession to sexuality. *John Bull* on 20 October 1928 mockingly denounced *Lady Chatterley's Lover*:

> Mr. Lawrence is a man of genius. As a psychologist he is in the front rank of living writers;

> as a stylist he stands supreme.
>
> Unfortunately for literature as for himself, Mr. Lawrence has a diseased mind. He is obsessed by sex. We are not aware that he has written any book during his career that has not over-emphasized this side of life.
>
> Now, since he has failed to conquer his obsession, the obsession has conquered him. He can write about nothing else, apparently. (Draper, 278)

The same tone exists in some of his obituaries. *The Times* on 4 March 1930, wrote that Lawrence "undoubtedly . . . had genius" (Draper, 322), but " . . . as time went on and his disease took firmer hold, his rage and his fear grew upon him. He confused decency with hypocrisy, and honesty with the free and public use of vulgar words" (Draper, 323). *The Glasgow Herald* on 4 March 1930 also wrote that after *Sons and Lovers*, "he became . . . more and more enamoured of the abnormal" (Draper, 328). As Draper points out, "Lawrence's purpose was taken as being merely pornographic" (Draper, 21) by his contemporary reviewers. Just like Emily Brontë, Lawrence died feeling unaccepted by the critics.

Emily Brontë and Lawrence thus had in common that they both rebelled against the contemporary literary society by choosing controversial contents, and faced severe criticism despite the high quality of their literary arts. Their choices imply not only that they were unique in the ways they interpreted and expressed human life, but also that they firmly believed in their own literary instincts and fearlessly stood up for them. Such attitudes suggest their shared powerful

individualism, which leads to another possibility of Lawrence's strong sympathy with Emily Brontë.

2. The Shared Keywords

Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence share not only the challenging attitudes towards their contemporary society but also plural other characteristics. The first half of this section looks at shared keywords centring on the "Romanticism" among their reviews, criticisms and biographies, to prove their Romantic connection. The second half focusses on other shared keywords to demonstrate their similar characteristics pointed out separately by the critics. By listing these keywords, the section argues that Brontë and Lawrence had similar literary bents.

(1) Keywords Centring on Romanticism

Romanticism

Romanticism is a rebellious movement against the society governed by scientific empiricism, industrialisation, and intellectualism. According to *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, Romanticism valued "imaginative spontaneity, visionary originality, wonder, and emotional self-expression over the classical standards of balance, order, restraint, proportion, and objectivity" (872). Its focus was more on individual feelings and sensitivities, than on the society as a whole. Both nature and human nature were explored, former in the Wordsworthian worships for natural environments, and the latter in the Coleridgean fascination with deep human psychology presented in supernatural or gothic elements.

It is well-known that the Brontës were avid readers of the

Romantic literature. Humphry Ward points out that the sisters were "readers of Christopher North, Hogg, De Quincey, and Maginn in *Blackwood*, of Carlyle's early essays and translations in *Fraser*, of Scott and Lockhart, no less than of Wordsworth, Southey, and Coleridge" and that "there can be no question that they were 'romantic' influences" (Allott, 96). Miriam Allott, mentioning the Brontë children's juvenile works such as *Angria* (by Charlotte and Branwell) and *Gondal* (by Emily and Anne), claims that "'Romantic' influences are strongly felt in the stories which the Brontë children made up for themselves, and, above all, in the fantasy worlds which they created and kept alive from their childhood to their early maturity" (Allott, 14). Their biographers, such as Elizabeth Gaskell and Juliet Barker, record that Emily's siblings sent letters to great Romantic writers; Charlotte sent a letter and her poems to Robert Southey, Branwell did the same to Wordsworth, and he also sent his translations of Horace's *Odes* to Hartley Coleridge. Emily did not send a letter to any famous Romantic writers asking for a recognition, but the episode suggests that she was in the environment where an influence of Romanticism was very strong.

According to Gaskell, when the siblings formed the play of the islanders in December 1827, each child chose an island and a chief man. Emily chose for herself the Isle of Arran and Walter Scott, one of the greatest Romantic writers (Gaskell, 66). Lord Byron's influence over *Wuthering Heights* has been repeatedly pointed out in reviews and articles. As early as on 8 January 1848, *The Examiner* mentioned the similarity between Byron's hero in the *Corsair* and Heathcliff (Allott, 40). Miriam Allott also wrote in 1958 that Heathcliff reminds readers of Byron's *Manfred* or *Cain* (Allott, 174).

Similarly, plural critics pointed out Lawrence's adaptation of Romanticism in his works. Michael Bell claims that, different from Eliot and Pound's occasionally negative attitudes towards Romanticism, Lawrence inherited and transformed the Romantic tradition as his central life's work (Bell, 180), referring to an episode in which Lawrence "astonished Ford Madox Hueffer with his knowledge of nineteenth-century literature", revealing the understanding of "the philosophical and psychological power, as well as the problems, of the romantic tradition from within" (Bell, 180). Helen Sword also declares that Lawrence "fits into a Romantic lyrical tradition stretching from Blake, Wordsworth and Shelley through Whitman, Hopkins and Yeats" (Sword, 120). Howard J. Booth points out that "Lawrence's opposition to the consequences of industrialisation took up and extended the arguments of the Romantics" (Booth, 7).

In this way, the reviews, criticism and biographies of Emily Brontë and Lawrence indicate that they share the influence of Romanticism.

Nature

Nature is a crucial element of Romanticism. The Romantic Movement denounced industrialization and science in favour of natural living. In order to live naturally, the Romantics encouraged readers to place themselves in natural environment and respect their natural instincts. The works both by Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence are filled with descriptions of nature and natural human emotions. The main characters are often empathic with the natural world, reminding readers of pantheism.

Reviewers and critics of *Wuthering Heights* detected strong

connection between nature and humans. *The Athenaeum* on 25 December 1847, for example, alluded the link between distorted trees and the inhabitants at the Heights by writing, "[t]he brutal master of the lonely house on 'Wuthering Heights' . . . has doubtless had his prototype in those uncongenial and remote districts where human beings, like the trees, grow gnarled and dwarfed and distorted by the inclement climate" (Allott, 39). *The Atlas* also pointed out the affinity of the characters and the scenery by writing that "the groups of figures and the scenery are in harmony with each other" (22 January 1848. Allott, 44). David Cecil in *Early Victorian Novelists* in 1934, considered *Wuthering Heights* as a microcosm of the universal scheme, and associated the main characters with cosmic atmosphere. He named the Heights "the land of storm" with "fiery, untamed children of the storm" (Allott, 121), and the Thrushcross Grange "home of the children of calm" (Allott, 121). Among more recent researchers, in 2015, Isabella Cooper in "The Sinister Menagerie: Animality and Antipathy in *Wuthering Heights*" contended the remarkable effect the mixture of animal and human images gives to the story. She claimed that Emily Brontë destabilised the traditional conceptions of "human nature" as superior to animal nature, by animalising language for her characters. She argued that the animalisation of humans by calling them by such terms as "a cur", "a brute", "a dog", and "a wolfish man", implies that human beings vary as greatly as species, and denies the idea of a unitary human nature. These arguments are all in common on the point that humans and nature merge in the world of *Wuthering Heights*.

The contrast between nature and civilisation is another

mainstream argument on *Wuthering Heights*. An early review, *Britannia* on 15 January 1848, wrote that, "[t]he uncultured freedom of native character presents more rugged aspects than we meet with in educated society" (Allott, 41), signalling the contrast between the uncultured world of *Wuthering Heights* and cultured contemporary society. Similarly, Sidney Dobell in *Palladium* in September 1859, described the ending of the story as "the last victory of nature over education" (Allott, 57). More recently, Terry Eagleton in *Myths of Power: A Marxist Study of the Brontës* in 1988, used a similar contrast in the context of Marxism. He argued that for the yeoman-farming structure of the Heights, "labour and culture, freedom and necessity, Nature and society are roughly complementary" (Eagleton, 105), while culture, or gentility, of the Lintons is the opposite of labour, an economic weapon, and a product of work itself (Eagleton, 105). In this way, plural critics pointed out the contrast between nature represented by the Heights, and artificiality / civilisation represented by the Thrushcross Grange.

Reviewers sometimes connect the whole story with nature. For example, *Britannia* on 15 January 1848 compared the story with a torrent running through natural landscape, in that "[t]he story rushes onwards with impetuous force, but it is the force of a dark and sullen torrent, flowing between high and rugged rocks" (Allott, 41-2). Charlotte Brontë expressed the essential quality of *Wuthering Heights* with an image of granite rock in the moors. She wrote that "*Wuthering Heights* was hewn in a wild workshop, with simple tools, out of homely materials. The statuary found a granite block on a solitary moor" (Allott, 63). These reviews reflect that the world of *Wuthering Heights* is closely associated with nature, which its readers cannot help

sensing. Such powerful images of nature the story conveys signal Emily Brontë's strong affinity with nature.

At the early stage, reviewers of Lawrence also pointed out the importance of nature in many of his works. For example, Allan Monkhouse in *The Manchester Guardian* on 8 February 1911 wrote about *The White Peacock* that, "[i]t is the book of a literary young man with a feeling for nature who is groping his way among the complexities of human character" (Draper, 34). *The Morning Post* on 9 February 1911 called its narrator Cyril, "a poetic naturalist" (Draper, 36), and asked the readers whether Lawrence was "a new prophet of the old fallacy of 'returning to Nature'" (Draper, 37). Henry Savage in *The Academy* described Lawrence's treatment of natural environment and human nature in *The White Peacock* as follows:

> The action takes place in the rural districts of Nottinghamshire, and it would hardly be fanciful to say that Nature is the protagonist of the drama, and that the author has drawn her character with uncommon care. We realize her in all her moods, and she is as interesting as she is convincing".
>
> Nor has the author taken less pains with the drawing of those special manifestations of Nature that are called men and women. (18 March 1911. Draper, 42)

In fact, Lawrence often personifies nature in the form of a protagonist such as Annable in *The White Peacock* and Mellors in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. These characters are associated with Pan, an ancient goat-footed God of nature in Greek mythology.

Lawrence's personification of nature in his works is similar to the way Brontë merges nature and humans in her works. Nature and humans overlap through metaphors or similes.

Like Brontë, Lawrence uses the contrast between nature and artificiality / civilisation. *The Westminster Gazette* on 14 June 1913 wrote about *Sons and Lovers*, that "[t]he contrast between the grim and drunkenness of colliery life and the beauty of Derbyshire lanes and farmhouses, the glory of spring and the raptures of childhood, the relief of rest from toil, are all woven into the vacillating tragedy of Paul's youth" (Draper, 61). Here, the grim colliery life, representing industry / civilisation, forms a striking contrast with the nature in Derbyshire. This kind of binary opposition exists in many of his works. *The Manchester Guardian* explained this dichotomy in his obituary:

> [Lawrence] personified . . . the suffering of a self-conscious mind exasperated by the soulless clangour of machinery, stifled by the fumes of all its waste products, and seeking fanatically to recover unity and health by a return to the primitive. It was this which drove him eventually to Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Mexico. He sought the unity of an instinctive life, untainted by self-conscious thoughts, among the Indians, in beasts and birds, reptiles, fish, and even mosquitoes. He sought it in trees and flowers and fruits. And the finest of his writings, whether in poetry or prose, are those which evoke the hot, bright, throbbing life of unconscious things, of the primitive dance, the sleek stallion, or the fireflies in the corn. (4 March 1930. Draper, 324-5)

The reviews quoted above, and many others, agree that Lawrence loved nature and hated anything which damaged it. Industrialisation and civilisation destroyed forests and fields, and civilisation and school education supressed instinctive human nature by rationalising people. Therefore, Lawrence hated and often attacked these elements.

Some reviewers noted his tendency to identify himself with nature. For example, Edwin Muir in *The Nation* on 11 February 1925 wrote that "[i]t is [Lawrence's] identification of himself with nature which gives him that extraordinary knowledge of natural potencies which seems occult to more rational minds" (Draper, 244) and that "[t]his identification is so close that in describing nature he cannot write merely like one who sees with his eyes and his imagination but rather like one whose whole being, whose blood, lusts, instincts, and senses are ecstatically sharing in the life of the things described" (Draper, 244). Stuart P. Sherman made a similar contention, when he wrote about *St Mawr* in *The New York Herald Tribune Books* on 14 June 1925, that "[Matthew] Arnold called Wordsworth 'a priest of the wonder and bloom of the world'. It is a beautiful phrase, but it should have been reserved for D. H. Lawrence" (Draper, 253), and that " . . . to reward [Lawrence] for his disinterested adoration of the multitudinous spirit of life . . . it seems as if life had let him penetrate into intimacies unknown even to those who have made most boast of her confidences" (Draper, 253). Sherman thus considered Lawrence a priest who could interpret life and nature. Like Brontë, Lawrence's works thus reveal strong identification with nature.

Lastly, in recent years, ecocriticism is becoming a shared

genre between Brontë and Lawrence. 'Ecocriticism' is, according to *The Oxford References*, "a new subfield of literary and cultural enquiry that emerged in the 1980s and 1990s, devoted to the investigation of relations between literature and the natural world and to the rediscovery and reinterpretation of 'nature writings' . . . in the light of recent ecological concerns" (*The Oxford References*: Web). Both Brontë and Lawrence being very empathetic towards nature, some critics look at their works from ecological points of view. To give a few examples, Ivonne Defant, in "Inhabiting Nature in Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*" in 2017, claims that Emily had a pantheistic view of nature (38), and that focussing on "the relation between Emily's bodily and spiritual immersion in nature . . . can shed light on the environmental issue of ecopsychology" (38). Anne Odenbring Ehlert, in *"There's A Bad Time Coming": Ecological Vision in the Fiction of D. H. Lawrence* in 2001, examins Lawrence's fictions to "highlight a philosophical attitude towards life and the environment which calls to mind the key elements of today's ecological thinking" (181).

In this way, nature plays essential roles in the works both of Brontë and Lawrence. They use similar methods of mixing the images of nature with humans, and foreground the contrast between nature and artificiality / civilisation. Emily's strong empathy with nature is reflected in the ways critics use the images of wild nature to describe *Wuthering Heights*, and Lawrence's in the ways critics see him identified with nature. The employment of ecocriticism to argue their works also reflects the essentiality of nature in their works.

Prophecy

Another sign of the romantic heritage in Brontë and Lawrence is their "prophetic" aspect. In the Romantic Movement, poets were considered privileged, as they had special talent for spontaneous creations endowed by God. According to *The Norton Anthology of English Literature II*, Blake, Coleridge in his early poems, Shelley, and Wordsworth assumed "the persona and voice of a poet-prophet, modelled on Milton and the prophets in the Bible", and put themselves forward "as a spokesman for traditional Western civilization at a time of profound crisis" (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature II,* 7).

In *Aspects of the Novel* (1927), E. M. Forster called Brontë and Lawrence a prophetess and a prophet. He considers that prophecy means employing shocking methods to convey messages: when the poet's theme is the universe, he sings, instead of says anything about the theme, and "the strangeness of song arising in the halls of fiction is bound to give us a shock" (129). Forster claims that *Wuthering Heights* is prophetic because it is filled with sound, such as storm and rushing wind, and because the sound is more important than words and thoughts (148). He considers that Brontë deliberately introduced chaotic situations in the story, "[b]ecause in our sense of the word she was a prophetess" (148). On the other hand, Forster calls Lawrence "the only prophetic novelist writing today . . . the only living novelist in whom the song predominates, who has the rapt bardic quality and whom it is idle to criticize" (146). He claims that Lawrence's greatness lies in his aesthetic. "The prophet is irradiating nature from within, so that every colour has a glow and every form a distinctness which could not otherwise be obtained" (147). This is, according to Forster, a power of re-creation and evocation others cannot possess. Thus, Lawrence is

a prophet in the way he can shock readers with his aesthetic beauty when he presents nature with its very essence.

Considering the fact that the Romantic "poet-prophets" wrote poems to speak out while Forster discussed Brontë and Lawrence's prophetic character of shocking their readers, the term "prophet" in these situations are not exactly the same. However, the Romantic poets' strong confidence in themselves and their daring methods of setting themselves up as prophets, are in common with Brontë and Lawrence's deliberate choices of shockingly unconventional styles and their firm belief in themselves.

(2) The Keywords from Early Reviews

Next, the following section looks at shared keywords among early reviewers who wrote about Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence. The early reviews are chosen mainly because they were written when the authors' reputations were still in the process of being established. The articles therefore tend to express the reviewers' fresh impressions.

Four groups of keywords appear repeatedly in the targeted articles: "passion / emotion / intensity", "imagination / creativity", "poetry / lyricism" and "truthfulness / realism". Even though there surely are other keywords as well, these keywords form the essential characteristics of their works.

"Passions / Emotions / Intensity"

The meanings of "passion", "emotion", and "intensity" overlap. In *The Oxford English Dictionary*, the definition of "passion" includes "overpowering emotion", and the same dictionary explains "intensity" as having "an ardent feeling",

that is very close to “being passionate”.

These keywords appear frequently in the articles on Emily Brontë. The reviews on *Wuthering Heights*, as early as in 1848 in *Britannia*, used “passion” four times to emphasise the novel’s violent emotions (“its passions”, “passionate ferocity”, “strong passion”, “unchecked passion”). Émile Montégut in 1857 claimed that the characters and scenes in *Wuthering Heights* threaten us with “ferocious passions and criminal impulses” (Allott, 74), and that “[h]er energetic firmness of style indicates a spirit which is familiar with such terrible emotions and make sport with fear” (Allott, 76). Peter Bayne in 1857 referred to the novel’s insane level of “emotions”, by expressing that, “[t]he emotions and the crimes are on the scale of madness” (Allott, 76). These reviews convey the magnitude of shock the novel’s extremely violent and fearful passion / emotion gave to the reviewers. Such powerful “passions / emotions” lead to another characteristic of the novel; “intensity”. T. Wemyss Reid in 1877 wrote that “*Wuthering Heights* is yet stamped by . . .the same intense individuality” with *Jane Eyre* (Allott, 84), and Angus M. Mackay describes the imagination in *Wuthering Height* as “its power, its intensity, its absolute originality” (Allott, 94).

Lawrence’s contemporary reviewers and critics also used “passions”, “emotions”, and “intensity” to describe his works. For example, Henry Savage in *The Academy* on 18 March 1911 calls *The White Peacock* “a really masterly study of passion” (Draper, 43), with “passionate men” being led to making “passionate love” to the heroine. Talking about *The Trespasser*, *The Morning Post* on 17 June 1912 wrote “[i]t is a wonderfully sustained, though a somewhat too unreserved, description of

emotion at high pressure" (Draper, 48). *The Standard* on 30 May 1913 wrote on *Sons and Lovers*, "[n]o other English novelist of our time has so great a power to translate passion into words" (Draper, 58). These reviews signal that Lawrence impressed plural reviewers with these characteristics from the early stage of his career.

Reviewers continued to detect the same qualities in his later works. Catherine Carswell in *The Glasgow Herald* on 4 November 1915 wrote on *The Rainbow*, "[t]his is a book so very rich both in emotional beauty and in the distilled essence of profoundly passionate and individual thinking about human life, that one longs to lavish on it one's whole-hearted praise" (Draper, 100). Edward Garnett, in "Art and the Moralists: Mr. D. H. Lawrence's Work" in *The Dial* on 16 November 1916 called Lawrence "the poet-psychologist of instincts, emotions, and moods" (Draper, 114), and described *Love Poems, and Others* and *Amores*, "as a burning lamp, passion" (Draper, 115). He also called *The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd* "a drama intensely human in its passionate veracity" (Draper, 118), and *The Prussian Officer* "the triumph of passion thrilling both flesh and spirit" (Draper, 118). Thus reviewers referred to "passions", "emotions", and "intensity" when they discussed Lawrence's works.

In fact, both Brontë and Lawrence used the term "passion" and its derivatives frequently in their works. In *Wuthering Heights,* "passion", "passionate", and "passionately" appear thirty-one times. As for the works by Lawrence, *The White Peacock* uses these terms thirty-six times, *Sons and Lovers* (including the title for Chapter XII) fifty-nine times, *Women in Love* eighty-eight times, and *The Rainbow* uses them more than a hundred times. "Emotion" and "intensity" appear less in their

works, but, as mentioned above, their meanings overlap with "passion". These figures suggest that both Brontë and Lawrence were intentionally writing stories of "passion".

In this way, "passions", "emotions", and "intensity" were the features early reviewers and critics recognised as main characteristics of both Brontë and Lawrence. It is also interesting to remember that Lawrence connected Emily Brontë with "passion" in his "Introduction to *The Mother* by Grazia Deledda", and with "intensity" in "Blessed Are the Powerful". In the "Introduction to *The Mother*", Lawrence describes the feeling of the heroine, Agnes, as "sheer female instinctive passion, something as in Emily Brontë" (*Phoenix*, 265), implying Brontë's having "sheer female instinctive passion". In "Blessed Are the Powerful", he argues the importance of living "to live", claiming that "life is not mere length of days" (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 322), and compares Emily Brontë with Queen Victoria by saying "[p]oor old Queen Victoria had length of days. But Emily Brontë had life. She died of it" (*Reflections of the Death of a Porcupine*, 322). This quotation indicates his belief that Brontë's life was condensed and intense. Lawrence was thus seeing, in Brontë, "passion" and "intensity", which were also the characteristics of his own life and personality.

"Imaginations / creativity"

"Imaginations" is another shared keyword which connects Lawrence with Brontë. When *Wuthering Heights* was first published, many critics called the novel "strange". *Douglas Jerrold's Weekly Newspaper* on 15 January 1848 wrote "*Wuthering Heights* is a strange sort of book . . . ." (Allott, 43), *The Atlas* on 22 January 1848 wrote "*Wuthering Heights* is a

strange inartistic story" (Allott, 43), and even Charlotte Brontë in the Preface to the 1850 edition wrote "*Wuthering Heights* must appear a rude and strange production" (Allott, 60) to those who knew nothing about the author or the locality of the scenes. Such "strangeness", or, in another term, "uniqueness" reveals unconventionality of Emily Brontë's creation. *Britannia* on 15 January 1848 recognised Brontë's creativity in that, "He [Ellis Bell] displays considerable power in his creation" (Allott, 41), and called Brontë "an imaginative writer" (Allott, 42). W. C. Roscoe in 1857 considered that all the Brontës had "strong imaginations" (Allott, 70), and claimed that "the whole story [of *Wuthering Heights*] embodies a wonderful effort of imagination" (Allott, 72). *The North American Review* in October 1857, noted that in *Wuthering Heights*, "[t]he power of creation is as great as it is grotesque" (Allott, 76). These reviewers saw, in Brontë's unorthodox work, signs of vivid imagination and creativity.

Lawrence's power of imagination was pointed out by plural contemporary reviewers as well. Interestingly, just like Emily Brontë, Lawrence's works puzzled his contemporary reviewers. For example, *The Time Literary Supplement* on 26 January 1911 called *The White Peacock* "this rather odd book" (Draper, 33), and *The Saturday Review* (21 June 1913) asked its readers about *Sons and Lovers*, "[w]hen were there written novels so strange as these of Mr. Lawrence?" The reviewers' puzzlement on the "strangeness" of his works, like of Emily Brontë's, proves his unconventional "uniqueness". To look at some reviewers' use of the term "imagination / creativity" in their arguments on him, Garnett in *The Dial* on 16 November 1916 praised *The Prussian Officer*'s "intensity of the poet-psychologist's imagination" (11 January 1922. Draper, 118), and Francis Hackett in *The New*

Republic saw in *Sea and Sardinia* "one of the most hungry and inflammable and rebellious of imagination" (Draper, 173-4). *The Time Literary Supplement* wrote on *The Captain's Doll*, that "[t]he whole book, indeed, is steeped in imagination. The very things which give titles to the stories make, each of them, an image. And the tension in the story, through which beat the mystery and pulse of life, is relieved and made beautiful by this imaginativeness" (22 March 1923. Draper, 192). Alan Reynolds Thompson in *The Bookman* on July 1931 concluded that Lawrence was by nature "imaginative" as well as passionate and sensitive (Draper, 358). Arnold Bennett, in *The Evening Standard* wrote that "[Lawrence's] creative work cannot be outmoded. The creations of first-class emotional power never are" (10 April 1930. Draper, 342).

The contemporary reviewers of both Brontë and Lawrence thus noticed the powerful imagination and creativity in their works. Since the Romantic tradition encouraged imaginative spontaneity and visionary originality, Brontë and Lawrence's controversially original imagination must be, in part, due to their Romantic heritage.

"Poetry / Lyricism"

Considering the fact that both Brontë and Lawrence were poets as well as novelists, it is natural that their prose works have characteristics of lyricism. In the UK, the Romantic Movement was most influential in the genre of poetry and many major Romantic figures were poets. Therefore, the influence of the British Romanticism on Brontë and Lawrence must have been largely through poetry, even though they were both well acquainted with the European literature as well. Their prose

works are heavily influenced by their poetic sensitivities.

Many early reviewers mentioned Brontë's being poetic. For example, Dobell, in *The Palladium* on September 1850 called the scene in which ghost Catherine I appears in Lockwood's nightmare but refuses to appear for Heathcliff, "the masterpiece of a poet, rather than the hybrid creation of the novelist" (Allott, 58). Later, *The Galaxy XV* (1873) cited the same scene, where Heathcliff desperately begged ghost Catherine I to enter from the window, and claimed that the intensity of the passion resembled Heine's poems on the tragedy of a human life. John Skelton, in his review in 1857, called *Wuthering Heights* "[t]his richness and affluence of poetic life in which Emily invests the creations of her brain" (Allott, 69-70) and saw "a refrain of fierce poetry" (Allott, 69) in its characters. Montégut (1857) analysed *Wuthering Heights* as "the poetic effect gains peculiar power from the fact that the author never shows herself behind her character" (Allott, 74). Angus M. Mackay commented in *The Westminster Review* in 1898 that "Emily Brontë's rank as a poet is to be measured, not by her verse, but by her single romance" (Allott, 94). These reviewers, in general, agreed on the poetic characteristics of *Wuthering Heights*.

Reviewers often called Lawrence's works "poetic" or "lyrical" as well. *The Time Literary Supplement* on 26 January 1911 wrote on *The White Peacock*, that Cyril Beardsall, the narrator of the novel, "appears to have poetic thoughts" (Draper, 33). Monkhouse in *The Manchester Guardian* on 8 February 1911 claimed that "[Lawrence's] strongest impulse seems to be lyrical" (Draper, 34). Lawrence's lyricism was regarded both as weakness and strength by reviewers. *The Standard* on 30 May 1913 gave a negative opinion on his lyricism in *Sons and Lovers*, by claiming

that "[Lawrence's] weakness is that he is too often the lyrical poet making his creatures speak his thoughts, and this is a bad fault for a novelist" (Draper, 58). In contrast, Lascelles Abercrombie in *The Manchester Guardian* considered that being a poet is Lawrence's strength, by arguing as follows:

> . . . it seems incredible that *Sons and Lovers* can be anything but a dull success of cleverness. So, perhaps, it would be, if Mr. Lawrence were simply a novelist. But he is a poet, one of the most remarkable poets of the day . . . . Indeed, you do not realize how astonishingly interesting the whole book is until you find yourself protesting that this thing or that thing bores you, and eagerly reading on in spite of your protestations. (2 July 1913. Draper, 68)

Richard Aldington, Lawrence's life-long friend, wrote in *The Saturday Review of Literature* on 1 May 1926, that Lawrence had an "essentially poetical way of seeing and feeling" (Draper, 273) and that "(t)hat poetic mind is startlingly present in his novels" (Draper, 273). John Macy, writing about *Women in Love* in *The New York Evening Post Literary Review* on 19 March 1921, called Lawrence "a lyric as well as a tragic poet" (Draper, 159) and counted him as one of those "poets, who happen also to be novelists" (Draper, 159). The comment about Lawrence's being 'a poet writing novels' overlaps some reviewers' comments on Brontë.

These reviews suggest that Brontë and Lawrence were both essentially poets, with their novels heavily influenced by the poetic language and imagination.

"Realism / Truism"

The last keyword is "realism / truism". Literary works need to include realism, at least to some extent, to make their contents convincing. Especially in the case of the novels which contain supernatural elements, such as *Wuthering Heights*, realism is crucial. The modern critic, Lyn Pykett, explains that *Wuthering Heights* is a combination of Romanticism and the Victorian Domestic Realism (Pykett, 73). Many of Lawrence's major works, on the other hand, do not involve supernatural elements, even though he wrote some which do, such as "The Rocking Horse Winner" (1926), "The Last Laugh" (1924), and "The Fox" (1922). His writing style is essentially based on the realism, which was the tradition of the British Literature built by authors such as Jane Austen, George Eliot and Thomas Hardy.

Among early reviewers, striking realism of *Wuthering Heights* is recognised as soon as it was published. *The Spectator* on 18 December 1847 wrote that "the delineation is forcible and truthful" (Allott, 39). *The Athenaeum* on 25 December 1847 also called the novel "truth to life in the remote nooks and corners of England" (Allott, 39). G. H. Lewes, in *The Leader* on 28 December 1850 described the world of *Wuthering Heights* as "sombre, rude, brutal, yet true" (Allott, 64). Charlotte explained the accuracy of Emily's observation of the local people, by saying in the Preface to the 1850 edition, "she knew [the people round]: knew their ways, their language, their family histories; she could hear of them with interest, and talk of them with details, minute, graphic, and accurate" (Allott, 61). Even the reviewer of *The Eclectic Review* in February 1851 who considered the characters of the tale "devoid of truthfulness" and "are not in harmony with

the actual world" (Allott, 67), praised the "vividness and graphic power in her sketches" (Allott, 66). In this way, despite the difference of opinions, the depictions in *Wuthering Heights* were highly evaluated as realistic.

The realism in Lawrence's works impressed his contemporary reviewers as well. Henry Savage, in *The Academy* on 18 March 1911 wrote on *The White Peacock*, that "[i]t is apparent to us that Mr. D. H. Lawrence is one of those rare writers who intends only to tell the truth as he sees it, and nothing but the truth" (Draper, 43), and *The Standard* on 1 October 1915 wrote on *The Rainbow* that "Mr. Lawrence is a realist to the point of brutality" even though he is not "bound by wearisome note-books, nor does he offer a smattering of science as an explanation of life" (Draper, 89). Charles Marriott in *The Manchester Guardian* on 29 January 1926 called the characters and their surroundings in *The Plumed Serpent* "extraordinarily real" (Draper, 264). Just like Brontë, even the reviewers who felt his works rather "unreal" admitted that the characterisation, action, and language were truthful. For example, *The Morning Post* on 9 February 1911 described *The White Peacock* as "the characterization is, generally speaking, deft and lifelike" (Draper, 37), even though the reviewer considered some quality created "a rather unreal atmosphere" (Draper, 37). Robert Lynd, in *The Daily News* on 5 October 1915, wrote on *The Rainbow* that "[t]here are truthful, physiologically truthful, things in the book, but the book itself is not true, either in its representation or in its propaganda" (Draper, 91). Edward Shanks in *The London Mercury* in October 1922 wrote "[c]haracters, action, and language had a real reality in the author's mind and were capable of becoming real in all minds capable of understanding

his" (Draper, 181) but that "[i]t is by no means a slice of life in the old sense, for it is not at all what used to be described as realism. Mr. Lawrence is not and never has been a realist" (Draper, 181). Thus, some critics pointed out unreal aspects in atmosphere, representation, or propaganda, yet reviewers, in general, admitted that Lawrence's creations, especially characterizations, are truthful.

3. Critiques Which Connect D. H. Lawrence and Brontë

Considering numerous research papers and books on Emily Brontë and on Lawrence, the number of articles which link between them is relatively small. However, plural critics noted and maintained the connections of these two writers.

(1) Lawrence as Brontë's Successor

Some critics located Lawrence as a successor of the Brontës. For example, Raymond Williams, in *The English Novel: From Dickens to Lawrence*, points out that *Wuthering Heights* "belongs in an English tradition with Blake and Lawrence and very specifically with Hardy" (63-4). Harold Bloom in *The Brontës*, also calls Lawrence and Thomas Hardy "the heirs of the Brontës" (1). Sandra Gilbert, in *Approaches to Teaching the Works of D. H. Lawrence*, contests that the ferociously intense texts of *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* are indebted to "quasi-Gothic products of the female imagination like *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights*" (44) and calls Rupert Birkin in *Women in Love* "twentieth-century Heathcliff" (44). Daniel Schneider, in *D. H. Lawrence: The Artist as Psychologist*, considers that Lawrence's plot structures resembles Emily Brontë's in that he frequently uses a contrast of opposite lines of action: that is, Lawrence

often presents paired characters, one of whom dies while the other thrives (87).

Other critics such as Anne Smith and Michael Black also refer to the similarities between Emily Brontë and Lawrence. Anne Smith in *The Art of Emily Brontë*, argues that "the problem of language which Emily Brontë had to face in writing of the love of Heathcliff and Catherine I: the problem of expressing a great tragic passion in nineteenth century prose" (Smith, 15) was not tackled by any other novelists for a long time, until Lawrence started trying to find a prose language for passion. She also calls Hardy and Lawrence as Emily's "great successors" (Smith, 94), and considers Emily's insistence on the sacredness of selfhood as "almost Lawrentian" (Smith, 127). Michael Black, in *Lawrence's England: The Major Fiction 1913-20*, relates Lawrence with Emily Brontë plural times. For example, Black compared the story of the Brangwens in *The Rainbow* with the Earnshaws in *Wuthering Heights*, as they are both deeply-rooted farmers, "independent landowners living a traditional life, content in their world, cut off from the wider one" (Black, 55). They also bear "the same relationship to reality—and to myth" (Black, 69) by looking back to an ancestral age. Analysing Lawrence's story, "Hadrian", Black claims that Lawrence "has added a reworking of the *Wuthering Heights* legend" (Black, 166), as the story of Old Earnshaw and Heathcliff overlaps with that of Ted Rockley and Hadrian.

(2) Carol Siegel

The following part introduces the arguments by Carol Siegel, who devoted considerable pages to demonstrate the connections between Emily Brontë and Lawrence.

As mentioned in the introduction, both in *Lawrence among the Women: Wavering Boundaries in Women's Literary Traditions* in 1991, and "Border Disturbances: D. H. Lawrence's Fiction and the Feminism of *Wuthering Heights*" in 1994, Siegel analyses how and why Lawrence became under the influence of Emily Brontë. In the former, arguing nineteenth-century female writers' influence on Lawrence, she wrote that "he was . . . above all responding to *Wuthering Heights*" (55), and that "Lawrence rarely mentioned *Wuthering Heights* directly, but his few recorded comments on the book reveal both his admiration for Brontë and his view of her as the medium of purely female discourse" (55). Then Siegel refers to his "Introduction to Grazia Deledda's *The Mother*" as a proof that Lawrence regarded Brontë as "sheer female instinctive passion", to "Blessed Are the Powerful" as an essay in which he gave Brontë the highest praise by writing "Emily Brontë had life. She died of it" (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 322), and to *John Thomas and Lady Jane* as a story in which he equates Clifford Chatterley's lack of interest in *Wuthering Heights* with his emptiness and failure as a man. She demonstrates the similarities between *Wuthering Heights* and *The White Peacock*, and calls the latter "the reconstruction of the major themes" (56) of the former. Siegel also mentions that "Lawrence's later works abundantly show Brontë's influence on him" (59).

In the latter article, Siegel focusses on the connections between Emily Brontë and Lawrence on the issue of intertexual gender. She argues that even though both Brontë and Lawrence draw a clear line between male and female, the difference does not follow the conventional fictional representations of gender. The male characters such as Heathcliff in *Wuthering Heights*,

Annable in *The White Peacock*, Cicio in *The Lost Girl*, and Don Cipriano in *The Plumed Serpent* function "as expression of the wild half of woman" (64). These male characters, therefore, represent a displaced aspect of the heroines. Siegel contends that Emily Brontë "values woman's natural passions above all else, and disdains everything . . . that interferes with the expression of those passions" (73), and this is where she and Lawrence meet in agreement. However, she also argues that Lawrence claimed the necessity of men to interpret female passion for women, and this confrontation blurs the border.

(3) *Wuthering Heights* and *The White Peacock*

As discussed above, the influence of *Wuthering Heights* on Lawrence has been pointed out by plural critics from various viewpoints. Especially, a number of critics, including Siegel, mention striking similarities between *Wuthering Heights* and *The White Peacock*.

To give some more examples, Keith Sagar, in *The Art of D. H. Lawrence*, compares Lettie with Catherine Earnshaw in "[l]ike Catherine Earnshaw, [Lettie] chooses wealth, security, adoration, a life of elegance and frivolity, thus betraying her 'true' lover and her own heart" (10). Michael Black, in *D. H. Lawrence: The Early Fiction* also argues that "[m]ore strikingly, the strong rustic pair at the farm (George, Emily) against an overbred pair from a cultivated drawing room (Lettie and Cyril) may remind the reader of *Wuthering Heights*—Lettie's wilfulness and charm and her disastrous choice are very like Catherine Earnshaw's" (47). John Worthen, talking about the existing fragmentary plot outline for chapters XIV-XX, claims that "Lettie's delusions, hallucinations and attempts to express her

wounded feelings dominate the surviving fragment, which is reminiscent of Emily Brontë and Hardy rather than of George Eliot" (139). Lastly, F. B. Pinion also shares the same argument in *A D. H. Lawrence Companion*;

> Like Catherine Earnshaw in *Wuthering Heights,* she [Lettie] plays a taunting role to her bucolic lover and, like Catherine's, her ambition 'led her to adopt a double character without exactly intending to deceive anyone'. Her marriage to Leslie and repudiation of an instinctive bond with George are the cause of his moral collapse and decline, which form a more normal analogue to Heathcliff's developing madness. (128)

These arguments all support the striking similarities between *The White Peacock* and *Wuthering Heights*, in its plot and characters.

****

This chapter demonstrated the connections of Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence using their reviews, critiques and biographies. The first section, "The Receptions of Early Reviewers and Critics" pointed out that they both shocked contemporary reviewers by rebelling against the conventions of the time and, in consequence, faced negative criticism. The second section, "The Shared Keywords", demonstrated the overlap of specific terms which appear repeatedly in the reviews and critics on them. The first half focussed on the terms centring on Romanticism to prove that Romanticism is one of the key elements connecting them. The latter half focussed on early

reviewers' "fresh" impressions on the authors and their works and pointed out four groups of shared keywords; "passion / emotion / intensity", "imagination / creativity", "poetry / lyricism" and "truthfulness / realism". The last section, "Connecting Lawrence to Emily Brontë", looked at the reviewers and critics who argued Brontë's influence over Lawrence. As a whole, the past reviews and critiques on them thus reveal that Emily Brontë and Lawrence had many shared elements in their literary taste and that their works give similar impressions to their readers.

Chapter 2
Gender and Feminism

1. Masculine Brontë and Feminine Lawrence

Emily Brontë and Lawrence have many differences as well, and are quite contrastive in some ways. While Brontë was a woman who had, or desired, very few friends outside the family circle, Lawrence was a man with more sociable personality, always surrounded by a number of friends as well as his family members. The literary styles they chose are, in some aspects, opposite from each other. While Brontë's personal voice is totally hidden behind the narrating characters in *Wuthering Heights*, Lawrence almost always makes his own voice heard through his narrators and characters. Meticulously calculated symmetry of the family trees and layers of the narratives in *Wuthering Heights* make a striking contrast with the loose structures of Lawrence's narratives. Another notable contrast is that Brontë was rather masculine, while Lawrence rather feminine. This section focusses on the two writers' androgynous aspect.

(1) Emily Brontë: A Masculine Woman

Gaskell writes that Emily at home "took the principal part of the cooking upon herself, and did all the household ironing", and that after the family's long-term servant, Tabby, grew old, Emily "made all the bread for the family" (Gaskell, 105). These descriptions might give us an impression that she was conventionally feminine, selflessly devoting herself to the domestic chores for the family. However, biographies reveal that she also had exceptionally masculine characters. Brian Wilks, in *The Brontës*, lists the unconventional and rather

masculine characteristics of Emily Brontë in her daily life: she practiced shooting a rifle with her father, whistled to call her dogs, and fearlessly walked into the Black Bull, a local pub, to bring back her brother, Branwell (138). Charlotte called Emily "the Major" (Barker, 327), teasing her tenacious defence of Ellen Nussey, a friend of Charlotte's, from the attentions of their father's assistant, William Weightman. Gaskell noted that "the fierce, wild, intractability of [animal's] nature was what often recommended it to Emily" (199), and provided two episodes which convey Emily's fearless nature. Once, when a strange dog, probably with rabies, bit her, she went straight into the kitchen with "her noble stern presence of mind" (Gaskell, 200), took up a red-hot iron, and sear the bitten place by herself. Another episode is about her pet bull-dog, Keeper. One day, Keeper disobeyed her direction and lied on the best bed. Emily, realising that, dragged him downstairs, and then,

> she let him go, planted in a dark corner at the bottom of the stairs; no time was there to fetch stick or rod, for fear of the strangling clutch at her throat—her bear clenched fist struck against his red fierce eyes, before he had time to make his spring, and, in the language of the turf, she 'punished him' till his eyes were swelled up . . . . (Gaskell, 200-201)

These episodes prove Emily Brontë's brave, daring, and masculine aspects in her daily behaviours.

There are other episodes as well, which signal Emily's uncommon aspects as a woman in her days. For example, Emily took charge of "the sisters' financial affairs, and invested their

legacies in shares in the York and Midland Railway Company" (Pykett, 10). This means that she could handle finances unlike many women of the day. Constantin Heger, Emily's tutor in Brussel, praised that her "head for logic, and a capacity of argument" are "unusual in a man and rare indeed in a woman" (Barker, 392). He said;

> [Emily] should have been a man—a great navigator. Her powerful reason would have deduced new sphere of discovery from the knowledge of the old; and her strong imperious will would never have been daunted by opposition or difficulty; never have given way but with life." (Barker, 192)

These episodes indicate that Emily was capable and willing to both handle financial matters and argue logically like a man, with her male teacher.

The masculine feature of her writing is another point of argument. When *Wuthering Heights* was published under the pseudonym, reviewers believed that it was a man's work, until the author's real sex was revealed. *Britannia* on 15 January 1848 calls the author "Mr Bell" (Allott, 41), and other reviews such as *Douglas Jerrold's Weekly Newspaper* on 15 January, 1848 and *The Atlas* on 22 January 1848, used "he" to indicate the author.

Then, after the death of Branwell Brontë in 1848, the debate over the authorship of *Wuthering Heights* broke out, as some of his friends claimed that its real author was Branwell. In *Pictures of the Past*, Francis Grundy wrote that "Patrick [Branwell] Brontë declared to me, and what his sister said bore out the assertion, that he wrote a great portion of *Wuthering*

Heights himself." (80), and claimed as follows:

> Indeed, it is impossible for me to read that story without meeting with many passages which I feel certain must have come from his pen. The weird fancies of diseased genius with which he used to entertain me in our long talks at Luddendenfoot, reappear in the pages of the novel, and I am inclined to believe that the very plot was his invention rather than his sister's. (80)

William Dearden, who was acquainted with Branwell, wrote in *The Halifax Guardian* in June 1867 that Branwell entered a friendly poetic contest, but, by mistake, brought an incomplete manuscript of a novel instead, and read it aloud to his friends (Leyland, Vol 2, 186-9). Dearden claimed that "[t]he scene of the fragment which Branwell read, and the characters introduced in it . . . were the same as those in 'Wuthering Heights'" (Leyland, 188). Another friend of his, Edward Sloane, "declared to Mr. Dearden that Branwell had read to him, portion by portion, the novel as it was produced, at the time, insomuch that he no sooner began the perusal of 'Wuthering Heights', when published, than he was able to anticipate the characters and incidents to be disclosed" (Leyland, 188).

In general, the Brontë scholars consider Emily to be the real author of *Wuthering Heights*. However, even in recent years, some critics contend that Branwell might have had some part in its creation. Flintoff, in "Branwell at the Heights: an Investigation into the Possible Influence of Branwell Brontë on *Wuthering Heights*" (1994), pointed out the accuracy of the local

dialects in *Wuthering Heights* and Branwell's voluminous knowledge on and mastery of writing down dialects by the mid-1830s. Flintoff proposed that Branwell must have helped Emily, at least in the use of the local dialects in *Wuthering Heights*.

One reason this debate still goes on, lies in the novel's masculine style and content. Leyland argued about *Wuthering Heights* that "[i]t never crossed the minds of the critics in those times [the time of its publication] that the book could be by any but a man of strong personal character, and one with a wide experience of the dark side of human nature" (181), and that "from time to time, when the book was discussed, much astonishment was manifested that a simple and inexperienced girl, like Emily Brontë, had been able to draw, with such nervous and morbid analysis, so sombre a picture of the workings of passions which she could never have actually known, and of natures 'so relentless and implacable, of spirits so lost and fallen' as those of Heathcliff and Hindley Earnshaw" (182-3). In this way, whatever the truth might be, along with several testimonies provided by Branwell's friends, the incongruity between the masculine atmosphere of the novel and its female author deepened the mystery of its authorship. Masculine elements in Emily's writings were pointed out by Charlotte as well, who wrote about Emily's poems that they were "not at all like the poetry women generally [wrote]" (Pykett, 74).

Emily Brontë thus left biographical episodes and literary works which suggest that her behaviours, logical thinking, financial handling, and literary creations were all unconventionally masculine.

(2) D. H. Lawrence: A Feminine Man

Lawrence was rather feminine in some aspects, even though he certainly had a masculine side too. He was a delicate child in the coal mining village of Eastwood where strong masculinity was expected for working-class men. His weak constitution and sensitive personality made it difficult for him to conduct masculine physical labours, and led him, instead, to take up what was traditionally considered "feminine roles" such as performing housework. In this way, he came to share some daily experiences with women. The following sentence in his letter to Frieda conveys how strikingly fragile he appeared to others and how he used to be treated "with care" by his male friends. Lawrence wrote to her, on 9 May 1912, how a man in the hotel he stayed in Trier, Germany, tried to look after him, saying "[h]e would do what my men friends always want to do, look after me a bit in the trifling, physical matters" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*, 396). Smith points out that "[w]hat is not so often noticed is the evidence that his physical weakness as a child caused him to be cast in a feminine rôle, by himself perhaps as much as by others" (10).

Smith further quotes Lawrence's sister Ada's comment that he "preferred the company of girls", Mabel Collishaw's memory of Lawrence helping her make bread, and Ada's comment about "how naturally he slipped into the feminine rôle . . . and . . . how he identified with his mother", making potato cakes in his mother's blue apron (11). In letters to his friends, Lawrence revealed that he enjoyed housework. For example, in a letter to Arthur McLeod on 17 January, 1913, he wrote, "I got the blues thinking of the future, so I left off and made some marmalade. It's amazing how it cheers one up to shred oranges or scrub the floor" (*The Selected Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, 55). As Smith

points out, scrubbing floors can be a man's task, but not making marmalade (12). In another letter to Mary Canaan on 12 December, 1920, he wrote "Did I tell you we've got such a good *oven* in our kitchen. Being Sunday, roast beef, baked potatoes, spinach, apple pie. Also I made heavenly chocolate cakes and dropped them . . . also exquisite rock cakes, and forgot to put the FAT in!!" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence III*, original emphases. 637). Middleton Murry and Hilda Brown Cotrell, respectively, reported that Lawrence trimmed a hat for his wife, Frieda, and that he designed and sewed an evening dress for his sister (Smith, 12). Barbara Weekley Barr, Frieda's daughter, wrote that "[Lawrence] did not have the ordinary man's domineering dependence on his womenfolk, but could mend, cook, and find his own possessions" (Smith, 13). Such remarks of his own and those by his family and friends, all prove that he was more feminine than the norm of the patriarchal men who were unwilling to take up domestic work that women were expected to do, and who demanded that women should do all housework for them.

Lawrence's creation also reveals his feminine side. Anaïs Nin, in *D. H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study,* calls Lawrence's writing "androgynous". Nin writes that "[t]he intuitional quality in Lawrence resulted in a curious power in his writing which might be described as androgynous" (57). She further suggests that Lawrence "had a complete realization of the feelings of women", and that "very often he wrote *as a woman* would write" (57, original emphasis), referring to the fact that one critic mistook the author of *The White Peacock* as female: a reviewer in *The Morning Post* on 9 February 1911 wrote that "[i]t is a book that piques one's curiosity in many ways. To begin with,

what is the sex of 'D. H. Lawrence'? The clever analysis of the wayward Lettie, surely a woman's woman, and the particular way in which physical charm is praised almost convince us that it is the work of a woman" (Draper, 36).

In this way, Lawrence had a feminine side both in his life and works. His weak constitution placed him closer to women's position and experiences than other men of his time, and, at least to some extent, he seems to have been happy taking up what was traditionally considered the "female role". His writings also had characteristics of those by women, so much so that a reviewer mistook him for a woman.

Thus Brontë and Lawrence were, in many ways, contrastive, not only in their sexes, sociability, and ways they plot and construct stories, but also in their genders. Considering the fact that Brontë was masculine and Lawrence feminine, we might also consider them "similar" in their androgyny. They were both outsiders, as neither of them met the social expectations of their gender roles. Combined with other aspects in common, such as their rebellious attitudes towards the conventions, strong belief in themselves, and attachment to nature, it seems natural that Lawrence, who read *Wuthering Heights* and Gaskell's *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*, realised that he shared crucial life experiences and values on life with Emily Brontë and felt strong interest in her person and work. In his letter to Blanche Jennings, he declared that *Shirley* and *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Brontë were "two of [his] favourite English books" (4 November 1908, *Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*, 88). His choice of *Shirley* as one of his favourite English books might have been because he knew that one of its heroines, Shirley, was modelled after Emily

Brontë.

2. Feminists' Views on Emily Brontë and Lawrence

Despite so many shared characteristics between Brontë and Lawrence which we saw above, feminists tend to see them as opposite, as they consider Emily Brontë a rebellious spirit against the patriarchy, and Lawrence as a misogynistic male supremacist. Such contrastive images lead us to see them "different" rather than "similar". To demonstrate the contrast, this section first looks at the feminists' positive receptions of Emily Brontë, and then the negative attitude to Lawrence by Kate Millett, a feminist who started ferocious attacks on him in the context of feminism.

(1) Brontë and Feminism

According to *The Concise Oxford Companion to English Literature* (197), feminist criticism was established in the late 1960's and 1970s, with Ellen Moers's *Literary Women* and Elaine Showalter's *A Literature of Their Own*. One of their main goals was to present women writers' attempt to "question their own culturally determined concepts of women" and "place women writers in a female literary tradition" (*Lawrence among the Women*, 3). Both Moers and Showalter placed Emily Brontë as a part of a literary women's tradition, the former pointing out Brontë's breaking away from the familiar "Victorian clichés about women being by nature (and women writers, therefore, being by right) gentle, pious, conservative, domestic, loving, and serene" (Moers, 100), and the latter referring to *Wuthering Heights*'s use of dialects as an example of unconventional language in women's literature which Victorian readers rebuked

as "coarse" (Showalter, 25). Showalter also argued that *Wuthering Heights* gave influence on *The Story of an African Farm,* written in 1883 by a South African feminist novelist, Olive Schreiner. In this way, early feminists considered that *Wuthering Heights* accorded with and promoted feminism.

(2) Some Feminist Literary Scholars' Arguments on *Wuthering Heights*

Let us further look at the arguments on Emily Brontë by major feminist literary scholars. Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar first published *The Mad Woman in the Attic* in 1979, in which they argue that "women were not only writing, they were conceiving fictional worlds in which patriarchal images and conventions were severely, radically revised", and mention Emily Brontë as an example of such female writers. They contest that Emily Brontë, along with Mary Shelley and George Eliot, "covertly reappraise[s] and repudiate[s] the misogyny implicit in Milton's mythology by misreading and revising Milton's story of woman's fall" (80). According to them, Brontë reversed the patriarchal order of Heaven and Hell by interpreting Catherine I's fall from Christian Heaven to the middle of the moors as from "hell" to "heaven". In other words, Brontë made "a tough, radically political commitment to the belief that the state of being patriarchal Christianity called 'hell' is eternally, energetically delightful, whereas the state called 'heaven' is rigidly hierarchical, Urizenic, and 'kind' as a poison tree" (255). In this way, Gilbert and Gubar present Emily Brontë as a rebellious feminist writer trying to overthrow the patriarchal Western society through the act of writing.

Pykette published *Emily Brontë* in 1989 as a part of

"Women Writers Series" in which she connects *Wuthering Heights* with "Female Gothic" that represents and investigates "women's fears about the private domestic space which is at once refuge and prison" (76-7). According to Pykett, women novelists in those days were accepted and given authority only within the feminine sphere, only when female experiences and sensibility such as courtship and domestic life become central to literary works, and when they deal with marginal and non-political contents. Therefore women writers had choices of accepting and writing within this cultural domain, or refusing to do so by escaping, transcending, or rebelling against it (Pykett, 82). Pykett claims that all these strategies are used or acknowledged in *Wuthering Heights* (82). Catherine II's civilising Hareton in the domestic romance of the second generation, is a reversed version of a male character educating an "ignorant" female character, which was common in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century fictions. With Heathcliff's final decline, "Hareton's patrimony is returned to him via the female line" (Pykett, 84), and their marriage is based on balanced powers.

Thus, Gilbert and Gubar, and Pykett both agree that *Wuthering Heights* rebels against patriarchy and tries to increase female power. There are other feminist critics such as Stevie Davies in *Emily Brontë: The Artist as a Free Woman* (1983), who claims that the novel is "a female vision of genesis, expulsion and rebirth" (Pykett, 132), and Carol Senf, who, in *Essays in Literature* 12, 1985, calls *Wuthering Heights* "Emily Brontë's version of Feminist History" (Pykett, 133). Emily Brontë and *Wuthering Heights* have been thus evaluated positively by feminists as rebellious against the patriarchal system.

(3) D. H. Lawrence and Feminism

On the other hand, critics have often accused Lawrence of being a misogynist. Especially, Kate Millett, who, in her influential book, *Sexual Politics* (1970), fiercely attacked Lawrence as a male supremacist, and damaged his public image and reputation. Under such attacks, he became, at least to some women, an abhorred sexist. Anne Smith, in "A New Adam and a New Eve—Lawrence and Women: A Biographical Overview", explains how controversial and unpopular Lawrence became again with the rise of feminist criticism in the 1970s, after the notoriety of the Lady Chatterley trials around 1960.

> It is not so long ago that hidebound old ladies were carrying copies of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* out of bookshops with tongs, to burn it on the pavement, and now liberated young women are all but doing the same. (7)

However, this section argues that Millett's presentation of Lawrence as a male supremacist was inaccurate. Lawrence was much more sympathetic to women than many other men of his time.

Kate Millett's *Sexual Politics* and Some Critical Responses

Sexual Politics was based on the 1969 doctoral dissertation that Millett submitted to Columbia University. The book was published in 1970 and it became a huge success in both the academic and non-academic worlds. Indeed, Millett's obituary, published in *The Guardian* on 7 September 2017, introduced her

as the "author of the ground-breaking bestseller *Sexual Politics*". Another obituary on Smithonian.com, noted that "*Sexual Politics* sold 80,000 copies in its first year alone". *The New York Times* on 6 September 1979 called *Sexual Politics* "the Bible of Women's Liberation", and Millett's portrait was featured on the 31 August 1970 cover of *Time* magazine.

However, at the same time, Millett's arguments faced multiple disagreements. For example, Camille Paglia, herself a feminist, criticised Millett's attacks on male writers, claiming that her critiques had harmed American intellectual society. In *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Paglia declared that Millett was responsible for "the current eclipse of D. H. Lawrence, Earnest Hemingway, and Henry Miller in the college curriculum" and that she did "enormous damage to American cultural life" (25 July 1997. B4). As Paglia indicates, Millett's attack on Lawrence greatly damaged his public image. This can be seen in the previously noted example of liberated young women burning copies of his works.

The flaw of Millett's argument on Lawrence lies in her focussing only on his masculinist side, which was not Lawrence as a whole but only a part of him. In fact, as we have seen above, he had a feminine side as well, which helped him understand and empathise with women in both his work and daily life. Lawrence was a very complicated and contradictory individual. In her memoirs of her husband, *Not I, But the Wind . . .* (1935), Frieda Lawrence details his quick changes of mood and thought. On one occasion, she said "But Lawrence, last week you said exactly the opposite of what you are saying now", and his reply was "And why shouldn't I? Last week I felt like that, now like this. Why shouldn't I?" (40-1). Lawrence allowed himself to change his

mind based on his feeling and did not care much about inconsistency. Anaïs Nin, in *D. H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*, explained that "Lawrence has no system, unless his constant shifting of values can be called a system: a *system of mobility*." (Nin, original emphasis, 14). In "Eros and Metaphor: Sexual Relationship in the Fiction of Lawrence" (1978), Mark Kinkead-Weekes emphasised the importance of considering Lawrence's work as one continuous flow:

> [B]ecause Lawrence is so uniquely exploratory a writer, concerned with the development, flux, and change of relationship, one can only see him truly by seeing his art as a continual process of discovery, not only within each novel, but from novel to novel. One cannot generalize about "Lawrence's treatment of sexual relationship" at any stage, without both superficiality and distortion. One has to try to account intensively for moments, and simultaneously for the fact that they are momentary, partial arresting of a flowing exploration, always moving beyond. (102)

Kinkead-Weekes also argued that, for Lawrence, "sex is a way of talking about something else, so that Eros becomes Metaphor. Sexual activity and consciousness become the vehicle for exploring wider and wider relationships, within people, between them, throughout society, and the connection of man to the universe" (102). Millett, however, examined Lawrence and his male characters exclusively from the viewpoint of chauvinism, and this limited and distorted her understanding of his work and

personality.

Harry T. Moore argued against Millett in "Bert Lawrence and Lady Jane" (1978), pointing out her misunderstandings and misinterpretations. He explains that Lawrence lived at a time when male chauvinism was dominant, and, unlike the majority of his male contemporaries, Lawrence was often aware of chauvinism and fought against it. Moore also mentions Lawrence's bitter experiences with powerful and domineering women, especially his mother, whose influence was psychologically damaging. He then argues against Millett's interpretation of Ursula in *The Rainbow* as a dangerous "new woman". Millett used the scene in *The Rainbow* in which Ursula destroys Anton Skrebensky, to claim that Lawrence disliked revolutionary new women. However, Moore contends that Ursula is an idealized young woman with whom Lawrence identifies, as he reflects himself in her through their shared teaching experience. In response to Millett's argument that Lottie in *Aaron's Rod* is cruelly abandoned by her husband, Moore argues that "on the three occasions when she is present, she is portrayed as a bully and a scold" (182). Moore further claims that Millett's interpretation of Somers in *Kangaroo* as a homosexual and a fascist is definitely wrong, since "Somer's (sic) interest in Kangaroo and his personality does not in any way seem sexual, and his rejection of fascism, as well as socialism, is clear" (183).

To demonstrate Lawrence's domineering inclination, Millett quoted an episode that Frieda included in a 1951 letter to Middleton Murry. In the letter, Frieda states that Lawrence put his hands on her throat, pressed her against the wall, and insisted that he was the master. However, Moore contends that

Millett did not include, in her argument, what happened after this event. According to the letter, after this, Frieda said "Is that all? You can be master as much as you like, I don't care", and Lawrence's hands dropped away (Moore, 187). Therefore this does not represent Lawrence's forcing patriarchal roles onto his helpless wife, as Millett would have us believe, but shows a fight between a husband and wife who were equally aggressive. Moore cites another episode in which Frieda bumped her head against a shutter and was astonished to see Lawrence in "an agony of sympathy and tenderness" while nobody else seemed to care (187). Moore concludes that Lawrence, who was socially, physically, and psychologically handicapped, tried to be "right" in his relationship with women, even though sometimes he was "wrong" (188).

Lawrence's Attitudes to Women

As seen in the previous section, Lawrence's willingness for housework, which was traditionally performed by women, brought him emotionally closer to women than many other men of his day. His physical weakness also limited his outdoor activities, and confined him indoors with women. In this way, his life experience was rather close to those of women in the sense that he tried to cover for his lack of masculinity by actively engaging in the traditionally female role of performing housework, and that his health obliged him to be dependent on others. The situation Lawrence was in appears to have helped him see the problems women faced and empathise with them. In a letter to Sallie Hopkin, for example, Lawrence expresses his sympathy for women, by writing "I shall do a novel about Love Triumphant one day. I shall do my work for women, better than

the suffrage" (23 December 1912, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*, 490). Here, he was willing to help women through his literary works. Carol Siegel in *Lawrence among the Women*, citing this letter, suggests that "Lawrence's goal could perhaps best be described as helping women articulate their deepest emotions" (12).

As early as in 1915, Lawrence's attitudes towards women were quite modern. In his letters to Bertrand Russell, he described the role of women in an ideal society which he hoped to build with Russell. On 12 February 1915, he wrote about women's wages and social care: "Every woman shall have her wage to the day of her death, whether she work or not, so long as she works when she is fit—keeps her house or rears her children" *(The Letters of D. H. Lawrence II*, 286). The comment illustrates Lawrence's ingrained belief that women's roles involved keeping a house and rearing children. However, considering that it was written in 1915 when the patriarchal system was de facto, and women were expected to do housework for nothing as a matter of course, his ideas radically sympathise with women's situations. He also wrote on 16 July 1915 about women's roles in the government: "There must be women governing equally with men, especially all the inner half of life . . . . The women's share must be equal with the men's" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence II*, 365). On 26 July 1915, he continued: " . . . as the men elect and govern the industrial side of life, so the women must elect and govern the domestic side. And there must be a rising rank of women governors, as of men, culminating in a woman Director, of equal authority with the supreme Man" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence II,* 371). Again, Lawrence's plans to assign women to the domestic sphere reveal

the gender bias of the time. However, his propositions—that women should have the authority to govern the society and be treated equally with men in respect of earnings, promotions, and social standing—seem to align with what twentieth-century feminists tried to achieve.

The recent discovery of an unpublished article by Lawrence supports Moore's argument that Lawrence was, or tried to be "right" in his relationship with women. On 11 April 2013, *The Guardian* reported finding an article written by Lawrence, in which he responded to a short article by "JHR" in *Adelphi* in April 1924. In the article entitled "The Ugliness of Women", JHR argued that "in every woman born there is a seed of terrible, unmentionable evil: evil such as man—a simple creature for all his passions and lusts—could never dream of in the most horrible of nightmares, could never conceive in imagination" (11 April 2013, *The Guardian*). JHR challenges the readers to explain why the most beautiful woman appeared ugly and repellent to him at certain moments. Lawrence replied to this, by saying, "the hideousness he [JHR] sees is the reflection of himself, and of the automatic meat-lust with which he approaches another individual" (11 April 2013, *The Guardian*) and that "[e]ven the most 'beautiful' woman is still a human creature. If he [JHR] approached her as such, as a being instead of as a piece of lurid meat, he would have no horrors afterwards" (11 April 2013, *The Guardian*). As Andrew Harrison—while commenting on Lawrence's newly-found article—points out, Lawrence presented a very modern attitude towards women, which, again, accords with the feminist ideology of opposing female objectification and commodification.

Related to this point, Siegel argues that Lawrence was

eager to integrate female opinions and ideas into his works. She maintains that Lawrence was heavily influenced by Victorian female predecessors such as George Eliot, Charlotte and Emily Brontë, and Olive Schreiner. He identified himself with these female writers, experienced their female views and emotions through their works, and adopted the experience into his own works. Reflecting on his approach to writing, Lawrence once said to Jessie Chambers that "[t]he usual plan is to take two couples and develop their relationships . . . . Most of George Eliot's are on that plan. . . . I shall try two couples for a start" (Chambers, 103). He also asked his female friends to read his works and give some feedback. He asked Chambers to read *The White Peacock* and *Sons and Lovers* multiple times, and Frieda began reading for him from the last version of *Sons and Lovers* and onward. According to Siegel, both Chambers and Frieda seem to have contributed to *The Rainbow* (*Lawrence among the Women*, 15). It should also be noted that Lawrence collaborated with female writers. He worked on *The Trespasser* with Helen Corke and *The Boy in the Bush* with Mollie Skinner. The fact that he had many female friends seems to prove that, despite Millett's claim, at least he was not an extreme male supremacist who hated and despised women. Gilbert points out that H. D., a feminist female writer and Lawrence's contemporary, regarded Lawrence as one of her initiators and that her work, *Bid Me to Live* was a tribute to him (Gilbert, xiii). Katherine Mansfield wrote that Lawrence was "the only writer living whom I really profoundly care for" (Gilbert, xiii). Gilbert argues that, as a working-class artist in late-Victorian England, Lawrence was "a radical outsider and a rebel" (Gilbert, xiv), and, consequently, he was "in many ways politically radical and egalitarian" (Gilbert, xvi).

In this way, Lawrence had plural reasons to feel close to women. His physical weakness led him to stay with women for a long time, and he voluntarily took up the domestic works which were regarded as women's job. The letters and article quoted above, all demonstrate his compassion to women. He was influenced by female writers and tried to reflect female voices in his works, by asking for feedback from his wife and female friends, or writing with women. Plural female feminist writers declared that Lawrence was especially influential on them. This proves that these talented feminist writers found Lawrence fundamentally 'right', or at least 'not wrong', in relation with women, despite his occasional use of masculinist voice.

Millett's Arguments

Millett called Lawrence the evangelist of "phallic consciousness" for whom "the transformation of masculine ascendancy into a mystical religion, international, possibly institutionalized" was essential (238). However, this image does not accord with the personality of Lawrence who was willing to cook, clean and sew with and for women, who did not have overbearing attitudes towards women, and who wrote letters that demonstrated his consideration for the conditions of women's lives. Considering this, Millett's argument about Lawrence's desire for "the perfect subjection of women" (241) seems incongruent:

> An admirably astute politician, Lawrence saw in this [sexual revolution] two possibilities: it could grant women an autonomy and independence he feared and hated, or it could be manipulated to create a new

> order of dependence and subordination, another form of compliant to masculine direction and prerogative. The frigid woman of the Victorian period was withholding assent, the "new woman," could, if correctly dominated, be mastered in bed as everywhere else. (Millett, 241)

It is inaccurate to say that he hated women or that he did not want them to be autonomous and independent. In his letters to Russell, he proposed the creation of systems to promote female independence. Even if he had some fears about it, his sentiments must have been mixed with sympathy.

According to Millett, Lawrence believed that "the world will only be put right when the male reassumes his mastery over the female in that total psychological and sensual domination which alone can offer her the 'fulfilment' of her nature" (Millett, 242). However, Lawrence depicts many of his heroines as energetic, assertive, independent, and strong. Female characters, like the Brangwen sisters or Connie Chatterley, give readers the impression that Lawrence prefers assertive women to submissive ones like Miriam Leivers in *Sons and Lovers*. Ursula refuses to marry Skrebensky at the end of *The Rainbow*, and the Brangwen sisters struggle for independence in *Women in Love*, by acquiring professions, boldly speaking up, and acting on what they feel or think is right. This implies that these characters have self-confidence and independent spirits. Though Connie in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is often considered rather passive in relations with Mellors, she is also a strong-willed woman who refuses to obey her husband and decides to leave behind her socially privileged status in order to live the life she believes in,

that is, to be with Mellors. This is a rebellious act in the patriarchal society, since Mellors, without power, status, or financial security, is a social outsider. In *Kangaroo*, Somers's wife, Harriet, is another assertive character. She frequently quarrels with Somers, trying to make their relationship reflect her will. Siegel remarks upon the strong personalities of Lawrence's female characters, saying "Lawrence consistently depicts the natural female state as furious rebellion. For Lawrence the female voice must always undercut rather than affirm the male author's message" (16) and that "[t]he experiences of Lawrence's female characters cannot be understood in reference to traditional visions of woman as man's subordinate or victim" (18).

In his personal life, Lawrence fell in love with Frieda Weekley, his future wife, who had a very strong and assertive personality. Once, when annoyed by his comment that women had no souls and couldn't love, Frieda had broken a plate over Lawrence's head (Smith, 31). Lawrence and Frieda seem to have fought frequently, and Lawrence considered it an important way to revitalise their relationship. On 11 October 1916, he wrote to Murry saying:

> Frieda and I have finished the long and bloody fight at last, and are at one. It is a fight one has to fight—the old Adam to be killed in me, the old Eve in her—then a new Adam and a new Eve. Till the fight is finished, it is very honourable to fight. But, oh dear, it is very horrible and agonising. *(The Letters of D. H. Lawrence II*, 662)

This letter reveals that Lawrence did not fight with Frieda in order to control her, but to destroy their relationship in order to rebuild it, like a phoenix reborn from its own ashes. In her memoirs, *Not I, But the Wind . . . .* , Frieda referred to their fights from her perspective. She wrote "[t]here was the ordinary man-and-woman fight between us, to keep the balance, not to trespass, not to topple over. The balance in a human relationship was one of Lawrence's chief themes" (vi). This verifies her belief that Lawrence did not fight with her to either subjugate or control her. It should also be noted that many of Lawrence's female friends were independent-minded feminists. For example, Blanche Jennings, one of Lawrence's most frequent correspondents in his young days, was an active feminist. Other friends such as Jessie Chambers, Louie Burrows, Alice Dax, and Helen Corke were also all "connected with the suffragette movement" (Smith, 18). Smith explains that his mother was a "strong woman", and that his relationships with his friends and his mother "inevitably shade into that of the 'masculine' woman" (18). His preference of "masculine" women might have contributed to his special interest in Emily Brontë as well, who had, as discussed above, rather masculine characteristics.

In this way, both in fiction and in real life, Lawrence liked self-assertive and independent women. His heroines do not submit to men. They often refuse men's suggestions and fight against male wills to live the way they want. This liberated image of women seems incongruous with Millett's argument that "Lawrence considered that total psychological and sensual domination alone can give female the 'fulfilment' of her nature" (242). If Lawrence believed in such nature in women, he would have preferred using heroines who are completely dominated by

men, to demonstrate how women should be. Such "total domination" does not apply to his relationship with his wife in his personal life either. Both Lawrence and Frieda understood that their fights were not for Lawrence to dominate his wife, but to readjust the balance in their relationship.

Millett also tends to treat Lawrence's male characters' words and deeds as if they were the author's own. She blames Lawrence for what his male characters do or say. For example, she regards the character of Mellors as Lawrence's ideal self, saying that he is "the very personification of phallic divinity"[1] (242). Millett considers Paul Morrel to be an "idealized self-portraiture" (250) of Lawrence, Rupert Birkin to be "Lawrence himself" (262), and Aaron Sisson and Rawdon Lilly as the "two versions of Lawrence himself" (269). She maintains that Richard Lovat Somers "is so transparently David Herbert Lawrence" (280), and Ramon and Cipriano "are Lawrentian men and mouthpiece" (284). She analyses these characters saying, "Mellors and other Lawrentian heroes incessantly exert their wills over women and the lesser men it is their mission to rule. It is unthinkable to Lawrence that males should ever cease to be domineering individualists" (244). It is true that the Lawrentian heroes try to take over some control over their lovers, but so too do many Lawrentian heroines. These characters struggle trying to find a middle point. The process of building up a balanced relationship through struggles is one of Lawrence's main interests, as Frieda rightly observed.

Millett further blames Lawrence for what his male characters do to women. For example, Millett examines the scene in *Sons and Lovers* in which Paul teaches Miriam, and argues that "The scenes of his condescension are some of the most

remarkable instances of sexual sadism disguised as masculine pedagogy which literature affords until Ionesco's memorable *Lesson*" (253). She does not blame Paul for his aggressive behaviours towards Miriam: she blames Lawrence for creating such a "sadistic" scene. This is made obvious by her reference to Ionesco, and his novel, *Lesson*, in parallel with Lawrence and his novel. She treats Ionesco and Lawrence as the same kind of authors who wrote "sadistic" novels, and directs the readers' focus on the writers themselves, instead of their characters.

Millett also critiques Lawrence for the scene in which Aaron leaves his wife and children in *Aaron's Rod*. She explains:

> Lawrence's picture of her [Lottie] has that surprising disdain and malice that is typical of his treatment of women from the class he escaped. When Aaron decides that to stay in the cramped and sordid world of the poor would only mean to drown, he cheerfully leaves Lottie and his little girls to sink or swim . . . . Aaron is never ashamed to admit that he first beat his wife, then experimented with being systematically unfaithful, and finally resorted to utterly ignoring her presence. Lottie is said to deserve all this because of her detestable 'female will' (274).

Here, again, Millett blames Lawrence for the way Lottie was treated. She criticises Lawrence's portrayal of Lotti for its "surprising disdain and malice", and she also criticises Lawrence for Aaron's treatment of Lottie. She claims that Lawrence believes that "Lottie . . . deserve[s] all this because of her detestable 'female will'". Though Lawrence often incorporated

biographical elements into his works and spoke through his characters, they are, ultimately, fictional characters. It is misguided to treat all their words and deeds as if they were exactly what Lawrence would say or do.

Lawrence's Desire to Control Women

In some of Lawrence's comments, it is possible to detect signs of chauvinism. They seem to reveal his annoyance with women or his desire to control them. For example, on 5 December 1918, he wrote to Katherine Mansfield:

> I do think a woman must yield some sort of precedence to a man, and he must take his precedence. I do think men must go ahead absolutely in front of their women, without turning round to ask for permission or approval from their women. Consequently the women must follow as it were unquestioningly. I can't help it, I believe this. Frieda doesn't. Hence our fight. (*The Selected Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, 163)

This quotation sounds like a typical male supremacist comment. However, the phrase, "without turning round to ask for permission or approval from their women", alludes to the fact that, in reality, he has to ask his woman for permission or approval. Though he might wish to have more control over his woman, in reality, she is strong enough to refuse his control. They are on an equal footing in their struggles over power and control.

In *Kangaroo*, the male protagonist's fretting over some control over his wife is well depicted in the chapter titled

"Harriet and Lovat at Sea in Marriage". In this chapter, Lawrence presents Somers as comically pathetic, a man who tries and fails to take control over his wife. By laughing at this male character's inability to become the master of his wife, Lawrence seems to caricature the male desire to dominate and control his woman. In this chapter, Somers says to Harriet, "I will be lord and master, but ah, such a wonderful lord and master that it will be your bliss to belong to me" (192), but she only reveals her annoyance by saying "You! . . . You a lord and master! Why, don't you know that I love you as no man ever was loved? You a lord and master! Ph! you look it! Let me tell you I love you far, far more than ever you ought to be loved, and you should acknowledge it" (192). Somers tries to show her a new flag, which he has been sewing himself, as a symbol of his new status as a master, but Harriet won't even look at it. Somers's chauvinistic desire to control his wife is contrasted with his incongruous willingness to tackle what was traditionally considered the "feminine work" of sewing. The incongruity makes him comical: a feminine man facing his masculine wife and trying, in vain, to gain control over her. He uses timid expression to address his wife: "I would rather . . . that you deferred your loving of me for a while, and considered the new proposition" (*Kangaroo*, 192), which contradicts his impudent proposition in "We shall never sail any straight course at all, until you realise that I am lord and master, and you my blissful consort" (192).

The odd combination of his timidity and impudence can also be seen when Somers compares himself to Roman Gods and simultaneously admits to Harriet that he is not as great as they are: "Supposing, now, you had the real Hermes for a husband, Trismegistus. Would you not hold your tongue for fear you lost

him, and change from being a lover, and be a worshipper? Well, I am not Hermes or Dionysus, but I am a little nearer to it than you allow" (192). Harriet laughs at his proposition and mockingly calls him "Mr Dionysus and Mr Hermes and Mr Thinks-himself-grand" (192-3). She then declares, "I've got one thing to tell you. Without *me* you'd be nowhere, you'd be nothing, you'd not be *that*" (original emphases, 193) and snaps her fingers under his nose. This episode is not about male supremacy. It is about the struggle between a man and a woman for dominance, in which the latter holds a superior position over the former. This passage does not represent the author's desire for male supremacy. Rather, it shows his humorous view of the power struggle between a sensitive man and a strong and assertive woman.

In "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover" (1929), Lawrence discusses that the good old England of Defoe and Fielding is gone, and blames Jane Austen for starting such a change, as he calls her "this old maid".

> This, again, is a tragedy of social life today. In the old England, the curious blood-connection held the classes together. The squires might be arrogant, violent, bullying and unjust, yet in some ways they were *at one* with the people, part of the same blood-stream. We feel it in Defoe or Fielding. And then, in the mean Jane Austen, it is gone. Already this old maid typifies 'personality' instead of character, the sharp knowing in apartness instead of knowing in togetherness, and she is, to my feeling, thoroughly unpleasant, English in the bad, mean, snobbish sense

> of the word, just as Fielding is English in the good, generous sense. ("A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover", original emphasis, 333)

Calling a woman an "old maid" is surely derogatory. However, contrary to the abusive expression, his attitude towards Austen before the publication of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in June 1928, had been consistently positive. For example, in a letter on 29 June 1914 to Catherine Jackson who aimed to be a writer, he wrote, "You must be willing to put much real work, hard work into this, and you'll have a genuine creative piece of work. It's like Jane Austen at a deeper level" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence II,* 188). The letter shows that Lawrence considered Austen's work "a genuine creative piece of work".

The essays, "John Galsworthy" and "Introduction to *The Mother* by Grazia Deledda", published in March and May 1928, respectively, further indicate Lawrence's admiration for Austen's skills as a writer. In the former, he argued that Galsworthy's characters, the Forsytes, cannot be considered human beings, and wrote:

> Why can't we admit them [the Forsytes] as human beings? Why can't we have them in the same category as Sairey Gamp for example, who is satirically conceived, or of Jane Austen's people, who are social enough? We can accept Mrs. Gamp or Jane Austen's characters or even George Meredith's Egoist as human beings in the same category as ourselves. (*Phoenix*, 540)

In this quotation, Lawrence acknowledges Austen's skill of depicting fictional characters as real human beings. In the latter essay, Lawrence shows admiration for Austen as a novelist, by saying, "we respond . . . quite vividly to the emotions of Jane Austen or Dickens, nearer a hundred years ago" (*Phoenix*, 263). This indicates his understanding that Austen's fictional world is great enough to transcend time. These quotations prove that Lawrence highly evaluated Austen's skills as a writer.

What, then, changed Lawrence's attitude to Austen after the publication of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*? In order to understand this point, we must look at the situation he was placed under when he wrote "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover" in 1929. When *Lady Chatterley's Lover* was published in Florence late in June 1928, many reviewers attacked the novel for being obscene. The reviewer in *The Sunday Chronicle* on 13 October 1928 criticised the novel as "one of the most filthy and abominable ever written . . . an outrage on decency" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VI,* 13), and another in *John Bull* on 20 October 1928, ridiculed Lawrence for being a writer who had become obsessed with sex and ruined his career (Draper, 278). Many copies were refused by booksellers to handle, or confiscated by authorities in England and America. In his letter to Laurence Pollinger, he wrote "I hear that a miserable firm of booksellers in London have refused their 36 copies ordered" (30 July 1928. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VI*, 482), and in another letter to Aldous and Maria Huxley, he wrote "the booksellers have hastily written to say we must take back their copies at once, they couldn't handle the *Lady*, and I must cancel their orders, and will we remove the offence at once. That is in all 114 copies we have to fetch back. Of course, these children of God haven't paid"

(31 July 1928. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VI*, 484). Calling the booksellers "these children of God", Lawrence bitterly satirised these booksellers' decisions to maintain their middle-class Christian respectability by rejecting his book.

In the same letter, Lawrence revealed the seriousness of the situation by writing, "there are rumours that the police are going to raid the shops" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VI*, 484), and then continued "I suppose people hope they will", implying his sense of isolation. He confessed to the Huxleys that he had lost most of his friends because of this trouble, and expressed irritation by writing, "But, oh, your friends, Lorenzo! By their reactions shall you know them!" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VI*, 484). His anger was against those who avoided him so as not to be involved in the troubles themselves. Another letter by Lawrence to Mabel Dodge Luhan, said that "police were reported to have a warrant to search for [*Lady Chatterley's Lover*]" (9 August 1928, *The Selected Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, 402). According to Frieda in her letter to Richard Aldington, "Lawrence was lying on his bed, looking furiouser and furiouser every minute" (31 July 1928, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VI*, 485). Due to this effective banning of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, the novel was widely pirated, which further infuriated Lawrence. In a letter to Laurence Pollinger, Lawrence wrote, "I hear there is another edition (pirated) of *Lady C.* about to appear in Philadelphia, illustrated this time. My hat! What will it be like" (20 July 1929, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VII*, 381-2).

Another blow for Lawrence was the confiscation of his paintings by the police. The exhibition of his paintings started in London from 15 June 1929. He was too frail to go in person, so Frieda went to London to attend the exhibition while he

stayed in Italy. On 5 July, the police came to the gallery and confiscated 13 paintings, claiming that they were too obscene to be exhibited. Lawrence, having heard the news, angrily wrote to Edward Huelin, that "Yes, they've got 13 of my pictures in gaol, and want to burn them—don't suppose they'll dare—dirty hypocrisy" (15 July 1929. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VII*, 373), and later to Early Achsah and Harwood Brewster that "I suppose you heard my picture show was raided in London—after over 12,000 people had been to it—and the police seized 13 pictures as being obscene—which pictures now lie in gaol under threat of being *burnt*. England my England! Did ever you know such hypocrisy? That *Accident in a Mine* which I did in Gsteig seized for obscene—it is too crassly stupid. But now the police hate me—for *Pansies* too . . . ." (10 July 1929. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VII*, original emphasis, 379).

In these ways, Lawrence and his works were repeatedly rejected and humiliated by British and American intellectual societies. Lawrence associated these troubles with the dominant middle-class bourgeois values. He was angry with the hypocrisy of the bourgeois tendency to ignore the physical side of human beings, especially sexuality, in order to maintain a semblance of respectability. He regarded Jane Austen's world as representative of such middle-class values, which would not allow sexuality to be discussed frankly, and which labelled his works obscene. In the statement quoted above from "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover", Lawrence compares Defoe and Fielding to Austen. The main difference he discusses is whether they are "at one with the people" or not. Even though he criticises the old England of Defoe and Fielding to some extent, such as the existence of arrogant squires, he still considers the period

positively, looking in favour what he describes as "the curious blood-connection held the classes together". On the other hand, he blames the more recent England that Austen represents, for upholding class divisions, which he characterises as Austen's "sharp knowing in apartness instead of knowing in togetherness". Lawrence further calls her "thoroughly unpleasant, English in the bad, mean, snobbish sense of the word" in contrast with Fielding, whom he describes as "English in the good, generous sense". For Lawrence, the contrast between "snobbish" and "generous" is connected to the contrast between "separateness" and "oneness". Therefore, "snobbishness" here is understood as a belief in narrow-minded middle-class values to the exclusion and denigration of the values espoused by other classes.

After the publication of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Lawrence was thus persecuted by the police and severely frustrated by the middle-class values which had been brought to bear on his novel. He felt that the bourgeois were unfairly hostile to him and his works. Calling Austen "this old maid" was a way to vent his rage against hypocritical bourgeois respectability. Given that Austen also satirised bourgeois hypocrisy, Lawrence's insult is arguably unfair as well as inaccurate. At the same time, however, labelling Lawrence a chauvinist based on this comment seems equally unfair to him, especially because he was personally both considerate of and sympathetic to women overall.

The Oxford English Dictionary (the Second Edition) defines "chauvinism" as "excessive loyalty to or belief in the superiority of one's own kind of cause, and prejudice against others", and "supremacist" as "[o]ne who believes in the supremacy of one of the races or of either of the sexes or of any other social group". The key to deciding whether Lawrence was a chauvinist or male

supremacist lies, therefore, in understanding whether he considered men to be superior to women, and whether he was prejudiced against women. His general attitudes towards women, discussed above, cast doubt on this possibility. Lawrence was close to women, had many female friends, and was willing to take up the role of a woman himself by performing housework with and for women. His willingness to help women was not limited to housework, but extended to the realm of politics. He promised Sallie Hopkin that he would do his part to work for the improvement of women's life, and even proposed Russell to build a society together in which women could have financial independence, stable incomes, and social positions of authority and responsibility equal to men. He valued female views and actively accommodated them in his works by asking women for feedbacks, and by collaborating with women writers. Carol Siegel argues that his works, as well as his biographies, prove that he was greatly influenced by female writers. These prove that Lawrence considered women to be intelligent, and that he valued and paid respect to both their literary and political capabilities. Therefore, in a strict sense, Lawrence should not be labelled "a chauvinist" or "a male supremacist".

Lawrence as a Feminist

Some critics regard Lawrence as "a feminist". For example, in *Reading D. H. Lawrence's Feminism*, Chiseki Asahi claims that Lawrence's feminism is based on the idea that both men and women have their soul's greatest impulse at the core of their masculinity or femininity. The former is represented by a phallus and the latter by a womb, and they function as general symbols of man and woman. Asahi argues that Lawrence's feminist view

of woman is based on his belief that a woman's independence can be achieved by the exertion of power from the very core of her femininity, and that she could use it to influence society. Carol Siegel also considers Lawrence close to a feminist, by arguing that he contributed to the development of female literature. In *Lawrence among the Women*, she claims that "there seems to be something about the feminism study of women's literature that brings us back again and again to Lawrence" (1), and contends that he inherited and participated in the formative processes of women's literature (1). She further suggests that "recognition of Lawrence's connections to women's literary traditions can increase our understanding of the development and continuance of these traditions" (2). Sandra Gilbert considers his works "like a quasi-feminist" and, in *Acts of Attention: The Poems of D. H. Lawrence*, confesses that "[o]ne of the questions that has stopped and often stumped me over the last ten years has to do with D. H. Lawrence, and it usually goes more or less like this: *How do you reconcile your work as a feminist critic with your admiration for the art of D. H. Lawrence? In other words, how can you be a feminist and a Lawrentian*? (ix, original italics)". Gilbert considers some of Lawrence's writings to be misogynist, including poems such as "Figs" and "Purple Anemones", but she also claims that "[e]ven at his most overtly masculinist, I sensed that Lawrence did not quite fit into what I'd now call the 'patriarchal modes' in which I had been educated" (xii). She explains that Lawrence did not have "grandiose and authoritative authorial intentions" (xii). According to Gilbert, Lawrence has two sides: a sermonizing one that excoriated the women who won't submit to him, and one with "wonderful, desirable life-rapidity" (xii) to which he himself submitted. The

latter charmed many female readers, including feminist writers such as H. D., Katherine Mansfield, and Anais Nin. Other female writers such as Amy Lowell and Catherine Carswell, and a female patron of the arts, Mabel Dodge Luhan, are also known to have been his supporters. This dual nature seems to explain the contradiction that some feminists consider Lawrence to be a male supremacist and others view him as a quasi-feminist.

Nin and Gilbert both argue that, in his works, Lawrence equally depicted male and female thoughts and emotions. Nin remarks on the "truthfulness" of Lawrence's writing: "In all the descriptions of conflict the man and the woman's response is equally stated. He is absolutely conscious of the twofold currents, in even measures" (59). Gilbert remarks that Lawrence has "an uncanny ability to transcribe with unusual clarity energies and emotions at the edge of consciousness" and that "[e]ven his agonistic participation in . . . a 'war of words' with women, then, paradoxically reveals his awareness of gender issues in a society still struggling to marginalize such matters" (xviii-xix). Gilbert interprets Lawrence's battle against women as a battle against their fixed will "which would subordinate flesh and blood to an idealized authority" (xix), and argues that Lawrence severely criticised men for the same reason. Their arguments lead us to understand that Lawrence presented the emotions and feelings of both men and women, paying attention to the marginalised position of women. Therefore, looking only at the way that Lawrence writes about masculine emotions, as Millett did, results in an inaccurate interpretation of him as a male supremacist. In contrast, analysing his writings about female emotions leads to an interpretation of Lawrence as a feminist / quasi-feminist.

****

This chapter focussed on Brontë and Lawrence in relation with gender. “Masculine Brontë and Feminine Lawrence” argued the two writers’ androgynous characteristics and their swerve from traditional gender roles, which irregularity made them both outsiders of the society. “Feminists’ Views on Emily Brontë and Lawrence”, on the other hand, presented the contrastive ways the feminism treated Brontë and Lawrence: the former as a female artist rebellious against patriarchy, and the latter as a male supremacist. Then, the section argued against Kate Millett’s influential attack on Lawrence in *Sexual Politics*, to establish that such contrastive images between Brontë and Lawrence, created by the feminists, are not exactly accurate, considering frequently-detected female influence on Lawrence and Lawrence’s empathy with women.

Chapter 3

Love of Nature and Fear of Death

This chapter demonstrates the shared love of nature between D. H. Lawrence and Emily Brontë in their works, letters, and biographies, and proposes that the shared love led Lawrence to have an affinity with Brontë. It further argues that their love of nature emerged from similar life experiences of constantly living under the threat of death as both instinctively felt that nature helped them overcome their anxiety. Scientific research is referenced to prove the revitalising power of nature and its positive influence on the mental health, the possibility of losing a loved one in childhood leading to fear of death, and nature's mitigating power over such fear. By revealing that Brontë and Lawrence's fear of death led them to turn to nature to escape that fear and by pointing out that Lawrence was aware of their similarities from reading *Wuthering Heights* and *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*, this chapter contends that such crucial parallels drew Lawrence's attention to Brontë.

1. Identifying Biographical Connection between Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence

Lawrence read *Wuthering Heights* when he was young. In *D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record,* Jessie Chambers recollects the young Lawrence forbidding her from reading *Wuthering Heights* in the following words:

> A book that Lawrence absolutely forbade me to read was *Wuthering Heights*. "You mustn't read it," he said in his excited way. And when I asked why not, he said;

> "You mustn't, that's all. It might upset you". (Chambers, 102)

His expression "(i)t might upset you" suggests that, by the time the conversation occurred, Lawrence was likely familiar with the content of *Wuthering Heights*. Chambers also reports that Lawrence declared her similar to Emily Brontë; "You *are* like her, you are intense and introspective like she was" (Nehls, 63 original emphasis). This implies that Lawrence was aware of Emily's biographical history, most likely from reading Elizabeth Gaskell's *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*. His letter to Louie Burrows on 12 January 1909 mentions the biography:

> What do you propose to do with your nights, Louise? Read [*The*] *Life of Charlotte Brontë* and weep? --Let it bide a bit, don't let bitterness for poor Carlotta blind your eyes to the young merits of your flock. (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*, 105)

By the time Lawrence wrote this letter, he knew that Charlotte's life was tragic enough to make Burrows want to weep, which strongly suggests that he had read *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* himself. If so, the images of Emily that he had must have been heavily influenced by Gaskell. As mentioned in the introduction, Lawrence made no comments on Emily's poems. Therefore this paper uses *Wuthering Heights* and *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* as Lawrence's main sources of information on Emily Brontë's life and person.

2. Shared Love of Nature between Emily Brontë and D. H.

Lawrence

Having read Brontë's novel and biography, Lawrence must have found in her inclinations similar to his own. The most prominent feature was their attachment to nature. "Nature" here includes two features: the uncontrolled innate nature of a human and the nature of the outside world.

(1) Belief in One's Innate Nature

First, let us look at how both Brontë and Lawrence valued their innate nature, that is, spontaneous emotions and feelings.

Emily Brontë, according to Gaskell, valued her own feelings and opinions most highly, and believed that she should never be forced to do or think in a certain way by others. Gaskell writes that "Emily was impervious to influence; she never came in contact with public opinion, and her own decision of what was right and fitting was a law for her conduct and appearance, with which she allowed no one to interfere" (Gaskell, 122). Her preference regarding dressing, for example, represented her indifference to others' opinions. She liked and persisted in wearing outmoded dresses with gigot sleeves, and her petticoats were also out-of-date with no curve or wave.

Emily's preference for a reclusive life, which Gaskell depicts, also implies her wish to avoid others' interventions. She did not seek friendly interactions outside her family, and whenever she lived away from home and was surrounded by others, her health deteriorated. During their stay in Brussels, Charlotte and Emily were often invited by Mrs Jenkins (the wife of the British chaplain in Brussels from 1825 to 1849) to spend Sundays and holidays with her, but during those times, "Emily hardly ever uttered more than a monosyllable" (Gaskell, 162). At

school, Emily "rarely spoke to any one" (Gaskell, 177). However, she could be assertive when she wanted. When Constantin Heger, the instructor in Brussels, proposed an educational plan for Charlotte and Emily, Emily protested that "she saw no good to be derived from it; and that, by adopting it, they should lose all originality of thought and expression" (Gaskell, 167). Emily thus persisted in her opinions even with persons in authority.

Emily's tendency to protect her innate self resonates with Lawrence's life values which emphasise individual consciences. In "Democracy", Lawrence encourages readers to fight "for the soul's own freedom, of spontaneous being" (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 80) and not to yield to the mechanisation and materialism that other people forced on them. The same idea appears in "Education of the People", in which Lawrence writes thus: "If we want to be free, we cannot be free to do otherwise than follow our own soul, our own true nature, to its fulfilment" (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 99). Like Emily, he valued each individual's free and spontaneous decisions.

Lawrence was sociable and constantly sought to communicate with his friends and family. The great volume of letters he left marks a striking contrast with the very few letters left by Brontë. However, Lawrence also had a reclusive side. In *Death and the Author*, David Ellis writes that "[Lawrence] was like most people in alternating between wanting to be alone, with (although sometimes also without) Frieda; and needing to find outlets for what had certainly been in his youth a strong natural sociability" (Ellis, 88). In *Kangaroo*, his half autobiographical novel, the main character, Richard Lovat Somers, expresses his reluctance to interact with others when he arrives in Australia with his wife: "[Somers] started with a

rabid desire not to see anything and not to speak one single word to any single body—except Harriet" (*Kangaroo*, 24). Later, Somers gets involved with local Australians and their underground political activities. He becomes weary of those who try to control him for their own benefit and drifts into indifference again, wishing that a man had no soul and no feelings like animals and plants. At the end of the novel, he concludes that "People mattered so little. People hardly matter at all" (*Kangaroo*, 379). A poem by Lawrence, "Mountain Lion", reveals his distrust of humans: "Men! The only animal in the world to fear!" (*Complete Poems*, 401). This illustrates that, like Emily, Lawrence wished to be away from others to protect his natural self, even though he had a sociable side.

Lawrence's outspoken manner caused many fights with others. His fierce fights with Frieda, his wife, were notorious among those who knew them. Ellis writes that "[o]ther people the couple knew were able to become aware of this intensity [of the couple's relationship] when they saw blows exchanged and the occasional item of crockery flying across the room. There was also a good deal of verbal aggression which neither party bothered to conceal" (Ellis, 137). This indicates that Lawrence was straightforward about his feelings and opinions in a way similar to Emily.

Having read *Wuthering Heights* and *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*, Lawrence must have felt an affinity with Brontë as he realised that they both believed in the natural and spontaneous self and acted according to what they believed was right, regardless of others' opinions. They also maintained some seclusion to protect themselves. However, they achieved their life values differently: while Emily Brontë shut out others to

protect her natural self, Lawrence protected himself without foregoing interactions with others.

(2) D. H. Lawrence's Admiration for Emily Brontë's Natural Vitality

Gaskell writes that "Emily's countenance struck me as full of power" (Gaskell, 102). Such a powerful impression accords with the biographical descriptions of Emily's energetic and fearless behaviours, such as searing her arm with hot iron when she was bitten by an ill-looking dog, or punishing her mischievous pet bulldog by striking him with her bare clenched fist until his eyes swelled. Chambers recollects that Lawrence called Emily "intense and introspective" (Nehls, 63). Emily's intensity made a strong impression on Lawrence. He repeats the image when he mentions Emily.

Lawrence refers to Emily Brontë or *Wuthering Heights* in several of his works: "Introduction to These Paintings", *Fantasia of the Unconscious,* "*The Mother*, by Grazia Deledda", "Blessed Are the Powerful", *The Rainbow,* and *John Thomas and Lady Jane*. The first two do not reflect Lawrence's positive evaluation of Emily, as "Introduction to These Paintings" criticises the Brontës' unhealthy lack of interest in the body, and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* refers to Catherine Linton as a troublesome wife who should "force herself into a consumption . . . owing to her obstinate and determined love-will" (*Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 178). In the rest, however, the tones are positive. In "*The Mother*, by Grazia Deledda", he writes;

> The feeling of Agnes, the woman who loves the priest, is sheer female instinctive passion, something as in

> Emily Brontë. It too has the ferocity of frustrated instinct, and is bare and stark, lacking any of the graces of sentiment. This saves it from "dating" as d'Annunzio's passions date. Sardinia is by no means a land for Romeos and Juliets, nor even Virgins of the Rocks. It is rather the land of *Wuthering Heights*. (*Phoenix*, 265)

Here, Lawrence connects Emily with "sheer female instinctive passion". He then relates Sardinia to the world of *Wuthering Heights* in contrast to *Romeo and Juliet*. Although they are both epic love stories, the former is about a wild couple trying to pursue their desire while ignoring social decorum, whereas the latter concerns a less aggressive couple caught between their instinctive desires and their warring families. Emily and her world, for Lawrence, represents rule-less and instinctive passions.

"Blessed Are the Powerful" contains the same sort of admiration for Emily's vitality. In this essay, Lawrence emphasises the importance of the quality of life by writing; "Man lives to live, and for no other reason. And life is not mere length of days. Many people hang on, and hang on, into a corrupt old age, just because they have *not* lived, and therefore cannot let go" (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 322, original emphasis). He then compares Emily's life with Queen Victoria's; "Poor old Queen Victoria had length of days. But Emily Brontë had life. She died of it" (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 322). He considers Emily's life more highly than Queen Victoria's because the former "had life". Lawrence aimed at such an intense life for himself. In the same essay, he writes that "the life will

not come unless we live. That is the whole point" (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 322), and that "[l]iving consists in doing what you really, vitally want to do: what the *life* in you wants to do, not what your ego imagines you want to do" (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine* 323, original emphasis). Lawrence lived intensely. Tony Hoagland, in his poem "Lawrence", described him as "a man who burned like an acetylene torch / from one end to the other of his life" (Web). In short, Lawrence found in Emily Brontë what he was looking for: an intense life.

In *The Rainbow* and *John Thomas and Lady Jane,* Lawrence uses *Wuthering Heights* to ironically signify spiritually dead characters who cannot understand passion. Anton Skrebensky in *The Rainbow* unwittingly buys Ursula a copy of *Wuthering Heights*. Considering Chambers' recollection that, in real life, Lawrence forbade her from reading *Wuthering Heights* because she was "intense and introspective" like Emily Brontë, Skrebensky's choice of gift exposes his inability to predict how it would affect the passionate Ursula. In *John Thomas and Lady Jane*, Clifford Chatterley cannot appreciate *Wuthering Heights*, revealing his incapability to feel passion for life.

Passion is the element that Lawrence considers most essential for human life. Lawrence thus saw in Emily Brontë an attitude towards life similar to his own: to live passionately and intensely based on one's spontaneous feelings.

(3) Distrust of Medical Science

Both Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence refused to resort to medical aid when they became fatally ill, and preferred to believe in natural healing power.

Charlotte writes, in her letter of 23 November 1848, about Emily in the last stage of her illness: "[w]hen a doctor had been sent for, and was in the very house, Emily refused to see him . . . and the medicines which he sent she would not take, denying that she was ill" (Gaskell, 277). Charlotte's letter of 10 December 1848 also notes that "[Emily's] repugnance to seeing a medical man continues immutable,—as she declares 'no poisoning doctor' shall come near her" (Gaskell, 278). Only a few hours before her death did Emily finally give in by saying, "If you will send for a doctor, I will see him now" (Gaskell, 279).

Before his own death, Lawrence also denied the seriousness of his illness and avoided medical treatment. In March 1929, encouraged by the Huxleys, Lawrence made an appointment for an X-ray but refused to keep it. His short poem "The Scientific Doctor", written in the summer of 1929, reveals his distrust in modern medicine:

> When I went to a scientific doctor
> I realised what a lust there was in him to wreak
> his so-called science on me
> and reduce me to the level of a thing.
> So I said: Good-morning! and left him.
> (*Complete Poems*, 620)

In another poem, "Healing", he writes: "I am not a mechanism, an assembly of various sections. / And it is not because the mechanism is working wrongly, that I am ill. / I am ill because of wounds to the soul, to the deep emotional self . . ." (*Complete Poems*, 620). In both poems, he refuses to be reduced to an object.

According to Ellis, Lawrence was willing to take patent

medicines, but refused to be treated in a sanatorium until the final stage of his illness. Instead, he tried to find a natural environment to heal himself. Ellis points out that Lawrence ignored "what the Mexico City doctors told him yet took their advice about returning to the ranch" (Ellis, 43) and "tried the effect of mountain air quite often" (Ellis, 43) until he realised that the mountain air could not give him the benefit he needed. Lawrence was also convinced that, before the rise of Western culture, "there had been a now lost science more in tune with the real needs and aspirations of human beings than its contemporary version" (Ellis, 47) and preferred folk remedies. He tried a few unorthodox treatments under several doctors, but ultimately concluded that "they [the doctors] can do nothing for one. They are merely a fraud" (Ellis, 49).

While Emily Brontë clung to Haworth because the moors were the very wellspring of her life, Lawrence kept on travelling seeking an environment that could heal his illness. Their lifestyles were contrasting, but they had the same overriding desire to stay in the natural environment where they could thrive.

Brontë and Lawrence's firm belief in the healing power of nature came from their attention to nature's characteristics of cycling and rebirth. Emily's French essay "Le Papillon (The Butterfly)" describes the survival of the fittest where the stronger prey upon the weaker, but the dismal tone changes into hope as she depicts an ugly caterpillar's metamorphosis into a beautiful butterfly. The essay argues that something beautiful might come out of ugliness. *Wuthering Heights* reflects this philosophy in that, after extreme violence and misery come the reunion of Catherine I and Heathcliff after death and the

marriage of Catherine II and Hareton in life.

Lawrence was also optimistic about what comes after a dismal situation. His essay "Whistling of Birds", for example, depicts the cruel deaths of birds in the winter:

> The frost held for many weeks, until the birds were dying rapidly. Everywhere in the fields and under the hedges lay the ragged remains of lapwings, starlings, thrushes, redwings, innumerable ragged, bloody cloaks of birds, whence the flesh was eaten by invisible beasts of prey. (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 21)

However, the depressing tone gradually changes as he shifts focus to the arrival of spring. Lawrence repeats that the revitalising force of nature is absolute and that birds in spring merely follow the force as "[i]n their throats the new life distils itself into sound" (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 21-2), just like "the rising of the silvery sap of a new summer, gurgling itself forth" (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 22). In his poem, "Almond Blossom", he writes about his experience of seeing almond trees in Taormina looking like "bare iron hooks" in winter but, in January or February, finding them in bloom. He yearns for such an invincible life himself, exclaiming: "Oh, give me the tree of life in blossom!" (*Complete Poems*, 305). The trees that looked dead in winter but revived in spring became a symbol of rebirth and hope for him.

In this way, Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence had similarly negative attitudes towards western medicine. Such attitudes came from their belief in the healing power of nature and

distrust in artificial interventions. They both desired to absorb nature's revitalising power into themselves. Lawrence must have noticed such shared values with Brontë as he read Gaskell's descriptions of her death.

(4) Love of Nature as an Escape

Another shared feature between Emily Brontë, presented by Gaskell, and D. H. Lawrence is their fascination with the outside natural environment. Their biographies depict their love for plants, animals, and staying amidst wild nature. This section looks at their attitudes towards nature in their lives and works, and argues that nature functioned for them as an escape from everyday struggles.

Emily Brontë

Charlotte explains Emily's strong affection for the moors as follows:

> My sister Emily loved the moors. Flowers brighter than the rose bloomed in the blackest of the heath for her;—out of a sullen hollow in a livid hill-side, her mind could make an Eden. She found in the bleak solitude many and dear delights; and not the least and best-loved was—liberty. Liberty was the breath of Emily's nostrils; without it she perished. (Gaskell, 104)

Charlotte thus testifies to Emily's taste for rugged nature and points out that, for Emily, nature was an Eden as it meant solitude and liberty. Gaskell also calls Emily a "free, wild,

untameable spirit" (Gaskell, 111) and writes that Emily was "never happy nor well but on the sweeping moors that gathered round her home" (Gaskell, 111). These indicate that Emily was happy only when amidst wild nature. In other words, the moors functioned for her an escape from the constraints of society and scrutiny of others. Emily's love for nature included animals. Gaskell writes that Emily was attracted by their fierce, wild, intractable nature; that is, their untamed, natural state. Living amidst nature and with animals allowed Emily to free herself from societal constraints.

The concept of nature as a refuge is reflected in *Wuthering Heights*, as the characters often escape into it. For example, in their childhood, Heathcliff suggests Catherine I that they run away from Hindley and Joseph's bullying and "have a scamper on the moors" (Brontë, 22). Nelly also testifies to Lockwood that "it was one of their [Catherine I and Heathcliff's] chief amusements to run away to the moors in the morning and remain there all day" (Brontë, 46). Heathcliff, not happy about Catherine I inviting the Lintons to her dinner party, carries "his ill-humour onto the moors" (Brontë, 55). Catherine I even considers nature a better place than Heaven. In her dream, she falls from Heaven onto the moors, and cries with joy. When she fell fatally ill, Catherine I claims that the air around the moors can cure her illness, saying, "I wish I were out of doors . . . I'm sure I should be myself were I once among the heather on those hills" (Brontë, 124).

Catherine I and Heathcliff's eagerness to go out to the moors is inherited by the second generation. Catherine II and Linton Heathcliff quarrel over the ideal environment to spend a hot July day. Linton says that he wants to be in the middle of

the moors with the bees humming and the larks singing, and the blue cloudless sky and bright sun above him (Brontë, 245), while Catherine II wants to be rocking in a rustling tree, with a west wind blowing and clouds flitting rapidly, while many kinds of birds are singing on every side, with the view of the moors at a distance and long grass waving to the breeze nearby (Brontë, 245). Even though Catherine II prefers a more energetic nature to Linton's mild-mannered one, they agree that, on a fine summer's day, the natural environment is an ideal shelter from their highly stressful lives—stressful for Linton because he is sick and under Heathcliff's surveillance and for Catherine II because she must hide her meetings with Linton owing to the feud between Heathcliff and her father.

Heathcliff, with his mysterious origin and a name seemingly representing nature itself ('heath-cliff'), can be interpreted as its personification. Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar call Heathcliff "both demon lover and ferocious natural force" (Gilbert & Gubar, 253). The term "heath" is also related to "heathen" which, according to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, "has generally been assumed to be a direct derivative of Gothic *haipi*, HEATH, as if 'dweller on the heath' . . ." (75, original emphasis). Therefore, the name "Heathcliff" connotes primitive pagans living in wild nature. Viewing from this perspective, he, as "nature", functions as an escape for Catherine I. Being a daughter in a patriarchal society, Catherine I has no power in the household. Her frustration with her oppressed position expresses itself in her choosing a whip as a souvenir. Mr Earnshaw brings Heathcliff back to her instead of bringing a whip, and she gains power over him as he "would do *her* bidding in anything" (Brontë, 43, original emphasis). In other words, he

provides her with a world to escape into, where she is allowed both power and control.

D. H. Lawrence

Lawrence believes that civilisation has made society unhealthy because, under the influence of industrialisation and mechanisation, people have lost touch with their deep instinctive animal side. He associates nature with a sanctuary from stressful civilisation and a restorative power.

Chambers comments on the young Lawrence that "[t]here seemed no flower nor even weed whose name and qualities [he] did not know" (Chambers, 34), implying his voracious desire to absorb and be absorbed in the world of flowers by knowing everything about them. His frequent mentions of nature in his writings also suggest that nature was constantly on his mind. In a letter to Sallie Hopkin on 23 December 1912, he asks her, "Do you think, when primroses and violets are out, you could for this once muster seven or eight pounds and come and see us?" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*, 490). The sentence uses flowers to indicate the season, suggesting the writer's knowledge of the ecological cycle of these plants. In the same letter, he continues, "You should see the moon rise up behind the snowy mountains across the lake: and you should gather great handfuls of perfect Christmas roses in the clefts of the hills, and in the olive orchards" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, *I* 490). His enjoyment in seeing the moon behind the mountains and gathering Christmas roses reveals how closely his daily enjoyment was connected to nature.

There are many other letters in which his thoughts drifts to nature. Let us look at another example from his later life. In

a letter to Aldous Huxley on 2 September 1928, he writes, "You don't want to be there [Sicily] till November—it's really best in January when the almond blossoms. Now, it will be pretty dried up. But I love Sicily. –But if we like the Port-Cros island I think we'll go there for the three winter months—very warm and fine pine-forest on the island . . ." (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VI*, 542). The letter reveals that the condition of local trees, such as almond trees and pine-forests, greatly influenced Lawrence's judgement on whether a place was worth visiting. Enjoying nature was so important for him that it even affected his travel plans.

His experience of nature, like Emily's, functioned as an escape. In his letter to Louie Burrows on 7 November 1908, Lawrence joyfully writes; "Down here it is wonderful. The masses of gorgeous foliage, the sharp hills whose scarps are blazing with Autumn, the round valleys where the vivid dregs of Summer have collected—they have almost intoxicated me" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*, 90). Such an ecstatic experience seemingly had a cathartic effect, allowing him to temporarily forget the worries and troubles of real life.

Lawrence's works also reflect the notion of nature as an escape. The most obvious one is *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, in which the forest becomes a shelter for Connie to revitalise herself. Connie's husband, Sir Clifford Chatterley, is paralysed from the waist down because of his injury during the war, and his paralysis reflects his unhealthy attitude towards life. Clifford is a mine owner and a businessman who is absorbed in technology, machines, and the development of industry. His lack of feeling for nature is symbolised in his running over wildflowers with his wheelchair. Even when he appreciates the

beauty of the spring, it sounds to Connie "as if even the spring bloomed by act of Parliament" (*Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 184). Clifford's distant and unsympathetic treatment of nature contrasts sharply with Mellors' role of nurturing and protecting nature as a gamekeeper.

Clifford's dry encouragement to Connie to bear a child with another man also reveals his lack of empathy. He says, "I shouldn't mind, if it made no difference between us" (*Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 111). This indicates his inability to understand the essentials of human nature: that such emotional experiences always affect one's emotions. The inseparable link between physical and emotional aspects is presented in the scene where Connie holds a chick in Mellors' hut, is deeply moved, and begins crying. Frustrated with Clifford's attitude towards life, and feeling unbearably forlorn, Connie begins looking for refuge in the woods. The narrator says, "[s]he had only one desire now, to go to the clearing in the wood. The rest was a kind of painful dream." (*Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 114). Thus, for Connie, the woods function as a healing place to escape into, while Wragby is a nightmarish reality.

Lawrence often uses the image of the Greek god, Pan as a personification of nature. Pan is considered a deity representing *all* of nature: *The Oxford English Dictionary* explains that, "in later times, from association of his name with rò πᾶν the all, everything, the universe, he was considered as an impersonation of Nature, of which his attributes were taken as mysterious symbols" (120). Etymologically, Pan is related to Pantheism. According to the *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, "[t]he term 'pantheism' . . . is constructed from the Greek roots *pan* (all) and *theos* (God)" (Web: original emphases). Therefore, Pan

can be interpreted as a personification of Nature, similar to Heathcliff. In *The White Peacock*, Annable is a Pan-like figure, just as Mellors is in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. They are both "gamekeepers", protecting nature.

Thus, both Brontë and Lawrence present nature as an escape and a place of revitalisation. It is difficult to imagine that Lawrence did not notice Emily's shared understanding of the role of nature, considering that he had read both Brontë's biography and *Wuthering Heights*.

3. Interpretation of Emily Brontë's and D. H. Lawrence's Love of Nature

(1) Nature's Healing Power

Let us now consider why Emily Brontë and Lawrence needed nature to rely on. In Emily's and even Lawrence's days, people simply sensed from their experiences the benefits of staying in the natural environment. Wordsworth, in "The Table Turned" (1798), encourages readers to "quit your books", claiming that nature "has a world of ready wealth / [o]ur minds and hearts to bless". Wordsworth thus values the natural environment more highly than books for our minds and hearts. Another of his poems, "Daffodils" (1807), also depicts the positive influence nature has on humans. The poem starts with the narrator wandering in a pensive mood. Suddenly, he sees a host of golden daffodils by the lake dancing in the breeze, and the scenery improves his mood, as he writes, "A poet could not but be gay / In such a jocund company!" Later, at home, again he becomes pensive, but, by remembering the dancing daffodils, his mood recovers. This poem claims nature's healing effects on our mental health. Nature's benefits are presented in more recent works as well, such as *The*

Secret Garden (1911) by Frances Hodgson Barnet and *Tom's Midnight Garden* (1958) by Philippa Pearce, in which a garden plays an essential role in healing and revitalising the main characters. These works reveal that even without scientific proof, people instinctively sense the positive power of nature.

In recent years, scientific studies have confirmed the benefits of nature for human health. These studies give us hints as to why Brontë and Lawrence were so eager to absorb and be absorbed by nature.

Edward O. Wilson, a biologist and the main advocate of "the biophilia hypothesis", maintains that "our existence depends on this propensity [innate love of nature], our spirit is woven from it, hope rises on its currents" (Wilson, 1). Ryan Lumber et al. further explain the biophilia hypothesis as follows:

> The emotional bond expressed unconsciously through biophilia leads to a reverence for nature that incorporates awe and wonder, with this reverence creating a love for life and the complexity of nature. It has been suggested that this affiliation or love for life was essential for survival and often sought after by humanity's ancestors. (Lumber et al., 3)

The biophilia hypothesis forms the basis of Julia K. Africa's argument that "[t]he eddies and swirls of seasonal winds, the fractal branching of trees, the low murmur of streams and Fibonacci structure of flower petals all provide unconscious and conscious cues that settle the addled mind and soothe the troubled body" (Africa, 149–50). This explains why, from ancient times, humans found comfort in nature and nature-evoking-

objects such as flower patterns, wooden objects, and nautilus-shaped spirals.

Roger S. Ulrich, a health care designer who works on integrating hospitals with nature, contends that experiencing the sights, sounds, and smells of nature is a positive distraction with stress-reducing effects (Ulrich, 102). His research results reveal that "many nature scenes or elements foster stress recovery because they elicit positive feelings, reduce negatively toned emotions such as fear, anger, and sadness, effectively hold attention/interest, and accordingly might block or reduce stressful thoughts" (Ulrich, 103). In this way, human's innate love for nature allows us to use associating with it to manage our mental health.

The Attention Restoration Theory of Kaplan and Kaplan also elucidates the healing function of nature. The theory identifies nature's four restorative components. The first and central component is "fascination", which means that we need no effort to appreciate nature, such that focusing on it releases us from our usual tension. Stephen Kaplan explains that "clouds, sunsets, snow patterns, the motion of the leaves in the breeze—these readily hold the attention, but in an undramatic fashion. Attending to these patterns is effortless, and they leave ample opportunity for thinking about other things" (Kaplan, 174). The second component is the perception of "being away", which "frees one from mental activity that requires directed attention support to keep going" (Kaplan, 173). Kaplan gives examples of such places as the seaside, the mountains, lakes, streams, forests, and meadows. The third component is "extent", which provides the sense of a rich and coherent other world. Distant wilderness is suitable for this effect, but, on a smaller scale,

trails and paths or the miniaturisation often found in Japanese Gardens, also give a sense of being in a different world (Kaplan, 174). The fourth component is "compatibility", which means that nature allows one to carry out what he/she wishes to do, such as hiking, bird-watching, or camping. Kaplan explains that "[t]here should be compatibility between the environment and one's purposes and inclinations" (Kaplan, 173). The theory contends that, with the effects of these components combined, one can psychologically benefit from nature, such as through stress reduction and recovering the capacity to focus attention.

These arguments raise the possibility that Brontë and Lawrence's strong attachment to nature reflects their psychological and, to some extent, physical struggles in real life and their involuntary trials to escape from it. The biophilia hypothesis suggests that they could relax in natural environments and feel better both physically and psychologically, while the Attention Restoration Theory explains that natural environments temporarily released them from everyday worries and troubles. The research by Africa and Ulrich also confirms nature's beneficial effects on humans. Brontë and Lawrence must have felt nature's revitalising effects particularly strongly, partly because they lived in areas where industrialisation coexisted with wilderness. Yorkshire, where Emily lived, had wild moors and the textile industry, while Nottinghamshire, where Lawrence lived in his early days, had beautiful Midland nature and the coal mining industry. During their lifetimes, nature diminished along with industrialisation. They must have instinctively recognised the importance of nature for human health and the gravity of its loss.

Another reason they needed nature was because Brontë and

Lawrence had many reasons to feel stress. Above all, they were both outsiders in their times.

Brontë, with her poor communication skills and avoidance of people outside her own family, suffered from the prying eyes of the neighbours who considered her strange. Gaskell quotes Emily's neighbour speaking of her carelessly that "[s]he never showed regard to any human creature" (Gaskell, 199). According to Barker, when Emily was in Belgium, she obstinately kept on wearing her old-style dress, and "[t]he oddity of her figure and dress brought taunts from her school-fellows" (Barker, 393). Such disharmony with those who surrounded her added unpleasant tensions to her life.

Lawrence, with the lack of boyish masculinity by constitution, was marked "unusual" from early in his life as well. Hopkin, a local shopkeeper, was surprised to see Lawrence as a baby whom he called "the frail little specimen of humanity" (Worthen, 5). Worthen describes Lawrence's powerless position among his peers as "[t]he frail Lawrence would have been lost in a crowd of children; and if they noticed him, then they despised him 'because he couldn't take part in their games'" (Worthen, 76). Consequently, he experienced depression and anger toward the other children. As he grew up, while his health remained precarious, his jealous mother tried to control him and keep him away from his first girlfriend, Jessie Chambers. He himself found it very hard to find a female partner he could be happy with, until he met Frieda in 1912. He then had to fight against Frieda's husband, Ernest Weekley, to win her legally. He also fought against discrimination in the literary circle against his working-class background and unconventional treatment of sexuality in his works.

(2) Fear of Death

Among many sources of their stress, Brontë and Lawrence's anxieties related to death are prominent. They had both witnessed many deaths of those close to them and anticipated their own. Although not everyone who finds comfort in nature has death-driven anxiety, and although both had other sources of stress as seen above, the fact that "rebirth" was a key feature of nature for them implies that they feared death and desired to transcend it through rebirth. The influence of nature-loving Romanticism partly explains their fascination with nature. However, as nature played an essential role from early in their lives, it seems more reasonable to suppose they were attracted to Romanticism due to their affinity with nature.

Death in Emily Brontë's Life

By the time Brontë wrote *Wuthering Heights*, she had lost her mother at the age of three, her two elder sisters at the age of six, and her aunt and her father's curate, William Weightman, who was "on unusually intimate terms with all the family" (Barker, 324), at the age of twenty-four. Barker points out that, in Emily's days, "the mortality rates in Haworth rivalled those in the worst districts of London" (Barker, 96) and that, in Haworth, "over forty-one per cent of children died before reaching their sixth birthday and the average age at death was twenty-five" (Barker, 96). Such figures show that death was effectively an everyday occurrence in Haworth. Considering that Emily was a curate's daughter, she must have witnessed many funerals of parishioners as well.

Now, let us look at the deaths of her siblings and their impact

on her. On 25 November 1824, six-year-old Emily was taken by her father, Patrick, to Cowan Bridge, a local boarding school for clergymen's daughters, and there she joined her elder sisters, Maria, Elizabeth, and Charlotte. However, the inhumane policies and unhealthy condition of the school, which later appeared as Lowood School in Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, became a place of nightmare for the sisters. In February 1825, Patrick, quickly removed eleven-year-old Maria from school as she fell fatally ill. On 6 May 1825, she died of consumption at home, away from Charlotte and Emily. Three months later, Elizabeth, the second eldest, was sent home from school because of serious consumption. Patrick, noticing the abnormality of the situation, brought back the remaining daughters from school as well. The girls watched Elizabeth's condition worsening at home, until on 15 June 1825, she died.

The negative effects of losing a sibling in childhood have been studied in many fields including nursing, psychology, and psychiatry. Valerie Machajewski and Rebecca Kronk, both nurse practitioners, point out that "[t]he death of a sibling during childhood has a profound effect, and if not resolved, it can lead to emotional and behaviour problems as an adult, including psychiatric issues" (Machajewski & Kronk, 444). They also add that a child of six to nine years old who loses their sibling "often demonstrates an increased sense of anxiety and fear for his or her own health or chance of death" (Machajewski & Kronk, 447). George H. Pollock, a psychiatrist, argues that younger mourners who have lost a sibling are threatened by death, as they "fear the darkness and 'permanent sleep' that death connotes, including the loss of parents before they are ready for this permanent and irretrievable separation" (Pollock, 312). Jason

Fletcher, a health-economist, and his co-researchers claim that "surviving siblings may experience an existential crisis in which they question the meaning of life, fear that they too might die, or lose religious faith" (Fletcher, 822). In contrast to losing grandparents or parents who are much older than themselves, the loss of a sibling leads a child to realise that death can affect a child like themselves, and suddenly they face death as a real possibility. Maria and Elizabeth's sudden and successive deaths must have forced Emily to face the chilling possibility of being the next victim among the siblings.

It should also be noted that Emily lost her mother at the age of three. The psychoanalyst John Bowlby points out that children from about twelve months to three years of age respond deeply to the loss of a mother-figure and argues for the traumatic effect losing a main caregiver has on a child. According to Bowlby, a child initially tries to recover their lost mother by crying, but, gradually, as they realise that the mother is not returning, the child loses hope and becomes apathetic and withdrawn (Bowlby 9). Considering Emily's age at her mother's death, she would have been aware of the loss even though she was still a toddler. With the death of the two eldest sisters, Emily lost three caretakers to death during her childhood. Victor Florian and Mario Mikulincer, psychologists, explore the association between the early and the recent loss of significant others and the fear of personal death in adulthood. In their study, they conclude that "both early loss and recent loss were related to higher levels of fear of personal death" and that "[t]his finding supports the theoretical and clinical ideas that persons who experience such losses seem to be more aware and fearful of their own mortality" (Florian & Mikulincer, 17).

Emily Brontë faced the prospect of her own death whenever she was taken away from Haworth. When Charlotte took seventeen-year-old Emily to the Roe Head School as a student, after three months, her health quickly deteriorated. Charlotte writes that "I felt in my heart she would die, if she did not go home" (Gaskell, 104). When Emily went to Law Hill School as a teacher at the age of twenty, the problem recurred, and she was obliged to return home. Whenever her health deteriorated, Emily must have been all the more aware of the possibility of her own death because the mortality rate was high at that time and because she had lost two elder sisters to illness. In some of her poems, she expresses her craving for a release from this life, just like Catherine I desires to be released from the "shattered prison" of her own body. However, at the same time, Emily has the concept of nature's cycle and rebirth to rely on. Therefore, her craving for leaving this life does not mean a definite end of life but, rather, a passage into the next world. Her wish for a post-mortal eternal world reveals the very real fear she had of death.

Death in Lawrence's Life

Lawrence lost his elder brother Ernest when he was sixteen, and his mother when he was twenty-five. Ernest, seven years older than Lawrence, had erysipelas which induced the development of pneumonia, and he died in his lodging in London on 11 October 1901. Ernest's death hit their mother, Lydia, hard, as he had been her hope for success. Pollock, referring to the problem of badly affected parents after the death of their child, writes that "[w]hen parents cannot fulfil their responsibilities to the living children, and when the focus is too concentrated on

the dead child, the effects on these surviving children can be lifelong" (Pollock, 309) as "survivors can feel unloved, alone, ignored during the bereavement period or they may become overprotected and over-invested with care and apprehension" (Pollock, 309). The second case applies to Lawrence, as Lydia, after Ernest's death, concentrated all of her energy on looking after Lawrence who caught pneumonia soon after Ernest's death. Worthen writes that "[b]etween December 1901 and autumn of 1902 . . . Lawrence became for Lydia Lawrence the son who could replace Ernest in her love and hopes" (Worthen, 102). While Lydia's obsessive and controlling love gradually became a burden on him, Ernest's death at a young age must have given Lawrence the idea that he might die too, especially as he was often infected by the very illness which led to his brother's death.

Lawrence's own life was constantly threatened because of health problems. George Neville, Lawrence's friend, describes him as being "a thin, pale, weakly lad . . . with no energy for our oft-times over-robust games, and no apparent inclination to attempt to join us" (Worthen, 77). Worthen suggests that Lawrence left school on 20 October 1889, at the age of four, probably because of pneumonia (Worthen, 76). In 1901, just after Ernest died, Lawrence had another serious bout of the disease, which nearly killed him. According to Worthen, in Eastwood, "[t]here were regular epidemics: measles, diphtheria, diarrhoea, scarlet fever and whooping cough" (Worthen, 5) and that "in the late nineteenth century, respiratory diseases (tuberculosis and bronchitis) accounted for 17% of death in the area" (Worthen, 5). Yet Lawrence survived again, but, as Worthen points out, the illness in 1901 "left his health permanently delicate" (Worthen, 101).

After his mother's death in November 1911, Lawrence developed double pneumonia and once again, nearly died but managed to recover. On 15 December 1911, his sister Ada wrote to Edward Garnett, another friend of Lawrence, about the prediction of Lawrence's doctor that this illness would make him liable to consumption and that he would always need great care (Worthen, 323). Frieda, in her memoirs of her husband in "*Not I, But the Wind . . .*" recollects a conversation in which Lawrence said to her, "You always identify yourself with life, why do you?" (Frieda Lawrence, 43) This reveals Lawrence's uncertainty about his own life. All the more because he lived close to death, he adored and yearned for life. Nature was a symbol of life for him, and he liked to be in nature to identify himself with its vitality and never-ending cycle of rebirths.

In this way, both Brontë and Lawrence went through losses of siblings in their childhood. The contentions in the fields of nursing, psychology, and psychiatry that a child who loses a sibling tends to have a fear of death, indicate a strong possibility that fear of death lurked in the minds of Brontë and Lawrence.

(3) Nature as a Force to Mitigate the Fear of Death

The previous section looked at Brontë and Lawrence's traumatic experiences of losing their family members, especially their siblings, and their unstable health conditions, both leading to the possibility of their fear of death. This section contends that they turned to nature because nature has the power to mitigate death-driven anxiety.

The fields of palliative care and horticulture suggest the power of nature to mitigate fear of death. In his research paper

on palliative care, Stephen Buetow suggests that care providers can propose Pantheism to release patients from the fear of death. He claims that "Pantheism offers an impersonal immortality in which the mind or soul is absorbed into the absolute" (Buetow, 113). Peter Strang, another palliative care researcher, puts forward several ways to help one cope with one's fear of death. Among them, he includes associating with nature. Pointing out the importance of a sense of relatedness to address one's anxiety, he mentions that the feeling of connection is vital not only with loved ones but also with pets, the natural world and "something even greater" (Strang, 325) such as the universe. Strang also points out that "[a]ny symbol of continuation can potentially mitigate death anxiety, as such symbols strongly counter the terror of annihilation" (Strang, 325) and gives an example of "feeling connected to a transcendent power" (Strang, 325) such as "some larger force or on being a part of nature and thus a part of the ecosystem" (Strang, 325). This explains why Brontë and Lawrence desired to identify themselves with nature. They wished for the sense of being connected to the transcendent power of the natural world. Strang also suggests that "[a]nything that fosters hope might temporarily reduce death anxiety" (Strang, 325), pointing out that a dying person might wish for an afterlife instead of extinction. Nature as a revitalising symbol, then, greatly appealed to Brontë and Lawrence because it gave them hope for rebirth.

A. M. Unruh, an occupational therapist, introduces in her research paper an episode which testifies to nature's power to mitigate fear of death. In her research paper, she quotes an essay by Michelle Landsberg, a *Toronto Star* columnist, who had just been diagnosed with breast cancer. The essay shows her

overcoming the initial panic by looking at her spring garden plants:

> Almost without thinking, I lurched into the garden, and saw the first shoots of spring. I recognized my old friendly foe, garlic-mustard, its handsome greeny-red, crinkled leaves unfolding. A small army of lily-of-the-valley spears were poking up: fern fronds were brown nobs just under the dead leaves: the crimson early shoots of the peonies—the peonies!—caught my eye. My mind stopped racing: I felt a silvery calm happiness slowly rise in me like a cool water in a glass. I was in the world of it, entranced by it, and I had discovered the saving of my sanity. The garden would get me through. The garden would get me back into the moment and help me to live in it. (Unruh, 72)

The quotation captures the exact moment plants calm down the observer and help her conquer her fear of death, suggesting that living in close affinity with nature helps one mitigate death-related stress. Landsberg was cheered up by "the first shoots of spring", encouraged by their invincible vitality, and projected herself in them and felt the same sort of strong vitality and life in herself as these fellow living creatures; vitality which could break through the dark earth and come back into the sunlight. This is precisely the same point as what Brontë and Lawrence found reassuring in nature, that is, its revitalising power and circulations. Landsberg called her garden "The Garden of Hope" to show that the burgeoning plants in spring represented hope of revival for her.

Another cancer patient and Unruh's interviewee, Chris, comments on nature's function as a refuge from hard reality in the following passages:

> Especially on days when you've had treatment, you may not feel so great . . . [but] you can go out there . . . and listen to the birds and look at the garden and maybe go into another world a little bit. (Unruh, 75)

Her comment reveals that listening to the birds and looking at plants allowed her to escape into another world for a while, leaving behind the reality of being a cancer patient facing death. In other words, nature functioned for her as an escape from the fear of death.

(4) Religious Attitudes

One's idea of death is often connected with the way he/she perceives spirituality. Therefore, this section looks at Brontë's and Lawrence's religious attitudes. Interestingly, Brontë's and Lawrence's views of religion are similar in that they felt a need to change the orthodox Christian doctrines into something different, and that they had a pantheistic bent. Their upbringing made them both thoroughly acquainted with Christianity, and their literary imagery and vocabulary are built on their religious knowledge, but they both rebel, at least to some extent, against the orthodox Christian doctrines. This study contends that they were similar in that, while they retained their religious passion, they grew to regard the cosmos or the nature merged with, or in a similar position as God.

Emily Brontë

Brontë was a daughter of a clergyman, and naturally she was well-acquainted with Christianity and the Bible. Critics often refer to Methodist influence on her. Her father, Patrick, was an Irish Evangelical with Methodist and Romantic learning (Marsden, 13). Haworth, where he served as an Anglican Churchman, had many Dissenters, mainly Methodists and Baptists (Heneghan, 54). Emma Mason records that:

> Methodism had its most dramatic outbursts in the West Riding area of Yorkshire, in which Haworth is situated and where Brontë lived, accommodating over 17,000 Methodist members from the half-million Methodist population of Britain in the nineteenth century. (Mason, Web)

Even though Patrick considered that the extreme religious enthusiasm should be avoided (Marsden, 13), he "chose to work in harmony with the Dissenters, and was influenced by Wesleyan Methodism, particularly the focus on God's grace as allowing individuals to choose what they believe" (Heneghan, 54). Heneghan explains that this is the reason why the Brontë children were allowed to explore freely the idea about God and the individual (Heneghan, 54). Aunt Branwell, who looked after the motherless Brontë children, was also a staunch Methodist. Mason describes the characteristics of Methodism as "dislike of doctrine and pantheistic emphasis on nature"[2] (Mason, Web).

The influence of Christianity on Emily is evident from the fact that her works include many allusions to God and other Christian imagery and vocabulary. Critics see that many usages

of her imagery and vocabulary are fundamentally based on the Bible. Michael M. Clarke, for example, points out that Brontë's poetry has affinities with theological and literary traditions of Christian mysticism. Francis Fike and Simon Marsden both suggest Brontë's recreation of the Bible, the former by writing that Brontë "saw the need for expressing and understanding Christianity in new ways, the need for experiencing ultimate reality outside outmoded forms and expressions" (Fike, 148-9), and the latter that "Brontë interprets and appropriates the texts, symbols and theological traditions of Christianity, finding in them a language available for new acts of literary creation" (Marsden, 20). Mason emphasises Methodist's influence on Brontë's works by writing that "For Brontë, a pupil of a Methodist school and daughter of a minister preaching in a historically Methodist pulpit, Methodism indeed offered a language through which to voice an extremity of passionate expression" (Mason, Web), and claims that Brontë had two strains of enthusiasm: one was Methodism, and another was eighteenth-century poetics. Lisa Wang analyses Brontë's poems and *Wuthering Heights*, to prove the usage of biblical tropes and topos, while Janet Crosier claims that nearly fifty references to the number three in *Wuthering Heights* signal Brontë's religious influences, as "the number three is a highly significant religious number" (1).

On the other hand, *Wuthering Heights* is often regarded as "anti-Christian" (Tytler, 41 & Thormählen, 7), as it signals rebellious attitudes to Christianity by presenting religious characters such as Nelly, Joseph and Edgar less sympathetic than Catherine I and Heathcliff who, from their childhood, behave like pagans by hurling or kicking the "good books" into

the dog-kennel. Before her marriage with Edgar, Catherine I dreams about sobbing with joy as she is flung from heaven into the middle of the heath by angry angels. This dream reveals that she values the wild heath more than Christian Heaven. Heathcliff, as an adult, ignores Christian doctrines by maltreating his wife, his son, his brother-in-law, and his neighbours. Mildred A. Dobson, in "Was Emily Brontë a Mystic?" writes that "[Emily] was not Christian in her manner of thought . . . . In spite of the Christian background of her home life, she was predominantly pagan" (167). Stevie Davies, in *Emily Brontë: Heretic*, describes that, in their childhood, Emily and Branwell "sat [in the church] to listen to the paternal sermons with sneers in their hearts and feelings of violent or cold dissent" (139) and that "Emily Brontë's reaction to Christianity . . . was . . . in essence retaliatory" (140). Brontë's defiance against Christianity is thus often pointed out by critics.

Some critics regard Emily Brontë as a pantheist. For example, Edward Chitham and Tom Winnifrith repeatedly call Brontë pantheistic. In *Charlotte and Emily Brontë*, they claim that "Emily's tendency to pantheism appears to have been fed to some extent on Wordsworth's work, though resemblances to Shelley may be more apparent" (57). In *Brontë Facts and Brontë Problems*, they quote Emily's poem "Aye there it is!", and write that "This poem, like others, is wholly Pantheistic in tone, closest to Shelley, but echoing the long tradition of Pythagoras and Plato in a manner that is certainly Pagan, without any Christian nuance" (105). Heneghan maintains that "The conception of God in *Wuthering Heights* reflects the Romantics' pantheistic view, with God being seen in nature, and conceptualised through the sublime" (52). John Hewish, on the

other hand, argues on "No Coward Soul Is Mine" that "The line of descent of the attitude here is perhaps from Bruno through Spinoza and German and English romanticism: it is the pantheist feeling for life and nature, the permanent romantic apotheosis of consciousness" (88). Other critics declare it wrong to regard her as a pantheist. Michael M. Clarke refutes Hewish's claim above and declares that the field of literary studies must "seek a hermeneutics that considers religion in relationship to secular epistemologies" (218). Wang, referring to Brontë's tendency to create vagueness in her use of theological discourse by avoiding allusion, points out that critics struggle "seeing in it everything from atheism to pantheism" (161). Wang herself refuses the idea of Brontë being either atheist or pantheist.

The arguments of the Christian influence on Brontë are convincing, but, at the same time, it is also true that Brontë was not sympathetic to the orthodox Christian doctrines of her days. Her complex views on Christianity thus give her works religious ambiguity. The notions of Christian God and nature merge in her, connecting nature with God, or the Spirit. Methodist might have influenced her to see God in his creations (i. e. the natural world), and the Romantic Movement further encouraged her interest in nature. At the same time, judging from her biographical information and her works, one cannot deny that Brontë was genuinely fascinated by nature and relied on it as an escape from the real world.

Let us now look at the double implication some religious terms bear in Brontë's works. For example, when Brontë writes about "wind" in her poems and *Wuthering Heights*, it symbolises the Holy Spirit, as Wang points out (162), but, at the same time, it also means the natural movement of the air. Choosing the term

"a wind" instead of a more direct expression such as "God's breath" implies that her focus is on natural phenomena as well as on God. In the following stanza from "High Waving Heather, 'neath Stormy Blasts Bending", for example, "life-giving wind" can mean figuratively "God's life-giving breathing" and literally "wind bringing fresh air and new life".

> All down the mountain sides, wild forest lending
> One mighty voice to the life-giving wind;
> Rivers their banks in the jubilee rending,
> Fast through the valleys a reckless course wending,
> Leaving a desolate desert behind.

The quotation also contains other expressions which create the ambiguity of double implication. "One mighty voice" indicates God's almighty voice carried by "the life-giving wind", but it also presents the wild forest with the noise (or the voice of Great Nature) caused by the "life-giving wind" which runs down the mountain sides. The other stanzas include detailed depictions of nature as well, such as waving heather bending beneath stormy blasts, midnight with moonlight and bright shining stars, rivers rending their banks and wending a reckless course through the valleys, and waters extending wider and deeper leaving a desolate desert. These natural descriptions combined together project the poet's focus on nature. At the same time, terms such as "mighty" and "jubilee" in the quotation above, and "glory", "rejoicingly", "heaven", and "spirit" in the other stanzas give a religious tone to the poem.

Thus Brontë's religious attitude is complex, as she had her own interpretation of God which merges with Nature. Gaskell

reports an episode in which, hearing Charlotte's friend Mary Taylor saying that the question of her religion was between God and her, Emily exclaimed "That's right" (443). This episode conveys her independent standpoint on religion, which led her to interpret God or the Bible in the way she felt right. Irene Cooper Willis in *The Brontës*, quotes Romer Wilson and Mary Robinson's interviews with Ellen Nussey and local villagers, and writes that Emily "had no definite religious views . . . but was deeply religious in feeling. She believed in all-loving, eternal Power who pitied human transgressions and granted rest, in the end, to all sinners" (119). The "all-loving, eternal Power" here can be interpreted as a god, and also as Mother Nature, or the Cosmos.

D. H. Lawrence

Lawrence was similar with Brontë in that he had a complex relation with Christianity. His upbringing brought him deeply involved in Christianity, but, at the same time, he did not feel the orthodox Christian doctrines convincing. As Worthen writes, "chapel had been a formative experience in Lawrence's childhood" (Worthen, 64). His father, Arthur, sang in Brinsley church choir when he was young, but was not a church-goer. His mother, Lydia, took religion more seriously, and gave powerful influence on the young Lawrence, even though Luke Ferretter claims that Lydia had a complex relationship to the Congregationalist faith herself, as she stopped singing hymns at home after her son Ernest's death, and said "I believe in retaliation. This 'bear and forbear' gospel is too one-sided for me!'" (Ferretter, 183).

Apocalypse conveys the intensity of the religious education Lawrence received as a child:

> From earliest years right into manhood, like any other nonconformist child I had the Bible poured every day into my helpless consciousness, till there came almost a saturation point. Long before one could think or even vaguely understand, this Bible language, these "portions" of the Bible were *douched* over the mind and consciousness, till they became soaked in, they became an influence which affected all the processes of emotion and thought. (*Apocalypse*, 59 Original emphasis)

He writes that he knew the Bible "with an almost nauseating fixity" and felt dislike, repulsion, and resentment against it because "[n]ot only was the Bible verbally trodden into the consciousness . . . but the foot-prints were always mechanically alike, the interpretation was fixed, so that all real interest was lost" (59). This comment suggests that he disliked the conventional interpretation of the Bible.

As some critics point out, he was heavily influenced by the Bible, just as Brontë was. Shirley Bricout argues that "it is undeniable that, thanks to his religious upbringing and continual engagement with theological works, Lawrence's extensive knowledge of the Bible pervades his entire oeuvre" (90). T. R. Wright also maintains that "[Lawrence's] writing, at all stages of his career, contains frequent references to biblical characters and symbols while, even when not invoking any particular passage from the Bible, his language is permeated by the rhythms of the Authorized Version" (1). Lawrence's life and work were thus deeply rooted to the Bible. At the same time, Lawrence rejected orthodox interpretations of the Bible, as

Brontë did. His early doubt against Christianity is found in his letter to Reverend Robert Reid on 3 December, 1907, in which he writes "At the present moment I do not, cannot believe in the divinity of Jesus" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*, 40). In the same letter, Lawrence continues that "there must at least be harmony of facts before a hypothesis can be framed. Cosmic harmony there is—a Cosmic God I can therefore believe in" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*, 41). The expression "a Cosmic God" suggests that he identified the cosmos with God, while the use of an indefinite article for God suggests that he allows the possibility of plural Gods.

Lawrence describes himself as "primarily I am a passionately religious man" in his letter on 24 June 1910 (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*, 165), and Worthen explains that, in his twenties, he "found himself to be a man whose mind and conscience were imbued with the habits of religious thought, although he lacked the context and support of any particular faith" (Worthen, 179). This description has a striking similarity with Clarke's description of Emily Brontë that she "had no definite religious views . . . but was deeply religious in feeling" (Clarke, 203). They both were passionately religious but could not accept Christianity uncritically. Therefore they had to explore and find or reinvent a religion that suits their values. Lawrence declares to Ernest Collings in his letter on 17 January 1913, that "My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect" (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*, 503), and claims that our mind can misguide us while our blood does not. He declares that it is why he likes living in Italy: "[t]he people are so unconscious. They only feel and want: they don't know" (504). He thus valued highly instinctive or natural innate

feelings, as he considers that being in a natural state is essential for human life. Being passionately religious without being able to believe in orthodox Christian teaching, he started searching for a religion he could fully believe in.

His essay, "On Being Religious", written in *Adelphi* in February 1924, explains his ideas about God and Christianity. Here, Lawrence treats Jesus not as the Great God but as one of many saviours:

> From time to time, the Great God sends a new saviour. Christians will no longer have the pettiness to assert that Jesus is the only Saviour ever sent by the everlasting God. There have been other saviours, in other lands, at other times, with other messages. And all of the Sons of God . . . . All of them showing the Way of Salvation and of Right. Different Saviours. Different Ways of Salvation. Different pole-stars, in the great wandering Cosmos of time. And the Infinite God, always changing, and always the same infinite God, at the end of the different Ways. (*Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*, 192)

Lawrence thus looked for the infinite God, who changes his existence and messages in accordance with lands and times.

Mornings in Mexico (1927) reveals Lawrence's interest in animism, in which he indicates his fascination with the religion of the aboriginal Americans:

> But strictly, in the religion of aboriginal America, there is no Father, and no Maker. There is the great

> living source of life: say the Sun of existence: to which you can no more pray than you can pray to Electricity. And emerging from the Sun are the great potencies, the invincible influences which make shine and warmth and rain. From these great interrelated potencies of rain and heat and thunder emerge the seeds of life itself, corn, and creatures like snakes. And beyond these, men, persons. But all emerge separately. There is no oneness, no sympathetic identifying oneself with the rest. The law of isolation is heavy on every creature. (81)

In the quotation above, the repetition of the adjective, "great", signals Lawrence's approval of the aboriginal religion. The religion regards the sun as "the great living source of life" which replaces Father or Maker in Christianity. The productivity of the sun is expressed in its "great potencies" of rain and heat and thunder which nourish the seeds of life, corn, creatures, and persons. The sun is thus the source of the continual vitality of nature. His faith in the revitalising power of the sun is also presented in his short story "Sun" (1926), in which the heroine, Juliet, escapes from the lifeless living with her husband in New York, into a countryside in Sicily, where she recovers her vitality by sunbathing by the sea every day. *Apocalypse*, written during the winter of 1929-30 just before his death, also refers to the sun. It concludes the work by writing: "Start with the sun, and the rest will slowly, slowly happen" (149). All in all, these writings imply Lawrence's faith in the vitalising power of the sun. In *Apocalypse*, Lawrence connects the sun, blood, and revitalisation, by claiming that he can communicate with the sun

through his blood when he strips himself of personal feelings and ideas. He writes that "[the sun] gives me life, sun-life, and I send him a little new brightness from the world of the bright blood" (76-7), as "the sun, like a lion, loves the bright red blood of life, and can give it an infinite enrichment if we know how to receive it" (77). Again, the sun is thus associated with revitalisation, as the sun gives him sun-life. The "infinite enrichment" of the sun also refers to eternal continuation of rich natural life.

Lawrence's definition of the term "god" seems to waver till the end. While *Apocalypse* suggests that it is the sun and the Cosmos, rather than God or Gods, that are essential for his religious belief, "Shadows", a poem written in months before his death and included in *The Last Poems Notebook*, mentions God in the following context:

> And if tonight my soul may find her peace
> in sleep, and sink in good oblivion,
> and in the morning wake like a new-opened flower
> then I have been dipped again in God, and new-created.
> (*Complete Poems*, 726)

Here, Lawrence admits God as a saviour. The narrator says that if his soul is peaceful in sleep and wakes up refreshed like "a new-opened flower", he is dipped in God and newly created. Therefore, God has the power to renew a person. The poem compares the narrator to a flower, and God to water, leading to an image that a flower revives when dipped in water, and associating both human and God to the natural world. The

association of the narrator with nature continues in the later part of the poem when "the dark of the moon" is compared to the narrator's darkening spirit, and his pain with "falling leaves, and stems that break in storms" (727). The narrator ends the second stanza by writing that "I shall know that I am walking still / with God, we are close together now the moon's in shadow" (727). The third stanza ends in parallel with that of the second stanza, as it says "then I shall know that my life is moving still / with the dark earth, and drenched / with the deep oblivion of earth's lapse and renewal" (727). Here, "walking with God" is paraphrased by "moving with the dark earth", suggesting that God is equivalent of the earth. The fifth stanza compares his dying situation to "odd, wintry flowers upon the withered stem, yet new, strange flowers / such as my life has not brought forth before, new blossoms of me—" (727). Again, here, the dying narrator is compared to flowers on the withered stem, dying, but, at the same time, internally embracing new blossoms. This implies the expected revival of the flowers in future. The poem's final stanza continues as follows:

> Then I must know that still
> I am in the hands [of] the unknown God,
> he is breaking me down to his own oblivion
> to send me forth on a new morning, a new man. (727)

"The unknown God" means that He does not belong to any major religions such as Christianity. The image of God's breaking down the narrator and sending him forth on a new morning as a new man can be interpreted as a description of the cycle of dying and going back to the earth to be renewed.

Apocalypse ends with the following sentences, which convey what Lawrence valued most in his life:

> For man, as for flower and beast and bird, the supreme triumph is to be most vividly, most perfectly alive . . . . We ought to dance with rapture that we should be alive and in the flesh, and part of the living, incarnate cosmos. I am part of the sun as my eye is part of me. That I am part of the earth my feet know perfectly and my blood is part of the sea. My soul knows that I am part of the human race, my soul is an organic part of the great human soul, as my spirit is part of my nation. (149)

In the passage, man is grouped the same as flower and the beast and bird, as a part of incarnate cosmos, the sun, the earth, and the sea, implying that Lawrence considers himself equal to plants and animals. His claim that his soul is "an organic part of the great human soul" suggests his recognition of himself being a part of the collective human soul which continues organically from generation to generation. Such views remind one of Pantheism which, as we have seen previously, "offers an impersonal immortality in which the mind or soul is absorbed into the absolute" (Buetow, 113) and which gives the feeling of being "connected to a transcendent power" (Strang, 325) such as "being a part of nature and thus a part of the ecosystem" (Strang, 325).

In this way, even though Lawrence's notion of religion was heavily influenced by the Bible and Christianity, he followed his own insight on what was divine, and tried to find or create the

religion he could believe in. It was close to pantheism as he believed in the divine power of the Cosmos and the sun. Lawrence's complexity of the relation to religion is similar to Brontë's. His religious passion originally has its foundation in the Bible, but, like Brontë, he could not be satisfied with the orthodox Christianity, and explored new possibilities to find another religion which he could truly believe in. As a result, for them both, the notion of God merged with that of the Nature or the Cosmos.

(5) Death and the Life Beyond in Poetry

Unsurprisingly, both Brontë and Lawrence wrote poems on death. In fact, Emily wrote many poems on the subject, suggesting that death was frequently on her mind. Some of her poems belong to the Gondal stories, set in an imaginary world created by Emily and Anne in their childhood. Emily kept on writing stories and poems for Gondal well into adulthood. As the Gondal saga is filled with wars and intrigues, the poems contain many references to death and mourning. Her non-Gondal poems also frequently deal with the notions of death and mourning.

For Lawrence, the theme of death becomes increasingly personal towards the end of his life. Early works such as "A Man Who Died" use "death" metaphorically as a state of "not living one's life". However, by the time he wrote the poems which were posthumously published, his interpretation becomes more about his own death. The fact that, in his early days, he did not treat death as his own issue, however, does not necessarily mean that death was not on his mind, because his obsession with life and living intensely paradoxically reveals his efforts to avoid becoming lifeless, that is, dead. As his health deteriorated in

the final stage of life, he started writing his own emotional journey to death in poems such as "So Let Me Live", "Gladness of Death", "The Ship of Death", and "Difficult Death".

One distinctive characteristic of the poems on death by both Brontë and Lawrence is that they both present one's continuing existence after death, either by rebirth, shifting into another world, or being connected with another ongoing life.

Emily Brontë

A poem by Brontë, "Death", likens the dying narrator to a withering branch. The branch is stripped of its blossom and foliage as he goes through sorrow and guilt. However, the narrator explains that "Life's restoring tide" flows forever "within its parent's kindly bosom", suggesting the possibility of revitalisation. The final stanza, quoted below, reveals Emily's belief in continuing life after death:

> Strike it [the branch] down, that other boughs may flourish
> Where that perished sapling used to be;
> Thus, at least, its moulding corpse will nourish
> That from which it sprung—Eternity. (*The Complete Poems*, 25)

Here, the branch, that is, the narrator, is to be cut down and dead, but the body, nourishing the tree's life, becomes a part of the tree's eternally cycling life.

Another poem by Emily, "Lines", also claims eternity of existence beyond death. The narrator, despite that he is dead at the beginning of the poem, keeps on narrating till the end,

implying his continual existence after death just like the tree in "Death". He asks the addressee not to weep as he has "anchored safe and rest at last / Where tears and mourning can not come" (*The Complete Poems*, 59). The dead is now residing somewhere safe and peaceful. By contrast, the addressee's life is compared to a dangerous and desolate sailing, in "On that dark ocean sailing drear / With storms around and fears before / And no kind light to point the shore" (*The Complete Poems*, 59). By using the image of a sea voyage, Brontë thus presents life and death as one organic continuity. Then the last stanza continues as follows:

> But long or short though life may be
> 'Tis nothing to eternity.
> We part below to meet on high
> Where blissful ages never die.
> (*The Complete Poems*, 59)

The description reminds one of Christian Heaven, but, at the same time, it is about the grandeur of cycling and renewing ecosystem through many "blissful ages", compared to which the length of individual life is nothing, whether it be "long or short".

As we have seen, Brontë repeats eternally continuing existence after death, which she values highly. "No Coward Soul Is Mine", one of her best-known poems, shows strong faith in an "Almighty ever-present Deity" which arms the narrator against fear and which exists in the narrator as "undying life", holding the narrator fast "So surely anchored on / The steadfast rock of Immortality" (*The Complete Poems*, 182). Again, "Deity" here can be interpreted as nature. By identifying with nature, she has no

fear against death, as she becomes "undying" and immortal. Her use of natural images in these poems to express life and death, such as a tree, an ocean, and rock, also reflects her perception of human life and death as a part of the natural domain.

D. H. Lawrence

For Lawrence, death means oblivion and an adventure to the new world, and, like Brontë, he considers the dead's existence transcends deaths. For example, in "So Let Me Live", Lawrence compares death to an adventure looking for new beauty:

> So let me live that I may die
> eagerly passing over from the entanglement of life
> to the adventure of death, in eagerness
> turning to death as I turn to beauty
> to the breath, that is, of new beauty unfolding in death.
> (*Complete Poems*, 676)

Even in the face of death, the narrator wants to live eagerly, which allows him to stay active instead of dying passively. Death here is presented as a shift from "the entanglement of life" to "the adventure of death"[3] which leads him to the breath of new beauty. "Breath" connotes the breath of God in *The Old Testament*, and, therefore, revitalisation. "New beauty unfolding in death", then, is interpreted as "new life burgeoning after death", just as new shoots come from dead branches. The same idea of death as an adventure is repeated in "Gladness of Death", in which he writes "(a)nd so I know / after the painful, painful

experience of dying / there comes an after-gladness, a strange joy / in a great adventure / oh the great adventure of death, where Thomas Cook cannot guide us" (*Complete Poems*, 677). The negative experience of death followed by an exciting new adventure again reminds us of the dead trees in winter revitalised in spring. The dying narrator is also compared to flowers in "I have always wanted to be as the flowers are / so unhampered in their living and dying, / and in death I believe I shall be as the flowers are" (*Complete Poems*, 677). His desire to identify himself with flowers and "blossom like a dark pansy, and be delighted / there among the dark sun-rays of death" (*Complete Poems*, 677), connects life and death with nature.

The most well-known death poem by Lawrence is "The Ship of Death". The poem, again, uses the image of a sea adventure. The narrator repeatedly asks if you have built your ship of death and claims that you will need it, implying that the dead need to cross "the dark and endless ocean of the end" (*Complete Poems*, 718) to the next world. The poem describes the process in which the frightened soul oozes out of the bruise of the dying body, the body dies, the ship launches with the soul on it and is gone in darkness, then the narrator sees the yellow, rosy light of dawn, and "the whole thing starts again". The body emerges "strange and lovely", and the soul is housed by it. Thus, the poem presents one's corporal death and rebirth as identical to the cycle of vegetation.

Finally, "Phoenix" suggests the necessity of one's destruction before a real change, as the narrator says "Are you willing to be made nothing? / dipped into oblivion? / If not, you will never really change" (*Complete Poems*, 728). He then describes the phoenix, who has to be burnt alive and reduced to

ash to be renewed, just as vegetation is burnt down to enrich the soil and bring luxuriant growth. He calls the phoenix an "immortal bird".

Lawrence thus considers death an adventure to the new world and a chance to make a real change. Adventures into the next world connotes the renewed or continuing life after death, just as dead trees enlivened in spring. He also compares death to the natural domain such as flower and a sea voyage. His view that rebirth after death can be possible when humans are connected with cosmos, the sun, and nature, is presented in *Apocalypse*. It describes the seven spheres of ancient pagan consciousness in which the dead initiate journeys through the underworld, until he reaches the new day and is "clothed anew and successively by the spiritual body, the soul-body, and then the 'garment' of flesh" (*Apocalypse*, 104). Lawrence claims that we should re-establish such pagan consciousness, as it connects us with cosmos and nature.

In this way, Brontë and Lawrence both suggest the possibility of continual existence after death. Their wish for after-death rebirth and eternity reveals their unsettling fear of existential annihilation. Nature's cycle of death and rebirth as a symbol was essential for them to rely on, as it abated their fear of death.

****

This chapter first discussed the attachment to nature shared by Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence, referring to both the innate nature of humans and the natural world. Brontë and Lawrence valued spontaneous emotions and feelings, and, although Lawrence had a sociable side, they shared a desire for

solitude to maintain their own natural selves. Lawrence noticed Brontë's intense feeling and natural vitality, which he considered most essential for an authentic life. Their shared distrust in medical science originated from their strong belief in nature's own healing power, along with the bitter experiences of losing their loved ones more than once. Nature functioned for them both as a shelter from daily stress and fear of death. Gaskell mentions Emily's reliance on nature to refresh herself, and *Wuthering Heights* reflects this concept of nature as a sanctuary. Nature was a revitalising escape for Lawrence as well, which can be detected in his works and biographies.

Next, the chapter suggested that the everyday stress experienced by Brontë and Lawrence, especially the stress resulting from death-related anxiety, was a possible reason for their attachment to nature. Both writers lost multiple loved ones, and both were constantly troubled by thoughts of their own mortality and more of their loved ones dying. Scientific concepts, such as the biophilia hypothesis and the Attention Restoration Theory, suggest that nature provides an escape from reality by giving those who are stressed opportunities to relax and be revitalised. While nursing and psychiatric research has shown the serious impact that losing a sibling can have on a child, studies in palliative care identify pantheism as an effective philosophy in removing death anxiety, giving one a sense of connectedness, transcendental power, and hope for an after-life through nature.

Thus, even though Brontë and Lawrence may seem very different at first glance, Lawrence's life experiences were fundamentally close to Brontë's, especially in his fear of death and his desire to overcome it by connecting himself with nature.

Knowing Brontë's work and life, he must have noticed that she shared his essential life values on nature and tendency to depend on nature, both innately and outwardly, to shield herself from everyday societal pressure and stress as well as death-related anxiety. This surely must have led him to an affinity with and positive interest in Brontë.

Chapter 4
The Influence of *Wuthering Heights* on D. H. Lawrence's Works

T. S. Eliot wrote, "Immature poets imitate; mature poets steal; bad poets deface what they take, and good poets make it into something better, or at least something different" (72). His sentences suggest that all poets receive influences from other poets' works, whether they be good or bad. It is the same with novelists. This chapter presents how the literary elements of *Wuthering Heights* are reflected in two of D. H. Lawrence's works: *Kangaroo* (1923) and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" (1924). At first, these works do not seem to have much in common with *Wuthering Heights*, but careful analysis reveals connections, which have rarely been examined by other critics (to the best of my knowledge). In contrast, the similarities between *The White Peacock* and *Wuthering Heights* have already been pointed out, as mentioned in Chapter One, by several critics such as Michael Black, Sandra Gilbert, John Worthen, George Ford, and Carol Siegel.

It is difficult to determine whether the parallels between *Wuthering Heights* and Lawrence's works are intentional. It is possible that the experience of reading *Wuthering Heights* naturally affected his writing, or that he deliberately integrated elements from *Wuthering Heights* into his works. The following analysis focusses on how *Kangaroo* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" reflect the themes, images, descriptions, plots, and language of *Wuthering Heights*, exposing Brontë's crucial influence on Lawrence's works. The analysis also reveals Brontë and Lawrence's shared admiration of nature and natural

living, and, finally, their fear of mortality concealed by these values, connecting the analysis in this chapter with the arguments in Chapter 3.

1. *Wuthering Heights* and *Kangaroo*

The comparison between *Wuthering Heights* and *Kangaroo* reveals Brontë's and Lawrence's shared insight into the uniqueness and complexity of individuals as "organic beings", which is often in conflict with larger society and its constraints. This shared insight reflects the authors' real-life struggle against societal rules, customs, demands, and expectations. Their difficulties led them to seek peace, solitude, and seclusion, especially in nature.

Kangaroo is often called a "leadership novel", as its main character, Richard Lovat Somers, meets two political leaders and explores ideal leadership. The plot of *Wuthering Heights*, on the other hand, revolves around the passionate love between Catherine I and Heathcliff. At first, they do not seem to have much in common. However, the phonetic sound and the spelling of Somers's middle name "Lovat" are very close to *love*, which suggests the possibility that "love" plays an important role in *Kangaroo* as well. In fact, both works explore the nature of love and relationships. For example, Ben Cooley, a fascist leader, aims for a political revolution by strategically appropriating the concept of "paternal love". Willie Struthers, a communist leader, also tries to start a political revolution by advocating "the trusting love of a man for his mate" (*Kangaroo*, 219). Lawrence, thus, depicts how love is exploited as a political strategy in *Kangaroo*. Concurrently, the novel explores other kinds of love, such as Richard and Harriet's matrimonial love, patriotism (love

for one's own country), and Richard's love of nature. Therefore, the novel shares with *Wuthering Heights* one of its main themes, "love".

Kangaroo is a semi-autobiographical story based on Lawrence's visit to Australia with his wife from May to August 1922. The biographical context is explicit in chapter twenty-one, in which Lawrence narrates his own bitter experiences in the First World War through Somers' point of view. During the war, Lawrence and Frieda, living by the sea in Cornwall, were marked as spies, mainly because of Frieda's German nationality and Lawrence's negative attitude towards the war. The police started watching them, following them outside, and intruding on their privacy for inspections. Their house was inspected, even in their absence. They were accused of sending signals to German submarines and providing food to the enemy. During this period, Lawrence was summoned three times to check his health for military service, treated as though he were a convict during the process, and rejected as unfit each time. In October 1917, they were forbidden to live by the sea and were forced to leave Cornwall. They were also required to regularly report their address to the police. Lawrence's bitter war-time experiences reappear in the novel as Somers'.

From the opening of the novel, similarities with *Wuthering Heights* are striking with regards to both theme and plot. For example, Somers is presented as someone with an ambiguous social origin. His neighbour, Jack, describes him as "a gentleman, apparently, and yet different, not exactly a gentleman" (*Kangaroo*, 44). This reminds readers of Lockwood's introduction of Heathcliff in *Wuthering Heights* as "a dark-skinned gipsy in aspect, in dress and manners a gentleman"

(*Wuthering Heights*, 5). Thus, both works present their main character as a mysterious outsider with regard to the social order. The way they use the term "satellite" is also noteworthy. In the opening of *Wuthering Heights*, as Lockwood returns to the Grange from his second visit to the Heights, he refers to Nelly and the other servants at the Grange as "[m]y human fixture and her satellites" (31). *Kangaroo* also uses "satellite" in the description of a lonely fisherman with his son: "He had a sad, beery moustache, a very cold-looking face, and, of course, a little boy, his son, no doubt, for a satellite" (*Kangaroo*, 302). In both cases, "a satellite" means "an attendant". *The Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd edition) defines "satellite" as "an attendant upon a person of importance, forming part of his retinue and employed to execute his orders. Often with reproachful connotation, implying subserviency or unscrupulousness in the service" (496). Therefore, its usage in *Kangaroo* may not seem special. However, considering that the examples quoted in the *OED* are all from before 1864, this particular usage of "satellite" was prevalent in Brontë's time, but not in Lawrence's. This bolsters the possibility that the experience of reading *Wuthering Heights* influenced Lawrence's use of the term.

(1) Parallels in Sick-room Scenes

The sick-room scenes in *Wuthering Heights* and *Kangaroo* have striking parallels. In *Wuthering Heights*, Heathcliff eagerly visits Catherine I on her deathbed, and in *Kangaroo*, Somers reluctantly visits Ben Cooley in the hospital. Even though the relationships between the patient and the visitor, (and each visitor's feelings towards the patient) are contrastive, Catherine I's disappointment and anger over the inability to

control Heathcliff's love are very similar to Cooley's anger upon Somers' refusal to love him. Both Catherine I and Cooley insist that the other's lack of love is killing them, by using the identical sentence "You have killed me".

In *Wuthering Heights*, Catherine I says "You and Edgar have broken my heart, Heathcliff! . . . You have killed me" (158), to which Heathcliff protests by saying "You know you lie to say I have killed you" (159) and "*you*, of your own will, did it. I have not broken your heart—*you* have broken it; and in breaking it, you have broken mine" (161). In *Kangaroo*, Cooley tries to persuade Somers by repeatedly telling him "I love you" and begging Somers to love him back, but is ultimately refused. After Cooley is shot in the belly at a political meeting and hospitalised, he blames Somers' refusal to reciprocate his love as the cause of this fatal calamity. He says "You've killed me. You've killed me, Lovat!" (*Kangaroo*, 369), and rejects Somers' denial. Thus, in both *Wuthering Heights* and *Kangaroo,* the dying patient blames the visitor's lack of love as the direct cause of their approaching death. Cooley's repetition of Catherine I's expression "You have killed me" signals yet another parallel with *Wuthering Heights*. Thus, both sick-room scenes involve the elements of love and control. Even Catherine I and Heathcliff, who regard the other as "his/her own soul", become frustrated with the incomprehensibility of the other.

There are other similarities in the expressions and descriptions of the two sick-room scenes. For example, Cooley's sudden exclamation "I'm dying! I'm dying! I'm dying!" (*Kangaroo*, 368) reminds readers of Catherine I's shriek when Heathcliff, hearing that Edgar has returned home, tries to leave in a hurry: "Heathcliff, I shall die! I shall die!" (*Wuthering Heights*, 236).

Cooley's weak and tense whisper "Say good-bye to me. Say you love me now you've done it, and I won't hate you for it" (*Kangaroo*, 369) rings close to Catherine I's "It is enough! You left me too: but I won't upbraid you! I forgive you. Forgive me!" (*Wuthering Heights*, 161), as they both declare their forgiveness.

Another striking parallel in the sick-room scenes is the patient's reaction when their visitor is about to leave. First, let us look at the scene from *Wuthering Heights*:

> He [Heathcliff] would have risen, and unfixed Cathy's fingers by the act—she clung fast, gasping: there was mad resolution in her face. "No!" she shrieked. "Oh, don't, don't go. It is the last time! Edgar will not hurt us. Heathcliff, I shall die! I shall die!" (162)

Next, here is the parallel scene from *Kangaroo*:

> Richard . . . tried to disengage his [Cooley's] hand. But the dying man clasped him with suddenly strong fingers. "No, no" he said fiercely. "Don't leave me now. You must stay with me. I shan't be long—and I need you to be there." (369)

In both scenes, the patient clings to the departing visitor, desperately begging him not to leave because they are dying. The scenes reflect the strong human desire to be loved and the difficulty of being loved in the way they desire. In *Wuthering Heights*, Catherine I's facial expression during the meeting is depicted as "[h]er present countenance had a wild vindictiveness in its white cheek, and a bloodless lip and scintillating eye" (158), while in *Kangaroo*, Cooley's expressions during his

meeting with Somers are described as “the corpse-face was eagerly upturned to [Somers’ face]” and “the eager, alert face, yellow, long, jewish, and somehow ghoulish” (370). In both descriptions, the patients’ last-minute eagerness creates an atmosphere of lifeless madness. Catherine I’s scintillating eye parallels Cooley’s alert eagerness, her vindictiveness parallels his ghoulish appearance (in the sense that they are both menacing), and her “white cheek” and “a bloodless lip” parallel his “corpse-face”. In *Wuthering Heights*, Catherine I eagerly rises and springs towards Heathcliff, who catches her, and they are locked in a symbolic loving embrace. This passionate scene is parodied in *Kangaroo,* with Cooley repeatedly demanding Somers to say that he loves him, and waiting for the answer with “the sharpened face, that seemed to be leaping up to him, or leaping up at him, like some snake striking” (370). Just like Catherine I, Cooley is ready to “jump” at Somers, but as Somers refuses to return his love, Cooley misses the chance. Lawrence compares Cooley to “some snake striking” to imply that, in fact, Cooley’s intentions are predatory in nature, different from Catherine I’s straightforward yearning for Heathcliff.

Thus, the sick-room scenes in *Kangaroo* and *Wuthering Heights* are strikingly similar and contrasting in specific ways, lending further credence to the argument that *Wuthering Heights* influenced Lawrence. Catherine I and Heathcliff are deeply in love in *Wuthering Heights*. In contrast, Cooley’s attitude towards Somers is exploitative, with Somers seeing through his deception and refusing to return his love. It also emphasises Cooley’s tyrannical arrogance in demanding self-sacrificing love from Somers as if they were soul mates from childhood, despite the fact that he did not know him long. At the

same time, Catherine I and Cooley share the desire to control the person from whom they seek love. Nelly describes Catherine I's frustration at Heathcliff's uncontrollability as "indignant disappointment" (159). This applies to Cooley as well, when he finds Somers uncontrollable. Brontë and Lawrence, depicting the characters' inability to control other people, suggest that an individual cannot be owned, fully understood, or controlled by anyone else, as he/she is unique, unfathomable, and fluid.

(2) The Complexity of Human Nature

The Newly Arrived Characters

From the outset, both *Wuthering Heights* and *Kangaroo* focus on the characters' conflict between their desire for solitude and social interaction. Lockwood, arriving at the Heights, calls himself a misanthropist and declares his joy in finding "a situation so completely removed from the stir of society" (*Wuthering Heights*, 3). However, in the next sentence, he expresses his wish to socialise with Heathcliff by saying "Mr Heathcliff and I are such a suitable pair to divide the desolation between us. A capital fellow!" (*Wuthering Heights*, 3). He then visits the Heights twice, hoping to socialise with the residents. On the first visit, a pack of dogs attacks him and Heathcliff does not try to rescue him. On the second visit, the bad weather makes it impossible for him to return to the Grange alone. He asks Heathcliff for either a guide or a chair to sleep on in the living room for a night, but both are declined. Disgusted, Lockwood says "I am now quite cured of seeking pleasure in society, be it country or town" (*Wuthering Heights*, 28). However, when he arrives at the Grange, he makes himself companionable and asks Nelly to narrate her story. The episode at the seaside also

reveals his contradictory wish to both socialise with and stay away from others. He is attracted to a girl by the seaside and admires her goddess-like beauty from afar, until she notices his feelings and returns his glance with her own. As soon as she shows interest in him, he shrinks coldly into himself.

In *Kangaroo*, Somers, new to Sydney, does not wish to socialise. He desires "not to speak one single word to any single body—except [his wife] Harriet" (*Kangaroo*, 24). However, he is gradually charmed by his neighbour Jack, and wants to participate in political activities with Jack and his boss, Cooley. When Jack invites him to take part in their activities, the narrator reveals Somers' conflicts, narrating that "[he] wanted so much. To be mates with Jack in this cause. Life and death mates. And yet he felt he couldn't. Not quite. Something stopped him" (*Kangaroo*, 117). Somers' oscillating nature is explained by the narrator as, "It was usually the same. He started by holding himself aloof, then gradually he let himself get mixed in, and then he had revulsions" (*Kangaroo*, 74).

In *Wuthering Heights*, the description of conflicts shifts from Lockwood to other characters as the story proceeds. For example, Heathcliff does not believe in anyone except Catherine I, but he sometimes discloses his personal feelings and thoughts to Nelly. The conflicts these characters experience reflect Brontë and Lawrence's views on human nature: social interaction may bring joy and offer new possibilities, but it can also cause difficulty and trouble. Conflicts may arise, and meeting others' expectations may restrict one's own freedom. Both Brontë and Lawrence value unrestrained individuality highly, but are also fully aware of how difficult it is to live as a free and unique individual. However, there is a difference between these two

works. Somers, even though he wishes to live isolated and indifferent, is aware that socialising is inevitable. On the other hand, Heathcliff and Catherine I disregard social decorum whenever they like. This difference reflects the different attitudes that Brontë and Lawrence had towards others. While Brontë chose to shut out others to protect her natural self, Lawrence did not forgo interactions with others.

Conflicts between Man and Woman

Couples are no exception to such conflicts, as they need space from each other (even more so, because of their intimacy). Ultimately, people want to maintain their uniqueness and not be swallowed by the influence of others. The novels depict the characters maintaining distance from their loved ones to protect their individuality. In *Wuthering Heights*, Catherine I, transformed after a five-week stay at Grange, worries about Heathcliff's dirty fingers soiling her beautiful dress. Noticing this, Heathcliff snaps "You needn't have touched me! . . . I shall be as dirty as I please" (54). His reaction implies resistance against the new bourgeois values she brought back with her being forced upon him. In another scene, irritated by Heathcliff's criticism of her spending more time with Edgar, Catherine I says, "And should I always be sitting with you?", refusing to be controlled by criticism (69). Similarly, when accused by Catherine I of seducing Isabella, Heathcliff growls "I have a right to kiss her, if she chooses: you have no right to object" (110-111). These conflicts imply that even Catherine I and Heathcliff, who both admit themselves to be inseparable, need some distance from each other.

In *Kangaroo*, the chapter "Harriet and Lovat at Sea in

Marriage" is an allegorical depiction of Mr & Mrs Somers' marital life, in which Harriet, aiming for the "perfect lover' and 'true friend and companion", tries to continue their sail with a "flag of perfect love". On the other hand, Somers wishes to be treated as the "lord and master who is honoured and obeyed" (*Kangaroo*, 188) by his wife, and asks her to let him put up his flag of a phoenix rising from a nest in flames. This is an allegory of their actual marital conflicts. For example, Harriet in actuality protests against being excluded from the political discussions Somers enjoys with other men, but Somers continues to resist her, saying, "You see . . . I have the roots of my life with you. But I want if possible to send out a new shoot in the life of mankind—the effort man makes forever, to grow into new forms" (*Kangaroo*, 78). Thus, he clarifies his rigid intention, despite using soft expressions to show concern for Harriet's feelings. In this way, the characters in both works maintain distance from others, even their loved ones, to avoid being controlled by them.

(3) The Transience of Human Nature

Lovers Drifting Apart

Wuthering Heights and *Kangaroo* illustrate the transient nature of individualistic personalities, which makes human relationships complex. Catherine I and Heathcliff's discordance arises despite their psychological affinity, after Catherine I's five-week stay at the Grange, because the experience made her see the merits of being wealthy. She marries Edgar to help Heathcliff, but without a shared experience Heathcliff fails to understand her intentions. He even blames Catherine I on her deathbed, saying, "What *right* had you to leave me? . . . for the

poor fancy you felt for Linton?" (*Wuthering Heights*, 160). Heathcliff's three-year absence further widens the gap between them. Catherine I, on her deathbed, says "That is not *my* Heathcliff. I shall love mine yet" (159), making it clear that she wants a past version of Heathcliff, and not the Heathcliff present before her. Such comments reveal that they have grown apart from each other.

Somers, on the other hand, recognises that each change a person goes through influences his/her relationships with others, and claims that a relationship should be fluid. The narrator explains human love and trust from Somers' point of view as follows:

> Human love, human trust, are always perilous, because they break down. The greater the love, the greater the trust, and the greater the peril, the greater the disaster. (*Kangaroo*, 220)

He warns against seeking absolute love or trust in another, by saying:

> Absolute lovers always smash one another, absolute trusters the same. Since man has been trying absolutely to love women, and women to love man, the human species has almost wrecked itself. (*Kangaroo*, 220)

"Absolute lovers" here reminds one of Catherine I and Heathcliff, because they do not admit the transient nature of their own relationship. Voicing Somers' thoughts, the narrator points out

that our individuality makes us "wayward, wilful, dangerous, and untrustworthy" (*Kangaroo*, 220) to other individuals, and that "every individual is bound at some time to react against every other individual" (220).

The Transience of Somers and Harriet

Kangaroo depicts a constantly changing relationship between Somers and Harriet. Somers shuts out Harriet from his world in order to concentrate on his relationship with Jack and Cooley, even though he loves her and depends on her. He also loses interest in Harriet while in Cornwall, as he starts socialising with people on the farm, such as John Thomas. The narrator says:

> Poor Harriet spent many lonely days in the cottage. Richard was not interested in her now. He was only interested in John Thomas and the farm people. (*Kangaroo*, 263)

Somers' unstable attitude towards Harriet, despite his strong affection for her, can only be explained by his natural waywardness. Somers and Harriet's attitudes towards Australia and its people have also changed. On arrival, while Somers is unwilling to interact with Australians, Harriet is pleased with the freedom she finds in the new land. However, Somers starts to enjoy interacting with local people, while Harriet starts to dislike the land as she gradually recognises its hostility. By the time they leave Australia, Somers has lost interest in the local people, but he and Harriet are both strongly attached to the beauty of the land.

(4) Humans as Part of the Natural World

Trees and Humans

Wuthering Heights and *Kangaroo* present images of wild animals and plants as self-sufficient, continually changing as a part of the natural world. This impermanence is also what Brontë and Lawrence believe to be the best and most natural human state.

The novels personify trees using similar expressions. The trees around the Heights are described by Lockwood during his first visit as follows:

> Pure, bracing ventilation they must have up there at all times, indeed: one may guess the power of the north wind, blowing over the edge, by the excessive slant of a few stunted firs at the end of the house; and by a range of gaunt thorns all stretching their limbs one way, as if craving alms of the sun. (*Wuthering Heights*, 4)

The unhealthy appearance of the trees signals the roughness of the land not only for plants and animals, but also for humans both physically and psychologically. The narrator calls the thorny branches "limbs", which also refers to the arms or legs of a person. *The Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd edition) defines "limb" as "[a] part or member of an animal body distinct from the head or the trunk, e.g. a leg, arm, wing" (956) as well as "[a] main branch of a tree" (956). Brontë also uses, in the quotation above, the term "gaunt" for the thorns, which can mean the lean and haggard appearance of a person (especially due to suffering,

starvation, or age). *OED* defines "gaunt" as "[a]bnormally lean, as from hunger; haggard-looking; tall, thin, and angular in appearance" (404). In this way, these terms can be interpreted as personifying the thorns as suffering humans.

Kangaroo uses the same terms ("limbs" and "gaunt") for gum-trees, suggesting that Lawrence was trying to create the same uncanny atmosphere as depicted in *Wuthering Heights*. From the beginning of the story, Somers (or the narrator) senses the spirit of the bush waiting for something as if it were human, and describes the trees using "gaunt" once and "limbs" several times. For example, the narrator describes the trees in the bush as "Overhead rose the gum-trees, sometimes with great **stark, dead limbs** thrown up" (*Kangaroo*, 196, emphasis added), "the gum-trees like white, **naked nerves running up their limbs**, and the inevitable **dead** gum-trees poking **stark grey limbs** into the air" (*Kangaroo*, 387, emphases added), and "the **gaunt**, lightless gum-trees rearing a little way off" (*Kangaroo*, 390, emphasis added). In these sentences, the terms "dead", "limb" and "gaunt" associate trees with dead or dying humans, and "stark dead limbs" fortifies the image of dead humans because the term "stark" means stiffness or rigidness of the dead. *OED* defines "stark" as "[r]igid, stiff (in death)" (534). "[N]aked nerves running up their limbs" also generates a painful image of human nerves in one's hands and legs being exposed. Lawrence's use of terms such as "corpse" (*Kangaroo*, 18) and "tall, nude, dead" (*Kangaroo*, 19) to depict trees in other sentences also presents trees like humans.

In this way, both works connect these uncanny personifications of ill-looking trees to humans in ill-health.

Blurred Lines between Humans and Nature

While both Brontë and Lawrence describe trees like humans, they also present humans as a part of nature. The characters' physical features, personalities, and emotions are reflected in descriptions of animals and plants. For example, in *Wuthering Heights,* Catherine I compares her love for Edgar to the foliage, and that for Heathcliff to the eternal rocks beneath. Nelly compares Catherine I and Edgar to thorns and honeysuckles, respectively. The pack of vicious dogs at the Heights becomes a metaphor for the roughness of those who live with them. Catherine I compares Isabella to a "tigress" and a "vixen", and Edgar to a "leveret". In *Kangaroo*, Somers, tired of associating with others, wants to "get out of this lit-up cloy of humanity, and the exhaust of love, and the fretfulness of desire" (*Kangaroo*, 154), to "break the bond and be single" (*Kangaroo*, 154), and become like a gannet, a hawk, or a kite. He yearns to live indifferently like a plant or an animal in the bush or by the sea, and admires the way fish live with self-sufficient vigour. The repeated depictions of the sea and the waves symbolise Somers' constantly and organically changing mind and emotions, and descriptions of the frightful and mysterious bush reflect the dark inscrutable parts of his heart. Cooley is called a "kangaroo" because of his appearance and a "snake" because of his stealthy aggression. Likewise, Harriet is compared to a "tigress", while Somers is compared to a "dog" and a "snake".

Merging humans with wild animals and plants effectively blurs the borders between them, denying the conventional notion that humans are superior to other species. Humans seek solitude and independence and continue to change, just like other creatures in the natural world. However, humans also live in communities and seek to socialise. Both Brontë and Lawrence

are aware that this contradiction makes human life difficult. The conflict between the human desires for socialising and isolation brings to light the unnatural character of human life, compared with the natural isolation and indifference of other organisms.

(5) Conclusion

Wuthering Heights and *Kangaroo* demonstrate a shared understanding of the unnatural state of human life. First, they illustrate that individuals are difficult to understand because of their contradictory desires and constantly changing nature. This reflects Brontë and Lawrence's emphasis on the values of individual uniqueness, complexity, and independence as natural beings. Second, the novels showcase the constraints of society and the necessity for humans to adapt themselves to these constraints for survival. *Wuthering Heights* describes the tragedy of a couple who cannot survive because they ignore the rules of their community, and *Kangaroo* presents the main character's conflict between the yearning for solitude and socialising. Both authors present their characters as trapped in unnatural situations where they are torn between trying to be a free individual and being expected to behave as a part of a community. The striking similarities between *Wuthering Heights* and *Kangaroo*, such as the sick-room scenes, the choice of identical terms, expressions and similar plots, suggest that, on multiple levels, *Wuthering Heights* influenced Lawrence in his creation of *Kangaroo*.

2. *Wuthering Heights* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman"

This section posits Lawrence's short story "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" as a story that mirrors *Wuthering Heights*.

The story presents the main character, Jimmy, as a parody of Lockwood, as they share the characteristics of superficiality typical of the elite, and fear of straightforward communication, while Mrs Pinnegar is presented in the role of Catherine II, giving the gentleman-guest the cold shoulder. The two stories reflect both Brontë's and Lawrence's views, which value straightforward expressions of natural and spontaneous emotions more than polite and artful interactions. Jimmy and Lockwood, who are socially-privileged males, represent the voice of high society, while Mrs Pinnegar and Catherine II, deprived of their fortunes and freedom by their patriarchs, represent the voices of exploited but strong women. Their agony, frustration, and anger are positively presented by the authors as natural, energetic, and human.

(1) Jimmy and John Middleton Murry

Lawrence wrote "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" from February to April 1924. It was published in *The Criterion*, Vol. 3, in October of the same year. Even though Jimmy in the story bears a resemblance to Lockwood in *Wuthering Heights*, he is also modelled on Lawrence's friend John Middleton Murry. Murry, a talented literary critic, served as the editor of the literary magazine *The Athenaeum* from 1919 to 1921, and founded another literary magazine, *The Adelphi*, in 1923. He is also known for supporting modernist writers, such as T. S. Eliot and Virginia Woolf, and for having been the partner and husband of Katherine Mansfield. He met Lawrence in the summer of 1913, when the latter submitted a short story to *Rhythm*, a modernist magazine edited by Murry, and their friendship started including their partners. However, according to Toda, their relationship

had extreme emotional ups and downs, and tended to oscillate between attraction and antagonism (307).

Tetsumura refers to the possibility that Lawrence's wife, Frieda, and Murry became physically intimate during Frieda's solo trip back to Europe in the autumn or winter of 1923 (Mansfield died in January 1923). Lawrence was in Mexico at the time. The same year, on 12 December, Lawrence joined Murry and Frieda in England, sensed their intimacy, and became distrustful of Murry. Shortly after this, he wrote "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" (Tetsumura, 387-9).

Lawrence wrote a series of works, including "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman", that satirised Murry. Jimmy undoubtedly resembles Murry in many ways. For example, Jimmy is the "editor of a high-class, rather high-brow, rather successful magazine" (349) called *Commentator*, just like Murry was a talented editor of intellectual magazines. Jimmy and Murry are also alike in that they orchestrated meetings with female contributors to their magazines, seeking romance. Mansfield met Murry when she sent her work to *Rhythm* in the autumn of 1911. Sensing her literary talent, Murry asked her to send more of her work and then arranged a meeting (Toda, 301). Mansfield was not the only female contributor whom Murry approached. According to Brian Finney, in 1923, when Lawrence returned to England to join Frieda, Murry went to Nottinghamshire to see a miner's wife who had sent him her work for *Adelphi*. Murry was unable to develop a relationship with her and, according to Finney (534), Lawrence heard about this episode and wrote "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman". John Worthen, referring to this episode, said that " . . . during this week Lawrence helped Murry from yet another emotional entanglement with a woman,

the one he later commemorated in his story 'Jimmy and the Desperate Woman'" (304). Tetsumura mentions another case. In the spring of 1924, Violet le Maistre, aged twenty-four, sent a short story to *Adelphi*, and Murry fell in love with her. They got married on 24 April in the same year. In this way, as Tetsumura points out, Murry was good at starting romantic relationships with female contributors (391). These episodes echo the plot of "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman", in which Jimmy receives Mrs Pinnegar's poems for his magazine, becomes interested in her, asks her to submit other poems, and then proposes a meeting. The narrator explains that he is attracted to her because she exuded a desperate and tragic aura. Here, Lawrence ironically implies that, consciously or unconsciously, Jimmy (and, indirectly, Murry) seeks a vulnerable woman who would easily succumb to him.

To make the connection between Jimmy and Murry clearer, Lawrence also makes their physical appearances similar. Jimmy is depicted as follows:

> . . . the fine, clean lines of his face, like the face of the laughing faun in one of the faun's unlaughing, moody moments. The long, clean lines of the cheeks, the strong chin and the slightly arched, full nose, the beautiful dark-grey eyes with long lashes, and the thick black brows. (349)

Some of the facial characteristics match Murry's features in his photos, such as "the long, clean lines of the cheeks", "the strong chin", "the slightly arched, full nose", the beautiful eyes "with long lashes", and "the thick black brows". Another thing they

have in common is their spectacles. The narrator repeatedly refers to Jimmy's spectacles, while Murry asked Mansfield to send him his glasses in a letter in June 1913 (*Letters between Katherine Mansfield and John Middleton Murry*, 24).

Jimmy, like Murry, graduated from Oxford University. Lawrence expresses his negative opinions of an elite education both in a comment to Murry and in descriptions of Jimmy. Lawrence wrote to Murry in 1913, "I think Oxford did you harm" (*Letters II*, 112). In the story, he satirises Jimmy's intonation and manners that convey his Oxford background. For example, phrases such as "in a voice more expostulatingly Oxford than ever" and "a resonant Oxford voice" express Jimmy's pompous manner of speaking, which is out of place in a mining village. The term "expostulatingly" reveals Jimmy's sense of superiority over the villagers. The narrator describes Mrs Pinnegar's bewilderment over Jimmy's demeanour: "It was his manner, his rather Oxfordy manner, more than anything else, that went beyond her. She wasn't used to it" (357).

Murry and Jimmy were also immature and lacked self-confidence. Toda writes that Murry was exceptionally indecisive:

> Whenever he faced making decisions on jobs or marriage, he was painfully indecisive, and could not reach any decision on these matters. In the end, he was driven by necessity to earn his own living, and decided to take a position in journalism in London. However, even after that, for a long time, he had a strange tendency to rely on others when he had to make important decisions, whether on business or in private life. (Toda 264, translated by Yamanouchi)

Murry's indecisiveness, low self-confidence, and consequent unreliability resemble, to some extent, Jimmy's personality. From the beginning, the narrative depicts Jimmy as having failed as a husband by mentioning that his wife left him for a rich young American. In this pitiable condition, he starts looking for "some really *womanly* woman, to whom he should be *only* 'fine and strong', and not for one moment 'the poor little man'" (348). In short, he wants a submissive woman. This implies his lack of self-confidence. Jimmy's weakness is more exaggerated than Murry's, as Jimmy's wife left him, while Murry and Mansfield stayed together until death did them part. At the same time, Jimmy's wife's fickle behaviour casts doubt on his sagacity in the choice of his wife. Considering that Mansfield was a good friend of Lawrence's, Jimmy's wife is not based on Mansfield.

Thus, Jimmy is a satirised version of Murry. He is different from Murry in several ways, but those who knew Murry personally would have realised that he was the model.

(2) Jimmy and Lockwood

Jimmy reminds readers not only of Murry but also of Lockwood in *Wuthering Heights*. This section points out significant similarities between them and posits that Lawrence drew inspiration from *Wuthering Heights*, at least to some extent, when he wrote "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman".

Backgrounds and Personalities

Jimmy and Lockwood come from similar backgrounds and share similar personality traits. This section first looks at their settings, such as where they live, their financial status, and

educational backgrounds. Then, the section analyses their personality traits, such as their inability to grasp situations appropriately, their overreliance on polite and insubstantial communication, and anxiety about straightforward communication with others. The analysis reveals a causal link between their affluent and wealthy background and superficial lifestyle.

◆Places of Residence

Both Jimmy and Lockwood are from the southern part of England. Jimmy, who visits Mrs Pinnegar in Yorkshire, has scarcely set foot north of Oxford before. He now lives in London (he asks Mrs Pinnegar: "Come to London and live with me, as my wife" 355). Lockwood also moves from the south to Yorkshire. Arriving at the Grange, he asks the housekeeper to serve dinner at five. Pauline Nestor explains in the notes of *Wuthering Heights* that his desire to "dine at five is a legacy of his fashionable southern lifestyle" (338). Lockwood also compares people in towns and people in the region around the Heights and the Grange and says that the latter "live more in earnest, more in themselves, and less in surface, change, and frivolous external things" (61). He goes so far as to say "I could fancy a love for life here almost possible" (61). He draws these comparisons, aware that he belongs to "people in towns". When he decides to leave the Grange, he says, "I shall spend the next six months in London" (295). Even though he might not be a regular resident of London, this suggests that he usually belongs to the social circles of towns in the south.

Thus, both works tell "a story of a man from the south of England visiting the north". As will be examined in detail in the

following sections, the stories characterise the men from the south (Lockwood and Jimmy) as well-educated and affluent but also frivolous, superficial, and artful, while people in the north (especially the residents of the Heights, and the Pinnegars) are presented as less educated, less affluent, and uncouth but straightforward and passionate. With Brontë being from Yorkshire and Lawrence from Nottinghamshire, such positive representations of people in the north indicate their attachment to where they grew up.

◆Classical Education

Lockwood and Jimmy share a classical education. Jimmy, as the editor of a high-class magazine, is an intellectual who gives a lecture "Men in Books and Men in Life". Jimmy's viewpoint reflected in the narrative is full of references to texts such as Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, Goethe's *Faust*, the Old Testament, and Greek and Roman mythologies. For example, in the mining village, while he is looking for Mrs Pinnegar, he "felt like some modern Ulysses wandering in the realms of Hecate" (352). Ulysses is a Greek mythological hero, and Hecate is a Greek goddess often associated with witchcraft and ghosts. Jimmy, wandering around the village, boasts about his braveness by thinking "How much more dismal and horrible, a modern Odyssey among mines and factories, than any Sirens, Scyllas or Charybdises" (352). Odyssey, or Odysseus, is the Roman name for Ulysses. Sirens, Scyllas, and Charybdises all appear in Greek mythology. Sirens are supernatural creatures whose song lures sailors to rocks causing shipwrecks, Scyllas are female sea monsters who devour sailors, and Charybdises are dangerous whirlpools personified as female monsters. Thus, the narrative

demonstrates Jimmy's familiarity with classical literature, especially the Greek and Roman mythologies. It also hints at his tendency to frequently refer to classic literature as if to show off his knowledge to others. His imagination, which compares the mining village to a foreign mythical world filled with dangerous female monsters, also reveals his fear of those who are "different from himself", such as miners and women. His sense of discomfort in the mining area is evident, as he calls the place "unhabitated like a cold black jungle" (353). Jimmy transmogrifies the unfamiliar English mining village into a prehistoric jungle outside England filled with lurking dangers.

Lockwood also mentions classic literature implying the kind of education he received. Other than the multiple references to the Bible, he refers to *King Lear*, *Twelfth Night*, and *Macbeth* by William Shakespeare. His strong attachment to books is evident when he examines all of Catherine I's library in the box bed at the Heights, when he explains sorrowfully to the readers "I am too weak to read" (90) when in bed with a cold at the Grange (implying that he would have read if he were stronger), and when he exclaims as he notices that Catherine II has no book to read at the Heights, "No books! . . . How do you contrive to live here without them? If I may take the liberty to inquire—Though provided with a large library, I'm frequently very dull at the Grange—take my books away, and I should be desperate!" (298). Lockwood's sophisticated use of the English language is apparent through his florid expressions, complicated sentence structures, and Greek- or Latin-rooted vocabulary. For example, when he sees Heathcliff for the first time, he says, "I do myself the honour of calling as soon as possible, after my arrival, to express the hope that I have not inconvenienced you by my perseverance

in soliciting the occupation of Thrushcross Grange . . .” (3). He uses roundabout expressions such as “I do myself the honour of calling” and “I have not inconvenienced you” and Latin-rooted vocabulary such as “perseverance”, “soliciting”, and “occupation”. This tendency also indicates his prestigious education and his habit of making it visible to others. Lockwood’s educational background is presented by Brontë rather negatively, just as Lawrence depicts Jimmy as unnecessarily over-pompous and pretentious.

◆Negative Evaluations of the Affluent and Well-educated Characters

In *Wuthering Heights* and “Jimmy and the Desperate Woman”, Brontë and Lawrence, respectively, depict affluent elites negatively. They have had a good education granted to them without striving for it. Lockwood is a nineteenth-century gentleman who does not have to work, while Jimmy, being a magazine editor, is a twentieth-century white-collar worker. Therefore, they belong to different classes. However, what they have in common is that their respective social classes and incomes are higher than those of the other characters. Just as Lockwood is financially more affluent than the yeomen of the Heights, Jimmy has a higher status and income than the Pinnegars, a miner’s family. The differences in class and social standing naturally produce educational gaps between the characters. However, the characters with lower incomes such as the Pinnegars and the inhabitants of the Heights are not “uneducated”. They are cultured in their humble ways. Mrs Pinnegar has teaching certificates and Mr Pinnegar reads journals such as the *Liberator* and *Janus*. At the Heights,

Lockwood perceives Heathcliff as “very intelligent” based on the topics that they discuss. Both Catherine II and Nelly like to read. At the end of the story, Hareton strives passionately to learn how to read. The characters belonging to the less affluent class thus culture themselves by using the resources available to them. Such efforts towards self-education despite their adverse circumstances suggest a genuine passion for learning, in contrast with Jimmy’s and Lockwood’s effortlessly endowed education.

Depicting the contrast between well-off characters with an elite education and social status, on the one hand, and those with limited means spurred by desires to learn, on the other, Brontë and Lawrence’s respective texts converge on the point that the upper-class characters are not very “alive” in the sense that the hothouse of civilisation is artificially keeping them alive. The lower-class characters’ struggles for learning are spontaneous and passionate based on their natural desires, and, hence, they are more “natural” and “alive” in learning. This argument is understandable when we consider that both Brontë and Lawrence had to struggle for their education and careers as writers; the former because she was a woman in patriarchal nineteenth-century England and the latter as he had a working-class background.

◆Reality vs. Fantasy

Jimmy and Lockwood, both well-acquainted with classic literature, also share a tendency to confuse reality with fantasy.

First, Jimmy considers fictional women such as Tess, Gretchen, and Ruth ideal partners and tries to look for them in real women. He sees literary characters as ideal women, because

their personalities are fixed and easy to grasp, allowing him to choose safely. Jimmy, whose marriage has just failed, seeks security, however illusory, by escaping into controllable fictional worlds. In real life, of course, human beings are complicated, fickle, and unpredictable. The title of his lecture, "Men in Books and Men in Life" is ironic, as he is the one who confuses people in books with those in real life.

Lockwood's narrative also exposes similar confusion. First, he chooses to stay in an isolated part of Yorkshire, looking for some Gothic experiences. Gothic stories, often set in remote mansions, monasteries, or ruins, were popular around 1801, the year he visits the Heights. The Gothic boom started with Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), and its popularity reached its peak with Ann Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794), which was seven years before Lockwood's visit to the Heights. It is also the period in which "picturesque" scenery was in fashion, and many travelled the countryside, like Lockwood, looking for the sublimity of wild nature and weather-beaten ruins. In fact, at the beginning of the novel, Lockwood deliberately creates a Gothic atmosphere in his narration about the Heights. For example, he explains his first impressions of Heathcliff:

> . . . how my heart warmed towards him when I beheld his black eyes withdraw so suspiciously under their brows . . . and when his fingers sheltered themselves, with a jealous resolution, still further in his waistcoat, as I announced my name. (3)

Here, Lockwood introduces Heathcliff by using negative terms such as “suspiciously” and “jealous” but claims positive feelings towards him by saying “my heart warmed towards him” (3). Lockwood even calls him “[a] capital fellow” (3) despite his realisation that Heathcliff says “walk in” with the sentiment of “Go to the Deuce!” (3). Lockwood’s amusement on seeing Heathcliff’s rude eccentricity is because Heathcliff looks just like a Gothic villain in a Gothic-like remote and wild environment. Noticing that Heathcliff will not open the gate for him, Lockwood announces “that circumstance determined me to accept the invitation” (3), suggesting his perverse enjoyment. His viewpoint is thus biased. Lockwood gets excited when Nelly tells him the Gothic-like drama of the Earnshaws, the Lintons, and the mysterious outsider Heathcliff (“I was excited, almost to a pitch of foolishness, through my nerves and brain”, 35).

He also depicts the Heights imitating the atmosphere of Gothic novels. The thorns around the Heights are ominously compared to severely suffering humans in “a range of gaunt thorns all stretching their limbs one way, as if craving alms of the sun” (4). As mentioned before, the terms and expressions such as “gaunt”, “stretching their limbs”, and “craving” (4) are usually used for humans. The interior of the Heights is also described in the style of Gothic literature. For example, Lockwood describes the preserved meat as “*clusters of legs* of beef, mutton and ham”, giving readers a gruesome image of multiple legs hanging from the ceiling. He also calls a red-brown dog “liver-coloured”, associating the dog with the internal organ, and its puppies “*a swarm of* squealing puppies”, creating a grotesque image in the description of the puppies, which are more often associated with cuteness. His choice of the phrase

"lurking in the shade" (5) to depict a few heavy black chairs makes the chairs seem like dangerous animals or monsters that might pounce out of the shade at any moment.

Thus, Lockwood seeks Gothic elements in real life and narrates his story through that lens. He escapes into his Gothic fantasy because, like Jimmy, he lacks confidence in his communication skills and because people are more predictable and easier to control in fiction. Escapism shelters him from the anxiety caused by life's uncertainties, even if, just as in Jimmy's case, it is only illusory. His poor communication skills are most evident in the seaside episode where he fails to communicate with a girl he fancies. He even calls himself "unworthy of a comfortable home", revealing his lack of confidence with women. At the Heights, his mistakes are repeatedly brought up by others but he continues to view the world the way he prefers. At the end of the story, even after having been well-acquainted with the destructively passionate stories of Catherine I and Heathcliff, he still cannot help but offer a prosaic fairy-tale-like conclusion that their after-life would be peaceful in "how any one could ever imagine unquiet slumbers, for the sleepers in that quiet earth" (334).

Thus, Jimmy and Lockwood share the habit of escaping into fictional worlds to avoid the anxiety of facing the fluid and incomprehensible real world. Their way of navigating life is thus deliberate and unnatural.

◆Misunderstanding Reality

Much like their habit of looking at the world through literature, Jimmy and Lockwood also frequently misunderstand reality. In other words, they have a poor ability to understand

their circumstances. Lawrence sarcastically points out the gap between Jimmy's self-evaluation and others' evaluations of him. His male friends consider him "[a] good-looking, smooth-skinned satyr" (349). Satyr, a Greek mythological character now conflated with the iconography of the Pans, is a half-human half-horse/goat woodland demi-god who is associated with drunkenness and strong sexual desires. Therefore, the description implies that Jimmy is considered someone who is fond of drinking and women. His female friends describe him as "a fascinating little man with a profound understanding of life and the capacity really to understand a woman and to make a woman feel a queen" (349). His talent of being able to please women corresponds with his male friends' opinion of him as a womanising playboy. His female friends call him "a fascinating little man", referring to his smallness. However, Jimmy considers himself *great* by comparing himself to Saint Sebastian, a Christian martyr in the third century. The comparison reveals Jimmy's grandiose delusions. Saint Sebastian is known to have been a handsome young man who was killed during the Roman emperor Diocletian's persecution of the Christians. Jimmy therefore believes himself to be a handsome victim of others' persecutions. Hence, he is bent on fictionalising his situation into something more desirable for himself.

Lockwood's characteristic unreliable narration is associated with his incapability to objectively understand his circumstances. First, as mentioned above, he narrates what he sees through the tinted lenses of Gothic novels, giving readers biased information. Second, his interpretations of the residents of the Heights turn out to be incorrect. At the beginning of the story, he wrongly narrates that "Mr Heathcliff and I are such a

suitable pair to divide the desolation between us" (3), expecting Heathcliff to be someone pretending to be a misanthropist but who, in reality, avoids blatant displays of feelings. He tells readers "I know, by instinct, his reserve springs from an aversion to showy displays of feeling—to manifestations of mutual kindness. He'll love and hate, equally under cover" (5). The expression "by instinct" ironically exposes how wrong his "instinct" is, as, before long, he sees Heathcliff's passionate and uncontrollable outburst, tearfully begging Catherine I's ghost to come into the window. Brontë thus signals to her readers the unreliability of Lockwood's narration at the beginning of the novel. Lockwood also wrongly guesses that Hareton is Heathcliff's son and Catherine II's husband. He even mistakes a pile of dead rabbits for Catherine II's pet cats. His poor ability to grasp the real world makes him a comical figure who makes eccentric mistakes.

In this way, Jimmy's and Lockwood's prestigious educational backgrounds and social status do not guarantee the accuracy of their understanding. In fact, their intelligence misleads them as it recreates the world the way they wish it to be. At the same time, Jimmy and Lockwood are comfortable expressing their wrong interpretations in public, as they feel validated by their high educational and social backgrounds.

◆Relationships with Women

Jimmy's and Lockwood's poor abilities to understand reality are most noticeable in their relationships with women.

Jimmy is conceited about his popularity among women, but, at the same time, he fears them. His fear is revealed, for example, when he imagines that the mining area is filled with dangerous

female Greek monsters. For him, women are incomprehensible and hence ominous creatures. He seeks simple and obedient women who are totally under his control and won't hurt him. He wishes to be revered like a king by women, with the narrator saying "It was the turn of the women to make him feel a king" (350) and starts looking for "Some . . . woman, to whom he would be a sort of Solomon of wisdom, beauty, and wealth" (350). He reflects on how to find a woman like that and concludes that "She would need to be in reduced circumstances to appreciate his wealth" (350). Jimmy expects Mrs Pinnegar to meet these requirements. However, Mrs Pinnegar, who certainly is in reduced circumstances, is not submissive. She is educated, assertive, and independent enough to rebel against her husband. Thus, Jimmy's choice again reveals his poor ability to understand his circumstances.

The narrator expresses Jimmy's fear of Mrs Pinnegar during their conversations by stating "Jimmy felt definitely frightened" (354) and repeatedly compares his communication with Mrs Pinnegar to a gamble and Jimmy to a gambler, as in "The very sense of a gamble, in which he could not lose desperately, excited him" (355). This comparison suggests that, for Jimmy, Mrs Pinnegar is merely a prize in a game. The narrator also repeatedly describes Jimmy as "a drunken man", suggesting that he is not in a sober state of mind. His mind is closed when he talks to Mrs Pinnegar, as the narrator describes ". . . like a man talking absolutely to himself, and turning his eyes inwards" (355) and "He spoke still with his eyes turned inwards talking to himself" (356). It is his fear of the possibility of Mrs Pinnegar hurting him that makes him talk to himself and not to her, as if he were a drunk gambler. Jimmy's reliance on Oxford manners to

conceal fear and agitation is very similar to Lockwood's tendency to hide his emotions behind superficial communication and adherence to social rules.

Lockwood's poor ability to relate to women is apparent in the seaside episode and in the way he interacts with Catherine II. At the seaside, when the girl whom he praises as "a real goddess" returns "the sweetest of all imaginable looks", he shrinks icily into himself and embarrasses her. It is his lack of confidence in his interpersonal skills and fear of women that make him cold and cruel. With Catherine II, who ignores all social codes, Lockwood persistently adheres to diplomatic language and gallant manners. As explained above, this is very similar to Jimmy's persistent Oxford manners despite Mrs Pinnegar's inability to understand them. Both Lockwood and Jimmy use their high-class manners as armour to protect themselves, as these are seen as a sign of a good education and social standing. Simultaneously, they wrongly believe that their elite manners are appreciated in any situation and by women of any background.

Lockwood is both fascinated by and afraid of Catherine II, and his fear prevents him from approaching her. When he listens to Nelly talk about Catherine II's mother, his fear becomes obvious as he narrates:

> let me beware of the fascination that lurks in Catherine Heathcliff's brilliant eyes. I should be in a curious taking if I surrendered my heart to that young person, and the daughter turned out a second edition of the mother! (152)

However, when he visits the Heights for the third time, Lockwood tries to "get a last glimpse of Catherine" (301) before he leaves, showing interest in her. At the end of the story, Lockwood reveals his regret about having stayed away from Catherine II. Looking at Catherine II and Hareton studying together, he narrates, "I bit my lips, in spite, at having thrown away the chance I might have had, of doing something besides staring at [Catherine II's face's] smiting beauty" (305). Thus, Lockwood cannot act when necessary, and later regrets the missed opportunity.

At the same time, Lockwood is conceited enough to think that women should appreciate him. On his third visit to the Heights, he implies that he belongs to "a better class of people" by saying: "Living among clowns and misanthropists, she [Catherine II] probably cannot appreciate a better class of people, when she meets them" (301). He also narrates:

> What a realisation of something more romantic than a fairy tale it would have been for Mrs Linton Heathcliff, had she and I struck up an attachment, as her good nurse desired, and migrated together into the stirring atmosphere of the town! (301)

It is noteworthy that the phrase "for Mrs Linton Heathcliff" implies that he regards the elopement beneficial for her rather than for himself. Considering that Catherine II has no interest in Lockwood, his self-conceited fantasy signals, again, his poor ability to grasp the situation.

Thus, Jimmy and Lockwood are both well-educated members of the elite who tend to confuse the literary world with the real

one. Their confusion, which lowers their ability to grasp what is happening around them, is caused partly because they look at the world in the ways they want to and interpret it to suit their own convenience. Consequently, the world they see is distorted. Their over-confidence in their educational background makes it even harder for them to realise their problems. *Wuthering Heights* uses Lockwood's first-person narration in parts, and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" uses Jimmy's viewpoint throughout the story even though it employs the third-person narrative. Brontë and Lawrence employ sarcasm to depict these unreliable narrators, especially their relationships with women, so that readers notice their role as clowns. They are good at interacting superficially, using sophisticated or fashionable manners, but not at being frank and straightforward. They fear women because women are "different", "incomprehensible", and "uncontrollable", and they are afraid of getting involved in relationships with women who might hurt them, cause them trouble, or expose them to irrational/violent emotions. Brontë and Lawrence express, through Lockwood and Jimmy respectively, that civilisation and elite education damage natural and instinctive responses, which are essential for human life.

Visiting a Household in the North

This section looks at Jimmy and Lockwood's similar experiences when they visit a household in the north.

◆Expressions of Bleakness

Jimmy's journey to the Pinnegars and Lockwood's to the Heights are very close in their situations and images. First, here

is the scene in which Jimmy goes through the mining village looking for the Pinnegars.

> . . . as he **waded through icy black mud**, in a **black** lane, under **black** trees that moaned an accompaniment to the sound of the coal-mine's occasional hissing and chuffing, under a **black** sky that quenched even the electric sparkle of the colliery". ("Jimmy and the Desperate Woman", 353, emphases added)

Lawrence repeats the adjective "black" in "black mud", "black lane", "black trees", and "black sky" to suggest ill weather resulting in muddiness, the approaching darkness, and the sooty coal-mining village. He also mentions the "icy" temperature. The same images of muddiness, blackness, and coldness are detected in *Wuthering Height*s when Lockwood visits the Heights for the second time.

> Yesterday afternoon set in misty and **cold**. I had half a mind to spend it by my study fire, instead of **wading through** heath and **mud** to Wuthering Heights. On coming up from dinner, however . . . on mounting the stairs with this lazy intention, and stepping into the room, I saw a servant-girl on her knees, surrounded by brushes and coal-scuttles, and raising an infernal dust as she extinguished the flames with heaps of cinders. This spectacle drove me back immediately; I took my hat, and, after a four miles

> walk, arrived at Heathcliff's garden gate just in time to escape the first feathery flakes of a **snow shower.**
>
> On that bleak hill top the earth was hard with a **black frost**, and the air made me shiver through every limb. (*Wuthering Heights*, 8, emphases added.)

Here, the earth with "black frost" suggests dark mud and approaching dusk. At the same time, "frost" "cold", and "snow" suggest the freezing temperature, and "mud", "frost", and "snow shower" suggest the wet weather. The two scenes thus share blackness, darkness, muddiness, wetness, and coldness. The visitors have to "wade through" mud for a long time before they reach their destinations. Jimmy visits the Pinnegars after "much weary walking and asking" (352) in February when patches of snow are on the ground. Lockwood, at the beginning of the novel, visits the Heights twice after a four-mile walk, wading through the heath and mud around the end of November to early December, and, on the second visit, he experiences a heavy snowstorm. The cold weather foreshadows the cold treatments they receive during the visit, especially by the women they are attracted to, and the muddy ground anticipates the unpleasant human drama they get involved in at their respective destinations.

In this way, even though Jimmy visits a miner's house in an industrialised area and Lockwood a desolate yeomen's house surrounded by wild moors, the descriptions of their trips share similar settings and images.

◆Unwelcoming Female Characters

When Jimmy and Lockwood finally arrive at their destinations after long, weary walks, their hostesses are not

welcoming. Jimmy's first impression of Mrs Pinnegar upon his arrival is: "A rather tall woman, looking down at him with a 'Who are you?' look, from the step above" (353). Even after she recognises Jimmy, her cold attitude does not change. Jimmy feels that there is "anger" and "revenge" behind it:

> Mrs. Pinnegar, a tall woman with a face like a mask of passive **anger**, looking at him **coldly**. (353, emphases added)

> She sat there rather **distant**, very **laconic**, looking at him with those curious **unyielding** eyes. She looked to him like a woman who has had her **revenge**, and is left stranded on the reefs where she wrecked her **opponent**. Still **unrelenting**, unregretting, **unyielding**, she seemed rather undecided as to what her **revenge** had been, and what it had all been about. (354, emphases added)

Jimmy thus feels Mrs Pinnegar's hostility. In fact, her anger is not directed at Jimmy personally, but at society as a whole. Her husband has a relationship with another woman, but Mrs Pinnegar has to do her duty as his wife. When Jimmy visits her, she is preparing dinner for her husband, and when the latter returns from the mine, she washes his back. These scenes symbolise the shackles of wedlock she is bound by. Her frustration with the loveless marriage is clear in the following conversation with her husband:

> "And what about me?" she asked, **coldly and fiercely**.

> "You? You've got a home. You've got a child. You've got a man who works for you. You've got what you want. You do as you like—."
> "Do I?" she asked, **with intolerable sarcasm**.
> "Yes. Apart from the bit of work in the house, you do as you like. If you want to go, you can go. But while you live in my house, you must respect it. You bring no men here, you see."
> "Do *you* respect your home?" she said.
> "Yes! I do! If I get another woman—who pleases me—I deprive you of nothing. All I ask of you is to do your duty as a housewife."
> "Down to washing your back!" she said, **heavily sarcastic** . . . .
> (362-3, emphases added)

Her "cold and fierce" attitude and "intolerable sarcasm" reflect her bitterness towards the situation. She writes to Jimmy that she has teaching certificates and used to be a schoolteacher before she got married. She confesses, "If I could, I would teach again, and live alone. But married teachers can't get jobs any more, they aren't allowed—" (350). The impasse that her marriage has brought her to thus aggravates her bitterness against her husband and society.

Similarly, Lockwood, in *Wuthering Heights*, is not welcomed at the Heights. On his second visit, he meets Catherine II for the first time. He is pleased to see the young mistress and starts socialising with her, but her demeanour is cold and aggressive. When Lockwood talks to her about the weather, she does not say a word and stares at him in a cool, indifferent manner, making

Lockwood feel “exceedingly embarrassing and disagreeable” (10). When she speaks, Lockwood finds her manner “repelling” and “scornful”. He notices that her eyes evince scorn and desperation. Her anger and desperation are caused by her nightmarish situation. Her father-in-law, Heathcliff, locks her up in the Heights and deprives her not only of her inherited fortune but also of her freedom. The Heights employs servants for the housework, but Heathcliff and Hareton yell at Catherine II and force her to make tea. Her situation is similar to Mrs Pinnegar’s in the sense that they are exploited physically and psychologically because of their marriage. Heathcliff reminds Catherine II of her weak position by saying, “. . . you live on my charity! . . . find something to do. You shall pay me for the plague of having you eternally in my sight—do you hear, damnable jade!” (30). Heathcliff demands from Catherine II essentially what Mr Pinnegar demands from his wife by saying, “All I ask of you is to do your duty as a housewife” (363).

Nevertheless, there are differences between Catherine II and Mrs Pinnegar. While Catherine II, young and inexperienced, tries to rebel against the patriarchy by refusing to make tea for Lockwood, Mrs Pinnegar, who is older and more mature, is willing to adapt herself to the circumstances and silently brings Jimmy tea, bread and butter, and jam and buns. Women like Mrs Pinnegar, who are trapped in an unhappy marriage, were/are not rare, while Catherine II’s situation is extreme. Lawrence thus replaces Brontë’s young heroine in unusual circumstances into a mature heroine in more quotidian circumstances. In fact, Mr and Mrs Pinnegar’s unhappy marriage reflects that of Lawrence’s parents, who did not get on well. His father, Arthur John Lawrence, was a miner and, according to Worthen, his mother,

Lydia Lawrence, "would have liked to be a teacher" (14) before her marriage, and she had some experience "as a pupil-teacher in Sheerness, when she was 13 . . . and seems to have taught a little later (unqualified, apart from her time as a pupil-teacher) in a Dame's school" (Worthen, 14).

One of the weapons that Catherine II and Mrs Pinnegar share is their eyes. When Jimmy meets Mrs Pinnegar for the first time, he notices her "looking at him coldly" (353). The narrator specifies that her eyes have "a relentless, unyielding feminine will" (353), and that her "unflinching eyes with their gold flecks, seemed to be challenging him to something" (354). These descriptions convey the aggressiveness of her eyes. Jimmy is daunted by their power:

> The woman . . . started watching *him* with that slow, straight stare.
> "It's not"—he began, stuttering—"It's not anything sudden and unconsidered on my part." (355, original emphasis)

As the narrative reflects Jimmy's viewpoint, the italicised "him" connotes Jimmy's psychological discomfort due to her stare. His stuttering also implies his agitation. In *Wuthering Heights*, Catherine II, just like Mrs Pinnegar, challenges other characters with her menacing eyes. Lockwood describes her by mentioning that "The little witch put a mock malignity into her beautiful eyes" (15). Nelly also presents Catherine II's eyes as a weapon. Depicting Catherine II, who is locked up in the Heights, desires to go back to the Grange to see dying Edgar, and demands that Heathcliff give her the key, Nelly refers to "her [Catherine II's]

black eyes flashing with passion and resolution" (267). Nelly also narrates that "Catherine met [Heathcliff's eyes] with her accustomed look of nervousness, and yet defiance, which he abhorred" (315), and Heathcliff exclaims "What fiend possesses you to stare back at me, continually, with those infernal eyes?" (315).

In this way, both Mrs Pinnegar and Catherine II behave disagreeably because they are frustrated and angry with the predicaments brought upon by their respective marriages. Their peevishness is directed even at the guests they meet for the first time. Rude manners, cold expressions, and hostile eyes are the only weapons they have against the world, and their rebellious attitudes are straightforward expressions of their frustrations. Brontë and Lawrence present the angry heroines in a positive light, as they live according to their natural and spontaneous emotions.

◆Agitated Guests at Night

When Jimmy and Lockwood are about to leave the households at night, they are agitated for a number of reasons.

During Lockwood's second visit to the Heights, the snowstorm makes it difficult for him to return to the Grange. Despite the situation, Heathcliff refuses to provide him with either a guide or a chair to sleep on. Desperate, Lockwood grabs Joseph's lantern, intending to go back alone, but this triggers attacks by the dogs that Joseph sets on him, and Heathcliff and Hareton laugh at his struggle with the dogs. Lockwood's rage, humiliation, and excitement reach a peak as he becomes "hatless and trembling with wrath" (17) and in "[t]he vehemence of [his] agitation" (17). In anger, Lockwood narrates: "I ordered the

miscreants to let me out—on their peril to keep me one minute longer—with several incoherent threats of retaliation that, in their indefinite depth of virulency, smacked of King Lear" (17).

Jimmy is also in a state of agitation when he leaves the Pinnegars on the night of his visit; however, in his case, not with anger but with fear:

> There was a curious elation in his spirits, mingled with fear. But then he always needed an element of fear, really, to elate him. He thought with terror of those two human beings left in that house together. The frightening state of tension!" (364-5)

Jimmy's experience is quite different from Lockwood's in the sense that, while Lockwood is laughed at by Heathcliff and Hareton, fails to escape from the Heights, and stays overnight at the Heights against his will, Jimmy leaves the Pinnegars' household with the victory of having persuaded Mrs Pinnegar to come to London to live with him. However, their psychological experiences of strong agitation as they are about to leave the households are similar.

◆Refusing an Invitation to a Meal

The morning after their respective visits, Jimmy and Lockwood both decline an invitation to a meal, revealing their unwillingness to further associate with the families.

Jimmy, who slept in his hotel, goes back to the Pinnegars the next morning "rather sheepishly" and "[u]nwillingly", suggesting his reluctance. Mrs Pinnegar invites him to dinner, but he emphatically refuses:

> "You'll have dinner before you go," she [Mrs Pinnegar] said.
> "No!" he [Jimmy] cried in panic, unwilling indeed to eat before that other man.
> "No, I ate a fabulous breakfast. I will get a sandwich when I change in Sheffield: *really*!" (366, original emphasis)

Jimmy panics because he does not want to eat with Mr Pinnegar. The emphases such as "indeed" and the italicised "really!" express how strongly he feels against the idea.

In *Wuthering Heights*, Lockwood, after spending the night at the Heights, comes down to the parlour in the morning and finds Heathcliff and Catherine II arguing. He narrates, "I declined joining their breakfast, and, at the first gleam of dawn, took an opportunity of escaping into the free air" (31). Considering that having a meal together brings people closer, Jimmy and Lockwood's refusals signify their unwillingness to develop intimacy with the family members.

The two stories are thus similar not only in Jimmy's and Lockwood's backgrounds and personalities but also in some aspects of their plots. Considering these similarities, it is hard to think that "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" has nothing to do with *Wuthering Heights*. When Lawrence wrote "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" to satirise Murry, consciously or not, he had Lockwood in mind as a prototype of someone who is an affluent member of the elite, superficial, and afraid to "live" with passion.

(3) "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" as a Retelling of *Wuthering Heights*

In this way, "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" can be read as a retelling of *Wuthering Heights*, wherein the Yorkshire moors are transformed into a mining village. Lockwood, a single gentleman from the south, becomes Jimmy, an editor from London who recently divorced his wife. The young widow, Catherine II, corresponds to Mrs Pinnegar, who is married and has a daughter, and Catherine II's father-in-law, Heathcliff, is analogous to Mr Pinnegar, a domineering husband. The different milieus of the characters reflect, to some extent, the authors' different situations at the time they wrote the stories. Brontë was an unmarried woman in her late twenties who had lived most of her life in a corner of the Yorkshire moors in patriarchal nineteenth-century England and is believed to have had little to no experience of love affairs. Lawrence was a miner's son who grew up in a mining area in Nottinghamshire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He had had romances with multiple women before he met his future wife, Frieda, who was already married and had three children. Lawrence started living with Frieda, first as her partner and then, after her divorce, as her husband. The difference between the characters' age-ranges in *Wuthering Heights* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" reflects, more or less, the authors' age difference. Lawrence was in his forties when he wrote "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman", and Mr and Mrs Pinnegar are slightly younger than Lawrence. Both Brontë and Lawrence set their stories in the north of England, in areas they are familiar with. Lawrence's running away with married Frieda is parallel to the storyline of Jimmy

and Mrs Pinnegar, even though Frieda did not take her children with her when she came to live with Lawrence.

Compared with Brontë's characters (an upper-class gentleman, the family of local gentry, and the yeomen), Lawrence's characters belong to lower social classes (a magazine editor and a miner's family). However, the two stories are similar in that Lockwood's choices of sophisticated vocabulary and complex sentences form a striking contrast with the rustic and straightforward way of speaking and behaviour of the residents of the Heights, and Jimmy's Oxford way of speaking and manners are in contrast to Mr Pinnegar's working-class roughness. Just as Brontë presents Heathcliff's passionate life and person overwhelming Lockwood, Lawrence ends the story with Mr Pinnegar's powerful existence overpowering Jimmy. In general, Lawrence rewrote Lockwood's story by changing the setting into one with which he was familiar, including the age range, the location (i.e. a mining village), and the social classes. Lawrence also knew his characters well because they are, at least partly, based on his friend and parents.

Lockwood and Jimmy's outcomes are different in that Lockwood only dreams about taking Catherine II to London, while Jimmy actually succeeds in persuading Mrs Pinnegar to come to London. Considering that eloping in Lockwood's time was much harder than in Jimmy's time, it is possible to interpret Jimmy's achievement as an updated version of Lockwood's episode, reflecting the post-World War I era's more relaxed attitudes towards sexuality. Jimmy's episode is thus a successful version of Lockwood's failure. Jimmy's advice to Mrs Pinnegar that she chose the wrong path in life is exactly what Lockwood should have said to Catherine II (even though, in Lockwood's

time, divorce and remarriage were not viable options for Catherine II):

> You're evidently not happy here. You're evidently in the wrong circumstances altogether. You're obviously *not* just an ordinary woman. Well, then, break away. When I say, Come and live with me, I mean just what I say. Come to London and live with me, as my wife, if you like, and then if we want to marry, when you get a divorce, why, we can do it. (355)

However, even though Jimmy and Lockwood appear contradictory in their actions, considering that Jimmy could not win Mrs Pinnegar over in the real sense, a possible interpretation is that they both failed to build a trusting relationship with a woman. In a way, Brontë and Lawrence sarcastically rewrote the stereotypical fairy tale in which an unhappy heroine is rescued by an unknown hero. Their heroines are not innocent maidens, like in the classic fairy stories, but are either married or widowed, and the heroes cannot rescue them. Lawrence persuaded Frieda to live with him and (at least from his perspective) rescued her from a boring marriage. Therefore, to some extent, Jimmy reflects Lawrence himself. However, Jimmy's pathetic character makes it unlikely that Lawrence created Jimmy as his counterpart. It seems more natural to consider the possibility that Lawrence wanted to differentiate Jimmy (and Murry) from himself by presenting Jimmy's (Murry's) failure to win a woman's heart while Lawrence succeeded in winning Frieda's.

If Jimmy is modelled after Murry, how should we interpret

the other characters? Considering that Lawrence was bitter about Murry making advances towards Frieda, it is natural to regard Mr Pinnegar as Lawrence and Mrs Pinnegar as Frieda. Being a miner's son, it is not surprising that Lawrence identifies with Mr Pinnegar. While Murry (or Jimmy) has his roots in an Oxford education, Lawrence has his roots in the mining community, the legacy he was proud of, especially in adulthood. He presents Mr Pinnegar positively, introducing him in the story as "a blast of wind" or powerful natural energy, with his dignified and self-confident demeanour. He is "thin, but energetic in build", and the narrator presents him as physical, instinctive, and animal-like. The scene in which he washes his body "with brutal vigour" is considered "part of the collier's ritual" and is treated as something sacred. The narrator describes Mr Pinnegar as "[o]ne wary, probably hostile man" (360), "with a stare something like the child's, but aggressive" (360), and having a "peculiar harsh voice, that had a certain jeering clang in it, and a certain indomitableness" (360). Thus, Mr Pinnegar is aggressive, arrogant, and indomitable like a wild beast but also simple like a child. He looks straight and hard into Jimmy's eyes, while Jimmy struggles to maintain eye contact with others. Mr Pinnegar's stately, confident, and masculine figure symbolises "being fully alive" in Lawrence's understanding, in contrast with Jimmy's lack of confidence and vitality. If Mrs Pinnegar is Frieda's literary counterpart, the ending, in which Mr Pinnegar's strong influence over his wife overwhelms Jimmy, implies Lawrence's wish that he still had power over his wife even if she had become intimate with Murry. It also suggests Lawrence's claim that he, as a member of the mining community, is more "fully alive" than and superior to

Murry as a member of the middle-class elite.

As previously mentioned, Mr and Mrs Pinnegar resemble Lawrence's parents, suggesting that they are also modelled on them. Lawrence presents his father as uncouth, instinctive, smart, and dignified, and his mother as exploited, frustrated, and angry but also not very astute. During his childhood, Lawrence was deeply sympathetic towards his mother and disliked his father, thinking he was abusive. However, as he grew older, he noticed his mother's possessive and manipulative nature and came to view his father in a more positive light. Unlike Mrs Pinnegar, Lawrence's mother never ran away with another man, but young Lawrence, listening to her complaints, must have noticed her strong desire to be freed from the yoke of the unhappy marriage. Therefore, even if in an ironic way, her wish comes true in the story. "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" thus shows Lawrence's both positive and negative perceptions of his parents. At the same time, the story combines Lawrence and his father as the model for Mr Pinnegar, suggesting Lawrence's empathy for and identification with his father.

(4) Conclusion

Lawrence wrote "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" inspired by Murry's approaches to female contributors and Murry's possible betrayal of their friendship. Certainly, Jimmy has many of Murry's characteristics such as his job, appearance, educational background, and behavioural patterns. At the same time, this story mirrors Lockwood's episodes in *Wuthering Heights*, as their characters, settings, and plots share many similarities. Jimmy and Lockwood are both members of the elite who confuse reality with fantasy in their vain attempts to take

control over their life. They are poor at understanding their situations, they suffer from an inferiority complex, and they fear others, especially women. However, at the same time, they arrogantly consider themselves superior because of their educational and social backgrounds. Lawrence and Brontë both present their rough, lower-class characters in a more positive light than their cultured, higher-class characters, valuing the formers' unpretentious attitudes towards life. It might not be a coincidence that Mrs Pinnegar's first name is Emilia, similar to Brontë's first name, Emily. The analyses thus reveal the fundamental influence of *Wuthering Heights* on Lawrence's "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman".

3. Treatments of Death

Finally let us look at the treatments of death in Brontë and Lawrence's works to see that their fear of death behind the adoration for nature and natural living is expressed differently, reflecting their individual experiences of confronting with death and recognising it. Death appears in both Brontë's and Lawrence's works, revealing their anxiety about mortality. *Wuthering Heights*, on the one hand, is filled with characters' deaths while Lawrence's stories, on the other, involve very few physical deaths. Brontë kills off most of the Earnshaws and the Lintons, including the central couple, Catherine I and Heathcliff. It is only Lockwood, the servants (Nelly and Joseph), Catherine II, and Hareton who survive. The surviving young couple's lives are presented as a hope for the future amidst the high mortality rate of the two old families. Considering the very high mortality rate of Brontë's own family, the rapid and frequent arrivals of death among the characters seem to reflect her recognition of

death, and her helpless fear of its imminence and inevitability.

Lawrence instead uses the contrast of life and death more metaphorically than physically. Of the characters in the two stories, it is only Ben Cooley in *Kangaroo* who literally dies. The notion of death appears more frequently in the metaphorical form of "the living dead". In *Kangaroo*, the narrator points out the deadness of those who are "automatic":

> Most people are dead, and scurrying and talking in the sleep of death. Life has its automatic side, sometimes in direct conflict with the spontaneous soul. Then there is a fight. And the spontaneous soul must extricate itself from the meshes of the *almost* automatic white octopus of the human ideal, the octopus of humanity. (294, original emphasis)

Here, the Australians such as Jack Callcott, Ben Cooley, and Willie Struthers, who fight for their "human ideal" and "humanity", are treated as dead. In "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman", it is Jimmy whose soul is dead. The narrator compares Jimmy's "blank and expressionless" face to "the death-mask" (358) and Jimmy to a philosopher who "could hardly distinguish life from death at any time" (358). Lawrence thus deals more with metaphorical death than its physical manifestation. Besides, he does not kill characters such as Somers and Mr Pinnegar, with whom he identifies, unlike Brontë who kills both her beloved Catherine I and Heathcliff. The same thing happens in Lawrence's other major novels such as Paul Morel in *Sons and Lovers*, Rupert Birkin in *Women in Love*, Don Ramón Carrasco in

The Plumed Serpent, and Oliver Mellors in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Considering that, in real life, Lawrence was repeatedly threatened with death by illness and was acutely aware of its proximity, it seems natural that he was unwilling to kill his characters, especially his counterparts, without any special significance behind it.

Thus, even though both Brontë's and Lawrence's fear of death is detectable in their works, the ways they deal with it are different, reflecting their past experiences related to death.

****

This chapter demonstrated the influence of *Wuthering Heights* on Lawrence's creative process by analysing two of his works, *Kangaroo* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman".

Kangaroo integrates Brontë's view in *Wuthering Heights* that, even though it is essential for humans to live naturally like animals, such a life is hard to achieve because people are trapped by societal rules and customs. Ben Cooley's sickroom scene forms a parallel to Catherine I's sickroom scene in *Wuthering Heights*, signalling the two novels' congruity. The equivalence is supported also by using the same personified images and expressions for trees, which blur the line between humans and nature, as in *Wuthering Heights*.

The second section examined "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" and argued that Jimmy's story roughly follows Lockwood's in *Wuthering Heights*. This suggests that Lawrence considered Lockwood a prototype of the frivolous elite who dare not live with passion and created Jimmy's story based on Lockwood's episodes. Lawrence uses images, expressions, and characters' background settings and personalities which are

similar to those in *Wuthering Heights*, and they connect the two stories. Both "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" and *Wuthering Heights* repeat the contrast between the elite character's superficial and frivolous way of living, on the one hand, and the lower-class characters' rough, instinctive, and physical life, on the other. Lawrence and Brontë consider the latter's simple lives more natural and substantial and, therefore, better than the former's intellect-based, artificial outlook on life.

These two analyses suggest that Lawrence not only integrates into his works the adoration for nature he shares with Brontë, but also, consciously or not, he adopts the plot, scenes, expressions, and images from *Wuthering Heights* in his creation.

Conclusion

1. Looking Back the Arguments

The overriding objective of this thesis was to prove substantial connections between Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence by indicating the former's influence on the latter, and to explore the reasons why Lawrence was attracted to Brontë. The thesis proposed, as one possible reason for it, that the resemblance of their life values and literary tastes drew Lawrence to Brontë, and that especially their shared affection towards nature and the fear of mortality behind it, which they developed through life experiences, played a significant role in it.

Chapter 1 focussed on the similarities between Brontë and Lawrence's literary characteristics, which had been highlighted by previous reviewers and critics. They faced severe criticism and were regarded as problematic outsiders due to their rebellious attitudes to the contemporary literary conventions. However they both adhered to what they believed was most effective for the expression of their fictional worlds. The chapter introduced a number of keywords which are frequently used by critics to describe Brontë's and Lawrence's shared characteristics. One of the main keywords is "Romanticism", which further develops into two other keywords, "nature" and "prophecy". The early literary reviews on their works also demonstrate other shared keywords such as "passions / emotions / intensity", "imaginations / creativity", "poetry / lyricism", and "realism / truism". The existence of these shared keywords proves that many critics saw similar literary characteristics in their works, suggesting their fundamental closeness in literary

tastes. Lawrence himself must have noticed these similarities when he read *Wuthering Heights*. He also must have become aware of Emily Brontë's strong personality, the nature of which he admired, as he read *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*. Emily firmly believed in her own literary instinct and disregarded the contemporary convention about the level of violence in literary works. Considering that Lawrence also employed an unconventional level of sexuality in his works, he was in a similar situation with Brontë. It is likely, therefore, that this situation led him into a position whereby he felt sympathy with Brontë.

Chapter 2 looked at Brontë and Lawrence in regard to gender and feminism. First, the chapter presented that they were both outsiders in relation to gender because they had androgynous natures and did not fit in to the contemporary stereotype of gender roles. This suggests that they shared, to some extent, a sense of isolation in the communities they belonged to. Second, the chapter claimed that, even though Kate Millet's argument against Lawrence that he was a male supremacist still retains its influence on his reputation, she was inaccurate in the sense that she did not include, in her argument, the sympathetic side he had for women such as having many female friends, spending many hours in the company of women, helping them with housework, and wishing to support the enhancement of the role of women in society by writing and speaking for them. This chapter thus refuted the possibility that Lawrence viewed Brontë negatively because of her gender.

Chapter 3 focussed on Brontë's and Lawrence's biographical aspects to demonstrate their shared appreciation of nature. They were strongly attracted to nature and the natural world and both

looked to engage with nature. Their adoration for the countryside with its landscapes and living creatures, their desire to stay in or close to nature, and their wish to maintain innate nature such as instincts and spontaneous feelings, are detectable both in their biographies and works. The chapter suggested, as a possible reason for this shared appreciation, that nature's calming effect played a comforting role in their stressful life. They both had traumatic experiences of facing their family members' (especially siblings') death when they were young. They were also constantly reminded of their own mortality, partly because of the high death rate in their communities, and partly because of their own delicate constitutions. It is highly likely that Lawrence, sensing the same fear of death in Brontë as he had behind love of nature, felt strong affinity with her.

Chapter 4 analysed the influence of *Wuthering Heights* on two of Lawrence's works, *Kangaroo* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman", and argued that they contain not only similar themes, images, and wording, but also similar scenes and plots (especially in "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman") with *Wuthering Heights*. The sick-room scene in *Kangaroo* and the overall experiences Jimmy goes through in "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" both form parallels with *Wuthering Heights*. It is hard to consider such multi-layered resemblance with *Wuthering Heights* merely coincidental.

In this way, the four chapters support various connections between Lawrence and Brontë, and the influence of Brontë and *Wuthering Heights* on his works. His connections to Brontë derive partly from the shared or close experiences they went through in life, which were shaped by the combination of their

innate sensibility and life events. Especially their shared experiences of living in the vicinity of death, consequent fear of mortality, and desperate trials to escape from the fear by identifying themselves with nature's eternal vitality, are crucial, as they formed a special bond between Lawrence and Brontë when he recognised these elements in her. They both saw eternal life in the universe and natural ecosystem cycles, and sought comfort in nature and valued innate nature. Eventually they were both drawn to Romanticism.

With their shared life values and literary preference, it is not surprising that Lawrence felt strong connection to Brontë when he came to read *Wuthering Heights* and *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*. Even though, in his letter to Blanche Jennings on 4 November 1908, Lawrence wrote that his favourite English novels were *Shirley* and *Jane Eyre* both by Charlotte Brontë, his references to Emily Brontë and *Wuthering Heights* suggest that the passionate style of Emily's writing had a powerful impact on him. Lawrence's recommendation to Chambers not to read *Wuthering Heights* implies the level of anxiety Brontë's portrayal of violent female passion evoked in him. However, his references to Emily Brontë and *Wuthering Heights* in his essays such as "The Mother, by Grazia Deledda" and "Blessed Are the Powerful" generally reveal his admiration for Emily's innate vitality.

2. Lawrence's Adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* and Other Works

Lawrence's adaptation of *Wuthering Heights* is found not only in *Kangaroo* and "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" but also in other works as well, such as *The White Peacock* in which the plot of a love triangle among Lettie, George, and Leslie is

strikingly similar with that among Catherine I, Heathcliff, and Edgar in *Wuthering Heights*. Oliver Mellors in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is often associated with Heathcliff in the sense that they are both male characters who personify nature. Other possible influences from Emily Brontë are detected in "Daughters of the Vicar", written in 1911 under the title "Two Marriage" and published in 1914 after being rewritten in 1913, and *The Virgin and the Gypsy*, written in 1926 and published in 1930. In these works, Lawrence writes of two daughters living in a vicarage/rectory the settings for which remind readers of the biographical descriptions of the Brontë sisters in *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*, even though his adaptations is limited. The bleak atmosphere of the stone vicarage in "Daughters of the Vicar" and the stone rectory in *The Virgin and the Gypsy* resemble Gaskell's presentation of the stone parsonage in Haworth, and the authoritative and strict fathers in the two stories echo, to some extent, Gaskell's descriptions of Patrick Brontë who dealt with his children in stoic manners. Some other similarities between the two stories and Brontë's biography can also be detected, suggesting the formers' possible adaptations of the latter. For example, "Daughters of the Vicar" shares the mother's prolificacy with Brontë's biography as the narrator says "children were born one every year" (107). Maria Branwell Brontë, Emily's mother, also went through a childbirth for her six children almost every year from 1814 to 1820. On the other hand, the sisters in *The Virgin and the Gypsy* and the Brontë sisters share a motherless situation, even though the reason of their mothers' absence is different: the former because their mother runs away with another man, and the latter because their mother died in their infancy.

"The Brontë sisters" consists of Charlotte, Emily and Anne, but both "Daughters of the Vicar" and *The Virgin and the Gypsy* focus only on two sisters. Considering that Lawrence rarely showed any interest in Anne and hardly mentioned her in his writings, it is understandable that he omitted the third sister in his narrative. The two stories share a contrast between the elder sister's practical attitudes to life and the younger's romantic search for passionate love. Lawrence's admiration for the younger's attitude to life is made clear in the plot where she experiences "real living" by going through instinctive and passionate love with a man. The two sisters reflect, to some extent, Lawrence's overall images of rather conventional Charlotte and rebellious Emily, even though the fictional sisters' personalities are not identical with the Brontës'.

This thesis focussed on Lawrence's indebtedness to Emily Brontë as a predecessor. However, Lawrence's works are indebted to many predecessors, among whom Emily Brontë is one. His imaginary worlds often contain elements from literary masterpieces which he absorbed, refashioned, and interwove into his stories. For example, the plot of "Daughters of the Vicar" is similar not only to the Brontë sisters' biography but also with Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, as it contains the contrast of the elder sister's silent obedience and the younger sister's active independence, a dull clergyman's courtship to one of the sisters, and the younger sister's exploration and discovery of true love. *The Virgin and the Gypsy*, on the other hand, has a hint of *The Mill on the Floss* by George Eliot, as the story ends with a flood. However, different from Eliot who drowns Tom and Maggie, brother and sister, to eternalise their reconciliation in death with the Biblical epigraph "In their death, they were not divided"

(474), Lawrence chooses to let Yvette and the gypsy (Joe Boswell) survive and gives them a hope for a future reunion. Here, again, Lawrence avoids killing the characters who choose to live passionately and with whom he feels affinity.

3. Absence of an Essay on Emily Brontë

Now, let us consider why Lawrence did not leave an essay which focusses specifically on Emily Brontë despite the considerable influence he received from her. As already seen, he refers to Emily Brontë in several of his writings, but provides no detailed analysis of her work. On the other hand, he left many literary critiques on other writers including those written as prefaces, such as for *The Mother* by Grazia Deledda, *The Grand Inquisitor* by F. M. Dostoyevsky, and *The Dragon of the Apocalypse* by Frederick Carter. He also wrote essays on John Galsworthy ("John Galsworthy"), John Keats ("The Nightingale"), Somerset Maugham ("Ashenden by W. Somerset Maugham"), and Leo Tolstoy ("The Novel"). *Studies in Classic American Literature* includes his essays on Benjamin Franklin, Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, James Fenimore Cooper, Edgar Allan Poe, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Richard Henry Dana, Jr., Herman Melville, and Walt Whitman. His most well-known literary essay is probably "The Studies of Thomas Hardy", even though, in fact, it discusses more on Lawrence's philosophy of art than Hardy's works.

It must be noted that writing on a particular author does not necessarily guarantee Lawrence's positive interest in the author, as his negative opinions on Galsworthy in his essay demonstrate. However, at the same time, writing a detailed analysis on Galsworthy signals Lawrence's special, even if

negative, attentions to this specific author, and his desire to demonstrate in public his understanding of and attitudes to this author's works. In other words, publishing a critique on a particular writer becomes his public statement on the writer and his/her works, enabling him to control his own public image. If so, his not choosing to write a detailed essay on Emily Brontë means that, for some reasons, he did not feel a strong need to associate himself with Brontë *in public*. It is possible, as mentioned earlier, to interpret his silence as a sign of his anxiety about exposing Brontë's strong influence on him, following Bloom's theory. At any rate, Lawrence's not mentioning Brontë frequently does not contradict his having interest in or receiving influence from her, as discussed throughout this thesis.

Considering that he repeatedly referred to Brontë throughout his writing career mostly with admiration for her female passion, and that the influence of *Wuthering Heights* penetrates some of his works, it would be accurate to say that Brontë and *Wuthering Heights* were ingrained in and affected his mind throughout his career. In other words, encountering Brontë and *Wuthering Heights* gave him an enduring impact on his creative activities. This study argues that such deep impact derived, at least to some extent, from the strong affinity he felt with Brontë when he noticed in her the same kind of powerful emotional experiences as his own: fear of death and desire to escape from it by staying in or close to nature. Their relationship is thus unique in the sense that these emotional experiences played a role in forming their connections.

Notes

[1] Millett also points out that Mellors is Lawrence's fantasy of the idealized version of his own father (Millett, 248).

[2] Wesley, interested in the study of nature for Christian teaching, published multiple-volumed *A Survey of the Wisdom of God in Creation: or, A Compendium of Natural Philosophy*, first published in 1763. Laura Felleman explains Andrew Cunningham's argument that "Natural philosophy was about God's creation and God's attributions" (171) but "[a]s the study of the natural world became more secularized and less and less about a divine creation, science began to replace natural philosophy between 1760 and 1848" (171).

[3] The repeated concept of death as an adventure in Lawrence's poems might remind readers of a line from J. M. Barrie's *Peter and Wendy* (as a play 1904, as a novel 1911), in which Peter, standing on a rock with water gradually rising around it, feels "a drum beating within him . . . . It was saying 'To die will be an awfully big adventure'" (Barrie, 152). The concept of "death as an adventure" presented here by Peter, reveals Barrie's defiance against the elimination death brings. At the same time, it also suggests his fear of dying and wish to conquer it. Like Lawrence, Barrie lost his brother, David, at a young age. David was their mother's favourite son, but was killed in a skating accident on the eve of his fourteenth birthday. The mother was inconsolable, and her grief lasted throughout her life, leaving Barrie to suffer from a sense of exclusion from her attention, desperate yearning for her love, and anger against her refusal. Peter is often considered as based on David who died young and stopped growing. However, Peter's everlasting life also reveals Barrie's fear of death and longing to conquer it.

It is also noteworthy that, according to Andrew Birkin in his *J. M. Barrie and the Lost Boys*, Peter was named after "Pan", the Greek god "who symbolized nature, paganism and the amoral world" (Hollindale, xvii). In both *The Little White Bird* and *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens*, Barrie writes that all children were birds before they were human, and that Peter is half a bird and half a human as he escapes from becoming a full human. Peter Hollindale, in the introduction to *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens and Peter and Wendy*, calls Peter "the immortal creature, part baby, part bird, part natural god" (Hollindale, xvii), suggesting that Peter partly represents nature.

Bibliography

Abrams, M. H. et. al. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 5th Ed. Vol. 2. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1986.

Africa, Julia K. 'Nature, Health, and the Built Environment—Nature Therapy in North American Cities—'. 『自然セラピーの科学：予防医学的効果の検証と解明』宮崎良文編　東京：朝倉書店、2016.

Allott, Miriam. *Emily Brontë: Wuthering Heights*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992.

荒木正純、倉持三郎、立石弘道.『D.H.ロレンスと新理論』(*D. H. Lawrence and New Theories*). Tokyo: Kokushokankokai,1999.

Asahi, Chiseki. 『D.H.ロレンスのフェミニズムを読む』(*Reading D. H. Lawrence's Feminism*). Tokyo: Eiho-sha, 2000.

Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. London: Penguin, 1987.

Barker, Juliet. *The Brontës*. London: Phoenix Press, 1995.

Barrie, J. M. *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens and Peter and Wendy*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author". Trans. S Heath. *Image, Music, Text*. London: Fontana, 1977.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex.* Trans. Constance Borde & Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. New York : Vintage Books, 2010. Web. 21 April 2019.

Becket, Fiona. "D. H. Lawrence, Language and Green Cultural Critique". Ed. Howard J. Booth. *New D. H. Lawrence*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2009.

Bell, Michael. "Lawrence and Modernism". *D. H. Lawrence.* Ed. Anne Fernihough. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Black, Michael. *Lawrence's England: The Major Fiction, 1913-20*. London: Palgrave, 2001.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.

Bloom, Harold, ed. *The Brontës.* New Haven: Chelsea House, 1987. Print.

Booth, Howard J., ed. *New D. H. Lawrence*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2009.

Boulton, James T., ed. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence I*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.

---, comp. & ed. *The Selected Letters of D. H. Lawrence.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Boulton, James T., & Andrew Robertson, ed. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence III.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

Boulton, James T., & Margaret H. Boulton, ed. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VI.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Bricout, Shirley. "7. Biblical Aesthetics". *The Edinburgh Companion to D. H. Lawrence and the Arts*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2020.

Brontë, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. London: Penguin, 1995.

Brown, Keith. *Rethinking Lawrence*. Maidenhead: Open Univ. Pr., 1990.

Bryfonski, Dedria, ed. *Class Conflict in Emily Brontë's* Wuthering Heights. *Social Issues in Literature.* Farmington Hills: Gale Cengage Learning, 2011.

Buetow, Stephen. 'Using Philosophy to Help Manage the Fear of Death'. *Journal of Palliative Care.* 25, 2, 2009, pp. 111-116. Web.

Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

Byron, George Gordon. "Childe Harold's Pilgrimage". *The Norton Anthology of English Literature.* 5th ed. Markham: Norton,

1986.

Caudwell, Christopher. *Studies in a Dying Culture*. London: Bodley Head, 1938.

Cartmell, D. and Imelda Whelehan. "'To Die Would Be an Awfully Big Adventure': the Enigmatic Timelessness of Peter Pan's Adaptations". *Cadernos de Tradução*, 1 (7), pp.93-108.

Chambers, Jessie (E. T.). *D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1965.

Chitham, Edward & Tom Winnifrith. *Brontë Facts & Brontë Problems.* London: Macmillan, 1983.

Clarke, Colin. D. H. Lawrence: *The Rainbow and Women in Love.* Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1969.

Clarke, Micael M. "Emily Brontë's 'No Coward Soul' and the Need for a Religious Literary Criticism". *Victorians' Institute Journal*. 37, 2009. Pp. 195-223.

Crosier, Janet. "Religious Reflections from the Life of Emily Brontë: The Number Three and its Significance in *Wuthering Heights*". *The Forum on Public Policy*. 2012. Web. 31 March, 2021.

Davies, Stevie. *Emily Brontë: Heretic.* London: The Women's Press, 1994.

"DH Lawrence Manuscript Shows 'Enlightened' Attitude to Women". *The Guardian.* 11 April 2013. Web. 21 April 2019.

Defant, Ivonne. "Inhabiting Nature in Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*". *Brontë Studies: The Journal of the Brontë Society*. Vol. 42, 2017, Issue 1. 30 November 2016. Pp.37-47. Web. 3 December 2019.

Dobson, Mildred A. "Was Emily Brontë A Mystic?" *Brontë Society Transaction*. 11:3. Pp. 166-175.

Drabble, Margaret, ed. *The Oxford Companion to English*

Literature. 6th Edition. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Drabble, Margaret & Jenny Stringer eds. *The Concise Oxford Companion to English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

Draper, R. P. *D. H. Lawrence*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970. Print.

Eagleton, Terry. *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory*. London: Verso, 2006.

---. *Myths of Power: A Marxist Study of the Brontës*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Ehlert, Anne Odenbring. *"There's a Bad Time Coming": Ecological Vision in the Fiction of D. H. Lawrence.* Uppsala: Uppsala, 2001.

Eliot, George. *The Mill on the Floss*. London: Everyman, 1993.

Eliot, T. S. "Philip Massinger." *The Sacred Wood.* Mineola, Dover, 1998.

Ellis, David. *Death & the Author: How D. H. Lawrence Died, and Was Remembered*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

Fellman, Laura. "John Wesley's Natural Philosophy: A Survey of Several Misconceptions". *Methodist History*, 44:3. April, 2006. Pp. 170-176.

Fernihough, Anne. *The Cambridge Companion to D. H. Lawrence.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Ferretter, Luke. "Chapter 18: Religion". *D. H. Lawrence in Context*. Andrew Harrison ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2018.

Fike, Francis. "Bitter Herbs and Wholesome Medicines: Love as Theological Affirmation in *Wuthering Heights*". *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 23, 1968. Pp. 127-149.

Finny, Brian. "Introduction" *Selected Short Stories.* By D.H.

Lawrence. London: Penguin, 2000.

Fletcher, Jason, et al. 'A Sibling Death in the Family: Common and Consequential'. *Demography.* 50, 2013, pp. 803-826. Web.

Flintoff, Evarard. "Branwell at the Heights: an Investigation into the Possible Influence of Branwell Brontë upon *Wuthering Heights*". *Durham University Journal* 241-51, 1994 July. Reprinted in *Brontë Studies.* Vol. 36 No. 4, November 2011, 322-35. Web. 18 September, 2017.

Florian, Victor, & Mario Mikulincer. 'Fear of Personal Death in Adulthood: The Impact of Early and Recent Losses'. *Death Studies*. Jan/Feb, 1997, 21, 1, pp. 1-24. Web.

Ford, George H. *Double Measure: A Study of the Novels and Stories of D.H. Lawrence.* New York: Holts, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Forster, E. M. *Aspects of the Novel*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962. Print.

Furst, Lilian R. & Peter N. Skrine. *Naturalism*. The Critical Idiom. General Ed. John D. Jump. London: Methuen, 1971.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*. London: Penguin, 1997.

Gilbert, Sandra M. *Acts of Attention: The Poems of D. H. Lawrence.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1990.

---. "Notes Toward a Vindication." *Approaches to Teaching the Works of D. H Lawrence.* M. Elizabeth Sargent and Gerry Watson eds. New York: MLA, 2001.

Gilbert, Sandra M, & Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination.* 2nd Edition. New Haven: Yale UP, 1984.

Grundy, Francis H. *Pictures of the Past*. London: Griffith and

Farran, 1879.

Hankin, Cherry. *Letters between Katherine Mansfield and John Middleton Murry*. New York: New Amsterdam Books, 1998.

Hatfield, C. W. *The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë*. New York: Columbia UP, 1941.

Heneghan, Marie S. "The Post-Romantic Way to God: Personal Agency and Self-Worship in *Wuthering Heights*". *Australasian Journal of Victorian Studies*. 22.1. 2018.

Hewish, John. *Emily Brontë: A Critical and Biographical Study*. London: Macmillan, 1969.

Hoagland, Tony. 'Lawrence'. *Poetry*. Web. 4th September, 2020.

Hollindale, Peter. "Introduction". *Peter Pan in Kensington Garden and Peter and Wendy*, by J. M. Barrie. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

Jones, Bethan. *The Last Poems of D. H. Lawrence*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.

Kaplan, Stephen. 'The Restorative Benefits of Nature: Toward an Integrative Framework'. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 15, 1995, pp. 169-182.

"Kate Millett Obituary". *The Guardian*. 7 September 2017. Web. 27 September 2019.

"Kate Millett, Pioneering Feminist Author, Has Died at 82". *Smithonian.com*. 7 September 2017. Web. 27 September 2019.

Kinkead-Weekes, Mark. "Eros and Metaphor: Sexual Relationship in the Fiction of Lawrence". *Lawrence and Women*. Ed. Anne Smith. London: Vision Press, 1978.

Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue and Novel". *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Ed. Leon S. Roudiez. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, & Leon S.

Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1980.

Lawrence, D. H. *Apocalypse and the Writings on Revelation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

---. "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover". *Lady Chatterley's Lover and a Propos of 'Lady Chatterley's Lover'*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

---. 'Blessed Are the Powerful'. *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

---. *Complete Poems.* New York: Penguin, 1993. Web. 26 August 2020.

---. "Daughters of the Vicar". *D. H. Lawrence Selected Short Stories.* Brian Finney ed. London: Penguin, 2000.

---. 'Democracy'. *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

---. 'Education of the People'. *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

---. "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman". *D. H. Lawrence Selected Short Stories.* Brian Finney ed. London: Penguin, 2000.

---. "John Thomas and Lady Jane". *The First and Second Lady Chatterley Novels*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

---. *Kangaroo*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.

---. *Lady Chatterley's Lover.* London: Penguin, 2006.

---. Morning in Mexico and Other Essays. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009.

---. *Phoenix.* New York: Viking, 1968.

---. *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Mineola: Dover, 2005.

---. “Sun”. *D. H. Lawrence Selected Short Stories*. London: Penguin, 2000.

---. ‘*The Mother*, by Grazia Deledda’. *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence*. London: Heinemann, 1961.

---. *The Rainbow*. London: Penguin, 1995.

---. *The Virgin and the Gypsy.* London: Penguin, 2002.

---. ‘Whistling of Birds’. *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

Lawrence, Frieda. *Not I, But the Wind . . . .* London: William Heinnemann, 1935.

Leavis, F. R. *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist.* London: Penguin, 1994.

---. *The Great Tradition: George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad*. London: Penguin, 1993.

Leyland, Francis A. *The Brontë Family: With Special Reference to Patrick Branwell Brontë.* Vols. 1-2. London: Urst and Blackett Publishers, 1886.

Machajewski, Valerie & Rebecca Kronk. ‘Childhood Grief Related to the Death of a Sibling’. *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners*. 9, 7, July/August 2013, pp. 443-448. Web.

Mailer, Norman. *The Prisoner of Sex*. Boston: Little Brown &Co., 1971. Print.

Marsden, Simon. *Emily Brontë and the Religious Imagination*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Mason, Emma. “Emily Brontë and the Enthusiastic Tradition”. *Romanticism on the Net*. Issue 25, February 2002.

Matthews, Sean. “T. S. Eliot and D. H. Lawrence: Towards the Door We Never Opened”. The 50th Conference of the D. H. Lawrence Society Japan. 8 June 2019. Lecture.

Millett, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. New York: Columbia UP, 2016.

Moers, Ellen. *Literary Women*. London: The Women’s Press, 1978.

Moore, Harry T. “Bert Lawrence and Lady Jane”. *Lawrence and Women*. Ed. Anne Smith. London: Vision Press, 1978.

Murry, John Middleton. *Reminiscence of D. H. Lawrence*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1933.

中岡洋　『ブロンテ姉妹の留学時代』　東京：開文社、1990.

Nehls, Edward, ed. *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*. Vol. 1, 1885-1919. Madison, U of Wisconsins P, 1957.

---. *D. H. Lawrence: Interviews & Recollections* Volume I. London: MacMillan, 1981.

Nin, Anaïs. *D. H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study.* Athens: Swallow Press, 1994.

大平章、小田島恒志、他、編　『ロレンス文学鑑賞事典』　東京：彩流社、2002.

Ousby, Ian, ed. *The Wordsworth Companion to Literature in English.* Ware: Wordsworth, 1994.

Oxford English Dictionary, The. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. Print.

Page, Norman. D. H. Lawrence: Interviews and Recollections. Vol. I. London: Macmillan, 1981.

Paglia, Camille. “Academic Feminists Must Begin to Fulfill Their Noble, Animating Ideal”. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 25 July, 1997.

Pearson, Sara L. “Emily Brontë and the Religious Imagination”. *Brontë Studies*. Vol. 44. No. 2. April 2018. Pp. 171-2.

Pollock, George. ‘Childhood Sibling Loss: A Family Tragedy’. *Psychiatric Annals.* 16, 5, May 1986, pp. 309-314. Web.

Pykett, Lyn. *Emily Brontë.* Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989.

Sagar, Keith. *The Art of D. H. Lawrence*. London: Cambridge UP, 1966.

Sagar, Keith, & James T. Boulton, ed. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence VII*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Schneider, Daniel J. *D. H. Lawrence: The Artist as Psychologist*. Kansas: UP of Kansas, 1984.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe. "Mont Blanc: Lines Written in the Vale of Chamouni". *The Norton Anthology of English Literature.* 5th ed. Markham: Norton, 1986.

Showalter, Elaine. *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Brontë to Lessing*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999.

Siegel, Carol. "Border Disturbances: D. H. Lawrence's Fiction and the Feminism of *Wuthering Heights*. *Men Writing the Feminine.* Ed. Thais E. Morgan. New York: State University of New York Press, 1994.

---. *Lawrence among the Women*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1991.

Smith, Anne. "A New Adam and a New Eve—Lawrence and Women: A Biographical Overview". *Lawrence and Women*. Ed. Anne Smith. London: Vision Press, 1978.

Spilka, Mark. *D. H. Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Squire, Michael & Keith Cushman eds. *The Challenge of D. H. Lawrence*. Madison: Univ of Wisconsin Pr, 1990.

Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. Stanford Center for the Study of Language and Information. Stanford University. Web. 27 August 2020.

Strang, Peter. 'What Is Extreme Death Anxiety and What Are Its Consequences?'. *Journal of Palliative Care*. 30, 4, 2014, pp. 321-326. Web.

Sword, Helen. "Lawrence's Poetry". *D. H. Lawrence.* Ed. Anne Fernihough. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

戸田仁　『D.H.ロレンスの想い出：ジョン・ミドルトン・マリイ評

論集』　岡山：ふくろう出版、1998.

Tytler, Graeme. “The Role of Religion in Wuthering Heights. Brontë Studies. Vol. 32, March 2007. Pp. 41-55.

Ulrich, Roger S. ‘Effects of Interior Design on Wellness: Theory and Recent Scientific Research’. *Journal of Health Care Interior Design*. February 1991, pp. 97-109. Web. 26 August 2020.

Unruh, Anita M., et al. “The Occupation of Gardening in Life-threatening Illness： A Qualitative Pilot Project ”.*The Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*. Feb 2000, 67, 1: Nursing & Allied Health Database. Pp. 70-77.

Waddington-Feather, John. “Emily Brontë’s Use of Dialect in ‘Wuthering Heights’”. *Brontë Society Transactions*, 15:1, 12-19, DOI: 10.1179/030977666796499066. Published online 18 July 2013. Web. 3 December, 2019.

Wang, Lisa. “The Holy Spirit in Emily Brontë’s “Wuthering Heights” and Poetry”. *Literature and Theology*. Vol. 14. No. 2. June, 2000. Pp. 160-173.

Widdowson, Peter. *D. H. Lawrence*. London: Longman, 1992.

Wilks, Brian. *The Brontës.* Trans. Yoshiaki Shirai. Tokyo: Sairyu-sha, 1995.

Williams, Raymond. *The English Novel: From Dickens to Lawrence.* London: Chatto & Windus, 1973.

Willis, Irene Cooper. *The Brontë*. New York: Macmillan, 1957.

Wilson, Edward O. *Biophilia.* Cambridge, Harvard UP, 1984.

Winnifrith, Tom & Edward Chitham. *Charotte and Emily Brontë.* Baskingstoke: Macmillan, 1989.

Worthen, John. *D. H. Lawrence: The Early Years 1885-1912.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

---. *D. H. Lawrence: The Life of an Outsider.* London: Penguin,

2005.

---. “Lawrence as Dramatist”. *D. H. Lawrence.* Ed. Anne Fernihough. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Wright, T. R. *D. H. Lawrence and the Bible.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Zytaruk, George J., & James T. Boulton, ed. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence II.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.

ロレンス、D.H. 『D.H.ロレンス短篇全集４』 西村孝次、鉄村春夫、他、監訳 大阪：大阪教育図書、2005.