Moral Fable and Social Realism in Dickens's *Hard Times* and D.H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*

Monica Coral Hemstock Crooks

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

English

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

December 1983

ABSTRACT

Moral Fable and Social Realism in Dickens's Hard Times and Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover

Monica Coral Hemstock Crooks

This is an exploration and comparison of the unusual blend of moral fable and social realism in Dickens's Hard Times and Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover. Both authors reacted powerfully to the human consequences and environmental effects of the Industrial Revolution. Each chose a mixture of fable and realism as a literary technique with which to provide a critique of industrial society. They wanted to create a new mode of perception which would result in a change of individual consciousness. They both abhorred what they perceived to be an industrial attitude of mind that led to psychological repression and a crippling of the soul. In fact, an examination of the blend of fable and realism reveals that both authors resorted to fable in order to expose the negative aspects of an industrial society - precisely because it is an effective method of conveying the journey toward organic wholeness or spiritual harmony. Significantly, Gradgrind's 'conversion' and Connie's 'awakening' are the dramatized and rhetorically persuasive points where the novels' levels intersect. It is simultaneously the point where the rationale for the employment of the various levels is comprehended. Wildly disparate in style, but extraordinarily similar in theme and technique, Dickens and Lawrence depict the journey to organic wholeness with a similarity of purpose. Louisa Gradgrind is a prototype for Connie Chatterley.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my thanks to Professor G.D. Sheps of the English Department for undertaking to supervise my thesis and for his valuable comments.

My appreciation is also due Professor R.K. Martin, Graduate Programme Director, English Department, who encouraged me throughout the M.A. programme and provided me with several opportunities for development.

Special thanks go to my husband, Lieutenant-Commander Dean S. Crooks, for continuous moral, financial and logistical support for this project.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge Mrs. Marion Arbuckle who typed this manuscript and expressed sincere interest in its content.

Dedicated

to

the vivid memory

of

Audrey Muriel Vivian Ellison Hemstock

my mother

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Near the snow, near the sun, in the highest fields,
See how these names are fêted by the waving grass
And by the streamers of white cloud
And whispers of wind in the listening sky.
The names of those who in their lives fought for life,
Who wore at their hearts the fire's centre.
Born of the sun, they travelled a short while toward the sun,
And left the vivid air signed with their honour.

Stephen Spender

INTRODUCTION

Charles Dickens and D.H. Lawrence both chose to blend social realism with moral fable in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover. The combination of fable and realism is striking. Why did Dickens and Lawrence resort to fable in their efforts to expose the negative aspects of industrial society? Certainly their choice of literary method has created problems for some readers by raising expectations of the traditional realistic novel and then departing from realism and entering the realm of allegory and myth. Neither strictly realistic nor strictly fabulous, these novels plunge the reader into realms where language, setting, style, characters and plot are deceptively simple on one level of understanding. Both Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover can be reduced to a very simple story if the reader chooses to venture no further. However, on other levels, both novels employ a kaleidoscope of literary devices which have provided many critics with opportunities for a variety of interpretations.

It is possible to be disenchanted with these two novels because if they are read too simply we can develop a notion that Dickens and Lawrence were writers more concerned with

their moral message than their art. No one would deny the serious moral intent of either author; however, they were both also committed to their art as a close reading of Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover reveals. Since both Dickens and Lawrence wrote on multiple levels, suggesting, as some critics have observed, vertical dimensions of personality and experience, the reader must bring to these novels a willingness to feel as well as to think - for much in Dickens and Lawrence must be grasped intuitively and felt, as Lawrence would say, with the "solar plexus". Perhaps this is why both Dickens and Lawrence can be enjoyed by readers who are not formally educated in literary techniques, but who can appreciate the very real grasp of human nature which underpins the blend of fable and realism in these two novels. And no one who reads the novels closely can dismiss the compassion for humanity expressed in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover.

This exploration of the blend of social realism and moral fable in these two novels needs established perimeters. They are being inspected for their unusual blend of fable and realism and judged by Henry James's assertion that "The critic's task is to compare a work with its own concrete standard of truth".[1] While both novels have generated

[1] Henry James quoted in Anais Nin, D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study (Chicago: The Swallow Press Inc., 1964), preface.

considerable hostility from numerous critics over the years, it seems that frequently they were misread as philosophical tracts or as strictly 'realistic' novels that did not fulfill the reader's expectations of the genre. Actually the moral argument in both Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover is presented with the diagrammatic clarity of a picture, but of course, the symbolism itself was of necessity created by language.

Judged by their own concrete standards of truth, these two novels are successful works of art which embody and sustain the values that their authors perceive as truth. In each novel, the structure, characters, plot, setting and language all serve to reinforce one clear idea of truth while operating simultaneously on the levels of both realism and fable. When the central moral argument is traced from the beginning of each novel to the end, the totality of form and content with regard to the novelist's own view of truth is apparent. In very simple terms, in Hard Times Dickens presented the reader with quite traditional values of good and evil, and as Raymond Williams indicated, Dickens can assume that his audience shares these values.[2] Throughout Hard Times, he arranged his characters in 'good' and 'evil' contrasts in order to stage his assault on evil industrial

[2] Raymond Williams, The English Novel: From Dickens to Lawrence (London: Chatto & Windus, 1971), p. 15.

practices and to point out the 'right' way to live. This was, essentially, a Christian mode of living, but one that celebrates life by not overly repressing the natural impulses of man and by sanctioning the imaginative, playful faculties of human beings. He contrasted moral goodness in this novel with the evil practices of Victorian industrialism and at the novel's end affirmed his own view of morality which he had consistently sustained.

In Lady Chatterley's Lover, Lawrence did not assume traditional values of good and evil. In fact, he retrogressed and questioned all values. Essentially, Lawrence journeyed backward before the Fall and presented us with the choice between 'complete' life (life fully lived) or death. His vitalist ethic did not admit good or evil in a traditional sense. Anything life-denying was immoral to Lawrence. He contrasted human vitality in Lady Chatterley's Lover with the life-denying practices of modern industrialism and at the novel's end affirmed life over a living-death, which is the perception of truth he had maintained from the novel's beginning.

In order to attempt to discover the reason for Dickens's and Lawrence's decision to blend realism with fable it is necessary both to examine the social context behind the novels, because this forms the basis of the social realism, and to examine Dickens's and Lawrence's didactic purposes with

regard to Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover in order to discover their own perception of art that conveys a moral message. Next, the literary techniques used in each novel for the purpose of moral reform must be discussed as they relate to both realism and the fable, so that we can examine the different operating levels of action which arise from a mingling of conventional social realism with the fairy tale aura of fable. The test of each novelist's success at depicting their moral stance in a convincing and artistic manner must be determined through Connie's 'awakening' and Gradgrind's 'conversion' - the points where elements of fable and realism were employed and intersected to demonstrate each author's concept of 'wholeness'. This is the focus. It is the dramatized and rhetorically persuasive stage where the novels' levels must meet to make the novels' argument and drama convincing. It is also the stage where the apparent inconsistencies of the various levels are reconciled and we see the purpose of employing the various levels. Dickens and Lawrence needed more than one plane upon which to enact the journey toward organic wholeness or harmony. Certainly the intersecting of the realistic with the fabulous demanded an apprehension that is extraordinary - suggesting that a new way of perceiving is necessary in order to avoid the trap that the industrial-material world presents to most of us.

CHAPTER 1

FACT AND FABLE: THE SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Dickens and Lawrence wrote Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover largely as responses to the interaction of individual lives with social conditions; therefore, it is important to be aware of the general social-historical background which is invoked in these particular novels. It is, of course, from the social-historical background that the social realism is apparent in the novels and combined with moral fable presents the reader with an unique literary method for rendering criticisms and prescriptions regarding industrial society. An understanding of the general social context of these novels facilitates the reader's appreciation of Dickens's and Lawrence's critique of industrial civilization.

Before any discussion of the social context and Dickens's and Lawrence's critique of the industrial milieu can begin, it is necessary to define both realism and fable for the purposes of this discussion. Realism is commonly used in two ways: "(1) to denote a literary movement of the

nineteenth century, especially in prose fiction...: and (2) to designate a recurring way of representing life in literature which was typified by the writers of this historical movement".[1] However, "a thorough going realism involves not only a selection of subject matter but, more importantly, a special literary manner as well: the subject is represented or "rendered", in such a way as to give the illusion of actual experience...".[2] This rendering of the subject matter as actual experience is what Dickens and Lawrence attempted in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover. They both employed realism to convey an industrial milieu and human behaviour in such a milieu as to render convincingly and palpably the texture and feeling of human life in such an environment. Nevertheless, they simultaneously employed fable to provide a critique and to present an alternative to the 'real' world they depicted. Fable "exemplifies a moral thesis or a principle of human behaviour...".[3] It is a "story, especially of supernatural character, not founded on fact"[4] and is often composed of myths and legendary tales.[5]

[1] M.H. Abrams, (ed.) A Glossary of Literary Terms. Third Edition. (New York: Holt Rinehart & Windston, Inc., 1971), p. 140.

[2] Ibid., p. 141.

[3] Ibid., p. 5.

[4] H.W. Fowler and F.G. Fowler (eds.) The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. Fifth Edition. (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 431.

[5] Ibid., p. 431.

Clearly, the decision to blend realism and fable is unusual. It is for precisely this reason that an exploration and comparison of this technique in these two novels is considered to be worthwhile.

Dickens published Hard Times in 1854 and Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover was published in 1928. Although each author responded to very specific historical events, it is primarily the human consequences of the Industrial Revolution that underly their work and protests. Therefore, it is essential to discuss the upheaval and the dramatic changes in social life in the nineteenth century in order to understand what caused these protests and why these novels are so serious with reference to Dickens's and Lawrence's didactic purpose. The Industrial Revolution was accompanied by changes in living conditions which were drastic: "The Industrial Revolution marks the most fundamental transformation of human life in the history of the world recorded in written documents".[6] This transformation in human life came about as a result of "certain identifiable changes in the methods and characteristics of economic organization".[7] These changes, outlined by Phyllis Deane, constitute the development of what we define as an industrial revolution: "(1) widespread and

[6] E.J. Hobsbaum, Industry and Empire (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968), p. 1.

[7] Phyllis Deane, The First Industrial Revolution (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 1.

systematic application of modern science and empirical knowledge to the process of production for the market; (2) specialization of economic activity directed towards production for national and international markets rather than for family or parochial use; (3) movement of population from rural to urban communities; (4) enlargement and depersonalization of the typical unit of production so that it comes to be based less on the family or the tribe and more on the corporate or public enterprise; (5) movement of labour from activities concerned with the production of primary products to the production of manufactured goods and services; (6) intensive use of capital resources as a substitute for and complement to human effort; (7) emergence of new social and occupational classes determined by ownership of or relationship to the means of production other than land, namely capital".[8] These changes in economic organization led inevitably to an altered way of life for the English people. The Industrial Revolution increased the volume of goods and services produced, but it also changed the landscape and man's relationship to nature and time in a manner that caused confusion, alienation and hardship to many.

These characteristics of industrial revolution are reflected in the characters of Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's

[8] Phyllis Deane, p. 1.

Lover as we shall observe throughout this discussion. There is a clear parallel between the characters in these novels and the industrial economic process. Clifford Chatterley, as mine-owner, and Josiah Bounderby, as mill-owner, reflect the emergence of a new social class. This is a class determined by the relationship to the means of production. Industrial speed and purpose are mirrored in the delineations of Clifford's, Bounderby's and Gradgrind's characters and contrasted with the natural, slow, leisurely pace of Mellors's love-making and the long-suffering patience of Stephen Blackpool.

The transformation was essentially a change from an agrarian lifestyle to the new industrial system of living. And, although there continue to be debates regarding the actual 'beginning' of the Industrial Revolution in England,[9] it is apparent that by the time Dickens was writing, the Revolution had already altered the natural landscape and the life of a majority of people. These changes to the landscape and people are seen to proceed quite directly from the changes in economic organization outlined by Deane. Perhaps the most obvious change was the movement of people from the land into the cities in order to work in the factories.

[9] Phyllis Deane, p. 2.

Rather than living by the rhythmic seasonal cycles of rural life, time became measured by the amount a person could produce in an hour; in other words, time became measured by the punch clock of the factory workers.[10] Needless to say, although time itself was the same - the concept of it had dramatically altered and the pace of life increased. In fact, the Victorians felt a striking increase in the tempo of living as well as work.[11] So much so, that one observer felt that "the most salient characteristic of life in this latter portion of the 19th century is SPEED".[12] Naturally, it was the machines which produced this speed of living because goods could be produced so much faster, and improved transportation and communication hastened goods and people to their destinations. Also, market demands and competition to fill those demands stimulated the speed of production. Although profit is also a pre-industrial motive, industry technologized the profit motive and made it invade human activity more pervasively by accelerating the hectic pace of organization. This was done in order to sustain and increase

[10] Jerome Hamilton Buckley, The Triumph of Time (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1966).

[11] Walter Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), p. 7.

[12] Ibid., p. 7.

profits. However, the machines caused many changes beyond the apparent acceleration of life. Rapid technological and mechanical progress not only created - it also destroyed. For then, and it still appears to be the same today, "the political ideas and the moral sense of the nation" seemed to be lagging far behind technological progress.[13]

The machine began to dominate people's lives. The pace and rhythm of personal and intimate life was altered. This alteration affected a person's sense of himself and his relations to others. Instead of people adapting the technology to the needs of the people, the situation seemed reversed. People became slaves to the machine, forced into uncomfortable positions, long hours, tedious repetitions and poor living conditions, in order to conform to the discipline of an inanimate creation. The work discipline demanded a subservience to the mechanical process as it came to be the underpinning of profitable and market activity. Since the machine was linked to and made the foundation of market activity - the market and the machine became almost indistinguishable. The machine became symbolic of economic activity that altered human and social and personal life in a hitherto unprecedented scale. Naturally, there were many people who were extremely proud of mechanical progress as was

[13] R.J. Cruikshank, Charles Dickens and Early Victorian England (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1949), p. 46.

observed at the Great Exhibition of 1851. In fact, to many at the exhibition, a "missionary faith was there made manifest. Paxton's strange building of glass and iron was its temple".[14] Nevertheless, to others, these machines brought with them some human horror stories:

> The Industrial Revolution had developed so rapidly that it not only burst through the old political frames, but was likely to overwhelm the popular new philosophies. It brought with it a frightening accumulation of problems of human wretchedness and degradation, of child slaves and of women reduced to the condition of animals.[15]

It was amid this upheaval of conflicting ideas regarding progress and misery that Dickens wrote Hard Times.

In Walter Houghton's The Victorian Frame of Mind we may find the spirit of the age of novelists like Dickens. Houghton explored the apparent paradoxical ideas and attitudes of the time and revealed their interrelationships for the reader. He showed us that if there was one distinguishing fact about the time then it was the Victorian belief that they were living in an age of transition.[16] As Houghton indicated, although all ages are ages of transition, "never

14 R.J. Cruikshank, p. 44.

15 Ibid., p. 45.

16 Walter Houghton, p. 1.

before had men thought of their own time as an era of change from the past to the future".[17] The specific words "transition" or "transitional" were used by Prince Albert, Matthew Arnold, Baldwin Brown, Carlyle, Disraeli, Frederic Harrison, Bulwer Lytton, W.H. Mallock, Harriet Martineau, John Mill, John Morley, William Morris, Herbert Spencer, Hugh Stawell, J.A. Symonds and Tennyson;[18] therefore, it is clear that Victorians realized that they were living in an era of radical change. This sense of upheaval of old ideas and institutions caused both anxiety and optimism, as would be expected. It was as though Victorians were living on top of a volcano that was rumbling and threatening to blow at any time. And by 1830, it was clear that both the destructive and reconstructive aspects of revolutionary change were apparent.[19]

Charles Dickens, a man concerned with all sorts of social injustices, recognized that some very specific political and economic theories were of concern because they were used to justify what he perceived to be cruel practices of Victorian industrialism. He was especially concerned about the concepts of laissez-faire and utilitarianism. Laissez-faire was not entirely new economic theory. Adam

17 Walter Houghton, p. 1.

18 Ibid., p.1.

19 Ibid., p. 3.

Smith had written the "classic statement of the rationale of laissez-faire" in 1776 and it had been a "fundamental maxim"of economic theory since the seventeenth century.[20] However, John Stuart Mill publicized the phrase in England in 1848 when he used it as a chapter heading in his book Principles of Political Economy.[21] Cruikshank pointed out that although "the term has served as a term of contempt and abuse for a very long time", that it once had its part in the "evolution of the idea of freedom" and that restrictive practices like the Navigation Acts and the Corn Law of 1815 had convinced more liberal-minded men of the time that for Government to interfere with trade and commerce was a negation of freedom.[22]

Benthamite Utilitarianism grew out of a sincere attempt to find a way of distinguishing between good and bad laws.[23] Good laws were those that were useful in terms of providing for the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people. Jeremy Bentham reasoned that:

> Pleasure is the highest good. We all seek it. Pain is horrible. We all run away from it. What more rational a principle of Government than that? The purpose of the wise Governor is to assure the greatest happiness of the greatest number.[24]

20 William W. Watt in Charles Dickens's Hard Times (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958), p. xiii.

21 Ibid., p. xiii.

22 R.J. Cruikshank, p. 40.

23 William W. Watt, p. xiv.

24 R.J. Cruikshank, p. 49.

The "greatest happiness formula" apparently originated in the seventeenth century,[25] and Bentham, who was described as "a mountain of energy with a passion for figures" refused to account for any differences in the "quality of pleasures".[26] His algebraical formula led logically to a reductive attitude which Cruikshank described as "a wild excess of reason".[27] Naturally, in principle, both the laissez-faire and Benthamite Utilitarianism theories were formulated with good intentions; however, the application of these theories, and especially the unification in practice of these two principles, were used to sanctify inhuman practices.

These theories and their application find their expression as social realism in Hard Times. The description of these theories constitutes the literary social realism employed as descriptive device in the novel. The workers of Coketown suffer from the laissez-faire theory that allows them to suffer at the hands of the industrial managers, and the children are thoroughly starved of imagination due to an utilitarian education that prizes "fact" and negates the value of "fancy". Dickens's evil Mr. Bounderby is a tyrant whose principles were sanctioned by the theories of Adam

25 William W. Watt, p. xiv.

26 Ibid., p. xiv.

27 R.J. Cruikshank, p. 50.

Smith and Jeremy Bentham, while Mr. Gradgrind's spiritual blindness was supported by the belief that science and industry are to be exalted and that the arts and humanities are useless nonsense. Arts and humanities are seen as useless primarily in terms of society seen almost exclusively as an 'economy' or as a productive phenomenon. And the productive power of the use of machines encouraged this. Dickens could perceive the danger to the human spirit due to these industrial values of money and goods being raised to such heights that humans lose their humanity and become simply embodiments of social theories or the wasted by-products of a material age. Dickens fulfilled a role with his rendering of social realism that was a function of the leading writers of the Victorian period.[28] He had to "keep the springs of sympathy from drying up in that hard winter of materialism, and to preserve the vital sparks of pity and imagination, both in those who were grown drowsy from a surfeit of bread and meat, and those whose stomachs were aching with hunger".[29] His effort to keep the vital spark of humanity from being extinguished was carried on during the twentieth century by writers such as D.H. Lawrence.

[28] R.J. Cruikshank, p. 57.

[29] Ibid., p. 57.

Lawrence, as Raymond Williams has stated, "takes over the major criticism of industrialism from the nineteenth century tradition".[30] Williams illustrated the points which Lawrence carried over from the nineteenth century.[31] The first point was "the general condemnation of industrialism as an attitude of mind".[32] Of course, it is economy as well as industry that is the attitude of mind. Williams used a quotation from Lawrence's "Nottingham and the Mining Country-side" to explain this frame of mind: "The industrial problem arises from the base forcing of all human energy into a competition of mere acquisition".[33] Hence, Lawrence saw very clearly that industry is basically something built into an economic, and therefore human, attitude. Then, Williams observed, that when "narrowed to competitive acquisitiveness, human purpose is seen as debased" to simple mechanical materialism[34] - a point which Williams substantiated from Lawrence's essay "Democracy":

> When pure mechanization or materialism sets in, the soul is automatically pivoted, and the most diverse of creatures fall into a common mechanical unison. This we see in America. It is not a homogeneous,

30 Raymond Williams, "Lawrence's Social Writings" in D,H. Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays (ed.) Mark Spilka (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963), p. 163.

31 Ibid., p. 163.

32 Ibid., p. 163.

33 Ibid., p. 164.

34 Ibid., p. 163.

> spontaneous coherence so much as a disintegrated amorphousness which lends itself to perfect mechanical unison.[35]

Thus Lawrence saw society and social behaviour as modelled upon and shaped by the mode of operation found in industrial or factory organization. However, as Williams indicated, it is a "condition of mind" rather than the actual industry itself, which is perceived as having resulted in the "ugliness of an industrial society".[36] Lawrence clearly saw machines as used by and made by men and men thus submitting to what they made. This idolatry - man submitting to his own creation - distorts human behaviour:

> The real tragedy of England, as I see it, is the tragedy of ugliness. The country is so lovely: the man-made England is so vile ... It was ugliness which betrayed the spirit of man, in the nineteenth century. The great crime which the moneyed classes and promoters of industry committed in the palmy Victorian days was the condemning of the workers to ugliness, ugliness, ugliness: meanness and formless and ugly surroundings, ugly ideals, ugly religion, ugly hope, ugly love, ugly clothes, ugly furniture, ugly houses, ugly relationship between workers and employers. The human soul needs actual beauty even more than bread.[37]

35 Raymond Williams, "Lawrence's Social Writings", p. 164.

36 Ibid., p. 164.

37 D.H. Lawrence, "Nottingham and the Mining Countryside" in Raymond Williams, "Lawrence's Social Writings", p. 164.

Therefore, Williams identified for us the logical steps in the nineteenth century tradition of industrial criticism which was inherited by Lawrence. As for Lawrence's concern with the actual origins of industrial society, Williams made an important point when he reminded the reader that:

> Lawrence is little concerned, historically, with the origins of industrialism. For him, in this century, it is a received fact, and at the centre of it is the "forcing of all human energy into a competition of mere acquisition" - the common element in all the diverse interpretations of which the tradition is composed.[38]

The "utter negation of natural beauty" and the "utter death of the human intuitive faculty" which Lawrence protested in Lady Chatterley's Lover[39] proceeded quite naturally from this common element discussed by Williams.

Colin Clarke also perceived Lawrence to be writing within an inherited nineteenth century tradition of social and political thought.[40] Clarke saw Lawrence's observation that "the machine can indicate a dimension of soul as well as

38 Raymond Williams, "Lawrence's Social Writings", p. 164.

39 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1982), p. 158.

40 Colin Clarke, River of Dissolution: D.H. Lawrence and English Romanticism (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 136.

physical fact"[41] in terms of a contention expressed by Carlyle in 1829: "Not the external and physical alone is now managed by machinery, but the internal and spiritual also ... men are grown mechanical in head and in heart as well as hand".[42] Of course, this is the heart of what Lawrence's writing is about. Clarke pointed out to us that this contention was to be found in writings as early as Blake and that it appeared in Cobbett, Dickens, Matthew Arnold, Ruskin and William Morris.[43] Contrasting Carlyle's deployment of his large abstractions and antitheses (physical-spiritual, internal-external, visible-invisible) with Lawrence's ability to convey inner life, Clarke found Lawrence's strength to belong to "his inwardness with the native poetic tradition" as received from his Romantic predecessors.[44] In fact, Clarke stated that:

> Although it was from his Romantic predecessors that Lawrence took over the antithesis of mechanical and organic, it was precisely the great Romantics who make it possible for him ultimately to qualify and to subtleize the antithesis. In providing a whole new vocabulary for recording the chameleon quality of psychic process, the poets enabled him to plot far more intricate relationships between the vital and the mechanical than they themselves had ever envisaged...[45]

41 Colin Clarke, p. 136.

42 Ibid., p. 136.

43 Ibid., p. 136.

44 Ibid., p. 137.

45 Ibid., p. 137.

Clearly, Lawrence built upon the organic-mechanical contrast he inherited from his predecessors and one of those predecessors was Dickens.

Just as Dickens in 1838, after his first sight of Manchester, had vowed to "strike the heaviest blow in my power" for the victims of exploitation in the cotton mills,[46] so too was Lawrence provoked to write Lady Chatterley's Lover after a final visit in 1926 to his home among the collieries in Nottingham and Derby.[47] As Scott Sanders commented to us, what Lawrence saw on that trip - "The disfigurement of his fields, the decay of his villages, the misery and hopelessness of his people - moved him to write his last, gentlest and most compassionate novel, Lady Chatterley's Lover".[48] Sanders reminded us that although things had always been harsh in the mining communities, they grew worse in the years after the war and that by the autumn of 1926 the situation was grave.[49] "In May of that year the unions had staged a General Strike in support of the miners who were refusing to

46 William W. Watt, p. 41.

47 Scott Sanders, D.H. Lawrence: The World of The Five Major Novels (New York: The Viking Press, 1974), p. 172.

48 Ibid., p. 172.

49 Ibid., p. 172.

accept the coalowners' terms of reduced wages and longer hours".[50] Apparently spokesmen "for the propertied class and for the Conservative Government" announced that "class warfare" had begun and demanded that the workers surrender.[51] Although the General Strike ended peacefully after little more than a week, the obvious tension between classes had exposed the possibilities of a civil war and had frightened many English people, including Lawrence.[52] Nevertheless, Sanders informed us, that the coalowners, who were seemingly convinced that a class war was inevitable, prepared their forces.[53] The owners were aided by Baldwin's Government which passed laws allowing longer working hours and endorsing the owners' efforts to destroy the national miners union, as well as restricting the payment of poor relief.[54] In August, the Government sent thousands of police into the colliery districts as a show of strength.[55] By the time Lawrence visited the Midlands in September, the miners who had been on

50 Scott Sanders, p. 172.

51 Ibid., p. 172.

52 Ibid., p. 172.

53 Ibid., p. 173.

54 Ibid., p. 173.

55 Ibid., p. 137.

strike since May had long ago exhausted their funds and personal savings and many were forced into seeking either poor relief or the workhouse.[56] Finally, the miners were starved into capitulation by the beginning of September and had returned to the pit to work for longer hours at lower wages.[57] Their union was ruined, they were badly in debt and their jobs were susceptible to trade slumps and machinery.[58] Sanders stated that "these people who had surrounded Lawrence during his youth were to wait over a decade for relief: the villages and fields might wait forever".[59] This was the social reality which Lawrence expressed in Lady Chatterley's Lover.

While the exact social and historical contexts differ for Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover because they were written over seventy years apart, the social reality is remarkably similar. Lawrence, of course, wrote with World War One vividly in front of him. Nevertheless, both he and Dickens wrote out of the misery and distortion of human behaviour which followed rapid technological advances. They

56 Scott Sanders, p. 173.

57 Ibid., p. 173.

58 Ibid., p. 173.

59 Ibid., p. 174.

both reacted passionately to the human consequences of the Industrial Revolution. In fact, as we have discussed, there are many similarities in their assumptions which arise from the Victorian period. And although Lawrence created his own new novel form, Lady Chatterley's Lover is viewed by Sanders as a return to conventional realism and narrated by an essentially nineteenth-century narrator.[60] As we shall see in Chapter 5, Louisa Gradgrind is a prototype for Lady Chatterley.

Like Dickens in Hard Times, Lawrence mixed social realism with fable in Lady Chatterley's Lover. In a "hut in the magical wood", Mellors, the gamekeeper, meets Lady Chatterley and their love bridges the social gulf between them.[61] This "fable of love" is based upon the reality of desire: "Desire recognizes no class boundaries, it respects none of the political and economic barricades which men have erected to parcel out the earth".[62] In other words, love is an organic process that evades man-made barriers. And just as Dickens presented us with the fairytale giant tyrant Mr. Bounderby in Hard Times, so too did Lawrence provide us with the fantastical mechanical robot, Clifford Chatterley, in Lady Chatterley's Lover, in order to demonstrate what can happen to people when they repress or deny a vital part of their nature and become subservient to theories and machines.

60 Scott Sanders, p. 181.

61 Ibid., p. 177.

62 Ibid., p. 176.

CHAPTER 2

ART, MORAL REFORM AND THE FABLE

In chapter 1 we discussed the general social and historical background for the social realism in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover. Similarly, it is important to be aware of Dickens's and Lawrence's use of art for the purpose of reform since this underpins the moral fable. While their belief in the ability of art to instruct may appear self-evident, it will become clear as this discussion progresses that their didactic intent involves a quest for a passionate response from the reader rather than merely an intellectual grasp of the novels. It is an attempt to lead us to a new consciousness.

Dickens was devoted to literature[1] and Lawrence was committed to the art of the novel.[2] Both artists were very much

[1] Anthony Trollope, Dickens: The Critical Heritage (ed) Philip Collins (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1971) p. 325.

[2] D.H. Lawrence, "Why the Novel Matters", Phoenix (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1980), pp. 533-538.

concerned with the quality of life and the role that art could play in expanding the consciousness and altering perceptions, so that from individual changes or moral reform the result might be a changed society. Therefore, they both mixed realism with moral fable in order to teach lessons while simultaneously providing islands of removal from industrial life in order to present their positive values. The fable not only invokes imagination and play but also presents an ideal or alternative to the mechanized behaviour of people rooted in the industrial milieu. And perhaps most important of all, is the suitability of the fable to help convey the realm of the incorporeal.

In order to provide a critique of industrial society and to present an ideal - Dickens and Lawrence employed satire. Satire is an attack using irony that contains a purpose which is usually social.[3] Since both authors were critiquing society - satire was used to attack the negative, dehumanizing effects of industrialism while also providing a "dislocation of consciousness", which is a typical satiric technique.[4] This dislocation of consciousness is apparent in the use of the circus in Hard Times and the wood in Lady Chatterley's

[3] Professor H. Fink, "Lecture on Satire", at Concordia University, Montréal, Québec, Sept. 15, 1978.

[4] Ibid., Sept. 27, 1978.

Lover. The circus and the wood contain Dickens's and Lawrence's positive values. They are removed from the industrial milieu because the positive values are not to be found in society as it 'is'. Rather, they reflect things as they 'should' be. In other words, the social realism is there to show the 'real' world and the fable to convey the 'ideal' world.

However, the attack on the 'real' world must be seen for what it is. It is based on a genuine concern and compassion for humanity. It is important to keep in mind that satire is rooted in a caring for mankind and is essentially, "a form of sympathy".[5] Both Dickens and Lawrence abhorred anything that reduced a human being to nothing more than an instrument of economic production. They both fought for the recognition of man's right to creative expression and fulfillment regardless of his occupational status. Wholeness or harmony in an individual could only result when a human being was allowed and encouraged to express his desires and fancies.

The goal and core of Lawrence's message are one. Organic wholeness or the achievement of "full spontaneous being" is not only the core of his message but also the cause of his commitment to the novel:[6]

[5] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1982), p. 104.

[6] Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1955.), p. 4

> Now I absolutely deny that I am a soul, or a body, or a mind, or an intelligence, or a brain, or a nervous system, or a bunch of glands, or any of the rest of these bits of me. The whole is greater than the part. And therefore, I, who am man alive, am greater than....anything....that is merely a part of me. I am a man, and alive....
>
> For this reason I am a novelist. And being a novelist, I consider myself superior to the saint, the scientist, the philosopher, and the poet, who are all great masters of different bits of man alive, but never get the whole hog.[7]

By reading the novel Lawrence felt that, "you can develop an instinct for life....instead of a theory of right and wrong, good and bad".[8]

> Right and wrong is an instinct: but an instinct of the whole consciousness in a man, bodily, mental, spiritual at once. And only in the novel are all things given full play.... For out of the full play of all things emerges the only thing that is anything, the wholeness of a man, the wholeness of a woman, man alive and live woman.[9]

"In other words, the art of the novel was the religious art for Lawrence".[10] And in Lady Chatterley's Lover, the acts of love are "communion-rites"; therefore, as Spilka asserted, to call them "naturalistic descriptions of the sex act", or to speak of them as "revelations of biology, is to miss the whole tenor and purpose of the reading experience":[11]

[7] D.H. Lawrence, "Why the Novel Matters", p. 535.

[8] Ibid., p. 538.

[9] Ibid., p. 538.

[10] Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p. 4.

[11] Ibid., p. 191.

> If you're a parson, you talk about souls in heaven. If you're a novelist, you know that paradise is in the palm of your hand, and on the end of your nose, because both are alive...[12]

The vital struggle toward organic wholeness is Connie's quest as she journeys from one realm to another in Lady Chatterley's Lover.

This struggle toward wholeness is something Dickens understood, as is apparent in Hard Times. Dickens's portrayal of Louisa's and Tom's development is psychologically accurate. Louisa, who has no emotional outlet except for her brother, Tom, marries Bounderby in order to better her brother's prospects for advancement. Therefore, due to the Gradgrindian restriction and starvation of emotion, natural human qualities of affection lead to disastrous effects. Louisa sacrifices herself for her brother, participates in a loveless marriage, and becomes susceptible to the calculated attentions of James Harthouse. Tom becomes a monster who manipulates the 'fact' of his sister's devotion to him and ultimately becomes a criminal. These are the 'natural' or logical and inevitable results of an 'unnatural' upbringing.

There are many similarities in the way that Dickens and Lawrence express their moral contrasts and the struggle toward wholeness. Sissy Jupe's moral goodness is very

[12] D.H. Lawrence, "Why the Novel Matters", p. 533.

similar to Lawrentian vitality. [13] And of course, Sissy is the antithesis of the utilitarian philosophy:

> There is an essentially Laurentian suggestion about the way in which 'the dark-eyed and dark-haired' girl, contrasting with Bitzer, seemed to receive a 'deeper and more lustrous colour from the sun', so opposing the life that is lived freely and richly from the deep instinctive and emotional springs to the thin-blooded, quasi-mechanical product of Gradgrindery.[14]

Significantly, Sissy's symbolic value is inextricably interconnected with Sleary's Horse-riding and the circus, where the circus performers represent human spontaneity and express vital human impulses.[15] There are definite similarities between Dickens's 'goodness' and Lawrence's 'vitality' throughout Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover and these will be evident throughout this discussion as the specific references to the texts are made.

Although both Dickens's and Lawrence's purpose is didactic in these two novels, it is not didactic in a simple sense - because both authors wanted a passionate response from their readers, in order to affect more than the intellect alone. Therefore, both writers chose to convey the central argument of their works with visual imagery, in order that

[13] F.R. Leavis, "Hard Times: The World of Bentham", Dickens the Novelist, F.R. and Q.D. Leavis, (London: Chatto & Windus, 1970.), p. 277

[14] Ibid., p. 256.

[15] Ibid., p. 257.

the reader might apprehend their message in a manner that resembles the desired deep instinctive response to a visual art, rather than what is often a solely intellectual response to written words:

> The essential function of art is moral. Not aesthetic, not decorative, not pastime and recreation. But moral. The essential function of art is moral.
>
> But a passionate, implicit morality, not didactic. A morality which changes the blood, rather than the mind. Changes the blood first. The mind follows later, in the wake.[16]

While Lawrence in Lady Chatterley's Lover attempted to change the 'blood' and the mind, Dickens in Hard Times, hoped to change the 'heart' and the mind of his readers.

Essentially, both Dickens and Lawrence protested the repression and reduction of the human spirit and championed the spontaneous and creative forces of man. Dickens, in Hard Times, was preoccupied with a comprehensive vision - a vision in which the "inhumanities of Victorian civilization are seen as fostered and sanctioned by a hard philosophy, the aggressive formulation of an inhumane spirit".[17] The representative of that 'hard' philosophy is Thomas Gradgrind, Esquire,

[16] D.H. Lawrence, Studies in Classic American Literature (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1977), p. 180.

[17] F.R. Leavis, "Hard Times: The World of Bentham", p. 253.

Member of Parliament for Coketown. Mr. Gradgrind develops his children along the lines of the utilitarian experiment in education which John Stuart Mill recorded as being his own childhood experience.[18] The result of this education was the starving of the human need for beauty and the expression of the imagination. When Gradgrind marries off Louisa to Josiah Bounderby (banker, merchant, manufacturer), a man who cares only about temporal power and material success, he further alienates Louisa from the possibility of achieving love and personal fulfillment. It is the cruel insistence on "fact" at the total expense of "fancy" which not only distorts the psychological growth of Gradgrind's children, but also condemns the Coketown workers to a monotonous existence of life without beauty.

Lawrence recoiled from these same repressive forces in Lady Chatterley's Lover. In fact, Lawrence could have learned from Dickens about the flow of spontaneous life, if he had not already known it instinctively:

> Lawrence didn't need to learn from Nietzsche that life flows from sources far below the level of will and ego-enforced idea; that it is spontaneous, unmeasurable and creative; and that men, all the same, are continually trying, in one way and another, to ignore or defeat these truths. If he had needed to find them in other writers he could have learnt them from Shakespeare and the Greek tragic poets and from all the creative writers and artists he studied with the insight of genius. My immediate point is that he could have learnt them

[18] R.J. Cruikshank, p. 53.

> from Dickens, with whom he has special affinities, and to whom, like the post-Dickensian novelists in general, he was immensely indebted.[19]

In Lady Chatterley's Lover Lawrence completed his final critique on an industrial civilization that sinned against the organic life by encouraging the submersion or denial of essential human needs and capabilities. Like Dickens, he was opposed to philosophies or theories which restricted human growth and development and forced rigid patterns and analysis:

> There is no point. Life and love are life and love, a bunch of violets is a bunch of violets, and to drag in the idea of a point is to ruin everything. Live and let live, love and let love, flower and fade, and follow the natural curve which flows on, pointless.[20]

This is important because all romanticism is opposed to the clear and definite "point" or target of ideas of industry and progress. The natural flow of life evades the restrictive, reductive theories designed by man; therefore, the effects of these theories is frequently a perversion of what would have been natural expression. It is any form of absolutism which results in the crippling and distorting of human expression that occupied both Dickens and Lawrence.

Mrs. Gradgrind's intuitive grasp that something was missing from her utilitarian household was one of the examples

[19] F.R. Leavis, "Hard Times: The World of Bentham", p. 278.

[20] D.H. Lawrence in The Achievement of D.H. Lawrence (eds.) F.J. Hoffman and H.T. Moore (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953), p. 72.

in Hard Times that Dickens used to reflect the fact that a forced denial of spontaneous life forces eventually leads to illness. At her death, Mrs. Gradgrind asks for a pen as she attempts to convey to Louisa what it is that is missing from their home:

> "You learnt a great deal, Louisa, and so did your brother. Ologies of all kinds from morning to night. If there is any ology left, of any description, that has not been worn to rags in this house, all I can say is, I hope I shall never hear its name."....
>
> "But there is something - not an ology at all - that your father has missed, or forgotten, Louisa. I don't know what it is.... I shall never get its name now. But your father may. It makes me restless. I want to write to him, to find out for God's sake what it is. Give me a pen, give me a pen".[21]

Just as Mrs. Gradgrind's home, Stone Lodge, is a fortress of fact, so is Lady Chatterley's home, Wragby, a mansion of the mental life:

> Poor Connie! As the years drew on it was the fear of nothingness in her life that affected her. Clifford's mental life and hers gradually began to feel like nothingness. Their marriage, their integrated life based on a habit of intimacy, that he talked about: there were days when it all became utterly blank and nothing. It was just words, just so many words. The only reality was nothingness, and over it a hypocrisy of words.[22]

All these facts and words, are, of course, attempts to deny or 'talk away' the deeper life forces in human beings which

[21] Charles Dickens, Hard Times (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc, 1958), p. 183.

[22] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 52.

might interfere with the material progress of man. Forcing all human energy into the competition for material acquisition necessitates the sublimation and denial of creative and spiritual forces which threaten to distract man from his discipline to the machine of the industrial society:

> Perhaps we are so used to the demands civilization makes upon us to regard our bodies merely as serviceable instruments that we cannot respond to Lawrence's insistence that our bodies are ourselves and that the only way to be alive is in the flesh. But it seems to me he has discovered the perfect place to rest a case against an industrial civilization. For no one pretends that such a civilization offers spiritual rewards to its supporters. It offers merely the promise of a richer material existence, and Lawrence suggests that the offer is a swindle.[23]

So did Dickens.

Therefore, it is clear that Dickens and Lawrence chose in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover to employ art in an endeavor to alter their reader's perceptions and pre-conceived notions regarding the world around them. However, Dickens made it just as evident in Hard Times that he valued art as entertainment. Nevertheless, his belief in the amusement value of art is a logical part of his central argument and moral purpose in Hard Times. A life of all work and no play is cruel, dehumanizing, and dangerous. Dickens said of the Coketown populace:

[23] Julian Moynahan, "Lady Chatterley's Lover: The Deed of Life", D.H. Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays (ed.) Mark Spilka (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963), p. 83.

> Cultivate in them, while there is yet time, the utmost graces of the fancies and affections, to adorn their lives so much in need of ornament; or, in the day of your triumph, when romance is utterly driven out of their souls, and they and a bare existence stand face to face, Reality will take a wolfish turn, and make an end of you.[24]

Dickens was advocating the entertainment value of the arts, because he recognized the dangers of repressed emotion and unexpressed creativity which were sanctioned by the spirit of industrialism.

However, this insistence by Dickens concerning the entertainment value of art, was, as Leavis noted, something that Dickens had previously expressed in Bleak House, the novel which immediately preceded Hard Times:

> During the whole time consumed in the slow growth of this family tree, the house of Smallweed, always early to go out and late to marry, has strengthened itself in its practical character, has discarded all amusements, discountenanced all story books, fairy tales, fictions and fables, and banished all levities whatsoever. Hence the gratifying fact, that it has had no child born to it, and that the complete little men and women whom it has produced have been observed to bear a likeness to old monkeys with something depressing on their minds.[25]

The preceding passage is both an example of Dickens's belief in the value of entertainment, and, simultaneously, evidence of his own capability to amuse. Nevertheless, all comic

[24] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 150.

[25] Charles Dickens, Bleak House, in "Hard Times: The World of Bentham", F.R. Leavis and Q.D. Leavis, Dickens The Novelist (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1978), p. 211.

devices employed in Hard Times have an obvious satiric purpose within the main argument of the fable, and that purpose is a moral one. No one who reads Hard Times can overlook Dickens's dark reaction to the suppression of vitality. His portrayal of Louisa Gradgrind's stifled growth anticipates Lawrence's depiction of Connie's paralyzed existence in Lady Chatterley's Lover:

> And here lies the vast importance of the novel, properly handled. It can inform and lead into new places the flow of our sympathetic consciousness and it can lead our sympathy away in recoil from things gone dead.[26]

[26] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 104.

CHAPTER 3

FACT AND FABLE: THE FAIRY-TALE AURA

In order to lead us to a new state of consciousness Dickens and Lawrence transcended the expectations of realistic fiction in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover. They employed a wide variety of literary devices to dramatize two opposing realms in each work. While Dickens used Sleary's Horse-riding and the circus to convey his positive values in Hard Times, Lawrence utilized the wood in Lady Chatterley's Lover for his rendering of growth and vitality. However, it is not merely the simple juxtaposition of the industrial world with that of the circus or the wood that argues symbolically against the repression of the human spirit, but also the plot, characters, language and style of each novel.

It is characteristic of moral fable that everything be of significance with regard to the intent of the story. F.R. Leavis stated that: "I need say no more by way of defining the moral fable than that in it the intention is peculiarly insistent, so that the representative significance

of everything in the fable - character, episode, and so on - is immediately apparent as we read".[1] K.J. Fielding reminded us that Henry James interpreted the moral fable in terms of a "fictional story with a clear intellectual purpose".[2] Examined with these definitions of the moral fable in mind, both Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover can be viewed in this light.

Obviously, there is a clear, intellectual purpose evident in Hard Times. From the opening schoolroom scene until the end of the novel, there is no doubt at all that Dickens is attacking the reductive attitude of a materialistic spirit. The satire is unmistakeable. Absolutely everything in the novel contributes to the main argument: "Like the characters and the setting, the plot of Hard Times is entirely continuous with its satiric argument: every line leads directly into the central fable".[3] Dickens polarized values and presented them throughout the novel in the characters and institutions. The reader is always aware of this polarization. There is never any doubt about Dickens's intent. We

[1] F.R. Leavis, "Hard Times: The World of Bentham", p. 188.

[2] K.J. Fielding, Charles Dickens: A Critical Introduction (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1958), p. 160.

[3] Sylvia Bank Manning, Dickens As Satirist (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), p. 145.

know that Gradgrind, Bounderby, M'Choakumchild, Sparsit, Harthouse, Bitzer and Slackbridge are representative of one world, and that Sissy, Rachael, Stephen and Sleary are representative of another. We know that the Coketown world is the realm of fact and that the circus world is the realm of fancy. We also see clearly that child and adult are divided this way. And the clarity of our perception is intended and necessary. For if the reader cannot recognize the polarities - the point of the entire novel is missed:

> Hard Times, ... is moral satire. Like all Dickens's fiction, it is concerned essentially with the moral dilemmas of opposition between mechanical rigidity and vital fluidity, scientific learning and intuitive knowledge, self-propelling masculine aggressiveness and nurturing, feminine receptivity. Dickens polarizes these values in the various characters and institutions of the novel.[4]

It is the industrial, utilitarian realm opposed to the realm of emotion, imagination, charity, and love. Dickens has a romantic, organic pre-supposition implicit in his work. Therefore, in seeking a balance between fact and fancy, Dickens stressed fancy because it was the neglected aspect in the quest for wholeness.

Lawrence's intellectual purpose and method are similar in Lady Chatterley's Lover. We are no less confused regarding his polarities. Lawrence's juxtaposed worlds - one cerebal, abstract, and unvital, and the other, physical, concrete and vital or organic - are dramatized throughout the novel.

[4] Sylvia Bank Manning, p. 133.

There is no doubt concerning Lawrence's viewpoint. "The novel's structural method involves a simple juxtaposition of the two modes; its narrative method combines explicit interpretative comment by a narrator who from the beginning makes clear his sympathy for the vitalist viewpoint together with lucid and objective renderings of characters, situations, and settings".[5] As in Hard Times, the polarities are obvious and are meant to be. Characters and places are either representative of the unvital realm of Clifford and Wragby Hall or the organic realm of Mellors and the wood. For Lawrence there were no degrees of vitality - only vitality or the lack of it. While Dickens, in Hard Times, polarized his characters and institutions around a split between fact and fancy, Lawrence, in Lady Chatterley's Lover, polarized his characters and situations around the split between mind and body. Mellors is himself conscious of the polarization and decides to re-emphasize the body to repair the split. Like Dickens, in seeking totality, Lawrence emphasized the neglected component in the quest for wholeness. He deplored the over-emphasis of the mind at the body's expense and sought an integration of the two. Therefore, Clifford Chatterley represented all the negative values which Lawrence viewed as being aligned with the mental life:

[5] Julian Moynahan, "Lady Chatterley's Lover: The Deed of Life", pp. 72-73.

> Thus Clifford displays all those ills which Lawrence associated with the mental life: insistence on social forms, fascination with science, lust for domination, acquisitiveness, devotion to industry, physical impotence, and substitution of art for life".[6]

The 'mental' life in Lady Chatterley's Lover and the 'fact' life in Hard Times are remarkably similar.

Clearly, then, both novels qualify as moral fables because they are fictional stories with an insistently obvious intellectual, even didactic, purpose and this purpose can be seen to be operating throughout the novels in terms of settings, characters, plot and situations. This explains then the criticism regarding the characters in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover. Many critics have complained about what they consider to be one dimensional caricatures rather than fully developed characters in these novels. However, what some of these critics failed to realize, is that this polarization of character-qualities is an essential component in the fable aspect of each novel. Edgar H. Johnson reacted to the compact and insistent mood of Dickens's description of Coketown and its inhabitants:

> Every packed detail of this entire setting is surcharged with significant emotional and intellectual comment, and every character among the small unified group, symbolic and stylized, who act out their drama in the gritty industrial world, serves to deepen and intensify the meaning. Josiah Bounderby, banker and manufacturer, is its blatant

6 Scott Sanders, p. 183.

> greed and callous inhumanity in action. Thomas Gradgrind retired wholesale hardware dealer, man of facts and figures, is the embodiment of utilitarian economic theory and its endeavour to dry up life into statistical averages. Young Thomas Gradgrind, devoted first and only to his own advantage, is the mean product of the paternal theories - that not unprecedented triumph of calculation which is usually at work on number one". (I, IX) The daughter Lousia is their predestined tragic victim going to doom, in her face "a light with nothing to rest upon, a fire with nothing to burn". (I, iii) The consummate achievement of Mr. Gradgrind's system is represented by Bitzer, one of the pupils graduated from the day school founded by Gradgrind: for Bitzer everything is a matter of bargain and sale, accessible to no appeal except that of self-interest.[7]

Johnson also noted the essential contrast in Hard Times which is just as stylized:

> In contrast to these, Sissy Jupe, the strolling juggler's child, spending her childhood among the acrobats and equestrians of Sleary's Horse-riding, symbolizes everything in human nature that transcends the soulcrushing hideousness and mere instrumentalism of Coketown: she is vitality, generosity, uncalculating goodness. It is significant that she has been born and nourished among a people whose activities were not dominated by pure utility, but have at least some association with those of art, self-fulfilling, self-justified, and containing their ends within themselves.[8]

In fact, the characters generally are so stylized that Geoffrey Thurley saw many of them (Bounderby, Mrs. Sparsit, James

[7] Edgar Johnson, Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1952), Vol. 2, p. 50.

[8] Edgar H. Johnson, pp. 50-51.

Harthouse, Slackbridge and Stephen Blackpool) as "social emblems or caricatures rather than 'real' people".[9]

The characters in Lady Chatterley's Lover are also frequently described as caricatures rather than believable characters. Sanders felt that all the characters in Lawrence's novel were more like "ciphers in an argument" or "figures in a symbolic algebra" rather than the "complex and unfathomable characters in Lawrence's great earlier novels".[10] Sanders found Clifford particularly unconvincing:

> Clifford stands for rather than justifies this equation of mentalism in art, society, science, industry and so on. Like a figure in chess he can only move in certain directions; his significance is defined by the rules of the game rather than by his individual character. In short, he is a type, quite proper in fable or romance, but unconvincing in a realistic novel.[11]

However, this is just it - Clifford is a character in a fable as he is also a character in a realistic novel. Clifford is far more than just a symbol. He is also a complex character of the milieu of self-conscious cleverness and progress that forms both he and Connie. They are rooted in a particular cultural environment and employ personal will as part of the syndrome of the technologized habit of mind. The famous

[9] Geoffrey Thurley, The Dickens Myth: Its Genesis and Structure (St. Lucia Queensland: University of Queensland Press), p. 203.

[10] Scott Sanders, p. 185.

[11] Ibid., p. 185.

wheelchair scene in Lady Chatterley's Lover is much more than just caricature. Clifford is subsumed by his mechanical chair. Its breakdown leaves him not only physically but morally dependent. This is because, as Spilka observed, he has sunk "the roots of his life into industry itself".[12] Life-responsibility is placed on the machine and is not found within.[13]

What can be said then of characters such as those we discover in these particular novels? We have to keep in mind the traditional approach to the English novel. Leavis did. He felt that there was a traditional approach to the appreciation of the Victorian novel:

> The business of the novelist, you gather, is to 'create a world', and the mark of the master is external abundance - he gives you lots of 'life'. The test of life in his characters (he must above all create 'living' characters) is that they go on living outside the book. Expectations as unexacting as these are not, when they encounter significance, grateful for it, and when it meets them in that insistent form where nothing is very engaging as 'life' unless its relevance is fully taken, miss it altogether.[14]

Leavis referred to Hard Times; however, the same can be said of Lady Chatterley's Lover.

12 Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p. 182

13 Ibid., p. 182.

14 F.R. Leavis, "Hard Times: The World of Bentham", p. 187.

Nevertheless, neither of these works is solely fable. The realism is blended with fable and therefore the characters can be seen also to exhibit realistic qualities. Although the characters in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover may not be as complex as those found in other novels by Dickens and Lawrence - it is not true that there is no psychological development of character. Dickens's portrayal of Louisa Gradgrind shows depth beyond that found in fable. The reader is provided with an intelligent and accurate rendering of a young woman whose environment has stifled her self-expression, leaving her entrapped body and soul and yet being aware of her paralysis. This is the cruelty. Trapped and unable to escape, it is her fate to retain the instinct for vitality and be unable to act upon it. Toward the end of the novel Louisa tells her father of her constant battle against natural human instincts:

> "With a hunger and thirst upon me, father, which have never been for a moment appeased; with an ardent impulse towards some region where rules, and figures, and definitions were not quite absolute; I have grown up, battling every inch of my way".[15]

And when Louisa's father tells her that he did not know that she was unhappy, Louisa replies:

> "Father, I always knew it. In this strife I have almost repulsed and crushed my better angel into a demon. What I have learned has left me doubting, misbelieving, despising, regretting, what I have not learned, and my dismal resource has been to

[15] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 199.

> think that life would soon go by, and that nothing in it could be worth the pain and trouble of a contest".[16]

The psychological reality of Louisa's state is grasped both intellectually and intuitively and the reader has watched her tragic development from the novel's beginning. Therefore, Louisa Gradgrind is not merely a social emblem or caricature. She is a 'real' character in the novel and because of that we are angry at the system which has entrapped her.

It is consciousness that makes Louisa a character and not just a caricature or symbol. It is, as we shall see in more detail in chapter 5, the development and manifestation of her own consciousness of her situation and of the kind of person that she is. Mellors and Connie also have this consciousness of themselves as human which resists mechanism. And although this consciousness is mental, it is not the same as intellect alone. In fact, the point is that Mellors helps bring Connie to further consciousness. Clifford is less conscious because he allows 'intellect' and will to subsume his consciousness. He is mind without consciousness.

Therefore, the character of Connie Chatterley is carefully psychologically developed by Lawrence. Lawrence does not just haphazardly throw Connie and Mellors into a wood.

16 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 199.

They are quite believable. Lawrence has portrayed Connie's growing sense of paralysis and deadness and we view her as a woman who is becoming wrapped in Clifford's cocoon of words and sterility as the life drains out of her. By the time she meets Mellors, we have been well prepared for what will likely be her last chance for life over a living-death. Unlike Louisa Gradgrind, Connie Chatterley is not doomed to a sterile life because she is awakened by Mellors. As the novel progresses, the reader recognizes that Connie uses her body and her mind to make the choice for life and therefore she is a 'real' character and cannot at all be considered a pawn in a game of chess.

Although, as we can perceive, both novels are very realistic in basic outline - there is an aura of the fairy tale about them which proceeds from the moral fable. Michael C. Kotzin, in Dickens And The Fairy Tale, discussed the relationship between Dickens and the fairy tale as it was regarded and used in his time.[17] Kotzin reminded us that Dickens was not the first English novelist whose works can be connected with the fairy tale - and he pointed out these connec-

[17] Michael C. Kotzin, Dickens And The Fairy Tale (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green Popular Press, 1972), p. 2.

tions with regard to Oliver Goldsmith's The Vicar of Wakefield, Sir Walter Scott's The Black Dwarf, The Heart of Midlothian and The Monastery and also Jane Austen's Persuasion and Mansfield Park.[18] Kotzin wrote that Dickens followed these writers in "merging the fairy tale and realistic fiction".[19] Kotzin felt that the patterns of fairy tales are so submerged in Jane Austen's fiction that he doubts that they were intended; however, he asserted that Dickens "succeeded in assimilating the fairy tale into the realistic novel in ways that Goldsmith and Scott could not or did not want to".[20] Kotzin attributed Dickens's success mainly to his genius; however, Kotzin also recognized that Dickens was exposed to fairy tales more than Goldsmith or Jane Austen could have been and that he wrote for an audience which "was more demanding of artistic unity and realism than Scott's - but which was also receptive to fairy-tale-like fiction".[21]

In order to discuss the fairy tale elements in Hard Times it is necessary first to define the fairy tale and to examine the functions of them in Victorian England. Defining

18 Michael C. Kotzin, pp. 3-4.

19 Ibid., p. 5.

20 Ibid., p. 5.

21 Ibid., pp. 5-6.

the fairy tale is a more difficult task than recognizing it, as Kotzin noted:

> Fairy tales are perhaps more easily recognized than defined. Folklorists group them with other kinds of folk tales, such as animal stories, jests, and fables. They are a type of narrative which has traditionally been told aloud by peoples throughout the world, and although some of the fairy tales in oral traditions have literary sources and many literary versions of the tales have been written, the popular, primitive origins of the fairy tale genre are often thought of as having determined its character.[22]

It was speculated that the root of the word "fairy" was the Latin fatum, which led to the verb fatare (to enchant) which in French became faer, from which was created faerie.[23] "Faerie", meaning illusion or enchantment, was extended after being adopted into the English language.[24] Kotzin told us that J.R.R. Tolkien insisted that fairy-stories are not, in normal English usage, stories about fairies or elves, but stories about Fairy (Faërie), the realm in which fairies have their being:[25]

> Particular qualities of the world of "Fairie" include the presence there of magical acts, the animation of non-living things, the transformation of one thing or person into another, an unnaturally quick or unnaturally slow passage of time. Fairy tales are recognized by the recurrence in them of this subject matter, and by the recurrence of

22 Michael C. Kotzin, p. 7.

23 Ibid., p. 7.

24 Ibid., p. 7.

25 Ibid., pp. 7-8.

certain narrative patterns or combinations of them.[26]

The lines dividing myths, legends, and folk tales often overlap; however, the distinction between myths and fairy tales is easier to distinguish.[27] The subjects of myths are prehistorical and function in an explanatory way, while folk tales are ahistorical and function as entertainment.[28] The provision of amusement was one of the major functions of fairy tales in Victorian England; however, they were also used for moral effect - a function which occurred in the nineteenth century and was considered justification for allowing children to read them.[29]

Dickens's use of the fairy tale in Hard Times was judicious. Victorian authors had concurred with the Romantics by stressing the fairy tale's imaginative value - although they had also reverted somewhat to the instructional qualities advocated by the Enlightenment.[30] Nevertheless, as utilitarianism, industrialism, and science grew, some Victorian men of letters defended the fairy tale and probably contributed to its new stature: "In those statements and elsewhere, they reveal the synthesis of appreciation of the

26 Michael C. Kotzin, p. 8.

27 Ibid., p. 8.

28 Ibid., p. 8.

29 Ibid., p. 9.

30 Ibid., p. 26.

imagination and moral posture which characterizes the Victorian acceptance of the fairy tale".[31] Dickens employed this acceptance of the fairy tale when he wrote Hard Times as he simultaneously used it to advance its cause, while also protesting the inhumane and repressive spirit of an increasing materialism and advocating a life which allowed and encouraged imaginative expression.

Dickens argued for a little less fact:

> "You are to be in all things regulated and governed", said the gentleman, "by fact. We hope to have, before long, a board of fact, composed of commissioners of fact, who will force the people to be a people of fact, and of nothing but fact. You must discard the word Fancy altogether. You have nothing to do with it. You are not to have, in any object of use or ornament, what would be a contradiction in fact. You don't walk upon flowers in fact; you cannot be allowed to walk upon flowers in carpets. You don't find that foreign birds and butterflies come and perch upon your crockery; you cannot be permitted to paint foreign birds and butterflies upon your crockery. You never meet with quadrupeds going up and down walls; you must not have quadrupeds represented upon walls. You must use," said the gentleman, "for all these purposes, combinations and modifications (in primary colours) of mathematical figures which are susceptible of proof and demonstration. This is the new discovery. This is fact. This is taste.[32]

Of course it is this same "proof and demonstration" attitude which is used to denigrate the fairy tale and all other imaginative creations. When Louisa and Tom are caught peeping at

31 Michael C. Kotzin, p. 26.

32 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 6.

the circus, Bounderby tells Gradgrind that this "vulgar curiosity" has its roots in "idle imagination".[33] The Gradgrind children are to be kept free of wonder:

> No little Gradgrind had ever seen a face in the moon; it was up in the moon before it could speak distinctly. No little Gradgrind had ever known wonder on that subject, each little Gradgrind having at five years old dissected the Great Bear like a Professor Owen, and driven Charles's Wain like a locomotive engine driver. No little Gradgrind had ever associated a cow in a field with that famous cow with the crumpled horn who tossed the dog who worried the cat who killed the rat who ate the malt, or with that yet more famous cow who swallowed Tom Thumb: it had never heard of those celebrities, and had only been introduced to a cow as a graminivorous ruminating quadruped with several stomachs.[34]

No fairy tales were to be allowed to fire the imagination of Gradgrind's children. Of course, it is ironic that Bounderby energizes himself with a fantasy concerning his own childhood.

Actually, it is quite fitting that Dickens employed the fairy tale as part of his own creative assault on the negative aspects of an increasingly industrial and utilitarian England. Although some critics found the fairy tale atmosphere strange in realistic fiction they are actually appropriate for Dickens's satiric intent as well as a suitable vehicle for his expression of the need for amusement. In fact, as Kotzin noted, at a 1962 symposium Edgar Johnson made

33 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 6.

34 Ibid., pp. 8-9.

observations concerning four "emergent strands in Dickens criticism".[35] One of these observations was:

> the willingness to treat Dickens not as a novelist aiming at literal realism or naturalism and not quite succeeding... but seeing in him instead something much more adventurous than that, in which the elements of the fairy tale are superimposed on the every day world and the deep symbolic truths of myth gleam through the surface.[36]

Perhaps this is one observation that we should keep in mind as we examine the blend of realism and fable. Clearly, the moral fable gains strength from the association with the fairy tale elements; however, underneath the fairy tale atmosphere is always the social realism. No matter that Sissy is the "good fairy",[37] Mrs. Sparsit is the "Bank Dragon"[38] or that Bounderby is the "giant" in the "red brick castle".[39] Never for a moment does Dickens let the reader forget the cruel reality of a 'forced fact' education or the analogy between the Gradgrind children and the Coketown workers:

> Is it possible, I wonder, that there was any analogy between the case of the Coketown population and the case of the little Gradgrinds? Surely, none of us in our sober senses and acquainted with figures, are to be told at this time of day, that one of the foremost elements in the existence of the Coketown working-people had been deliberately

35 Michael C. Kotzin, p. 1.

36 Ibid., pp. 1-2.

37 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 254.

38 Ibid., p. 104.

39 Ibid., p. 134.

> set at nought? That there was any Fancy in them demanding to be brought into healthy existence instead of struggling on in convulsions? That exactly in the ratio as they worked long and monotonously, the craving grew within them for some physical relief - some relaxation, encouraging good humour and good spirits, and giving them a vent - ...[40]

Gradgrind is enforcing the proletarianization of children - children are being made indistinguishable from the industrial working class. This, in effect, would produce a proletarianization of the world. Children and workers become identical. This, for Dickens, was the great sin of industrialism. It made children into workers and also removed the child-like quality from workers. For Dickens, it is good to have child-like qualities. The workers are not allowed this.

Clearly, Dickens recognized that submerged energies needed to be "vented". In so recognizing, he not only conveyed social realism but psychological reality - for psychiatrists like Freud have revealed the dangers of repression,[41] while others like Jung have displayed a reverence for "wonder".[42] While for Dickens childhood is destroyed; for Lawrence, love is destroyed. Here is the fairy-tale heart of

[40] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, pp. 22-23.

[41] Sigmund Freud, Civilization and Its Discontents (London: The Hogarth Press, 1972).

[42] C.G. Jung, Modern Man In Search Of A Soul (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1933).

it: children and lovers are transformed evilly by mechanization, and imagination re-transforms the 'ugly frog' into 'the prince'. All people need Fancy. They need entertainment. The circus is the external manifestation of the fancy and freedom within.

Just as the circus and the fairy tales provide the sense of wonder and mystery in Hard Times, so too does the wood in Lady Chatterley's Lover provide this sense of the fabulous. Although Connie had walked in the forest many times - it is only immediately preceding her "visionary experience"[43] of Mellors washing himself, that Connie begins to perceive the potency of the wood. At first the world seems dead to Connie:

> The air was soft and dead, as if all the world were slowly dying. Grey and clammy and silent, even from the shuffling of the collieries, for the pits were working short time, and today they were stopped altogether. The end of all things!
>
> In the wood all was utterly inert and motionless, only great drops fell from the bare boughs, with a hollow little crash. For the rest, among the old trees was depth within depth of grey, hopeless inertia, silence, nothingness.[44]

[43] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 68.

[44] Ibid., p. 67.

However, as Connie walks on she begins to sense the growth and vitality of the wood:

> Connie walked dimly on. From the old wood came an ancient melancholy, somehow soothing to her, better than the harsh insentience of the outer world. She liked the inwardness of the remnant of forest, the unspeaking reticence of the old trees. They seemed a very power of silence, and yet a vital presence. They, too, were waiting: obstinately, stoically waiting, and giving off a potency of silence. Perhaps they were only waiting for the end; to be cut down, cleared away, the end of the forest, for them the end of all things. But perhaps, their strong and aristocratic silence, the silence of strong trees, meant something else.[45]

And then she comes out of the wood and sees the gamekeeper's cottage:

> As she came out of the wood on the north side, the keeper's cottage, a rather dark, brown stone cottage, with gables and a handsome chimney, looked uninhabited, it was so silent and alone. But a thread of smoke rose from the chimney, and the little railed-in garden in the front of the house was dug and kept very tidy. The door was shut.[46]

This, of course, is the home of the 'prince', Mellors, who will shortly awaken the 'sleeping beauty', Connie. In other words, Mellors is like Merlin the magician. He will rescue Connie from her prison of 'false being' and make her a beautiful princess again.

The planes of realism and fable intersect in Lady Chatterley's Lover. Sanders commented on the preceding passages:

45 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, pp. 67-68.

46 Ibid., p. 68.

> At first the woods seem to her as dead as the outer world, where silence means the arrest of industry; but in the third paragraph she begins to suspect that the stillness of the forest disguises growth. In this passage the realistic and the fabulous intersect: on a naturalistic plane, the trees are only potential industrial timber, mine props, temporarily reprieved, a pathetic remnant of the defeated past; but on the plane of fable they offer sanctuary, they stand for the enduring forces of regeneration, they shelter the potent dark prince who will restore Connie to life. The keeper's cottage partakes of the general silence and isolation of the forest and is likewise ambiguous: it appears to be abandoned, lifeless, yet it trails a thread of smoke connoting warmth and life; realistically it is a poor and ramshackle place, but fabulously - using that word in its root sense - it lodges the dark prince, it is a frail ark that just might weather the flood. The whole pageant of Lady Chatterley is acted out simultaneously on these two planes of realism and fable.[47]

In Lady Chatterley's Lover there are reverberations of myth which proceed from the moral fable and add a fairy tale aura to an otherwise realistic novel.

Although Lady Chatterley's Lover is allegorical in nature, Lawrence does use what Sanders called "mythic echoes" in this novel.[48] These are: the fertility myth, an inverted Eden myth, and the resurrection myth.[49] As Sanders noted, the basic fertility myth was delineated in The Golden Bough by Sir James Frazer: "the crippled and sterile king (Clifford) rules a barren country (the mining district); his queen (Connie), who suffers from the barrenness of his realm, is

[47] Scott Sanders, p. 190.

[48] Ibid., p. 200.

[49] Ibid., p. 203.

restored to fertility by a potent prince (Mellors), who has survived various ordeals (the war, pneumonia, his first wife) to reach her".[50] Of course, in Lady Chatterley's Lover, fertility is not restored to the entire land; therefore, the myth is not completely employed. And, when Lawrence suggests the Edenic myth - it is, of course, an inverted form whereby Connie and Mellors (Eve and Adam) are cast back into the garden to rediscover their innocence.[51] Even the resurrection myth is employed, as are the fertility and Edenic myths, as part of the organic metaphor which is central in this novel.

Clearly, both Dickens and Lawrence combined social realism with moral fable in an unique way in these novels. Adventurous and daring, this unusual blend represents an original attempt to employ a wide variety of literary devices in order to convey each author's perception of morality. Both Dickens and Lawrence had great compassion for the submerged and repressed creative energies of the industrial world. They wished to alter our perception - so that we would develop an instinct for spiritual health and a disdain for the purely material and abstract. By combining fact and fable they challenged the reader's perception, because we cannot confine them to one narrow category and then apply our own 'absolute' values.

[50] Scott Sanders, p. 200.

[51] Ibid., pp. 200-201.

CHAPTER 4

MORAL PURPOSE: INDUSTRIAL IMAGERY, ORGANIC METAPHOR, AND BIBLICAL ALLEGORY

The essential symbolism in both Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover is based upon the central contrast of mechanical versus organic or paradisal. Both Dickens and Lawrence created a vivid picture of the "machine in the garden"[1], which underlies, informs, and pervades these two novels. These bold contrasts proceed quite naturally from Dickens's and Lawrence's poetic approach to art and vividly reflect their attitude toward the threats of industrialism.

Juxtaposed with the industrial imagery and the simultaneous interpretive narrative in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover are pastoral and organic images and Biblical references which are employed as stark contrasts to the industrial scenes. The destructive, metallic, and mechanical is opposed to the creative, warm, and spontaneous. The reader is presented with a kaleidoscopic view in both novels,

[1] Leo Marx, The Machine in the Garden (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964)

as the action, occurring on the planes of both realism and fable, operates with the aid of conflicting images and vertical dimensions of meaning. Everything becomes symbolic. Characters, places and names are what they seem. The fables, while presented on the primitive, basic level of story-telling, employ a wide variety of literary devices which all work to convey one comprehensive vision of Truth.

Dickens and Lawrence have both been likened to painters with words, because of their use of vivid, visual imagery. Nancy K. Hill reminded us that Victorians considered the visual arts to be literature's sister:

> A remarkable unanimity of purpose characterized the sister arts as poets and painters recognized the power of the visual image to instruct the burgeoning number of people admitted to the world of culture. In this age of didactic purpose and cooperative endeavor in the arts, Charles Dickens emerged as a central figure, one who combined moral purpose and visual imagery in highly persuasive fashion. [2]

Dickens employed his powerful skills with visual imagery in order to change the reader's perception and thereby to bring about reform. As Hill observed, during the Victorian era, the central aesthetic was still most likely the picturesque.[3] However, Dickens recognized the dangers inherent in this

[2] Nancy K. Hill, A Reformer's Art: Dickens' Picturesque and Grotesque Imagery (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1981), p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 9.

limited approach and he designed a way of exposing his readers to other realities of life by employing the grotesque:[4]

> An extremely complex aesthetic mode, the grotesque combines natural forms not found in nature; it animates the inanimate; it cavorts with the unexpected, the startling, the extraordinary.
>
> Because it establishes a mood of tension and imbalance, grotesque art can be profoundly disquieting and can be used by the serious artist as a means of awakening his readers to social concerns.[5]

This "disquieting sense of apprehension" is elicited by means of the grotesque in Hard Times.[6]

Dickens's description of Coketown is an example of his use of the grotesque in order to point out that, in reality, this reduction of life to utilitarian principles has warped the people of the town and made them grotesques themselves:

> It was a town of red brick, or of brick that would have been red if the smoke and ashes had allowed it; but as matters stood it was a town of unnatural red and black like the painted face of a savage. It was a town of machinery and tall chimneys, out of which interminable serpents of smoke trailed themselves for ever and ever, and never got uncoiled. It had a black canal in it, and a river that ran purple with ill-smelling dye, and vast piles of buildings full of windows where there was a rattling and a trembling all day long, and where the piston of the steam-engine worked monotonously up and down like the head of an elephant in a state of melancholy madness. It contained several large streets all very like one another, and many small

4 Nancy K. Hill, pp. 9-10.

5 Ibid., p. 10.

6 Ibid., p. 10.

> streets still more like one another, inhabited by people equally like one another, who all went in and out at the same hours, with the same sound upon the same pavements, to do the same work, and to whom every day was the same as yesterday and tomorrow, and every year the counterpart of the last and the next.[7]

This, of course, is the grotesquerie of the increasingly industrial world. In one paragraph, Dickens painted a grotesque picture for his reader that pointed out not only the mindless monotony of repetitive work and forms, but also the air, water and noise pollution which surrounded these indistinguishable workers. Comparing smoke to "serpents" and the piston of the steam-engine to the head of an "elephant", Dickens animated the inanimate. The animal imagery, combined with the vision of the "painted face of a savage" conveys the idea that Coketown is a mechanical jungle. It is this type of visual imagery which caused David Lodge to comment on the belief that "Dickens's greatest achievement as a novelist was his depiction of a disordered universe in which the organic and the mechanical have exchanged places,..."[8] Certainly, Dickens's description of Coketown illustrates the end result of a society being dominated by its own inanimate creations who seem to absorb the life from the human beings and leave them mindless robots.

[7] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 20.

[8] David Lodge, "The Rhetoric of Hard Times", (1966) in Dickens: Hard Times, Great Expectations and Our Mutual Friend (ed.) Norman Page, (London: The MacMillan Press Ltd., 1979), p. 85.

Lawrence used grotesque visual imagery in much the same way, as he depicted the industrial workers of Tevershall as grey robots in Lady Chatterley's Lover:

> Incarnate ugliness, and yet alive! What would become of them all? Perhaps with the passing of the coal they would disappear again, off the face of the earth. They had appeared out of nowhere in their thousands, when the coal had called for them. Perhaps they were only weird fauna of the cold-seams. Creatures of another reality, they were elementals, serving the elements of coal, as the metal-workers were elementals, serving the element of iron. Men not men, but animas of coal and iron and clay. Fauna of the elements, carbon, iron, silicon: elementals. They had perhaps some of the weird, inhuman beauty of minerals, the lustre of coal, the weight and blueness and resistance of iron, the transparency of glass. Elemental creatures, weird and distorted, of the mineral world! They belonged to the coal, the iron, the clay, as fish belong to the sea and worms to dead wood. The anima of mineral disintegration.[9]

This picture is also grotesque and functions in the same manner as the scene of the Coketown mechanical jungle. Human and yet non-human, the workers are described as "weird and distorted" creatures of the mineral world. Again, there is the conjunction of the animate with the inanimate - the perception of the workers as half-alive beings mindlessly serving the inanimate while the life drains out of them. This is the picture that Dickens and Lawrence insistently present in these two novels. It is a world gone mad - a world where organic life is subservient to the mechanical creations of man. It is a world where the natural life is fast disappearing under the mechanical regime.

[9] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 166.

Both Dickens and Lawrence relentlessly presented the reader with industrial imagery in these two novels. They combined the industrial imagery with organic metaphor which creates a vivid and effective contrast between mechanical and living things. Industrial and pastoral imagery is juxtaposed. The organic context is distorted by mechanical intrusion. Consider the scene in Hard Times when Sissy and Rachael go for a walk in the country:

> Though the green landscape was blotted here and there with heaps of coal, it was green elsewhere, and there were trees to see and there were larks singing (though it was Sunday), and there were pleasant scents in the air, and all was over-arched by a bright blue sky. In the distance one way, Coketown showed as a black mist; in another distant hills began to rise; in a third there was a faint change in the light of the horizon where it shone upon the far-off sea. Under their feet, the grass was fresh; beautiful shadows of branches flickered upon it, and specked it; hedgerows were luxuriant; everything was at peace. Engines at pits' mouths, and lean old horses that had worn the circle of their daily labour into the ground, were alike quiet; wheels had ceased for a short space to turn; and the great wheel of earth seemed to revolve without the shocks and noises of another time.[10]

The green landscape is still evident; however, it is being blotted out by encroaching industrialism. By the time Lawrence wrote Lady Chatterley's Lover it was fast disappearing:

> This is history. One England blots out another. The mines had made the halls wealthy. Now they were blotting them out, as they had already blotted out the cottages. The industrial England blots out

[10] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, pp. 242-243.

> the agricultural England... And the continuity is not organic, but mechanical.[11]

Throughout Lawrence's novel the threat to the wood is obvious:

> And suddenly, on the left, came a clearing where there was nothing but a ravel of dead bracken, a thin and spindling sapling leaning here and there, big sawn stumps, showing their taps and their grasping roots, lifeless.[12]

The wood is vanishing and the animals are getting fewer:

> And once there had been deer, and archers, and monks paddling along on asses. The place remembered, still remembered.[13]

The natural landscape is being obliterated.

Of course, it is not only the natural landscape that is being obliterated. The very qualities that distinguish human beings from machines are threatened with obliteration. Intuition, imagination, and love would be stamped out, in favour of a strict control of the emotions and an adherence to the facts and figures of pure reason and scientific technology. In other words, the goal of characters such as Bounderby and Clifford Chatterley would be consistent with a type of robot-life - a life devoid of emotions, instinct and imaginative, creative amusements. Essentially Dickens and Lawrence were

11 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 163.

12 Ibid., p. 43.

13 Ibid., p. 44.

demonstrating that in order to have a maximum industrial output and therefore an increased profit, industrial managers were willing to allow and condone the dehumanization of the workers of society as well as deny their own instinctive life forces and those of their families.

The children of Coketown receive a 'hard fact' education designed to prepare them to be one-dimensional creatures rather than fully developed human beings. This is to school them in a 'method' that will make them like Bounderby - a successful business man. But Bounderby succeeds by his own particular ability, which is a kind of commercial and industrial genius. The idea of the method is to create numerous Bounderbys through techniques that can be learned. Therefore, the children are not educated to think for themselves but instead are filled with facts:

> The speaker, and the schoolmaster, and the third grown person present, all backed a little, and swept with their eyes the inclined plane of little vessels then and there arranged in order, ready to have imperial gallons of facts poured into them until they were full to the brim.[14]

They are compared to "vessels" precisely because their educators do not see them as individual human beings but perceive them rather as a mass of empty containers which only need to be filled with the 'correct' facts. This is borne out by the

14 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 2.

manner of addressing each child. They all respond to numbers, rather than names. The reader is introduced to Sissy Jupe as "Girl number twenty", the one who cannot define a horse in the Gradgrindian terms.[15] Note how her inquisitor is described in mathematical, mechanical terms:

> Thomas Gradgrind, sir - peremptorily Thomas - Thomas Gradgrind. With a rule and a pair of scales, and the multiplication table always in his pocket, sir, ready to weigh and measure any parcel of human nature, and tell you what it comes to....[16]

> Indeed, as he eagerly sparkled at them from the cellerage before mentioned, he seemed a cannon loaded to the muzzle with facts, and prepared to blow them clean out of the regions of childhood at one discharge. He seemed a galvanizing apparatus, too, charged with a grim mechanical substitute for the tender young imaginations that were to be stormed away.[17]

It is so much easier for characters such as Gradgrind, Bounderby, and M'Choakumchild to deny the fluidity and changeability of 'real' life and to attempt to replace raw life with a mechanized substitute. If one replaces a spontaneous, alive human being with a programmed dead-alive person - that person may be better controlled and manipulated to serve the needs of a materialistic world: "Bring to me, says M'Choakumchild, yonder baby just able to walk, and I will engage that it shall never wonder".[18]

15 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 3.

16 Ibid., p. 2.

17 Ibid., p. 3.

18 Ibid., p. 45.

This same cruelty - the denial of spontaneous, creative life forces - is vividly apparent in Lady Chatterley's Lover. Clifford Chatterley sees the miners as simply industrial objects, not men of flesh and blood:

> The miners were, in a sense, his own men; but he saw them as objects rather than men, parts of the pit rather than parts of life, crude raw phenomena rather than human beings along with him. He was in some way afraid of them, he could not bear to have them look at him now he was lame. And their queer, crude life seemed as unnatural as that of hedgehogs.[19]

And Lawrence described Clifford's attitude toward human life in much the same way as Dickens described Gradgrind's measuring of human beings:

> He was remotely interested; but like a man looking down a microscope, or up a telescope. He was not in touch... Connie felt that she herself didn't really, not really touch him; perhaps there was nothing to get at ultimately; just a negation of human contact.[20]

Just as Gradgrind weighed human nature on his scales, Clifford observes the miners as though they were objects of a scientific experiment. In fact, both Dickens and Lawrence demonstrated the fact that the industrial workers seemed more like laborious insects than human beings. Dickens stated in Hard Times:

> For the first time in her life Louisa had come into one of the dwellings of the Coketown Hands; for the first time in her life she was face to face with anything like individuality in connexion with

19 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 16.

20 Ibid., pp. 16-17.

> them. She knew of their existence by hundreds and thousands. She knew what results in work a given number of them would produce in a given space of time. She knew them in crowds passing to and from their nests, like ants or beetles. But she knew from her reading infinitely more of the ways of toiling insects than those of men and women.[21]

Lawrence presented the same black, beetle-like picture in Lady Chatterley's Lover:

> Because when I feel the human world is doomed, has doomed itself by its own mingy beastliness, then I feel the Colonies aren't far enough. The moon wouldn't be far enough, because even there you could look back and see the earth, dirty, beastly, unsavory among all the stars: made foul by men.... Though it's a shame, what's been done to people these last hundred years: men turned into nothing but labour-insects, and all their manhood taken away and all their real life...[22]

The 'real' life is disappearing amidst the insistent demands of the industrial spirit and the denigration of the human soul's desire for creative expression and beauty.

Both Dickens and Lawrence employed industrial imagery that conveys a very black, bleak picture of the industrial world. In fact, Dickens painted us a picture of Coketown as Hell:

> The streets were hot and dusty on the summer day, and the sun was so bright that it even shone through the heavy vapour drooping over Coketown, and could not be looked at steadily. Stokers emerged from low underground doorways into factory yards, and sat on steps, and posts, and polings, wiping their swarthy visages, and contemplating coals. The whole town seemed to be frying in oil. There was a stifling smell of hot oil everywhere.

21 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 145.

22 Ibid., pp. 229-230.

> The steam-engines shone with it, the dresses of the Hands were soiled with it, the mills throughout their many stories oozed and trickled with it.[23]

And this picture is made more grotesque because Dickens calls the factories "Fairy palaces", repeats the animal imagery of previous passages, and reminds the reader of Coketown's substitute for "rustling woods":

> The atmosphere of those Fairy Palaces was like the breath of the simoom: and their inhabitants, wasting with heat, toiled languidly in the desert. But no temperature made the melancholy mad elephants more mad or more sane. Their wearisome heads went up and down at the same rate, in hot weather and cold, wet weather and dry, fair weather and foul. The measured motion of their shadows on the walls, was the substitute Coketown had to show for the shadows of rustling woods; while for the summer hum of insects, it could offer, all year round, from the dawn of Monday to the night of Saturday, the whirr of shafts and wheels.[24]

If this depressing picture of heat, machines, noise and measured monotony is not enough to convince the reader that this is a Hell on earth - then Dickens spells it out for us:

> Drowsily they whirred all through this sunny day, making the passenger more sleepy and more hot as he passed the humming walls of the mills. Sun-blinds, and sprinklings of water, a little cooled the main streets and the shops; but the mills and the courts and alleys, baked at a fierce heat. Down upon the river that was black and thick with dye, some Coketown boys who were at large - a rare sight there - rowed a crazy boat which made a spumous track upon the water as it jogged along, while every dip of an oar stirred up vile smells. But the sun itself, however beneficent, generally was less kind to Coketown than hard frost, and rarely looked

23 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 102.

24 Ibid., pp. 102-103.

> intently into any of its closer regions without engendering more death than life. So does the eye of Heaven itself become an evil eye, when incapable or sordid hands are interspersed between it and the things it looks upon to bless.[25]

This industrial wasteland is Dickens's Hell.

Lawrence painted us a similar picture of Tevershall:

> The car ploughed uphill through the long squalid straggle of Tevershall, the blackened brick dwellings, the black slate roofs glistening their sharp edges, the mud black with coal dust, the pavements wet and black. It was if dismalness had soaked through and through everything. The utter negation of natural beauty, the utter negation of the gladness of life, the utter absence of the instinct for shapely beauty which every bird and beast has, the utter death of the human intuitive faculty was appalling. The stacks of soap in the grocers' shops, the rhubarb and lemons in the greengrocers! The awful hats in the milliners! All went by ugly, ugly, ugly, followed by the plaster-and-gilt horror of the cinema with its wet picture announcements, 'A Woman's Love', and the new big Primitive Chapel, primitive enough in its stark brick and big panes of greenish and raspberry glass in the windows. The Wesleyan Chapel, higher up, was of blackened brick and stood behind iron railings and blackened shrubs. The Congregational Chapel, which thought itself superior, was built of rusticated sandstone and had a steeple, but not a very high one. Just beyond were the new school buildings, expensive pink brick, and gravelled playground inside iron railings, all very imposing, and mixing the suggestion of a chapel and a prison. Standard Five girls were having a singing lesson, just finishing the la-me-doh-la exercises and beginning a 'sweet children's song'. Anything more unlike song, would be impossible to imagine: a strange bawling yell that followed the outlines of a tune. It was not like savages: savages have subtle rhythms. It was not like animals: animals mean something when they yell. It was like nothing on earth, and it was called singing. Connie sat

25 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 103.

> and listened with her heart in her boots as Field was filling petrol. What could possibly come of such a people, a people in whom the living intuitive faculty was dead as nails, and only queer mechanical yells and uncanny will-power remained?[26]

Devoid of beauty and intuition Lawrence's description of Tevershall reminds the reader of Dickens's Coketown, because Tevershall also seems to be posessed by evil. Keith Sagar commented on the tough prose which Lawrence employed to describe the reality of Tevershall: "The prose toughens to convey the hellishness of the whole show, soulless and ugly, and insidiously destructive of freshness and beauty as if possessed by an evil, obscene will".[27] Sagar recognized what the reader is forced to view in the streets of Tevershall:

> The dirt and squalor combine with human philistinism, vulgarity and commercial exploitation to kill off the 'living intuitive faculty' in men, women and children. In work and leisure, school and play, there is the same pervasive ugliness.[28]

This ugly life, a life devoid of beauty, has resulted in a generation devoid of life:

> Tevershall! That was Tevershall! Merrie England! Shakespeare's England! No, but the England of today, as Connie had realized since she had come to live in it. It was producing a new race of mankind, over-conscious in the money and social and political side, on the spontaneous, intuitive side dead, but dead. Half-corpses, all of them: but with a terrible insistent consciousness in the

[26] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 158.

[27] Keith Sagar, The Art of D.H. Lawrence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), p. 181.

[28] Ibid., p. 186.

> other half. There was something uncanny and underground about it all. It was an under-world. And quite incalculable. How shall we understand the reactions in half-corpses? When Connie saw the great lorries full of steel-workers from Sheffield, weird, distorted smallish beings like men,... she thought: Ah God, what has man done to man? What have the leaders of men been doing to their fellow men? They have reduced them to less than humanness; and now there can be no fellowship any more! It is just a nightmare.[29]

Lawrence, like Dickens, painted a picture of the industrial nightmare.

The industrial nightmare is contrasted with the imaginative, kind, generous, and loving values in Hard Times which are represented by the use of fairytale references and circus imagery to supplement the central Biblical allegory. Dickens used these devices in Hard Times not only to demonstrate what should not be suppressed in people, but also to demonstrate what cannot be suppressed:

> There was a library in Coketown, to which general access was easy. Mr. Gradgrind greatly tormented his mind about what the people read in this library: a point whereon little rivers of tabular statements periodically flowed into the howling ocean of tabular statements, which no diver ever got to any depth in and came up sane. It was a disheartening circumstance, but a melancholy fact, that even these readers persisted in wondering. They wondered about human nature, human passions, human hopes and fears, the struggles, triumphs and defeats, the cares and joys and sorrows, the lives and deaths of common men and women! They sometimes, after fifteen hours' work, sat down to read mere fables about men and women, more or less like themselves, and about children, more or less like

29 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 139.

> their own. They took DeFoe to their bosoms, instead of Euclid, and seemed to be on the whole more comforted by Goldsmith than by Cocker. Mr. Gradgrind was forever working, in print and out of print, at this eccentric sum, and he never could make out how it yielded this unaccountable product.[30]

Dickens made it clear that people will continue to "wonder" and to seek out expressions of "fancy"; therefore, he shows fancy's revenge in Hard Times.

Fancy's revenge is apparent in Dickens's choice of imagery. Whereas Dickens employed industrial imagery in keeping with the social realism, he employed fantasy imagery consistent with fable. Much of the fantasy imagery results from the imagery of the novel, which Robert Barnard found quite insistent. Barnard stated that:

> Even more insistent is the imagery of the novel, with its constant reference to fables, fairy tales, and the stuff of childhood and adolescent reading. Everything that was lacking in the upbringing of Louisa and Tom is present in Dickens's treatment of their story, and the Hard Fact men, who sternly outlaw fancy and emotion from their lives, become, paradoxically, the stuff of fairy-tales — mere ogres.[31]

Barnard further discovered fancy's revenge through Dickens's use of myth and fable:

30 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 46.

31 Robert Barnard, Imagery and Theme in the Novels of Dickens (New York: Humanities Press, 1974), p. 83.

> Stephen, for example, betakes himself at one point to "the red brick castle of the giant Bounderby". Mrs. Sparsit, whose classical features are of the "Coriolanian Style", is surrounded by Roman references... Not particularly fanciful herself, Mrs. Sparsit is the source of fancifulness in Dickens, and is rich in a number of other comparisons of a fabulous nature: she is a griffin, she is the "Bank Dragon keeping watch over the treasures of the mine...", she trails Louisa "like Robinson Crusoe in his ambuscade against the savages". Similarly Coketown, as well as being full of fairy palaces, is "red and black like the painted face of a savage". The more repulsively unimaginative the subject, the more exotic and fantastic the imagery Dickens lavishes on it, always with rich comic effect. Mr. Bounderby, for example, is a Venus... risen out of the mud;" by banging his hat he becomes an oriental dancer... Indeed, his own description of the aspirations of the Coketown hands - "to be set up in a coach and six, and to be fed on turtle soup and venison, with a gold spoon" is drawn from the world of childish fantasy, reminding one of the young Pip's lies about Miss Havisham. Thus in all these ways Dickens drives home his message that the irrational and life-giving world of fancy cannot be suppressed, will be heard; as Sleary says to Gradgrind: "You mutht have uth, Thquire... make the betht of uth; not the wurtht".[32]

Sleary, of course, reminds us of the circus - where the imagery has always been of a fantastic nature ("curls, wreaths, wings, white bismuth, and carmine")[33] and the circus people depicted as generous and kind:

> there was a remarkable gentleness and childishness about these people, a special inaptitude for any kind of sharp practice, and an untiring readiness to help and pity one another, deserving often of as much generous construction, as the every-day virtues of any class of people in the world.[34]

32 Robert Barnard, pp. 83-84.

33 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 27.

34 Ibid., p. 33..

These same positive values find their expression in the central Biblical allegory of Dickens's novel. In fact, the morality of the novel is so thoroughly Christian - that many critics discussed it as a moral fable containing a parable.[35] Hornback was accurate when he identified the text of the sermon as the "mad world".[36] As we have seen, Coketown represents the mad world - the mechanical jungle. The characters who embody Dickens's protest against this world of mechanical madness are Sissy Jupe and Stephen Blackpool.

Sissy Jupe is goodness and vitality. From our first introduction to Sissy until the novel's end, there is no doubt that Sissy represents the author's positive values. Responding to the question on Political Economy "What is the first principle of this science?",[37] Sissy says, "To do unto others as I would that they should do unto me".[38] Therefore, Sissy is associated not only with the positive values of the circus people, but also functions within the Christian parable as a chief representative of moral goodness.

35 K.J. Fielding, p. 168.
Bert G. Hornback, "Noah's Arkitecture": A Study of Dickens's Mythology (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1972), p. 112.
Jane Vogel, Allegory in Dickens (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1977), p. 63.

36 Bert G. Hornback, p. 112.

37 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 51.

38 Ibid., p. 51.

Stephen Blackpool is the central character in the Biblical allegory of this novel. He functions as the Christian martyr who was stoned to death. Obviously, in Hard Times Dickens showed us that Stephen was, essentially, 'Stone Lodged' to death. From the time that the reader is introduced to Stephen, there is one word that conveys his state - 'suffering'. Stephen suffers throughout the novel and is not only associated with the Saint, but also Christ:

> It is said that every life has its roses and thorns; there seemed, however, to have been a misadventure or mistake in Stephen's case, whereby somebody else had become possessed of his roses, and he had become possessed of the same somebody-else's thorns in addition to his own. He had known, to use his words, a peck of trouble. He was usually called old Stephen, in a kind of homage to the Fact.[39]

The reader immediately imagines a crown of "thorns" and as the parable proceeds finds that the connection with Christ is deliberate.

Stephen is associated with the truly exceptional qualities of goodness. He is a man of love, integrity and dignity who forgives his fellow men when he is cast out, endures remarkable suffering, and dies with a prayer for a better world. Jane Vogel best articulated the Biblical allegory in Hard Times:

39 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 58.

> Hard Times in its turn is set in what Dickens calls 'Old Time', the initials OT aglare, in an English factory town in which eatanswill-ish 'Smoke Serpents' coil overhead, shutting out the sun and chimneys like 'Towers of Babel' (Old Time indeed) loom. Hebrew and Roman spirits command here. One is Josiah Bounderby; another is a dour matron of the 'Coriolanian style of nose' (anticipating Wopsle's like - aggravating Roman nose in Great Expectations perhaps), pagan to the root in her obsessive visions of stairs that lead down, down, as into an underworld or abyss. Again, it might be B.C. as an Elect flourishes while the abject masses toil in despair, fade, and die. Rising up against intolerable conditions, Stephen, a factory hand, confronts forces that crush him. One adversary is the demagogue, Slackbridge: Slackbridge, symbolically a slack bridge, a spiritual No Thoroughfare, sign of treacherous footing over the void. No Two Cities, Christ-celebrating sunrise is seen from the vantage point of a Slackbridge. Following him, men follow a false Saviour and reject the Stephen-revealed, true way.[40]

Here, Vogel mentioned Rachael, who is also associated with goodness in Hard Times:

> Stephen Blackpool suffers further in loving a high-souled, spiritual Rachael, kept from him by an archaic marriage law. As in first OT time her hard-bargaining father kept Rachael from Jacob, so in Dickens Rachael symbolizes the joy of man's desiring unattainable, or won only at soul-wearing cost, under the old covenant... As Stephen was stoned to death under Law in OT time, so in Hard Times a Stephen defeated by Law is 'Stone Lodged' to death, as it were; in the end he falls down a mine shaft, called the Old Hell shaft, as man without a Redeemer into Hell. Yet man in A.D. was not meant for the Old Hell, but the New Heaven. Hard, stoning - Hard Times indeed.[41]

40 Jane Vogel, pp. 63-64.

41 Ibid., p. 64.

Stephen is, essentially, too 'good' for the world as it is. He dies because of the evil of the world. He dies precisely because he is an embodiment of pure integrity:

> One of the first and principal losses in the world of absolute system is the dignity of the individual. The man who would seek to retain his own integrity, follow his own convictions, make his own judgements and try to perceive the truth is necessarily destroyed. The man who makes private promises and tries to keep them in spite of public pressures on him to abandon himself to a cause is crushed... In his efforts to follow a complex rôle, to endure the suffering of domestic misery and simultaneously foster the love-relationship with Rachael, Stephen chooses the private life. The rhetoric of Slackbridge is professional and designed to produce a unity in the workers, "one united power", that leaves no room for personal decision or private allegiance. Caught on the one side, between his imprisonment in the stereotype of the "hands", created by Bounderby to justify his exploitation of the workers, and on the other by the Union's relentless demand for membership and public profession, Stephen is not merely cast out, he is used as a scapegoat both by Tom Gradgrind and by Slackbridge, the two halves of the social vise that crushes him.[42]

An industrial society founded upon non-Christian values defeats Stephen Blackpool. He has to achieve his ideal by dying because he is so other-worldly that on earth his behaviour and values seem foolish. An ironic hero, he fails in earthly terms. Saintliness becomes folly in the industrial world.

In Lady Chatterley's Lover the industrial wasteland is contrasted with the "wood" and the "tenderness" of the relationship between Connie and Mellors. This is achieved

42 Joseph Gold, pp. 201-202.

largely through the use of organic imagery and myth. The realism and poetic symbolism in this novel combine to create a work of art which Nin stated is, "Paradoxically... at once his fleshliest and his most mystical work:"[43]

> To the telling of this story he brought the combined forces of his sensuous grasp of reality and his poetic symbolism. With the symbolism he expressed conceptions too subtle to reach the intellect directly. I do not refer to the obvious symbolism of Clifford's paralysis, of the scene where Lady Chatterley cries over the new-born chicks (because she desires a child), of Mellors's occupation as a gamekeeper (symbolic of a force close to the earth), but to the actual descriptions of the union of Lady Chatterley and her lover. Here the rhythm of emotions is associated with the profounder rhythm of nature itself (a feeling familiar to the poets), and Lady Chatterley feels that she is sinking into the deepest sources of creation.[44]

Lawrence took Connie and Mellors back to the source. He put them into the Garden of Eden before the Fall - a beautiful remnant of Sherwood forest.

Lawrence argued for the organic life and the intuitive, instinctive mode of human awareness, as opposed to the industrial life and the mental mode of human awareness. In other words, he juxtaposed two modes: one concrete and physical and the other abstract and cerebral. These two opposing realms of experience are in conflict, and the heroine of the novel, Lady Chatterley, goes from one realm to another. Her eventual choice is Lawrence's choice, even though Lawrence recognized that the realm of reason has the power.

43 Anais Nin, p. 107.

44 Ibid., p. 107.

Sir Clifford Chatterley has the power. He is titled, owns Wragby Hall, is a writer and also a successful businessman. Clifford is portrayed throughout the novel as representative of the realm of reason. He is more like a machine than a human being and becomes so detached and isolated that, as we have already observed, Connie perceives him to be "a negation of human contact".[45] This obviously negative picture of Clifford is placed near the beginning of the novel, and it is clear that he lives in an abstract world that lacks vitality. Although Clifford is physically paralyzed from the waist down, and is therefore isolated from some degree of human contact, it becomes evident that Clifford would be just as detached if he was not physically disabled. Clifford preferred the "mental life" even before he was wounded. His relationship with Connie before he was paralyzed was a kind of mental intimacy which they preferred to sex:

> No, the intimacy was deeper, more personal than that. And sex was merely an accident, or an adjunct, one of the curious obsolete, organic processes which persisted in its own clumsiness, but was not really necessary.[46]

Sex is an organic process that belongs to the realm of the wood in Lady Chatterley's Lover - not to the intellectual realm of Wragby Hall.

45 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 17.

46 Ibid., p. 13.

Wragby itself becomes representative of the world of reason and the intellectual life. It is not only Clifford whose enjoyment is connected with the world of abstract ideas, but also his friends and acquaintances. Their discussions at Wragby show that they prize the mental life above the physical. Tommy Dukes is the character that Lawrence employed to point out the dangers of a split between the mind and the body:

> But, mind you, it's like this; while you live your life, you are in some way an organic whole with all life. But once you start the mental life you pluck the apple. You've severed the connection between the apple and the tree; the organic connection.[47]

Immediately, the reader is reminded of Adam and Eve living in the Garden of Eden relying solely on intuition, until the eating of the apple gave them knowledge and disconnected them from Paradise. Lawrence used the metaphor of a plucked apple to demonstrate the lack of wholeness in an individual who maintains a division between the cerebral and the physical part of his being. Yet it is essential to note that while Tommy Dukes articulates this viewpoint - the one who acts upon it is of the wood. Hence, the fable element is confirmed. Sex has to be escape into the fabulous wood, for Lawrence - a negation of the modern social world. This is why Tommy Dukes will not do.

47 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 39.

The mental life causes a fragmentation of personality such as is evident in Clifford, and it also creates an atmosphere that is static and dream-like. This is what happens at Wragby. Clifford's paralysis pervades Wragby and spins a web that entangles Connie and renders her void of energy or interest. "Connie felt it spread in her. An inward dread, an emptiness, an indifference to everything gradually spread in her soul".[48] Life at Wragby becomes a life of non-existence, as though it were only a dream. "And thus far it was a life: in the void. For the rest it was non-existence. Wragby was there, the servants... but spectral, not really existing".[49] Life at Wragby becomes disconnected from the natural world and appears as simply a mirror image of life.

Connie becomes absorbed into this artificial world and often echoes Clifford's views; however, she knows that something is very wrong. Clifford is becoming very successful, but there does not seem to be any energy or life at all at Wragby. There were only words and "they were not the leafy words of an effective life, young with energy and belonging to the tree".[50] Again Lawrence used the organic metaphor and represented the world of the intellect as a world of disconnectedness. It is this dissatisfaction that Connie feels

48 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 52.

49 Ibid., p. 19.

50 Ibid., p. 52.

with the world of reason, however vague, that makes her susceptible to an alternative life-style. It is at this time in her life that she could be 'reborn' if the opportunity arose. At this time in Connie's life she has reached the pivotal stage where she will either enter into an emotional state of suspended animation or she will emerge somehow from the inertia and begin to 'live'. "Was it actually her destiny to go on weaving her life into his life all the rest of her life? Nothing else?".[51] No it is not!

It is Connie's destiny to suddenly come upon Mellors in the wood, and this ultimately changes her life. Mellors, a gamekeeper, represents a mode of awareness that is totally opposite to the world of the intellect. In fact, Mellors and his realm of the natural world is a threat to the world of reason: "That was how she had seen him, like the sudden rush of a threat out of nowhere".[52] Mellors and the wood represent the counter force against Clifford and Wragby and the industrial world; therefore, it is significant that Mellors emerge suddenly and with energy, with vitality. It is also significant that he lives in the wood and is obviously at ease there among the birds and animals. While Mellors is very much at home in the wood, his refuge, he resents the

51 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 47.

52 Ibid., pp. 47-48.

intrusion of people: "His recoil away from the outer world was complete; his last refuge was this wood; to hide himself there!".[53] Mellors withdraws from a world where natural instinct is replaced by mechanical reasoning. He also escapes from his wife, Bertha Coutts, whose egoistic possessiveness is viewed as representative of a universal social and economic web of a wider form of behaviour. Mellors, like Clifford, is also isolated. Mellors exiles himself from the world outside the wood.

Mellors is surrounded by "Lawrence's sacred wood within which life-mysteries are enacted".[54] Mellors's realm is a realm of biological processes and instinct - a natural world of the annual cycle of fertility. Lawrence's beautiful descriptions of the wood are images of a vital, alive place:

> Yellow celandines now were in crowds, flat open, pressed back in urgency, and the yellow glitter of themselves... The lush, dark green of hyacinths was a sea, with buds rising like pale corn, while in the riding the forget-me-nots were fluffing up, and... Everywhere the bud-knots and the leap of life![55]

The wood, which is the world of Mellors, is so 'alive' in an obvious contrast to Wragby and Clifford's paralyzed existence.

53 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 91.

54 Julian Moynahan, "Lady Chatterley's Lover: The Deed of Life", p. 76.

55 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, pp. 171-172.

The wood and the natural world of Mellors offer a promise of new life to Connie. A relationship with Mellors offers Connie the "organic connection" and a sense of being 'alive' that Lawrence deemed essential for Connie's rebirth of vitality. Because sex is a basic, physical instinct, the sexual scenes between the lovers are indicative of the organic connection. These scenes are not at all gratuitous. The physical world of Mellors must be described in a concrete fashion to express wholeness in the same way that disconnectedness at Wragby required description. Connie's relationship and 'rebirth' with Mellors is only possible through sex: "The possibility of a rebirth of wholesome feeling is grounded in the sex act because only at the moment of orgasm does the individual escape his self-obsession into identification with the 'living universe'."[56] In other words, when one ceases to exercise their own personal will they can abandon themselves to instinct. However, for Connie, this is a gradual process. That is why all the sexual scenes are different to each other and evolve. It is not simply sex, of any kind, that will do.

Mellors, then, representing the organic element within society, is the key to Connie's rebirth of vitality. "Mellors, the complete Lawrencean man, furnishes the key to her

56 Julian Moynahan, p. 87.

final understanding of sex as a living thing; for he has kept aloof both from the repressive forces of modern industrialism and from the petty intellectualism of Clifford's tribe".[57] Mellors's mental consciousness does not dominate his bodily consciousness or his intuition and this is, of course, an essential theme in Lawrence's work. Lawrence advocated a new "life-morality" which had to be established on an organic basis.[58] When Connie leaves Clifford "she sins against bourgeois morality - but Clifford sins against organic life".[59] As Spilka noted, it is the "whole weight of bourgeois sentiment, which represents, ultimately, Clifford's only moral asset".[60] The life Connie lived before she met Mellors, was a life of deadness because it was established upon the 'old' morality:

> 'All the great words, it seemed to Connie, were cancelled for her generation: love, joy, happiness, home, mother, father, husband, all these great, dynamic words were half dead now, and dying from day to day. Home was a place you lived in, love was a thing you didn't fool yourself about, joy was a word you applied to a good charleston, happiness was a term of hypocrisy used to bluff other people, a father was an individual who enjoyed his own existence, a husband was a man you lived with and kept going in spirits. As for sex, the last of the great words, it was just a cocktail term for an excitement which bucked you up for a while, then

57 F.J. Hoffman and H.T. Moore (eds.) The Achievement of D.H. Lawrence (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983), p. 113.

58 Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p. 197.

59 Ibid., p. 197.

60 Ibid., p. 196.

> left you more raggy than ever. Frayed! It was as if the very material you were made of was cheap stuff and was fraying out to nothing.[61]

The theories of Tommy Dukes and Connie's instincts are embodied in the gamekeeper and his world.

The gamekeeper's realm of the natural world is threatened on both sides. "The wood stands approximately in between two forces of negation".[62] On the one side it is threatened by the ugliness of the houses and mining installations of Tevershall and on the other, by Wragby Hall - whose occupants value it only in terms of property and tradition. The wood, symbolically a Garden of Eden, is the realm of natural order. This is Eden before the "plucked apple" episode severed the organic connection between man and his natural environment, and rendered intellect triumphant. The wood is surrounded by the societies of Tevershall and Wragby; here, as in Dickens's Coketown, abstractions of money, power, and property are worshipped and human affairs are mechanically organized. The wood is a quickly disappearing habitat for animals and world-weary individuals who happen to take refuge there from the encroaching 'civilized' world.

Throughout both Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover, Dickens and Lawrence clearly portrayed the natural organic life as a threat to mankind's civilized pretensions. Characters such as Gradgrind, Bounderby, and Clifford Chatterley

61 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 64.

62 Julian Moynahan, p. 76.

are actually very much afraid of the claims of the organic life. The organic life is so full of mystery and therefore frightening - the mechanical world so knowable and therefore reassuring. We have seen that the circus in Hard Times is associated with the mysterious:

> By the end of the novel, Tom and his father become dependent on the Circus and its mysterious powers. The element of mystery, of magic, or miracle, of gravity and reason defied, where dogs do tricks and horses dance, is a world that cannot be comprehended in the language of political economy. The horse which dances defeats Bitzer because it is outside the realm of his experience, for it was Bitzer we remember who first defined for us a horse, a definition that takes no account of that reality which includes a horse's capacity for learning to dance.[63]

It is the wood in Lady Chatterley's Lover which contains the element of magic:

> The wood was silent, still and secret in the evening drizzle of rain, full of the mystery of eggs and half-open buds, half-unsheathed flowers. In the dimness of it all trees glistened naked and dark as if they had unclothed themselves, and the green things on earth seemed to hum with greenness.[64]

Lawrence's wood and Dickens's circus are vital, mysterious sanctuaries. They contain the remaining undissected mysteries of life and harbour the refugees from the 'civilized' world. Significantly, the circus is run-down and the wood is quickly vanishing.

63 Joseph Gold, p. 203.

64 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 127.

CHAPTER 5

ISOLATION, ALIENATION AND PARALYSIS

Images of entrapment and paralysis abound in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover. The reader responds to feelings of imprisonment, restriction, and suffocation in both novels. This atmosphere of pervasive paralysis is a direct result of the suppression of vitality which occurs in these works due to the demands of a hard, industrial society. Functioning on the levels of social realism and fable - the paralysis leads to feelings of disconnectedness and isolation which further alienate human beings from themselves and others.

The characters who are the most obvious victims of psychological repression are Louisa Gradgrind and Connie Chatterley. Locked up in Stone Lodge and Wragby Hall they are portrayed as the 'ice princess' and 'sleeping beauty' respectively. However, the psychological accuracy of Dickens's portrait of Louisa, and Lawrence's depiction of Connie is what makes the paralysis effective on the levels of both fable and realism. Of all the characters in these two novels, Louisa and Connie are the best developed. Although they are not tremendously complex characters, both Louisa and

Connie are obviously not the rudimentary figures found in pure fable.

Lawrence's portrayal of Connie Chatterley bears a remarkable similarity to Dickens's Louisa Gradgrind. Louisa is a prototype for Connie Chatterley. Both women occupy a fairly high level on the social scale and do not want for anything material. Both women suffer from sterile environments where abstractions of money and power have reduced human beings to robots. And each woman is enchained by men who denigrate the imaginative and physical beauty of life. They both repress their natural instincts to meet the demands of society, until nothing is left but an empty shell containing a dying soul.

Louisa Gradgrind and Connie Chatterley are flowers that are not blooming - plants that are not growing. Both Dickens and Lawrence employed the organic metaphor to convey the 'choked-off' lives of Louisa and Connie. When Louisa finally accuses her father of denying her everything that distinguishes life from death, she states:

> "How could you give me life, and take from me all the inappreciable things that raise it from the state of conscious death? Where are the graces of my soul? Where are the sentiments of my heart? What have you done, O father, what have you done, with the garden that should have bloomed once, in this great wilderness here?" [1]

[1] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 198.

As Louisa puts her hands upon her heart, the reader understands the psychological reality within the melodramatic language. Louisa is deadly serious. Just like a plant needs water and sunlight, so too does Louisa need some food for the soul. Like a neglected garden she has withered and died.

Lawrence employed the same organic imagery in Lady Chatterley's Lover to demonstrate the paralysis Connie experiences living with Clifford. Together they are viewed as an entangled, dying plant:

> It was as if thousands and thousands of little roots and threads of consciousness in him and her had grown together into a tangled mass, till they could crowd no more, and the plant was dying. [2]

Living with Clifford is like living with a parasite. He lives off Connie's vitality, just as he lives off the vitality of his miners - he profits from them and drains their vitality. Clifford drains the vitality from Connie because he lacks it himself: "The fine flower of their intimacy was to her rather like an orchid, a bulb stuck parasitic on her tree of life, and producing, to her eyes, a rather shabby flower". [3]

Since Louisa and Connie suffer from psychological repression, entrappment imagery is also used to convey the state of their stifled existence. These images of entrappment are directly related by both Dickens and Lawrence to

[2] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 86.

[3] Ibid., p. 86.

each woman's restricted feelings of creative and sexual expression. Married off to a man she does not love, thirty years her senior, Louisa is the 'ice princess' of suppressed passion:

> Her instincts, feelings, and imagination, as a woman, have been forced back into the interior recesses of her mind by the method of her education, and are therefore ever ready to burst forth, with an impetuosity corresponding to the force used in their repression and restraint. Now Dickens, as an English novelist, was prevented, by his English sense of decorum, from describing in detail those sensuous and passionate elements in her nature which brought her to the point of agreeing to an elopement with her lover. [4]

This is an accurate description of Dickens's portrayal of Louisa. Dickens, in his discreet Victorian way, is speaking of sexual repression and describing a potential Connie Chatterley. She is, as Dickens shows us, imprisoned:

> Her features were handsome; but their natural play was so locked up, that it seemed impossible to guess at their genuine expression. Utterly indifferent, perfectly self-reliant, never at a loss, and yet never at her ease, with her figure in company with them there and her mind apparently quite alone - it was of no use "going in" yet awhile to comprehend this girl, for she baffled all penetration. [5]

Dickens employed Louisa Gradgrind, who is imprisoned and psychically ill, to provide an example of the destructive effects of repression of the human spirit:

[4] Edwin P. Whipple, from an essay on Hard Times, in the Atlantic Monthly, in Dickens: The Critical Heritage, p. 320.

[5] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 117.

> All closely imprisoned forces rend and destroy. The air that would be healthful to the earth, the water that would enrich it, the heat that would ripen it, tear it when caged up. So in her bosom even now; the strongest qualities she possessed long turned upon themselves, became a heap of obduracy, that rose against a friend. [6]

Throughout the novel, these images of entrapment serve to mirror the paralyzed condition of Louisa.

This state of emotional deadness and paralytic disintegration is evident also in Connie Chatterley. Clifford's physical paralysis becomes an overall paralysis at Wragby Hall and Connie is entangled in this web of numbness. A growing restlessness in Connie becomes a sense of emptiness and nothingness:

> And she went through the days drearily. There was nothing now but this empty treadmill of what Clifford called the integrated life, the long living together of two people who are in the habit of being in the same house with one another.
>
> Nothingness! To accept the great nothingness of life seemed to be the one end of living. All the many busy and important little things that make up the grand sum-total of nothingness! [7]

The paralysis which spreads from Clifford to Connie was exacerbated by the organic "bruise" of the war:

[6] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 206.

[7] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 52.

> And dimly she realized one of the great laws of the human soul: that when the emotional soul receives a wounding shock, which does not kill the body, the soul seems to recover as the body recovers. But this is only appearance. It is really only the mechanism of the re-assumed habit. Slowly, slowly the wound to the soul begins to make itself felt, like a bruise, which only slowly deepens its terrible ache, till it fills, all the psyche.... [8]

The organic bruise which Clifford received in the war spreads like a cancer throughout the novel in the same way that Shakespeare depicted Hamlet's emotional paralysis following a great shock to the psyche.

Nevertheless, although Connie is inevitably affected by both Clifford's physical and emotional paralysis and is drawn into his cocoon-like existence of the mental life, she is also aware of the essential 'deadness' of Clifford and his friends:

> Michaelis had seized upon Clifford as the central figure for a play; already he had sketched in the plot, and written the first act. For Michaelis was even better than Clifford at making a display of nothingness. It was the last bit of passion left in these men: the passion for making a display. Sexually they were passionless, even dead. [9]

Connie lives, as does Louisa, surrounded by people who prostitute themselves to what Lawrence called the "bitch-goddess

[8] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 51.

[9] Ibid., p. 53.

of Success". [10] This quest for money, power, and recognition is pursued at the expense of emotions and feelings. Clifford tells Connie:

> ... Emotions that are ordered and given shape are more important than disorderly emotions'... 'The modern world has only vulgarized emotion by letting it loose. What we need is classic control'.[11]

This "classic control" is essentially a fear of life.

Both Bounderby and Clifford Chatterley are portrayed as puffed up 'windbags' who substitute talk for actual living. Dickens created for us a comical picture of Bounderby:

> He was a rich man; banker, merchant, manufacturer, and what not. A big, loud man, with a stare, and a metallic laugh. A man made out of coarse material, which seemed to have been stretched to make so much of him. A man with a great puffed head and forehead, swelled veins in his temples, and such a strained skin to his face that it seemed to hold his eyes open, and left his eyebrows up. A man with a pervading appearance on him of being inflated like a balloon, and ready to start. A man who could never sufficiently vaunt himself a selfmade man. A man who was always proclaiming, through that brassy speaking-trumpet of a voice of his, his old ignorance and his old poverty. A man who was the Bully of humility.[12]

Note Dickens's emphasis on Bounderby's tendency to loudness and boasting. Bounderby expends his energy puffing himself

10 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 111.

11 Ibid., p. 144.

12 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 13.

up and proclaiming his accomplishments as a "self-made man". Also, Clifford sees himself as a self-made man, despite his inherited wealth. Of course, Mellors declines the opportunity to be a self-made man of success. For Mellors, to be part of nature and organic life, one does not 'make' oneself. Both Bounderby and Clifford overwhelm people with an excess of talk as they create a self-propelling image of themselves as successful.

Clifford Chatterley surrounds himself with friends and acquaintances at Wragby Hall who sit in drawing rooms and discuss sex, politics and philosophy in dispassionate terms. Sanders felt that Wragby Hall seemed a "thin confection of words, not simply because Lawrence like any novelist has written his world, but because the inhabitants and friends of Wragby have spun around themselves a chrysalis of talk, theories and fictions as a shelter against life".[13] To keep the "organic claims of life" [14] away, both Bounderby and Clifford Chatterley substitute talk for life. They erect barriers around themselves in an effort to keep out emotional life.

Both Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover are filled with references to prison. This is because the characters in

[13] Scott Sanders, p. 187.

[14] R.B. Portlow and H.T. Moore, D.H. Lawrence: The Man Who Lived (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1980) p. 149.

the novel are bound by social class as well as restrictive philosophies. Class is a man-made barrier that imprisons and stifles all classes. Class awareness is, of course, a characteristic of the British novel; however, in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover the reader is always cognizant of its detrimental effects on all concerned. Because people move in different "spheres",[15] which are determined by social class, they miss out on some great human values which are to be found in the class to which they do not belong. Not only that, they are often trapped between spheres and sacrificed like Stephen Blackpool:

> "Then, by the prejudices of his own class, and by the prejudices of the other, he is sacrificed alike? Are the two so deeply separated in this town, that there is no place whatever for an honest workman between them?" [16]

Class is a barrier also against individualism. Stephen Blackpool cannot be tolerated because he refuses to conform.

Lawrence, like Dickens, conveyed class barrier as a restrictive force. Connie thinks of Clifford's lack of warmth as a human being and attributes some of this to the maintaining of class barriers by himself and his counterparts:

15 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 110.

16 Ibid., p. 146.

> They were all inwardly hard and separate, and warmth to them was just bad taste. You had to get on without it and hold your own; which was all very well if you were of the same class and race. Then you could keep yourself cold and be very estimable, and hold your own, and enjoy the satisfaction of holding it. But if you were of another class and another race it wouldn't do; there was no fun merely holding your own, and feeling you belonged to the ruling class. What was the point, when even the smartest aristocrats had really nothing positive of their own to hold, and their rule was really a farce, not rule at all? What was the point? It was all cold nonsense. [17]

Lawrence saw class distinctions as artificial barriers which separated and isolated human beings. It cut off the natural flow of life: "Class makes a gulf across which all the best human flow is lost".[18] Therefore, Connie's own class barriers in regard to Mellors (encouraged by her sister's snobbery) are eventually eroded in this novel.

The metallic imagery in Hard Times and the crustacean imagery in Lady Chatterley's Lover reinforces this idea of hard separateness in both novels. Gradgrind and Bounderby are constantly referred to in hard, metallic terms, while Clifford Chatterley is frequently compared to crustaceans. Clifford is "one of the amazing crabs and lobsters of the modern, industrial and financial world, invertebrates of the

[17] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 74.

[18] D.H. Lawrence, in Geoffrey Thurley, p. 207.

crustacean order, with shells of steel, like machines, and inner bodies of soft pulp,..."[19] Essentially, as we have observed, Dickens and Lawrence contrasted the organic way of life with the mechanical. Their employment of this imagery is an attempt to convey the crippling effects of a system which has narrowed human energy rather than allowed it freedom for growth:

> You can have life two ways. Either everything is created from the mind, downwards; or else everything proceeds from the creative quick, outwards into exfoliation and blossom... The actual living quick itself is alone the creative reality.[20]

Characters like Gradgrind, Bounderby and Clifford Chatterley clearly create their lives from the "mind, downwards" while they suffocate characters such as Louisa and Connie who would, if free to do so, "blossom".

19 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 114.

20 D.H. Lawrence, "Democracy" in Phoenix, p. 712.

CHAPTER 6

GRADGRIND'S CONVERSION AND CONNIE'S AWAKENING

The pivotal stage in Hard Times is Gradgrind's 'conversion' and in Lady Chatterley's Lover it is Connie's 'awakening'. In each novel, it is a change toward organic wholeness and a spiritual resurrection. However, the methods employed by Dickens and Lawrence to demonstrate these transformations, while often similar, also indicate a striking difference in end result - which is totally in keeping with their respective moral stances and visions of Truth.

Let us first examine Gradgrind's conversion. Dickens set the stage for Gradgrind's transformation from the beginning of the novel. Although the "ogres" in Hard Times are Gradgrind and Bounderby, there is an essential difference in the manner of their characterization. This is immediately apparent in their differing responses to Sissy. While Bounderby feels no sympathy for Sissy, Gradgind does. He offers to take Sissy into his home:

> "Well then. I, who came here to inform the father of the poor girl, Jupe, that she could not be received at the school any more, in consequence of there being practical objections, into which I need

> not enter, to the reception there of the children of persons so employed, am prepared in these altered circumstances to make a proposal. I am willing to take charge of you, Jupe, and to educate you, and provide for you...[1]

Naturally, Gradgrind attaches conditions to his proposal:

> The only condition (over and above your good behaviour) I make is, that you decide now, at once, whether to accompany me or remain here. Also, that if you accompany me now, it is understood that you communicate no more with any of your friends who are here present. These observations comprise the whole of the case".[2]

Although Gradgrind's conditions are cruel, Dickens portrayed him as a man who had meant to do well:

> In gauging fathomless deeps with his mean little excise-rod, and in staggering over the universe with his rusty stiff-legged compasses, he had meant to do great things. Within the limits of his short tether he had tumbled about, annihilating the flowers of existence with greater singleness of purpose than many of the blatant personages whose company he kept.[3]

Gradgrind errs; however, it is due to an entirely false perception of humanity rather than to the limitless self-interest which Bounderby pursues.

Gradgrind's fault, of course, is his non-critical attachment to a system of belief:

> He has been wedded to a system and thus abdicated his sympathies, his perception, his heart. It is a

1 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 35.

2 Ibid., p. 35.

3 Ibid., p. 204.

> form of self-blinding. Gradgrind represents the dangers of doctrine, dogma and absolutism, in this case Rationalism, in education, yet education by definition is resistant to the evils of its forms, for, except in a totalitarian state... education is the most disinterested form of social activity. It is always, relatively speaking, liberating and for this reason Dickens places much value and emphasis on it.[4]

Gradgrind's system of education, as we see in Hard Times, is very far from "liberating". It is isolating and restrictive. Therefore, Gradgrind is able to miss all the signs of Louisa's pent-up emotions and Tom's corruption. He is blind.

Nevertheless, although Gradgrind is metaphorically blind, the possibility of transformation lies in his necessary relations with others. As Gold pointed out: "It is Gradgrind's inevitable involvement with others (his pupils, his government, his constituents) that keeps his tenuous thread of sympathy unbroken and permits his redemption".[5] This is true. Gradgrind is affected by the positive values of association with Sissy, even though he does not recognize it until the change is occuring:

> "Louisa, I have a misgiving that some change may have been slowly working about me in this house, by mere love and gratitude: that what the Head had left undone and could not do, the Heart may have been doing silently. Can it be so?[6]

4 Joseph Gold, p. 200.

5 Ibid., pp. 200-201.

6 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, pp. 205-6.

Sissy is associated with the compassionate values of the heart. Her presence in Gradgrind's home affected the entire household in a positive way.

Manning indicated that Gradgrind's breakdown and rejection of his system is not only the last step in the thematic demonstration, but also signals the escape of the character himself from the satiric mould to novelistic sympathy.[7] For although Tom and Louisa suffer because of Gradgrind's beliefs, the strength of Dickens's attack lies in Gradgrind's confutation by his own system:

> ... only Mr Gradgrind's realization of failure, his gradual perception of Sissy's values, and his consequent rejection of his own system can fully demonstrate that system's poverty. At the same time, however, that he is used as a satiric counter to make this point, in his struggle to assert the human values he has learned he achieves the novelistic state of a sympathetic character. As he stammers to explain to Bounderby the "enlightenment (that) has been painfully forced upon" him (Bk. III, chap iii), the acute discomfort of a man as yet without words to express his new emotions combines with the unabated bluster of Bounderby to make Gradgrind wholly deserving of compassion and Bounderby the sole satiric villain.[8]

Gradgrind's transformation is such a painful process that the reader cannot continue to see him as a villain.

[7] Sylvia Bank Manning, p. 146.

[8] Ibid., p. 146.

Dickens makes it very clear that Gradgrind's transformation is a painful process:

> "It would be hopeless for me, Louisa, to endeavour to tell you how overwhelmed I have been, and still am, by what broke upon me last night. The ground on which I stand has ceased to be solid under my feet. The only support on which I leaned, and the strength of which it seemed, and still does seem, impossible to question, has given way in an instant. I am stunned by these discoveries. I have no selfish meaning in what I say; but I find the shock of what broke upon me last night, to be very heavy indeed".[9]

Gradgrind's subsequent mistrust of himself, leads to an essential recognition of what he lacks:

> "Some persons hold," he pursued, still hesitating, "that there is a wisdom of the Head, and that there is a wisdom of the Heart. I have not supposed so; but, as I have said, I mistrust myself now. I have supposed the head to be all-sufficient. It may not be all-sufficient; how can I venture this morning to say it is! If that other kind of wisdom should be what I have neglected, and should be the instinct that is wanted, Louisa - "[10]

This new insight is bought at a great expense of personal suffering for Gradgrind, who is forced to recognize what his 'system' has done to Louisa, his favourite child:

> "In the course of a few hours, my dear Bounderby", Mr Gradgrind proceeded, in the same depressed and propitiatory manner, "I appear to myself to have become better informed as to Louisa's character, than in previous years. The enlightenment has been

[9] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 203.

[10] Ibid., p. 205.

> painfully forced upon me, and the discovery is not mine. I think there are - Bounderby, you will be surprised to hear me say this - I think there are qualities in Louisa, which - which have been harshly neglected, and - and a little perverted. And - and I would suggest to you, that - that if you would kindly meet me in a timely endeavour to leave her to her better nature for a while - and to encourage it to develop itself by tenderness and consideration it - it would be better for the happiness of all of us. Louisa", said Mr Gradgrind, shading his face with his hand, "has always been my favourite child".[11]

Gradgrind is beginning to see with his heart.

Gradgrind's transformation is further facilitated by having to acknowledge the fact that his son Tom is a criminal and that he had framed the now dead Stephen Blackpool. Facing these facts ages Mr Gradgrind considerably - causing him to lose his appetite, to pace in his room and to generally suffer an emotional shock. "Aged and bent he looked and quite bowed down; and yet he looked a wiser man, and a better man, than in the days when in his life he wanted nothing but Facts".[12] Gradgrind is redeemed by his suffering, while in Lady Chatterley's Lover we see that Clifford is embittered and alienated by it. Though, in Great Expectations we see that Dickens also sees that suffering may embitter. There is no question that Gradgrind is suffering and is repentant; however, his spiritual conversion is accomplished not only by his own grief - but also, through the suffering of numerous

[11] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 221.

[12] Ibid., p. 253.

characters and the ultimate sacrifice of Stephen Blackpool. Of course, this use of sacrifice is not found in Lawrence. Dickens used the remnant of a Christian myth. If Dickens is Christian in his fable, Lawrence is Dionysian.

Gradgrind certainly does not directly cause Stephen's death; however, he is part of a society that 'kills' good people - and it is his own son, Tom, who sets the stage for Stephen's death. If Stephen had not been ostracized by the union and isolated by Bounderby, and then deliberately set up as a scapegoat by Tom, he would not have fallen down Hell Shaft returning to exonerate himself. Had Stephen not been exiled and cruelly treated, he would not have left Coketown and Rachael. Therefore, Gradgrind must bear some of the responsibility for Stephen's death.

However, it is essentially the entire industrial society or the "mad world" which kills Stephen. It is a world where Mammon is worshipped and human beings are merely cogs of a wheel. Stephen's fall into the uncovered mine shaft is symbolic of the descent into Hell. Nevertheless, it is a Hell on earth; because the pit is a relic of past industrialism that is still killing in the present:

> "I ha' fell into th' pit, my dear, as have cost wi'in the knowledge o' old fok now livin', hundreds and hundreds o' men's lives - fathers, sons, brothers, dear to thousands an thousands, an keeping 'em fro' want and hunger. I ha' fell into a pit that ha' been wi' th' Fire-damp crueller than battle. I ha' read on 't in the public petition, as onny one may read, fro' the men that works in

> pits, in which they ha' pray'n and pray'n the lawmakers for Christ's sake not to let their work be murder to 'em, but to spare 'em for th' wives and children that they loves as well as gentlefok loves theirs. When it were in work, it killed wi'out need; when 'tis let alone, it kills wi'out need. See how we die an no need, one way an other - in a muddle - every day!"[13]

Stephen is totally innocent. He is raised from the pit and before he dies he sees the star that led the wise man to Jesus. On the fabulous level, Stephen is a martyr whose death aids in Gradgrind's redemption. Realistically, he is a 'good', hard-working man who is a tortured victim of forces operant in the industrial wasteland.

Although Stephen's death contributes to Gradgrind's conversion, because Gradgrind is forced to recognize what his son Tom has done to Stephen; nevertheless, it is essentially Sissy, Louisa and Tom who are responsible for opening his eyes. Barbara Hardy stated that Gradgrind's redeeming opposite is Sissy and his double is his son Tom.[14] Sissy, of course, is "the pupil who teaches her master that the truth of the heart can be stronger than the truth of reason, and he can learn her lesson only when faced by the sterile fruits of his teaching in another pupil, his daughter".[15] Hardy

13 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 249.

14 Barbara Hardy, "Change of Heart in Dickens' Novels" in Dickens: A Collection of Critical Essays (ed.) Martin Price, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1967) p. 49.

15 Ibid., p. 49.

further pointed out that full insight comes to Gradgrind when he is quoted out of his own mouth:[16]

> His dishonest son says, "So many people are employed in conditions of trust; so many people, out of so many, will be dishonest. I have heard you talk, a hundred times, of its being a law. How can I help laws? You have comforted others with such things father. Comfort yourself!" (Bk. III, chap. 7). The statistical unit confounds the statistician, and Tom is made even more detestable and ridiculous by the "disgraceful grotesqueness" of his comic minstrel disguise. The truth is driven home in the form of gross parady.[17]

Gradgrind is confronted with his double.

Obviously, Hard Times is filled with irony; however, it is particularly effective near the end of the novel when Gradgrind and Bitzer re-enact the opening schoolroom scene and Gradgrind finds out what a perfect pupil of Utilitarianism Bitzer has become. Gradgrind is attempting to stop Bitzer from taking Tom back to Coketown for punishment:

> "Bitzer", said Mr Gradgrind, broken down, and miserably submissive to him, "have you a heart?". "The circulation, sir," returned Bitzer, smiling at the oddity of the question, "couldn't be carried on without one. No man, sir, acquainted with the facts established by Harvey relating to the circulation of the blood, can doubt that I have a heart".
>
> "Is it accessible", cried Mr Gradgrind, "to any compassionate influence?". "It is accessible to Reason, sir", returned the excellent young man. "And to nothing else".[18]

16 Barbara Hardy, p. 49.

17 Ibid., p. 49.

18 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 263.

By this time, Mr Gradgrind's face is as white as Bitzer's; nevertheless, Gradgrind continues to appeal to some pity in Bitzer:

> "What motive - even what motive in reason - can you have for preventing the escape of this wretched youth", said Mr Gradgrind, "and crushing his miserable father? See his sister here. Pity us!".[19]

Bitzer replies to Gradgrind, in a "very business-like and logical manner", that he does, in fact, have a reasonable motive.[20] Bitzer intends to hand over Tom to Bounderby and thereby gain a promotion at the Bank.[21] When Gradgrind says to Bitzer, "If this is solely a question of self-interest with you -", Bitzer interrupts:[22]

> "I beg your pardon for interrupting you, sir"... "but I am sure you know that the whole social system is a question of self-interest. What you must always appeal to, is a person's self-interest. It's your only hold. We are so constituted. I was brought up in that catechism when I was very young sir, as you are aware".[23]

Bitzer was an excellent student.

19 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 263.

20 Ibid., p. 263.

21 Ibid., p. 264.

22 Ibid., p. 264.

23 Ibid., p. 264.

When Gradgrind tries to buy Bitzer's co-operation and he does not succeed, Dickens then underlines again the 'buy and sell' attitude of a material world:

> It was a fundamental principle of the Gradgrind philosophy that everything was to be paid for. Nobody was ever on any account to give anybody anything, or render anybody help without purchase. Gratitude was to be abolished, and the virtues springing from it were not to be. Every inch of the existence of mankind, from birth to death, was to be a bargain across a counter. And if we didn't get to Heaven that way, it was not a politico-economical place, and we had no business there.[24]

This last line is comical; however, the reader knows that Dickens was not laughing when he wrote it. Gradgrind's conversion is a transformation from that hard, heartless philosophy to a new perception of life. He gains insight into the warm, compassionate values of people who actually give without thought of recompense. Gradgrind learns the Truth. However, it is ironic that he learns it in terms of self-interest (though underlined with affection) when his own son is the victim.

It is of crucial significance and deliberate irony, that at the novel's end, Gradgrind discovers Truth amid the circus. For, as we have seen, the circus represents far more than merely an argument for entertainment:

> Sleary's itself represents more than the diversion of entertainment from relentless Gradgrindery. It is the principle antithesis to the whole world of

[24] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, pp. 264-265.

> mechanized, confined, antagonistic non-humanity - a vital mixture of animals, people, and imagination that emodies the fluidity of life itself. Its symbol - which opposes both the Bounderby selfinterest and the divisiveness of the trade union - is a human pyramid.[25]

Manning is correct in her observation that the human pyramid is the circus's own symbol:[26] "The father of one of the families was in the habit of balancing the father of another of the families on the top of a great pole; the father of a third family often made a pyramid of both those fathers, with Master Kidderminster for the apex, and himself for the base".[27] This is Sissy's original environment and family setting; therefore, she developed in an atmosphere of "reciprocal interdependence"[28] that ultimately proves to be Gradgrind's salvation.

Gradgrind's conversion could not have occurred strictly within his own society. Dickens showed us that Coketown had no regard for the warm, vital impulses of humanity. The conversion had to be achieved through association with the representative of these outlawed values - Sissy. Just as Tom's rescue could only occur with the help of the circus ensemble, so too was Gradgrind's conversion dependent upon the humane impulses found outside society. It is because it is outside

25 Sylvia Bank Manning, pp. 142-143.

26 Ibid., p. 142.

27 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 32

28 Sylvia Bank Manning, p. 143.

society (i.e., outside the real world as constituted) that the valuable forces and behaviours must belong to the world of the fabulous. This is one of the reasons why the authors resort to fable:

> Saving Tom may disregard a code, but it obeys the humane impulse of generosity in a situation where there are extenuating circumstances that the code's rigidity would not recognize. The illegality of Tom's rescue, in fact, has the same relation to Bitzer's code that the circus has to Coketown: the formal code is so inconsiderate of individual exceptions that the impulse of human forgiveness and charity can only be realized outside it; Coketown has no room for Sleary's, so the values of the latter can be embodied only in a gypsy-like group barely on the fringes of society.[29]

Gradgrind learns Truth amid dogs, horses and clowns, and receives his final moral lesson from Sleary:

> It theemth to prethent two thingth to a perthon, don't it, Thquire?" said Mr Sleary, musing as he looked down into the depths of his brandy and water: "one, that there ith a love in the world, not all Thelf-interetht after all, but thomething very different; t'other that it hath a way of ith own of calculating or not calculating, whith thome-how or another ith at leatht ath hard to give a name to, ath the wayth of the dog ith![30]

Gradgrind is taught that love is the greatest mystery; that it eludes <u>all</u> attempts to define it and that it is no less present because we refuse to recognize it. Mrs Gradgrind's dying words echo in our ears again: "But there is something - not an Ology at all - that your father has missed or forgotten, Louisa... I want to write to him, to find out for God's

29 Sylvia Bank Manning, p. 143.

30 Charles Dickens, <u>Hard Times</u>, p. 268.

sake, what it is".[31] Gradgrind, after inflicting much suffering on others and then experiencing it himself, finally has a change of heart.

The transformation of Connie in Lawrence's novel is also a type of rebirth; however, the resurrection is from a living-death to life, rather than a change from 'evil" to 'good'. Both organic and Biblical, the transformation process is grounded in the physical. For Connie there must be a physical rebirth for the spiritual resurrection to occur. As Connie draws further away from Clifford toward Mellors, these words blow through her mind:

> 'Ye must be born again! I believe in the resurrection of the body! Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it shall by no means bring forth. When the crocus cometh forth I too will emerge and see the sun!'[32]

Lawrence united the organic metaphor with the Biblical promise of resurrection, reinforcing his message of totality of body and soul.

Clearly, Lawrence demonstrated that one <u>cannot</u> deny the body and pretend to be all mind and spirit; however, it is apparent that <u>this</u> is the goal of numerous modern people:

> 'So long as you can forget your body you are happy', said Lady Bennerley. 'And the moment you begin to be aware of your body, you are wretched. So, if

31 Charles Dickens, <u>Hard Times</u>, p. 183.

32 D.H. Lawrence, <u>Lady Chatterley's Lover</u>, p. 87.

> civilization is any good, it has to help us to forget our bodies, and then time passes happily without our knowing it'.[33]

How sad this is, and how abnormal, is obvious to Lawrence. He recognized the human robots produced by this mentality. Tommy Dukes speaks for Lawrence:

> We're not men, and the women aren't women. We're only cerebrating make-shifts, mechanical and intellectual experiments... But it'll come, in time, when we've shoved the cerebral stone away a bit, the money and the rest. Then we'll get a democracy of touch, instead of a democracy of pocket.[34]

It is these words which echo inside Connie: "Give me the democracy of touch, the resurrection of the body!".[35]

Connie's awakening is both physical and spiritual. Lawrence prepared us for her transformation by depicting her increasing restlessness with her sterile existence and the mental life. When Connie sees Mellors washing himself, unaware that he is being observed, she has a visionary experience:

> He was naked to the hips, his velveteen breeches slipping down over his slender loins. And his white slim back was curved over a big bowl of soapy water, in which he ducked his head, shaking his head with a queer, quick little motion, lifting his slender white arms, and pressing the soapy water from his ears, quick, subtle as a weasel playing with water and utterly alone. Connie backed away round the corner of the house and hurried away to the wood. In spite of herself, she had had a

33 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, pp. 76-77.

34 Ibid., pp. 77-78,

35 Ibid., p. 78.

shock. After all, merely a man washing himself; commonplace enough, Heaven knows![36]

The shock is both real and mystical:

> Yet in some curious way it was a visionary experience: it had hit her in the middle of the body. She saw the clumsy breeches slipping down over the pure, delicate, white loins, the bones showing a little, and the sense of aloneness of a creature purely alone, overwhelmed her. Perfect, white, solitary nudity of a creature that lives alone, and inwardly alone. And beyond that, a certain beauty of a pure creature. Not the stuff of beauty, not even the body of beauty, but a lambency, the warm, white flame of a single life, revealing itself in contours that one might touch: a body![37]

Realistically, the scene is one of a man bathing himself; however, on the fabulous level, Mellors is the "white flame" of life.

Connie and Mellors's celebration of the human body is, of course, a celebration of life itself:

> For man, the vast marvel is to be alive. For man, as for flower and beast and bird, the supreme triumph is to be most vividly, most perfectly alive. Whatever the unborn and dead may know, they cannot know the beauty, the marvel of being alive in the flesh.[38]

When Connie 'awakes' to passion, then she begins to live from

36 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 68.

37 Ibid., pp. 68-69.

38 D.H. Lawrence, in The Art of Perversity: D.H. Lawrence's Shorter Fictions, K. Widmer (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962), p. 192.

centers other than the mind.[39] Spilka discussed the various descriptions of love as dramatic centers in the novel:

> for the act of love is the communion-rite in this novel, and every description of it conveys some part of the general change of being in Constance Chatterley - from the first submission to the first adoration, from ridicule to rebirth, and then the final rooting out of shame.[40]

Connie's transformation is charted, in part, through her changing responses to sexual communion. We cannot forget that when Connie married Clifford she shared his love of talk. Her experiences in Germany discussing "philosophical, sociological and artistic matters"[41] had left her with the conviction that: "It was the talk that mattered supremely: the impassioned interchange of talk. Love was only a minor accompaniment".[42] In fact, she and her sister, Hilda, had their "love experience"[43] as though it was an item on a checklist. They soon forgot their lovers when they died in the war.

Lawrence told us that at the beginning of the relationship between Connie and the gamekeeper - Connie viewed Mellors's behaviour during love-making to be rather ridiculous:

39 Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p.187.

40 Ibid., pp. 187-188.

41 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 6.

42 Ibid., p. 7.

43 Ibid., p. 8.

> After all, the moderns were right when they felt contempt for the performance; for it was a performance. It was quite true, as some poets said, that the God who created man must have had a sinister sense of humour, creating him a reasonable being, yet forcing him to take this ridiculous posture, and driving him with blind craving for this ridiculous performance. Even a Maupassant found it a humiliating anti-climax. Men despised the intercourse act, and yet did it.[44]

Soon, however, Connie finds love-making to be absolutely beautiful:

> How beautiful he felt, how pure in tissue! How lovely, how lovely, strong, and yet pure and delicate, such stillness of the sensitive body! Such utter stillness of potency and delicate flesh. How beautiful! How beautiful![45]

After each encounter with Mellors everything seems more vivid to Connie:

> As she ran home in the twilight the world seemed a dream; the trees in the park seemed bulging and surging at anchor on a tide, and the heave of the slope to the house was alive.[46]

Senses acute, and mind now in abeyance, Connie experiences life through touch.

Life, for Connie, is renewed through touch - direct contact with the organic world: "Connie wakes to passion, beauty, and human warmth through Mellors' touch, and Mellors

44 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 179.

45 Ibid., p. 182.

46 Ibid., p. 185.

himself returns from lonely isolation, to life and warm-hearted love".[47] In the wood, Connie is released from the cold grip of the industrial world and reborn through human contact:

> Thus "touch", which the modern world regards as mere sensation, is conceived here in its fullest and finest sense, as a mode of communion, as a binding and regenerative force for love, friendship, and creative labour. It flows outward, as it were, from men and women who are "quick and alive" at emotional levels of consciousness, and thereby helps to restore some of the old warmth, closeness, and togetherness to human tasks and relationships.[48]

Connie's rebirth is clearly both physical and spiritual.

To make her choice, Connie moves both physically and psychologically between the two opposing orientations toward life delineated in the novel. Her experience results in her choice for the physical and concrete existence. Clifford says to her that he supposes a woman does not take supreme pleasure in the mental life. She responds:

> Is that sort of idiocy the supreme pleasure of the life of the mind? No, thank you! Give me the body. I believe the life of the body is greater reality than the life of the mind: when the body is really awakened to life.[49]

47 Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p. 190.

48 Ibid., p. 192

49 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 245.

Lawrence made a distinction between the life of the body "awakened" and the life of the body when it is not 'alive'. Connie has been awakened to life by Mellors and her retort is a typical Lawrencean retort from a character who has experienced a rebirth of vitality. Connie chose between the two realms and the concrete and physical realm triumphed over the abstract, cerebral one. The heroine of the novel has not only made her choice, but she has also used both her body and her head in choosing, and therefore experiences and ultimately succeeds in achieving an emotional integration - a totality of body and mind.

The plausibility of Connie's awakening and Gradgrind's conversion is not the point. In fact these transformations should be somewhat implausible - because what is needed is some kind of break with the current consciousness. It is a consciousness of a certain kind of wholeness that they did not have before. In both cases, it is the hope to save the things that human beings once had but are now lost. It is an expression of the retrieval of what is lost.

Lawrence's portrayal of Connie's transformation in Lady Chatterley's Lover demonstrated his own 'new morality' which is in contrast to Dickens's view of morality in Hard Times as perceived through Gradgrind's conversion. In Hard Times we have observed that the 'change of being' occurs in Gradgrind,

rather than Louisa. Louisa remains trapped by the static, hard effects of her upbringing while her father experiences the transformation for which numerous characters are sacrificed. In a traditionally Christian perspective, the previously cruel Gradgrind becomes aware of compassionate values. However, in Lady Chatterley's Lover, Lawrence did not sacrifice Connie for a spiritual awakening of Clifford but rather showed her emerging from her paralyzed state and asserting a new view of morality:

> ... Connie pushes this deadness aside by rejecting Clifford - a physically helpless man - as her husband. And therefore she asserts the priority of phallic marriage over the half-dead morality; and at the same time, she also asserts what I would call the root-value of Lawrence's work, from a social point of view: for the new "life-morality" now acts as the base, or better still, the fount from which the old morality of ideals can be regenerated; it comes before good and evil, as we know them, and makes them once more possible - and in this it differs radically from its supposed counterpart, Nietzsche's "master-morality", which lies beyond good and evil.[50]

It is this non-traditional view of morality which directs Connie's choice for life over a living-death.

No matter how much Dickens sympathized with Louisa - it was her fate to remain permanently crippled by her childhood deprivations. Louisa is the tragic example that must serve

[50] Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p.198.

as a basis for her father's conversion. Lawrence's view of morality could never let him confer such a fate on Connie. Unlike Dickens, who enabled Gradgrind to become a sympathetic character, Lawrence never let Clifford escape his role as a satiric villain.

It is Spilka who articulated for the reader three immediate aspects of Clifford's physical paralysis.[51] These aspects contribute to our understanding of Lawrence's purpose with regard to what has sometimes been seen as a cruel depiction. Spilka pointed out that Clifford's paralysis "served to isolate the sensual basis of human existence".[52] Connie holds Clifford morally responsible for his coldness:[53]

> Deep inside herself, a sense of injustice, of being defrauded, began to burn in Connie.... Poor Clifford, he was not to blame. His was the greater misfortune. It was all part of the general catastrophe.
>
> And yet was he not in a way to blame? This lack of warmth, this lack of the simple, warm, physical contact, was he not to blame for that? He was never really warm, not even kind, only thoughtful, considerate, in a well-bred, cold sort of way! But never warm as a man can be warm to a woman, as even Connie's father could be warm to

51 Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, pp. 195-197.

52 Ibid., p.195.

53 Ibid., p.195.

> her, with the warmth of a man who did himself well, and intended to, but who could still comfort a woman with a bit of his masculine glow.[54]

Thus, Lawrence impressed upon the reader, as Spilka asserted, that Clifford's impotence here is sensual rather than sexual.[55] Clifford "fails to affirm the common sensual basis of human sympathy, and his paralysis helps to isolate and define his moral lapse".[56]

However, Clifford's paralysis also dramatizes another concrete fact - "his lack of life-responsibility:"[57]

> Throw this "crippling" element out, leave Clifford whole and potent, and you must also toss out Mrs Bolton, the motor-chair scene, and the sharp moral contrast with Mellors - in short, the present moral core of the novel, and much of the most successful ritual drama. For it is only through the fiasco with the motor-chair, remember, that Connie is finally purged of the deadly attachment to her husband: "And it was strange, how free and full of life it made her feel, to hate him and to admit it fully to herself. - 'Now I've hated him, I shall never be able to go on living with him, came the thought, into her mind".[58]

Spilka noted that this feeling of "freedom-through-hate" not only brings out the final significance of Clifford's paralysis, but also leads to the "bourgeois sentiment" aspect of

54 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, pp. 73-74.

55 Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p.196.

56 Ibid., p.196.

57 Ibid., p.196.

58 Ibid., p.196.

this novel.[59] Clifford's only real claim on the reader's sympathies is our pity for his injury received in the war; however, as the novel progresses the reader begins to find that even this pity is strained by Clifford's lack of truly admirable human qualities:

> And so we actually come to hate Clifford as Connie hates him, consciously and vividly, because he makes a false demand upon our sympathies, because he lacks the moral strength and human warmth which alone could command our respect and love. True enough, when Connie leaves him, she sins against bourgeois morality - but Clifford sins against organic life. Two moral systems clash and yet we recognize at once that phallic marriage is creative and moral, above and beyond our vision of Clifford's plight. Indeed, goodwill turns counterfeit before our very eyes, because it rests on counterfeit emotion, on easy public righteousness".[60]

To be born again, Connie must disentangle herself from her relationship with Clifford - because he lacks the human warmth and vitality which alone can bring her to life and raise her out of a permanent numbness. Clifford's disconnectedness is replaced by Mellors's understanding of creative living:

> Living is moving and moving on. My life won't go down the proper gutters, it just won't. So I'm a bit of waste ticket by myself. And I've no business to take a woman into my life, unless my life does something and gets somewhere, inwardly at least, to keep us both fresh. A man must offer a

59 Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p.196.

60 Ibid., p.196.

> woman some meaning in his life if it's going to be an isolated life and if she's a genuine woman. I can't be just your male concubine.[61]

Mellors's understanding of human relatedness is in stark contrast to Clifford's mechanical life and egoistic attitude. Her choice is her salvation.

Dickens's rendering of Gradgrind's conversion and Lawrence's portrayal of Connie's awakening are totally consistent with each author's moral stance in their respective novels. Dickens's central argument for 'goodness' is presented through the use of 'good' and 'evil' contrasts and the Christian values of warmth and kindness are celebrated and affirmed through Gradgrind's conversion. Similarly, Connie's awakening celebrates Lawrence's vitalist philosophy and affirms warmth and tenderness as natural expressions of physical love. Clearly, Dickens's idea of 'goodness' and Lawrence's view of 'vitality' are both grounded in the belief that life is not a system of absolutes - no matter how much we try to render it static.

61 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 289.

CHAPTER 7

MORAL FABLE AND SOCIAL REALISM: VEHICLE TO ACHIEVE HARMONY

Dickens and Lawrence blended social realism with moral fable in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover in order to create a new mode of perception which would result in a change of individual consciousness. These creative and prophetic artists fought for a balance between fact and fancy, mind and body, that would result in wholeness, totality or spiritual health. While neither author provided social blueprints for reform, they both advocated love and personal integrity as the basis for a new way of seeing. Divergent in some respects, but extraordinarily similar in method and content, Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover are successful works of art that challenge our preconceived expectations of the traditional realistic novel while simultaneously enacting on two planes the quest for harmony.

As we have observed, the central problem that concerned Dickens in Hard Times and Lawrence in Lady Chatterley's Lover was the repression and sublimation of creative energies and basic human needs and capabilities. Although Dickens and Lawrence wrote these novels over seventy years apart, they

were both fighting against the crippling and stultifying effects of an increasingly mechanized world. They both reacted with passion against what they perceived as crimes perpetrated by the industrial society against natural human instincts and needs. Both artists saw the threat to the human soul inherent in a work ethic that valued increased material production and wealth over moral and spiritual concerns.

Since the soul is intangible, both Dickens and Lawrence needed more than one level on which to enact the quest for organic wholeness or spiritual harmony. While realism would allow the presentation of the 'fact' or physical realm, fancy or fable could help convey the realm of the incorporeal or metaphysical existence. Therefore, in order to relate the threat to the spirit inherent in reductive philosophies and practices - Dickens and Lawrence chose to blend realism with fable. The choice was judicious. Fable could help convey the ineffable.

Hill is one critic who recognized that in Hard Times Dickens was protesting the reduction of life to "paltry dimensions".[1] She realized the importance of the soul in his work: "An immaterial entity it may be, yet, as Dickens shows, the soul holds the key to whether life continues at all.

[1] Nancy K. Hill, p. 113

Neglected or destroyed, the shrunken soul throws up a grotesque surface."[2] We see the same grotesqueness in Lady Chatterley's Lover, where as Williams indicated, "the recovery of the human spirit from the base forcing of industrialism must lie in the recovery of 'the creative reality'."[3] Clearly, spiritual progress is difficult to articulate through the use of realism alone, because our ordinary understanding of reality tends to be restricted to what we can experience by sight, sound, touch, taste, or smell.

By combining fable and fancy with the realism, Dickens and Lawrence were able to take us into another world. This is a world where literal probabilities or the plausibility of experience was not important - because both authors created these worlds to evoke a break in consciousness in order to encourage a new way of perceiving. Fancy was used not simply to present an ideal and evoke imagination, but also to combine with the realism as a transcendent method of conveyance. In other words, the realism in both novels was just a solid foundation or stepping-stone to an awareness of the metaphysical quality of the human spirit.

Although they have not discussed in depth the mixture of realism and fable in these two novels, there are critics who recognized the transcendence of realism. Vogel stated: "At moments any Dickens reader will recognize that he has left

2 Nancy K. Hill, p. 118.

3 Raymond Williams, "Lawrence's Social Writings", p. 173.

the realms of realism behind and entered a Pilgrim's Progress-like world of giant symbols."[4] Thurley said of Dickens's novel:

> In Hard Times, Dickens is moving from a fiction which, however dazzlingly expressionist in his hands, conformed to the laws of realistic practice, to an altogether more daring idiom, in which natural symbolism, emblem, and metaphor function as integral elements in the narrative design.[5]

Critics also commented on Lawrence's development from realism toward fable and myth. Sagar noted that "Lady Chatterley's Lover takes its place in the long-term development of Lawrence's fiction from realism towards myth."[6] Sanders felt that "read as a fable the novel has the cogency of myth. But the insistent realism of the sexual descriptions prevents us from reading Lady Chatterley simply as a fable".[7] It is Nin, however, who realized that Lawrence's work is realistic because of the "vividness of his senses",[8] but that the realism is merely a beginning or basis.[9] Of Lawrence himself she correctly observed that:

> Probabilities of the literal kind do not bother him, and his dialogue is as often impossible as possible, his situations unreal as real. He is

4 Jane Vogel, p. 42.

5 Geoffrey Thurley, p. 210.

6 Keith Sagar, p. 196.

7 Scott Sanders, p. 195.

8 Anais Nin, p. 63.

9 Ibid., p. 108.

> outside of that. A great part of his writing might be called "interlinear" because of his constant effort to make conscious the silent subconscious communications between human beings.[10]

The realism is only the beginning for the creation of a new mode of perception which would lead to a change in individual consciousness. Both Dickens and Lawrence recognized that in order to effect social change, they had to begin with the individual. The society would change with the multiplying effect - since society is, after all, only a collection of individuals. Sagar noted that by the time Lawrence wrote Lady Chatterley's Lover he realized that doing something for the future England was no longer a challenge to social or political activity.[11] Sagar said of Lawrence that "He saw that there must be a change in the individual consciousness before such action would be possible".[12]

Therefore, both authors employed the blend of realism and fable in an effort to provide a new way of perceiving, that, when acted upon would result in social change. What Dickens and Lawrence attempted to accomplish with their novels, is clearly the kind of social criticism that Williams saw as belonging to literature:

10. Anais Nin, p. 16.
11. Keith Sagar, p. 178.
12. Ibid., p. 178.

> But the social criticism, giving that phrase its full value - not a set of opinions only, nor a series of reforms only, nor even habitual attitudes only, but a vision of the nature of man and the means of his liberation in a close and particular place and time - this social criticism is in the end marvellously achieved and still profoundly active. For indeed it is the kind of social criticism which belongs to literature and especially, in our own civilisation, to the novel. Sociology can describe social conditions more accurately, at the level of ordinary measurement. A political programme can offer more precise remedies, at the level of ordinary action. Literature can attempt to follow these modes, but at its most important its process is different and yet still inescapably social: a whole way of seeing that is communicable to others, and a dramatization of values that becomes an action.[13]

It is precisely through presenting a new way of seeing and a dramatization of these values, that both Dickens and Lawrence hoped to effect a change in the reader's own perception.

In order to awaken readers to a new mode of perception, Dickens and Lawrence needed to clearly dramatize the deficiencies in Gradgrind's, Bounderby's and Clifford's views of reality. This necessitated in Hard Times an obvious delineation of the split between fact and fancy, and in Lady Chatterley's Lover, a clear disconnectedness between mind and body. They chose to dramatize these divisions through the apparently opposed genres of fact and fancy or realism and

[13] Raymond Williams, The English Novel: From Dickens to Lawrence, pp. 58-59.

fable. By combining such diverse elements, both authors challenged the reader's traditional habits of perceiving, while simultaneously dramatizing the need for harmony in individuals between the body and the mind and spirit, or between a person's physical being and their intellectual, imaginative, and spiritual existence.

Essentially, then, both Dickens and Lawrence argued for wholeness; therefore, they united fact and fable to present Gradgrind's and Connie's journey toward wholeness while simultaneously mixing the 'real' with the 'imagined' as their method of presentation to match the content of their works. Bounderby and Clifford, while 'real' characters in many respects, are also 'imagined' limits toward which the industrial society can distort human behaviour. We all know people like Bounderby and Clifford, but we are also aware of the fact that they are not as 'evil' or as 'dead-alive' as these two characters of fiction. That is because both Dickens and Lawrence employed the moral stereotypes of fable to dramatize imagined results of the division between fact and fancy, mind and body.

However, Bounderby and Clifford are 'real' as recognizable symbols. Since they are stereotypes of industrial managers they are readily familiar to the reader. The fable functions in order to allow the reader to perceive these

characters as 'good' or 'evil' in a fairytale-like manner so that the didactic messages of the novels are not lost or buried beneath psychological complexities of character.

It is because of the insistent moral lessons in these novels that characters are aligned on opposite sides. Therefore, if characters such as Sissy, Stephen, and Rachael seem 'too good to be true' - it is because they function largely on the level of fable and are largely fairytale-like characters. They are essentially symbols of goodness and vitality and therefore their behaviour is extraordinary or fabulous. Nevertheless, these characters also exhibit realistic qualities. Stephen may be a mythological saint and Sissy the good fairy; however, men and women capable of selfless love and uncompromising integrity do exist in the 'real' world.

Love and integrity are seen by both Dickens and Lawrence as the paths to personal and social salvation. Certainly Lawrence saw love as mutually inclusive of personal integrity. To love was to recognize the essential isolate soul in another while nurturing the interdependent relationship. Lawrence stated:

> Love is a thing to be learned through centuries of patient effort. It is a difficult complex maintenance of individual integrity throughout the incalculable processes of inter-human polarity.[14]

[14] F.R. Leavis, D.H. Lawrence: Novelist, p. 118.

It is this individual integrity and love which Dickens also suggested. Sleary asserted that there was something beyond self-interest and this was love.[15] And Thurley noted that however great Dickens's understanding of the social organism was - he always in the end held "the persistent integrity of the individual as the only real mode of human and even of social salvation".[16]

Dickens and Lawrence viewed love as a nurturing process encouraging of others' unique capabilities and special qualities, rather than a restrictive force. That is why the 'evil' characters in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover are those who would deny another human being's individuality and cast them into a mold. Characters such as Bounderby and Clifford deny the individual qualities of people. They see them as simply cogs of an industrial wheel rather than human beings with needs for an existence inclusive of emotional, spiritual, imaginative, and physical expression.

There are critics who found Dickens's and Lawrence's remedy of love and integrity to be overly simplistic. Watt noted that "some critics have asserted that Hard Times....

15 Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 268.

16 Geoffrey Thurley, p. 219.

offers no message except as George Orwell puts it: "if men would behave decently the world would be decent".[17] However, the question the reader must address is the one that Watt himself posed. "Is the Golden Rule too trite to be the central theme of a great novelist?"[18] The answer is no!

Unquestionably, questions of morality are the business of literary artists. In fact, as Dr. Johnson asserted, it is the frequent business of the human mind to be perpetually moralists.[19] In the search for the Truth there is no moral discussion that is undeserving of repeated examination.

Aidan Burns questioned the usefulness of Lawrence's remedy in Lady Chatterley's Lover because he felt that the theme of tenderness no more solved the complex problems of industrial life than the old Christian formula of "Love thy neighbour".[20] Of course, these critics seem to expect details of proposed social or political programmes which we look to other disciplines to provide. Dickens and Lawrence employed literature for what it was capable of doing. They

17 W.W. Watt, p. XXII.

18 Ibid., p. XXII.

19 Dr. Johnson, quoted in "A Conversation with Sir Peter Medawar" by Rosemary Dinnage, Psychology Today, July 1983, p. 69.

20 Aidan Burns, p. 104.

hoped to promote change through a new mode of awareness that would then serve as a basis for the regeneration of old ideals or the creation of new ones.

The love advocated by Dickens does not differ significantly from that of the world's major religions. And while Lawrence's idea of love is more complex and individual, it nevertheless has much in common with Christianity, as Father Tiverton pointed out.[21] Tiverton praised Lawrence for his grasp of the ISness rather than the OUGHTness of religion"[22] and traced the correspondence between three of Christianity's central tenets with Lawrentian philosophy.[23] As Spilka indicated, if Tiverton is correct, then the "pagan element" in Christianity is much stronger than many Christians would admit.[24]

The love remedy advocated by Dickens and Lawrence would alleviate numerous problems if it were acted upon. Action is the key. Mankind has had this answer for a long time; how-

[21] Father Tiverton, D.H. Lawrence and Human Existence quoted in Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p. 214.

[22] Ibid., p. 214.

[23] Ibid., p. 215.

[24] Mark Spilka, The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence, p. 215

ever, if we do not practice what we preach it is of no value. For example, consider the following tale in light of Dickens's and Lawrence's remedy:

> A Rabbi and a soap-maker went for a walk together. The soap-maker said, "What good is religion? Look at the trouble and misery in the world after thousands of years of religion. If religion is true, why should this be?
>
> The Rabbi said nothing. They continued walking until he noticed a child, filthy with mud and grime, playing in the gutter. The Rabbi said, "Look at that child. You say that soap makes people clean. We've had soap for generations, yet look how dirty that child is! Of what value is soap?"
>
> The soap-maker protested, "But, Rabbi, soap can't do any good unless it is used!"
>
> "Exactly", smiled the Rabbi.[25]

Dickens's and Lawrence's answer is meant to be put into action. Their answer may seem simple - but who has decided that Truth is complex? The complexity lies only in attempting to translate belief into practice. This is the challenge they present to us. It is a call to purposive action based upon a new awareness and felt through our deepest and best instincts.

Of course, the fact that they expressed their answers as fable also seems to imply a pessimism about the translation

25 Francis Gay, The Friendship Book, (London: D.C. Thompson & Co. Ltd,) p. 98.

of their remedies into action. However, this is inevitable precisely because they do see these realms of regeneration as existing only on the margins of society - as being absent from common social reality. They seem to be saying that salvation exists only on the periphery, until the periphery joins the center. In other words, salvation is not possible until the fable (periphery) unites with the realism (center) and results in harmony.

Although Dickens and Lawrence viewed love and personal integrity as paths toward salvation, and both employed the the same striking literary blend of realism and fable with similar patterns of metaphor - there is also a striking and significant difference in their final outlook in these two novels. This difference not only reflects the years between these works, but also demonstrates each author's consistency with regard to his own vision of Truth and his successful rendering of his vision.

Both novels, when judged by their own standard of truth, are clearly successful works of art. Dickens blends realism with fable and advocates a change in consciousness based upon a fairly traditional understanding of Christian principles. His remedy of love without self-interest is seen as a "duty to be done".[26] The novel's end presents a bleak future for

[26] Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 274.

most of the characters and a real sense of darkness and foreboding. The totality of form and content is apparent throughout Hard Times. Following the Biblical schema of Sowing, Reaping and Garnering, characters reap what they sow. The exception is Stephen Blackpool. True to Christian myth, he is persecuted, exiled, and subsequently dies because of his other-worldly 'goodness'. He suffers, like Jesus, because of the sins of others. The bleak ending is appropriate. There is a sense of futility about Stephen's death and the injustice of Louisa's fate. There is a call to action at the novel's end that is in keeping with a return or maintenance of Christian morality.

Lawrence's change in consciousness is an advocacy of a new morality that seems like quite a departure from Christian principles. His remedy of love is physically grounded and includes no sacrifice. The only duty is to the life in oneself. Therefore, Connie does not sacrifice herself to a life with Clifford but responds instead to love founded upon instinctive desire and attraction rather than an adherence to social convention or Christian morality. This is of course a radical digression from our understanding of Christian principles. Traditional Christian authors would have bound Connie to Clifford for life due to the marriage vows and deep feelings of pity for war-wounded Clifford. There would be little thought for Connie's bleak future. She would be sacrificed. She would respond to the social conventions and

her own sense of duty. The fact that Lawrence courageously united Connie and Mellors, despite all traditional Christian morality and social convention, demonstrated the totality of form and content in Lady Chatterley's Lover. The form of the novel is governed by the natural flow of Lawrence's writing. In the same way, the relationship between Connie and Mellors is governed by the natural flow of desire and attraction, rather than the mechanical adherence to social forms. Unrestrained by rules of construction or convention Lawrence's writing can be called organic. Corresponding with J.B. Pinker, Lawrence stated that, "all rules of construction hold good only for novels which are copies of other novels. A book which is not a copy of other books has its own construction".[27] And, in keeping with Lawrence's philosophy of living and flowing, there is not a tidy summation at the end of Lady Chatterley's Lover. Although the ending leaves plenty of doubt concerning the future of the lovers and their unborn child, there is a strong sense of serenity and hope:

> You can't insure against the future, except by really believing in the best bit of you, and in the power beyond it. So I believe in the little flame between us. For me it's the only thing in the world... And I won't let the breath of people blow it out. I believe in a higher mystery that doesn't let even the crocus be blown out.[28]

[27] Richard Foster, "Criticism as Rage: D.H. Lawrence" in D.H. Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays (ed.) Mark Spilka (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963), p. 178.

[28] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 316.

Of course Lawrence's belief in a "higher mystery" is shared by Dickens as we can see in Hard Times. There is also mystery in the power of love in both novels. More important, there is a clear belief in a power beyond man. It does not really matter whether that higher mystery is God as is suggested in Hard Times or nature as evident in Lady Chatterley's Lover. It is the belief in something beyond that which man himself can create that is important.

Bounderby and Clifford are essentially arrogant because they see no power or mystery beyond themselves. Wrapped forever in their own egos they suppose man's own creations, technological or otherwise, to be the supreme accomplishment. Forever boasting about himself as a "self-made" man, Bounderby ploughs through life oblivious to anything naturally beautiful. Clifford is the same: "I ride upon the achievements of the mind of man, and that beats a horse".[29] Both men revel in their own personalities - not stopping to ponder the beautiful mysteries of nature, the "common pulse of humanity"[30] or their part in a larger design beyond their own creation.

Quite simply, both Dickens's and Lawrence's efforts in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover can be viewed as an attempt to create an understanding or consciousness of the

[29] D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 186.

[30] Ibid., p. 15.

human soul's need for expression and beauty. They wished to alter, through the mixture of realism and fable, the narrow and cruel reduction of life to ism's or "ologies". Their fight was a reaction against the assault to the human spirit inherent in reductive systems and beliefs. All systems and artificial orders ignore the diversity within life by trying to reduce life to that which can be codified, measured, and regulated.

Therefore, the journeys of Gradgrind and Connie toward wholeness, are journeys away from ideas of life that are severely restrictive and reductive. The characters which are most successful in both novels are those who function credibly on the levels of both realism and fable: Gradgrind, Louisa, Mellors, and Connie. In fact, each novel 'works' precisely because Gradgrind's conversion and Connie's awakening - the crucial stages in the dramatic presentations - are the points where realism and fable intersect and are convincing. The changes in 'being' do not have to be entirely believable, because as we noted in chapter 6, plausibility is not the point.

As we have observed, there are remarkable similarities in the way that Dickens and Lawrence chose to dramatize their messages in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover. They both juxtaposed the mechanical with the organic and polarized

their characters accordingly. The victims of psychological repression, Louisa Gradgrind and Connie Chatterley, are identified with images of entrapment and paralysis and appear as the ice princess and sleeping beauty respectively. Their captors are their husbands who are captains of industry and leaders in the community. Louisa is pent up in Stone Lodge, a fortress of fact, while Connie is imprisoned in Wragby Hall, a mansion of the mental life. Coketown and Tevershall are described as polluted, industrial towns blackened with soot and the industrial workers are robots and beetles scurrying to and from work - their life devoid of beauty. Dickens and Lawrence even shared a similar view of unions. Both authors see that the union's demands are still on an economic level. Essentially, they both sum up the whole industrial problem as a "muddle".[31]

Significantly, the ironic heroes of both novels are men capable of love and possessed of personal integrity. Their roles are quite divergent and differ in effectiveness; nevertheless, they both choose the private life over the social one. Their integrity necessitates a private existence because they do not compromise their personal values and beliefs in order to conform to the social order. They are at

31. Charles Dickens, Hard Times, p. 69.
D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 314.

once a part of the world and yet apart from it. They both have the courage of their own convictions and the strength to endure the consequences of iconoclastic behaviour.

The sanctuaries in both novels are also apart from society. The circus in Hard Times is on the fringes of Coketown and the wood in Lady Chatterley's Lover is a small remnant of Sherwood Forest. The circus and the wood are shelters where the fluidity of life is recognized and warm, vital impulses can be freely expressed. It is for this very reason that Dickens and Lawrence chose these places to be the sanctuaries in these novels. It is only 'outside' the industrial society where we can find this haven where life can be celebrated rather than restricted.

Dickens and Lawrence fought for a natural flow in life as opposed to a rigid existence full of absolutes. Louisa and Connie, like birds in a cage beating their wings against the bars, represent this fight for freedom from soul-destroying forms and philosophies. Lawrence said: "We can't make life. We can but fight for the life that grows in us".[32] The remedy of love would allow people the space to grow and change rather than remain static. It would also provide an

32 D.H. Lawrence, Note to "The Crown", Phoenix II (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1978), p. 364.

atmosphere conducive to dialogue rather than confrontation. For Dickens and Lawrence did not fight to replace reason with instinct, or scientific knowledge with the intuition of the heart or blood, but rather to create a balance, whereby science and technology, facts and figures, were not exalted over the expressions of the humanities and the special feelings and emotions of human beings. The challenge is to act upon the best that is in us as human beings or to destroy ourselves with the worst that is in us. We have been passionately forewarned. We are free to choose.

CONCLUSION

The exploration of the unusual blend of moral fable and social realism in these novels, provides us with an answer to the question posed in the introduction: "Why did Dickens and Lawrence resort to fable in their efforts to expose the negative aspects of industrial society?". They employed fable as a technique to assist in the conveyance of the realm of the incorporeal. Of course, this is not the only reason that they used fable. It was also employed to teach lessons, create islands of removal, invoke imagination and play and to present their ideal. However, its most valuable function in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover is precisely its suitability as a vehicle to convey the realm of the metaphysical.

The journey toward organic wholeness or harmony cannot be communicated strictly through the use of realism. Realism can convey the physical aspects of human existence and behaviour; however, it is an inadequate method of rendering metaphysical qualities. Both Dickens and Lawrence were protesting industrialism as a habit of mind that eventually led to a shrinking of the soul. The industrial mileu, or physical environment, could be accurately and vividly reflected through the use of realism; however, since the soul is intangible and ineffable, the fable (being of supernatural character) could suggest it. Due to the soul's immaterial

nature, it can only be grasped intuitively through the aid of language or symbolism which attempts to capture its ethereal essence.

The main threat to the human soul is the depersonalization inherent in the industrial system. Dickens and Lawrence dramatized the split between fact and fancy, mind and body, in terms of the heavy emphasis on reason and technology at the expense of intuition and imagination. They were not alone in their perception of the threat to the individual in an increasingly mechanized world. George Eliot and Hardy are among those who recognized this threat. Lawrence continued the process of providing a critique of industrial society. This process became more evident in authors writing after World War One. As we see in Surfacing, Margaret Atwood is one of numerous contemporary writers whose reaction to the influx of technology has resulted in an attempt to get back to our roots. It is a quest to recapture something we have lost. One contemporary writer, Norman Cousins, captures this feeling of despair:

> ... The new technology has produced the theoretical basis for the greatest liberation from drudgery in human history, but the pervasive effect has not been availability of new options but the quantification of life. Human beings in a world of computerized intelligence are taking on a quality of spindled artifacts; they are losing their faces. They are also losing their secrets. Their mistakes and indiscretions are metabolized by a data base, never to be forgotten. Nothing is more universal than human fallibility; nothing is more essential than forgiveness or absolution. Yet statistical maintenance is as remorseless as it is free of redeeming judgements nourished by intangibles or the passing of time. Hope must be associated with names, not numbers. Helplessness, therefore,

> increases in direct proportion to numbering mechanisms that are unaffected by acts of faith, or grand leaps of intuitive splendor.[1]

Clearly, Cousins's understanding of the depersonalizing effects of today's technology is a reflection of Dickens's and Lawrence's perception in Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover.

The perception that science and technology should not be glorified above the arts and humanities is at the heart of this discussion. It is at the heart of the discussion precisely because, without imagination, the scientific discoveries and technological creations would not exist. In fact, it is technology that is subordinate to human imagination: "... we went to the moon not because of our technology but because of our imagination. An objective had first to be conceived. The conception fathered technology".[2] Therefore, Dickens's and Lawrence's blend of realism and fable is an attempt to dramatize the need for both reason and imagination. There can only be harmony when both are acknowledged as equally necessary and the split between them is repaired. Integration or organic wholeness depends upon an inter-connected balance between the two.

[1] Norman Cousins, The Celebration of Life (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1974) p. 42.

[2] Ibid., p. 44.

Of course, in a discussion of two such didactic novels, it is a natural tendency to assume a strident tone; however, such a tone is justified since to discuss these novels is to become involved with the moral argument. Obviously, the subject matter of Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover is as relevant today as it was then. However, it is the literary significance of this discussion that must be our focus. The content of this examination of the blend of fable and realism leads to a number of interesting discoveries and suggests new avenues of exploration.

One of the facts that this thesis reveals is that when these two novels are read with the blend of fable and realism in mind, the previous misconceptions with regard to characterization in these novels is apparent. As discussed in Chapter 3, the characters must be viewed in terms of both realism and fable. In this light, some previous interpretations of the characters may be seen to be insufficient; since any discussion of characterization that does not recognize both operating levels of action in the novels is likely to be an over-simplification. In fact, any discussion of characters, language, style and plot in these works must acknowledge and address both planes of action if they are to be comprehensive. Although both these novels have generated considerable hostility over the years - it is thought that this must be due to an adverse reaction in response to the preachy tones of the novels or a basic disagreement concern-

ing the subject matter and moral argument. Certainly, this must be the case, since this thesis reveals that Hard Times and Lady Chatterley's Lover are successful works of art when judged according to Henry James's understanding of the critic's task, as stated in the introduction of this discussion. The substance of this thesis, and in particular Chapter 7, reveals the totality of form and content with regard to each author's own standard of truth. The various levels are reconciled at the point where the realism and fable intersect. This is, of course, Gradgrind's conversion and Connie's awakening, as delineated in Chapter 6. This is the dramatized and rhetorically persuasive point where the novels' levels meet and render the argument and drama convincing.

Lawrence is usually read in terms of Hardy. Nevertheless, as indicated in Chapter 2, he has special affinities with Dickens which F.R. Leavis noted. Jerome Meckier saw Hard Times as Dickens's Brave New World and as a novel which anticipated not only Huxley, but Wells and Lawrence.[3] John Bayley, in his essay "Oliver Twist: Things As They Really Are", commented that "The Dickens of Hard Times whom Dr. Leavis admires, manipulates symbolic meaning in a manner that reaches its apotheosis with Clifford Chatterley sitting in

[3] Jerome Meckier, "Dickens and the Dystopian Novel" in The Novel and its Changing Form (ed.) R.G. Collins, (Winnipeg, 1972) from A Bibliography of Dickensian Criticism 1836-1975 (ed.) R.C. Churchill, (New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1975), p. 98.

his motor-chair".[4] Perhaps in the future Lawrence will be read in terms of Dickens. We know that Lawrence read Dickens[5]; therefore, it is reasonable to believe that Dickens influenced Lawrence's work. We should not allow a wild disparity in style to blind us to a close similarity in theme and technique. For instance, looking at the content of this thesis, we can see how Louisa Gradgrind is a precursor of Constance Chatterley. The connections are established. The possiblities for further literary correlations between Dickens and Lawrence are considerable, and therefore, exciting.

[4] John Bayley, "Oliver Twist: Things As They Really Are" in Dickens And The Twentieth Century (eds.) John Gross and Gabriel Pearson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), p. 62.

[5] Jesse Chambers, D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Record (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1964).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Dickens, Charles. Hard Times. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958.

Lawrence, D.H. Lady Chatterley's Lover. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1982.

Secondary Sources

Abrams, M.H. (ed.) A Glossary of Literary Terms. Third Edition. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1971.

Balbert, Peter H. "The Loving of Lady Chatterley: D.H. Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination". In D.H. Lawrence: The Man Who Lived. Eds. R.B. Portlow and H.T. Moore. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1980, pp. 143-158.

Barnard, Robert. Imagery and Theme in the Novels of Dickens. New York: Humanities Press, 1974.

Bayley, John. "Oliver Twist: Things As They Really Are" in Dickens And The Twentieth Century. (eds.) John Gross and Gabriel Pearson, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

[redacted]ckley, Jerome Hamilton. The Triumph of Time. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1966.

Burns, Aidan. Nature and Culture in D.H. Lawrence. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd., 1980.

Chambers, Jesse. D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Record. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1964.

Clarke, Colin. River of Dissolution: D.H. Lawrence and English Romanticism. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.

Cousins, Norman. The Celebration of Life. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1974.

Cruikshank, R.J. Charles Dickens and Early Victorian England. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1949.

Deane, Phyllis. The First Industrial Revolution. Cambridge: London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1958.

Fielding, K.J. Charles Dickens: A Critical Introduction. London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1958.

Foster, Richard. "Criticism as Rage: D.H. Lawrence". In D.H. Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Mark Spilka. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963, pp. 151-161.

Fowler, H.W. and Fowler, F.G. (eds.) The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Freud, Sigmund. Civilization and Its Discontents. London: The Hogarth Press, 1972.

Gay, Francis. The Friendship Book. London: D.C. Thompson & Co. Ltd., 1982.

Gold, Joseph. Charles Dickens: Radical Moralist. Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1972.

Hardy, Barbara. "The Change of Heart in Dickens' Novels". In Dickens: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Martin Price. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967, pp.

Hill, Nancy K. A Reformer's Art: Dickens' Picturesque and Grotesque Imagery. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1981.

Hobsbawm, E.J. Industry and Empire. Great Britain: The Garden City Press Ltd., 1968.

Hoffman, F.J. and Moore, H.T. (eds.) The Achievement of D.H. Lawrence. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953.

Hornback, Bert G. "Noah's Arkitecture": A Study of Dickens's Mythology. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1972.

Houghton, Walter. The Victorian Frame of Mind. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1957.

Johnson, Edgar. Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph. Vol. [redacted] New York: Simon and Shuster, 1952.

Jung, C.G. Modern Man in Search of a Soul. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1933.

Kotzin, Michael C. Dickens and the Fairy Tale. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green Popular Press, 1972.

Lawrence, D.H. "Democracy". In Phoenix. Ed. Edward D. McDonald. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1980, pp. 699-718.

----------. "Nottingham and the Mining Countryside". In Phoenix. Ed. Edward D. McDonald. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1980, pp. 133-140.

----------. Studies in Classic American Literature. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1977.

----------. Note to "The Crown". In Phoenix II. Eds. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1978.

----------. "Why the Novel Matters". In Phoenix. Ed. Edward D. McDonald. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1980, pp. 533-538.

Leavis, F.R. and Leavis, Q.D., Dickens: The Novelist. London: Chatto & Windus, 1970.

Leavis, F.R. D.H. Lawrence: Novelist. London: Chatto & Windus, 1962.

Lodge, David. "The Rhetoric of Hard Times" In Dickens: Hard Times, Great Expectations and Our Mutual Friend. Ed. Norman Page. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd., 1979, pp. 69-72.

Manning, Sylvia Bank. Dickens as Satirist. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.

Marx, Leo. The Machine in the Garden. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Meckier, Jerome. "Dickens and the Dystopian Novel" in The Novel and its Changing Form. (ed.) R.G. Collins, (Winnipeg, 1972) from A Bibliography of Dickensian Criticism 1836-1975 (ed.) R.C. Churchill, New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1975.

Moynahan, Julian. The Deed of Life: The Novels and Tales of D.H. Lawrence. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Nin, Anais. D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study. Chicago: The Swallow Press, Inc., 1964.

Portlow, R.B. and Moore, H.T. D.H. Lawrence: The Man Who Lived. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1980.

Sagar, Keith. The Art of D.H. Lawrence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Sanders, Scott. D.H. Lawrence: The World of the Five Major Novels. New York: The Viking Press, 1974.

Spilka, Mark. The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1955.

----------. (ed.) D.H. Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963.

Thurley, Geoffrey. The Dickens Myth: Its Genesis and Structure. St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 1976.

Trollope, Anthony. "Anthony Trollope on Dickens". In Dickens: The Critical Heritage. Ed. Philip Collins. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1971, pp. 322-326.

Vivas, Eliseo. D.H. Lawrence: The Failure and the Triumph of Art. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Vogel, Jane. Allegory in Dickens. Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1977.

Watt, William W. "Introduction to Hard Times" In Charles Dickens's Hard Times. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958, pp. vii-xxxiii.

Whipple, Edwin P. from an essay on Hard Times, in the Atlantic Monthly, March 1877. In Dickens: The Critical Heritage. Ed. Philip Collins. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1971, pp. 315-321.

Widmer, K. The Art of Perversity: D.H. Lawrence's Shorter Fictions. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962.

Williams, Raymond. "Lawrence's Social Writings". In D.H. Lawrence: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. Mark Spilka. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963, pp. 162-174.

----------. The English Novel: From Dickens to Lawrence. London: Chatto & Windus, 1971.

Works Consulted

Ashton, T.S. The Industrial Revolution 1760-1830. London: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Becker, George J. D.H. Lawrence. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1980.

Buckley, Jerome Hamilton. The Victorian Temper. New York: Vintage Books, 1964.

Cockshut, A.O.J. The Imagination of Charles Dickens. London: Butler & Tanner Ltd., 1961.

Gray, Paul Edward. (ed.) Twentieth Century Interpretations of Hard Times: A Collection of Critical Essays. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Howe, Marguerite Beade. The Art of the Self in D.H. Lawrence. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1977.

Manfred, Norman C. An Outline of the Industrial Revolution in Europe. London: Forum House Publishing Co., 1970.

Niven, Alastair. D.H. Lawrence: The Novels. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

----------. D.H. Lawrence: The Writer and His Work. Great Britain: Longman Group Ltd., 1980.

Romano, John. Dickens and Reality. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

Spender, Stephen. (ed.) D.H. Lawrence: Novelist, Poet Prophet. London: George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd., 1973.

Stoll, John E. The Novels of D.H. Lawrence: A Search for Integration. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1971.

Tedlock, Jr., E.W. D.H. Lawrence, Artist and Rebel. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1963.

Thompson, E.P. The Making of the English Working Class. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1964.