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一口に言って、三人の作家の関係を総合的に把握し、具体的に作品の中でこれを実証するような研究は、未だ出ていない。しかし、研究方法や焦点もまちまちではあるが、彼らのうち二人ないしは三人の共通性や影響関係を指摘する論文はLeavis以来、散発的に登場しており、ここに近年、Forster–Lawrence研究、George EliotとLawrenceを結ぶ伝統、思想研究への関心が高まりつつある。これらの研究を拾ってみると、Raymond WilliamsからFrank Kermode、J. B. Beer、H. M. Daleski、Judith Wilt、C. Bedient、R. Ebbatsonその他の学者の多様性と、文学と歴史、哲学、科学に及ぶ彼らの関心の幅の広さに、まず驚かされる。それらを総合的見地から収集、分析することにより、その全体像と空白部分を明らかにするのが、本論の第一のねらいである。
Except for Calvin Bedient's book, *Architects of the Self*,¹ there are very few attempts² at the comparison of just those three novelists. Moreover, Bedient's aim was not to make a textual comparison per se but to "concentrate" on "the three major architects of the self in English fiction, in their adjoining and complementary eras" in order to envisage how "they together form a digest, a colloquium, on the question of what the human being is and ought to be" because, he believed, "in them stands most of the story of what British writers since 1830 have held it humanly desirable to be". If Bedient had found Joyce, Yeats, Conrad, or any of the others he mentioned in the book to be more representative or significant in the formation of the idea of the self of that particular period, one might say, he would have "concentrated" on them instead. Apart from the general cultural (religious, scientific, psychological, aesthetic, political, social and moral) history in which they took their respective part, and apart from their idealistic, as well as realistic, tendencies, there seems to have been no particular strong link between the three novelists that prompted Bedient to compare them. However, it would be unfair not to mention that Bedient pointed out, though not with detailed analysis and concrete evidences, "the interrelations among their work so dense and active... in a period when human character underwent a revolution in goals and sanctions", contending that "they are the red and the white of this revolution, necessary to each other, and joined as only lovers and enemies can be joined". Still, if one depends on the historical, social and ideological comparison rather than on the detailed textual comparison, one can too easily guess and concur with Bedient's contention:

Apart from the Victorians, Lawrence and Forster are not quite complete, not quite intelligible: their fervor lacks occasion, their advocacy of the body seems *de trop*, rather as if one were to encourage the clouds to bloom, or to recommend drinking water.

Full of response and contest, Forster and Lawrence form the antistrophe to George Eliot's strophe, the Nay to her Yea, the Yea to her Nay.³

But is it really so simple as that? Could we so easily identify George Eliot with "the Victorians" as if she were the very incarnation of the Victorian morality and ideas? Could we automatically put Forster between Eliot and Lawrence because Forster's "general balance and sense, his more 'human' (if less striking) 'Greek' ideal of self-development", was more moderate than Lawrence's "zealous" preaching of a "'phallic consciousness' in which 'knowing and being' are 'one and undivided'"⁴? Moreover, what in concrete were the "interrelations" among the texts of the novels themselves? If we answer the last question, the answer will be also a clue to the first and second questions.

If we look at the comparison between Lawrence and George Eliot, there are more studies in the recent years. Still, if we remember Leavis's first effective evaluation of Lawrence as belonging to George Eliot's tradition of English novels, the number and depth of subsequent studies which compare those two novelists seems far from enough.
This explains partly why people, in general, still consider Lawrense and G. Eliot to be as far from each other as ever could be. Is this because the critics have more or less overlooked or ignored the significance of Leavis's implication? Or was Leavis wrong or forceful in pronouncing the affinity of the two novelists? Peter New, who studied the relationship between fiction and purpose (the writer's aim, utopia, fantasy, moral, "the desire to reshape the brute world") in *Utopia, Rasselas, The Mill on the Floss* and *Women in Love*, seems to say that Leavis was a little too forceful:

... with Lawrence, Leavis seems to me to be conditioned uncritically into accepting the modern idea that creativity entails the creation of new values... Leavis's situation is in fact radically paradoxical: the writer from whom he believes he most fully takes his bearings rejected the old moral order, in which words such as 'duty', 'responsibility', 'dedication to work' belonged, and went off to no place; yet Leavis does not desert the commonwealth—he returns to it, to expound, with great dedication and responsibility, the teaching of the man who did desert... I do not think, then, that Lawrence can actually offer what in Leavis's account of him he would seem to offer—that is, an interpretation of life fundamentally in accord with traditional Western European attitudes, without religious beliefs... To More and Johnson, the end of man was revealed, and self-proposed alternative ends are appraised by reference to that... For George Eliot, the end was not divinely revealed, though it was inherited; and because it had not the status of revealed truth, it had to be made appealing through the rhetoric of form... but her particular form, with the kinds of resistance which I have analysed, constitutes an at least partially successful discipline on the fantasies of self-proposed ends. In Lawrence, the end is self-proposed, not inherited: so it has to be not only made appealing but entirely generated within the form. So the form cannot function as resistance: in effect it advocates fantasy. In the three earlier writers, fiction works as a means of containing fantasy—recognising that it is a part of man's nature, but a part which needs to be held in check through self-consciousness. In Lawrence, the distinction between fiction and fantasy has disappeared... If the model is not static, what can authorize change?... what happens when a new value conflicts directly with an old one? Lawrence is in no doubt: the old automatically goes. Ursula, near the end, even feels resentful towards her own memory: 'She wanted to have no past... What had she to do with parents and antecedents?' But I doubt whether Leavis, for example, would really assent to this. To be specific, there is apparent in these four fictions a shift, corresponding to a general cultural shift,
from self-discipline for the benefit of the community, to self-fulfilment despite the community. George Eliot very deliberately turns backwards, as Maggie rejects Stephen's arguments. In *Women in Love*, the commonwealth is deserted so that Birkin and Ursula may have life, may develop 'singleness of being' through 'freedom together'. If such a complete reversal as that may be admitted, what of the old values will be abandoned next? [underlines, mine]

Here I gave a lengthy quotation not so much because I disagree with New as because it represents, in rather gross terms, the sort of criticism Lawrence tends to get. The typical criticism—that with Lawrence, especially after *Sons and Lovers*, realism (or fiction which holds fantasy "in check through self-consciousness", to use New's term) broke. That there is a great discontinuity between George Eliot, who is an inheritor of Christian moral "virtues" despite her rejection of Christian faith, and Lawrence, who has dis-inherited almost all the virtues and values (along with evils and corruptions) of "the traditional Western European attitudes" without a qualm. New's argument of history concerns the conflict between the community and the self. Notice the almost hysterical note of alarm in the last sentence of the quotation. New was right in pointing out that Lawrence was radically against the values of liberal humanism, and New's criticism of Leavis has a certain relevance in that sense. But that particular 'humanism', built on the idea of "the transcendental end" whose universal faith disappeared and left a vacuum (while 'humanism' itself survived), has a relatively short history within the European history since the Greek Ages. Also the idea of 'tradition' may vary according to one's class, interest, temperament, and experience. Even if Lawrence "deserted" the particular commonwealth and the particular blend of humanitarian attitudes which New wants to preserve, Lawrence may be the inheritor of the Western and English tradition from another point of view.

In that sense, Raymond Williams's book, *The English Novel: From Dickens to Lawrence*, offers another view of the 'tradition' of the English novel as containing the sense of a particular living "community" with "irreducible characters" and the "familiar language" of "people hitherto unwritten about", and he located George Eliot, Hardy, and Lawrence along that line. Williams's difficulty seems to arise with the "irreducible characters", which applies to *Sons and Lovers* but not to Lawrence's later novels; however, instead of claiming a discontinuity there, Williams chose to find a continuity in the sense of the living "community" which Lawrence portrayed directly. Yet again it is the beginning part of *The Rainbow* that directly portrays the subconscious rhythm of the community, which gets lost as the generations progress and become increasingly self-conscious and negative towards the society and culture which surround them. In Williams's view, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is Lawrence's deliberate turning back to the lost sense of community, where he not only puts common dialect (often intentionally vulgar) into Mellors's mouth but makes it part of the narrative as well. Although this positive appreciation of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is far from Peter New's negative view or even his disgust, Williams shares with him the hesitation to recognise the value of all the novels between
that and *Sons and Lovers*. With *Women in Love*, which Leavis called Lawrence’s best novel, their hesitation is heard in an ambiguous note: It is a great novel, but it is “not a climax”, only a “conclusion”, drawing on the experience of a single generation whose feelings “must compose their own pseudo-active world” instead of living in any actual society, and having “a scheme and rigidities as hard as any he [Lawrence] had begun rejecting.” Although Raymond Williams and Peter New have different ideas of “community” in mind, they both find it difficult to locate *Women in Love* and the larger part of Lawrence’s novels (with the exception of *Sons and Lovers*) within the tradition of the English novel.

Other scholars have presented the ideas of ‘tradition’ not in terms of “community” or conflict between “self” and “community” but in terms of conflict between “nature” and “culture”. According to Philip Weinstein:

> Nature and culture are, in the Victorian imagination, intrinsically opposed; and the tragic world of late-nineteenth century literature can be most simply defined as the failure (within the protagonist’s identity and behavior) of a set of debilitated cultural paradigms to account for the stresses of an amoral and empowered nature.

Lawrence reconceives the relation of nature and culture within human identity. He removes their necessary hostility and thereby rejects the inevitability of tragic impasse. . . . Lawrence, unlike Dickens and Eliot, Hardy and Conrad, anticipates this prospect of release with joy. The exposure of the artifice of culture to the flame of nature is the only means of cultural renewal. . . . If Eliot, Hardy, and Conrad are imaginatively attuned to those pressures within and without that spell disaster, to the “things gone dead” that block fulfillment, Lawrence is interested in breaking away and coming upon the “new places,” the possibilities, despite all, for greater life.”

The distinction between Lawrence and Eliot, Hardy, etc. rings a note somewhat similar to that of Calvin Bedient; however, while Bedient paid attention to the Victorian morality and social and cultural attachment ingrained in the structure of Eliot’s novels, Weinstein calls more attention to “the tragic impasse” and the frustration of the “amoral” desire within, calling it “nature” and recognizing its own continuity from the great Victorian novels to Lawrence and Joyce. It remains to be seen whether the desire, especially the bodily, irrational and amoral (in the sense of being against one’s own ethical) desire, always lies frustrated or has some open possibilities within George Eliot’s characters—especially in case of Dorothea in *Middlemarch*. And we can see why Weinstein included Hardy if he was to consider “the tragic impasse”. Roger Ebbatson wrote a book, *Lawrence and the Nature Tradition: A Theme in English Fiction 1859–1914*, and discussed Meredith, Hardy, Richard Jefferies, W. Hale White, and E. M. Forster, besides Lawrence. We shall later come back to this book, but it is a pity that Ebbatson did not include George Eliot in the list.
There are other names for the irrational and amoral side of human identity. When fantasy leans heavily on this side and almost deprives fiction of its power to check private fantasy, New finds it indistinguishable from mere egoism. Judith Wilt calls the literature dealing with this side “the Gothic” or “heretic” and claims it always has a close connection with orthodoxy, tracing the tradition of Gothic fiction from The Castle of Otranto, The Italian, The Monk, Frankenstein, Dracula, etc. to Austen, George Eliot, and Lawrence, and trying to establish the line along “the rhythm and the doctrines . . . of English religious history”:

Classic English Gothic, we recall, took shape in the 1760s and 1770s, after a hundred years of enlightened Anglican revision of the Puritan counterreformation, after a hundred years of safer but duller parliamentary and party rule had blurred the memory of divine right tyrants and *eminences grises*, Roman, Anglican, and Puritan. The rhythm and the doctrines, not just the “props,” of English religious history lie quite close to the surface of many Gothic novels. This rhythm, set up in the sixteenth century, described a movement from orthodoxy to reform powered by humanist and rationalist thought. This movement, however untractable in the main, constantly generated a powerful counterflow back to the orthodox mysteries, when the simplifications and certainties and civilities of humanism or tolerance, latitudinarianism or deism or later liberalism were perceived as robbing life of some of its richness, nobility, or intensity. . . . If realism is indeed “a bourgeois prejudice” as Herbert Read engagingly asserts and Ian Watt more soberly argues in The Rise of the Novel, then we may well look to the Gothic for evidence of that subconscious and slippery alliance between the “superstition–loving populace” and the aristocrats of imagination that continues to challenge liberal, critical accommodations . . . . In some ways Leavis’s “Great Tradition” in prose fiction was begotten, not made, by the Gothic tradition. The Gothic treats of the separated one, and the great tradition was begotten from it by heretics who wished to allow the separated one his or her mission in the outward curve—allow it and then rescue the missionary. For as Gothic fiction shows unmistakably and as Trinitarian theology implies, the most intense moral life is always lived at the edge of separation or recommitment. 11

Then her reference to Trinitarian theology begins to sound a parallel to Lawrence’s prophetic view of history: the era of the Father, the era of the Son, and the era of the Holy Ghost. The interest in history from the viewpoint of “mystery” and “the religious” characterizes such critics as Leavis and Wilt. Terms such as “humanism,” “deism,” “liberalism,” and “realism” begin to change their connotation as they are grouped together with “a bourgeois prejudice” and “demythologization.” On the other hand, terms such
as “heretics” and “superstition-loving populace” begin to sound a more favourable note as they are allied with “the missionary” and “the aristocrats of imagination”. What seems to matter in the this change of scale, as Wilt stresses time and again, is the point that “the missionary” will be finally “rescued” after “the outward curve” back into orthodoxy, that the duality of the “separate” and the “con-substantial” is vulnerable and “either seeks collapse into oneness or else seeks to generate a third term to marshal itself into unity, not oneness”, though the latter always fails in the Gothic. Whether the result is a “collapse”, a “rescue”, or an unsubstantialized “third term” is an ambiguous matter of evaluation as well as faith in the strength of the mysterious (irrational, beyond knowledge) passion on the part of the writer and the reader. We should not overlook the case of the sudden revelation of irrational, physical passion that took hold of Dorothea. With Lawrence, the question seems to hinge on the plausibility of faith on the face of universal failure to find a visible space for “the third term”—particularly in Women in Love where even Birkin and Ursula are left with no place for living outside their passionate and basically turbulent connubial relationship. It may be a hope. It may be a fake and disastrous departure from “the religious rhythm” underlying “the Great Tradition” and “the Gothic tradition”.

As I have implied through the analysis of those criticisms, the discussion of literary tradition involves not just the comparison between the established older work and the more recent, more problematic work (which reveals the latter's debt or originality) but the re-interpretation and re-evaluation of both works. Although that is nothing new, considering T. S. Eliot's view of “living tradition”, it should be further stressed in the practice of critical studies so that the interpretation of any literary tradition would be more dynamic and fruitful. If that is so, I suggest we make more direct comparisons between the texts of the old and the new, freely and without letting our preconceptions and knowledge of background history (helpful as they are) close the door to some possible reflection of light from one text upon the other and back.

Certainly we should have a better knowledge of history and novelists' ideas and reflections on novels (of their own and of others'), society, history, etc., to lead us out of our more superficial understanding of history and to guide us to see where the direct comparisons are likely to be more fruitful than elsewhere. We should first look into the three novelists' common experiences and reflections on each other's works. Those common experiences and reflections on each other's works have tended to be overlooked, and recently some scholars started making efforts to dig up what we might call 'the outside evidences' for the direct influences and shared experiences, especially between Forster and Lawrence and more sporadically between George Eliot and Lawrence. Important as those studies are—and I feel the special need to combine the results of those studies, adding a few more details if I can, to make a sort of summary-map of the triangle which may help to locate the relationship between the three novelists—still we should not stop there. We should further step into the texts of the novels themselves to find parallels, variations, transformations, contrasts, and the dynamics of influences and shared tradition, filling in, correcting, and re-making the map as we go along.
Now there are few such studies of direct textual comparison between George Eliot's works and Lawrence's. The most stimulating exception would be *Continuities*, written by Frank Kermode in 1968, though his discussion of George Eliot and Lawrence forms only part of the book. The discussion is not extensive, but it gives at least one revealing example of textual parallelism between *Middlemarch* and *Women in Love* to demonstrate how "Lawrence not only learned from the good and the bad in Eliot's figures, but... remembered and reproduced"\(^{13}\) the scene of a particular reality.

In *D. H. Lawrence and Tradition*, edited by Jeffry Meyers, H. M. Daleski analyzed the link between *The White Peacock* and *The Mill on the Floss*, referring to Lawrence's comments and reflections on Eliot's novels and discussing the parallelism between the scenes and characters of the two novels, to demonstrate "that George Eliot was the major initial influence on Lawrence, and that he indeed found himself through her".\(^{14}\) The point is that the two lovers in the love-triangle in *The Mill on the Floss* represent not only the thoroughgoing opposites but the opposite tendencies within Maggie herself, which were to develop through Lettie's divided consciousness into Lawrence's later novels. The argument is convincing and instructive—especially the contention that one-third of *The White Peacock* develops further the impact of Maggie's "individual duality", to show what would happen to the lives of those who married one person for intellectual or social needs, against their sexual needs and desire for somebody else (Lawrence criticized Eliot for marrying Maggie to Philip, though actually Maggie did not marry him but rejected Stephen as well, to be "reduced to the kind of despair that knows and wants only death", and that "long suicide" is suddenly turned into a more dramatic death by the flood which "comes across as sentimentally contrived") . We are almost led to believe that Lawrence had really "gone beyond George Eliot in his first novel"\(^{15}\) before going ahead in search of his "wholeness of being" in his later novels, leaving Eliot far behind with the paralyzing effect of the self-division within her heroines. However, Daleski does not explicitly say that much, though the implication seems to be there. Without comparing other works of Eliot and Lawrence, we should not make too hasty a conclusion. Interestingly, Daleski himself says:

The love-triangle in *The Mill on the Floss* clearly offers a model of how to put "a bit of both" in a novel, how to incorporate both the "inside" and the "outside," for it figures the externalization of inner conflict... whereas George Eliot throughout her career continued to combine inner and outer views, nowhere more strikingly perhaps than in *Middlemarch*, in the end it was Lawrence himself who, in *The Rainbow*, made one of the most sustained efforts in the English novel to put all the action inside... in *Women in Love* and subsequent novels he returned to a more even balance between inner and outer worlds.\(^{16}\)

In that case, we should really compare *Middlemarch* and *Women in Love* before making any assessment of the two authors—if there is enough parallelism between those novels.

As for the relationship between Forster and George Eliot, funnily enough, not much...
has been written about it. One possible reason is that critics have felt no particular need to stress the connection between them because they never considered Forster a revolutionary but always regarded him as the natural and possibly “last” heir to the tradition of English liberal humanism. Another possible reason is the simple fact that Forster was a homosexual while George Eliot was a woman. Moreover, she had a tendency to idealize a certain type of woman with moral conscience (such as Dorothea Brooke), while Forster kept a distance from his women—the attitude which critics called “cold” or “satiric”. One way or the other, the significant parallelism between them has been much ignored. It is high time we should enquire what in particular were their common heritage, interconnections, and conscious reworkings of one material into the other in their novels.

As for the relationship between Forster and Lawrence, the approaches of recent studies can be divided into three. One is to study the record of the meetings and correspondences that took place between them and their comments elsewhere on each other’s work and personality. John Beer’s comprehensive study and also Paul Delany’s analysis let us see the attraction and tension between Forster and Lawrence in the context of their relationship with other friends (Bloomsbury group and Cambridge minds, Keynes, Russell, Dickinson, also Murry, and others). They can lead to and support the second and third approaches. In fact, Beer also discusses the impact upon both novelists of Kenneth Grahame (the generation succeeding Hardy’s “passional note” and “fascinated with the dynamic element in earlier mythologies”) and Ruskin (representing the enterprise from the mid-nineteenth century of “keeping alive a sense of the ‘spiritual’ while giving full weight to the demands of utilitarian thought—embodied in a more absolute form the strong feeling for the mother”).

The second approach is to study the ideas (contemporary and Victorian) of philosophers, scientists, and other thinkers that influenced them both. Roger Ebbatson focused on Spencer and his evolution–theory (involving Darwin, Samuel Butler, Edward Carpenter, Tylor, J. F. Herbart, Max Weber, Freud, Marx, and others during the discussion) in *The Evolutionary Self: Hardy, Forster, Lawrence.* Other thinkers’ include poets and novelists as well. Kim Herzinger in *D. H. Lawrence in His Time: 1908–1915* follows Lawrence’s earlier attraction to and later break from the Georgian poets and thinkers headed by Edward Marsh. There in one chapter (“Landscape and Community”) he discusses Lawrence’s “ambivalence” or sense of “collision between ‘true human community’ and self–responsibility”, against the Georgian “attraction of optimism” to be found in Rupert Brooke and Forster, briefly studying “*Howards End* as Georgian Archetype” and “*The Rainbow* as Georgian and Anti–Georgian Novel”. It comes back to the question of the tradition of ‘self’ and ‘community’ which I mentioned earlier when I pointed out the difference of opinion between Raymond Williams and Peter New. What ‘community’ is, what ‘landscape’ is, and what ‘nature’ is—as much as what ‘self’ is—varies from person to person, from age to age. In a sense, Herzinger’s focus on the Georgians helps to interpret positively the disappearance of community in Lawrence’s novels after *The Rainbow*, which Williams could not do. It was Lawrence’s “break” from
“the Georgians’ dreamy musing over the English landscape and the soothing notions of community that such landscapes are likely to suggest.” But the problem remains. If Williams was right in pointing out that the community in The White Peacock, Sons and Lovers, and part of The Rainbow contained the force other than the “dreamy musing over the English landscape and the soothing notions”, why did Lawrence have to throw away that force together with the Georgian optimism? And could we so easily define Forster, the slippery and ambiguous figure who kept a distance also from the Bloomsbury group, and conclude: “In Howards End, Forster sees the landscape with a Georgian eye”?

The third approach is to study the parallels and direct influences (or deformations) between the works of Forster and Lawrence. Before coming to this approach, however, I should look at Ebbatson’s Lawrence and the Nature Tradition: A Theme in English Fiction 1859–1914, which deals with the very question I just mentioned: What has ‘nature’ been to individual authors and to the changing tradition as a whole. In that sense, it is akin to Raymond Williams’s The Country and the City, which, too, has some interesting points to offer about Lawrence. If we focus on the comparison between Forster and Lawrence, Ebbatson’s book comes somewhere between and combining the first, second and third approaches, though the weight on the third approach is not so great. He contends:

Forster shared with Lawrence a literary inheritance: the authors who were crucial to Forster were also vital to the young Lawrence a few years later. Both authors drew on a tradition of the novel which centres upon the contrast between Nature and civilisation, and develops the theme of the primacy of emotion and the instinctual in human behaviour. . . . Lawrence rejected Forster’s passivity: ‘A man of strong soul has too much honour for the other body—man or woman—to use it as a means of masturbation. So he remains neutral, inactive. That is Forster’, he told Bertrand Russell. Yet he also recognised Forster as working in the same tradition and espousing the same fundamental values as himself: ‘there is something real in him, if he will cause it not to die. He is much more than his dummy-sucking, clever little habits allow him to be’. . . .

Maurice, Forster’s most Lawrentian work, relates closely to the world of The White Peacock and Sons and Lovers, Forster’s favourite Lawrence novels. In the work of both novelists, the Nature theme introduced by Hardy and Meredith is reworked within a dynamic new context to yield fresh and exciting insights.

Ebbatson, too, saw what T. E. Lawrence recognised as the contrast between Forster’s “neatly layered” world which never strays beyond “trim privet hedges” and Lawrence’s turbulent world of “hussies and bounders”. But his nuance which calls attention to Forster’s “passivity”, reticence and “honor for the other body” is considerably different from Herzinger’s description of “a Georgian eye” with “dreamy musing over the English landscape and the soothing notions of community”. Whether Herzinger’s understanding of the Georgian poets is appropriate or not is not for me to say (though I suppose he is
right on the whole if we compare them with Lawrence), but it seems more fruitful to compare Forster and Lawrence with the “great” (great or significant to them) novelists of the last century than to compare them with their contemporary or just preceding generation of poets. In novels, than in poetry, there is a greater tendency to contain, to dramatize, the tension between the two conflicting forces of thoughts and feelings. We might call it the tension between realism and romanticism. Since those two terms mean different things in different contexts, we might rather call it the tension between plot and image. Or it might be the tension between the conscious plot and the unconscious (or more spontaneous and imaginative) plot. On different occasions, we might call it the tension between community and self, between civilization and nature, or between the mind and the body. The terms are ambiguous, and we cannot simply put one term in place of another, but there is clearly one common feature among those pairs—the split and tension between the pair. In *Howards End*, Margaret Schlegel called it “poetry and prose”. The motto of the novel was “Only connect...”. With Leonard Bast falling under the hand of death (be it human or not) and Mr. Wilcox surviving only as a half-man (though a better and more lovable man), *Howards End* can hardly be just the “landscape” for “dreamy musing” and “soothing notions of community”. The sense of the split was evident in Hardy to which both Forster and Lawrence express their debt. For Hardy, however, the sense of the split was the sense of tragedy, which Lawrence criticized in his “Study of Thomas Hardy”. In my opinion, the sense of the split, with its tension and the irrationally persistent hope, should be traced both from Forster and from Lawrence back before Hardy to George Eliot.

As far as concentration on the third approach is concerned, several studies have taken it to compare *Maurice*, what Ebbatson called “Forster’s most Lawrentian work”, with *The White Peacock*, with *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, or with *The Plumed Serpent*. But the mutual influences and parallels do not exclusively belong to those works. Ebbatson himself suggests the link between *The Longest Journey* and *Howards End*. Paul Delany, John Beer, and others have found it “revealing” to compare the two rainbows at the end of *Howards End* and *The Rainbow*. M. L. Raine showed some verbal parallelism between *A Passage to India* and “St. Mawr”. *The Longest Journey* and *Sons and Lovers* are both autobiographical novels, though, as John Beer pointed out, the distance between the author and the protagonist varies. I myself once compared *Women in Love* with *Howards End* and *Mrs. Dalloway*, focusing on the novelists’ common interest in the historical meaning of Hamlet and the predicament of his modern equivalent (Gerald Crich, Leonard Bast, and Septimus Warren Smith) in what they saw as the last phase of modern civilization. Anne Wright, focusing on a similar point, wrote *Literature of Crisis, 1910–22*, and discussed *Howards End, Heartbreak House, Women in Love*, and *The Waste Land*. She says:

Money is at the core of the novel, as is Leonard Bast. Both are central to the confrontation of Wilcox and Schlegel... Leonard, the urban clerk, is the modern focus of the Edwardian novel...
Leonard's deathwish connects him with the figures of... and Gerald Crich in *Women in Love*. The focus on these characters is such, and the cruelty and violence that attach to their experiences so intense, as to move them to the heart of the respective texts. Even the process of rejection, of 'selecting out', endows them with tragic stature. (As in Shakespearian tragedy the deaths are cathartic, and precede an affirmative coda.) Far from being diminished, the eliminated character becomes *inclusive* symbolic figure for the text, and his death a ritual act, both elegy and warning for a whole society. This inclusiveness disturbs the texture of the narrative and denies it simple, unambiguous closure. Although I share much of her view, I do not think that Leonard Bast (nor money) necessarily stands "at the core of the novel". Neither does Gerald Crich, though our sympathy may be greatly stirred by him. From one point of view, that of the crisis (or split) of the society and the man bearing it and being squashed beneath it, they certainly stand at the centre of the drama. But there are several plots in both novels. I myself see another common plot, or structurally central image, which should provide a focus for comparing *Howards End*, *Women in Love*, and also *Middlemarch*. Focusing on an image and dramatic structure, we can find parallelism in much more details of the texts, and, in doing so, we can trace the dynamic process of composition and organization in the novels. Also, we should incorporate much more historical, social, and biographical informations to assess the validity and challenging ambiguity of the textual comparison, for there are evidences both inside and outside the novels which suggest the interrelationship between the texts.

As I have shown through my rather lengthy account of the studies in the past, the comparisons between the three novelists have lacked both the total vision and the observation of textual details. There has been the lack of balance between the methods of comparing George Eliot with Lawrence and the methods of comparing Lawrence with Forster. The former have been based on the discussion of ideas and social and cultural history, while the latter have focused more on the direct influences between the novelists and their evidences in the texts. There has been little discussion of the relationship between George Eliot and Forster. What we need now is a unifying principle for finding and looking into the parallels between the works of all three novelists.
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