

**G. Eliot, Forster and Lawrence (2)**  
**—Their Common Ground in Life and Literature—**

Masako Hirai

## 要約

### G. エリオット、フォスター、ロレンス(2) ——その共にした体験、人生、文学——

平井 雅子

G. エリオットの主要作品の一、*Middlemarch* が書かれた時点と、フォスター、ロレンスの主要作（ことに *Howards End* と *Women in Love* を念頭におくと）が書かれた時代との間には、ほぼ五十年間の隔りがある。一口に言えば、十九世紀と二十世紀の違いがある。しかし、五十年といえは、それは、若き小説家が最も影響を受ける、前代の大家の作品との出会いを意味し、その影響力は、同時代の作家のそれに勝るとも劣らぬものと考えられる。また、現代の問題に取り組む作者にとって、その究明は、現代の中の過去の究明を意味し、その際、彼が現代の全ての問題の根を、ことに近代の最も影響力ある時代の作品の中に見出したとしても、自然の事である。*Middlemarch* そのものが、その舞台を、執筆より四十年前の社会に設定している事は、やはり、過去の中の現代、現代の中の過去という歴史認識に立つものと言ってよい。そして、実際、ロレンスもフォスターも、G. エリオットの影響、また、これとの意識的な闘いを示唆する発言を行っている。これらの事実を、まず、跡づける必要がある。加えて、三人の作家の発言、作品の中に、あるいは伝記に見る彼らの姿の中に、彼らが共有した、その背後にある何らかの影響力、その実体を探る事も重要である。

それは、人生、文学という二つの側面から探る事が出来る。片親との密接な関係、教育、階級意識、個人の恋愛と社会との軋轢。文学では、エリオット自身の影響の他に、シェイクスピア、聖書はもとより、様々なものが考えられるが、ここではギリシャ悲劇、*Antigone* に焦点をしばって考えたい。それは、上掲の三つの小説を念頭に置いたものである。

Before comparing novelists of different periods and such greatly diverse character as George Eliot, E. M. Forster, and D. H. Lawrence, there are three things to consider : (1) Does it make sense to compare writers who had different social and cultural backgrounds and who shared no experience in life? (2) Did the works of the earlier novelist influence those of the later novelist? (or, if they were contemporary, did they influence each other?) and (3) Was there in life or literature some common experience, spanning the years between them, which gave a particular character or motif to their novels?

The answer to the first question partly depends upon the other two and also on how we deal with the relation between the individual work and its own time. It is a delicate matter, and I believe we should always keep the time and the author's own experience in mind when we discuss literature. But if we remember that George Eliot towards the end of her life came home from a production of *Agamemnon* in Greek by Oxford undergraduates "‘fired with the old words’, and planning to read through the Greek dramatists again”<sup>1</sup> (my italics), one can see that the works of the past may play a greater role in the author's mind than contemporary literature (and possibly greater than other sorts of cultural experience). My interest lies not in the comparison of novels abstracted from their time, but in the interaction between the authors' times and experience and the power of literature to leap over such gaps.

To the second question, the answer is not easy to give, and that is perhaps why there are few studies which compare those three novelists. Forster and Lawrence, however, left evidences<sup>2</sup> of meeting each other several times in 1915, of respecting and criticizing each other's work, discussing (at least on Lawrence's part) the prospect of going to America to build a Utopian community together (for which Forster could never feel enthusiasm), and keeping up correspondence almost till the end of Lawrence's life. (Although the letters became less frequent as the years passed by, it was exceptional for Lawrence to keep sending his books to another author, and to write to him, for such a long time.) A fuller account of their relationship has been given by John Beer in "‘The Last Englishman’: Lawrence's Appreciation of Forster", in which he says :

Lawrence had read *Howards End* in 1911, well before he began *The Rainbow* : it is possible that Forster, in turn, read *Women in Love* before writing *A Passage to India*. Lawrence certainly knew *A Passage to India* when he wrote 'St Mawr', and M. L. Raine has demonstrated some close verbal parallels in Lawrence's novella which seem to involve reminiscences (conscious or otherwise) from Forster's novel.<sup>3</sup>

To determine where and how the novels influenced each other, there are two methods : Raine, for instance, set out to find "verbal parallels" in the texts, while Beer sought for some common intellectual or emotional basis, so that the authors felt sympathy and concern for each other's novels. My method is to combine the two, and it also involves my third question.

In life, common factors could be sought in their family relationship—especially in the close relationship with one parent. There is the problem of education and their puritan, ambiguously middle-class upbringing (though Lawrence's father was a miner). The tension between their personal, emotional life and a society hostile to it is another experience common to all three.

In literature, behind Forster and Lawrence lie not only Hardy, Ruskin, and others, whom I mentioned in my article in the previous issue (Vol. 35 No. 2) also of this journal, but George Eliot, Jane Austen, Shakespeare, Sophocles, the Bible. . . . The list is almost inexhaustible, but it would add another dimension to the Eliot-Forster-Lawrence triangle if I could establish the influence of the fourth upon all three. The inclusion of the fourth, whom I shall take to be Sophocles, will make the comparison more accurate and revealing.

In fact, the subject is so broad that it is difficult to pinpoint what things are more essential than others. Therefore, in the following two sections I shall discuss the novelists' common experience in life (Section I) and their common experience in literature (Section II), not only to give a wide context to my further discussion but gradually to narrow the range of focus and to find a common axis for different levels of approach.

## I. Common Experience in Life

To be sure, literature could not have been the only common experience, and the other kind, life-experience, also requires a proper lens for interpreting its meaning.

### (1) Relationship with Parents

When John Beer discussed the significance of the close mother-child relationship which Lawrence and Forster shared and its impact on their works, he did not mean the mother-son relationship in the Freudian sense but in what he called the now "unfashionable" sense of the "relationship between mother and son which assists the transmission of a certain kind of spirituality" and creativity. He attributed its origin to "the mid-nineteenth century, when it had promised to provide a counter-weight to the lack of scope for the 'spiritual' in utilitarian thinking".<sup>4</sup> So far as Lawrence is concerned, I have elsewhere<sup>5</sup> discussed the significance of the mother-son relationship in the text of *Sons and Lovers* and came to a conclusion which meets Beer's view: Their relationship has a role more deeply sustaining than destructive in Lawrence's creativity, and in the novel it comes from Paul's observation of his mother's ambivalent attitude toward the arguably ignored father. It is essential in Lawrence's case to distinguish this 'kind of spirituality' from the purely exclusive trait of Miriam's religious and intellectual aspiration. If Beer is right about the creative role of the mother-child relationship and its mid-nineteenth century origin, George Eliot might be shown to have had the same sort of relationship with her parent. Although in her case it was her father who came closer to her, his role was more feminine than masculine. Instead of forcing her to take practical or money-making modes of thinking (probably because she was a daughter), he supported her emotionally and made much of her brightness especially in her childhood, as both *The*

*Mill on the Floss* and Gordon Haight's biography illustrate.

Also the background absence of one parent-figure and the struggle with the other of the parents is manifest in all three novelists (though in Forster's case, much more subdued). In Eliot's case, her mother never played much of a role in her life and died before the critical stage of her outgrowing childhood, but her father played both the mother's role and the father's role for her to love and fight against. As she matured, her new ideas on religion and her associations with new friends (such as Mr. and Mrs. Charles Bray who rejected Christianity in favor of a more 'scientific' and mechanical view of man) caused an insufferable moral offence to her father. Probably the offence was more social than moral because her father declared he could not go to church if his daughter was no longer coming and, after a period of her banishment from home, finally accepted her on the condition that she would simply show her presence in the pew, admitting her right to think what she liked during the service.

Lawrence's mother was a pious church-goer as well as an enthusiastic member of the reading group and other intellectual activities. The young people's cultural life, too, at first centred on the local Congregational church. There must have been a conflict between her appreciation of his cultural and intellectual growth and her resentment at his growing tendency to speak against Christianity and against all sorts of conventional social and moral values, which *Sons and Lovers* partly describes. It is symbolic that he did his best to get *The White Peacock* published before she died and, to his disappointment, she did not even open the book when he gave it to her. Admittedly, she was wearied from long suffering from cancer, but we can judge that it would have cost her an emotional as well as a physical effort to read his book. Although she was proud of his achievements, what he sought and expressed in his early writings already conflicted with her ideas and wishes.

Forster's mother seems to have treated Christianity as a social institution to respect and observe, but she was not a spiritual enthusiast. When he announced his atheism acquired at Cambridge, she swallowed it without much difficulty. Partly because of the lapse of time, partly because they were men, and partly owing to the absence of a father's authority in spiritual matters, neither Forster nor Lawrence suffered such violent opposition to their independent thinking from their mothers as George Eliot did from her father (and later her brother).

Lawrence's father was a near-illiterate, easy-going miner, often criticized by his more spiritual wife. Forster's father died when he was a baby. The fact that he was spared conflict with this tangible authority seems characteristic of his whole life. Although he suffered not a little in a male-chauvinistic public school, he enjoyed his undergraduate years at King's College, Cambridge (with its liberal academism and unworldly friendship), which he never left spiritually but kept coming back to, and where he died as an honorary fellow. In real life he never was forced to fight, the only occasions being for his sense of justice and truth, and for others. Then he fought willingly and sincerely in speech or with his pen, but never with violence. With his mother he was always considerate and does not seem to have had much contention,

except that she was (like Lawrence's mother) a woman of determination, practical wisdom, and common sense, which put him in an awkward position whenever he tried to lecture her, he being impractical and "silly-simple" in many ways.

If we are to concentrate on the parent-child relationship in the novels, we should first choose *The Mill on the Floss*, *Sons and Lovers*, and perhaps *The Longest Journey* or *Where Angels Fear to Tread*. But it appears in various forms in other novels, too. The common feature in *Middlemarch* and *Howards End* on this theme is that the heroines (or sisters in both novels) are orphans, though they have grown up well-protected and well-equipped with education and cultural refinement. In *Women in Love*, the most striking parent relationship is the horrible slow death of Gerald Crich's father who fights persistently against it, but we should also remember the less dramatic but comically ineffective parents of Ursula and Gudrun, who cannot entirely ignore them and suffer when they are forced to face and oppose them. Presumably, the parents belong to the past world, both socially and culturally below the standard which the sisters have reached as teacher and artist, and as emancipated women. It seems, in these novels, that even after the parents cease in one way or another to belong to the same world as their children, the children have to struggle continuously not only with their shadows but with the shadows of the past and of death. In their growth, they are the murderers of the past, and they have to fight with their sense of guilt and bereavement as well. In this way, the personal problem of the parent-child relationship is extended and moved to the social (and cultural) plane.

## (2) 'Education' and the Individual

P. N. Furbank makes some interesting observations about Forster. Let me quote a little from his remarkable book as it concerns also other wars against parents and society: education and personal distinction.

The sort of thing that amused him was, having run out of soap, to dangle a string out of his window, for a friend to attach a new cake to it. Yet there was a queer sureness about him, a super-quick sensing of immediate situations, and—in flashes—an extraordinary sweep of human understanding. His remarks expanded in the mind.<sup>6</sup>

Intellectual sophistication coupled with childishness is characterized by the quick, instinctive human understanding, so much unlike the sort of sophistication to be cultivated by education in the ordinary sense. To compare with this, it is worth citing from the manuscript of Forster's BBC talk on D. H. Lawrence:

For a time he [Lawrence] was a schoolmaster in a London suburb, and perhaps this accounts both for his mistrust of education and for the didactic way in which that dislike is expressed. Then he took to literature, and it was then or about then—that is to say in the Spring of 1915—that I met him three or four times. I didn't know him well, nor meet him again subsequently, but he leaves an ex-

traordinary impression—so radiant and sensitive, so quick with his fingers and alive in his spirit, so sure that if we all set out at once for one of the South Sea Islands we should found a perfect community which could regenerate the world.<sup>7</sup>

Here it is interesting to see how Forster himself is trying to analyse the background and personality of the man whom he regarded as “one of the glories of our twentieth century literature”.<sup>8</sup> Here again is the quickness of the spirit as well as of the fingers, and Forster is impressed (though not persuaded) by Lawrence’s childish belief in his Utopian community.

Also Lawrence’s “mistrust of education” (which Forster probably found in Ursula’s teaching experience in *The Rainbow*) must have struck him strongly, because Forster had had his own miserable experience of school-education (though his was a public school) as well as his ‘glorious’ undergraduate years as a Kingsman at Cambridge which he recreated in the first part of *The Longest Journey* and slightly fantasized in *Maurice*. And, though he never openly admitted it, he must have been often exasperated by the futility of ‘cultivating’ the students of the Working Men’s College in London where he devotedly taught for twenty years or more. This college was founded in 1854, “just after the defeat of Chartism and the year of revolutions—when there was a concerted effort by intellectuals and the ‘clerisy’ generally, to heal the class-war by means of ‘culture’”. Furbank remarks:

He [Forster] shared some of Margaret Schlegel’s doubts about Leonard and his fellows: ‘She knew the type very well—the vague aspirations, the mental dishonesty, the familiarity with the outside of books. . .’<sup>9</sup>

So the problem of education involves the problem of class-structure.

In the BBC talk which I cited, Forster went on to liken Lawrence somewhat to Shelley but said:

Lawrence was a rougher tougher proposition than Shelley, there is a vein of cruelty in him. . . .<sup>10</sup>

Although Forster did not use the word ‘common’, and the word was not suitable anyway, he seems to have sensed something in Lawrence which did not exist in the gentrified middle classes. Even Forster does not escape this kind of snobbery. Elitism is partly class felling, and it is not only prejudice but also fear.

In *Howards End*, the appearance of Leonard Bast introduces another kind of superiority in the Schlegel sisters: they pity and want to ‘educate’ the lower-class man (though Bast is not exactly a working-class man, rather a clerk who does not belong to middle-class society). It is inevitable that one who climbs up the hill and catches a wider view should look down upon those below, though they may have their own view which one does not share. The noble intention of helping and leading others is coupled with the sense of self-created isolation. It seems that it is this sense of disconnectedness from the rest of the world that spurred the novelist more than anything else to fight against prejudice, and to write “Only connect. . .”.

And their elitism singles them out not only from the working class but from the business world. Again Furbank remarks:

Though his feelings towards Cambridge fluctuated later, the place always had a precise significance for him; it was the place where things were valued for what they were in themselves, not for what use you could make of them. . . . And apart from the Cambridge truth, there was, I think, a Cambridge prejudice which he acquired—namely, that it was scholars and civil servants, not business men, who ran Britain. The effect of the Cambridge reforms of the nineteenth century had been to strengthen rather than weaken this assumption. The underlying aim of the reformers had been to increase the prestige of the professions; they were casting professional men for the role of the new gentlemen of England, the successors to the landed aristocracy; and the complement of this was a low view of 'business'.<sup>11</sup>

This is precisely the subject and cultural background of *Howards End*, as it is of *Women in Love* and also of *Middlemarch*, as I shall explain. In *Howards End*, though Cambridge itself takes only a marginal place with Tibby as its only representative, the intellectual and spiritual superiority of the Schlegels is set against the efficient but narrow-minded businessman's view of the Wilcox family. Margaret Schlegel in due course becomes the second Mrs. Wilcox (the last heiress of the landed gentry family). In marrying Mr. Wilcox, she is attempting to unite with and 'educate' him spiritually.

Socially, Tibby represents both the limitation and the unpretentious honesty of the academic mind which does not presume to know or influence anything outside its own sphere; but he is also physically weak, spoiled (unable to think of and care for others), and emotionally quite cold. (Once, during the story, Helen's tears surprise and touch him, though he does not 'understand' her.) Both Helen and Margaret represent a more open, humanist attitude of the liberal mind, willing to do what they can for the good of society—but particularly for its spiritual good, as they understand it. The sisters' reactions to the Wilcoxes and to Leonard Bast, who are outside their own intellectual milieu, diverge in two directions as I shall discuss later. But both sisters are described with sympathy and irony, and their ambiguous relationship is a means of developing and criticizing their distinctive "missions" (the practice of their wish to help others).

George Panichas, comparing the views on education of Forster and Lawrence, says:

Forster's educational aims might best be termed corrective; that is, his main aspiration is to correct a bad condition, a 'muddle', and to emphasize 'the belief that man is, or rather can be, rational, and that the mind can and should guide the passions towards civilization'. . . . To Lawrence the problem of education require instant, total action, inasmuch as man has fallen 'from spontaneous reality into dead or material reality'. . . . The reorientation of education, he says, must begin with the premise that 'mental consciousness' in [is] not a goal



but a cul-de-sac.<sup>12</sup>

This is correct, if we compare and contrast the two novelists' 'ideas' especially as they appear in their essays and letters, where they tend to have a more analytical and single voice. If we look closely at their novels, we must say this say it is both correct and not correct. It seems to me that they were both keenly aware of the problem of 'elitism' inherent even in their own views of education, which contributes to ambiguity and, I would even say, the dynamics of their novels. Similarly, Panichas analyses the basis of their difference:

Whereas Latrence's reactions to education developed in the midst of working-class life in the English Midlands, with its great nonconformist tradition, Forster's reactions were shaped by the gentlemanly middle class, with its public school and its ancient universities. . . .<sup>13</sup>

But we should examine more closely the details of their personal experience of "working-class life", "public school", and so on, which contain equally ambiguous elements. In my opinion, a significant part of their sympathy and the common ground between them lay in these ambiguities.

Lawrence had his own sharp experience of the isolation of the exceptional individual; he grew up as the only one in the mining community to get a scholarship to go to Nottingham High School and later to the University of Nottingham. He could share his cultured views only with a few intimate friends and his mother; but then he outgrew them. When he eloped with his former professor's wife for 'real' love, it was a scandal to the whole country (except for a 'chosen few'); later he was suspected as a spy during the War (his wife being German) and bullied by officials and the police; he had his books banned for 'obscenity' by people who did not understand them. Finally he escaped from England to set up his ranch in New Mexico, and cut off many once-important connections (such as Bertrand Russell) when he found they were 'dead'.

Their reactions to Cambridge and its people mark a clear difference between Forster and Lawrence. S. P. Rosenbaum in his notes to "Dickinson and McTaggart" remarks that when Lawrence came to Cambridge during the War as Bertrand Russell's guest to talk about the solutions to the war, he particularly wanted to meet Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson, though later he described him, along with Cambridge itself, as England's disease, not its hope. But when Forster was an undergraduate, he got to know Dickinson, a don, as a senior friend, and he respected Dickinson for life as a sort of spiritual mentor for the integrity of his mind and action. In the end, even Forster was cut off by Lawrence:

*St Mawr* a bit disappointing. The Bloomsbury highbrows hated it.  
Glad they did. Don't send any more of my books to E. M. Forster—  
done with him as with most people. Vogue la galere.<sup>14</sup>

In Lawrence's case, isolation imposed from the outside is violently counter-attacked by self-imposed isolation.

Even so, the 'priggishness' and 'preachiness' of such an attitude is often attacked in

his novels, and it is the main cause of conflict between Ursula and Birkin in *Women in Love*. In that novel there are many scenes and discussions which concern either 'education' in the ordinary sense of the word, or the 'private teaching' of a more revolutionary idea, and there we also find the criticism of priggishness inherent in either form of teaching. The most thorough criticism comes from women—from Ursula and Gudrun, but particularly Ursula. Gerald Crich tentatively believes in education because people need discipline to be kept in line. But discipline without morality is an empty venture, and he has lent his hand to burying his 'philanthropic' father out of the world by the ruthless modernization and mechanization of his mine. His latent self-contradiction, his fear, and his secret joy in retaliation is piqued by Gudrun who makes daring gestures to 'outdo' the world's standards and thrives on her superior artistic talent and self-imposed alienation. Their relationship develops and subtly undermines his hold on life—a process which requires a more detailed discussion to decipher its meaning.

On the other hand, Rupert Birkin, a school inspector, does not entirely believe in the traditional meaning of education. His first direct meeting with Ursula takes place in the Classroom where she is teaching. Birkin (and Hermione who joins him) intrudes into this sacred place, frightening Ursula. But he gets absorbed in the hazel sprigs they have been drawing and 'teaches' them to color the male and female flowers in simple yellow and red to emphasize the one "fact" they ought to know—the mystery of gender (the separate identities of gender which appear for the purpose of coupling). Ursula is attracted to him by the stillness of his motion. But when Hermione comes in, treating them playfully and flaunting her intimate relationship with Birkin, the atmosphere changes. When Hermione, in turn, gets absorbed in the beauty of the red stigma on the female flower, Ursula and her class are made to feel as if they are only there to witness Hermione's hyper-sensitive and rhapsodic appreciation of the secret knowledge. There is a growing resentment. When Hermione asks him, "Do you really think the children are better for being roused to consciousness?", Birkin is tortured on the spot. Why? He himself must have often felt that he is only creating new gaps by teaching a whole lot of children, and part of him, at least, suffers in sympathy with them. Considering that in a much later chapter, as a result of a violent quarrel and subsequent peace of love between Ursula and Birkin, they immediately make a decision to leave their posts in education, the development of their love and the tension between them is closely related to their understanding of 'education' and intellectual barriers—not only in society but in their own independent philosophy of life and love. The famous quarrel in "Excuse" shows the height of Ursula's criticism against Birkin's dilemma, and the scene in "Moony" dramatizes Birkin's resistance against Ursula's 'eternal' and 'all-embracing' womanhood which again is both fascinating and deathly in its pride. Together with the relationship between Gerald and Gudrun, that between Birkin and Ursula constitutes a drama of couples, of duality and dilemma; and one of the dilemmas to be explored by this (closely related to other dilemmas of life and death, love and hate, faith and fear. . .) is 'education and the isolation of an elite'. Thus the drama links public life with most intimate private life.

In George Eliot's (Mary Ann Evans's) case, too, there was always in her education or learning a grain of isolation and an enclosed relationship between the sympathizer and herself. Starting with her relationship with her father, whose sympathy was emotional rather than intellectual, she continued to seek for connections and was embittered by their limitations until she met George Henry Lewes, who sympathized with her both intellectually and emotionally and supported her talent. Even then, the fact that writing her novels cost her tremendous efforts (Haight's biography is full of strenuous researches, head-aches, and depressions) not just for money (which was important for supporting Lewes's another family and also some of Mary Ann's relations) but for a more artistic purpose indicates her need and struggle to connect with the world outside.

In *Middlemarch*, particularly in Dorothea (and also in Lydgate) we can observe both the strength and frustration of this desire to 'connect' with the world outside. As I shall discuss later in detail, Dorothea first appears in the novel bent on her small project to renovate the tenant houses; her spirit yearns "by its nature after some lofty conception of the world which might frankly include the parish of Tipton and her own rule of conduct there". She continues to seek a unity between her personal morality and its practice in society, though it is inevitable for that desire to meet its frustration in a world where "women were expected to have weak opinions" and "opinions were not acted on".

Also, the particular educations received by Dorothea and Celia Brooke, by Lydgate, and Ladislav are united by the counter-cultural, European element and the problem this produces (distinction and isolation) in the local community. Dorothea's liberal, progressive and philanthropic tendency as well as her wide academic interest are implicitly the result of combining her inherited Puritan blood, her ardent nature, and her education, which was "at once narrow and promiscuous" (first in an English family and then in a Swiss family). Lydgate's medical knowledge profit largely from his Continental education; and he also found in a great French doctor his model for combining local medical practice with the universal task of scientific research and discovery. In *Middlemarch* this stimulus both helped him to advance his practice and to win a new distinction, and it also stirred suspicion and hate both in the minds of his fellow practitioners and in the general public mind of *Middlemarch* society, which hated any radical change. This bright side and dark side gradually weave a powerful background pattern to Lydgate's action in *Middlemarch*—a pattern beyond his own understanding, which finally defeats his *idealistic* and *high-minded* ambition both in public and private life. Lydgate's twofold failure to fulfill, first, his selfless public intention of improving the state of medical practice in *Middlemarch* and, secondly, in his personal hope of a restful and supportive home with some social distinction (by marrying the beautiful and gentlemanly Rosamond Vincy from a cheerful, prosperous bourgeois family), is primarily the result of his inability to take in this pattern. His broader, unparochial view first promises to liberalize man and society through him, then alienates him, then through solipsism limits his own view, and finally deprives him of the ground for his confidence and faith.

As I shall examine more closely, this is the essential problem of education. On the

one hand, it broadens views, fosters scholarship, the arts, etc. ; on the other hand, it leads to the isolation of the individual talent or intelligence which it produces. None of the major characters escapes this : Even Mr. Brooke who “had travelled in his younger years” and prides himself on a sort of liberalism fixed on no faith or principle, is caricatured, though warmly, for resorting to whatever theory or literary passage comes to his mind, irrespective of coherence, and displaying a “too rambling habit of mind”. Young Will Ladislaw who also likes travelling, especially in Italy, and is presumably the freest from prejudice and solipsistic intentions of using or being used by other people, yet is caught in his aesthetic dilettantism, unable to take action even for the woman he loves. Rosamond with her pride in artificial refinement aspires to marry a “stranger”, to move into a broader society outside and beyond the social limits of Middlemarch. Bulstrode builds up his social position from nothing and effectively hides his shadowy past by accumulating pious and charitable actions, almost succeeds in converting his self-image and attempting to convert society from this moral centre. Casaubon is immeasurably proud of the bulk of his knowledge, has no human concern even for his young wife with her devoted wish to help his work, and is, nevertheless, doubts himself and is haunted by the fear of death before writing his *Key to All Mythologies*. . . .

The title of Casaubon's unwritten book is not only reminiscent of A. Comte and Feuerbach,<sup>15</sup> reminding us of George Eliot's self-education through reading, translating, and discussion with her friends, but also literally indicates Casaubon's interest in universal (again, counter-cultural or cross-cultural) matters, thus implying the link between actual travel and the intellectual experience of books and literature. Both kinds of experience, in broad terms, provide ‘education’ of the mind and sensibility, cultivating both breadth (or truth, as the occasion may be) and new solipsistic limitations. In the next part, I shall consider the socially stressed relationship which each novelist experienced with his or her sexual partner, which again links them and must have played a significant role in the growth of their minds. Then, in the following chapter, we shall come to view their shared experience of specific books which they possibly used in their own writings.

### (3) Against Society : Love and Personal Isolation

Forster was a homosexual. The process of his self-discovery and the meaning it had for his emotional, psychological and intellectual development is so honestly and sympathetically described in Furbank's biography of Forster that to read through it itself affords a poetic experience, releasing for recognition some obscure currents of our mind. *The Longest Journey* is usually considered Forster's semi-autobiographical novel and does succeed in rendering the rare quality of friendship at Cambridge and its effect upon one's later moral and erotic development—the purity of friendship, youth, and respect for truth, however bare or eccentric it may be. In fact, Ansell in his person seems to testify that individuality and austerity of conduct, true to one's instinct and oblivious of social pressures, is a guarantee of truth and purity. However, the homosexual overtone is suppressed, though Rickie's half-brother, Stephen, does signify the attraction of an instinctive, mentally half-dormant male rooted in the earth; a theme which becomes

overt only when we come to *Maurice*.

The process from *The Longest Journey* to *Maurice*, and then from writing *Maurice* to actually publishing the book (only after his death) is a clear indication of the social stress and the pains Forster took to pursue and guard the fragile purity of his erotic experiences. In a sense, writing *Maurice* must have been a personally liberating experience. Forster himself admits that the novel was prompted by the startling sensation which he experienced when Edward Carpenter's secretary quickly ran his hand along the back of Forster's body. Carpenter was a crucial figure who intellectually supported and helped to liberate Forster's homosexual inclinations, which had become a knot of suppressed, faltering, and frustrated emotion even in the free and stimulating atmosphere of Cambridge. The move from the intellectually and emotionally stimulating friendship with H. O. Meredith to a more physically warm feeling towards his Indian friend Masood and then to a fully physically rewarding experience with a driver in Alexandria; and then back in London to his continuous earnest search for and devotion to younger friends from the working class . . . . All this shows a drive to find his erotic experience first in intellectual stimulation but, given its limitation and frustration, later in physical and uninhibited contact with a man of another class. In any case, Forster was both careful about guarding his privacy from a society hostile to homosexuality and willing to share his "happy" experience with his friends who could "congratulate" him. Although from the beginning he had no wish to have *Maurice* published before his death, he did circulate it among his close friends as soon as he wrote it. Ironically, H. O. Meredith (apparently the model for Clive) showed little interest in the novel, which hurt Forster. Those interplays between Forster's life and his writing allows us to glimpse the intricate structure of the solidarity of a minolity (or "aristocracy", to use Lawrence's favourite word) to be woven and unravelled within his mind.

Critics still argue whether Lawrence had a homosexual inclination or not. His attraction to J. M. Murry and his offer of special friendship is well known. The "blood-brotherhood" offered by Birkin to Gerald in *Women in Love* is the source of puzzles and arguments. Beginning with *The White Peacock*, his works show signs of clear attraction to the body of a strong and youthful man's, while he himself was physically slight and consumptive. On the other hand, when he visited Cambridge, one of the things which spurred him to a venomous hate of the place was the open homosexuality of Keynes and his set,<sup>16</sup> the mixture of rapacious sexual promiscuity, frivolity, rationalism and eqoism. To assess the nature of Lawrence's homosexual tendency is beyond the scope of my study, but it is clear in his life the relationship with women, especially Frieda and also Jessie Chambers, played the dominant role. As for George Eliot, G. Haight describes some sweet and gentle communications she had with her woman friends, and some of them, such as Edith Simcox, were devoted to her like lovers. At the same time, Haight makes clear that George Eliot had no lesbian relationship as such, and that her dependency on woman friends was no other than the need for sympathy, the sisterhood of intellectual and emotional understanding, among her own sex. Evidently, she relied much more on her relationship with men, and her mature life seems to centre on her

liaison with George Lewes.

On the face of it, Forster, Lawrence, and G. Eliot do not share the same kind of sexual life. And yet there is an important common factor—the relationship with their major partner was not acceptable by the morality of the day. They also shared a heavy (body and soul) dependency on the relationship which was further intensified by the hostility of society. The intensity and unworldliness of the amoral love caused them to seek not only the essence of love between two beings but the reality of relationship between man and nature and, through nature, the possibility of a natural relationship between man and society. Or so it seems. A discovery, a new philosophy, an aristocratic knowledge of life, is bound to arise. But, at the same time, there must have been large drawbacks, frustrations, hesitation, suspicions, doubts and hostilities which ever threatened to bind and impede the natural flow of faith and affection.

Before moving to evaluate the element of social conflict in their emotional experience, we must remember the intellectual and elitistic element inseparable from it. I have already hinted that George Eliot's relationship with George Lewes may have suffered some stress not only from outside but also from within because of the difference (not necessarily of degree) in their intellectual concerns and developments. If we read Haight's biography carefully, we can see how Lewes and George Eliot spent time together, reading the classics, learning languages, exchanging or discussing ideas. . . , all of which combined to successfully cover up the unspoken irritations and disappointments if one of them was not quite able to follow the other to the last lonely pursuit of the mind. In my view, their efforts were both fruitful and stressful, and the stress was accentuated socially because Lewes was a married man.

This interpretation of the weak point of their no-doubt mutually strong love may cause some controversy. Therefore, to see the point more clearly, I would like to observe another case, George Eliot's relationship with Dr. Brabant. She met him in her youth, and Dr. Brabant was an elderly married man, though their relationship did not develop in such a way to cause either of them to entertain the idea of actual sexual relationship between them. Dr. Brabant was a distinguished medical doctor (having numbered among his patients Thomas Moore and Samuel Taylor Coleridge), had studied German in order "to sound the perilous depths of theological science under the guidance of fearless and learned interpreters",<sup>17</sup> and knew both Paulus and David Friedrich Strauss. Their meeting took place through the circle of the Brays and Dr. Brabant's daughter, from whom Mary Ann Evans (later George Eliot) was soon to take over the task of translating Strauss's *Das Leben Jesu*, at the time when she still felt the reverberation of her 'holy war' against her father, which made her susceptible to another force of protection and understanding. When Dr. Brabant invited Mary Ann to stay in his house and insisted that she must consider the library *her* room and punningly baptized her *Deutera* because she was to be a second daughter to him,<sup>18</sup> she found :

I am in a little heaven here, Dr. Brabant being its archangel. . . time would fail me to tell of all his charming qualities. We read and walk and talk together, and I am never weary of his company. . . .

read de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis, but the genius of sloth has possessed us, and we have sent much new pavement to our future abode.<sup>19</sup>

She was never weary of his company, and spent most of her day in the exclusive communication of reading German to him, reading Greek together, etc., except for feeling frequently "so faint as to be obliged to lie on the sofa until walking time"; but all the time the blind Mrs. Brabant and her unmarried sister were watching with increasing suspicion and anger. When Mary Ann was virtually turned out of the house, Dr. Brabant's daughter, who had just come back from her honeymoon to discover the situation, later described it as follows :

[Mary Ann] in the simplicity of her heart and her ignorance (or incapability of practicing) the required conventionalisms, gave the Doctor the utmost attention; they became very intimate; his sister-in-law, Miss S. Hughes, became alarmed, made a great stir . . . Mrs. B. vowed she should never enter the house again, or that if she did, she, Mrs. Brabant, would instantly leave it. Mrs. Hennell says Dr. B. acted ungenerously and worse towards Miss E., for though he was the chief cause of all that passed, he acted towards her as though the fault lay with her alone.<sup>20</sup>

This squalor was caused by what we might call 'nothing'. It was sexually nothing. But the close spiritual intimacy which thrived on the sense of being intellectually out of the ordinary (observe the air of conceit in Mary Ann's letter quoted above), coupled with her ignoring (or ignorance) of the social conventions, gave rise to such emotional anger. The relationship had an inbuilt element of friction with society at large, with the people who 'did not understand' and the people who supported the conventions; and the ladies, though prejudiced, were quick to detect this element. Even her friend thought that partly "the fault lay with her". Confronted by the friction, Dr. Brabant himself faced about, to rejoin his wife and recover domestic peace, even accusing Mary Ann in his manner as if she were the prime offender. It would have been a difficult choice to stand his ground and support the girl in such a situation, and Dr. Brabant showed *his* limitation in this weakness of character. Also, getting sober, Mary Ann later discovered the limitation of his intellect, and found that her writing to him was a favour to him. There are many similar incidents in Mary Ann Evans's life, for which one should consult Haight's biography. Both she and George Lewes were stubbornly strong in supporting each other's company against social convention which countenanced no union outside legal marriage (though Lewes's legal wife continued to live with another man, bearing his children, and yet retained her social position and Lewes's full financial support), but that does not mean that they did not suffer from and struggle with the limitation of their isolation.

Charles Bray's phrenological observation of the cast of George Eliot's head is well known :

In her brain-development the Intellect greatly predominates; it is

very large, more in length than in its peripheral surface. In the Feelings, the Animal and Moral regions are about equal ; the moral being quite sufficient to keep the animal in order and in due subservience, but would not be spontaneously active. The social feelings were very active, particularly in the adhesiveness. She was of a most affectionate disposition, always requiring some one to lean upon, preferring what has hitherto been considered the stronger sex, to the other and more impressible. She was not fitted to stand alone.<sup>21</sup>

This is a shrewd account, for he was a long-term friend of hers. Although he does not explain the connection between the predominant Intellect and the social adhesiveness, nor say why she required some one to lean upon, one can find at the bottom the ever-gnawing sense of isolation much like Forster's; compare it with the following passage from Haight's biography :

She felt 'inexpressible relief' at being freed from the appalling apprehension of eternal damnation and the heavy burden of evangelical dogmas, which so long disturbed 'that choice of the good for its own sake that answers my ideal'. Yet she never ceased to regret the impetuosity that had caused the conflict. Years later, in 1869, she told Emily Davies of 'having come into collision with her father and . . . how much fault there is on the side of the young in such cases, of their ignorance of life, and the narrowness of their intellectual superiority.'<sup>22</sup>

Years of experience and her relationship with Lewes had taught her the narrowness of intellectual superiority as well as the relief of intellectual freedom. Intellect for ever separates even those whom it once drew together. From this point of view, even her relationship with Lewes rests on a fragile base. Look at it in the light of what she said earlier in life to the young woman whom she gave German lessons :

How terrible it must be to find one's self tied to a being whose limitations you could see, and must know such as to prevent your ever being understood.<sup>23</sup>

This is the problem of Casaubon and Dorothea in *Middlemarch*. Some people believe that Casaubon's original is Dr. Brabant,<sup>24</sup> but his case shows the universal problem of marriage based on intellect. Although Lewes showed memorable scholarship in writing the biography of Goethe and doing pioneering work in biology, we can observe a different, perhaps more journalistic turn of mind, which moved from one subject to quite another so soon as he completed a work. Probably his strength lay there, in detecting new possibilities and finding people's talents, in covering a wide range of interests and in being sharp in business matters as well as in different ideas of society. His strength encouraged and supported George Eliot a great deal, but at the same time her loyalty to Lewes must have been tested and milled constantly *unless she recognized* a power different from her own, while hers was of a more persistent, thorough-going



character. At any rate, as must be true with any genuine art, beyond a certain point Lewes always found it impossible to 'share' her acts of creation : all he could do was to wait and watch her solitary heart-rending struggles.<sup>25</sup> And of course it was a great occasion when she came out of the work, and then they could share the work and the joy together. It was a reward for both of them. Lewes's character may more readily remind us of Ladislav than Casaubon. Critics often associate the first two but, as far as I know, never the third. But it is only part of the truth.

True, Casaubon has been also associated with various other thinkers, contemporary and old, and with the novelist herself in his intellectual egoism and the unrelated accumulation of knowledge from which she, too, could not escape.<sup>26</sup> But there is one more thing to be said. We should not miss the tension between George Eliot and Lewes : all their efforts at sharing things imply tension as well as pleasure. There were inevitable gaps and estrangement. George Eliot was always grateful for Lewes's patience, but it is all the more a sign that there was such a tension behind. If Ladislav seems rather insignificant and the novel, as many critics feel,<sup>27</sup> loses much of its interest after Casaubon disappears from the scene, it is because this important element of tension is incorporated in the Dorothea-Casaubon relationship but not in the Dorothea-Ladislav relationship. It is ironic that later, when Lewes died, Eliot (like Dorothea) attempted to revise and complete his unfinished work and, spending many hours with a headache over the fragments, both felt it disloyal to change his writing and yet found it difficult to see how he himself would have wanted to organize the whole.

Needless say, the intellectual tension was more violent in Lawrence's relationship with women. In his novels, we can think of many, such as Miriam in *Sons and Lovers* and Hermione in *Women in Love*. It is more accurate to say that the violence appears when people try to break out of the tension. Birkin and Ursula are not exempted from violence as they consciously try to find a better, freer love. In life, the tension between Jessie Chambers and Lawrence is well known, but there was always tension between him and other women : Helen Corke, Louie Burrows. . . . With Frieda particularly, though their relationship proved to be the most satisfactory one for him, it involved extremes of close intimacy and violence. They read together, discussed his work, wrote letters together (which Forster found slightly annoying), shared friends, and kept no secret from each other even about their private thoughts and love affairs. Not only did her eyes pass over everything he wrote but she even claimed she herself influenced the work, discussing and suggesting things. By telling each other outright what passed in the most private corners of their mind, they gained intimacy as well as extraordinary pain, which helps to explain the sudden violent rows and the passionate reconciliation which their friends witnessed with embarrassment.<sup>28</sup> The point I want to stress is not the extraordinariness of their relationship but the tension inherent in the spiritual intimacy and their need to counterbalance it with some other power.

In fact, we must not too easily contrast Jessie Chambers with Frieda Lawrence, or Hermione Roddice with Ursula Brangwen. Frieda may well have grown out of Jessie, and Ursula out of Hermione. There is an indication of this in *Women in Love*, as I shall

discuss later, especially in the "Classroom" scene (where Hermione flaunts the intimacy of her understanding with Birkin, even probes his dilemma, provoking his anger, and excluding the children and their teacher, Ursula, who is resentful, attracted, and frightened) and in Birkin's taunting retort in "Excuse" that Ursula is "no better than Hermione". We must look further into the novel to see its real import.

At the same time, we must notice the particular situation of Lawrence's relationship with Frieda. There are several factors which increased and emphasized the conflict with society. First, Frieda Weekly was the wife of Lawrence's former professor at the University of Nottingham and mother of two children. According to all social standards, Professor Weekley was blameless as a faithful and responsible husband, father and respectable member of society. To leave him purely for an affair and to desert their young children for her own satisfaction offered no excuse or ground for sympathy to a morally oriented society.

Although the situation is somewhat similar, George Eliot's case contains quite a different element: Lewes's legal wife and her lover, Thornton Hunt, showed no sign of moral and financial responsibility even for the children born of their love (who were legally Lewes's) but continued to live together in another house with Lewes financially supporting the entire household. George Eliot fully cooperated with him for paying the large expense (his wife being careless and rather extravagant) and became a good and well-loved mother to Lewes's children when they became older and visited their father. Thornton Hunt, besides carrying on his relationship with Lewes's wife, had a family of his own and had no intention of marrying or supporting her. Consequently, she had no intention of getting a divorce and releasing Lewes from his duties. That was the situation which prevented Lewes from legally marrying George Eliot till the end of his life. According to the middle-class moral standards of the time, which stressed and guarded the institutional status of marriage, Lewes and particularly George Eliot, the woman and the threat to this status, were to blame. According to today's moral standard, which may have established itself only recently but was already entertained in a small minority of liberated minds in the mid-nineteenth century, Eliot and Lewes had every reason to be sympathized with and nothing to be blamed for. From this viewpoint, Eliot could be regarded as a sort of martyr or saint.

But I was comparing general moral standards, especially in middle-class society, which tend to emphasize the external view of things at all times. What actually took place in the minds of those involved must have been far more complex, and we should register the ambiguity of *their* moral standards as well. We can get a glimpse of this in Haight's account of Lewes's family-situation before he met George Eliot:

The first number of the *Leader* was published 30 March 1850, just one week after the Lewes's youngest son, St. Vincent, died of whooping-cough. Two weeks later, 16 April, Agnes gave birth to a fifth son, whose father was Thornton Hunt. Perhaps acknowledging that he was partly to blame, certainly unwilling to stigmatize the child, Lewes registered him as Edmund Alfred Lewes

and treated him exactly like his own boys. There were no recriminations on either side. Agnes had merely followed her feelings; it was a principle they all accepted. Thornton wrote that 'Human beings are born with passions; you will not discipline those passions by ignoring them, and nature always avenges herself by retorting upon the false moralist some depravity as the result of his handiwork.' Lewes shared this view. His review of Mrs. Gaskell's *Ruth* attacked the intensity of grief afflicting little Leonard when he learns that his mother is unmarried:

This language is sheerly impossible. No child would at once realize any such shame, even were it a fact, that illegitimacy in actual life *did* bring with it disgrace...; the least reflection will tell Mrs. Gaskell that in our day no such brand affects the illegitimate child.

... With Thornton Hunt, Lewes continued to work harmoniously on the *Leader*. But the offence was repeated. Before Agnes bore Hunt a second child, Rose Agnes Lewes, 21 October 1851, Lewes had ceased to regard her as his wife. He still kept on friendly terms with her...<sup>29</sup>

Here is the mind of a liberal intellectual, first confident in his emancipated view but later shaken and torn between his sympathetic conviction (spoken, printed, and advertized), an ordinary man's anger (jealousy, loneliness, sense of betrayal...), and the social shame about which he flamboyantly claimed "that in our day no such brand affects" the person in the situation. An idealistic mind, which places itself beyond the moral standards of society, may react in various ways when it faces the reality of lonely suffering, not only failing to achieve its goal but facing unexpected results, ugly emotions, betrayals, misunderstandings, and dishonour which are quite defeating. On the one hand, Lewes and George Eliot seem to have maintained their faith in natural passion. On the other hand, we can sense especially in George Eliot the strong wish to achieve the perfection of more internalized moral standards. When I say "more internalized", I am hinting at her difference from Lawrence and Forster, implying the link which is still there between social morality and her inner morality. To simplify the matter, we might say that Lawrence and Forster sought no external moral justification, no moral support from others, for their socially amoral conduct. Probably they could not seek it in their particular situation. George Eliot could still seek it and did seek it. But real suffering was shared by all three, and the more subtle differences and ambiguities should be sought in their novels.

Returning to Lawrence's particular situation, we can name two other factors which intensified the conflict between society and his relationship with Frieda. One is the War (with its war logic and suppression of non-patriotic, amoral literature), Frieda's German origin (for which he was suspected as a spy), and his weak physique (which was repeatedly examined, ridiculed, and rejected by the army for t. b.). The second factor is

Frieda's aristocratic and intellectual pride, especially her emancipated views under the influence of Otto Gross, her former lover, who was an important disciple of Freud and a major sexual emancipationist on the Continent. Especially during the War, they were incredibly poor, he could not publish his books, *The Rainbow* was banned for "pornographic" scenes, they moved from one friend's house (or cottage) to another, depending on their friends' charity, and suffered more when even friends turned their back or this socially outcast pair, the police came in to search his papers and finally turned them out of the cottage in Cornwall, and they were not permitted to leave England because he might be a spy. Frieda's aristocratic view made nothing of English society. Although at times Lawrence was infuriated by Frieda's insolent attack even on the police, his deeper sympathy lay with her, and they had no-one but each other to support their way of life. During the War, Lawrence is said to have gone near the verge of insanity, beating Frieda, who ran, tearing her hair. At one time, they sought to live separately. Against all odds, however, their relationship survived, so that Lawrence's expressed views particularly on sexual matters are bound to have a clearly anti-social force.

Both Lawrence and Forster suffered from the War, their loss of faith in humanity and in the liberal view of culture and society.<sup>30</sup> But, comparing the two, one might say that Lawrence's anti-social, amoral view was doubly intensified by the external situation, while Forster's was still felt to have risen from inside: he accepted and acknowledged the fact that he was "different". Having inherited sufficient bequest to live independently, and being a gentleman with a Cambridge degree and on an equal footing with socially-respected friends, he could afford to stay aloof from the madness of the War and "serve" as a Red Cross 'searcher' for missing soldiers at Alexandria, enjoying its exotic life and finding an Egyptian driver who could "release" him "from sexual 'apprenticeship'".<sup>31</sup> Of course *Howards End* was written before the War, but the difference of their external situation during the War, in its emphasized form, reflects the general difference in their social position which contributed to the different psychological developments in their life and works.

This, again, calls for a close examination of their novels. There the intricate relationship between society and the individual mind can be explored and unravelled through the woven strands of sexuality, passion, amorality, loneliness, and the isolation of the superior being in human relationship.

## II. Common Experience of Literature

### (1) George Eliot for Lawrence and Forster

A vital part of their common experience of literature is, of course the appreciation (and criticism) of each other's work. But since I have already given evidence of mutual appreciation between Forster and Lawrence (and there is John Beer's essay to refer to), I shall leave more details to the later discussion and consider first how they received George Eliot's novels: what in particular Forster and Lawrence saw in Eliot's novels and how it is related to their work.

When Lawrence was ready to write *The White Peacock*, his first novel, he told Jessie Chambers that it was with George Eliot's novels in mind :

'The usual plan is to take two couples and develop their relationships,' he said. 'Most of George Eliot's are on that plan.'<sup>32</sup>

As it proved, it is also the plan of *Women in Love*, and its original title, *The Sisters*, seems to stress the link, particularly with Dorothea and Celia's story in *Middlemarch*. Although Celia has not been much highlighted in previous studies of *Middlemarch* (Lydgate, Casaubon, and Bulstrode usually take more weight in such discussions), Celia is *at least* structurally important in the book, and Lawrence's aim might cast a new light upon the understanding of both novels. In fact, the pattern of two couples developing different relationships, together with their different attitudes towards society is one of the few major patterns in Lawrence's novels and short stories, typically in "Daughters of the Vicar" and right up to *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, so that it is clearer in Lawrence's case than in George Eliot's. However, in novels like *The Mill on the Floss* and *Adam Bede*, one can find the same latent form. In *Women in Love* and other novels, by introducing 'the sisters' rather than cousins or spiritual sisterhood between women, Lawrence stressed this common heritage, which also relates his work to *Middlemarch*.

It applies very closely to Forster's *Howards End* as well, where the sisters share a highly cultured and special atmosphere in their half-German, half-English home, and yet develop their love and marriage differently because of the difference between their attitudes to life. It is a novel which, everybody agrees, is dominated by the question, 'Who shall inherit England?' Although the question involves all the characters in the novel, and also highlights the contrast between the businessman's mentality of the Wilcox family and the spiritual mentality of the Schlegel family, the conscious seekers for the answer are limited to the two sisters, Margaret and Helen Schlegel. From that point of view, the term *England* needs not to be limited just to the few things Margaret comes to inherit in the end, "the spirit of Mrs. Wilcox",<sup>33</sup> her house, and its symbolic elm tree. It can more widely be defined according to what each person acknowledges she or he has inherited; it should certainly include, out of place as it may seem, the German intellectual inheritance of the Schlegel household. One only needs to be reminded of the element of German philosophy in the Cambridge ideas and views of life, the German backbone in theology and Evangelical belief, and the idea of leading and educating others which stems from them. Whether the total 'vision' of England should include everything and everybody from German intellectualism to Mr. Wilcox and Leonard Bast, or just be reduced to a few symbols and choice people—that may or may not be adequately represented in *Howards End*. The house itself is initially only the home of an upper-middle class family; but it 'stands for' the whole heritage of social and intellectual life.

Although people more often think of Forster than Lawrence as belonging to the same tradition as George Eliot, Forster did not openly admit he had 'borrowed' any pattern or plot from her. But he mentions or discusses her in a number of essays and broadcasts, in one of which he refers to her as much a part of the tradition of the English as the Authorized Version of the Bible :

This, the great monument of our seventeenth-century speech, constantly influenced our talk and writing for the last three hundred years. Its rhythm, its atmosphere, its turn of phrase, belonged to our people and overflowed into our books. Bunyan, Johnson, Blake, George Eliot, all echo it.<sup>34</sup>

The deep note Forster finds in the language of the King James' Bible is reflected on the only nineteenth-century author to be mentioned, George Eliot.

As was more apparently the case with Lawrence, Forster is not simply impressed by Eliot; he objects to her being a "preacher" rather than a "prophet" when he compares her with Dostoevsky:

George Eliot talks about God, but never alters her focus; God and the tables and chairs are all in the same plane, and in consequence we have not a moment the feeling that the whole universe needs pity and love—they are only needed in Hetty's cell. In Dostoevsky the characters and situations always stand for more than themselves; infinity attends them, though they remain individuals they expand to embrace it and summon it to embrace them. . . .<sup>35</sup>

The fairness of this criticism aside, Forster is trying to define the appeal of Eliot's novel for him, and to find a possibility beyond its limitation. It is about God, Infinity, but it is not itself infinite but limited to her own version and, therefore, cannot be all-embracing. This manner of criticism is also a sign of Eliot's influence on Forster, and her novels might well have assisted him in his working out the problem of social difference. Could Margaret embrace Mr. Wilcox? Could Helen embrace Leonard Bast? Could Howards End embrace them all?

A few more words about the ambiguity which envelops the sort of criticism both Forster and Lawrence tend to make against George Eliot. She was the great novelist of the previous century whose limitations they felt keenly and tried to outgrow. In doing so, they tended to exaggerate her shortcomings without sufficiently acknowledging their debt to her. Readers in general have fallen into this trap and been deceived by the apparent disparity between their handling of moral, and in particular sexual issues in their work. This is especially true of Lawrence. However, if we look at the following words from his essay, along with Jessie Chambers's notes to which I drew attention, we can at once observe two sides of Lawrence's reaction to George Eliot's "pattern":

. . . just as there are many men in the world, there are many masculine theories of what women should be. But men run to type, and it is the type, not the individual, that produces the theory, or "ideal" of woman. . . . Dante arrived with a chaste and untouched Beatrice, and chaste and untouched Beatrices began to march self-importantly through the centuries. The Renaissance discovered the learned woman, and learned women buzzed mildly into verse and prose. Dickens invented the child-wife, so child-wives have swarmed ever since. He also fished out his version of the chaste

Beatrice, a chaste but marriageable Agnes. *George Eliot imitated this pattern*, and it became confirmed. The noble woman, the pure spouse, the devoted mother took the field, and was simply worked to death.<sup>36</sup> (my italics)

The “pattern” here refers to George Eliot’s use of the ideal “type” of woman, “noble”, “chaste”, “learned”, and “pure”, which had been handed down from Dante and secularized (turned “marriageable”) by Dickens. This seems to hold true if we only see Dorothea as a woman who marries Casaubon for learning and pure spiritual purpose. But the later development which shakes Dorothea’s ideal frame—and certainly Maggie Tulliver and Gwendolen Harleth—shows that this is not the whole picture of Eliot’s women. To some degree, Lawrence could say that George Eliot “imitated” this pattern, but she certainly did not initiate it. She, too, was the inheritor, and she had to enter her own struggle with her heritage. We know also from Jessie’s notes that Lawrence used the word “plan” to describe the usual pattern of Eliot’s novels (to take two couples and develop their relationship) which, we could say, he “imitated” or inherited from her and her tradition. Such a “plan” involves a more dynamic and multi-dimensional development than the use of a simply ideal “type”. Lawrence seems to have sensed that there are two sides to the pattern which women follow in George Eliot’s novels.

## (2) *Antigone*, the Greek Tragedy

If such a pattern exists in Eliot’s novels and if it is inherited, consciously or unconsciously, by Lawrence and Forster, what older literature lies behind this pattern and is reflected in the works of all three novelists? More generally: Was there a common experience of literature, which particularly characterizes the three novelists?

To the general question, the answer which immediately comes to mind is the Authorized Version of the Bible, already referred to, and Shakespeare. As F. R. Leavis pointed out,<sup>37</sup> especially the beginning of *The Rainbow* and many parts of Lawrence’s novels reflect George Eliot’s description of the English farm life, and what echoes in both is the language of the Authorized Version. Not only its rhythm but the religious images and references to the Bible appear frequently in both novelists’ works. Perhaps no English novelist could escape Shakespeare’s influence, and I have elsewhere discussed the relationship between *Hamlet* and *Women in Love* (Gerald Crich’s death) and *Howards End* (Leonard Bast’s death).<sup>38</sup> Another influence of no less, possibly more, significance would be that of Greek tragedy; Sophocles’s *Antigone* has a particular relevance to the ‘pattern’ of the novel mentioned above.

It is specifically the drama of ‘the sisters’ in *Antigone* and possibly also in *Electra* that has relevance. In the Prologue of Sophocles’s *Antigone*, there is a debate between the sisters: Antigone assents that she must bury the exposed corpse of their brother, against Creon’s order and the threat of the death-penalty. Ismene, her sister, argues that burying the dead, which is normally an obligation, ceases to be so if the attempt leads to another’s death; that it is anyway useless to make an attempt that cannot succeed; and that “we are women, not meant to fight against men.”<sup>39</sup> Antigone and Ismene, the

daughters of the tragic Theban king Oedipus, had two brothers, both of whom died in the last battle, one fighting for the city and the other against it on the side of the outside force. It is the body of Polyneices that Creon, their uncle and the new king, has forbidden to be buried. The ancient Greeks believed that the dead, unless given proper burial, would for ever have to wander over the earth. Creon's order is the severest punishment of the dead man, and his family can hardly be expected to bear it. But obviously Creon regards loyalty to the city and to his Law as of primary importance, and expects everybody to obey it before anything else. Individuals suffer in such a situation, but their reactions turn out differently. Antigone's voice is that of a passionate, emotional, disobedient, revolutionary, even mad, and fearless individual. Ismene's voice is that of a sensible, practical, obedient, conservative, and humanly fearful individual. Although her arguments seem strong, they are backed by fear rather than conviction. She doesn't dare to break the pattern. Yet the later development of the drama, as we shall see, tells us that their personalities are not fixed but undergo changes and that at some points they *almost* exchange roles. Even Antigone has to suffer fear and depression after she has completed her action and faces the punishment of slow death among the dead: even Ismene cries before Creon that she wishes she had joined her sister to bury their brother and that she now wants to be punished with her. Still, there is a clear gap between the sisters, which Antigone does not allow her sister to forget.

Andrew Brown, who recently translated *Antigone*, wrote:

Most critics allow that she [Antigone] is no plaster saint, for there can be no moral justification for her rudeness and cruelty to Ismene. . . . Now most critics still assume, with little argument, that she was under a genuine moral and religious obligation to attempt the burial. . . . The 'ordinary Greek' was not a religious fanatic, and god's commandments were not laid down for him in any sacred books. They were indeed 'unwritten rules' (545-5), resting only on man's subjective impression of what was right and fitting. They would hardly, then, have so transcended common sense as to demand that the living should sacrifice themselves for the dead.<sup>40</sup>

From this point of view, one could analyse the debate between the sisters as the conflict between common sense and the fanatical pursuit of religious (or transcendent) action. One might call the latter 'heroic action' because Sophoclean heroes are "exceptional individuals . . . set apart from the common run of men by their inflexible adherence to some principle, whatever the cost to themselves and those around them."<sup>41</sup>

The same pattern is recognizable in *Middlemarch*—especially in the opening chapter, in the contrastive description of the two sisters and the verbal exchange between them over their dead mother's jewelry. George Steiner must have noticed this when he said in his book on the Antigone myth:

George Eliot, in the inward fabric of whose *Middlemarch* the figure of Antigone was to play so subtle and formative a role, riposted. . . . The conflict staged by Sophocles was of a timeless urgency. It



dramatized clashes of private conscience and public welfare of a nature and seriousness inseparable from the historical, social condition of man. Indeed, Eliot read the Sophoclean text as possessing an insistent closeness to her own most absolute concerns. The Greek play enacts 'that struggle between elemental tendencies and established laws by which the outer life of man is gradually and painfully brought into harmony with his inward needs'.<sup>42</sup>

George Eliot's own essay, "The Antigone and Its Moral", upon which Steiner's argument is based, stresses the conflict between Creon and Antigone as the conflict between "the duties of citizenship" and "the impulse of sisterly piety" but also recognizes more subtle movements of their minds beneath their expressed thoughts:

... both are also conscious that, in following out one principle, they are laying themselves open to just blame for transgressing another; and it is this consciousness which secretly heightens the exasperation of Creon and the defiant hardness of Antigone.<sup>43</sup>

Perhaps we can attribute "this consciousness" to Ismene's role as constant reminder of common sense to Antigone.

Both Brown and Steiner, from different viewpoints, try to reassert the importance of Ismene's role (the equivalent of Antigone's) in their sisterhood and conflict, for later Romantic ideas in art and literature, they believe, have been unjust to her. Especially Steiner describes the later versions as follows:

In Rotrou's *La Thebaïde* (first performed in 1638), in Racine's version, in Alfieri's, it is the figure of Argia which replaces that of Ismene. The same is true of numerous baroque operatic treatments. Antigone-Argia duets, united in pathos, replace the tense dialectic of the two sisters. It is not until the modern period and the eclipse of Statius that playwrights and commentators restore to Ismene her Sophoclean presence.<sup>44</sup>

Steiner also blames (so does George Eliot) Matthew Arnold for saying that "an action like the action of the Antigone of Sophocles, which turns upon the conflict between the heroine's duty to her brother's corpse and that to the laws of her country, is no longer one in which it is possible that we should feel a deep interest".<sup>45</sup>

The fact that George Eliot took the conflict between the two sisters in Sophocles's play and introduced it into her novel, is an indication of its timeless appeal and the possibility of modern interpretation. Indeed, the name *Antigone* itself appears when the German artist Naumann calls Dorothea "a sort of Christian Antigone", but to treat it simply as a definition of one character would limit the perspective of the novel. Thus how Celia is portrayed and how Dorothea herself varies from Sophocles's unbending, unchanging Antigone (unchanging at least in action and principle) needs to be studied in detail. In other words, George Eliot's reading of the subtle, implied drama in *Antigone*, involves both conscious and unconscious actions, and also its further development.

Roughly speaking, Dorothea is an Antigone without overt violence, with patience

and efforts at sympathy, and also with intellectual needs. Celia is Ismene on a smaller scale, with less sense of tragedy or greatness, at first less assured in face of Dorothea's spiritual fervor, and yet after her own marriage (which is most successful in terms of upper bourgeois 'common sense') Celia grows into a matronly figure who feels herself entitled to 'lecture' her sister who is so unworldly. Unlike Ismene, Celia never steps out of her own sphere in order to really understand or interpret Dorothea's greatness for the world. Even more than Celia, Dorothea is a growing, changing figure, unlike Antigone who sticks to her principle with stubborn exclusiveness to the end. The contention between the sisters is as it were brought inside Dorothea herself, instead of on to the open Greek stage.

One more piece of evidence shows George Eliot's deep interest in Sophocles :

When R. C. Jebb (at Trinity, Cambridge) asked how Sophocles had influenced her, he was startled to hear her say, 'In the delineation of the great primitive emotions'.<sup>46</sup>

How this is reflected on the delineation of Dorothea's inner drama will be another point of focus when we study the novel.

There is similar direct evidence of E. M. Forster's interest in Sophocles's *Antigone*, though the tone of the reference is strikingly different :

I suggest, furthermore, that when you feel that you could almost have written the book yourself—that's the moment when it's influencing you. . . . I don't suppose that I could have written the *Divine Comedy* or the *Decline and Fall*. I don't even think I could have written the *Antigone* of Sophocles, though of all the great tragic utterances that comes closest to my heart, that is my central faith.<sup>47</sup>

Whatever his 'central faith' might signify—and probably it means loyalty to personal impulse and reverence for the beloved individual rather than obedience to the state—Forster's deeper faith seems to lie in the 'common' experience of man. He places the community of people's understanding beyond the transcendent, exceptional experience itself. For Forster, at least half the virtue of a transcendent action would be gone if it had no relevance to the common run of mind. Although he seems half to dismiss *Antigone* as beyond the sphere of common understanding, we must remember that tragedy can be the utterance of the struggle of the exceptional individual against the common understanding, which ideally should be widened and enriched by it. Forster, with his temperament, is more likely to have read tragedy that way whenever such an interpretation is possible.

If we make this assumption, the choice of *Antigone* out of all tragedies becomes more meaningful because it implies Forster's recognition of Ismene's part in the play. Hers is the common mind which shares the feelings and thoughts of the chorus, changeable as they are; and she can also act as critic and interpreter of Antigone's action because they share the royal blood, the experience of its tragedy, and there is a sisterly feeling between them.

Certainly it is difficult to know exactly how Forster read Ismene. If her role is merely passive and acquires some sort of significance only when she understands and learns from Antigone's heroic action, *Antigone* can become a convenient example for supporting the liberal ideal of the especially talented individual leading the common mass. It is tempting to think Forster entertained this view, self-flattering as it is, and to associate it with his problem of limitation of an intellectual, but Forster cannot be so easily summed up. For one thing, I believe, and I think Forster recognized, that Ismene plays a more active role in the play. Indeed, he may have wished that her role had been even more active. He suggests, as we saw, that the experience which comes 'closer' to his heart is one in which he as reader feels he has not learned something greater than himself but that he could have written the book himself. This emphasis on the community between author and reader, placed above his "central faith", tips the balance further towards common, prosaic understanding, away from the romantic, Victorian liberal ideals of the especially talented individual leading and educating the mass.

In *Howards End*, the weight of Margaret's "prose" (her effort at connecting people, and her more practical ways) against Helen's "poetry" (her effort at spiritually uplifting Leonard Bast and her exclusive ideas) seems to reverse Antigone's predominance over Ismene in Sophocles's play. Both sisters are highly spiritual, but Margaret, who has more common sense and practical wisdom, consciously seeks a connection with the businessman Mr. Wilcox. Thus, Margaret is Ismene given weight, and Helen is Antigone seen critically. Helen, too, is trying to find a connection, seeking to 'cultivate' the spiritual passion in Leonard Bast, who is socially downtrodden and yet aspires to culture; however, she is doing it because of her belief in the individual as against society; and she is against the Wilcoxes who run society.

It is even possible to find Creon in Mr. Wilcox, who is a confident businessman, in his own way trying to improve the state of society (its circulation system, typified by the building of the dock on the Thames), but willing to recognize nothing outside the scope of his business mind. He is a sort of Edwardian or Victorian ideal of a good-humoured, well-meaning, reliable business-tyrant who is relentless in money matters but lenient and indulgent towards his family, and also towards 'culture' which, though a matter for women and children, is part of his status, and *as long as it does not interfere*. That intervention comes from women, especially when Helen demands that he take a moral responsibility beyond his business responsibility, for misdirecting Leonard Bast's career (due to a change of market values after he gave advice). That is the major clash which creates an *Antigone*-like drama. But Margaret, too, has several near-clashes with Mr. Wilcox, between the feelings and thoughts which do not meet, as for instance when he refuses to face his moral responsibility for having bought a prostitute and betrayed his first wife. Margaret has to adjust conflicting emotions within herself and tell herself sensibly that his cheap affair took place before she met him and, therefore, does not personally concern her. But a more decisive clash comes when things do concern her personally.

As I shall show in later chapters, there are many plots and sub-plots besides the

subtle differentiation of character which complicate the drama in *Howards End*, but basically its pattern grows out of *Antigone*, whether Forster took it directly from there or from another later source. There is good reason to suppose that he had *Antigone* in mind, but that does not exclude the possibility of his having studied a later literary model as well.

The relationship between the individual and society is a major theme also with Lawrence. For him, too, Sophocles as much as Shakespeare and the Bible, became a crucial reference for his reading in and writing about literature. One instance is to be found in his *study of Thomas Hardy*:

And this is the quality Hardy shares with the great writers, Shakespeare or Sophocles or Tolstoi, this setting behind the small action of his protagonists the terrific action of unfathomed nature, setting a smaller system of morality, the one grasped and formulated by the human consciousness within the vast, uncomprehended and incomprehensible morality of nature or of life itself, surpassing human consciousness. The difference is, that whereas in Shakespeare or Sophocles the greater, uncomprehended morality, or fate, is actively transgressed and gives active punishment, in Hardy and Tolstoi the lesser, human morality, the mechanical system is actively transgressed, and holds, and punishes the protagonist, whilst the greater morality is only passively, negatively transgressed, it is represented merely as being present in background, in scenery, not taking any active part, having no direct connection with the protagonist.<sup>48</sup>

What is unique is Lawrence's use of the word *morality*, the social term, for both "the greater morality", which is of nature and, therefore, transcends established society and human knowledge, and "the lesser, human morality" which is of society, the limited, known, "mechanical system". This shows both his characteristic stand against social morals and his persistent social need—the need for a greater morality which is not of society and yet can embrace the whole of society. The result is the ambivalence and difficulty latent in his simplistic statements, which often verges on dogmatism or misinterpretation in case of essays on other writers and thinkers. Here, Lawrence's appraisal of Sophocles is seemingly too simple. What may pass for *Oedipus* may not pass with *Antigone* so easily, for that conflict between Antigone and Ismene involves more than the simple dichotomy of the great and the small. As will be seen in my later discussion, it is not merely the drama of a heroine overcoming common sense but the drama of tension and its impact on the characters who go through change.

Suppose Lawrence himself recognized the significance of the sisters' contention in *Antigone*. There is evidence which seems to support this view. Lawrence, writing to thank Dollie Radford for sending him her play, remarked:

There is to me something rather terrible in the idea of the chorus of unloved women chanting against the chorus of prostitutes—some-

thing really Great in the conception. That is the most splendid part of the play. I wish you could have made the Margery a sterner, more aloof, more completely abstract or generalised figure—as Antigone in a Greek play—so that she is a figure of vengeance as well as of love: and the same with Carol. Those who know how to love must know how to slay. If we are not to be given up to love, then let us be given up to the contest with the dragon. . . . For there is the dragon preventing us.<sup>49</sup>

Finding the conflict between two types of women, both spiritually unloved but one accepting physical love and the other renouncing it, Lawrence immediately thought of Antigone as “sterner, more aloof” from the ordinary, practical herd and, therefore, is “more completely abstract or generalised”. Considering that this letter was written in April 1915 and that Lawrence began *The Sisters* in 1913 and finished *Women in Love* in 1916, it is natural to suppose that *Antigone* was very much on his mind (at least at some stage) during the time of composition.

However, it is not easy to tell in *Women in Love* who is Antigone and who is Ismene. Although Gudrun is the more outwardly exceptional woman, an artist, who strikes “the first” and “the last” blow at Gerald and drives him to death (which reminds us that Antigone’s disobedience to the point of death caused Creon’s son to kill himself in shame), there is the fierceness of virginity in Ursula as well, though it is considerably toned down from her relentlessness towards Skrebensky in *The Rainbow*. In a way, Ursula is the more persistent pursuer of the ideal and the spiritual, and her sense of ‘connection’ is not just common sense and obedience to authority (which she rejects anyway) but a deeper feeling of heritage which Lawrence had to explore as the blood-connection in *The Rainbow*. (Chronologically, *The Rainbow* comes before *Women in Love*, but both developed from *The Sisters* which had basically the same pattern as *Women in Love*.) On the other hand, Gudrun is more of a woman of the world, knowing how to swim in the hostile environment of the city, how to be socially impressive, and how to get what she wants—contrary to the self-conscious, often baffled and awkward Ursula. Moreover, in conversation with Ursula, Gudrun often resents her sister’s ultimate questions because she “did not want to be too definite” (*WL*, p. 9),<sup>50</sup> which seems to show a further link with ‘common sense’. It is certainly a far cry from Ismene’s common sense or Celia Brooke’s, but they are linked by their sense of self-preservation in society. So there is a mixture of Antigone and Ismene in both Ursula and Gudrun, highly transformed, and yet they still form a contrast to each other.

I could give more details at this point to prove that those novels, *Middlemarch*, *Howards End*, and *Women in Love*, follow the pattern of *Antigone* and transform it in different manners. For instance, there is a Creon, or Creons, not only in *Howards End* but also in *Middlemarch* and *Women in Love*. I will leave this to later discussions—to a more detailed analysis of the texts themselves—because what is more important than mere facts of similarity and difference are their meanings and nuances: how and why they are similar, how and why they are different. It is our task to give that interpretation.

### (3) The 'Sisters' and the Common Heritage

Calvin Bedient, criticizing Leavis, wrote :

In his book *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist*, F. R. Leavis asserts, as an "important truth," that "Lawrence belongs to the same ethical and religious tradition as George Eliot." Thus in the opening scenes of *The Rainbow* Leavis explains, "George Eliot would have recognized the known and poignantly familiar. . . ." But what, exactly, is "important" in this? The common "tradition" it implicates is scarcely more than geographical. It tells us, not what these writers "belong" to, but what they had absorbed in their youth—what, in a sense, belongs to them. The truth is that George Eliot would have viewed the life of Marsh Farm through a lens entirely foreign to Lawrence's—a lens different, precisely, because it *was* ethical,<sup>51</sup>

and he characterized Eliot as "ethical" and Lawrence as "aesthetic and religious". It is quite likely that they had different lenses, but were their lenses so "entirely foreign" to each other? What I have been trying to do is to find the common axis for "what they had absorbed", what they particularly noticed, commented on or took into their work, out of the common heritage. It is not just what they read but how they read it. The same is true with their experience in life. Given that common axis, one can see how the different lenses focus on it, and one is likely to see more clearly how those lenses work.

The image of two sisters, particularly in *Antigone* but also elsewhere<sup>52</sup>, offers one axis (though not the only one) around which we can observe the problems the novelists shared in life, in reading, and in writing novels—spiritual passion vs. practical sense, the individual vs. society, personal distinction, education, social-estrangement, tensions in personal relationships, close ties or estrangement between parent and child, between family members. . . . It seems that we can fruitfully compare George Eliot, Forster, and Lawrence by focusing our attention on the image and studying how it is interpreted, divested, and transformed into various forms in individual works.

In the following chapters, I shall compare the texts of *Middlemarch*, *Howards End*, and *Women in Love*, from this viewpoint.

#### Notes

- 1 Gordon Haight, *George Eliot: A Biography* (Penguin Literary Biographies: New York, 1985; 1st pub. by Oxford Univ. Press, 1968), p. 547.
- 2 C. f. *Selected Letters of E. M. Forster*, ed. by Mary Lago and P. N. Furbank (Collins: London, 1983); *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, II, ed. by George J. Zytaruk and James T. Boulton (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981).
- 3 John Beer, "The Last Englishman': Lawrence's Appreciation of Forster", pp. 248-249.
- 4 John Beer, p. 261.
- 5 Masako Hirai, "Chichioya Fuzai No Paradox: *Sons and Lovers* O Megutte" ["The Absent Father: The Paradox of *Sons and Lovers*"], *The English Literary Studies*, LXIII, ii (Tokyo, Dec. 1986).

- 6 P. N. Furbank, *E. M. Forster: A Life*, I (London: Secker and Warburg, 1977), p. 67.
- 7 The Manuscript of BBC Talk on "D. H. Lawrence" by E. M. Forster, in King's College Archive. C. f. *Listner*, III, 1xviii (30 April 1930), pp. 753-4.
- 8 *Ibid.*
- 9 Furbank, p. 174.
- 10 The Manuscript of BBC Talk on "D. H. Lawrence" by Forster.
- 11 Furbank, pp. 49-50.
- 12 George A. Panichas, "E. M. Forster and D. H. Lawrence: Their Views on Education", *Renaissance and Modern Essays*, ed. by G. R. Hibbard (Routledge and Kegan Paul: London, 1966), pp. 200-11.
- 13 *Ibid.*, p. 205.
- 14 *Letters from D. H. Lawrence to Martin Secker 1911-1930* (privately published, 1970). C. f. John Beer, Notes.
- 15 See William Meyers, *The Teaching of George Eliot* (Leicester Univ. Press, 1984), esp. p. 8, for their universal ideas on the origin of religions in primitive cultures.
- 16 See "Dickinson and McTaggart" in S. P. Rosenbaum, *Victorian Bloomsbury: The Early Literary History of the Bloomsbury Group*, I (Macmillan: London, 1987).
- 17 *Westminster Review*, 93 (Apr. 1970), p. 346.
- 18 Haight, *George Eliot: A Biography*, p. 49.
- 19 *The George Eliot Letters*, ed. by Gordon Haight (Yale Univ. Press: New Haven, 1954-6), I, pp. 163-8.
- 20 Gordon Haight, *George Eliot and John Chapman* (Yale Univ. Press: New Haven, 1940), p. 186.
- 21 Charles Bray, *Autobiography*, pp. 74-5—quoted in Haight, *George Eliot: A Biography*, p. 44.
- 22 Haight, *George Eliot: A Biography*, p. 44.
- 23 *George Eliot's Life as Related in Her Letters and Journals*, arranged and edited by J. W. Cross (1855; New ed., Blackwood: Edinburgh and London, 1887), p. 58.
- 24 For instance, Elza Lynn, who visited Dr. Brabant in 1847, was convinced that he was the original of Mr. Casaubon. C. f. Haight, *George Eliot: A Biography*, pp. 50-1.
- 25 See Haight, *George Eliot: A Biography*.
- 26 In George Eliot's Notebook, U. C. Knoepfelmacher noticed the name of a theologian and linguist in Shakespeare's time, Isaac Casaubon, and found both in this erudite representative of the Renaissance and in his equally productive but less unenthusiastic son some specific parallels with Casaubon of the novel. C. f. Knoepfelmacher, "Fusing Fact and Myth: The New Reality of *Middlemarch*", *This Particular Web: Essays on Middlemarch*, ed. by Ian Adam (Univ. of Toronto Press, 1975), pp. 53-8. Richard Ellmann, after giving the list of possible models for Casaubon (Pattison, Herbert Spencer, Brabant, Jacob Bryant, and Robert Mackay), wrote: "... putting these Casaubon *manqués* aside, we come to George Eliot herself. F. W. H. Myers related in the *Century Magazine* for November 1881, that when asked where she had found Casaubon, 'with a humorous solemnity, which was quite in earnest, nevertheless, she pointed to her own heart.'... What must be sought is not a Casaubon, but Casubonism, and this George Eliot found, as Flaubert found *le bovarysme*, in himself."—Ellmann, "Dorothea's Husbands", from *Golden Codgers: Biographical Speculations* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1973) repr. in the Norton Critical Edition of *Middlemarch*, ed. by Bert G. Hornback (Norton: New York, 1977), p. 755.
- 27 C. f. "The treatment of Will Ladislav in the novel seems to me to be unsatisfactory, and to fail to achieve that attachment and detachment that give the other important characters in their novel their three-dimensional quality. For this reason I shall say very little about him and the parts of the novel in which he plays an important part, because although his role is conceived

- as significantly related to Dorothea's, his presence is in fact ineffectual."—R. T. Jones, *George Eliot* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1970), p. 81. "He [Ladislaw] is not (everyone agrees) substantially 'there' . . . we are expected to share a valuation of them [Dorothea and Ladislaw] extravagantly higher than any we can for a moment countenance."—F. R. Leavis, *The Great Tradition: George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad* (1948; Penguin Books, 1962), p. 92.
- 28 See Paul Delaney, *D. H. Lawrence's Nightmare: The Writer and His Circle in the Years of the Great War* (Basic Books: New York, 1978), pp. 213–315, esp. pp. 229–30.
- 29 Haight, *George Eliot: A Biography*, pp. 131–2.
- 30 See Delaney, *D. H. Lawrence's Nightmare*, and Furbank.
- 31 Furbank, p. 52.
- 32 E. T. [Jessie Chambers], *D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record* (1935; Frank Cass: London, 1965), p. 103.
- 33 John Beer, writing on Forster's dependency on the link with his mother for the maintenance of his certain values "in an age growingly dominated by scepticism", comments: "What is being suggested here bears on the points made by Wilfred Stone. . . that in Forster's early fictions love is often seen as a kind of 'spiritual currency'; and by Richard Parkinson—that in *Howards End* the dominating question, who shall inherit England?, is almost identifiable with the question, who shall inherit the spirit of Mrs. Wilcox?"—John Beer, " 'The Last Englishman': Lawrence's Appreciation of Forster", p. 262. We should not forget, however, that the term "spiritual currency" and also "the single ticket" to *Howards End*, which Margaret buys for joining Mrs. Wilcox and to which Parkinson draws our attention, both contain the double meaning of money and spirit, and the strength of Parkinson's argument lies partly with his diagrammatic and symmetrical view of all who appear in *Howards End* around (not excluded from) the house. Particularly, his recognition of Mr. Wilcox's "spiritual acuteness or his charm", "the self-confidence and optimism of youth", his "common sense. . . normally far more practically sensitive than the blind rationality of Charles", etc. is helpful for reminding us of his important role for the house. C. f. R. N. Parkinson, "The Inheritors; or A Single Ticket for *Howards End*", *E. M. Forster: A Human Exploration*, pp. 55–68. Also in the same book, Wilfred Stone, "Forster on Profit and Loss", pp. 69–78.
- 34 E. M. Forster, *Two Cheers for Democracy*, ed. by Oliver Stallybrass (1951; Arnold: London, 1972), p. 27.
- 35 E. M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel*, ed. by Oliver Stallybrass (1927; Arnold: London, 1974), p. 91.
- 36 D. H. Lawrence, "Give Her a Pattern", *Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works by D. H. Lawrence*, coll. and ed. with an introduction and notes by Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore (Heinemann: London, 1968), p. 535.
- 37 C. f. F. R. Leavis, *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist* (Chatto and Windus: London, 1967).
- 38 C. f. Masako Hirai, "No More Hamlet?—Around the Death of Gerald Crich", *The English Studies* (The English Literary Society of Japan: Tokyo), LVIII, i (1981).
- 39 C. f. Sophocles, *Antigone*, ed. with translation and notes by Andrew Brown (Aris and Phillips: Warminster, Wiltshire, 1987), 58–60, 65–8, 78–9, 90, 92, and 61–2.
- 40 Brown, "Introduction" to *Antigone*, pp. 7–8.
- 41 *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- 42 George Steiner, *Antigones: The Antigone Myth in Western Literature, Art and Thought* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1986), p. 5.
- 43 George Eliot, "The Antigone and Its Moral" (29 March 1986) in *Essays of George Eliot*, ed. by Thomas Pinney (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1963).



- 44 Steiner, p. 146.
- 45 *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- 46 Haight, *George Eliot: A Biography*, p. 464.
- 47 Forster, *Two Cheers for Democracy*, p. 215.
- 48 D. H. Lawrence, *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*, ed. by Bruce Steele (Camb. Univ. Press, 1985), p. 29.
- 49 *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, II, ed. by George J. Zytaruk and James T. Boulton (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981), p. 316.
- 50 WL stands for D. H. Lawrence, *Women in Love*, ed. by David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987).
- 51 Calvin Bedient, *Architects of the Self: George Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, and E. M. Forster* (Univ. of California Press: Berkeley, 1972), p. 98.
- 52 For instance, Gilian Beer offers the story of 'The Two Sisters' in *The Arabian Nights* (where Princess Parizade wads her ears in order not to hear the terrible noises on the way to find and hear the sweet music of the bird, the tree, and the fountain) as a possible inspiration for George Eliot's later novels. —Gilian Beer, *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Routledge and Kegan Paul: London, 1983), pp. 55–8. There are enough parallels to support this view.

(Received December 2, 1988)