



Swansea University  
Prifysgol Abertawe



## Swansea University E-Theses

---

# Cinematic ways of seeing in the novels of D.H. Lawrence.

England, Adam John

### How to cite:

---

England, Adam John (2002) *Cinematic ways of seeing in the novels of D.H. Lawrence.*. thesis, Swansea University.  
<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa42423>

### Use policy:

---

This item is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence: copies of full text items may be used or reproduced in any format or medium, without prior permission for personal research or study, educational or non-commercial purposes only. The copyright for any work remains with the original author unless otherwise specified. The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder. Permission for multiple reproductions should be obtained from the original author.

Authors are personally responsible for adhering to copyright and publisher restrictions when uploading content to the repository.

Please link to the metadata record in the Swansea University repository, Cronfa (link given in the citation reference above.)

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/library/researchsupport/ris-support/>

1

Cinematic  
Ways of Seeing  
in the  
Novels of  
D.H.Lawrence

Adam John England

Submitted to the University of Wales in fulfilment  
of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy of English

University of Wales Swansea 2002

ProQuest Number: 10798131

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10798131

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346





## Summary

This thesis aims to identify and analyse the cinematic ways of seeing in Lawrence's novels by comparing the novels to the films adapted from them. Methodologically, the cinematic ways of seeing are initially identified in the novels by a series of pointers which are derived from Lawrence's comments on the cinema in his letters, novels, short stories and essays. These ways of seeing, once identified, are compared to the ways of seeing in the film adaptations. The films are considered as works of art in their own right, but the focus falls on them as metanarratives, the analysis of which draws out characteristics of the novels' ways of seeing. The thesis's introduction presents Lawrence's own comments on the cinema, and thus facilitates connections between the novels' ways of seeing and Lawrence's life. The connections suggest that the ways of seeing are expressions of Lawrence's experiences as a son, a lover, a husband, an outcast and a traveller. In each role, especially that of the outcast during and after the war, there is a gulf between him and society which is reflected in his characters' and narrators' ways of seeing. This alienation has its counterpart in the form of the novels and generates some of the prototypical tropes of modernism and postmodernism. Lawrence understood that seeing is a form of relationship; that how we see is as important as what we see; and that it is in our seeing that the drama between health and sickness in each individual is played out. This thesis will study aspects of that drama through its analysis of ways of seeing in three of Lawrence's novels and their film adaptations.

DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date ..... 29/4/02

STATEMENT 1

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date ..... 29/4/02

STATEMENT 2

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loans, and for the title and summary to made available to outside organisations.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date ..... 29/4/02.

## Contents

List of abbreviations 6

Introduction: A History of Lawrence and the Cinema 9

*Sons and Lovers* 84

*Women in Love* 160

*Kangaroo* 294

Bibliography 350

Filmography 370

### **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the following people and organisations: My supervisor, John Turner, without whom the thesis would not exist; my family, for believing in me and encouraging me; Claire Smith, who was there in the beginning; Claire Atwell, who was there for me when I needed someone; Véronique Ayme, who was extremely patient; Tricia Hodge, whose love and support helped me re-write the thesis; Craig Thomas, Robert Fell and Beverley Thomas, who have been great friends; the examiners, whose comments helped to shape the thesis into its current form; the English Department at Swansea University; the Gilchrist Educational Trust, and the Professional Classes Aid Council, who helped me financially at critical moments; CATCH!, who employed me, and gave me crucial ideas; Robbie and Max, the two dogs; Michael Bell, for his encouragement; Julian Bahari, Gill Clement, Ryan and Anna Guest, Brett Lyons, Phil Jones and David Morgan. I cannot remember everyone else who helped, but there are many of them, and I would like to express my thanks here, and apologise for not mentioning you by name.

Guide to Abbreviations and Editions.

A - *Apocalypse*. Ed. Mara Kalnins. London: Penguin 1995.

AR - *Aaron's Rod*. Ed. Mara Kalnins. London: Penguin 1995.

BB - *The Boy in the Bush*. Ed. Paul Eggert. London: Penguin 1996.

CP - *The Complete Poems of D.H.Lawrence*. Eds. Vivian de Sola Pinto and Warren Roberts.  
London: Heinemann 1964.

E - *England, My England and Other Stories*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge University  
Press 1988.

FU - *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. No editor listed. London: Penguin 1986.

I - *Twilight in Italy*. Ed. Paul Eggert. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1994.

K - *Kangaroo*. Ed. Bruce Steele. London: Penguin 1997.

L - *Letters*. General Ed. James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1979 - 1991.

LCL - *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Ed. John Lyon. London: Penguin 1990.

LG - *The Lost Girl*. Ed. John Worthen. London: Penguin 1995.

P - *Phoenix*. Ed. Edward McDonald. London: Heinemann 1936.

P2 - *Phoenix II*. Eds. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore. London: Heinemann 1968.

PO - *Pornography and Obscenity in Phoenix*. London: Faber and Faber 1929.

PU - *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious*. London: Penguin 1986.

R - *The Rainbow*. Ed. Mark Kinkead-Weekes. London: Penguin 1995.

RDP - *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays*. Ed. Michael Herbert.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1988.

SL - *Sons and Lovers*. Eds. Helen Baron and Carl Baron. London: Penguin 1994.

SS - *D.H. Lawrence: Selected Short Stories*. Ed. Brian Finney. London: Penguin 1989.

TH - *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge  
University Press 1985.

TI - *Twilight in Italy*. With an Introduction by Richard Aldington. London: Heinemann 1956.

WL - *Women in Love*. Eds. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen. London: Penguin 1995.

WL (i) - *The First 'Women in Love'*. Eds. John Worthen and Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998.

WP - *The White Peacock*. Ed. Andrew Robertson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1983.

## Introduction: A History of Lawrence and the Cinema.

This thesis explores the cinematic ways of seeing in some of Lawrence's novels by comparing these novels with the films based on them. A rudimentary key, or constellation, of pointers to these ways of seeing is summarised in the following paragraph. Please note that to facilitate a chronology the source inspiration and date of each pointer as it has appeared in connection with Lawrence and his work are given in parentheses. This first chapter will also list the references to the cinema in Lawrence's work in chronological order, drawing out their contributions to Lawrence's understanding of the cinema.

The first two pointers are mechanical watching, or, as Lawrence calls it, 'Kodak-vision' (*Creative Evolution*, Bergson, 1911), and mechanical time, or the artifice of the moment (*ibid.*). This sense of the mechanical leads into the dancing and dithering pictures of the cinematograph in *Sons and Lovers* (1913) and *The Lost Girl* (1920). The flickering, jerky action of the pictures is thus a further pointer to the cinematic way of seeing in Lawrence's prose. These initial pointers, which centre on subject/object relations and the actual hardware of the cinema, circumscribe a basic concept of the cinema which the subsequent pointers elucidate. The voyeurism intrinsic to watching a film, and the sadism and masochism associated with such perception, are detectable in *The Rainbow* (1915), as are the mechanical forces or power, like brilliant electric light, which are essential for film projection. Additionally, *The Rainbow* features methods of narration which resemble film techniques such as close-ups, framed action and tracking shots. These characteristics exist in prototypical form in *Sons and Lovers*, too. Notably, the tracking shot is developed in the later novels, especially *Women in Love* (1920), *Kangaroo* (1922) and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928). *Women in Love* (1920) and *The Lost Girl* (1920) graft more detail to



Lawrence's concept of the cinema. The language of the occult<sup>1</sup> which accrues at potentially cinematic moments in *Women in Love* links the cinema with a sense of absence, a sense of that which must be summonsed rather than that which is actually there. This sense also unfolds in *The Lost Girl* where there is an awareness that a film tells its story using effigies of an absent reality located in a flat, non-dimensional diegesis. The final pointers, which are derived from work published towards the end of Lawrence's life, accentuate his concept of cinema as unlovely and unnatural. Mainly, these pointers are stereotypical images of beauty in 'Film Passion' (*Pansies*, 1928), black and white pictures in 'When I Went to the Film' (*ibid.*), and sentimentality or counterfeit emotion (*A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 1929).

Shortly, the history of the above pointers will be traced. Prior to explaining how they have been worked out, there are some crucial words associated with the key which, in the context of this thesis, require a working definition. The first and most obvious of these is 'cinema'. The second is 'montage'. It is useful to provide an overarching definition of both words, as well as an indication of what they might mean in Lawrence's oeuvre.

To begin with the word 'cinema', it has an array of meanings. Originally spelled with a 'k', it seems to have been derived from 'kinematic' (relating to pure motion, i.e. to action considered abstractly, without reference to force or mass) and 'kinematics' (considered without reference to the matter or objects moved, or to the force producing or changing the motion (*OED*, 1989, 442)). Obviously, the reference to the abstraction of force from motion and mass from objects encompasses a parallel divorce in the cinema where force and mass become illusions of movement and presence generated by the projection of a series of instantaneous photographs (taken in rapid

11

succession) on to a screen. According to the *OED*, 'cinema', as well as referring to the underlying philosophy of the medium, also refers to the place a film is shown, as well as cinema films collectively. It is clearly serendipitous that the *OED* uses not one but two quotations from Lawrence's works to demonstrate attributes of the word 'cinema'. To show that it can be an abbreviation of 'cinematograph', the place where films are exhibited, *England, My England* (256) is quoted: 'The cinema was just going in and the queues were tailing down the road' (*OED*, 1989, 220). And, as an example of its use as an adjunct or adjective, the dictionary refers to *Etruscan Places* (171) where Lawrence mentions 'A cinema-camera taking its succession of instantaneous snaps' (*OED*, 1989, 220). The use of these quotations is emblematic of Lawrence's involvement in cinema culture, just as the quotation from *Etruscan Places* is itself demonstrative of his understanding of cinema as 'kinematics'. Thus, 'cinema', during Lawrence's lifetime, came to refer not only to the sheer physics (or lack thereof) involved in projecting images of absent forces and objects on to a screen, but also the mechanisms and whereabouts of projecting these images. If we take Lawrence's reference to cinema in *Etruscan Places* as exemplifying what cinema meant to him, it would seem to convey a wholly modern experience where the essence (force and mass) is missing from the apparent reality of the perception (photographic image). Certainly, if the history and contexts of Lawrence's references to the cinema are considered, the associations of the word 'cinema' with nullity and the spiritlessness of the place where films were actually shown, seem to hold true. For example, Paul's experience after the death of his mother in *Sons and Lovers* might be characterised as cinematic in that the protoplasm seems absent from his life.

The second pivotal word which requires a definition is 'montage'. The fundamental concept of montage is best explained by looking at its opposite - shooting in deep focus. In brief, with deep

focus, all the planes within the camera's lens from background to foreground are brought into high resolution. Thus interrelationships are built up between the objects *in* shot, rather than *between* shots. Montage, however, works on the second principle of editing quickly from shot to shot, creating relationships *between* shots to shape a particular narrative. It is essentially ideological, as opposed to the seamless naturalism of the more realistic technique of deep focus. It is a style which mostly stems from the Soviet experimental cinema of the 1920s (probably, the word was first formally used in 1922) and is primarily linked with Sergei Eisenstein who employed it to create political meanings. For example, he theorised that by rapidly juxtaposing shots a collision or conflict could be generated, and from the collision, meaning would be produced. A simple illustrative example, provided by Eisenstein himself, is a shot of an undernourished woman and baby at an empty table, followed by one of a fat well-dressed man at a table laden with food. Theoretically, a third set of images is created in the spectator's mind, showing that the proletariat is oppressed by the bourgeoisie.

From this overarching explanation of montage, we have to distil what it means in the context of Lawrence's work. It can be taken to imply most of the features suggested by Eisenstein up to and including the sense of conflict created by a quickly edited set of shots. That is, Lawrence's changing perspectives of scenes, created by using various spectators in the text, as well as the narrator's own, seem to be a literary equivalent of montage. The sense of fragmentation, of breaking a scene in a novel into a series of points of view, rather than seeing it holistically from an omniscient point of view, seems to be a legitimate expression of conflict in relationships, and of the effect of conflict - the war - on relationships. Thus in the context of Lawrence's novels, 'montage' implies changing points of view, rapid 'editing' of these points of view, and alternation

with the narrator's own, changing perspectives on events, to create a sense of fragmentation germane to the themes of these novels. Ultimately, such literary montage contributes to the genesis of a third set of frames, or meaning in the spectator/reader's head that montage in the films generates.

I would like to make one final aside before summarily returning to the working-out process which leads to the key of pointers to Lawrence's cinematic ways of seeing. A quick reference to the films based on Lawrence's work gives an indication of the appeal his writings have made to the cinema. In Britain and the United States, at least twenty-six films (including television serials) based on Lawrence's life and works have been released. There are plenty of adaptations to compare with Lawrence's source texts, and the subject of Lawrence and film seemed important enough to fill the first edition of *The Literature and Film Quarterly* (Jan 1973). Officially, this was a special Lawrence issue. *The English Novel and the Movies* devoted a chapter to Ken Russell's film of *Women in Love*, and the theme of Lawrence and film features strongly in Durgat's *Sexual Alienation in the Cinema*.

Lawrence's anti-cinematic stance has been well-documented<sup>2</sup>, so it is surprising that he refers directly to the cinema in a number of his novels from *Sons and Lovers* (1913) to *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928). Also, he touches on it in his shorter works, *The Daughter-in-Law* (1909), *The Ladybird* (1923), *England, My England* (1924), specifically 'Tickets, Please' and 'Fanny and Annie', his poems, *Pansies* (1928), and his non-fiction *Twilight in Italy* (1916). Another crucial work is *The Lost Girl* (1920) because it evinces the most sustained critique of the cinema in any of the novels. This is the locus classicus of Lawrence's polemic and the logical

starting point for a study of potential cinematic characteristics in Lawrence's work. However, before looking at *The Lost Girl* and references to the cinema in other works by Lawrence, I would like to discuss Lawrence's reading of Bergson's *Creative Evolution* (1906).

### Lawrence and Bergson.

Available in English in 1911, *Creative Evolution* discussed theories of knowledge in the context of the cinema. Within the span of Lawrence's writing career, it offers an early and tangible connection between Lawrence and cinema. However, the first reference Lawrence makes to the cinema is in 1908, when he talks of the cinema in the context of a sort of modern psychic disturbance or even death. A cinematograph is a key feature in the euthanasia room he would build for the sick masses: 'If I had my way, I would build a lethal chamber as big as the Crystal Palace, with a military band playing softly, and a Cinematograph working brightly' (*Letters i*, 81). During a weekend in January 1909, the pictures seen on Saturday made him much worse on Sunday (*ibid.*, 106)(given the next reference and the detrimental effect of the pictures, 'pictures' is taken to be a metonym for the cinema). Notably, the cinematograph is an emblem of the fast and furious suffragette demonstration in March: 'There are great crowds surging through the streets - there is a searchlight wandering overhead through the darkness - there are cinematographs at upper-storey windows' (*ibid.*, 123). In the following year, the association of the cinema with an acutely modern experience of life is suggested by Lawrence's proposal to Ezra Pound that Pound should run a cinematograph:

Having had all the experiences possible for a poor man, he will now proceed to conquer riches, and explore the other hemisphere. He will sell boots - there is nothing in that blown

egg, literature. I ventured that he should run a Cinematograph: a dazzling picture palace; for which valuable suggestion he tendered me a frown.

(Ibid., 166)

Pound's sarcastic nature seems to have brought out a similarly sarcastic streak in Lawrence. Here, Lawrence is satirising Pound's attraction to modern trends of entertainment, like the cinematograph, or even Buffalo Bill's travelling Wild West Show, run by the father of one of Lawrence's and Pound's friends, Grace Crawford. This acme of modernity, the cinematograph, had a partial appeal to Lawrence who found a certain comedy in the early pictures. Over a year after the above suggestion to Pound, he had developed enough insight into the cinema to write:

We went to the Picture Palace in the evening, and I was nearly killed with laughing. Really, they are very daft, these pictures. But as they get more melodrama and intensity into the gestures, they get the humanity out. It is a pity. Now it is often rather like pictures of wonderful marionettes - the individuality is gone.

(*Letters i*, 304)

Lawrence's statement is typical of the slipperiness of his thinking about the cinema. As the cinema develops along one axis, incorporating melodrama and intensity into fantastic gestures and wonderful marionettes, it devolves along another, losing humanity and individuality. Lawrence says this is a pity, and as we shall see, his concern seems to impinge upon the poor use this new art form is put to, rather than its intrinsic demerits.

The plastic nature of Lawrence's statement sets a precedent for his ideas on cinema. It is an art form which he at once denigrates yet, if his literature is closely analysed, embraces. The plasticity of his thinking extends to Bergson. Although Lawrence later wrote that he found Bergson 'a bit thin' (April 1913), in February 1912 he urged Helen Corke to send Alice Dax an article on Bergson from *The Hibbert Journal* by A.J.Balfour called 'Creative Evolution and Philosophic Doubt' (v10, 1911-12):

The article... examined the theories of... Bergson in a way much in accord with Lawrence's own thinking - that life struggles on, blindly but in a forward direction, towards the vague but discernible goal of more diverse forms of life.

(Maddox, 1994, 85)

So it seems fair to assume that in or around the interim period between February 1912 and April 1913, Lawrence read *Creative Evolution* in English. He would have definitely encountered Bergson's ideas about the mechanism of our ordinary knowledge being of a cinematographical kind. He would have had a certain insight into the inherent absurdity of the idea of movement coming, in the cinema, from two immobile frames or shots, and he would have been aware that a prerequisite of arriving at real, vital movement and essence is the renunciation of the cinematic mechanism of ordinary thought and intellect.

Bergson's theory of the cinematographical character of knowledge is probably best mapped onto Lawrence's novels by looking at the Gudrun Brangwen of *Women in Love* (qv below). Significantly, by the time of Lawrence's reading of Bergson, he had already produced one work,

17

*The White Peacock* (1911) which, in terms of its collage-like structure, had been linked to the cinema. The writing of a cinematic narrative which could precede his first known, definite formal contact with cinema theory points either to an innately cinematic way of writing, or to the pre-eminence of a cinematic style of narrative in Lawrence's oeuvre (for an expansion of the latter point, see Jaffe Young, 1999, 12). However, of the works that are more contemporaneous with Lawrence's reading of Bergson, *Sons and Lovers* is probably the most important. Several examples of Bergsonian thought, and illustrations of such thought, occur in the narrative. Strikingly, though, Lawrence uses the same word as Bergson in referring to Paul's and Clara's visit to the cinema when he speaks of the 'cinematograph'. Lawrence works his way through a number of words - cinema, kinema, cinematograph, film - to refer to the cinema collectively. So his use of the same word - cinematograph - as Bergson's in a novel written at the same time as he was most likely reading Bergson indicates that the word had a similar meaning for Lawrence as it did for Bergson. That is, it expressed mechanism, and a purely mechanical sort of intellectualisation of life which produced false 'becoming' or knowledge, just as the cinematograph produces a false or absurd sense of movement from two juxtaposed frames which are essentially immobile. As such, the mechanism of the cinematograph seems synonymous with the idea of cinema as kinema, that is, the depiction of massless objects and forceless motion.

It seems appropriate to ask why the sense of cinema as cinematograph, or kinema, would have lodged itself in Lawrence's mind at this time. As we have seen, he might have come across this concept of cinema early in 1912 when he speaks of finishing *The Trespasser*, so, in his search for a new post-*Trespasser* form, the cinematograph could have suggested some possibilities to him, which is manifested in the shape of *Sons and Lovers* (qv ch.1). Additionally, Bergson discourses



at length about the photographic reality of cinema and, as can be seen in Lawrence's later works, he is acutely aware of this capacity in the cinema. At this stage, it would be helpful to engage critically with some of the statements Lawrence made about films, and some of the films he knew about or went to see. He preferred the essential beauty of the comic Charlie Chaplin to the artificial, contrived look of stereotypical handsomeness associated with Valentino. From the analogy Lawrence made between John Dos Passos's method of narration in *Manhattan Transfer* and a film camera recording people and events, indiscriminately and seamlessly, he seemed to enjoy the film's capacity for documentary-style realism, too. What annoyed Lawrence about many classical Hollywood-type films, epitomised by 'Ben Hur' (which nauseated him), was that they were clearly contrived, sentimental and artificial yet took their claim to realism so seriously. So the sort of slipperiness in Lawrence's attitude to the cinema that could be seen emerging in his early thinking about it continues to manifest itself. Clearly, he had a lot of negative ideas about it, especially regarding Hollywood's inclination to be unwittingly parodic while taking itself seriously, yet he seemed to appreciate cinema's capacity for kinetic realism. One way to explain this apparent contradiction is to say that he might well have liked the new way of storytelling offered by cinema form but had been disappointed at how it was put to use. Many of the early films were probably BAD. The fact that Lawrence criticised cinema so much shows some interest or at least concern. Could it be he would have liked to see this new art form live up to its potential? To make an analogy, when Lawrence first met Ford Madox Hueffer, editor of *The English Review*, he said: "This isn't my idea of an editor's office". It seems he had other ideas for cinema as well.

However, these suggestions about why cinema might have struck a chord with Lawrence deal only with the *form* of cinema. To move on to why the *idea* of cinema (as kinema) might have made an impact on Lawrence, a mention of his state of health during his convalescence is helpful. Feeling so dilatory in convalescence in late December 1911 before going to Bournemouth, feeling, as it were, what it was like to have a sick body devoid of its usual force and mass, Lawrence could have found the idea of cinema as an expression of movement and objects minus force and mass particularly resonant with his poor health. A brief discussion of the story he was working on ('Soiled Rose', later 'The Shades of Spring') during his illness should support this idea. If, as argued above, cinema made an appeal to Lawrence because its disembodiment of mass and force was commensurate with an equivalent feeling in his illness and convalescence, in 'Soiled Rose', a 'sick man's work' (*Letters i*, 553), we would expect to find ideas of being from which these essences are abstracted.

To begin with the story's final title, 'The Shades of Spring', the use of the definite article 'the' adds a particular timbre. Instead of 'Shades of Spring', which denotes the idea that something in the story anticipates Spring, Lawrence uses 'the', which shows that the shades are specific. Most likely, the shades are Syson and Hilda who, in the denial of a plasmic development of their relationship, which foreshadows a similar scenario between Paul and Miriam in *Sons and Lovers*, seem to have faded to shades of their potential beings. In fading thus, they are bodies of light and dark, like cinematic ghosts, who have no force or mass. This split between real being and a ghostly incarnation of such quiddity is mirrored in the landscape which comprises, respectively, the enduring vision (*SS*, 160) of the pastoral memory Syson has of the dog days with Hilda, and

the mechanical behaviour associated with the blacksmith and the forge (ibid.). A striking example of living minus life is imagined by Syson himself in his recollection of the wounded knight in the Chapel of Lyonesse 'with the truncheon of a spear deep in his breast, lying always as dead, yet [who] did not die' (ibid., 172). Especially in its reference to the mortal wound to the chest, this image calls to mind the pneumatic Lawrence and, of course, a sort of cinematic state of being where characters are neither killed nor die. In the cinema's repeated and mechanical showing of reels without incremental difference or development, characters just survive constant action replay, the likes of which Syson watches when he sees (voyeuristically and at a distance, as a cinema audience would) Hilda re-enacting a scenario with the gamekeeper similar to the one she must have played out with him some years previously (ibid., 172). Nothing has changed; the reel is simply playing again. It is the sort of relationship which adumbrates Gudrun's and Gerald's. Their relationships do not flower; the same mechanical actions are played again and again, like the repeated projection of the same frames by a cinematograph. A variation on this idea emerges in *Sons and Lovers* where the cinematograph's dancing and dithering pictures kinematically play before Paul as a symbol of his blanched and bloodless relationship with Miriam. However, before moving on to *Sons and Lovers*, I would like to conclude my analysis of Lawrence and Bergson.

As it turns out, then, Bergson might not have been so thin, especially as his theory on the cinematographical character of knowledge<sup>3</sup> seems to illuminate ways of being and seeing that belong to knowing, looking personae like Gudrun Brangwen in *Women in Love*. Basically, Bergson argues that the essence of life is the 'élan vital', a disorderly, constantly diverging life force, producing new from old. But human, especially ancient knowledge, which gives many of the mathematical, geometrical, and philosophical principles, is such that, as with the

cinematograph, life is seen as a series of frames on our mental, perceptual apparatus. The *élan vital* exists in the interval between these frames, like the life between the chinks wished for by Birkin (*WL*, 361). But a reductive way of knowing seeks to access it only by producing frames between these frames, and then more frames between the second set of frames, and so on ad infinitum, so that the *élan vital* is forever withdrawing. As indicated above, Gudrun seems to typify this cinematographical way of knowing. Like a cinema camera, she watches mechanically the *élan vital* of others. For example, in 'Coal-Dust', she sees the scene of Gerald subjugating his horse through the eyes of the guard who is passing by on the train. This turns Gerald into a cinema image or tracking shot which, like a film frame, is 'isolated and momentary' (*WL*, 112). As Bergson says:

Instead of attaching ourselves to the inner becoming of things, we place ourselves outside them in order to recompose their becoming artificially [like the contrivance of the cinematograph]. We take snapshots, as it were, of the passing reality, and, as these are characteristic of the reality, we have only to string them on a becoming, abstract, uniform and invisible, situated at the back of the apparatus of knowledge, in order to imitate what there is that is characteristic in this becoming itself.

(Bergson, 1906, pp.322-3)

This is what Gudrun does. Placed outside a sense of inner becoming, she composes snapshots of events artificially and at a distance, stringing them together from the guard's moving point of view which gives her apparatus of knowledge its cinematographical character. Thus, one of the traits which characterises a cinematic locus in Lawrence's prose is the mechanical presentation of

externals in which 'everything [is seen] through the eye, in one mode of objective curiosity' (*FU*, 65). Gudrun's *objets d'art*, like her *little* sculptures of the birds she surrounds herself with, and the 'lovely *little* cups, scarlet and solid gilt' (*WL*, 336) (my italics), are indicative of this way of knowing which makes things smaller and smaller in its quest for the *élan vital*, making more and more frames of something that is continually withdrawing from such a means of being known.

A further clue to the cinematographical character of personae like Gudrun is the sort of time Lawrence applies to them. As Bergson sees it, the cinematographical method of scientific knowledge reduces duration to moments so that time is never a continuum, it is just a series of moments joined together mechanically like frames of a film. Significantly, both Gerald and Gudrun measure out time by moments, such as the ticking of the clock when Gerald seduces Gudrun at her parents'. Conversely, characters like Birkin, Ursula and Somers have an innate, organic sense of time as duration, and are not associated with timepieces, and the mechanical, cinematic division of time into units. The measured time of the moment is thus part of the artifice which typifies a potentially cinematic scenario in Lawrence's canon. This is not the only sign of a cinematic patch in Lawrence's prose. I can continue to map out my constellation of pointers by looking at other novels featuring the cinema. As I said above, the most important of these is *The Lost Girl*, but I will begin with *Sons and Lovers* as it follows, chronologically, Lawrence's reading of Bergson.

### *Sons and Lovers*

The earliest example of the cinema in the corpus of Lawrence's novels is Paul's and Clara's visit to the cinematograph in *Sons and Lovers*:

But they were both of them flaming with blushes, and immediately he ran away. He had touched her. His whole body was quivering with the sensation.

There was already a sort of secret understanding between them. The next evening he went into the cinematograph with her for a few minutes before train-time. As they sat, he saw her hand lying near him. For some moments he dared not touch it. The pictures danced and dithered. Then he took her hand in his. It was large and firm; it filled his grasp. He held it fast. She neither moved nor made any sign. When they came out his train was due. He hesitated.

(*SL*, pp.347-8)

This incident comes at the beginning of the chapter 'Passion', which, juxtaposed with the final stages of Paul's relationship with Miriam, counterpoints Miriam's cerebral, mental love with Clara's instinctive, de-spiritualised desire for Paul. A measure of the profundity of feeling, or 'secret understanding', between Clara and Paul is the touch between them in the cinema. If sight is the sense of the mental, spiritual psyche, then touch is the sense of the deeper, unconscious self. The underlying feeling in Lawrence's poems 'Touch' and 'Noli me Tangere' (*CP*, vol. I, pp. 468-9) is that a cerebral humanity 'can't bear to touch or be touched'. Touch occurs only when the white mind of consciousness sleeps, and then it is a measure of real contact, 'a generous kindled togetherness' ('Touch Comes', *ibid.*, 470). So, in the cinema, Paul's taking of Clara's 'large and firm' hand which 'filled his' is emblematic of a non-mental, personal intimacy that is never fully realised with Miriam. What is interesting, though, is that such a sincere form of contact is established in the cinema. In Lawrence's work, one way of interpreting the cinema, techniques

associated with film, and a photographic, objective way of looking - 'kodak-vision' as Lawrence calls it in the *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays* - is to see them as expressions of falseness or emotional artifice in characters and their relationships. Hence, an emotionally affected character like Gudrun Brangwen in *Women in Love* whose disposition is revealed by her epistemophilic, objective mode of vision, or 'empty' heroes like Jack Callcott and Kangaroo, might be associated with the cinema. But Paul and Clara's intimacy does not square with the cinema and its connotations of artifice. Lawrence sets the scene in the cinema to offer a contrast between Paul and Clara's *real* intimacy, embodied by the touch of her which makes his whole body quiver with sensation, and the obviously unreal, non-corporeal 'dancing and dithering pictures' whose kinematicness symbolises the absence of essence in his old relationship with Miriam.

Before examining *The Rainbow* for an example of the uninvolved, detached spectatorship commensurate with watching dancing and dithering images from which the *élan vital* is abstracted, I would like to consider the word 'dancing' Lawrence brackets with 'dithering' in his description of the film in *Sons and Lovers*. Initially, 'dancing' suggests the fitful, fluttering play of the projector on the screen but, significantly, Lawrence's descriptions of dances themselves seem particularly cinematic<sup>4</sup>. In *The Rainbow*, Will and Anna's dancing among the corn stooks is played out as silvery, shimmering action against the moon's luminous screen. Also, Gudrun's eurhythmics in 'Water-Party' are performed in a frame of 'steel-grey scaffolding' (*WL*, 165), again in front of a luminous screen, this time in the form of the milky white lake. So 'dancing' seems laden with cinematic connotations, much more than theatre, an association that Lawrence himself hints at when he equates the phrase 'prima ballerina' with 'cinema star' in a letter to Cynthia Asquith: 'I dreamed you were a sort of prima ballerina - which is a translation of cinema star, I suppose'

(*Letters iii*, 195). Indeed, Alvina scores the films almost as a musician scores a dance, thinking of how she 'banged at the piano to a set of dithering and boring pictures' (*LG*, 171). Thus, in Lawrence's canon, dancing and dithering, or flickery, jerking action, mechanically orchestrated (perhaps by music) can be seen as a concomitant of a cinematic type of scene. In *The Lost Girl*, Lawrence describes this flat, dead, recorded spectacle of the film, managed by equally 'mechanical factory-faced persons' (*ibid.*) washing over the voyeuristic audience who watch, safely and narcissistically, the emotionally and physically distant spectacle. Conversely, the live spectacle of theatre lessens the psychological distance between the performer and audience who, seated in front of actors capable of reciprocating their gaze, are no longer comfortable with looking narcissistically at a potent, present object. And as Alvina says, an identification comes about between audience and film "because [the audience] can spread themselves over a film, and they *can't* over a living performer" (*LG*, 116).

Because dancing is also an obviously live, vital activity, the suggestion that dancing, in all its senses, is unequivocally cinematic is not plausible. But the word does have cinematic overtones, especially in the context of the jittery and melodramatic silent films Lawrence would have watched which would have 'danced' across the screen. So, intercut with the idea that dancing might be cinematic is the polar sense that, in its liveness and immediacy, it is equally uncinematic. This dualism impinges on Lawrence's description of the dancing pictures in *Sons and Lovers* where the irony that something as dead and immobile as a succession of photographic frames could imitate the real, live performance of dancing seems to stress the mechanism or ennui of the cinema. This could be why Ursula's dances with Skrebensky, and Gudrun's eurhythmic in 'Water-Party', for example, are interspersed with cinematic effects. Lawrence has taken an



activity - dancing - that is traditionally vital and life-affirming, and described it in a modern way - which looks cinematic - to symbolise the dilution of an essential part of the characters who dance thus into a twisted derivation of a more divine form of being. That is, how they dance is who or what they are, analogous to the encapsulation of a peculiarly modern, mechanical experience of life in the trained bodies of Skrebensky and Gerald Crich.

I would also like to draw attention to the word 'dithering' Lawrence brackets with 'dancing' while writing of the cinematograph in *Sons and Lovers*. When mentioning the cinema, it is an important item of lexis for Lawrence as 'dithering' and 'dither' recur on at least two further occasions in connection with the cinema:

The lamps go out: gurglings and kissings - and then the dither on the screen.

(*LG*, 110)

In a minute Madame and Ciccio and all seemed to become unreal [to Alvina]- the actual unrealities: while the ragged dithering pictures of the film were actual, real as the day.

(*Ibid.*, 143)

To dither means to act nervously or indecisively (*Longman New Universal Dictionary*, 1982), and Lawrence applies 'dithering' to the early films for at least two reasons. First, at the turn of the century, an illness called neurasthenia or tired nerves became associated with the fast pace of modern life. James Houghton, the cinema owner in *The Lost Girl*, is a classic neurasthenic whose nerves are collapsing under a barrage of sensory input. Frequently, he is 'nervous and irritable'

(*LG*, 169), and develops 'a nervous horror of all *artistes*' (*ibid.*). This nervousness of the modern age, epitomised by the cinema, 'that nervous excitement of speed' (*TI*, 55) is evoked by Lawrence's choice of 'dithering'. Second, the flickering images would have depicted characters as nervous effigies of real actors jerkily playing out their roles. Certainly, Lawrence's expression of Alvina's sense of unreality connects it with film. Usually, the film is unreal, and the actual, present people and objects, real. But the effect of Miss Pinnegar's presence is such that the usual is reversed. Madame and Ciccio are transformed into the unreal while the 'ragged, dithering pictures' become real. The point to be made here is that the dithering pictures are connected with the unreal or the false. And their 'ditheringness' (their nervy, flickering semblance of reality) is a sign of their falseness. The mechanism of the cinematograph, implied by the dancing and dithering pictures it projects, seems to fragment its narrative, and merits an equally mechanical way of watching where the spectator's sympathies are divorced from the object of the gaze.

A clear delineation of what it is like to see cinematographically, that is, from different points of view and from a distance, can be distilled from this scene in the cinematograph in *Sons and Lovers*. It is a way of seeing that feeds itself into the form of the novel (qv Chapter One) which Lawrence himself felt was highly visualised (*Letters i*, 511, 526), the insistence on such a style going back as far as his suggestions to Louie Burrows in 1910 that, to write, she must 'examine the scene *pictorially*'... Gather the picture - get the essentials for *description* - present to the eye' (*Letters i*, 152). This cinematographic presentation might have further evolved during the time Lawrence spent in the Villa Igea on the shore of Lake Garda in 1912 and 1913 when he was redrafting and revising the novel. His memories of this time form the basis of *Twilight in Italy* where he mentions the many churches transmogrified into cinemas in Italy. Lawrence had several

churches and a theatre nearby which might also have doubled as a cinema and where he could have seen films while working on *Sons and Lovers*. The styles of such films and the way of watching them could, in turn, have inspired a cinematic form of narration in the novel where the action is seen from a series of points of view either alienating the reader, like the *Daily News* reviewer of *The Trespasser*, or drawing them in, just as Frieda was. She noted that Lawrence's bald and naked way of presenting his story with gaps in the action, that others might think formless, was, in fact, the opposite, possibly being too intimate or too close (*Letters i*, 479).

### *The Rainbow*

There seems to be a greater diversity and occurrence of cinematic ways of seeing in *The Rainbow* than *Sons and Lovers*, and they are ultimately developed into a more explicitly cinematic form in *Women in Love*. One of the core reasons for organising this introduction chronologically is to incorporate Lawrence's development as a writer into the key to the cinematic ways of seeing in his works. Thus, it is worth examining the historical and personal changes in Lawrence's life between the publication of *Sons and Lovers* in May 1913 and the publication of *The Rainbow* in September 1915, and questioning whether these changes are paralleled by particular cinematic movements in his work.

Many references in Lawrence's letters from Autumn 1914 to Autumn 1915, including philosophies on cathedrals, views of trains and planes from the Sussex Downs, and his request for information about the Royal Engineers to substantiate the character that eventually becomes Skrebensky, evolve into vivid scenes in *The Rainbow*. These references are intertwined with developments of the potentially cinematic ideas outlined above which also feed themselves into the novel.

Abstractly, Lawrence talks about the artistic expression of the whole by a part of the whole (*Letters ii*, 263). He is focusing on a method of symbolism which implicitly evokes the way film montage works. Again, he evokes people as pure phenomena without any real being, this time in a state of upset after a visit to London (*ibid.*, 399). During these months, he was probably attending Lady Ottoline Morrell's cinema parties (qv below), which he is presumably referring to in his statement about disliking them early in 1915 (*ibid.*, 274). Strikingly, on February 12th, nine days after this comment, Lawrence makes a critical statement about cinema to Bertrand Russell which illuminates his use and placement of potentially cinematic techniques in *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*:

The repeating of a known reaction upon myself is sensationalism. This is what nearly *all* English people now do. When a man takes a woman, he is *merely* repeating a known reaction upon himself, not seeking a new reaction, a discovery. And this is like self-abuse or masturbation...(sic)

There comes a point when the shell, the form of life, is a prison to the life. Then the life must either concentrate on breaking the shell, or it must turn round, turn in upon itself, and try infinite variations of a known reaction upon itself. Which produces a novelty. So that *The Rosary* is a new combination of known re-actions - so is Gilbert Cannan's *Young Earnest* - so is the cinematograph drama and all our drama and all our literature.

(*Letters ii*, 285)

Therefore, what better form than the cinematograph as a complementary and apposite expression for lives turning in on themselves, like those of Will Brangwen, Anton Skrebensky, Gudrun

Brangwen, Gerald Crich and Jack Callcott? Bound within the shell of their existence and engaged in a diabolic process of centripetal reduction, like an insect 'isolated within its own scaly, glassy envelope, and running seeking its own small end' (*Letters ii*, 520), such characters replay the same actions again and again. A cadre of techniques, like black and white, dithering, jerky action, mechanical behaviour, especially objective Kodak-like watching, flatness or non-dimensionality, stereotypical appearances, sentimentality and so on would highlight, by means of their inherent approximation to cinematographic functionality, the psychic void of a sensationalistic character who is basically a curio hunter, chasing titillations rather than revelations. A real-life inspiration for the equation of the cinema with a person who has exhausted her life for an introspective kingdom that was not worth the effort could have been Ottoline Morrell. Lawrence believed she had failed to transcend the temple of her life (*Letters ii*, 437), epitomised by the static, historic beauty of Garsington, and, of course, she seems to have been one of the main proponents of the cinema parties which Dorothy Warren and Lawrence attended. Yet a further correlation between cinematographic art and modern existence occurs in Lawrence's comments on Mark Gertler's famous painting, 'The Merry-go-Round'. He thought that Gertler's soul must have been in a maelstrom of destruction, and his own relationships a ne plus ultra of superifice, to paint such a 'combination of blaze, and violent mechanical rotation and complex involution, and ghastly, utterly mindless human intensity of sensational extremity' (*Letters ii*, 660).

The sense of disorder Lawrence sensed in society and swore wasn't a product of his imagination (*ibid.*, 331) is reflected in the ways of watching described in the novel. The false ways of seeing Lawrence satirises in the novel clearly had their roots in reality as the Lawrences themselves had experienced the subject/object split that is implicit in cinematic spectatorship. In August 1913,

Frieda Lawrence speaks of the 'cinematographic procession of people' (ibid., 64) she and Lawrence watched at Cynthia Asquith's holiday home in Margate, an event which inspired the cinematic scene of characters stepping their way across Breadalby's lawns in *Women in Love* (qv below). And in *The Rainbow*, the subjects are often detached and alienated from the object(s) of their gaze, the split between them paralleling the general social upset Lawrence felt in his soul during the war. A good example of this sort of uninvolved, irresponsible spectatorship that can be associated with the cinema is Will Brangwen's brief encounter with the 'small, common' (R, 210) girl in *The Empire*<sup>5</sup>. She is one of several female personages, like Vicky Callcott, who sometimes resemble stereotypical images of immaturity which film heroines of the day like Lillian Gish had to emulate. In 'The Crown', Lawrence shows his concern for the potentially negative effect of such stereotypes:

With all our talk of advance, progress, we are all the time working backwards. Our heroines become younger and younger. In the movies, the heroine is becoming more and more childish, and touched with infantile idiocy. We cannot bear honest maturity. We want to reduce ourselves back, back to the *corruptive* state of childishness.

(RDP, 285)

Lawrence's concern centres on the belief that the artificial and conventionalised cinema stereotype denies a real, 'blood conscious' relationship with the watching audience, typified by the hypothesis that if the women had ever touched the real Valentino, their perfect mental image of him would have been shattered. As James Cowan says, Lawrence's opinion of these cinematic conventions was that they inevitably engendered counterfeit emotion and sentimentalism, rather than the

discovery and expression of genuine feelings such as the novel evoked<sup>6</sup>. So by creating the 'small, common girl' in the Empire in the image of the childlike cinema heroine, Lawrence suggests that Will, like the cinema audience, stays on the safe, shallow plane of visual, narcissistic non-engagement with the object rather than undertaking the journey into deeper levels of a 'blood conscious' relationship with her.

A further indication of the modern, artificial nature of Will's voyeurism is Lawrence's reference to Will's '*electric* force upon her' (ibid., 114, my italics). Generally, Lawrence uses images of traditional, natural forces drawn from the fundamental elements, earth, wind, fire and water to characterise genuine characters or 'blood relationships'. But when he speaks of modern, superficial relationships, like Will's, often he uses a specifically modern range of vocabulary or imagery drawn from contemporary technology, like electricity, electric light or the cinema<sup>7</sup>. For example, electric light and cinema are bracketed together during John Thomas's fling with Annie in 'Tickets Please'. Before entering the cinema, they are greeted by 'the electric lights, the same smell of naphtha and of fried potatoes, and of electricity' (*E*, 37). Thus, these technological 'forces' are indices of characters or relationships which lack Lawrence's ideal of emotional profundity.

Will's voyeurism is also bound up with a sense of power. He is the active, seeing subject and the girl, the passive, seen object. To be the subject is to be the sadist, and to be the object is to be the masochist as Lawrence does build an element of sadism into Will's voyeurism: 'It was a rather horrible cry that seemed to come out of her... It was some strange agony of terror crying out the words... Her cry had given him gratification' (*R*, 215). In Lawrence's canon, the passion of cruelty, which involves the sadomasochism of characters enjoying each other's pain, and their own, too,

characterises these voyeuristic, artificial relationships. Ursula's and Skrebensky's relationship is bound up with the imagery of blades which sees each of them cutting the other. Similarly, Gudrun and Gerald seem to enjoy each other's pain. So sadomasochism, or the passion of cruelty, is another of these indicators of a voyeuristic scenario typical of the cinema.

Like *Sons and Lovers*, *The Rainbow* incorporates a strong sense of mobility into points of view, exemplified by Ursula's perspective of the Hemlock Stone as she and Skrebensky scud past it in their rented motor car which is, effectively, a tracking shot. From these early novels onwards, the tracking shot technique becomes a recurrent feature of Lawrence's prose, symbolising a sense of negative being, as in Gudrun's view of Gerald as seen through the eyes of the guard on the train as he tracks past (qv Chapter 2), Somers's view of the Australian interior as he tracks past (qv Chapter 3), and Connie's motorised view of Tevershall (qv Introduction). This mobile way of seeing, epitomised by the tracking shot, has been detected by Linda Williams, too: 'Lawrence is here visualising in literary terms a way of seeing which his wider cultural moment was determining and rendering necessary' (Williams, 1993, 89). As this feature emerges between 1913 and 1915 when the most significant historical matter for Lawrence would have been the outbreak of war in August 1914, it can be surmised that the mobility of point of view is synchronistic with the onset of the war, an event of such magnitude that it merits special mention.

### The War

Lawrence had probably never seen a tracking shot by the time he finished *The Rainbow*, as the necessary dollies weren't used in the American cinema until 1915, and in British cinema until 1926. Chronologically, it is possible for him to have witnessed one in an American film on release



in Britain before he completed *The Rainbow* in 1915, but it is more plausible to think of him evolving such a way of articulating reality from the same milieu as the military did - war. This is not to say that the war was the only contributory factor, but the war is the horizon against which many different small narratives of travelling on trains, buses and cars took place, such as Lawrence's day trip to Worthing in Spring 1915 (*Letters ii*, 330).

In terms of its size, speed and scope, the war had no historical precedent. It was based on modern industrial, mechanical systems. Machine guns replaced single-shot rifles. Long-range shelling and sniping took the place of hand-to-hand combat. Mechanised transport could move massed troops and artillery quicker than by horse. So for the directors of war, the generals, to keep pace with events, the war had to be filmed. And it was filmed, for the first time, using chronophotography, or a series of tracking shots taken from moving aircraft at the Battle of the Marne (1914). Dziga Vertov who, like Eisenstein<sup>8</sup>, worked on Lenin's agit-prop trains after the war, gives an idea of the mobility military reconnaissance had given to the camera:

I am the camera's eye. I am the machine which shows you the world as I alone see it. Starting from today, I am forever free of human immobility. I am in perpetual movement. I approach and draw away from things - I crawl under them - I climb on them - I am on the head of a galloping horse - I burst at full speed into a crowd - I run before running soldiers - I throw myself down on my back - I rise up with the aeroplanes - I fall and I fly at one with the bodies falling or rising through the air.

(quoted in Virilio, 1984, 20)

In Lawrence's oeuvre, the emergence of a mobile point of view, a point of view of mobile objects, and conflicting, contrasting montage shots like those described by Vertov (above), seems to have been accelerated by the First World War.

At the outbreak of the war in August 1914, Lawrence was acutely perceptive of the new form of industrialised warfare which, as was argued above, necessitated its mediation by film: 'From what he had seen of the Bavarian army in training the summer before, he foresaw the new kind of industrialised war that lay in store' (Maddox, 1994, 189). This cognisance comes at the same time as he was revising *The Rainbow* (which he finished in Spring 1915). In this novel, we can find mobile points of view, like Ursula's, of the countryside flashing by, and framed points of view of moving objects like the woman outside the lecture theatre flicking across her line of sight. It could be that in the climate of mechanised conflict, Lawrence sought to bring to his novels a comparably mechanical or artificial way of looking, like Ursula's. Her viewpoint is animated by the false mechanism of the car in the first instance, and framed by the artifice of the window in the second. *Sons and Lovers* was called the last novel of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth. *The Rainbow* is similarly split, this time between the vision of the painter and the vision of the cameraman. Typifying this bifurcation is the difference between the complete, static vision of the church set on the landscape's horizon on the opening page, which might come from a Constable painting, and Ursula's moving visions of the countryside and the woman outside the lecture theatre, which could come from film<sup>9</sup>.

The cinematic way of seeing, engendered and espoused by the military, reaches its apotheosis (as might be expected) in *Women in Love* and *Kangaroo*. Before discussing these novels, there is

another component of Ursula's vision worth considering, namely its frame. A framed sight is inherently artificial because the periphery of a full field of natural vision has been cut off, yet it is repeated in Lawrence's writings. To name but a few, there is the framed, moving vision of the woman Ursula sees from the lecture theatre, there is Gerald's binocularised view of Loerke, 'distinct and objective, as if seen through field glasses' (*WL*, 470), there is the Cornish love of 'lying behind a fence with field-glasses, watching through a hole in the drystone wall a man with a lass' (*K*, 227) and there is the view of the hummingbird in Lawrence's eponymous poem, seen through the wrong end of the telescope of time. Why are field glasses cinematic, though? The distance, detachment and frame they force on the subject/object relation parallel the private and antisocial way a film is watched in the cinema. These framed, optical viewpoints are not only obviously cinematic, but also are part of a military way of looking: 'In his pencil-like embrasure, the look-out and later the gunner realised long before the easel painter, the photographer, or the filmmaker how necessary is a preliminary sizing-up' (Virilio, 1984, 49). So it is no coincidence that two of the above perspectives, at least, belong to a military man and a martial scenario. The overall point to be taken from this glance at frames is that they are commensurate not only with a cinematic timbre, but also the sort of martial culture which permeated *The Rainbow* and, to a greater extent, *Women in Love* and *Kangaroo*<sup>10</sup>. Another way of putting it is to say that Lawrence, in evoking the climate of war, hits his target with a mode of vision congruent with the military consciousness and hits another, possibly unintended target, too, because this mode of vision squares with the cinema's. A map of the cinematic ways of seeing in Lawrence's novels would therefore consider tracts of martial discourse and military characters like Skrebensky, Gerald, Jack Callcott and Kangaroo, as well as the civilian characters - Gudrun Brangwen, for example - most involved with them. Gudrun's way of seeing is clearly a way of aiming, as is the

narrator's visualisation of events; by building this mode of vision into the text, Lawrence has incorporated a cinematic way of seeing *and*, more importantly for his wish to make the war omnipresent in *Women in Love*, a military one, too.

A secondary source of cinematic input into Lawrence's imagination at this time took the form of the cinema parties he attended with Dorothy Warren. In 1915, shortly before beginning work in April 1916 on what was finally to become *Women in Love*, he often went to cinema parties. Dorothy Warren, who was later art director in the Berlin Studios on works like the Longhi film 'The Man Without Desire', and who also exhibited Lawrence's paintings, wrote to him, recalling:

When I used to see you at Ottoline's, in Hampstead, and the cinema parties (I wonder if you remember them, I enjoyed them so much) I was eighteen, and so full of ponderous reflections that I must have been muddled or very glib - probably both. Now I am monotonously articulate. I am thirty-two.

(Nehls, iii, 1959, 200)

According to her husband, she first met Lawrence in 1915 while staying with Lady Ottoline Morrell at Garsington Manor<sup>11</sup>. She also came to stay with them at Byron Villas in Hampstead Heath, where the Lawrences lived between August and December of 1915 (ibid., 195, 695). This calls to mind several possibilities for the whereabouts of the cinema parties. First, Dorothy Warren's mention of Ottoline's could refer either to Garsington, or to the Bedford Square (London) residence of her politician husband, Philip. If the parties took place at Garsington, the most obvious point to make is that there was almost certainly no cinema in the village as the only

ones listed in the area were some five miles away in Oxford (*The Kinematograph Year Book and Directory 1915*). But the parties could have been actual parties within the manor building itself. It was big enough for the people gathered by the Morrells to put on plays and other performances. And its fictional equivalent, Breadalby in *Women in Love*, is a focus for cinematic ways of seeing. Moreover, there is a huge list of hirers of projection equipment and films located in London and the home counties in *The Kinematograph Year Book and Directory 1915*. Companies such as the Apex Film Renting House and Film Libraries Ltd. offered, for daily hire, films and newsreels. On top of the reels, they provided the Filmoscope, 'Self-Contained Cinema Apparatus for any room, any distance, any length'. There was also a primitive camcorder for hire, the Tress-o-Graph, which would take three or four exposures at once 'without turning the handle'. Theoretically, it would be the perfect facilitator of Hermione Roddice's 'pornography', her desire to watch and replay 'all her naked animal actions in mirrors'. As a matter of fact, Hermione's real-life equivalent, Lady Ottoline Morrell, was apparently a photophile, as her dramatically posed shot of Aldous Huxley, Dorothy Brett and Mark Gertler demonstrates (Feinstein, 193 ff, 1993). To come back to the idea of home movies, it thus seems that one of the trends of 1915 was to hire films and projection apparatus for home viewing, much as videotapes are rented today, and Lawrence could have watched films in Garsington Manor itself. However, if the reference to Ottoline's is to the Bedford Square house, where Lawrence met her on at least one occasion such as the dinner party he attended on 15 January, 1915, they could have seen films not only in the house, but also in the eighteen or so cinemas dotted around the immediate environs of Oxford Street, Tottenham Court Road, Leicester Square and Piccadilly Circus.

The final possible place for the cinema parties is Hampstead Heath. The house at Byron Villas would have probably been inadequate for the use of projection equipment. Fortunately, there were three cinemas within easy reach. The Electric Theatre in Heath Street was literally at the bottom of Lawrence's road. The Gem Theatre was further away on the other side of Hampstead Heath, south of Parliament Hill (which Lawrence evokes so vividly in *Kangaroo*). The Hampstead Picture Playhouse in Pond Street, though, was closer. Lawrence's good friend, Mark Gertler, lived on Pond Street, too (but whether in 1915 is open to question)(Maddox, 1994, 349). So it is not unthinkable that Lawrence, Dorothy Warren, Mark Gertler and maybe some of the Buckinghamshire circle would go to the cinema together as a group, a cinema party as it were.

The next main question to ask is what could Lawrence have seen, and what relevance would it have been to his work? The dominant theme of 1915, and what was probably on many people's minds, was the war. This was reflected by the number of war films on general release, some 32 in all, of which 28 came out in August to mark the anniversary of the conflict. As Virilio has noted, there appears to be a symbiosis between war and cinema. Perhaps Lawrence felt that the cinema's mechanical, optical means of presenting the mechanised conflict was an apposite metaphor for the conflict itself. From his comments on film and the Battle of the Somme in *Aaron's Rod* (qv below), it seems likely that he saw either newsreels of the war, or a war film itself. Consciously or unconsciously, then, this military way of looking, of zeroing in on the action, could have been fed into *Women in Love*, intertwining itself with the domestic conflict narrated by the novel. Although not directly linked with the war, another big film of the year was 'Wells v. Carpentier'. This vivid account of the world title fight, a possible symbol of the conflict that gripped Europe, might have caught Lawrence's eye and inspired 'Gladiatorial'. Lawrence would surely have noticed, too, the

number of adaptations around. On release were 'Old Curiosity Shop', 'Silas Marner', 'Heart of Midlothian', 'A Winter's Tale', 'The Count of Monte Cristo', 'Marguerite of Navarre', 'The Vicar of Wakefield', 'Beautiful Jim', 'The May Queen' and 'Study in Scarlet'. These could have suggested the potentially cinematic characteristics of the novel to him (a conscious connection between the cinema and the novel being evidenced later in *The Lost Girl*). And these adaptations might have inspired him to incorporate the cinematographic dynamic of the Futurist manifesto that had seemingly made a prior appeal to him (*Letters ii*, 180). Significantly, a number of Capital and Labour films were also made, such as 'Golden God', 'The Lily of the Valley' and 'The Lost Paradise'. These industrial feature films had great strike scenes, and might have encouraged the presentation of similar scenes in *Women in Love* which had their origin in Lawrence's upbringing. Finally, D.W.Griffith, one of the major formative film directors, had several films on general release in 1915. These included 'The Escape', 'The Battle of the Sexes' and 'Dishonoured Medal'. The last two films could have held a certain attraction for Lawrence. 'The Battle of the Sexes' is probably the central subject of most of his work which is always exploring relationships, especially those between men and women. Indeed, *Women in Love* is a battle between couples, building into its narrative the effects of the war Lawrence felt in his soul. 'Dishonoured Medal' told the story of rebellion in Algeria, and ties in with Lawrence's own rebellious attitude to his mother country in the war that he documents in 'The Nightmare' section of *Kangaroo*. Interestingly, Lillian Gish starred in 'Battle of the Sexes', as she did in Griffith's later classics 'The Birth of a Nation' (1916) and 'Intolerance' (1916). She embodied the film actress's youthful, almost juvenile look criticised by Lawrence in 'The Crown'. This criticism adds further weight to the idea that Lawrence saw films which featured Gish. Most importantly, if Lawrence did see Griffith's films, especially 'Intolerance' and 'Birth of a Nation', he would have been exposed to most of the major traditions

of cinema, especially the montage method. This particular method seems to be embodied in the structure and presentation of the narrative in *Women in Love*, and was later espoused and explained by Eisenstein in the nineteen-twenties.

### *Women in Love*

My next example of a cinema in Lawrence's novels is the one in Beldover in *Women in Love*.

Commensurate with the cinema's artifice, Gudrun's visits to it are surrounded with language, ideas and images of the false. A good example of a false, sentimental feeling which recurs frequently in Lawrence's novels is nostalgia. It is false in terms of its violation of Lawrence's (and Nietzsche's) ideal of seeking to surpass oneself as it involves returning to the past. Also, its dictionary definition shows that 'nostalgia' is a word underpinned by the sentimental: A wistful or sentimental longing for things, persons, or situations that are past and irrevocable (*Reader's Digest Universal Dictionary*, 1987); and: A wistful or excessively sentimental yearning for something past or irrecoverable (*Longman New Universal Dictionary*, 1982). Unsurprisingly, then, Gudrun's visits, where 'she sat among the louts in the cinema: rakish-looking, unattractive louts they were. Yet she must be among them' (*WL*, 117) are part of her 'nostalgia' (*ibid.*, 116), her 'strange, nostalgic ache of desire' (*ibid.*, 117) for the Beldover of her youth. Her situation is doubly cinematic. Her visits to the cinema are part of her nostalgia, her emotional matrix which, in terms of its artifice, comes under the collection of counterfeit feelings Lawrence associates with the cinema. There are thus two distinct components in 'going to the cinema', namely the narrative film projected for the members of the audience and what the film actually induces in them. The two components are never seen as an organic whole, thus typifying the nervous voyeurism that, to Lawrence, was not



only a concomitant of going to the cinema but a way of experiencing a society in which the dark current of his being was to meet increasing resistance.

Other potential symbols of false, modern existence crop up when Gudrun actually goes to the cinema: 'Gudrun strolled up and down, up and down the length of the brilliant two-hundred paces of the pavement nearest the market-place' (*WL*, 117). Usually, Lawrence links brilliant light with the upper, mental self, and its need for sight whereas darkness is integral to the unconscious soul and its essentially non-visual nature. Hence Hermione, one of Lawrence's hyper-conscious characters, is accused by Birkin of turning the electric light of consciousness on to the unconscious soul. So, visual brilliance goes hand-in-hand with the overly mental consciousness, which, divorced from the essential, unconscious soul, is only a false, shallow derivative of the soul's quiddity. Visual brilliance, like Gudrun's two-hundred paces of pavement, is thus an index of this false self, and is typified by electric light and electricity. Significantly, then, the 'boy', Palmer, who goes to the cinema with her, is an electrician (*WL*, 117).

The theme of the false is perpetuated during the brief narration of Gudrun's involvement with Palmer. The name, 'Palmer', suggests a degree of falsitude in him<sup>12</sup>. If something is palmed, or palmed off to someone, the object in question is given under false or fraudulent terms. The idea that Palmer is an inherently false, manly rather than masculine character, is borne out by Lawrence's description of his landlady's spreading reports about him: '[H]e *would* have a large wooden tub in his bedroom, and every time he came in from work, he *would* have pails and pails of water brought up, to bath in, and then he put on clean shirt and underclothing *every* day, and clean silk socks' (*WL*, 117). This fastidiousness is a far cry from the insouciance of Lawrence's

15

profoundly masculine characters like Walter Morel, Tom Brangwen, Rupert Birkin or Richard Somers who are men enough not to care too much about their appearance.

Palmer's and Gudrun's relationship is as false as their respective characters<sup>13</sup>. Typically, being a mentally-driven scientist, he sees her as just 'a fellow mind' (ibid.). If, as Palmer thinks, Gudrun has a similarly scientific mind to his own, this explains why, like a camera's kodak-vision, she often sees optically and why her art, like a photograph, diminishes reality. For example, her sculptures seem to mock real nature because they are small and sarcastic. Additionally, Palmer's lack of any flair for relationships is expressed in his thinking of women as just 'a new sort of machinery' (ibid.). His attraction to this machinery, which Lawrence says he is 'fascinated' (ibid.) by, contains a degree of inauthenticity. Frequently, Lawrence applies the language of the occult, like fascination, magic, spells, or glamour to the appeal of his emotionally artificial characters. This marginalises the positiveness of their relationships, and suggests the pull of an attraction that is fuelled by the sinister or the perverse or features that are otherwise antithetical to Lawrence's model of a healthy psyche. So when Gudrun's nostalgia threatens to draw her right back into the past, 'the darkish, *glamorous* country' (*WL*, 118) of her youth, Lawrence writes: 'The *spell* was beginning to work again' (ibid., both my italics). Gudrun's visit to the cinema with Palmer is the final measure of their inauthentic relationship. Like her previous visits, it is doubly cinematic. Within the cinema, Palmer resembles a flickering, colourless, cinematic effigy of a real man, like the images on the screen: 'So Gudrun strolled the streets with Palmer, or went to the cinema with him. His long, pale, rather elegant face flickered as he made his sarcastic remarks' (*WL*, 118). Further to his comparison of a sensationalistic life with the cinematograph in an earlier letter to

Bertrand Russell, Lawrence wrote to him again some time after finishing *The Rainbow* pointing to the weakness intrinsic to visual subject/object relations:

[W]hen I see, there is a connection between my mental consciousness and an outside body, forming a percept; but at the same time, there is a transmission through the darkness which is never absent from the light into my blood-consciousness: but in seeing, the blood-percept is perhaps not strong.

(*Letters ii*, 470)

Thus, the Beldover cinema is emblematic of the weaknesses of a modern way of seeing, and by extension, the relatively enfeebled state of the sensationalistic, cinematographic relationship between Palmer and Gudrun. The sensual ecstasy implicit in such relationships culminates later in the novel in the universal murder or devouring of the other, like a tiger drinking blood (as Lawrence puts it), when Gudrun kills Gerald. The sense that both couples - Palmer and Gudrun, and Gudrun and Gerald - are spectators of each other's lives rather than participants in them is confirmed by Lawrence's sense of feeling outside life during the war years. In his words, one suffers what one writes, and what he suffered certainly went into his novel: 'Life mustn't be taken seriously any more - at least the outer, social life. The social being I am has become a spectator at a knockabout dangerous farce' (*Letters ii*, 601).

Like the previous examples of the cinema, therefore, the one in Beldover is inextricably linked with the inauthentic or the artificial. To be added to the list of features which characterise the artifice of the cinema is that its films are black and white. Already, we have seen a narrative

awareness in Lawrence of the cinema's jerky, flickering narration via its dancing and dithering pictures, which recurs here in Palmer's flickering face; and we have noted his awareness of the unnatural relationship between audience and image. Now we see, in Palmer's pale face in the cinema, his preference for white clothes, and the darkish, glamorous Beldover night, that a further part of the cinema's artifice is its colourlessness, an idea that can be confirmed by looking at one of Lawrence's later poems, 'When I Went to the Film' (qv below). To sum up these two sections on *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* (the novels of the war years), the techniques approximating to those in the cinema that have been outlined could be analogues for the death in Lawrence's soul of many cherished ideals. Equally, such cinematic techniques could have been the product of studying a growing social trend. The accumulation of cinematic techniques in his fiction during the war foreshadows a similar build up in his poetry, prose and essays from around 1925 onwards. There could be a pattern of sorts here. The presence of such techniques is definitely linked to being in groups of people who regularly went to the cinema. However, such techniques would not be incommensurate with the disordered society Lawrence perceived in the war years. Before examining the cluster of references to the cinema made by Lawrence in the final five years of his life, I would like to discuss his juxtaposition of cinema (as kinema) with theatre (divine, live entertainment) in *The Lost Girl*.

### *The Lost Girl*

Why, in 1920, did Lawrence base a novel, itself originally conceived in a cinematic style that he calls 'eventual' (*Letters iii*, 459) - focusing on events - on the dialectic between cinema and theatre? To understand the development in Lawrence's fiction, it is enlightening to look at the radical changes in his life between 1916 and 1920. During these years, Lawrence lived

peripatetically in Cornwall, London, the Midlands and Berkshire, to name but the main areas. He was accused of being a spy, and was unable to have published, trouble-free, either of his two contemporary novels, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. Consequently, he relied on his short stories and poetry to earn some money, and the benevolence of friends and relatives for further income. Embittered, impecunious and wholly alienated by England, a state of mind encapsulated by Somers's parting vision of his mother country in *Kangaroo*, he left immediately after the end of the war in 1919, first for mainland Italy, then Capri and finally, Sicily, where he stayed until 1921. There are two important points to be extrapolated here. First, the incessant moving, and accompanying sense of apocalyptic deracination could have led to this cinematic focusing on events from a particular, detached distance that he expresses to Middleton Murry: 'I give it all up. One can only stand far off and watch - or not watch' (*Letters iii*, 122). Equally, Lawrence alludes to it in his description of *The Lost Girl* to Compton Mackenzie as 'all set across a distance' (*ibid.*, 549). Significantly, this style can be traced back to *The Rainbow*, where it is exemplified by the disturbed and distanced point of view of Wigginton, and *Women in Love*, where it is embodied by Gudrun and her rather icy spectatorship of life. Second, Lawrence's failure as a commercial writer would have been made increasingly apparent to him, and it would have been hammered home by his Capri rendezvous with Compton Mackenzie towards the end of 1919. The two had first met, courtesy of a shared publisher, in 1914. Initially nonplussed, Lawrence came to like Mackenzie. Mackenzie's increasing problems with sciatica induced him to seek an alternative means of making money, which he realised by writing novels. They proved to be popular and sold well, so it is easy to surmise that Lawrence, after renewing their acquaintance on Capri in December 1919, might have been tempted to emulate Mackenzie's manner of writing. Indeed, after spending some time with Mackenzie and moving on to Sicily, Lawrence ditched the old manuscript *The*

*Insurrection of Miss Houghton*, and the work he had recommenced on it when he received it, to begin afresh in Spring 1920 on what became *The Lost Girl*. The words Lawrence applied to the new novel - comic, popular, amusing - illustrate a fresh striving to create work with common appeal. From the point of view of the cinematic potential of his work, these words sound equally at home in describing a film. Imagine the billboard: 'The Lost Girl', based on a novel by D.H.Lawrence. Directed by D.W.Griffith. "A Comic Masterpiece" - The Times. "Hugely Popular" - Variety. "Wonderfully Amusing" - Kinema Weekly.

Indeed, it even seems likely that Lawrence was writing with the cinema in mind as he chose the title, *The Lost Girl*, because it sounded like a good film title: Lawrence wrote to Mackenzie: 'Secker prefers the title *The Bitter Cherry* - not *The Lost Girl*. *My Lost Girl* amused me so - such a film title' (ibid., 528). Mackenzie quotes the letter slightly differently: '*My Lost Girl amused me so - made a film title*' (Mackenzie, 1966, 179). Either way, the cinematic potential of the novel is implicit in the choice of title and person - Mackenzie - to whom Lawrence would write a letter of this nature. Mackenzie's connections with the theatrical and cinematic worlds were known to Lawrence, and Mackenzie had indeed tried to sell the cinema rights to his novels. It is easy to imagine Lawrence wanting to do the same, especially in America, the long-term goal of his peregrinations, where his reputation could be promoted by a commercially and critically successful film. Again, strikingly, he sounded out the possibility of selling the cinema rights to his novels, telling Mountsier 'to act for me in all matters literary, dramatic and cinematograph' (*Letters iii*, 577). Earlier, in May 1920, fifteen days after finishing *The Lost Girl*, he was solicited for these rights by a key American film agent, Maurice Revnes, who wrote again in November to urge Mountsier to send the available Lawrence material so he could 'do something real soon'

(*Letters iii*, 546). Revnes's first letter, dated 21 May 1920, post-dates Lawrence's declaration about concluding *The Lost Girl* by sixteen days. It does nevertheless seem possible that Lawrence, by writing a novel which talked about the cinema and was itself cinematic, was trying to be doubly attractive to a film agent or company. Revnes's comment too is interesting: 'Numerous English friends of mine have from time to time suggested to me your novels as having splendid material for the use in the making of motion picture plays' (*ibid.*, 546). It is not known which novels and friends he meant. But Lawrence told Mountsier that he was going to order Duckworth to send him all his books, including the novels *The White Peacock*, *The Trespasser*, *Sons and Lovers*, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. In the same letter, he gave Mountsier permission to let Revnes, the film agent, have them, pending a suitable agreement (*Letters iii*, 547). So the 'splendid material for the use in the making of motion picture plays' might have extended as far back as *The White Peacock* and, given Mackenzie's predominance in Lawrence's coterie just prior to his decision to jettison *The Insurrection of Miss Houghton* in favour of what became *The Lost Girl*, the splendid material for the cinema might be said to include this last text, too.

To judge from Lawrence's statements to Mackenzie about *The Lost Girl* and his own plays, Mackenzie seems to have had some influence on Lawrence's work in general, and on its cinematic potential in particular. Through Mackenzie, Lawrence first read *Ulysses* as it was serialised in *The Little Review* in 1920, provoking the comment to Mackenzie: 'I *must* show it can be done without muck' (Mackenzie, 1966, 167). Eventually, it was done without muck, and Lawrence called it *Kangaroo*, a cinematic travelogue of a novel which partly had, as we shall see, its roots in Lawrence's association with Mackenzie. Mackenzie had definitely recognised the photographic

quality of the backgrounds in Lawrence's novels (ibid., 173). Equally, the cinematographic style of Mackenzie's novel *The Vanity Girl*, published in May 1920 just as Lawrence finished *The Lost Girl*, was noted in what was otherwise a critical review: 'Of course, since Mr Mackenzie has the perfect art of the cinematographist, the scene as it unfolds before us is admirably and alertly diversified; it jumps and flickers just like the movies' (Mackenzie, 1966, 180). Unsurprisingly, Mackenzie very nearly sold the film rights of *The Vanity Girl* to Paramount. Was there a similar cinematic allure to her sister, Lawrence's *Lost Girl*? Having read a number of Mackenzie's works that he had sent to her in April, including two volumes of *Sylvia Scarlett*, Frieda noted the similarity between them and *The Lost Girl*, telling Mackenzie: '*You have created a real new free world there, how you have got rid off [sic] all that dull stuffy Englishness. No wonder they dislike you. No wonder they attack you - I love this book - Lawrence's new book has something of the quality of yours; I think that same having left all Englishness*' (ibid., 176). Clearly, there is a cinematic commonality between *The Lost Girl* and Mackenzie's novels which might be outlined as follows. Both authors use a cinematic style, but for different reasons. For Lawrence, the cinema and its associated techniques are symbolic of the stuffy Englishness and vulgar baseness he came to detest in England. Hence, the first half of the novel which details Alvina's English roots and life is the most cinematic, or, as Lawrence says 'not immediate, not intimate' (*Letters iii*, 549). Only the 'last bit' (ibid.), by which Lawrence presumably means her life in Italy, does he exclude from this lack of immediacy and intimacy. By contrast, Mackenzie seems to see the cinema as a symbol of, rather than an antithesis to, this new lifestyle, of this lack of stuffy Englishness that Lawrence associates with Italy. He makes the connection between cinema and regeneration because he is thinking about American cinema. To his way of thinking, the likes of Paramount were probably capable of doing justice to *The Vanity Girl*, whereas the old-fashioned grandees in charge of



British cinema companies were not. As Mackenzie says of the sale of his *Sinister Street* to Ideal Films, a series of novels was being acquired by this film company 'to infuse life into the British cinema' (Mackenzie, 1966, 186). It is the nationality of cinema that is the issue at this time and, by implication, British cinema was largely conservative and unimaginative whereas American cinema could be more modern and creative. Hence when Lawrence had something positive to say about cinema, for example, his review of John Dos Passos's *Manhattan Transfer*, it was in an American context.

There are further indications of a development in Lawrence's attitude to the cinema during the time he spent in the Mediterranean which might, initially, be attributable to Mackenzie. During the years prior to his arrival on Capri, then Sicily, Lawrence said very little about the cinema. But he does make a number of cinematic-sounding statements which give a grounding to his pronouncements about the cinema around the time spent with Mackenzie. When he writes to Amy Lowell, he evokes her American way of seeing where people 'have gone beyond tragedy and emotion, even beyond irony' (ibid., 30) in terms which approximate the subject/object split of cinematic perception and which, in their decadent finality, summed up the war's sense of an ending. As he builds up to his first post-war comments about the cinema, life is still 'chopped up into disagreeable moments' (ibid., 348) and, as he travels around Europe, 'it feels like accidents, the permanent way all dilapidated' (ibid., 421). After renewing his acquaintanceship with Mackenzie at the end of 1919, in January 1920 Lawrence writes to Lady Cynthia Asquith of going to the South Seas with him and the possibility of being filmed: 'He also talks of the South Seas; and of my going: but alas, a sort of réclame-trip [advertising trip], written up and voiced abroad and even filmed. Alas, I could not be filmed. I should feel like a savage, that they had

stolen my 'medicine' (ibid., 462). Similarly, in April, he repeats the idea to Robert Mountsier: '[Mackenzie] is planned to go to the Pacific and do a serial account of it and a film record and a film novel all at once. But though I like Mackenzie, I couldn't bear to be ravelled up in a film' (ibid., 504).

Although Lawrence objects to the film and being filmed himself, importantly, he doesn't reject the concept of the film novel. This would be commensurate with the idea that he worked on *The Lost Girl* with film in mind, writing it as a sort of 'film novel' which he finished about a month after this letter to Mountsier. At this time, Lawrence seems to be immersed in thoughts of photography. His letters of 1920 contain repeated references to photographs he was sent and wanted and, on Sicily, there was a film documentary crew which one of his acquaintances went with 'to climb Etna and peer down the crater' (ibid., 551). Mackenzie and the film crew might have inspired in him ideas of the film novel and the film travelogue, but he retains a certain antipathy towards the cinema at least until July when, speaking of the proposed journey with Mackenzie, he still feels: 'In a little yacht, minus the cinematographing concomitants, I'd just love it' (ibid., 567). Up to November 1920, Lawrence maintains some interest in Mackenzie's plans, asking him whether he was really going to put a cinema studio on one of the Channel Isles he had acquired (ibid., 608), and telling Mountsier of Mackenzie's rumoured plans for a cinema (ibid., 628). His interest in the film novel and documentary reaches one of its peaks in *Kangaroo*, a mix of both genres that is foreshadowed by *Sea and Sardinia*, the generic diversity of which is clear in the titles Lawrence suggested to Mountsier: 'Sardinian Films or Film of Sicily and Sardinia' (ibid., 696); and, to Curtis Brown: 'Sardinia Films' (ibid., 705).

Cinema's encapsulation of an acutely modern mantra is further illustrated in *The Lost Girl*. The first cinema named in *The Lost Girl* is Woodhouse's 'famous Empire' (LG, 85), followed by 'Wright's Cinematograph and Variety Theatre' (LG, 86). The differences between the two places, pointed out by Mr May, set up a dichotomy between cinema's dead, recorded spectacle and live performance:

[Wright's] was the kind of show that appealed to Mr May: pictures between the turns. The cinematograph was but an item in the programme, amidst the more thrilling incidents - to Mr May - of conjurors, popular songs, five-minute farces, performing birds, and comics. Mr May was too human to believe that a show should consist entirely of the dithering eye-ache of a film.

(LG, 86)

Alvina's statement about the identification of audience with the film (qv above) is at the heart of James Cowan's summary of Lawrence's apparent recognition of these cinema/theatre, absence/presence, dead image/live performance dichotomies: 'Whereas the stage performance involves the audience's active interaction by means of imaginative empathy, the cinema encourages passive projection and projective identification. That is why, as Lawrence sees it, the theatre can achieve the "trembling balance" of life that characterises true art, and the cinema cannot' (Cowan, 1990, pp.98-99). Of course, the thematic climax of *The Lost Girl* is contextualised within this theatre/cinema dichotomy. Alvina's marriage to one of the stage performers represents the novelist's repudiation of the symbolically dead society which prefers film - mind and mental consciousness - to stage - senses and body<sup>14</sup>. She is, as Lawrence says,

questing for a 'reunion with the dark half of humanity' (*Letters iii*, 521). This dark half is, presumably, the unconscious. Because it is essentially unknowable, shifting and denying identity, it is embodied in the form of Ciccio. He is a strange kind of performer, an Italian pretending to be a Red Indian whose outward self seems to collapse in on itself until, like a nest of Russian dolls, it seems multiply interwoven.

### Aaron's Rod

A glance at some of the remaining instances of the cinema in Lawrence's work around the time he wrote *The Lost Girl* will help to complete this picture of features which he sees as characteristics of the cinema's artifice. Lawrence first refers to *Aaron's Rod* in 1918, and he completed it in June 1921 so it can be considered as contemporary with *The Lost Girl*. Roughly outlined, it presents parallel themes to *The Lost Girl* as it deals with leaving England and travelling, and is the last in a line of apocalyptic novels which began with *Women in Love*. Where it differs from *The Lost Girl*, though, is that the vision of Europe is as apocalyptic as that of England, probably caused by Lawrence's experience of post-war Germany, where he sensed an apogee of the effects of the war which catalysed the conclusion of *Aaron's Rod*: 'Only Germany helped me to the finish of *Aaron*' (*Letters iv*, 259). Even the peace of his former island haunt eludes him, and this disillusion, this exhaustion of familiar pleasures, is ultimately realised in his departure from Europe under a cloud. It is epitomised by Aaron's contextualisation of what should be a pleasurable sojourn as a cinematic experience:

[Aaron] felt he ought to have his breath taken away. But, alas, the cinema has taken our breath away so often, investing us in all the splendours of the splendidest American

millionaire, or all the heroics and marvels of the Somme or the North Pole, that life has now no magnate richer than we, no hero nobler than we have been, on the film. *Connu!* *Connu!* Everything life has to offer is known to us, couldn't be known better from the film. (AR, 134)

Lawrence seems to be saying that part of the film's spurious relationship with the audience is that it cannot convey a real sense of actuality. The spirit of place, as Lawrence calls it, would always be lacking. Another aspect of this spuriousness is the film's stultification of desire, curiosity and responsiveness in the audience. As Mr May says: "[W]hy aren't they jealous of the extraordinary things which are done on the film?" (LG, 116).

The comments on the sense of illusory experience, of feeling that everything is known about the war or the North Pole from seeing it on film, tie in with Lawrence's sense of modernity and its nervous over-reliance on sight. He argues that to see is not to be - to see is to know, and 'to know is to lose' (FU, 72). The real way to be is to shut your eyes, thereby lessening the distance between yourself and life's protoplasm, partaking of it rather than just watching it. This way, like Ursula in *Women in Love*, you see feelingly, getting at the reality behind the appearance. Conversely, Gudrun, who sees optically, is always left with the surface, the simulacrum, not the essence, and usually has to watch instead of joining in.

### Kangaroo

Cinematic spectatorship is thematised in *Kangaroo*, too, where it expresses Somers's sense of isolation from the life he sees before him, an isolation which Lawrence himself had felt already in

Ceylon and which would be intensified by the time of his arrival in Australia. The pivotal difference in Lawrence's life between finishing his apocalyptic novels and writing *Kangaroo* is this first step outside Europe in Spring 1922. It was the start of an odyssey which took him through Ceylon, Australia, New Zealand, Tahiti and, ultimately, to the Del Monte ranch in New Mexico where he found his first lasting sense of inner peace since leaving England in 1919.

This prolonged quest is important because it shows that Lawrence did not realise his goal as soon as he left Europe. Initially, he felt he found more of what he wanted to leave behind, so that his journey from one apparent paradise to another resembles the tale of 'The Man Who Loved Islands'. Interestingly, this tale was allegedly inspired by Compton Mackenzie (who threatened to sue!). Mackenzie had acquired the two Channel Islands, Herm and Jethou, and proposed to put a cinema in situ (qv above). Thus, in the form of Mackenzie, there is a half-association between isolation - here, intrinsic to island-dwelling - and the detachment from the object of the gaze that is also implicit in cinematic spectatorship. It is a half-association that impinges on Lawrence's journey to Australia. Obviously, Lawrence had not felt truly at home in Europe during or after the war. This deracination dogs him during his stay in Ceylon. As he says: 'One only goes further and fares worse' (*Letters iv*, 221). On arrival, as with many places Lawrence visited on his travels, he feels 'everything has been easy and nice' (*ibid.*, 214). But, after a week or so, the void beneath the surface of the country has been felt: 'It is lovely to look at - but I doubt if I shall stay very long in Ceylon' (*ibid.*). And after sixteen days, his acquaintance with the island's sub-Buddhist culture leads to the statement: 'In short, after a slight contact, I draw back and don't like it' (*ibid.*, 218). This sentiment gives rise to a string of comments on the island being 'picturesque', 'as a

spectacle, wonderful' (ibid., 221), 'very interesting to look at, but... deadly to live in' (ibid., 227) and 'really wonderful pictorially' (ibid., 231).

The association of being detached from one's environment with just seeing it (instead of being at one with it) is epitomised in Lawrence's assertion: 'It's better to see it on the cinema: you get there the whole effect, without the effort and the sense of nausea' (ibid., 220). He is saying that the apparent superfluousness of the country denies him a sense of belonging, and because his experience has been limited to its appearance, it might as well be seen on the cinema. It is a split in subject/object relations which, in terms of Lawrence's characters, goes back as far as Paul's sense of Miriam, Ursula's of Skrebensky and Gudrun's of Gerald. Equally, it anticipates Lawrence's profile of empty Australia and its empty Australians whom one can get at through sight alone. To unwrap Lawrence's idea of what the 'whole effect' of the island is helps to open up further his sense of the cinema with which he equates this 'whole effect'. In his letters from Kandy, he talks of the island and its inhabitants as being a negation and negatives of what he is himself. Dark people in general are 'built round a gap, a hollow pit' (ibid., 226). Buddhism is 'built over an empty hole in space' (ibid.). After a month there, Lawrence talks rather like Evans, the expatriate Welshman of *Kangaroo* whose blood has thinned down, saying he nearly sweated himself 'into a shadow' (ibid.). Thus far, his vision of the island is one where the reality is abstracted; it is merely there on the plane of vision, without force and mass. This is why he feels its whole effect is equal to that of the cinematograph. Furthermore, when he speaks of the island in a cinematographic context, there are prominent strata of mechanism, and of a quasi-monochromatic colour, two features which we have already placed within the constellation of pointers to the cinematic ways of seeing in Lawrence's work:

No, the East doesn't get me at all. Its boneless suavety, and the thick, choky feel of tropical forest, and the metallic sense of palms and the horrid noises of the birds and creatures, who clammer and clang and rattle and cackle and explode all the livelong day, and run little machines all the livelong night.

(Ibid., 225)

From a cinematograph point of view [Ceylon] can be fascinating: the dark, tangled jungle, the terrific sun that makes like a bell-jar of heat, like a prison over you: the palm-trees and the noise and the *sullenness* of the forest: and then the natives, naked, dark, in all shades of darkness from yellow to mauve black, suave, smooth, in their way beautiful. But curiously enough, the magnetism is all negative, everything seems magnetically to be repelling one. You never for a second feel at one with anything.

(Ibid., 227)

Thus, the 'whole effect' of Ceylon, with its empty people, strangely gloomy colour, and mechanical, surreal jungle is one of alienation. Lawrence's experience of an ancient nation is acutely modern, which is why he enshrines it in the cinematograph, foreshadowing a similar presentation of Australia in *Kangaroo*. Similarly, in Australia, Lawrence could not for much of the time feel at one with his surroundings which, cinematographically, are maintained at a distance from him. The people and the country feel as if they are outside and outside of him. As such, the cinema epitomises their drive to outwardness away from the deep pool of the inner self.



Why did the mass of people not want this stillness and this peace with their own being?

Why did they want cinemas and excitements? Excitements are as nauseous as sea-sickness.

Why does the world want them?

(K, 155)

Clearly, Lawrence views the cinema as anathema to the integral, inner soul, something which the novel's Australians, whose insides have merged away to their outsides, seem to lack. An apposite symbol of the empty Australians is their library, the intellectual shallowness of which is suggested by its location in the cinema:

This building might have been a temporary chapel, as you came at it from the back. But in front it was labelled *Pictoria*, so it was the cinema. But there was also a black board with gilt letters, like a chapel notice-board, which said "School of Arts Library". And the *Pictoria* had a little wing, all wood, like a little school-room. And in one section of this wing was the School of Arts Library, which the Somers had joined.

(Ibid., 190)

Lawrence's perception of emptiness, and his feeling of never gelling with his surroundings, of forever being a sort of wanderer, continued to gnaw at him as he finished the novel, and for the rest of his journey. No shedding of (home)sickness through one's pen here! His displacement is neatly captured by several cinematic paradigms. In the same letter as he speaks of nearly finishing *Kangaroo*, he expresses his remoteness from Australia as 'rather like falling out of a picture and

finding oneself on the floor, with all the gods and men left behind in the picture' (*Letters iv*, 275). It is not clear whether 'picture' refers to portraiture or film, yet there is a definite cinematic spectatorship implied by the divorce between the subject on the floor and the objects - the gods and men - left in the picture. This split typifies Lawrence's journey to America. It is deeply pronounced during his last two days in Australia when he mentions the country's 'unget-at-able glamour' (*ibid.*, 282). And it persists well into the voyage. As he motors around Tahiti, his impressions are like those of Ceylon and Australia which are beautiful to look at but impossible to be at one with. Appropriately, this split is emphasised by his encounter with the film crew in Papeete and his visit to the cinema in San Francisco. Lawrence appears thoroughly distanced from the cast and crew of 'Captain Blackbird' who boarded at Tahiti, calling them undistinguished and common (*ibid.*, 287), and deploring their drunken internecine hatred (*ibid.*, 303). Equally, Lawrence's outing to a cinema in San Francisco, probably the Civic Auditorium just off Market Street (it matches the one he describes in a letter to Mountsier), is associated with a withdrawal from an insane world, one which recalls the illuminated mayhem outside the Beldover cinema:

But night, with great massed and bunches of light, and lights splashing and starrng and running up and down and round about, bewildering, beautiful too, a sort of never-stop Hades. I went to a cinema with a jazz orchestra and a huge and voluminous organ. Either it is all crazy or I am going.

(*Ibid.*, 290)

The references to motion and light, and the sort of real and ontological vertigo implied by them, summon up the image of Gertler's merry-go-round (Lawrence even uses the words 'round about')

here). The juxtaposition of the image of the city as a roundabout of light, which doesn't let you on it, with the cinema is indicative of the cinema's association with an acutely modern experience perceived by the nerves but not enjoyed by the soul. This disorientating experience of the city and the cinema is indicative not only of Lawrence's peregrinations through Australia and the islands, but America, too: 'One forms not the faintest inward attachment, especially here in America' (ibid., 313). Like Australia, the cinema seems an apposite symbol for an empty country and empty people as, even in the Del Monte Ranch which had a spirit of place amenable to Lawrence, he comments: 'But there's no inside to the life: all outside. I don't believe there ever will be any inside to American life' (ibid., 365).

At the ranch, Lawrence enjoyed the company of two Danish artists, Kai Gotszche and Knud Merrild. Before he resumed his travels, Lawrence mentioned in February 1923 the possibility that they might be going to Los Angeles to get some work with cinema companies (ibid., 392). And, by June, Gotszche was working for MGM in Los Angeles. His employment at MGM suggests a compatibility between his art and cinema and, in turn, the idea that he might have been a conduit to Lawrence for the cinematic possibilities of visual art (qv 'Sex and Loveliness' below). After living with the Danes, Lawrence resumed an old habit of writing to his correspondents either on the backs of photographs or postcards. Seemingly, Lawrence created a visual montage of his own life, an effect already achieved in words by his travelogue of a novel, *Kangaroo*. Art did indeed imitate life as the snapshots of events provided by these photos and postcards reflect the fractured picaresqueness of Lawrence's own life that he mentions to Molly Skinner in June 1923 (*Letters iv*, 467). As with Somers, a film (of sorts) was being made of a life that was already, in terms of its disjointedness and distance from others, part film itself. The connection between motion and the

inability to attach oneself to anything is one that is felt throughout much of Lawrence's travelling in the 1920s. It is clearly seen in microcosm in Lady Chatterley's famous motorised point of view of Tevershall.

### Lady Chatterley's Lover

So far, the artifice of the cinema has been seen in two lights. Either it has been a counterpoint to a genuine, emotionally profound situation, as in Paul's and Clara's case, or, more frequently, it has been a focus for the inauthentic, as was the case with Will Brangwen, Gudrun Brangwen, and the Australians. The mention of a cinema in Constance Chatterley's life falls into the second class; as it follows her involvement with Mellors, it seems to be a symbol for the falseness of her marriage to Clifford, and also of a general, cultural *mauvaise-foi*:

Never was an age more sentimental, more devoid of real feeling, more exaggerated in false feeling, than our own. Sentimentality and counterfeit feeling have become a sort of game, everybody trying to outdo his neighbour. The radio and the film are mere counterfeit emotion all the time, the current press and literature the same. People wallow in emotion: counterfeit emotion. They lap it up: they live in it and on it. They ooze with it.

*(A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover, LCL, 312)*

The day of her trip to Uthwaite, during which the cinema is noticed, begins 'cold and wet again... In spite of May and a new greenness' (*LCL*, 158). The coldness and wetness is typical of the blight Clifford's patriarchal, military and industrial culture casts on her life, and those of the local populace. This blight is evident in the outlook that Connie sees from the car:

The car ploughed uphill through the long squalid straggle of Tevershall, the blackened brick dwellings, the black slate roofs glistening their sharp edges, the mud black with coal-dust, the pavements wet and black. It was as if dismalness had soaked through and through everything. The utter negation of natural beauty, the utter negation of the gladness of life, the utter absence of the instinct for shapely beauty which every bird and beast has, the utter death of the human intuitive faculty was appalling. The stacks of soap in the grocers' shops, the rhubarbs and lemons in the greengrocers! the awful hats in the milliners! all went by, ugly, ugly, ugly, followed by the plaster-and-gilt horror of the cinema and its wet picture announcements, 'A Woman's Love!', and the new big Primitive chapel, primitive enough in its stark brick and big panes of greenish and raspberry glass in the windows.

(*LCL*, 158)

Several important features can be identified here. First, the environment is predominantly achromatic, which makes it look like the black and white film of Lawrence's poem 'When I Went to the Film'. Perhaps the wetness is indicative of a glossy, photographic vision of these scenes, typified by the cinema's 'wet picture announcements' (*LCL* 158) in Tevershall. The town definitely appears as a dead, recorded cinema image, as Lawrence writes of it in terms of 'The utter negation of natural beauty, the utter negation of the gladness of life' (*ibid.*). Connie's vision of Tevershall, though, contains apparent hints of colour in the form of the rhubarbs and lemons, and clear streaks of gilt, green and raspberry in the buildings. With the fruit, Lawrence names them without colouring them in, a trait developed in the Morel household in *Sons and Lovers*

which is filled with outlines of named objects which Lawrence does not colour. The sketched forms, or outlines, of objects without colour which either move, or are seen from a moving perspective, evoke the form of the animated film, a noteworthy comparison as Lawrence describes the Tevershall scenes without any accompanying noise in much the same way as a silent animated film would. British classics like 'Animated Cotton' (1909) had pioneered the form, and its popularity culminated in the nineteen-twenties at the same time as the publication of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* with the release of Disney's 'Steamboat Willie' (1928). In the novel, the film 'A Woman's Love' showing in the cinema is indicative of the aim of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* which Lawrence hoped would redeem love from the realm of clichés and sentiment, typified by such films, to higher planes of truth and tenderness. Thus, amongst the scene's prevailing colourlessness, normally associated with the cinema and its nullification of life, why are the cinema and the church associated with colour? On a simple level, the buildings are highlighted by being picked out in colour. On a more complex one, Lawrence is applying the sort of reverse irony to them that he applies to dancing when he describes it cinematically. Dancing, usually vital and positive, is transmogrified into its opposite by Lawrence's cinematic hues. The cinema and the church, commonly lifeless and unnatural, are fused with a sense of colour. The irony inherent in this fusion emphasises the negative connotations of cinema and church, as well as suggesting that while films and religion are anathema to Lawrence, they are the colourful opiate of the colourless milieu populated by the masses<sup>15</sup>. Indeed, he seems to be saying that the cinema is replacing the church. Sociologically and historically, this observation is true and it was first made by Lawrence in *Twilight in Italy*:

The theatre is an old church. Since that triumph of the deaf and dumb, the cinematograph, has come to give us the nervous excitement of speed - grimace, agitation, and speed, as of flying atoms, chaos - many an old church in Italy has taken on a new lease of life.

(I, 55)

Significantly, in the description of Tevershall in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, the colour Lawrence associates with the cinema is gold. The 'gilt horror of the cinema' is representative of its artifice, as the gilt brocade of Hermione's dress is of her inauthenticity, her failure to live life properly from the roots in 'Breadalby'.

The final and most important feature of the description of Tevershall is Lawrence's presentation of the town as a sequence of tracking shots. The brick dwellings, the roofs, the pavements, the grocer's, the greengrocer's, the milliner's, the cinema and the chapel, 'all went by ugly, ugly, ugly', seen from Connie's point of view in the chauffeur-driven car as a series of tracking shots. This is one of several episodes in Lawrence's novels which describe scenes from a focused, steady but moving point of view (qv above). This animated way of seeing, like the cinema's, is made possible by a machine. A tacit connection between this perspective made possible by machines like the car and the mechanism of the cinema comes in Lawrence's reference to A.W.Jordan in *The Lost Girl*. In the same breath as Lawrence tells us that Jordan is the owner of Woodhouse's cinema, the 'famous Empire' (LG, 85), he adds that the cinema-owner 'had a motor car' (ibid.). Lawrence's sense of the visual continued to overlap what can be called cinematic up to and during his writing of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and, subsequently, *Sketches of Etruscan Places*.

Sketches of Etruscan Places.

Chronologically, Lawrence's embryonic thoughts on *Etruscan Places* precede *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. He initially referred to doing a book on the Etruscans in April 1926, but by the time of completion in 1927, he had already finished drafting his 'rather improper' novel. Both books convey a sense of the illusion of the kinetically real in terms that are perspicaciously cinematic. The cinematic potential of *Lady Chatterley's* tracking shot is flagged by the actual presence of a cinema, and, as we shall see, Lawrence writes knowledgeably about the theory of cinema in *Etruscan Places*. Lawrence's references to the cinema accrue in the last five years of his life, first, in these two works, then in *Pansies, Pornography and Obscenity* and *Sex Versus Loveliness*. Earlier in his career, he had been exposed to a number of people associated with the cinema who were in a position to sow the seeds of particular concepts of the cinema in Lawrence's mind.

Compton Mackenzie was the first of several seminal figures in the history of Lawrence's involvement with the cinema in the nineteen-twenties (qv above). Mackenzie is followed by Knud Merrild and Kai Gotzsche, the two Danish artists with whom the Lawrences wintered in 1922-3. Merrild recalls discussing the cinema with Lawrence (qv below), and the milieu of Taos in general seems to have been a fertile place to meet people with cinematic connections. The arrival of Clarence Thompson, who later acted in the films 'The Love Thief' (1926), 'Butterflies in the Rain' (1926) and 'Sensation Seekers' (1927) and screenwrote for 'The Love Trap' (1929) and 'The Climax' (1930), at Mabel Dodge's ranch in April 1924 was eagerly anticipated by Lawrence (*Letters v*, 42). Through Clarence Thompson, Lawrence came to know Bobby Jones. Writing to Thompson in August 1924, he speaks of Mabel Dodge visiting Bobby Jones. Lawrence's use of the familiar 'Bobby' for his formal name Robert Edmond Jones (*ibid.*, 107) suggests some



acquaintance with Jones who was to become the production designer on the films 'La Cucaracha' (1934) and 'Dancing Pirate' (1936) and the art director on 'Becky Sharp' (1935). Lawrence also corresponded on several occasions with Karl Wilhelm Seelig, a literature, theatre and film critic who showed some interest in his work (ibid., 314). Films that Lawrence saw during the early and mid-twenties include 'The Thief of Baghdad' (1924) with Dorothy Brett at the Teatro Luis Mier y Teran on 7th December 1924, 'Ben Hur' (1925) with Earl and Achsah Brewster, probably in 1926 on Capri, and 'Chang' (1927) with the Wilkinson family in 1927, probably in the Gambrinus Halle Birrerria and Caffeteria, a large and popular bar with a cinema attached in the Via Brunelleschi, Firenze, not far from the Villa Mirinda. He might also have seen 'The Sheik' (1919) and 'The Son of the Sheik' (1926), Valentino's famous films, as he criticises him in his poems and essays and is facetious about the films' popular appeal (*Letters v*, 574).

To evaluate critically this biographical material helps to substantiate and develop some of the earlier points about the cinematic ways of seeing in Lawrence's novels. From Mackenzie in 1920 to Seelig in 1925, Lawrence was exposed to figures steeped in the form of cinema, and cognisant of the connection between the cinema and other art forms. Hence, for example, their influence might have undergirded Lawrence's thoughts about *The Lost Girl* being a good title for a film, and his contextualisation of Mollie Skinner's *Black Swans* as a cinema novel: 'It was too much of a cinema piece and stayed on the surface, and I wanted so much to like it and then really I didn't' (*Letters v*, 419).

As for the films Lawrence saw in the nineteen-twenties, his reactions to them encapsulate the point at the outset of this thesis, namely that while he was not impressed with the use to which the

new form of cinema was put, he was aware of the potentialities of cinema. He obviously disliked Valentino's films, and was nauseated by 'Ben Hur', suggesting that the clichéd, unwittingly self-parodic stereotypes of the action-adventure genre lacked artistic worth. However, he wrote nothing of the two other films, 'The Thief of Baghdad' and 'Chang'. It is impossible to say that he liked them, but they were both very different films from the typical Hollywood fare that he denigrates. 'The Thief of Baghdad' seemed to reveal the true potential of cinema for narration that Lawrence nods to in his praise of 'Manhattan Transfer': 'Here is magic. Here is beauty. Here is the answer to cynics who give the motion picture no place in the family of the arts... a work of rare genius' (*Photoplay, Halliwell's Film Guide 11th Edition*, 1139). Similarly, the enchanting music and ethnographic details of 'Chang' which resemble an anthropological fieldwork might have lead Lawrence to realise that film was capable of the sort of elucidation inherent in his own works like his history texts and travel books. The dynamism of the camerawork was also very impressive (*ibid.*, review by C.A.Lejeune, 209), and parallels the mobility and scale of point of view in some of his texts. Lawrence had been exposed to a form of cinema which was radically different from the usual Hollywood pap. The cinematography of 'Chang' *would* permit, say, the spectacle and motion of Gerald's subjugation of the mare in 'Coal Dust', a spectacle resembling some of the scenes in 'Chang'.

Nevertheless, all Lawrence's insights into the mechanisms and style of the cinema serve to emphasise that a cinematic perception is, for all its dynamism, still only kinematic and hence incomplete, a point he illustrates in such seminal fashion in *Etruscan Places* that his words are used as a paradigm of cinema in *The Oxford English Dictionary* (qv above):

For a man who sees not as a camera does when it takes a snapshot, not even as a cinema-camera, taking its succession of instantaneous snaps; but in a curious rolling flood of vision, in which the image itself seethes and rolls; and only the mind *picks out* certain factors which shall *represent* the image seen\*. We have made up our minds to see things *as they are*: which is camera vision. But the camera can neither feel the heat of the horse, his strange body; nor smell his horsiness; nor hear him neigh.

(*EP*, 127. \* Penguin Books 1967 version, 171, reads: That is why a camera is so unsatisfactory: its eye is flat, it is related only to a negative thing inside the box: whereas inside our living box there is a decided positive.)

Lawrence makes the workings of the cinema so transparent here that he offers a clear insight into both its potential and its limitations. Because he is so insightful, and so prone to using the techniques and language of the cinema camera - even self-fulfilment can be 'all a question of getting yourself focussed' (*Letters v*, 308) - it is easy to forget that his overall view of cinema is pejorative and that techniques approximating to those of the cinema in his work are expressions of a limiting experience rather than a liberating one. The paradox is neatly packed into a reply to Dorothy Brett who had written to him from New Mexico: 'It is exciting to hear of bears and bucks, oil-kings and cow-boys and bear-hunters. Seems to grow more movie-like each day' (*ibid.*, 595). Ostensibly, the equation of newness and excitement with the movies is positive, but, subverting this, is the realisation that all the characters and actions of this movie are stereotypes and clichés. To Lawrence in the nineteen-twenties, much as at the beginning of the previous decade when he read *Creative Evolution* and would have seen that cinema was a logical derivation of older ways of thinking, cinema, although offering a new form of narration, ironically

had very little that was new to narrate. Hence it encapsulates a sense of life-denial that dominates Lawrence's conception of the cinema in *Pansies*.

### *Pansies*

Lawrence appears to have finished *Pansies*, and the visions of the cinema therein, by December 1928. Lawrence's vision of film as the zeitgeist of an ersatz era in *Pansies* is the development of his earlier thinking which is concisely vented in 1927 in a letter to Harold Mason. Lawrence wrote: 'It is as if the age took *pleasure* in substitutes' (*Letters vi*, 28). Clearly, it is his reaction to this zeitgeist that underlies his creation of the essentially phallic novel, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, with its effort to redeem sex from the cerebral to the corporeal, from the surrogate to the essence. Film was clearly an epitome of the false and hence antithetical to the phallic consciousness, a suggestion Lawrence makes later to Kot with whom he shares this idea: [I]t's the death of the phallic consciousness which is making us go so withered and flat, filmy, in our lives' (*Letters vi*, 355). What does he mean when he says they have become 'flat' and 'filmy' in their lives? Given its juxtaposition to 'flat', which Mr May saw as a central trait of the cinema (qv above), it is likely that 'filmy' means that their lives have come to resemble a cinema film. As we shall see, in *Kangaroo*, this concept underpins Somers's life which is transmogrified into a parodic film of itself. Lawrence and Kot might have developed this concept of cinema as an antithesis to true sexuality from their early times in London together when the cinema parties (qv above) were popular. Shortly after Lawrence's statement about the age being one of substitutes, Kot wrote to him with his verdict about the production of *David*, which, having been in the pipeline for some time, had eventually taken place: 'The scene of Samuel and the prophets... was done badly, - rather like a cheap cinema, than a simple grand scene' (*Letters vi*, 67). Here, Kot is using the

simile of the cinema to express the transformation of *David* into a grotesquerie; and Lawrence repeated his words with the sort of sardonic recognition of film that is increasingly to be found in his writings in these last years:

They say the play was very dull, that it was like a cinema with too much talking, that it was boring and no drama in it, and that it was a very great mistake for a clever man like me to offer such a thing for the actual stage. - A clever man like me doesn't fret over what they say. If the producers made a bad film of it, that's the producers' fault.

(Ibid., 75)

To move on to *Pansies*, as we shall see, one of Lawrence's dislikes of the cinema was that it told its story in black and white. The use of black and white as a metaphor in his fiction dates back to *Sons and Lovers*, and a clear equation between the cinema and colourlessness is made in *Pansies*. While describing a scene from his holiday in Les Diablerets in the winter of 1927-8, which strikingly evokes a similar one in *Women in Love*, Lawrence unwittingly explains why he disliked black and white; it is antithetical to his sense of living form (*Letters vi*, 277). Given the equation he makes in *Pansies* between the cinema and black and white, it is hardly surprising that he finds, in this scene from his holiday, black and white to be synonymous with the uniformity that is part of the mechanism of cinema. Most importantly, though, is the distance placed between black and white and painting: '[I]t offends the painter in one'. So when Lawrence empties the colour from his prose to write in black and white, as he does on so many occasions from *Sons and Lovers* to *Kangaroo* and beyond, he is invoking not painting but film.

Certainly, photography continued to manifest some appeal for him, as it had done sporadically during the nineteen-twenties, and as it would to his death. He finds that the playwright Max Mohr's charming photograph of the calf 'gave me a nostalgia for the land, for a Bauerngut [smallholding]' (*Letters vi*, 304). Additionally, he seemed thrilled with photos of the garden and tea-party sent to him by his sister Ada (*ibid.*, 482). Yet this affinity for the Kodak is tempered with an awareness that it lacks substance. Trying to cheer up Lady Ottoline Morrell, he argues that the vision of her coming out of the imagination is the important part of remembrance. And even if that vision is only a photograph or a portrait and not the actual person or thing, it retains the power to move the imagination (another part of the paradox)(*ibid.*, 409). Similarly, he understands that photos sent by his sister show only what they want to show (*ibid.*, 482). They are only ever a partial vision, a point Lawrence makes about much modern visual art (*ibid.*, 447). On the whole, during the period prior to writing *Pansies*, Lawrence is, unsurprisingly, sensitive to the constitution of modern art. His sensitivity to a range of modern issues was turned into a series of articles for newspapers and magazines, with Lawrence enjoying considerably more commercial success as a journalist than a novelist, to the extent that he was asked to broadcast (on radio) by the BBC (*Letters vi*, 552). Nancy Pearn had been contacted more than once by the BBC with a view to securing Lawrence's services and she had passed the requests on to him, to be met with the expected response 'the thought of broadcasting makes my blood run cold' (*ibid.*). This imbrication with a variety of modern arts, particularly film, must have been behind the *Film Weekly* editor's remarks (made more than once), passed on to Lawrence again by Nancy Pearn, that: 'No doubt Mr Lawrence could write a good article on the sort of film he would write or produce if there were no censor' (*Letters vi*, 601). Whatever Lawrence was saying and doing, it

was enough to catch the *Film Weekly* editor's eye, and it was followed by clear ideas about films that are expressed in *Pansies*.

The first relevant poem in the collection is 'When I Went to the Film' (*CP*, pp.443-4). In the poem, the cinema's monochromatic colourlessness is an obvious sign of artifice. The feelings that nobody felt, the close-ups of kisses that could not be felt and the pure personalities, supremely unfelt, are all labelled by their black-and-whiteness. Other features Lawrence seems to associate with the cinema's artifice are its mediation of a conventionalised notion of love via the close-up, and its flat representation of characters by images of absent people - 'shadows of people' who 'move in flat ecstasy' (*ibid.*). The lack of dimensionality is perhaps a reflection of the absence of real, embodied emotion in the cinema. It is for this reason that Mr May criticises the cinema's flatness, too, equating flatness with a certain lack in the pictures: "'I can't believe they want nothing but pictures. I can't believe they want everything in the flat," he said' (*LG*, 115).

The second important poem is 'Let Us Be Men' (*CP*, 450). Here, Lawrence emphasises the mechanical, artificial form of entertainment offered by the film, and brackets it with the radio and the gramophone as he does elsewhere. The third is 'Film Passion' (*CP*, 538). In this poem, Lawrence's concern centres on the belief that the artificial and conventionalised cinema stereotype denies a real, 'blood conscious' relationship with the watching audience. People who watch cinematically, and the objects of the gaze shaped by the cultural pressure of the cinema into stereotypes like Rudolph Valentino and Lillian Gish, both stay on the safe, shallow plane of visual, narcissistic non-engagement with each other rather than undertaking the journey into deeper levels of a 'blood conscious' relationship. These three poems epitomise Lawrence's view of film, and

shape the final pointers to the cinematic ways of seeing in his work which can be mapped back to the opening constellation (qv above). Before concluding the history of this constellation, I would like to make one final reference to the cinema in 'Sex versus Loveliness', written shortly before Lawrence died.

### Sex Versus Loveliness

This article was probably completed by Autumn 1929, and contains the last direct reference Lawrence makes to the film or cinema in any of his works or letters:

Now beauty is a thing about which we are so uneducated we can hardly speak of it. We try to pretend it is a fixed arrangement: straight nose, large eyes, etc. We think a lovely woman must look like Lillian Gish, a handsome man must look like Rudolph Valentino.

So we *think*...

But to stick to the films - there is a greater essential beauty in Charlie Chaplin's odd face than ever there was in Valentino's. There is a bit of true beauty in Chaplin's brows and eyes, a gleam of something pure.

But our sense of beauty is so bruised and clumsy, we don't see it, and don't know it when we do see it. We can only see the blatantly obvious, like the so-called beauty of Rudolph Valentino, which only pleases because it satisfies some ready-made notion of handsomeness.

(*PII*, 529)



The article's latticework of thought dates back to the winter of 1922-3, which Lawrence spent with Knud Merrild and Kai Gotzsche at the Del Monte Ranch where Merrild recollects a similar diatribe by Lawrence on sex and beauty (Merrild, 1964, 151-3). The cinematic exemplum Lawrence uses to demonstrate his point in 'Sex Versus Loveliness' might have had its origin in the time spent with the Danes, too, as Merrild details many conversations about the visual arts with Lawrence, including a few on the cinema. Some of the first works the Danes showed Lawrence were their posters for a New York film company (Merrild, 1964, 18), and one of Lawrence's opening subjects was the vulgar neglect of what he called 'simple form' by the Tahitian film colony from Hollywood whom he met en route to San Francisco (ibid., 11). Merrild talks about the monthly picture show in Taos, too, but it is not clear whether he and Lawrence ever went (ibid., 38). The Danes were also very close to Lawrence while Seltzer was negotiating for the film rights to *Women in Love* in Hollywood in January 1923. Following Seltzer's departure from their New Year's Eve party, the debate about how much Seltzer could get, and what Lawrence would hold out for, became one of the pet topics of discussion amongst the four residents of Del Monte (Merrild, 1964, 124, 126). Such was their interest in the cinema, as art form, industry, and a source of income that Merrild and Gotzsche worked for film enterprises during the summer of 1923. Merrild went to The Monroe Doctrine Centennial and Motion Picture Industrial Exposition, and Gotzsche to MGM where he quickly became absorbed in the techniques and technology of picture-making and backstage life, both men quickly writing to Lawrence about their jobs (ibid., 300).

Merrild's interest in the cinema stems from his theories of abstract art. As art and especially pictures became more abstract, the storytelling technique became divorced from the picture itself.

Hence a particular phase of the picture, the image, began to evolve, a process culminating in cinema's mechanical image-making where, in fact, the image is de-emphasised and the pure abstract pattern of the images dominates, the pure pattern, Merrild reckons, being the essential part of great abstract art. For him, abstract art was therefore an art mainly concerned about art itself and exemplified by the pure abstraction of visual music (ibid., 224). There were branches of cinema theory which likened montage to music, reasoning that a film frame in a montage derives its meaning from its relation to the frames immediately before and after it as a note in a musical sequence would. Cinema would thus be an approximation of Merrild's abstract exemplum, visual music. Further consideration of Merrild's theories lends more weight to the argument that cinema is an appropriate expression of abstraction. After Lawrence walked away from another of their debates on abstraction, Merrild pensively writes:

As the life we live today is being more and more abstracted from nature, and less spiritual, an abstract rendering of our epoch or period, seems only logical.

Or as Ozenfant says:...

"The Einsteinian attitude of mind, upon reflection, is revealed as a magnificent seeking after what is constant in variation; a constant from varied angles, stability in mutation."

In conclusion, I will kill the old order with a quotation from Moholy-Nagy: "The art of the academies is dead. But the art of what is living still lives, and its forms, based on no previous analogies, grow out of present needs - even if these cannot always be formulated in words."

(Ibid., 227)

Merrild is arguing that the truest expression of the decade's cultural climate is an abstract art distanced from nature, constantly varying and capable of multiple perspectives, in short, the model of mechanical image-making - the movies - he elucidates earlier (ibid., 220, 222). Lawrence, to an extent, agrees, concurring that abstractionism is of machine industrialism and the soul's disintegration (ibid., 224). Where Lawrence chooses to differ, though, is on the question of its relation to life. Merrild saw abstractionism as the realest expression of the reality they were living through, in contrast to Lawrence who felt it had no relation with life. To put the debate in the context of their relationship with each other, Merrild was aware that he was a beginner in English and that Lawrence often teased him. This is the case here. Ostensibly, Lawrence concludes his argument by disagreeing with Merrild by asserting that abstractionism has no relation with life. In doing so, he is actually aligning himself with Merrild's belief that an art that has no relation with life is an apposite expression of a nihilistic post-war cultural climate.

Merrild developed the above arguments to defend painting in one of the many and varied debates he had with Lawrence on abstract art. Lawrence never openly capitulated, yet, as with the cinema, he had a capacity for enjoying something he spoke so vehemently against, possibly because he simply enjoyed being in opposition. Merrild cites Lawrence's description of the shells Somers brings Kangaroo as an example of Lawrence's propensity for painting scenes in words that are abstract, and by implication, cinematic, as they rely on the development of image, and the pattern of objects within the image: '[Lawrence] talks about lines, colour, pattern, different material, different qualities, transparency, substance and structure - all values the modern painter has accepted and incorporated in his work' (ibid., 226). Thus Lawrence can relish what he opposes,

and uses it to depict Kangaroo, the cinematic, abstract portrayal of whom represents the atrophy of his deep unconscious self.

The events of the final fifteen months of Lawrence's life, from December 1928 to March 1930, while he travelled from place to place, hoping for a paradise or an improvement in his health due to a change in diet or environment, not discovering it and regretting where he had just been and moving on again, probably seemed like the horrible whirl of an alien world like the one which flashes cinematically before Connie Chatterley while driving through Tevershall. As Lawrence says, either the world was different or he was, and his severance from this alien world of events which spun around him like a cinematic montage, their modern, staccato electric energy recalling that which he detected in Gertler's Merry-Go-Round, made him feel as if he were psychologically outside the modern world, spectating on it instead of being a part of it and hating its degeneration into obscenity, typified by the ruination of cities by modern mechanical force-emblems like electricity and petrol. The split between him and modern society parallels the separation of subject from object in the cinema, the separation in both cases resulting in the sort of uneasy voyeurism narrated in his novels. Further to this point, the cinematic zeitgeist he observed probably led to his feeling that a popular, cinematic novel like *The Lost Girl* would sell, meeting America's desire for the modern romance (*Letters vii*, 503). Within this cultural climate of cheap and vulgar concepts, shallow art, and hard, insensitive drawings forced out from the will with no delicacy of feeling, it is no wonder that *Pornography and Obscenity* appealed so much to the cognoscenti, written, as it was from the heart, and outselling Joynson-Hicks's ('Jix', the Home Secretary who came down so heavily on Lawrence) pamphlet advocating censorship by several thousand copies. Equally, it is not surprising that Lawrence railed so much against Frieda's gramophone, believing, as with the

cinema, that such a mechanical recording process, rather like some of the poorer German translations of his novels, could never preserve the spirit of the original. The falseness of the age is again epitomised visually by the substitution of blood-consciousness with image-making love, by a narcissus image as it were, encapsulated by the repellent (to Lawrence) sight of 'self-conscious young americans [sic] posing before their own cameras' (*Letters vii*, 648). Again, though, Lawrence can appreciate that which he satirises as he was happy to take such photos, typified by the one of Cresse Crosby (*ibid.*, tenth insert opp. 290). What, though, would Lawrence put in its place? Presumably, the 'big, old pagan vision of the world' (*ibid.*, 509), before the millstones of ideology and personality ground love and blood-consciousness into their current tiny, tight grist. No doubt this vision of the world would be symbolic for, as Lawrence says in September 1929: '[A]ll art is *au fond* symbolic, conscious or unconscious. When I began *Lady C.* of course I did not know what I was doing - I did not deliberately work symbolically... The wood is of course unconscious symbolism - perhaps even the mines - even Mrs Bolton' (*ibid.*, 477). Ironically, it is this symbolism, in its particularly visual form, that enables so much of the spirit of Lawrence's works to be seen and felt in the film adaptations, and which reflects back on the originals, enabling us to see it more clearly. Thus, the cinema itself is symbolic, consciously, even, in 'Sex Versus Loveliness' (*PII*, pp 527-531). The regular features and stereotypical attributes of Rudolph Valentino and Lillian Gish symbolise the replacement of essence with the ideal, the substitution of felt, innate beauty or loveliness with a thought, social image of beauty.

With this point, the history of Lawrence and the cinema has come full circle. It has uncovered Lawrence's thoughts on a subject he vehemently decried but whose potential interested him as an expression of the modern world. The context of his references to the cinema has been enriched by

looking at them through the prism of other people and events, particularly Bergson, Mackenzie, Merrild and the war, and by a consideration of his letters for, in the words of Merrild, there is no better way to know Lawrence than through his letters. We have a clearer idea of what the cinema meant to Lawrence during certain phases of his life, and this, in conjunction with the constellation of pointers outlined at the beginning of this history, enables us to gesture to the cinematic ways of seeing in his novels.

### Conclusion.

To focus closely on the cinematic ways of seeing in Lawrence's novels, it seems best to look at novels synchronistic with the peaks of cinematic activity in Lawrence's life. Selected from these are *Sons and Lovers* (written after reading Bergson), *Women in Love* (Ottoline Morrell's cinema parties and the war) and *Kangaroo* (Compton Mackenzie). My selection of three novels is commensurate with the scope of other studies of Lawrence and the cinema, most notably Jane Jaffe Young's, which have confined themselves to two, at most, three of Lawrence's works for reasons of economy. I will begin by looking for clusters of cinematic features in *Sons and Lovers*, and by comparing the novel with Jack Cardiff's adaptation of it. Indeed, the fascination of this project and the reason for undertaking the thesis is to shuffle between the novels and the films to see what the films make of the novels, and also to read the films in the contexts of the novels. I hope that this shuffling will facilitate a study in Lawrence's ways of seeing and that these ways of seeing will be magnified on film as, really, this is what the thesis is all about: *cultural ways of seeing, symbolised by the cinematic*.

## Notes.

1. The occult can be associated with the cinema for its marginalisation of Lawrence's ideal of positive emotional profundity. But the cinema also seems to parallel the occult in terms of its capacity to summon ghostly, black and white images of an absent world (Virilio, 1984, 41).

2. See Linda Williams, *Sex in the Head: Visions of Femininity and Film in the Work of D.H.Lawrence* and James Cowan, *D.H.Lawrence and the Trembling Balance* (pp. 95-114). I am much indebted to these highly readable books for the corpus of discussion that follows, as I am to Paul Virilio's excellent *War and Cinema* which has been an invaluable aid in pinpointing the cinematic highlights of Lawrence's work.

3. See Bergson's *Creative Evolution* (pp. 322-366), where he uses the cinematograph to evoke certain types of older knowledge.

4. Dances seem to have a special appeal to the cinema, perhaps because of their orchestration of character through the body. Anna and Will's dancing in the cornfields in *The Rainbow* features in the BBC adaptation, and Gudrun's eurhythmics are adapted by Ken Russell in his film of *Women in Love*. Sergei Eisenstein, the renowned formative Russian filmmaker, felt dances had a certain affinity with the cinema, too, particularly the exhausting hours-long dances in sunshine and dust by the Mexican Indians during their religious festivals (Wollen, 1960, 36).

5. Lawrence does not say whether The Empire in *The Rainbow* is a music hall or a cinema like The Empire or Wright's in *The Lost Girl*. But, in terms of Will's uninvolved, visual enjoyment of

the girl, his visit to The Empire typifies the sort of cinematic spectatorship discussed by Linda Williams. And, by 1914 or earlier, there were three Empire cinemas in South-East London that he could have seen during his residence in Croydon.

6. See *The Trembling Balance* (Cowan, 104, 1990).

7. Sometimes, Lawrence uses electricity for his 'blood relationships'. In 'Excuse', Ursula feels: 'She had established a rich new circuit, a new current of passionate electric energy, between the two of them' (*WL*, 314). But the electricity of this relationship is characterised in a particular way. It has none of the brilliance redolent of modern relationships. Instead, it is distinguished, oxymoronically, by an older, darker light like the fire which illuminates Birkin and Gerald in 'Gladiatorial': 'It was a dark fire of electricity that rushed from him to her' (*ibid.*).

8. Eisenstein fits into the discourse on Lawrence, cinema and war. He argued that his fragmentary style of montage was a result of the war. Similarly, Lawrence asserted that *Women in Love*, a novel of counterpointed montages, grew out of the war. The resemblances between both men's ideas are discussed more fully in the chapter on *Women in Love*. The point to be made here is that the war was instrumental in producing a theory of fragmentation. This theory was realised most effectively in films, but different arts, like literature, also converged on this and other cinematic styles catalysed by the war.

9. Walter Benjamin outlines a similar difference between the two visions (Benjamin, 1973, pp.235-6).



10. Significantly, after finishing *Kangaroo* in the summer of 1922, Lawrence spent the Autumn working on *The Boy in the Bush*, which has been called 'the most cinematic of all Lawrence's works' (Moore, 'Lawrence and the Flicks', in *Literature and Film Quarterly*, vol.1, n.1, Jan. 1973, 5). The completion of *Kangaroo*, and then another highly cinematic work, *The Boy in the Bush*, would seem to confirm Lawrence's interest in the cinema at this stage of his career.

11. Dorothy Warren was born in 1896. According to her letter, she was thirty-two by the time of writing (9 April 1928). Although the National Register of Births, Deaths and Marriages at Somerset House has no record of the exact date of her birth, she must have been born between January and April 1896. In that case, her eighteenth birthday would have been between these months in 1914, and she could have still been in her eighteenth year until as late as April 1915. But the Morrells did not buy Garsington until May, and Lawrence did not visit until June. So if, as her husband says, she first met Lawrence at Garsington, and did indeed come to Byron Villas, she would have been nineteen, not eighteen.

12. Usually, very little is in Lawrence's carefully-wrought narratives by accident, and this includes the names of characters and places. Morel, Wilford Road, Harby, Cossethay, Crich, Willey Water, Cooley and Mullumbimby (to name but a few) contain overtones of various themes in their respective narratives.

13. While their relationship may seem real to them, it lacks the qualities of Lawrence's model of the 'blood relationship'.

14. For another comparison of the theatre with the debased art of cinema, see Lawrence's review of Walter Wilkinson's *The Peep Show* in which he refers to 'the filthy kinema' (P, 373).

15. Paul Virilio points to the resemblances between church and cinema (Virilio, 1984, 38).

# Sons and Lovers

## Sons and Lovers: The Novel

The introduction revealed Lawrence's interest in Bergson's *Creative Evolution* and the analysis of cinematographic ways of seeing and being therein. Taken together with Lawrence's comments on the cinematograph in his letters up to the time *Sons and Lovers* was published in 1913, Bergson's discourse facilitates an identification of cinematographic analogies in Lawrence's novel. This is not to assert that Lawrence was overtly influenced by the cinematograph, or that it illustrated new ways of being or seeing to him. Simply, it is to state that there are analogies for the cinematograph's way of seeing, and the way films themselves are seen, in the novel<sup>1</sup>.

In *Creative Evolution*, Bergson builds a philosophy which, in its valorisation of duration and intuition, illuminates the very stuff of reality. He uses the cinematograph, and parallels to it, to illustrate the habits of our intellect which make us veer away from what he calls *durée* and intuition. These cinematographic parallels are identifiable in *Sons and Lovers* where they centre on society in general, Mrs Morel and William, and, especially, Mrs Morel and her husband.

Bergson conceived of modern time as fractured and measured, as opposed to time associated with ancient philosophies where, although divided, it was sensed as a greater organic whole. The decay of time from gold to small change, as Bergson puts it, is felt in the opening of *Sons and Lovers*. The brief focus on a pre-industrial era concertinas during the course of the ensuing novel into years, months, days and then hours, a process which culminates in Paul's momentary frame-by-frame experience of life after his mother's death. The transition from duration to frozen, fractured moments is felt in the Morels' decaying marriage, too. After an initial illusion of harmony, the couple fall out over money, reflecting the reverse alchemisation of their marriage

from the gold of their honeymoon period to the base elements of their quarrels. This underlying decay is symbolised by the miners' homes which, while florally colourful from the front, are ashily colourless inside and at the back. It is also clearly expressed by Bergson's cinematographic parallels.

One of the opening expressions of the unhappiness between the Morels is the distance surrounding the father. He is reported as seen through the window of the Moon and Stars, a framed, essentially voyeuristic perception of him. This 'shot' of Mr Morel itself foreshadows his wife's later cinematic perception of him from outside the house after he has ejected her. Basically, the Morels are opposites who have become increasingly polar rather than complementary. The paradigm of their marriage, which is paralleled by the novel's marriage of a cinematographic view of life with the sense of life as a religious, metaphysical flow<sup>2</sup>, is contained within Mrs Morel's way of seeing and Mr Morel's appearance. She is intellectually Bergsonian, a detached, distanced spectator who sees whitishly. Her father was an engineer, which explains, in part, her way of seeing. Engineering is based on physics, a discipline which, for Bergson, replaces duration with time length (an infinite series of moments), and works on fixed aspects of reality under an arrested form. Thus, Mrs Morel is congenitally and socially predisposed to a cinematic way of seeing. It contrasts with her opening way of seeing Mr Morel at the Christmas party where she was moved by meeting her opposite. Here, he was instinctively Bergsonian, going with the flow of his beloved dancing and initially bestowed with a rich, sensuous flame of life, 'full of colour and animation' (17). As the flow crystallises in the course of his marriage, his flame darkens to become red and smoky as a reflection of his resentfulness.

The resolution of the couple into polarities is acutely felt in Mr Morel's trimming of William's hair. It is seen in the reddening firelight, a hue which depicts the blockage in Mr Morel as it lacks the full colour of his initial flame. Mrs Morel is shocked by the event, and the event itself has a cinematic resonance. The point of view slides around cinematically, the juxtaposition of viewpoints reflecting the destabilising effect of the shock on her. The diminution of colour and a particular point of view and way of seeing are the prime cinematic concomitants of the coming fight between them, too.

Bergson connects the cinematographic habit of intellect and the colourless object of perception in *Creative Evolution*. The solidification of perception into fragmented images of the fluidity of essence restricts the viewing subject to seeing differences of state rather than change itself. To see thus is to see a false becoming which is 'always and everywhere the same, invariably colourless' (Bergson, 1906, 321). When Lawrence's narrative favours colourlessness, multiple points of view and a certain way of seeing, as it does on the day of the Morels' row, cinematic analogies can be made about the subject/object relations in the text which, ultimately, are mapped on to the Morels' relationship itself.

Prior to the men's departure from the home, the only suggestion of colour comes in the reference to Mr Morel's face. It has a similar hue to the reddening firelight in which he cut William's hair, being now 'perhaps too much inflamed' (27). Perspective becomes multiple with the arrival of his drinking partner, Jerry Purdy, who is initially seen from the narrator's point of view. He is then seen from a perspective identified with Mrs Morel. It is a transition which sets the tone for her husband's return, seen and felt largely from her point of view. His day out is marked by

colourlessness, contrasted with Mrs Morel's perception of the boys playing in the deep yellow water (30) and her revival of the flowers' yellow heads in her garden (31). The colour of these scenes gives way to the colourlessness of her moments of shock after her ejection from the house. The narrator sees her in a cold, great white light. She, in turn, stares at the glistening great rhubarb leaves, and mechanically recollects the moments of the last hour, a process which ends in her standing at the front of the house 'as if in an immense gulf of white light' (34). In terms of Bergson's cinematographic parallels, this section clearly contains cinematic analogies. The evolutionary flow of life, represented by the colour of the water the children bathe in and the flowers, has been interrupted by her row with her husband. The sense of a false change, a solidification of this flow, is felt in the fragments of her recollection, and the colourlessness of her environment as she and the narrator see it. Briefly, she is revived by the yellow pollen of the lilies, flowers emblematic of the psychological death and decay which underlie their row<sup>3</sup>, and this quickly gives way to further perspectives redolent with cinematic overtones. She sees the environment bereft of colour, and the narrator sees her in this environment. The words applied to the environment - glitter, shiny, pale - make it extremely cinematic. Equally, her point of view of the moth ricocheting over the white flowers is intrinsically cinematic. Although she sees her husband cinematically, that is, framed through the window and distanced from her, colour returns in the form of the copper colour of the table lamp. As Mr Morel observes, it contrasts with the external colourlessness: '[T]here stood the silver grey night, fearful to him, after the tawny light of the lamp' (36). The silver grey, associated with Mrs Morel, illustrates the degradation of her initial sympathetic way of seeing her husband into a colder, disillusioned one, and the tawny light, associated with Mr Morel, illustrates the burning down of his initial, coloured flame of life into a sooty residue of drunken enagement at being excluded from the family. Thus, the clogging of

Mrs Morel's relationship with her husband results in a colourless presentation of her surroundings, a fractured recollection of the row, and detached spectatorship of her husband. Essentially, while Lawrence is not absorbed by the narrative representation of subjectivity as he is in *The Rainbow*, he is developing a subjective form of narration which renders the subject's mood by modes of seeing which contain cinematic analogies.

In terms of subject/object relations, Mrs Morel, already given to spectating, becomes even more of a spectator as a result of this row<sup>4</sup>. Mr Morel, despite his flair for *joie de vivre*, fails to develop creatively in the eyes of his wife and the narrator. As they see it, he arrests the development of others, and is thus commensurate with being the object of cinematic perception. As Bergson suggests, such an object would be associated with an immovable state rather than the vital change beneath the state which changes it. In this denouement, colour centres on the inner house, and earlier, on the children, indicating that the real evolution, for Mrs Morel, focuses on the children. William, however, does not feel this evolution, as his love for his mother impedes his growth (30). The seed is thus sown for false becomings, expressed by cinematic analogies, in the later narration of the sons' lives.

After this row, Mr Morel's dawn snugs are narrated from a stable, single, omniscient perspective. The stable, static presentation of Mr Morel is an expression of his failure to develop creatively, and it relates closely to Bergson's sense of the cinema as a stable view taken of the instability of things which is arrived at by the application of 'the cinematographical mechanism of the intellect to the analysis of the real' (Bergson, 1906, 332). A cinematic way of seeing therefore incorporates various aspects, such as the earlier mobile point of view sliding around the scene of



William's haircut, and these fixed ones of Mr Morel's snugs. So, Mr Morel is seen cinematically here, and during Mr Heaton's visit where his black arms show up on the white table cloth. This way of seeing him foreshadows his alienation from the rest of the family who begin to watch him at a distance. Interestingly, he also sees cinematically. On leaving the mine when Paul is born, he regards the predominantly grey, dismal moving vista of the rain running down the trucks, and the miners streaming away into the fields. Significantly, the trucks are full of 'bright coal' (42). The word 'bright' seems to mitigate against the scene's correspondence to the parallels Bergson draws between the cinematograph, and the self which does not evolve according to expectations, exemplified by Mr Morel. It belongs to an aesthetic depiction of the pits which puts them in a different light from the large-scale capitalistic enterprises of *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*<sup>5</sup>. However, Lawrence uses 'bright' in connection with the cinematograph when he imagines the brightly working cinematograph of his euthanasia room (*Letters i*, 81). 'Bright', therefore, is associated with the luminous force of modernity that Lawrence expresses elsewhere as electric light and optical focus. It adds to the cinematographic aspect of Mr Morel's gaze by infusing it with the mechanism and distance associated with the cinematograph that are appropriate to the industrial object of the gaze. However, the detachment that is part of his gaze at the capitalistic enterprise of which he is but a tiny cog overlaps with his home life. Not knowing how to deal with his wife and new-born son, he stands at the foot of the bed, unable to embrace either.

The detachment of his mode of seeing and the drabness of what he sees contrasts with Mrs Morel's communion with her children and the vibrant colour surrounding it on the cricket field. The contrast between the two modes of seeing is made clear by the juxtaposition of their relative experiences of his drunken, physical assault on her (53-5). She experiences it feelingly, as

expressed by her concern for Paul. In the initial aftermath, he is a detached observer. His tone of 'wondering concern' (54) surfaces as he begins to register the harm he has inflicted. This harm is conveyed in his fascinated point of view of the gossamer drops of her blood soaking onto Paul's scalp. Obviously, as evidenced by his job and behaviour here, Mr Morel is a man of action. In Bergsonian terms, it is this aspect of his personality which characterises his cinematographic apprehension of life:

We are made in order to act as much as, and more than, in order to think - or rather, when we follow the bent of our nature, it is in order to act that we think. It is therefore no wonder that the habits of action give their tone to those of thought, and that our mind always perceives things in the same order in which we are accustomed to picture them when we propose to act on them.

(Bergson, 1906, 313)

Although not initially true of him, Mr Morel becomes bound by his polar reaction to Mrs Morel, and the mechanical nature of his work (which he enjoys), to see cinematographically, as he does after being alienated from his family by the second of his drunken rows. This way of seeing, whilst a product of his character and work, is, as Bergson postulates, part of what prevents the experience of life as an evolution:

A man is so much more a "man of action" as he can embrace in a glance a greater number of events: he who perceives successive events one by one will allow himself to be led by them; he who grasps them as a whole will dominate them.

(Bergson, 1906, 318)

Mr Morel falls into the first category, as, most obviously, do Gerald Crich, who is even more a man of action, and Jack Callcott, which explains their lack of personal and social harmony. Thus, the ways of seeing analogous to those associated with the cinema, and identified by the parallels Bergson makes between the cinematograph and a particular form of intellect, centre on the Morels. These ways of seeing express the distance between them and, in Mr Morel's case, his lack of positive development, limited, as he is, to recurring 'again and again to his old selves' (63).

As the couple drift apart, attention falls on Mrs Morel and William in Chapter III. There are no cinematic analogies in this chapter, the absence of which identifies it with Mrs Morel's desire to encourage William's personal development. By contrast, there are a number of these analogies in the next chapter, where they centre on Paul and, in separate but related incidents, his father.

The burning of the doll is presented in a manner analogous to cinematographic narration. The close-ups of the event are seen from a perspective which floats between Annie's, Paul's and the narrator's. The only reference to colour is to the doll's blackened limbs (83). The fragmentation of perspective on this colourless object into a series of snapshots of the essential change of form is relative to the mind - Lawrence's - which thinks it. Lawrence is articulating through Paul the leap from the child's inability to think itself capable of harm to the realisation that it can be destructive, if only accidentally so. The trauma of this realisation is felt in the event's cinematographic presentation which reflects the impending disintegration of the honeymoon period of the child's early years and the destruction of the domestic harmony it most desires.

Similarly, multiple perspectives, close-ups, and a large degree of colourlessness are the key narrative features of the simmering enmity between William and his father. The only reference to colour takes the form of the shift to the close-up of William's blue eyes. In Lawrence's work, blue eyes are often indicative of characters who are inclined to watching. Like his mother's, William's blue eyes are emblematic of the distance surrounding his father who is watched, and fails to invite engagement from the watcher (William) who is intrinsically distanced by the gaze and its object. The chapter points to the continuation of these drunken incidents, emphasising Mr Morel's failure to develop. As Lawrence says, he is 'like the scotch in the smooth, happy machinery of the home' (87). The impediment to life's flow caused by Mr Morel strengthens the association between his character and Bergson's cinematographic parallels. The association between such parallels and Mr Morel crystallises in Mr Morel's industrial work. In the framed viewpoints of the distant colliers (90, 92), the second of which refers to them as the 'small, black figures trailing slowly in gangs across the white field' (92), the colliers are seen in a cinematographic way - framed and distant - and look cinematic - they are black and white.

The combination of a cinematographic way of seeing and a lack of colour are the prime cinematic analogies of Paul's visit to the mine offices. The way of seeing the inside of the mine office keeps faith with the mechanisms of industry<sup>6</sup>, and, more importantly, with the son's alienation from his father and his father's workplace. The authorial point of view skips cinematically over the scene's components, mechanically breaking down the vision by alternating between perspectives as Paul collects his father's wages. Given Lawrence's assertion that cinema lacked individuality and humanity (*Letters i*, 304), a cinematic form would be appropriate for the industrial environment.

Lawrence's description of the cinema cameras filming the suffragette demonstration (*Letters i*, 123) shows that he was aware of the spectacle crowd scenes created for the camera. Significantly, part of the presentation of the mine focuses on the crowd of men and women whose knees jam Paul against the fire, just as Lawrence was hemmed in by the surging crowd at the political demonstration which he saw being filmed. So, there are parts of this chapter, involved with the coal industry, which are presented in a cinematographic way. This presentation reinforces Lawrence's concept of cinema as an abstraction from individuality and humanity which is thus an ideal form for expressing perverse modes of being, such as Paul's alienation from his father and the industry in which his father works. Moreover, the inside of the offices is distinguished by the references to colour around it as, in the office, initially, there is no mention of colour. Colour comes, when Paul is identified, in the form of the red face of Mr Winterbottom who rescues him from the anonymity of the crowd. The reduction in impersonality is followed by more colour, in the shape of the coins and the flora along the Mansfield Road, which expresses his relief at escaping the hot, oppressive office.

The aftermath of the event is expressed at home by an initial absence of colour. Colour returns with Mrs Morel's flowered dish. Thus, a pattern emerges of seeing the mother in a colourful way when Paul watches her ironing that seems indicative of the closeness between mother and son. Conversely, the father is seen in a colder light which reflects his separation from the family, and his subsumption by the industrial environment that dominates him. The oscillation is felt in the juxtaposition of the crimson view of the Derbyshire hills that the family loves to see from the Scargill Street house, and Mrs Dakin's view of the miners toiling home seen through the 'fine black crape at the back of a summer morning' (102).

The other main cinematic analogy focuses on the playing children (101). It is a scene of light and dark, but initially no colour, and it is viewed from both the narrator's and the children's perspectives. In context, the shuttling of perspective, although cinematic, expresses the underlying life-force of their play. It contrasts with similar presentations of their father as it shows that fights can be reconciled. Paul is not mollified by visiting his father in the public house after collecting his wages, and William does not make up with his father after the threat of the fight; but Paul is reconciled with Billy Pillins, as symbolised by the influx of colour in the form of the big red moon. There is an abundance of colour, too, in William's homecoming which emphasises the family's happiness. The cinematic analogies are thus an integral part of presenting Paul's complexes about realising he is capable of harm, especially with regard to his father, and about going to his father's workplace. The cinematic way of seeing at these junctures where Paul feels a gamut of emotions such as guilt, anger, jealousy and frustration expresses the negation of the vital process of ripening in him these emotions appear to cause. The focal point for the cinematic analogies has thus switched from the distance between the parents to the split between father and son, a split which is highlighted by the son's intimacy with his mother.

This ultimately constricting intimacy is developed in 'Paul Launches into Life' where, together with the contrasted theme of Paul's branching out into a new phase of life, it is reflected in the variety and plasticity of the novel's ways of looking. The split with his father is emphasised by Mr Morel's appearing only once, and then only to comment on William's girlfriend (126). The connection Paul feels with his mother is indicative of the sympathetic way of watching Bergson advocates as the antithesis to the intellect's cinematographic habits. In turn, this is counterpointed

by the description of Paul's search for a job which, in the reading room, lacks both colour and charm. Thus, the narrative oscillates between ways of seeing and the sort of objects seen as an integrated expression of the contradictory feelings that characterise Paul's life:

Usually, he looked as if he saw things, was full of life, and warm: then his smile, like his mother's, came suddenly and was very lovable; and then, when there was any clog in his soul's quick running, his face went stupid and ugly.

(113)

In accordance with this oscillation, the flow of Paul's life-force is associated with traditional ways of seeing, typified by the classical, Realist nineteenth-century novel. By contrast, the solidification or upsetting of this flow is associated with a way of seeing Bergson parallels with the cinematograph, analogies of which are present in this chapter. William, for example, has fallen into a negative flow<sup>7</sup>, spinning out of control on 'the quick current of the new life' (116). Emblematic of his absorption into the modern London lifestyle is the photograph of Louisa he sends home. It symbolises the setting of this flow into a colourless, false becoming which was suggested by the slices of crystallised pineapple in the previous chapter and which is ultimately symbolised by the story of the set sugar recounted on the night of his death. As described by William, the object of the photo, Louisa, is discernibly cinematic as she has 'the clearest of clear transparent olive complexions, hair as black as jet, and such grey eyes, bright, mocking, like lights on water at night' (ibid.). Although he mentions her olive complexion, he emphasises her resemblance to a transparent, black and white reflection of a person which, conspicuously, is bright, an epithet for the cinematograph. The photograph, and the cinematographic stilling of life

it represents, are sociological and psychological manifestations of the period which produces them. On a personal level, the photograph mirrors the characteristics of William's love and lifestyle which he brings to Louisa who is, in turn, emblematic of this love and lifestyle as photographers queue up to snap her.

The cinematographic way of seeing next emerges on the day of Paul's interview at Jordan's. It begins with Paul's looking at a picture of a wooden leg on the factory's notepaper (117), the picture itself representing the solidification of the process of manufacturing into an end product and amplifying his sense of imprisonment by industry. It is perpetuated by his gaze at his mother's hands, gloved in black, getting the silver out of her purse, which leads to various cinematic analogies and connotations. The close-up perspective of her hands slides from the narrator's to Paul's, and the colours, black and silver, are typically cinematic. The way of looking is a projection of the systole in Paul caused by his love for her which was adumbrated by the suggestion of the anguish in their feelings for one another in the previous chapter.

This way of seeing is intercut with its opposite at Jordan's. On arriving at the factory, Mrs Morel finds it homely (119), but her perspective slides into the narrator's which, in terms of the brown and cream luminosity it registers, sees the factory as a sepia tinted moving scene as an early cinematographic print would. Similarly, in Mr Jordan's office, Paul sees the yellow trusses as new and alive, yet 'by this time he was so much stunned that he only noticed the outside things' (ibid.). There is a clogging in Paul which is embodied in this way of seeing objectively and in the repeated sticking in his throat of the word 'handwriting'. Equally, Mr Jordan is ready for action. As Bergson said, when the habits of action characterise those of thought, that is, when we think in



terms of how we act on matter rather than in a purer, intuitive form, the result is a cinematographic form of apprehension which is how Mr Jordan sees Paul and his mother who are, respectively, pale and shut-off to him (121). Outside, the scope of vision expands to register the town's colour and vibrancy. The image mirrors the diminishment of Paul's rage and ignominy. Thus, chameleon-like, the way of seeing changes with the environment as an expression of the characters' feelings.

The way of seeing functions similarly during Paul's first day at work. It is a perfect morning (127), and the intimacy between mother and son is felt in her sympathetic watching of him as he leaves which reprises the earlier one of his watching her departure for the hospital. Conversely, at work, perspective moves indeterminately between Paul's and the narrator's as Paul follows the clerk around the rectangle of counters (128). The lack of colour, the gloomy light, and the seeing of the factory and its machinery through holes in the floor and ceiling make it look as if it were seen cinematically. Clearly, form matches content as the industrial environment is presented in a way analogous to that of a mechanical art form, and the way of seeing is also a manifestation of Paul's feelings. In *Twilight in Italy*, Lawrence equates nervous excitement with the cinema. This equation is discernible here. Paul is nervous as he waits for his boss (129), and this nervousness is mirrored by the cinematic mobility of perspective which mediates the factory and its denizens, typified by the close-up of the stiff and staccato Pappleworth's thin, hairy arm. As Paul warms to the factory, perspectival mobility is retained and there is a colourful revivification of the factory embodied by the women who mother him and who seem more direct and personal because they keep a personal part of themselves away from their work. The factory, although an industry, is different from the mine because of this sense of the personal. These two elements in the factory,

mobility and colour, relate to the evolution of Paul's life-force. This evolution puts his mother at ease and is felt in the unison of the men at work which he clearly enjoys (140). It is a similar sort of happiness in labour to that felt with his father at home, in that the children were at their happiest with the father when they united with him in the labour of making the explosive charges. Effectively, now, he is taking his father's place. As he says earlier, "I'm the man in the house now" (113).

Paul is pleased by this development. Despite some ennui, he feels 'rich in life and happy' (140). His mixed condition is articulated by the perspectives from train and on foot of the Midlands where the protoplasmic objects of his gaze reflect his sense of personal development. This sense is subverted by the fact that his way of seeing is an analogy for a tracking shot, the first from a train<sup>8</sup>, the second from his point of view and paced out by the distance between the lampposts. He has seized the image by a partial means rather than by intuition, just as time in the factory is apprehended not as duration but as temporal instants which govern the working day and actions therein. These analogies encapsulate the underlying breaking-down of personality and underlying clogging of vitality, necessitated by the dullness of his job, which culminate in his pneumonia<sup>9</sup>.

The split between the father and his sons, highlighted by the intimacy between the mother and her sons, is felt in the climax and aftermath of William's death. Mr Morel's most prolonged appearance occurs, ironically, after William has died, emphasising the distance between father and son in life. There is a tangible distance between Louisa, William, and William's family, too, which is discernible in the cinematic analogies in the build-up to William's demise. Overall, the narrative focuses intermittently on processes and events. Here, there is a growing focus on events.

Regardless of the ways of seeing in the prose, this focus is, in a Bergsonian sense, cinematographic. The cinematograph is synonymous with the events which make up the flow of life, rather than the flow itself. Thus, the chapter which narrates William's death consists of a rhythmic series of main events, each sub-dividable, namely; Louisa's Christmas visit, Paul's first visit to Willey Farm with his mother, Louisa's Whitsuntide visit, William's death, and the funeral. Besides the separation of the flow into events, a procedure readable on a number of levels, the events themselves involve ways of seeing analogous to the cinematograph's.

Louisa is first seen as a black and white handsome girl, an image congruent with her photograph. In turn, she sees cinematographically, registering the Morel household as 'small and curious' (143). It is a diminutive of real vision which, like Gudrun's, sees reality minutely as a film of itself. Like Paul in the factory, she is nervous (145), so her point of view matches this condition, flicking cinematically around the family, with no account taken of their colour apart from Mrs Morel's black blouse. William jokes uncomfortably at this strangeness, recalling Lawrence's laughter at the cinematograph's inability to realise people as people (*Letters i*, 304) which is embodied in Louisa's way of seeing. This way of seeing contrasts with the narration of Paul's visit to Willey Farm which emphasises colour and organic movement as a reflection of Paul's growing significance to his mother. However, there is one instance of a cinematographic way of seeing. The hurt contraction of Paul's heart with love for his ageing mother results in a systolic way of seeing her hand as a metonym for her whole self (153). It is repeated from the morning of his interview at Jordan's. As such, it is a leitmotif for his psychological contraction caused by his love for her which is developed later in the novel.

A similar fixation in William can be observed in his final visit home with Louisa. Louisa, already portrayed in earlier photos as a pinup girl, has become a sort of cinema image. Not reciprocating William's gaze, she is detached from him and he only wants 'to look at her, not to come together with her in her gaze' (158-9). Her cinematic appearance shows that she is outside Lawrencean blood-consciousness, a position which is confirmed by her understanding of 'nothing but lovemaking and chatter' (161) and William's opinion that she is 'shallow' (163). Louisa, for her part, sees William's carving of their initials in a heart as bits of an image, rather than as a whole: 'She watched his strong, nervous hand, with its glistening hairs and freckles, as he carved, and she seemed fascinated by it' (159). This is evidently a moving close-up of his hand. The fragmentation of the whole image complements the distance between subject and object indicated by William's desire to look at her, but not to meet her eyes. These ways of watching are thus pornographic, as the characters focus on watching parts of each other.

The sense of split consciousnesses climaxes in William's discussion with his mother (161-2), during which Lawrence refers to the ticking clock. It symbolises the fundamental level of splitting by breaking the narrative down into a series of moments, fracturing reality like frames in a film. Moreover, there is no colour in these scenes. And amongst the colourlessness, there is a close-up of his pale face, 'stamped with conflict and despair' (162). The perspectival splits that have adumbrated this temporal one reflect the ongoing psychological conflicts in William. His dissociative state stems from his inability to integrate his love of life, represented at the beginning of the novel by his desire to go to the Wakes and his enjoyment of bodily exercise like cycling, with the mental life of the bourgeois, represented by his job, which he is urged into by his mother, and his fiancée. Ultimately, the solidification of the flow of William's life manifests itself in his



cinematographic way of seeing on the night of his death when he looks at his mother but doesn't see her (166).

Paul's way of seeing the pit as he waits to tell his father about William's death contains the effects of this death. As Paul goes in, the narrator notes the soft blue sky and the headstock's twinkling wheels. Paul himself then sees the pit as colourless and mechanical. The effect of William's death is felt in the shift of points of view and the absence of colour in Paul's point of view. There is also a transition in his mother's behaviour that is reflected in her appearance. Before William dies, she is close to Paul. After his death, she is uninterested in him and seems unaware of him, which is conveyed by her cinematic appearance as small, white and mute. This is echoed by Paul's gaze at the monstrous and black ash tree in the faintly luminous darkness. The distance between subject and object, and the cinematic appearance of objects themselves, like the pale and dark men, wagon and horses who deliver William's coffin, and the disembodied limbs of the men who fetch it inside in the flickering candlelight, characterise Paul's and the narrator's experience of the Saturday night before the funeral. Paul's cinematographic way of seeing, highlighted by the close-up of the falling drops of sweat from his father's brow, indicates a blockage in his own life-force. It is a result less of the personal trauma of the death, and more of his mother's distance from him. Implicitly, Mrs Morel recognises that her distance has contributed to Paul's psychological and physical breakdown when she says, "I should have watched the living, not the dead" (171).

Once recovered, Paul sees the world recreated as a flowing, pristine vision which corresponds to Miriam's metaphysical way of seeing the whole of life in a mist of religion. However, their ways

of seeing each other go against this flow. Paul's first arrival at the farm after his illness is seen from Miriam's perspective as she peeps through the kitchen window (175). It is a framed, distanced, detached perspective which recalls Mrs Morel's point of view of her husband after their fight. It suggests that Miriam's and Paul's relationship begins at a point beyond the sensuous instinct cradling the genesis of the Morels' marriage, an instinct therefore bypassed by the younger couple. This point of view cuts to the narrator's close up of Miriam's dilating eyes to show, as the narrator later says, that all the life of her body is in her eyes (184). Short-sighted, she often has to focus closely on Paul (187). Thus Miriam sees Paul cinematically, as Mrs Morel sees her husband, and as Louisa sees William<sup>10</sup>. The white narcissi and lilies associated with Miriam's fascinations (203) are similar to the flowers which symbolised the underlying deathliness of the Morels' relationship. In Miriam's case, her way of seeing is commensurate with her predisposition to the intellect and her religious intensity which cuts her off from ordinary life. Her effort at living is closed in on itself and, unable to evolve, it is bound to see life as moments or fragments of real becoming, just as Mr Morel does. Paul, too, sees cinematically, noting Miriam to be psychologically distanced from him. This is due, in part, to his sense of the intensity of the social intercourse at Willey Farm which differs from the natural ordinariness of daily life at home. To him, Miriam's spirit is in a land 'far away and magical' (176). As a reflection of this distance, Paul connects with her visually rather than tactilely. Miriam is aware of his watching, of his 'taking her all in' (ibid.). It is a subject/object scenario which precedes the one of the cinema outlined in similar terms in *The Lost Girl* by Miss Pinnegar who says, of the cinema, '[Y]ou see it all and take it all in at once' (LG, 142). Equally, Bergson reckons that the cinematographic habits of the intellect generate the impression of everything being given at once, thereby controverting the

principles of evolution and creation. As we shall see, Paul's cinematographic apprehension of Miriam foreshadows the inability of their relationship to evolve.

This fascinated, cinematic way of watching each other thus characterises their relationship. It expresses the sublimation of real, dynamic intercourse into the intellect<sup>11</sup>. This process is evident in the underlying sexuality of the swing scene which, instead of flowering, crystallises into views of Paul watching Miriam and vice versa. It is also suggested by a number of other features, such as the white margin of the lake (185). Here, Paul adopts her pace of life and the whiteness around the lake reflects the sense of colourless false becoming inherent in this submission. Their study of mathematics is another feature which conveys a sense of the fluid fragmented into the momentary. During these mathematics sessions, Paul's distanced way of seeing Miriam develops on this fragmentary axis into a more pornographic and cinematic way of watching: 'It made his blood rouse to see her there, as it were at his mercy, her mouth open, her eyes dilated with laughter' (187). The fragmented image of her is associated with a sexual response which intensifies in further sessions (189). This way of watching Miriam contrasts with Paul's viewing his mother as a whole, 'bright with living form' (190), whose presence is synchronistic with real creation in his art.

The intellect, and an associated cinematic way of seeing, thus clearly predominate in Paul and Miriam's relationship. Revealingly, they regularly meet in the library where Mr Sleath, like William on his deathbed, sees physically but not imaginatively with his unseeing old blue eyes. Paul's anticipation of Miriam's arrival is conjoined to a similar sense of objective seeing, and an emphasis on moments rather than duration. When she finally arrives, there is a complementary

emphasis on her appearance and their mutual scopophilia (192). This cinematic way of seeing is followed by a cinematic presentation of the environment. The chief feature of their visit to the rose bush (194-6) is the repeated reference to shades of black and white. These are clearly correlatives for the couple's blanched and chaste intimacy, indicating that the experience is another false becoming for Paul who is left feeling 'anxious and imprisoned' (196) by the moments spent there, moments which are pointed out as being moments by Mrs Morel's glance at the clock as he returns. Much of the time Paul spends with Miriam is fragmented into such moments. The visits to the rose bush and the manor are marked by stillness<sup>12</sup>, showing that duration is cut into immobile moments or frames. Paul is made to feel guilty about these moments spent with Miriam, and this guilt is fed into how he sees his mother. The anguish of love between mother and son had previously resulted in a metonymic way of watching her. As a result of his guilt, he watches her in this way again, seeing in his mind's eye his mother's hair and the brow of her head rather than sensing her living form.

Paul and Miriam's ways of seeing are thus indices of their relationship. Their ways of watching each other gravitate negatively into increasingly distanced, fragmented viewpoints. Like Mr and Mrs Morel, they become polar rather than symbiotic. The inability to evolve a genuine lad-and-girl love is conveyed by Miriam's continued way of watching his arrival at Willey Farm through the window. Like Paul's, her way of watching has attached itself to a fragmentary aspect, seeing, as she does, fragments of her own appearance in the little looking-glass nailed to the wall. Reality is minutely apprehended by her cinematographic intellect which does not give her or Paul's instincts scope to flourish. As Bergson says, instinct helps intelligence to find what it naturally seeks. Without it, the intellect misses the fluid and apprehends reality cinematographically as immobile



slices cut out from the fluid. Lawrence gestures to the essential immobility of the moments Paul and Miriam spend together by repeated references to the stillness in and around them, such as Paul's stillness during his later comments on being disembodied by her (232) and his effort at understanding her (247). Her stilling of his soul becomes clearly understood by Paul who tells her that she wants to fix his soul 'well in its sheath' (233). As he comes home from one of his walks with her, immobility and a cinematic way of seeing converge. He stands immobile at the style, regarding the 'weird and dreadful' (231) vista of the pit's black upslopes dotted with tiny lights. Hence Miriam, and often Paul when he is with her or has been with her, see reality not as it is, that is, protoplasmically, but as the intellect represents it to them and, instead of mutually evolving, they tend to extend their relationship by degrees. However, this is not to negate a certain richness in their seeing which reflects the instincts and maturational processes at work in both of them.

This crystallisation of perception characterises the narrator's presentation of Clara's first appearance. The accounts of Arthur's enlistment and Paul's prize are told in a traditional manner, eschewing a cinematic style, but the point of view which mediates Clara's appearance is particularly multiple and indeterminate (222). The stilling of the flow in Paul's life, associated with the strife in love the women cause, is inherent in these multiple points of view which are the equivalent of a cinematic way of seeing. This way of seeing during these moments is enhanced by the narrative's focus on black and white. Although Clara is blonde, the narrative points to her grey eyes, white skin and black hat. As Paul later notes, he appreciates her as an object of desire to be gazed at whose visual appeal is, seemingly, similar to Louisa's.

The presentation of Miriam's appearance in the church is characteristic of the subjectivity Lawrence incorporates into the novel's subject/object relations. It begins with a close-up of her face, after which, Lawrence writes: 'But it gave [Paul] a very keen feeling, as if all his soul stirred within him, to see her there' (230). To speculate on the subject/object relation, the close-up of Miriam's face is implicitly followed by a reverse shot of his face to show his pained pleasure at the spectacle of seeing her there. However, these positions are not fixed for the reader who has to unpick a coherent relation from the array suggested. It allows the diligent reader into the story, and it segments the scene into a series of perspectives. This segmentation gives the scene its cinematic character which, in turn, is amplified by Paul's response to the spectacle. His response is less than the glow he feels from his mother's presence, suggesting the sort of masturbatory thrill Lawrence reckoned the audience got from watching films in *The Lost Girl*. The sense that there is a form of cinematic spectatorship occurring here is further amplified by Paul's concluding feeling that in his viewpoint of Miriam, 'there [was] something he could not get to' (ibid.). Equally, Miriam cannot connect with Paul as, earlier, he feels he has been an object to her (227). There is an overt gap between subject and object reminiscent of cinematic spectatorship where the object is neither temporally nor spatially present. It is a gap Lawrence implicitly acknowledges in *The Lost Girl*, and in his 1911 letter about the loss of individuality in the cinema in which he implies that, in the pictures, people are not really there as people, only as illusions thereof.

Paul's continued involvement with Miriam causes an intensification in his cinematic way of seeing. His art focuses on still design (240), indicating the intellectualisation of his perception which causes him to see in sequences of immobilities. Another part of this intensification is Paul's explanation of the geometrification of his way of drawing. His form of thought determines the

shape of what he perceives, hence he sees cinematically, registering the already-made rather than the being-made. In Bergson's terms, he is seeing reality as the intellect represents it to him, that is, as geometrical solids, and not as continuity, mobility and the reciprocal penetration of all by all. The slipping of Paul's way of seeing from vital to geometric order is preceded by the scene of his father dividing up the week's earnings. This scene adumbrates the change in Paul as it encapsulates Bergson's sense of the gold of enduring perception decaying to the pennies of a spatial reality. The attachment of Paul's perception to the geometric is suggested by his appropriation of his father's language (244). The dialect itself is analogous to such perception as it is composed of fragments of a bigger language, and Paul's appropriation of it parallels his seeing in terms of parts of the bigger picture, as his father, who uses the same language, does<sup>13</sup>. Yet, in acknowledgement of the novel's richness and multivalency, this dialect can also be warm, personal and erotic, as Paul uses it at key moments with Clara. Paul's form of perception is Miriam's, too, who sees Paul as his mother saw his father after their first row. During the moments of Paul's flirting with Beatrice, he is at his most distant from Miriam. She sees him cinematically as an object, feeling 'she had no connection with him, she might as well not have existed' (244). Her spectatorship of the scene as a series of objects adds to its considerable cinematic character. Thus, there is an interweaving of Paul's and Miriam's ways of seeing with events in the Morel household that invites comparisons with Mr and Mrs Morel's ways of seeing in the first part of the novel as the couple polarised. It is a comparison reinforced by the culmination of these events in a family row, which recalls earlier scenes of similar rows, especially the one in which William and his father verged on physical conflict. The cinematic way of seeing therefore encapsulates the fact that Paul is unable to surpass the strife in love of his parents' marriage - he sees as they do, although he also sees life's protoplasm. His cinematic way of seeing

is symbolic of his inability to surpass his parents as it corresponds to the ready-made, and inherently denies the being-made, or evolution itself. This is the basis of the novel's tragedy; characters change but they do not evolve.

An absence of change, and evolution, too, is clear in Miriam's way of watching Paul arrive at the farm from her bedroom window. It is the same as it was several years on from his first post-pneumonic visit. The main change centres on Paul who has a cold correctness about him, and who arrives on 'a bright grey day' (255) with a bicycle that no longer seems to be a living part of him but which glitters as he walks. There is a cinematic air to him which complements her way of seeing. This cinematic air is underlined by his behaviour. He entertains the family with a series of sarcastic take-offs, resembling the cinema's basic process which Lawrence saw as a sarcastic mimicking of reality. Moreover, he is seen in terms of the mechanical and electrical, as if he is a condensed image of his former protoplasmic self. Her way of watching, and his appearance and behaviour, express the scotch in the running between them. There is a deeper scotch in Paul's soul as he realises that his love for his mother both sustains and constricts him, compelling him to seek a form of love which is different from hers or Miriam's.

The development of a new centre of sexual consciousness drives him towards Clara. Yet he sees her in a similar way to the way he watched Miriam, pornographically focusing on her neck and hands during the opening moments of their meeting at Willey Farm (269), and then on her breasts and curve of her back during their walk (279). The difference between the two women is what he watches of them. With Miriam, he mostly watched her hands, eyes and lips. With Clara, his eyes fixate on the nape of her neck, her breasts and back, suggesting that her appeal is made through

the lower sexual centres of the body whereas Miriam's was made through the higher one of the intellect<sup>14</sup>. Clara's skin is particularly white, embodying the principle that she is another form of false, colourless becoming for Paul who will lead to a cul-de-sac of passion as Miriam leads to a cul-de-sac of intellect. Yet Paul's passion, for all its dissociation, reveals to him something of life's richness. However, his way of seeing both women reveals a lack of harmony and integration in himself that his interactions confirm. For example, his humiliation of Clara in front of Miriam and her brothers foreshadows the seesaw of domination and submission ridden by characters in later novels. In Paul's way of looking, the only harmony comes in his contemplation of nature when his gaze, united with Clara's and Miriam's, sees the vital world of the horse as a romantic vision (274).

Paul's way of glancing fleetingly at parts of Miriam and Clara extends to his way of watching his mother. On the train, itself a way of facilitating a cinematic way of looking out, he has a momentary sensation of her 'as if she were slipping away from him' (280). His way of looking is connected with anxieties about her age and health as he feels the distance between them. It culminates in a close-up of her, close enough to register her 'breaking bright into life again' (281) and the crow's feet near her eyes. His mother is fixed into these frames of perception by Paul as a means of fastening her, of chaining her to the present, yet his desire to do so results in this cinematic perception which, ironically, makes her seem more distant. The narrative is based on this distance between subjects and objects which frequently results in a form of voyeurism. Paul is seeing the women in his life, and the objects in the surrounding world, in terms of the knowledge or emotions he brings to bear on them rather than as he finds them. It is symptomatic of a growing sense of deracination, evident in his preference for Willey Farm to home at this time

(266) and his realisation that home is full of grown-up people whose lives lay outside it. Ultimately, these ways of seeing prevent the appropriation of safe positions from which to perceive the diegesis as we are obliged to engage with them to see who is seeing, how they are seeing and what they are seeing. The diegesis is thus explored by intermitting omniscience with points of view<sup>15</sup>. The continual relocating of the reader through the spectator's gaze creates its sense of reality through a plurality of perspectives. If reality is considered as a multiplicity of sensory information confronting and overwhelming the subject, as it seems to be for William, and then Paul, these ways of seeing are thus realistic ones. To speculate further on why Paul sees as he does, his way of seeing seems to have been catalysed, in part, by Miriam's insistence on the intellectual and, indicative of the lack of evolution enshrined in the novel, he remains fixated at this level. There is an insistence on seeing Clara fetishistically, which is the equivalent of seeing cinematically. It becomes increasingly pronounced because Paul's other perceptive faculties have been marginalised. An analogous process occurs in the cinema where sight dominates as no demand is made on the other senses.

Paul's way of seeing Clara recalls William's way of seeing Louisa, differing mainly in the clarity of its fragmentation and the intensity of its erotic charge. The comparison is inferred from Paul's adoption of William's mantle in the form of his brother's suit he symbolically wears to dinner at Mr Jordan's. Some months after this event which, for Mrs Morel, was part of pushing Paul into the upper classes, he is, ironically, driven further towards Clara who is from the lower classes. During Paul's first visit to her house, the narrative refers to the web of white lace in Clara's dark and warm kitchen (301). There are hints of colour, such as Clara's dun hair, and Mrs Radford's arms which are 'glossy and yellow as old ivory' (303). However, dark and light predominate in the

shape of the black stout Paul drinks, the surrounding white lace and Clara's creamy arms. Paul watches her as a series of body parts - throat, arms, ears, head, hands, neck, hair - and concentrates on her bare, moving, gleaming arms which are mentioned several times. The pull of their attraction suggests a fetishistic fascination which is located in their peculiar dull gleam (303). To Paul, they shine briefly or faintly in the darkness, teasing him, as it were, with their transient, flickering lightness. It is difficult to determine to what extent Clara's appeal is exerted through her cinematic appearance, and to what extent it is created through Paul's way of watching. However, it is clear that he watches cinematically, and she appears as both he and the narrator see her as a cinematic object of desire. Being such an object, she is attractive not in intrinsic terms of beauty or personality - Paul dislikes much about her - but in terms of a perverse set of circumstances such as her humility, subjugation and neediness which give Paul 'a thrill of joy' (304). Paul watched Miriam similarly, which was attributable, in part, to her intellectualisation of desire. Yet Clara is her opposite in such terms. Paul's ongoing fragmented way of watching Clara, which is common to both her and Miriam but not, in the home, to his mother or to Clara's mother, is therefore connected to an underlying complex of emotions, including anxiety and guilt, about his lovers caused by his relationship with his mother<sup>16</sup>.

His way of watching Clara is upheld at work where the fragments are developed into extreme close-ups such as the one of 'her magnificent neck, with its down and fine pencils of hair [which] shone white against the lavender, lustrous silk' (307). Here, it is symptomatic of their working relationship where he is in charge, a role synonymous with being an active voyeur. It is also indicative of the polarities in their relationship. As he observes, he is hot and she is cold (307).

115

Their relationship is thus vulnerable to cycles of intimacy and distance, and a way of watching associated with these cycles, both of which were observed in the Morels' marriage.

Moments of genuine intimacy occur during their dialogue in the castle grounds, and as a result of the book Clara sends Paul. They are, nonetheless, tempered by a cinematic way of seeing. The scene in the castle concludes with Clara's and Paul's reciprocal perspectives of each other's hands. This shifts into Paul's perspective of the surrounding country which, no longer a vibrant scene, is a lumpen 'matrix of sorrow and tragedy' (316). Later, after being moved by her birthday gift, Paul thinks of Clara in terms of her arms, shoulders and breasts as if he could 'see them, feel them, almost contain them' (317). He foregrounds sight, rather than touch, and the reference to containing them suggests that, in his mental picture, he is framing them, which would be a corollary to his fetishistic way of looking as it would augment the object by limiting it<sup>17</sup>. Similarly, the togetherness inherent in the image of their hands resting on each other, which is amplified by a warm and dim vision of the countryside, gives way to Paul's belief that he can enjoy women only if they are distant to him, as if sexual desire was detached from them (319). This thought explains his cinematic perception of women as pornographic images or bits of the real person. Seeing in this manner displaces sexual desire from these women onto images of objects or parts of them which are substitutes for the whole. It is partly caused by a sensitivity to women. Paul, having seen his father brutalise his mother in a number of ways, wishes to avoid brutalising women with desire (although there is clearly a sort of brutality and eroticism in his way of seeing). Currently, he rarely sees his mother in this way. His love for her drives him to see her as the principle integrated sexual object. His inherent way of seeing women other than his mother as condensed images made up of images of parts of their bodies contains an unconscious complex of feelings



about his mother. It is a feature of what he later calls 'dibbling in love', a sort of dithering with women which leaves room for his mother.

This perverse dithering, or mechanical oscillation of his intellect, continues to characterise his relationship with Miriam. They spend more time talking about their relationship than pursuing its repressed sexual element which is sublimated into views of each other, such as Miriam's fascinated point of view of his eyes (326) and his distant perspective of 'the pale blotch of her face down in the darkness under the hanging tree' (328). Her close up of his eyes, which are full of desire and not the love she wants, confirms the underlying emotion of his way of seeing women. The culminatory sense of life as cinema, connected to a way of seeing fuelled by desire, is evident in Paul's post-coital thoughts on life being a white shadow, stillness and inaction. It has become a series of immobilities strung together by the cinematographic habit of his intellect, a process exemplified by his way of seeing Miriam at her grandmother's house (333). Initially, he has a complete awareness of her beauty which blinds him. It is quickly substituted by his cinematic way of seeing as he focuses on her hips and eyes. The stillness implicit in his way of watching is fed back into him so that instead of lapsing out, his forward movement - physical and psychological - is arrested. His perception of Miriam is prefigured by three references to 'bright', an epithet for the cinematograph, which points to cinematic aspects of their relationship. The brook outside the house is bright, which suggests a sense of motion as a series of cinematographic images rather than a flow, especially as it goes nowhere, only into a bog, underlining the association between a cinematographic form of perception and an inability to develop. As Paul sees it, Miriam's face is bright like a transfiguration, underlining her resemblance to a cinematographic image. Paul's eyes themselves are bright, too, indicating his cinematic way of

seeing. This is not to ignore the richness of these moments which also belong to a time of sunshine, firelight and glory over which the old doubts are felt to play.

He continues to see Clara in similar, fragmented terms, fixating on her arms and hands. Whereas in his first series of fixated moments there was a strong current of movement in Clara, he now asks her to be still as he draws her arm (336). His art slipped into still life with Miriam, so there is a common theme of life stagnating in his relationships with Miriam and Clara. As Paul and the narrator see Miriam, she never gives off life, which explains, in addition to Paul's perception of her, why she is presented cinematically. By contrast, the vision of nature he has from his mother's garden (337-8) is redolent with life. Paul's gaze registers the beyond, but it also registers the lilies as a white fence, a white barrier of flowers across the garden. His gaze tries to be centrifugal or transcendent. Ultimately, it is restricted to his mother's garden, thereby expressing the strictures placed on him by his mother's love.

Paul's and Miriam's ways of seeing are a means of orchestrating the exhaustion of a relationship which, as they realise, has become a sham. In the drawing of this conclusion, Paul's way of seeing is again interwoven with Miriam's. She is stilled by the look on his face, and he sees her exactly as he has been seeing Clara in terms of her arms (339). Hers are much thinner than Clara's, reflecting how disembodied she seems to Paul. Paul is driven to think sadistically of her by the pitiful nature of her arms, his sadism corresponding to his active position as an aggressive seeing subject, the aggression resulting, in turn, from his frustration at being unable to complete a connection with her. Miriam sees him in analogous terms, looking at him but feeling his real self is absent. The most cinematic aspect of her gaze is its focus on motion, fascinated, as she is, by the movement of

Paul's arm (342). To see movement separated from the arm, she sees as modern geometry does, that is, in terms of continuous movement by which a figure is described. Her perception is thus a series of views taken along the continuity of the movement of the arm, which emulates the cinema's modus operandi. Her way of seeing resembles Paul's as an expression of a failure to create an enduring, evolving fluid connection.

After Paul's split with Miriam, he experiences creativity in his art and warmth with his mother. These positives do not extend to Clara whom, as before, he sees fetishistically when he is aroused. Appropriately, in the cinematograph, he focuses on the object of her hand (347). He condenses her being into this image which it is then displaced from, an absence expressed by her failure to reciprocate. As he waits to meet Clara the following Monday, time stands still in the form of his watch which stops (349). It is matched by his still way of staring. The temporal decay is further paralleled by Paul's psychological split into a shell of himself, and another self which watches this shell. These temporal and psychological divisions underpin his way of watching. Significantly, the use of the word 'shell' shows that his way of watching belongs to a hardening into an outer case of his protoplasm. The formation of a dermis results in seeing things a long way off, which recalls his perception of externals on the morning of his interview at Jordan's.

On meeting Clara, he sees her in the now familiar way of condensed images, namely, the fine down on her face and her ear. His desire to touch her initially fails to materialise, emphasising the idea that he is aroused by images of her rather than her actual self. On the tram, he sees her as he did his mother on the train. The parallel associates the train's measured motion with images strung kinetically together which constitute his cinematic way of seeing. Significantly, looking out at the

Castle Rock, he has an animated view of the black space of the railway, and the white cattle enclosure (351).

His way of seeing contrasts with the narrator's vision of Clifton Grove. The narrator sees the Grove as an infinity of things inaccessible to the eyes of the characters, especially Paul, whose way of seeing is limited to that on which he can act. In turn, the narrator's vision highlights Paul's ongoing fetishistic gazing at Clara, as does Paul's way of looking at the fishermen which differs from his way of seeing Clara. There is a sense of immobility underlying his behaviour with Clara which was previously observed in his relationship with Miriam. Paul and Clara's forward motion falters through the Grove, and there are references to stillness as their tryst reaches its sexual highpoint (355). The immobility alludes to the idea that Paul is in an impasse of a relationship. Intercut with this sense is the impression that these moments corroborate them both, as some kind of baptism occurs. Thus, the disappearance of the path into the water symbolises the arresting of their development by a form of passion which is, nonetheless, regenerative.

After the event, Paul still sees Clara condensed into her movement and, this time, the creases of her clothes (356). His way of seeing disappears with her departure. So, he has a vision of the world's goodness on the way home and, in the home itself, his fetishistic way of seeing is absent. When Clara visits Paul's home, Paul has a less fractured sense of her which is counterpointed by her arrival at the station. Here, Paul notices the beautiful fitting of her clothes over her breasts and shoulders, the focus falling on features, such as the fit of the clothes, which highlight the covered erotic objects. It is an acutely fetishistic way of seeing as he endows secondary objects connected to parts of Clara's body with special sexual significance. It amplifies the potency of her femininity

which is made more sexual by his way of watching. In terms of watching parts of him, her way of watching is similar to his, as she notes his quick hands putting the berries in her coat. In the apparent sanctuary of the home, these ways of seeing are absent, reflecting the repression of sexual interchange with Clara in the presence of his mother. Yet, in the theatre, he is intensely aroused by his fetishistic way of watching her, as he is in her mother's house afterwards where, looking at Clara, 'he had to bite his lip, and the tears of pain came to his eyes, she was so beautiful, and so desirable' (383). After he has looked, he can engage physically with Clara. His visual fantasy of her is a prerequisite to sexual engagement. It reduces the instinctive tension he feels about women, a tension which is presumably related to the impact on his unconscious by his love for his mother. Another way of putting it is to say Paul splits the object of perception - Clara - to reduce levels of anxiety about the dominant female influence in his life, his mother. This seems particularly accurate in the light of Paul's image of his mother standing next to Clara in the house, against whom, she looked 'done-for' (365). Each time he sees Clara in this way, he is recomposing a similar whole with similar parts. Seemingly, he reaches out to her with his intellect, which awkwardly represents the living to him as partial views of the whole. Yet he cannot approach her with a man's natural instinct for women, as it has been compromised by his love for his mother and Miriam. His love for his mother, which prevents him from going freely forward with his own life, is therefore one of the main roots of his tendency to follow a cinematographic form of perception.

Paul's connection with Clara is thus limited as it goes only 'as far as passion went' (395). Despite the limitation, the causes and effects of which are inherent in his cinematic way of seeing her, there are occasions when this way of seeing is transcended. Paul's vision of life (398), which

registers objects on a scale inaccessible to his eyes in Clifton Grove, illustrates a rare profundity in their meetings. It is indicative of the being-made, rather than the already-made. It recognises the incommensurability between Paul's personal space and a universal space, the scope between the two permitting a duration of creativity and evolution. This duration fails to endure, as Clara feels an absence in their passion and Paul tries to compartmentalise it into special hours outside work. The diminishment from one ambit to another at Theddlethorpe illustrates a similar unsustainability in the duration of their passion. It can be a great baptism, as the narrator's religious vision of the morning suggests (400). However, this vision boils down to Paul's long-shot point of view of Clara going into the sea, and then his pornographic watching of her bright shoulders and her breasts. The sliding scale of the ambits suggests the vastness of their passion, and its incompleteness. Paul's way of watching her, and the reasons behind it, explain why Clara felt her relationship with Baxter was more whole. Certainly, Paul's perception, as he is carried away by passion, has a cinematographic aspect:

Everything rushed along in living beside him, everything was perfectly still, perfect in itself, along with him. This wonderful stillness in each thing itself, while it was being borne along in a very ecstasy of living, seemed the highest point of bliss.

(408)

He sees things as a series of immobilities. Each thing persists in an immovable state until another changes it, as if his mind is taking snapshots of the continuity of becoming which, as Bergson reckons, is part of the cinematographic tendency of perception and thought. However, Paul's way of seeing his mother during the opening stages of her illness is not cinematic. This reaffirms the

earlier impression that his cinematic perception, identified with Miriam and Clara, is a form of defending his mother.

However, as Mrs Morel deteriorates, she and Paul see cinematically. Propped in her chair, she has a fixed perspective of the dying sunflowers and blossoming chrysanthemums (428), both of which symbolise her impending death. Ultimately, the fragmented way of seeing that typified Paul's earlier perception of Miriam and Clara is brought to bear on his mother. Feeding her the fatal sleeping draught, he sees her frail fingers over the cup, her puckered lips, and her throat as she swallows the milk. His fragmented way of seeing her is a reflection of the cellular dissolution constituting physical death. Moreover, his inability to see his mother as a whole is an expression of the idea that he is no longer defending her but killing her, a killing ritualistically enacted, and similarly seen, when he and Annie burnt the doll<sup>18</sup>. Paul's fragmented way of seeing is enhanced by his sense of time. Time is spatialised, measured, as it is, by the spaces between his mother's breaths. The narrator, too, emphasises the sense of breakdown by repeated references to the time, and measurements thereof. Paul thus has a frame-by-frame perception of reality which reflects his mother's death, and the death of an intrinsic part of him.

The stress of Mrs Morel's death induces Mr Morel and Annie to see cinematically. Mr Morel is restricted to viewing the form of his wife's corpse as he dares not actually see her in the way she has been prepared by the undertakers. In the narration of Mrs Morel's funeral (444-5), the point of view slides from the omniscient to Annie's and back. The scene is thus presented as a series of perspectives, which, alternately, are white and black and are underpinned by the glistening wet clay. The way of seeing closely approximates a cinematic method of narration. The presence of

this way of seeing at this juncture exemplifies the novel's marriage of form and matter. The inherently fragmented way of seeing in terms of multi-angled snapshots parallels Mrs Morel's physical dissolution, and Paul's psychological breakdown.

His breakdown is a sort of rite of passage, shown by Lawrence's conversion of Paul's Christian name to his surname directly afterwards, a change of nomenclature which first occurs when he made love to Clara. However, the experience of his breakdown scars Paul, as he continues to see in the fractured way in which he saw Clara, and he can no longer see in the integrative style of his art. He observes Baxter as a series of bits - wrist, white hand, pipe, ash and handsome legs covered with glistening dark gold hair. His detached withdrawal from life (448), and his splitting of perceived objects, especially Miriam, Clara, and finally his mother, are traits of a schizoid character whose ways of seeing are a defence against guilt and anxiety arising from his love for his mother.

Clara senses an ongoing cinematic aspect to Paul which is conveyed by his appearance. Her perspective of him seems particularly clear as it is preceded by a contrasting blur of the outside world. To her, Paul looks as if he is trying to squash himself into the tightest boundary or frame possible, to the extent that he appears 'paltry and insignificant' (450). The doors of perception have come down between him and the outside world as a means of self-preservation in his grief. In this state, as Clara notes, he arranges rather than creates, and sees accordingly in a cinematic fashion. Thus, the picture completed on the day of his mother's death was the last (454). Paul's cinematic appearance betrays his cinematic conception of reality. He considers reality in terms of the gap behind him left by his mother (451). As such, like a viewer watching the frames of a film



unwind behind each present frame, he is continually determining his position by relation to what has just been left behind, instead of sensing the actual flow of life.

Paul's lack of a continual change of form, or evolution, is evident in the belief that he is most himself either alone or at work in the factory. The division of labour necessitated by industry implies an association and convergence of willed effort which, in Bergson's terms, is anti-evolutionary, as evolution advances by dissociating an initial grand impetus into a divergence of efforts (Bergson, 1906, 123). The damming of this impetus, which characterises Paul's appearance and consideration of reality, is clear in his way of seeing. Under the electric light of his lodgings, he perceives the mice nibbling the crumbs as if he were a long way off, as if he were seeing without knowing. His way of seeing is punctuated by the clock striking two, and the regular clinking of the railway trucks, both of which infuse his way of seeing with a division into regular units which parallels the cinema's presentation of reality as a series of still frames. Reality on a larger, social scale, in addition to the microcosm of the mice, becomes equally distant and intangible (457). His way of seeing is commensurate with his desire to be with his mother again. He wants everything to stand still, to enclose reality in a freeze-frame as it were, so that he can fix in his mind the last moments he spent with her.

Paul's lack of evolution is also conveyed by his way of watching Miriam in which he concentrates her presence into an image of her brown, nervous hands (461). He sees her in the same way as he did when his mother was alive, so his mother's death has not freed him from seeing Miriam cinematically<sup>19</sup>. His fragmented way of seeing is highlighted by Miriam's contrasting vision of his essence in his slender body 'that seemed one stroke of life' (462). It is a vision that registers her

awareness of his restless instability, which Clara had also sensed. Yet he cannot see others in these terms. His inability to do so is emphasised by his penultimate view of the surroundings from the train (463-4). Everything seems to unravel behind him like an infinitely long film in which he has no place, and where he is unable to perceive the restless instability of life which escapes between the frames.

### 'Sons and Lovers': The Film

To summarise, the novel's cinematic ways of seeing represent a perceptive anaesthesia which problematises relationships between Mr and Mrs Morel, William and Louisa, Paul and Miriam, Paul and Clara, and Paul and his mother. The novel itself thus resembles effective cinematic art. To determine to what extent the film illustrates these ways of seeing, I will begin my analysis of its narrative by looking at the adaptation of the Morels' marriage, and, in turn, the adaptations of the aforementioned relationships between William and Louisa, Paul and Miriam, Paul and Clara, and Paul and his mother. Before examining the film's narrative, it is essential to consider the film-making process itself. This recognition of the film's own reality reveals its preoccupation with aspects of the novel which are relevant to its illustrations of the novel's ways of seeing.

The film's opening way of looking at the countryside and the mine as a panoramic *mise-en-scène* rather than a montage is one of its predominant ways of seeing which corresponds to the novel, as Denitto has noted (Denitto, 1980, 246). Jack Cardiff, the film's director, zooms into the novel's opening panorama probably because of his inclination towards the material, empirical discipline of photography. He began his career in films as a cameraman, so his flair for the visual and the physical would, theoretically, emphasise the novel's ways of seeing. At the time of its release, a

number of reviewers praised the film's visual, photographic images, images which were attributed to Jack Cardiff's history and expertise in photography.

It is worth considering the French reviewer's reference to what he calls Cardiff's 'genuine respect for the novelist's work' (Unsigned review, *Cinématographie Française*, n1869, 21/5/1960, 7), as it leads to a revealing profile of the director. Like Ken Russell ('The Rainbow', 'Women in Love') and Tim Burstall ('Kangaroo'), Jack Cardiff is the sort of cinematographer who *would* appreciate Lawrence. For example, he and Lawrence seem to share a mutual interest in painting. Lawrence's flair for sketching and painting makes itself felt in his prose which often resembles painting with words (such as the opening page of *Sons and Lovers*). Similarly, Jack Cardiff is known for the value he places on light and colour in painting, a great source of inspiration for him (Cardiff, x, 1996). Additionally, he seems to have the same affection for Cézanne as Lawrence did (*ibid.*, 23). His feel for painting underlies Martin Scorsese's belief that what Cardiff does, essentially, is 'to make cinema into an art of moving painting... [He] *paint[s]* with the camera' (*ibid.*, x - xi). Indeed, Scorsese goes on to paint a picture of Cardiff that might have been intelligible to Lawrence. The sense that film deals with fantasy and absence seems de-emphasised by the way Cardiff makes films, such as the 'African Queen'. As Scorsese points out, Cardiff tried 'to make the film *feel* real as opposed to merely *look* real' (*ibid.*, xii). Like Lawrence, Cardiff seems to have reacted against the artifice of the early cinema, going, instead, for places and styles which, in Scorsese's words, make film feel real. Just as he visited Renoir's house, Cézanne's house and Van Gogh's asylum to understand the places that shaped their creations, he chose to shoot 'Sons and Lovers', where possible, in the very places that feature in the novel. He shot scenes at the coal mine where Arthur Lawrence worked, used Lawrence's terraced house and Arthur Lawrence's favourite watering

125

hole, The Three Tuns, and got close to the actual people Lawrence based his story on - including the daughter of Alice Dax, from whom Lawrence in part drew Clara, and the brother of Jessie Chambers, the model for Miriam (Cardiff, 22-3, 1996). Cardiff interprets, in part, the novel as a biography, and his rationale of adaptation is therefore geared towards a faithful reproduction of the spirit and place of the novel.

Within this interpretation of the novel as biography is the sense of being an adolescent, of discovering oneself and others, of rebelling, and of escaping the British working class. The impression of rebellion and escape is particularly conveyed by the actors Mary Ure and Donald Pleasence who play Clara Dawes and Mr Pappleworth. Both had been involved with the Angry Young Men school of dramatic thought in the late fifties and had acted together in the film version of John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* in 1959 (Mary Ure was, in fact, married to John Osborne at the time). Under this rationale of evoking the novel's spirit and place, as Jack Cardiff sees them, the film also evokes the novel's ways of seeing. Its ways of seeing stem from two fundamentals, namely classical montage-style editing and shooting in deep focus. The new high-speed Tri-X film which increased depth-of-focus in the individual frame allowed more freedom of movement and more extreme close-ups while shooting indoors. Thus, the contrast between these shots and the cinemascope long-shots is highly pronounced. The clear demarcation of the ways of seeing enables close parallels to be drawn with the novel's ways of seeing.

Jack Cardiff's interpretation of the novel as a fiction based on a framework of autobiography, and his associated strategies of evoking the novel's spirits and place, facilitate the drawing of parallels between the symbolism of the film's scenery and the symbolism of the novel's places. However,

because the film was shot with monochromatic Tri-X film, it cannot veer from black and white to colour as the novel does. Therefore, some of the novel's contrasting visual transitions are forcibly absent from the film, such as the shift from the florally colourful fronts of the miners' houses to the ashily colourless insides and rears, and the shift from Mrs Morel's monochromatic view of the night to the red and smoky flame inside the house.

The film's narrative begins immediately prior to Paul's employment at Jordan's, thereby omitting a large proportion of the Morels' marriage. The residue describing their marriage in the first part of the novel is conflated with matter from the second part<sup>20</sup>. In this foreshortened version of events, the film begins by using the sons as a conduit for the tension between the mother and father. As portrayed in the film's opening scenes of the Morel household, Paul is favoured by his mother, and Arthur by his father. Mr Morel spoils Paul's portrait of his mother, reflecting the antipathy between father and son and husband and wife. After Arthur's death, the twin antipathies towards Mr Morel, and the isolation from the family which accompanies them, are developed by the way in which he is seen. During the family's post-funeral communion in the parlour, the camera twice cuts to shots of the father by himself, shots which contrast with shots of the sons and the mother together. The editing of the scene into parts approximates the way the couple are seen as separate entities in the first part of the novel. It reflects the fragmentation of their relationship, and the contrast between the shots thematises William's and Paul's intimacy with their mother as the split between them and their father grows. Point of view does not belong exactly to one character as it does in the novel, for example, when Mrs Morel regards her husband through the window after their first quarrel. Yet this third person omniscient point of view in the film facilitates various

perspectives on the object of perception, imitating the effect of the characters' points of view in the novel.

This way of seeing, when connected to events before and after the funeral, becomes more connotative. The floating point of view Lawrence uses to narrate the son's funeral is transposed to events leading up to the death of Arthur (not William) in the film. The fragmented, floating point of view, typified by the camera flicking through the crowd and the elevated shot from the pit-tower, portends Arthur's imminent demise. In this depiction of the mine, the film sees the mine as the novel does during Paul's visit to collect his father's wages. The fractured montage of people's feet splashing through the mine-filth after the explosion reprises the novel's style of alternating perspectives. It thereby expresses the anti-industrial theme of the social and personal dissolution caused by the mine - people are shown as bits rather than as whole, living entities. As in the novel, the film's way of seeing is a metaphor for the instability of life away from the mother's love, especially as the camera reprises its steadycam tracking for the scenes of the funeral when Mrs Morel is back in the picture. These shots foreshadow several others, filmed in a similar style, which express the togetherness between mother and son. When Mrs Morel and Paul wave off William at the station, they are filmed in a tracking shot walking towards the camera. The rails in the background to this shot run parallel to the camera's axis, implicitly pointing to the continuous steadycam apparatus that facilitates it. Similarly, Paul's visit to the art exhibition with his mother opens in a continuous, steadycam style. It becomes fractured into a shot/reverse shot sequence only when Miriam appears. The breaking up of the narrative style reflects the threat Miriam poses to Paul's relationship with his mother. In like fashion, the montage of close-ups and points of view in the funeral scene coheres around Mr Morel. When he comes back into the

parlour, believing that his wife has set their sons against him, he is seen from several angles, and there is a close-up of his fist slamming down on the table. By the same token, Henry Hadlock's proffered patronage of Paul's artistic career is presented as a series of cuts between him, Paul and Mrs Morel shot from a boom-mounted camera 'floating' around them. Seemingly, Miriam, Mr Morel and Mr Hadlock all undermine the security of the mother's love. Their potential for subversion is conveyed by the fractures in the film associated with their presence. Thus, in the funeral scene, once Mr Morel departs, the film resumes its wholeness, concluding with a static shot of the sons and mother together. So the film, although not seeing events in the same way as the novel, sees them in a similar way. Like the novel, it veers between ways of seeing as a means of expressing the relationship between the father and the mother, and the mother and her sons<sup>21</sup>.

In addition to splitting the narration of these events into perspectives, the film reductively fragments one of its perceived objects, Mr Morel, into an image of his hand. This way of seeing him anticipates Paul's way of seeing Miriam and Clara in the novel. This way of seeing Mr Morel emphasises the unity of the mother and sons, defending it by condensing Mr Morel into the image of his hand, and displacing him outside their circle. This sense of displacement is actively incorporated into the narrative when, after this shot, Mr Morel pointedly leaves the family.

The sense of displacement from his family is further developed in Mr Morel's departure to bed after his first drunken return home. The camera lingers on his shadow in the space he vacates, emphasising his abstraction from his wife and family. The way of seeing Mr and Mrs Morel during this scene points to the ebb and flow of their marriage. Mr Morel's appearance is introduced as a cut from Mrs Morel sewing, indicating a pause in the flow of their relationship. The flow resumes

as the camera pans back to shoot him and his wife, and cuts, again, to Mr Morel looking at Louisa's photograph. It pans left to register Mrs Morel, and right to include them both in the same shot. It cuts to Mr and Mrs Morel together, then to individual shots of Mrs Morel and Mr Morel, concluding with the last shot of Mr Morel's shadow. The intermitting of a flow in their relationship is incorporated into the way of seeing them as cuts in the camera's panning back and forth or left and right. Given Mr Morel's exclusion from the family, and Mrs Morel's stilling of his *joie de vivre* which he calls taking the curl out of him, this alternation in ways of seeing them illustrates a psychic distance between them, much as their cinematographic ways of seeing each other did in the novel.

Thus, irrespective of whether the film is aimed at a straightforward inscription of the novel's events, or a recreation of them as a new story, it seems that the film needs only to edit scenes into cuts, along the lines of classical editing, to approximate the novel's innately cinematic ways of seeing. The ongoing analysis of these ways of seeing in the film will therefore consider to what extent they continue to approximate the novel's, and to what extent they are integrated into the narrative of both film and novel as connections with the themes and ideas therein. For example, the candle and coconut in the above scene are symbols which link the ways of seeing with discourses evident in the novel and film. Mr Morel sees the coconut as a vital and life-sustaining gift for his wife, whereas she sees it in terms of a premeditated act which costs the family money. It belongs to the discourse of alienation, as does the candle. It is given to Mr Morel by his wife, imaging the burning down of his flame of life associated with his exclusion from the family.



This way of seeing the characters, whereby they move in and out of the narrator's point of view, which itself moves and cuts from one perspective to another, narrates the scene of Mr Morel's second drunken return. The scene conflates a number of scenes from the novel, mainly the one of Mrs Morel's ejection from the house and the fight between her and her husband in which she is struck by the drawer. Initially Mrs Morel, and then Mr Morel are seen in a continuous medium shot which he enters and she leaves. The cutting begins when Mrs Morel returns to the table as her husband takes the food meant for Paul. There are at least two discourses present, one focussing on the parents, the other on the mother's love for her son. The break in the continuum as the narrative shifts from one to another reflects an uneasiness between the two discourses, as if their being forced together destabilises point of view into a series of subject positions. It parallels a number of similar schisms in the novel, the shock of which is expressed by a multiplicity of perspectives.

Point of view falls on one character or another as they continue to argue. The argument is watched as a spectator watches a tennis match, the alternation from one character to another seen from a single point of view, thereby reflecting the adversarial nature of the objects seen. To extend the simile, as the characters come closer, for instance, when Mr Morel wrenches the drawer out, or pushes Mrs Morel out and they are seen in the same frame, the discord intensifies in their rally. However, at these moments, there is a paradoxical variance between the way they are seen, which implies togetherness, and what is being narrated, namely a violent argument, and this paradox calls attention to the separation of subject (audience) and object (the quarrelling couple), sharpening our sense of spectatorship and thereby amplifying our sense of Mr Morel's

violence. It is an approximation of the novel's hard and violent style which gives content scope to flourish in a particular form.

After Mrs Morel's ejection, the narrative point of view continues to see the characters through a sequence of thematically related cuts. Point of view cuts to Mrs Morel outside, and pans with her as she looks through the window and tries the outhouse door. It clearly approximates the point of view of her in the novel as she contemplates the colourless night after her first row with her husband. It cuts to Paul walking home, and pans to follow his movement to his mother and then the back door where he breaks a window. The cuts move the spectator to a series of positions within the house where Paul confronts his father, his mother and father conclude their argument, and Paul comforts his mother. As at other moments in the film, the aggregation of cuts has a self-reflexive effect. They call attention to the way the characters are perceived through a series of actual and personal immobilities. That is, the cuts heighten awareness that the action is being seen as a series of still frames, which solidify into series of larger crystals of narrative, like those constituting the above scene. In turn, the serialisation of narrative reflects the characters' lack of flow or development. As in the novel, the ways of seeing the characters draw in many of the major issues around them.

The way of seeing Mrs Morel and Paul at the end of the scene, and the way the family are seen the following morning, comment on such issues. The narrative becomes particularly fragmented after the static close-up of Mrs Morel as she talks about the halcyon days with her husband. This close-up works in a number of ways. Mrs Morel clearly has a reverence for the early days of her marriage, which is conveyed by her appearance. This sense is subverted by the shot itself. It is a

static close-up which suggests an arresting of development, associated with nostalgia and the current state of their marriage. This close-up becomes a sequence of cuts from Mrs Morel to Paul in which she narrates the history of the marriage. She has emasculated her husband, and numbed a certain intrinsic part of herself in the process. The stilling of the flow of her own life, her husband's, and Paul's is reflected by the way the scene is perceived as a series of fragments, especially at the end of the scene when she feels Paul is holding himself back from going to London in order to protect her from his father. The fragmentation is evocative of the sort of assemblage of perspectives characteristic of Bergson's concept of cinematographic perception. The sense of such assemblage is acutely felt in these montages, which are a logical product of Bergson's way of thinking. Historically, Griffith and Eisenstein were the first filmmakers to realise such a concept, but Bergson had clearly formulated it some years previously, and used the French word for assemblage - 'montage' - as an expression of it, an expression which ultimately developed a similar meaning in the cinema. Thus Lawrence, in reading Bergson, had early exposure to the basics of montage, which are incorporated into the novel *Sons and Lovers* and ultimately realised in the film's classical montage-style editing.

The way of seeing the quarrel is counterpointed by the way of seeing its aftermath. The two ensuing scenes of Mr Morel bringing tea to his wife and giving Paul breakfast are filmed without internal cuts, and the sense of flow is strengthened by the quarrel scene fading into the tea scene, rather than cutting into it. This way of seeing is aligned with Mr Morel's perspective. He views the quarrel stoically, as if it is part of the oscillatory flow of marriage. Mrs Morel, too, has a tendency to such stoic acceptance. Paul, however, comprehends matters differently. To judge from his comments, he believes such quarrels interrupt the flow<sup>22</sup>. Thus, the fragmented way of

seeing aligns itself with his understanding of the marriage as a threat to his mother and her love for him.

This way of seeing intersects with Paul's perception of his parents during William's homecoming. Mr and Mrs Morel are seen as a sequence of medium shots and close-ups as she assists him with his bath. The sequence is interspersed with cuts to a close-up of Paul's face as he watches them. This spectating on spectatorship, a recurrent feature of the corpus of Lawrence's work, creates an open field of subjects and objects in which the fragmented way of seeing associates itself with Paul's way of seeing. This way of seeing is a concomitant of his love for his mother as it seems to belong to a sense of anxiety about her relationship with his father. The anxiety is linked to moments of rapprochement between Mr and Mrs Morel when, as in this case, there is a bonhomie between them which would make Paul jealous of his father. It is also linked to a sense of wonderment about their past, which is referred to again. To consider Paul's later comments to William and his mother, he feels that such a grand love as his parents once had, however fleeting, has been beyond him. The thematisation of spectatorship which maps the narrator's way of seeing onto Paul's creates an effect commensurate with Paul's anxiety. The jump cuts destabilise point of view, analogous to the effect of multiple points of view in the novel. The disunity of point of view suggests that these moments of anxiety are instances of breakdown, rather than renewal, for Paul.

The narrator's way of seeing the parents contains the effects on them of Paul's relationship with Clara who, seemingly, represents the grand passion of his quest. For Mr Morel, Paul's liaison with Clara is a product of his mother's love. Paul, unable to discard the strictures of this love to develop a 'normal' relationship, decamps with a married woman, or a 'Nottingham tart' in his

father's words. This action, and the mother's love behind it, climax in the most intensely fragmented argument to date. Mr Morel's criticism of his wife, and her defence of her behaviour, are orchestrated by three vivid cuts, culminating in a shot of the diametrically opposed parents whose positions are an illustration of their differences over Paul. Ultimately, the fragmentation is total as, in the final sequence of their relationship showing Mr Morel talking to his sick wife, they are seen individually in shots which cut from one character to the other. Significantly, there is no diversity of scales or focal lengths in the way they are seen, which uses mostly medium shots to narrate their relationship. Overall, expression is derived from cuts and crystals of frames, rather than the lyricism or visual rhetoric of close-ups or long-shots or tracking shots. The consistent way of seeing on a particular scale in an unchanging environment - virtually all the shots of Mr and Mrs Morel are in the home - generates a sense of confinement, reflecting their nostalgia for an ephemeral happiness. The way of seeing thus places a real and thematic frame around them which they cannot transcend to position themselves within a duration of constant renewal.

The film's way of seeing Mr and Mrs Morel therefore approximates the novel's in terms of the cuts associated with multiple perspectives. It can be interpreted similarly to the novel's way of seeing as a form of illustrating the alienation between Mr and Mrs Morel. The novel's innate presence can therefore be sensed in the film because the film's way of seeing touches on the very form of the novel.

This way of seeing, which involves a limited range of ambits, and cuts into the perceptive continuity of a scene, briefly narrates William's and Louisa's relationship. Again, the way of seeing is not the same as the novel's. Point of view is not overtly intertwined with a particular

character's perspective, as it is in the novel when Louisa's point of view skims over the family's Christmas gathering. Moreover, William's character is fundamentally altered by the screenwriter. However, Louisa, as in the novel, is shallow, or 'silly' as Paul calls her. This is illustrated by her behaviour, and her appearance, which resembles the novel's visual concept of her. In the film's third scene of the Christmas visit, her recollection of mispronouncing 'nobly' is shot as a static, individual close-up. This shot evokes the style of photographic portraiture. It focuses attention on her photographic appearance, an appearance foreshadowed by the photograph of her 'naked bust' William gave to his mother. Louisa is thus seen in the film as she is in the novel by William, who describes her photographically, and by London society, whose way of seeing her is symbolised by the photographers who queue for her picture. The film's way of seeing her reflects the stasis of her relationship with William which, as Paul sees it, is unlikely to evolve. This stasis is clearly a characteristic of watching them as, in the first and second scenes of their arrival, their kiss is shown as a static close-up. The idea of a relationship drying up, or draining away, is definitely readable in the cut to Paul and his mother pouring his father's bathwater away as they talk of William and Louisa, and Mrs Morel warns him about Miriam. In these circumstances, the water is a richly textured symbol, standing for a potential state of all the characters' relationships. Importantly, there is a symmetry between the overall way of seeing these scenes as temporary flows intermitted with cuts, and the way of seeing the Morels. The symmetry suggests, as Paul says, that his parents' relationship was once like Louisa's and William's.

Ostensibly, the film's way of seeing William and Louisa is objective, divorced, as it is, from any character's actual point of view. However, in these scenes of William's and Louisa's visit, Paul's watching becomes a theme in itself. On three occasions, there are cuts to him watching the

courting couple or staring at an object out of frame and, one scene prior to the first scene of their arrival, there is an extreme close-up of his eyes as he watches Clara. It is therefore possible to associate the film's way of seeing with his, especially in the shots of William and Louisa kissing, and in the earlier scenes of Mr Morel's bath. Implicitly, Paul sees them cinematically. It replicates his way of seeing in the novel, but its meaning is recontextualised as, in the novel, he sees neither his parents nor William and Louisa as sequences of momentary shots. This implicit way of seeing his parents, and William and Louisa, in the film is therefore connected to themes or ideas in and around the scene, such as his anxiety over his mother and his fear of relationships dribbling out to stony ground, like the drained bathwater.

The symbolic value of water in the film is akin to that of water in the novel, and exemplifies the value placed by the director on the novel's style and spirit. The film's first scenes of Paul and Miriam show them by a lake, recalling the still, deep pond at Willey Farm in the novel. In both novel and film, the lack of flow in the lake symbolises a stalling in Paul linked to his involvement with Miriam. Indeed, water seems to function allotropically as other substances do in *Women in Love*. As we shall see, in the film, the lake ultimately freezes over when the couple split up, illustrating the doubts Paul has about Miriam. When he walks with Clara on the finger of land between the canal and the river, the water represents the status of Paul's life. Seemingly, he is forever oscillating between the stilled water of the canal, and the vital water of the river. The film valorises this sense of motion embodied by the river. When Paul's life-force falters, as it does when he makes love with Miriam, the water wheel at the farm stops turning. Yet, when it is revitalised, as it is when he connects with Clara, the film fades into the spinning jennies at Jordan's; the motion of these jennies illustrates his return to vitality. In addition to capturing the

157

novel's ways of seeing, the film takes some of the novel's symbols and invites us to interpret them as they are interpreted in the novel.

Having analysed ways of seeing in the film associated with Mr and Mrs Morel, and William and Louisa, it is time to examine the ways of seeing surrounding Paul and Miriam. A typically cinematic way of seeing which belongs to a character's perspective, and themes related to that character, is to be found in Paul's relationship with Miriam<sup>23</sup>. The film depicts the relationship in media res, conflating Paul's first and second visits to Willey Farm. Paul's second arrival in the novel is seen from various points of view, and it is seen similarly in the film. It begins with a cut, as it does in the novel, which contrasts with his approach to the farm. En route, he is shown from a deep focus long shot and a tracking shot of similar temporal length. The first fades into the second to create a harmonious interaction underlined by the style of the shots themselves which show the environment as a whole, rather than as a montage. It is a style which recalls the fusion of the elements in the panorama Paul sketches prior to his first visit to the farm in the novel. It also recalls his flowing vision of life before his second visit. The stylistic harmony of the approach shots to the farm gives way to a more jagged form of representation at the farm itself. The tracking shot of his movement through the forest cuts rather than fades to the opening shot of his arrival. This cut sets the tone for the portrayal of his relationship with Miriam which is shown through a series of shots which all cut to the next one in the sequence. The first shot of his arrival cuts to a shot aligned with his point of view of Miriam, then back to a reverse shot of him throwing mud at her. Miriam, surprised, turns to look at him and he walks into the frame. There is a cut to the pig, then a cut back to Paul and Miriam which becomes a tracking shot of them walking towards the lake while he talks about his painting. This is one of the most integrative



shots at the farm. Both characters are seen in the same frame, and the camera's tracking shot recalls the uninterrupted way of showing Paul's approach to the farm. The alternation between the two styles is indicative of the divisions in Paul. His love of life, represented by his interaction with nature on the way to the farm, and his painting, is indicated by an integrative way of shooting, namely a tracking shot. His love for Miriam, which is a sort of mental, spiritual love, is depicted by a series of shot/reverse shot sequences which suggests the splitting in Paul's consciousness that such a form of love of causes. His cinematic way of seeing her therefore approximates a similar way of seeing her in the novel.

Towards the end of this tracking shot, Miriam walks out of the frame, and returns as Paul walks out of the frame. Miriam sits down by herself. The camera begins another shot/reverse shot sequence. It cuts to Paul talking about his mother, to Miriam looking up at him, and to an upward shot of him virtually from her point of view which then becomes a more detached point of view as the camera shifts to show Paul moving into shot with her and lying down. The shot/reverse shot technique restarts with a cut to a close-up of Miriam, then of Paul, then back to Miriam, then back to Paul. This is a sort of cinematic stichomythia as the rapid shuttling from perspective to perspective reveals the excitement and the antagonism in their relationship, especially as this style is accompanied by succinct dialogue which itself shows Paul's and Miriam's potentially divergent views on religion, art and literature. The symbolic tone of the scene's stylistic features thus matches its thematic content, exemplified by the symmetry between the concluding shot of Paul running back to Bestwood and the opening shots of his approach to the farm. The symmetry suggests a lack of change or evolution in Paul's and Miriam's relationship. More importantly, these shots reveal a divergence in point of view. They clearly belong to the film's narrative point

of view, that is, a point of view identified with a third person narrator, in contrast to the majority of shots at the farm which are aligned with Paul's and Miriam's perspectives. In its shift from the narrator's perspective to the characters' perspectives, the film's point of view becomes subjective. This subjectification, or decentralisation, of point of view means that the spectator, who no longer occupies a unitary external viewpoint, has to reconstruct one by the particular discourses in the narrative, such as Paul's and Miriam's relationship. The way of seeing Paul and Miriam is more complex than the way of seeing Mr and Mrs Morel because of this interpenetration of points of view around Paul and Miriam. The interpenetration involves a deconstruction of the narrator's way of seeing which is reconstructed as a way in which Paul and Miriam implicitly see each other. The film changes the novel's characters, themes and chronology, but the way of seeing itself embodies the novel's way of seeing and encapsulates numerous interpretations associated with it.

As in the novel, there is a contrast between the way of seeing Mrs Morel and the way of seeing Miriam. This contrast is evident in the film's invention of a scene in the art gallery where Paul's picture is displayed. His arrival with his mother is shown by a fixed camera panning from right to left. The shot's style reprises the continuity of the tracking shot of Paul and his mother in the previous scene at the station. The way of seeing changes as Miriam appears. Mrs Morel's awareness of Miriam is synchronistic with a cut to her and Paul's point of view of Miriam staring at Paul's painting. The way of seeing Miriam develops into a close-up point of view of her face from Paul's perspective as she encourages Mrs Morel to praise Paul. Basically, Paul is seeing Miriam statically as a close-up image of a talking head<sup>24</sup>. It approximates his way of seeing her as parts of a whole in the novel, and it is emphasised by being juxtaposed to the way of seeing Mrs Morel. The ways of seeing are analogous to the novel's, as are the interpretations of them. Paul's

170

way of seeing Miriam contains an erotic aspect, focussing, as it does, on parts of her and prefiguring a way of seeing, associated with Clara, that becomes progressively erotic and fragmented. The focus on Miriam's head also illustrates the sort of intellectualisation of love associated with her in the novel. This intellectualisation is embodied by her previous intense gazing at Paul's picture which suggested her visual epistemophilia. In the light of Mrs Morel's comment about the right woman for Paul being stronger than his mother, his fragmented way of seeing Miriam in the Gallery is connected to his mother's dominance. Her dominance is implicitly defended by his way of seeing Miriam as a part of her bodily self, and by the split between subject and object implied by seeing Miriam cinematically as a close-up image from a static point of view.

The scene concertinas into a sequence of point of view shots and reverse point of view shots as Paul, his mother and Miriam observe the public response to Paul's painting. The disruption caused by the continual shifting of perspective emphasises perception itself. The emphasis on perception incarnated in the scene's form draws attention to Paul's statement about wanting to watch people looking at his picture. This spectating of spectatorship thematises the cinematic way of seeing people as fragmented images, images which themselves are divided into frames. It is a way of seeing which is mapped onto Paul's perception not only by his way of seeing Miriam, but by his way of seeing Mr Hadlock. After Paul's "Watch this one", his point of view of Mr Hadlock pans left and there is a jump cut in it as Mr Hadlock approaches the painting. This jump cut illustrates that Paul's point of view constitutes frames of perception, rather than a duration of transposing oneself within the flow of life. His way of seeing is also illustrated by his tendency to fix people and things as portraits, exemplified by the paintings or sketches of his mother, father, Clara, and the flowers.

The lack of evolution implied by seeing in this way is suggested by the sense of contraction inherent in the medium-to-close shots, and by the lack of diversity therein. However, the excess of information confronting subjects like Paul and William, which is part of an accelerated modern lifestyle, is inherent in the mobility and multiplicity of points of view as it is in the novel. The film again subjectifies point of view, showing the narrative's personae, especially Paul, as spectators who do not transcend their ways of seeing.

Paul's and Miriam's ways of seeing are an important element in the film's adaptation of the swing scene in 'Strife in Love', which is conflated with Paul's discourse on disembodiment in 'Lad-and-Girl Love'. The conflated adaptation is mediated through a kaleidoscopic sequence of cuts and perspectives, building into the narrative, as the novel does, the sense that the characters' repressed sexual urges culminate in a disjointed and partial way of seeing. Paul's belief that Miriam makes him feel disembodied is foreshadowed by the high angle cut of the empty swing as Miriam calls after him. Technically, he is there in the scene whereas bodily, he is absent from the shot. The sense of disembodiment is perpetuated in the ensuing shot which shows him virtually obscured by the hay. Apart from his hand, the top of his head is the only visible body part. The *mise-en-scène* suggests that the focus, in Miriam's presence, is on the upper centres of being like the spirit and the mind. The sense of disembodiment is structurally incorporated into the climax of Paul's discourse about being disembodied by her spiritual purity. After his second kiss and subsequent rejection, there is a cut to her saying she will miss him. At this stage, he is not in the frame. When he appears, he says she will only miss a disembodied spirit, not a man made of flesh and blood. His initial physical absence in this shot accentuates his disembodiment at her hands, a

process which is further emphasised by his actual presence when he insists on his embodiment, on being a man made of flesh and blood. Thus, Miriam's way of seeing abstracts Paul's body. The sense of disembodiment alternates between the characters, too. There is a striking shot of Paul looking in Miriam's direction as he says he cannot always be so spiritual with her, but only Miriam's shadow is visible, suggesting, as her mother says, that love is a thing of the spirit and not of the body. Equally, as they kiss for a third time, she moves out of shot, and her shadow veils him. She is technically present but physically absent, as Paul is in the next shot of her imploring him to teach her to love. As she talks, he is out of shot and his presence is concealed until he stands up. The camera follows him as he moves slightly, leaving her out of frame when she replies with a disembodied 'Yes' to his comments. The alternation between presence and absence, inherent in the characters' way of seeing each other, is evocative of their inability to conjoin. One is there while the other is not, a prototypical seesaw scenario of the Gerald-and-Gudrun type of relationship where one character is nullified for the other to exist. As with Gerald and Gudrun, the relationship between Paul and Miriam is destined to freeze in the bud rather than to flower, symbolised by the final shots of the farm in winter which show that the lake and water wheel, earlier symbols of some sort of dynamism between Paul and Miriam, have frozen. The ongoing symmetry between the ways of seeing Paul's arrivals at the farm reinforces this impression of their relationship's failure to evolve.

The film's way of looking at them from alternate points of view which become progressively identified with one persona or the other characterises, in part, its adaptation of their sexual initiation. The adaptation, like many others in the film, is a conflation, as it blends their first and second sexual experiences from 'The Test on Miriam'. Of these, the most pertinent is the second

where Paul psychologically and physically stands back from Miriam as he realises her feeling of self-sacrifice. The film's post-coital way of seeing Miriam conveys a similar impression. The cut to Paul's perspective of her standing up jump cuts to one from further behind Paul as she walks over to him. The shot shows that a part of him has been arrested, or even repelled by the experience, a concern he vocalises in the comparison of himself with a criminal. The sense of alienation is also conveyed by the narrator's point of view, which becomes increasingly detached from the characters'. In the previous scenes at the farm and the gallery, the narrator's point of view was closely identified with the characters'. In this scene, the identification is still evident in the characters' extreme mutual close-ups at the beginning, and in the shots and reverse shots of their post-coital dialogue<sup>25</sup>. However, the intertwining of point of view is unravelled in the narration of Paul's arrival, his walk to the lake with Miriam, and the scenic cross cuts while the couple have sex. These moments are clearly seen from a third person omniscient point of view as long shots. The juxtaposition of large and small scales in the long shots and point of view shots, which highlights the limit of each ambit, emphasises the metaphysical fragmentation at the heart of the scene. Furthermore, the narrator's detachment from the characters parallels Paul's detachment from Miriam.

The collapse of personal points of view into the narrator's is clearly discernible in Paul's split from Miriam. In the scene of the split, there are no point of view shots from the characters' perspectives, an absence which reflects the distance between the characters. Personal point of view is replaced with a narratorial point of view which looks at its objects through a series of cuts and tracking shots. The repeated cuts from Paul to Miriam reflect the split between them, especially as most of the shots focus on only one character. The slow tracking shot of Paul at the

edge of the frozen lake which features Miriam's voice on the soundtrack but which places her outside the frame is particularly relevant to the novel's way of seeing. Miriam's voice seems to become part of Paul's unconscious, vocalising the problems of his relationship with his mother, problems which he consciously denies. Paul is therefore seen at the same time as his internal conflict is dramatised. It is a form of narration which reprises the *modus operandi* of the novel's narration of Paul's break-up with Miriam. In 'The Test On Miriam', Paul is sketched within a particular locale and his thoughts are omnisciently noted.

The film closely approximates the novel's method of narrating events at Willey Farm, especially by editing scenes of Paul and Miriam into shot/reverse shot structures where each shot is very short and rapidly alternates with its reverse. These points of view highlight the subject/object relations in the sections of the novel narrating Paul's relationship with Miriam. As in the novel, the film shifts from a point of view identified with a particular character to a larger scale take on the same scene, and then returns to its initial perspective. In both media, the position of the viewing subject is relative. With each subject or point of view being seen by or from another, the position of the first has to be re-examined to confirm or change its co-ordinates. The plurality of points of view offered by the novel and fleshed out by the film is not only a quintessential element of the novel's modernity, but also a concomitant of its cinematic way of seeing. With reference to Ezra Pound, Lawrence had already made a sarcastic equation between the state of being modern and the cinema, and the relativisation of seeing in the novel also opens up this equation. To see thus is to be modern, and to be modern is to be cinematic. Of course, the relativisation of the position of the viewing subject leads to a paradox. To see a scene from multiple perspectives is to see cinematically; and yet the mind too can see in this way. Perhaps this was part of Lawrence's

concept of the cinema. He understood that cinema, or techniques approximating to the cinema, could open up the soul of the perceiving subject as well as the object. Underlying this expansion of the soul by cinematographic techniques, though, is the mechanism of the cinematograph itself. This argument is a development of Bergsonian thought, as it can be conjectured that Lawrence used cinematographic techniques to narrate events in his stories frame by frame, and to prise apart the gaps between the frames wherein lies the *élan vital*. The cinematograph is a Janus-like open field as it looks two ways. It pays homage to ways of seeing, being and feeling that are, by virtue of their cinematographic presentation, anathema to the *élan vital* and it facilitates other, antithetical ways of seeing, being and feeling that encourage consideration of the essential interaction between objects - the *élan vital* itself. This second way of seeing, which reflects Paul's and Clara's occasional moments of mutual corroboration in the novel, is present in the film's adaptation of their relationship. However, the film mainly magnifies their fragmented ways of seeing.

The film's opening shots of Clara amalgamate the novel's way of seeing Paul's inaugural day at work with its way of seeing Clara's first appearance. The temporal fractures associated with several of her appearances in the novel are clearly presented in the film by the chiming of the clock as Paul arrives at Jordan's, the sense of visual fragmentation itself resonating in the shot/reverse shot structure which mediates Paul's upward gaze at the clock. The fragmentation is structurally incorporated into the scene in a conspicuous fashion by the numerous shots and cuts which narrate his arrival in Jordan's where Clara first appears. The film has taken considerable liberties with the chronology and events of the novel by juxtaposing Clara's entrance with Paul's first day at Jordan's, but the style and story of the original are clearly present. The two events of



his first day at work and her first appearance are comparable in terms of the multiple perspectives which accompany their narration in the novel, and hence there is no particular dissonance between them. Certainly, in the film, the events interlock neatly. The number of cuts in the scene is the highest in any single scene in the film so far. There were thirty-six in the narration of the swing scene at Willey Farm, sixteen in the ensuing scene of Paul's return home, and there are forty-one here. The comparative number of cuts reflects the dissociations in Paul's consciousness as he is torn between his mother, Miriam, and now Clara. They also reflect the instability of life away from the aegis of the mother's love. Most importantly, though, they are a direct development of the mobile and indeterminate point of view which narrates Clara's appearance in the novel. Thus, in the film, there is a clear sense of the novel's temporal and spatial fractures which accrue around Clara, and they are located at Jordan's as a climax to her entry. There are twenty-eight cuts based on a shot/reverse shot framework before Clara appears. The introductory shot of her is particularly distinctive. The camera cuts to Pappleworth's tour of the production line with Paul in tow. The camera moves back to a medium long shot as Pappleworth begins, and pans right to take in the machinery to the accompaniment of his firing off the names of people and jobs. Clara appears in this long shot and rightward pan. The shot conveys the contrast between her and Miriam that is suggested in the novel at the point of her appearance. The smoothness of the pan and the expansive scope of the shot are at variance with the medium shots, medium close-ups and close-ups which narrate much of Miriam's story. In their difference from the shots of Miriam, they symbolise the expansiveness Clara brings to Paul, especially with regard to his sexuality. The rhythm of the cuts after this shot, and especially the close-up of the nape of Clara's neck, traditionally an eroticized object, and the reciprocating close-up of Paul's eyes accompanied by the rhythmic beat of the machinery, certainly convey a sexual nuance to their first encounter which

has been lacking with Miriam. The most important shots of the entire scene are the last five which, if the one of Pappleworth replacing the cork in the ear-tube is discounted, show Paul looking at Clara and Clara looking at Paul. The shots are based on a shot/reverse shot structure which is developed into a system which allows perspective to slide into multiplicity as it does in the novel.

After Pappleworth uncorks the listening tube, Paul is shown looking at Clara from a perspective which is identified with her, but clearly isn't her actual point of view. The camera cuts to Clara looking back at him, and the camera follows her sitting down as Paul's gaze would. Yet it is not Paul's gaze, it is a perspective identified with it, as Clara's gaze slightly to the left of camera confirms. When Pappleworth recorks the tube, the camera cuts to Paul watching Clara, again from what is virtually her point of view of him, then to what is virtually his point of view of her which develops into a close-up of the nape of her neck. Finally, the camera cuts to a close-up of Paul looking at her, which becomes an extreme close-up of his eyes. This is not a simple case of visual stichomythia, although this phrase partly describes these shots. The underlying structure is more complicated, as the points of view identified with each character slide into close-ups of the other character. By zooming into various body parts like this, cinematic point of view does something that ocular point of view cannot, unless the position of the viewing subject changes, which is not the case for Paul and Clara as their positions relative to each other have remained constant. Thus, a point of view which, in reality, cannot be a point of view becomes one, and the zoom effect which mitigates against its realistic quotient helps it to be identified with the character who is gazing at the object. It makes real one of the novel's general effects which is to focus on a character's body parts, and to associate that focus with the gaze of a specific other character. It is

a way of seeing closely connected with the characters in 'Passion' where Paul and Clara are seen as bits of a whole to symbolise the incompleteness of their relationship caused by the underlying passion which drives them. In the film, the effect is similar. Spiritualized sexuality was incomplete for Paul, as is passionate sexuality, the incomplete outcome of which is suggested by the fragmentation of this scene into cuts and points of view.

The number of cuts in the above scene increases to forty-four in the scene of the suffragette meeting and Paul's walk with Clara. This scene loosely conflates Clara's suffragette sympathies with the walk in Clifton Grove. The meeting itself is seen from a number of angles and points of view, recalling Lawrence's observation of a suffragette meeting he saw being filmed by several cameras. Importantly, the scene draws attention to Paul's way of seeing. The first cut to a close-up of Clara cuts to a pair of hands sketching her. The similarities between the sketch and the close-up point to a connection between the camera's way of seeing her and the sketcher's way of seeing her, the close-up of the hands themselves paralleling the characters' perspectives of hands in the novel. The subsequent cut to Paul shows that he is the one sketching, and, by association, seeing Clara as the camera in close-up does. It is a way of seeing which develops pornographically and fetishistically into the camera's way of seeing parts of a person, similar to the way in which his own hands are seen here, and the way his and Clara's hands are seen holding the flowers. This way of seeing is associated with confrontation rather than conjunction, as it mediates the opposition of some of the audience to the suffragettes. The fragmentation that is an implicit part of seeing as the camera does is evident in the shot of the supporter who lets her placard fall after Paul's question about free love. The falling placard resembles a shutter coming down, or a clapper board signalling the end of the shot. It highlights the scene's divisions of perception inherent in the

number of cuts. The contrast between the narrator's way of seeing and the characters' ways of seeing is similar to the novel's contrasting ways of seeing the characters at Clifton Grove. In the novel, Paul perceives things in terms of how he can act upon them, whereas the narrator sees things on a greater scale. The film juxtaposes comparable ways of seeing. Paul's sketch suggests that he sees Clara as the camera does, a mode of perception that is underlined in the sequence of shots and reverse shots of the couple as Paul picks the snowdrops; the upward shot of Clara in medium close-up from Paul's point of view as he bends down for the flowers blends his perspective with the camera's. By contrast, the previous way of seeing the characters in a tracking shot as they walked along the canal bank detached itself from the characters' perspectives and encompassed a greater ambit. The narrator's point of view, as opposed to Paul's, registered the canal, the barge and the swans.

In the above scene, Paul's way of seeing is more subjective than the narrator's. He sketches Clara as he wants to see her, rather than as she believes she is. The subjectification of perspective and a cinematic way of watching converge in the film's adaptation of Paul's and Clara's evening at the theatre. The main ways of seeing in both these scenes are counterpointed by the way of seeing Paul and his mother in the intervening scene in the family home which is filmed as one continuous shot. The film changes the theatre to a music-hall where the predominant way of seeing which rapidly flicks from one viewpoint to another closely approximates a similar way of seeing in the novel. The scene begins with four different shots from different angles, the camera cutting from the crashing cymbal to the dancers, a long take of the stage, a close-up of the stage, a shot of Paul and Clara together, a long, elevated frontal shot of the stage, a close-up, a long, side-on elevated take of the stage, a medium frontal shot of it followed by a close-up, and finally a close-up of

Clara, virtually from Paul's point of view. The sexualised excitement in the theatre is thus transposed to the film by the same vehicle as the novel uses, namely multiple perspectives. These perspectives are also used in the film's adaptation of the scenes at Mrs Radford's house<sup>26</sup>. Repeating the style of the music-hall scene, the camera frenetically switches between close-ups and medium shots of Paul and Clara as they play cards. It also changes its position to give profile shots, shots of Mrs Radford, point of view shots of Paul and Clara and of Paul's hands dealing the cards. The kinesis of the fragmentation, and of the spinning jennies at Jordan's that this scene fades into, symbolises the intrinsic passion of these scenes which is clear, for example, in Clara's erotic fixation upon Paul's hands. The style and content of these scenes at the music-hall and at Mrs Radford's thus affirm, inter alia, the disintegrative nature of the characters' passion which leaves Clara ashamed.

The way of seeing Clara and Paul at Mrs Radford's house extends to the way they are seen at Jordan's. The fade into the spinning jennies gives way to a staccato series of cuts associated with the threat of Baxter Dawes. The most significant shot of this scene at Jordan's is the one of Paul and Clara planning their trip to the seaside. In this shot, Clara is backlit by the window, which highlights the hair on her neck and face. Although it is not Paul's point of view of her in the film, the shot imitates the focus on detail of his point of view of her in the novel, further reinforcing the impression of his cinematic way of seeing as it is described in the novel. Again, the way of seeing Paul and Clara differs from the way of seeing the mother. In the ensuing scene of Paul's return home, the way of seeing the mother and her son repeats the continuous monoshot perspective of earlier scenes.

The strictures evident in this way of seeing Paul at home with his mother are supplanted by an impression of expansiveness in the opening long shot of Paul and Clara on the beach. The contrast between the way of seeing the home and the beach opens up dichotomies of nature and industry, and freedom and entrapment inherent in the novel's locales. The shot of the beach in the film approximates the novel's religious vision of the morning and Paul's long-shot point of view of Clara going to the sea. The continuous left-right long-shot pan of the characters dramatises their sense of mutual corroboration, of enjoying genuinely erotic times which constitute an experience of existential 'durée' such as Bergson associates with real living. The diminishment of this 'durée' into moments is illustrated by a fracturing of the initial long-shot into a series of close-ups and cuts as Paul and Clara talk about their former partners. Both the fetishistic moments of their passion, and the times of real, enjoyable living pass into the film via its approximation of the novel's ways of seeing. Such ways of seeing can therefore both negate the *élan vital* and gesture towards its presence.

Clara's feeling that her relationship with Baxter was more whole is expressed by a way of seeing her and Paul which is an extension of the way they are seen under the pier. The cuts are more pervasive, reflecting the impending disintegration of their relationship. The focus on one character or another suggests that, as with Miriam, one is nullified for the other to exist. It is a process illustrated in the left-to-right pan from Clara, who is seen from the same level as the bed, to Paul behind her as he tries to explain why he becomes detached from her in their lovemaking. Within the shot, the focal length changes to bring Clara in focus, and then Paul, but not both of them simultaneously. It is a way of seeing which illustrates their inability to develop a profound conjunction, an inability which manifests itself in Paul's frustrated, passionate kissing of Clara at

the end of the scene. The way of seeing the characters in this scene is paralleled by the way of seeing Paul's and Baxter's fight. In the scene of the fight, the camera moves in and out of the characters, dramatising the confrontation between them, and pointing to the underlying sense of disunity between Paul and Clara. Significantly, the way of seeing Paul, Clara and Baxter continues to contrast with the way of seeing Paul and his mother. After the fight, Paul and his mother are seen in the same mono-perspectival shot as in previous scenes, a shot which becomes a leitmotif for the lack of positive change in the fixated love of their relationship. This way of seeing also characterises the final scene of Paul's split with Clara. This scene contains none of the shot/reverse shot sequences which conveyed Paul's fetishistic way of looking at her. Nor does it use any shots like the long shot of them on the beach. The absence of both ways of seeing suggests an impasse in their relationship, an impasse which is expressed by the slowly circling close-up of their final embrace, and by the factory's static machinery.

As we have seen, stasis is also common to the film's way of seeing Paul and his mother<sup>27</sup>. The canvas of daffodils he paints for her is related to a particularly static way of seeing her in the novel. In the novel's description of Paul's point of view of her on the train, Paul sees her as a series of frames in an attempt to fix her to the present, thereby denying the ageing process. The film's stationary way of seeing Mrs Morel illustrates a similar idea, as does Paul's behaviour when she dies. He tries to hold her back rather than hasten her departure, as shown by his picture of the daffodils with which he tries to revive her.

Clearly, there are close approximations of the novel's ways of seeing in the film which are intricately connected to themes in both the film and the novel. The film therefore offers

equivalents for the ways of seeing in Lawrence's prose. These ways of seeing develop into classically edited scenes in the film, exemplified by the scenes with Clara in the music-hall and at her mother's. They also develop into the long-shot, deep-focus way of looking at the characters and their surroundings as a *mise-en-scène*, exemplified by the long shot of Paul and Clara running on the beach. However, on the page itself, these scenes are superbly edited and structured. The film thus reaches its critically-acclaimed peaks as pure film, and as an adaptation, when it offers approximations for the novel's ways of seeing, as it does when it offers analogies for the novel's prose style. It is not, as Greiff argues, at its best when it escapes the novel<sup>28</sup>, but when it embraces the ways of looking therein. The film certainly evokes the style, if not all of the spirit, of the novel. The novel's style is evoked by mixing classical cutting with the deep focus *mise-en-scène* of the new wave of social realism, thereby reflecting the novel's ways of seeing. The film's reflection of the novel's ways of seeing is also connected to Jack Cardiff's and Freddie Francis's backgrounds as professional cinema cameramen. They would have been extremely familiar with looking at objects and people from different perspectives, or from one fixed perspective, a habitual way of seeing which approximates the novel's and seems to confirm its fundamental link to the cinematograph's ways of seeing. Hence, to conclude, the novel's practical ways of seeing are cinematographic. Generally, in the novel, characters who see or are seen cinematographically are disengaged from life's evolutionary flow, although there are occasions when this way of seeing indicates a re-engagement with this flow. In *Women in Love*, the link between a cinematographic way of seeing and a disengagement from this flow will be examined in the characters, amongst others, of Gudrun and Gerald.



## Notes

1. These analogies are part of Lawrence's emphasis on the visual. Tony Pinkney points to 'the sharply visualised mode of presentation that characterises *Sons and Lovers*' (Pinkney, 1990, 95). Keith Sagar has perceived it, too: 'Lawrence himself describes the treatment as 'visualised' - 'in that hard, violent style full of sensation and presentation' (Sagar, 1966, 19). These features, which are analogous to cinematic techniques, are part of the novel's 'combination of personal material with an impersonal manner of presentation... A new kind of impersonality which could be much more closely in touch with the experience presented, and yet capable also of detachment and an open perspective' (Holderness, 1982, 135, 138)
2. The two ways of looking, which may be likened to an older, traditional way of looking and a modern, colder one, are evident in *Women in Love*'s 'Coal-Dust', too (Williams, 1992, 50).
3. Quoting Spilka, Poplawski argues that the characters' relations with nature are mediated through their response to flowers: 'Flowers are the most important of the 'vital forces' in *Sons and Lovers*. The novel is saturated with their presence, and Paul and his three sweethearts are judged, again and again, by their attitude toward them' (Poplawski, 1993, 66).
4. Her way of seeing is indicative of the distance between them. As Linda Williams notes, sight is generally antithetical to intimacy: 'Sight is the most inauthentic sense for Lawrence, indeed, it is hardly a sense at all - it is the sense which cuts consciousness off from sensual life' (Williams, 1992, 20).

5. Claude Sinzelle points out that in fact 'the mines are seen aesthetically in *Sons and Lovers*. There is not in the whole novel a single reference to the ugliness of the mines' (Poplawski, 1993; 70).
6. The way of seeing is not the only reflection of the novel's themes. Tony Pinkney argues that the novel's language enacts the themes, too (Pinkney, 1990, 44).
7. William is unable to surpass himself on this negative flow of life which, almost psychosomatically, entails a curtailing of vitality as Lawrence points out (*PO*, 28).
8. Like Dickens and Kipling, Lawrence views the train as one of the ultimate expressions of mechanical modernity. It facilitates a mechanical way of looking, and is used as a metaphor for the visual, conscious, loveless relationships of an industrial, capitalist society (*FU*, 137). Yet, as with Conrad's view of capitalism - that it is both a great power for good and for evil - the train is also symbolic of an optimistic mood (Swigg, 1972, 45).
9. Colin Milton, in his analysis of Lawrence and Nietzsche, points to the connection between death and fragmentation in the novel. Paul's pneumonia, which is a symptom of his mother's 'neglect' of him after his brother's death, shows that the 'idea of death is directly linked with the idea of fragmentation happening at the most fundamental, cellular level' (Milton, 1987, 59).
10. Linda Williams analyses Miriam's need to look: 'She can only 'take' Paul visually... The conflict of Paul and Miriam is, then, expressed in visual and epistemological terms... the feminine [is]

synonymous with a cerebral-visual fixation and the prioritising of conscious knowledge' (Williams, 1992, 51).

11. Colin Milton argues that this sublimation of desire into images stems from Lawrence's reading of Nietzsche (Milton, 1987, 90).

12. Another way of looking at this still, enclosed environment is as a correlative for Miriam's body (Williams, 1992, 129).

13. Sergei Eisenstein, while formulating his ideas on montage, observed that most people, in colloquial speech, did not utter complex and logically formed sentences so much as disjointed phrases connected by the listener. It follows that colloquial speech is like the disjointed bits of montage put together by the viewer. Hence Paul's fragmented colloquial speech could be seen as a kind of cinematisation of language, reflecting his cinematic way of seeing.

14. Other clues to Clara's predisposition to the vital, lower centres are her scorning of mechanical order like the automated production line (307), and her hatred of rules (308). Also, the image of 'The Rose and the Tomb' (ibid.) suggests that, compared with Miriam, whose willed, deathly self is symbolised by the tomb, Clara is the rose, full of a more passionate appeal. Likewise, Clara works with two women called Pussy (309) and Fanny (311). Their names are slang for female genitalia, and underline the idea that Clara and her colleagues personify a more sexual femininity than Miriam. At work too, she is called the Queen of Sheba (312). The connotations of exoticism

157  
or sensuality contrast with the reference to Miriam as Mary, Queen of Scots, a figure associated with conservative Catholicism.

15. Linda Williams points to the multiplicity of points of view in Lawrence's texts in general and *Sons and Lovers* in particular (Williams, 1992, 68).

16. The fragmentation that begins as wholeness spreads from Paul's interaction with Miriam, to his relationship with Clara, and then his mother. As Daleski says, Paul seeks the wholeness the narrative begins with, but because of the relationship with his mother and the nature of the women he loves, this is denied him and the narrative fragments (Daleski, 1965, 73).

17. This framing effect is part of an intellectualisation of reality which is central to cinematic spectatorship (Williams, 1992, 42).

18. The doll sacrifice could 'foreshadow the mercy killing of the mother' (Clark, 1980, 59).

19. The primacy of the mother underpins Paul's inability to evolve into the darkness and instinct which characterise masculinity in Lawrence's later novels (Clarke, 1980, 60, 67). 07

20. The condensation of the novel by the film is clearly felt in its regular confluences of 'two or more textual events taken from different parts of the novel and melded together into a single screen episode' (Greiff, 2001). 57

21. There are sections of unbroken smoothness in the film's way of seeing Mrs Morel which are evident from the first scene in the Morel household (Young, 1999, 108).

22. According to Mr Morel, Paul's point of view of the marriage is bleaker than the reality itself (Greiff, 2001, 39). Paul's way of seeing reflects his concept of the marriage, and the absence of a synthesis between his way of seeing and the way of seeing associated with his father's contains a sense of their ongoing antipathy.

23. Point of view often overlaps in the novel, clouding perspectives on objects as it moves from the narrator's to the characters' points of view. This optical conflation has been analysed as a reflection of Lawrence's ambivalence towards a number of themes in the novel (Young, 1999, 75).

24. Overall, there is a tendency to depict characters as 'talking heads'. This tendency is revealed by some of the cinematic hardware used to shoot the film, such as the type of film itself, and the prismatic lens. Both allow a clear focus of the characters' heads, even in extreme close-ups. According to one critic, these mostly simple, concrete images are analogies for the diction in Part One of the novel (Young, 1999, 92)

25. There is a degree of intimacy created by the repeated close proximity of the camera lens to its subjects (Young, 1999, 126). However, the cuts, and the intermittence of personal perception with a more detached point of view, reflect Paul's polarisation from Miriam.

26. These scenes in the music-hall and Mrs Radford's have been critically acclaimed for a number of reasons. The music-hall scene 'does justice to Lawrence's eroticized prose' (Young, 1999, 94). The symmetrical repetition of shots and reverse shots at Mrs Radford's mimics the rhythm of Lawrence's prose (ibid., 108). Clara survives cinematic transformation as a figure still Lawrence's in conception and spirit (Greiff, 2001, 38). She is the only figure to remain true to her textual counterpart (ibid., 40). For critics who reviewed the film at the time of its release, these scenes were among their favourites (see Smith, 'Sons and Lovers', in *Films and Filming*, v6, n10, July 1960, 24 and Hart, 'Sons and Lovers', in *Films in Review*, v11, n7, Aug/Sept., 1960, 424).

27. There are clearly rapid montages and 'travelling shots' within the film, and some of them feature Mrs Morel. However, within many shots filmed indoors, there is little shifting of camera angle or distance; like actors on a stage, the characters generally move within the frame, close to the camera, while the camera itself remains stationary (Young, 1999, 87). This stationary way of seeing becomes connected with Mrs Morel towards the end of the film.

28. Lou Greiff asserts that the film's achievements (as adaptation or film is left unclarified) are derived from moments when the film escapes the novel. Notable instances of such escape include the development of Walter Morel's character into a more complicated version of the novel's father, and the creation of its own artistic images, such as still portraits, turning wheels and linear progressions (Greiff, 45-6, 2001).

W

# Women in Love

### Women in Love: The Novel

As with *Sons and Lovers*, a number of pointers facilitate our understanding of the novel's cinematic way of seeing. There are additional pointers to the earlier ones of Bergson's analysis of the cinematograph and Lawrence's comments on the cinema in his letters. These additional pointers are mainly the war and the cinema parties Lawrence began to attend in 1915. The novel's dominant mode of perception is commensurate with Lawrence's sense of alienation during the war years, and with being in groups of people who regularly went to the cinema. This dominant mode, which is analogous to the cinematograph's way of seeing, permeates the text more than it did in *Sons and Lovers*. It is fundamentally integrated into the characters' psyches, and the narrator's way of seeing. Moreover, it facilitates and strengthens close interrelationships between the characters and the text's central themes, one of which is seeing. The text's thematisation of seeing is indicated by the overall number of references to seeing and eyes. These references have increased from 802 in *Sons and Lovers* to 1492. Although this statistic is meaningless by itself, it shows a greater focus on seeing in *Women in Love*, a focus which centres on close-ups of the characters' bodies, particularly their eyes. These close-ups are representative of the characters' and the narrator's ways of seeing.

It is, however, generally difficult to schematise this cinematic way of seeing in terms of the characters it affects. Birkin and Ursula, who are trying to live positively while living out the decadence of their own society, see cinematographically on more than one occasion. Conversely, Gerald, who is living more decadently than vitally, occasionally sees as if connected positively to the object of his vision. With the exception of Gudrun, the characters' ways of seeing vary between positive and negative poles. Her perverse, spectacular way of seeing, which gives her an



air of repudiating what she sees even as she is focussing on it, is particularly monolithic in its opposition to a more sympathetic mode. It fails to re-create itself as something new or transcendent, as Ursula's way of seeing does in 'Excuse'. Moreover, there is an identification between Gudrun's way of seeing and the narrator's. To presuppose an equation between the narrator and Lawrence, this identification might be seen to undermine Lawrence's critique of actual, optical seeing. However, given Lawrence's careful crafting of his novels, it is arguable that he consciously uses this way of seeing to express the decadence of his, and his characters' society.

The war was clearly important to the composition of *Women in Love*, and its presence surfaces in the novel's first chapter, 'Sisters', which is remarkable for the mobility of point of view therein. The chapter is divisible into four locales, namely, the Brangwens' Beldover house, the road from Beldover to Willey Green, the church, and the school from which Ursula and Gudrun watch the wedding. In each locale, there is a discernible mobility of point of view. This mobility recalls Vertov's description of the camera's capacity for multiple angles of perception whilst being mobile itself, a mobility which seemed to arise from the way the war was recorded for military intelligence. This mobility was clear in the newsreels of the war which Lawrence would have been able to see during the cinema parties. It is a way of seeing which reflects the final shaping of the novel during a period of war, just as the novel's vast military lexis does. It is difficult to say whether this way of seeing is coincidental or not, as there are instances of tracking shots and jumping from one perspective to another in *Sons and Lovers* and *The Rainbow*. Clearly, though, there is a commensurability between this mobility of perception and that described by Vertov. This commensurability between the novel's prevalent way of seeing and the war assumes greater clarity with the appearance of Gerald in the narrative. His soldierly mentality entails a rigid

apprehension of life, and the connection between his soldierliness and his way of seeing is suggested by the later comparison of the colour of his eyes to the bluing on a gun-barrel (204). A triangulation between the military, the cinematograph, and deathliness is discernible in one of Lawrence's pre-*Sons and Lovers* letters in his reference to the euthanasia room which would feature both a cinematograph and a military brass-band (*Letters i*, 81). The correlation between the military and the cinematograph therefore predates the war, but seems to have been strengthened by it.

In 'Sisters', the mobility of point of view first becomes noticeable in the shift from the narrator's description of Ursula and Gudrun in the bay window of the Brangwen house to Gudrun's searching, probing look at Ursula. This is the first of many references which imply a shot/reverse shot editing technique whereby the narrator's point of view zooms into the character's face to register a particular expression. Point of view then cuts to the character's which enacts the way of looking described by the narrator. In this instance, the description implies a close-up of Gudrun's face to note her quizzical gaze, followed by a shot from her point of view as she probes Ursula. This structure is repeated several times as point of view cuts from Gudrun's hardening, mask-like expressionless face to her point of view of her sister's face. Gudrun's need to look in a hard, violent way, which culminates in her way of seeing Gerald subjugate his mare, contains the sense that she is psychologically completed or bounded, whereas Ursula, who disavows looking in this manner, leans towards a continual change of form. The difference between the sisters' ways of being and seeing is exemplified by Ursula's absorbed ongoing creation of her brightly-coloured embroidery which is the opposite of Gudrun's angry erasure of her drawing.

Ursula, when she does look, espouses the empathetic way of seeing which, as Bergson suggests, projects the individual into the flow of life. Ursula, in her looking at Gudrun, therefore admires her with all her soul rather than with the distant reserve of Gudrun's gaze. Even so, Gudrun as object rather than spectator retains a sort of distance in her exquisite, aesthetic appearance. As well as looking, she wants to be looked at. Like an objet d'art, she is the gazed-at 'passive' (Lawrence's use of the word is significant) object whose cultivated appearance foreshadows Hermione's.

Ursula's gaze at her sister gives way to the narrator's which zooms into a series of close-ups of Gudrun's finely-curved eyelashes, her slow, mocking smile, and her flushed cheeks. Gudrun's, Ursula's, and the narrator's ways of seeing reflect key themes in the narrative. Ursula is engaged with a process of evolution, of something coming to pass deep within her, and sees accordingly. Gudrun, however, alienated by her return to the Midlands, sees coldly, or cinematically. And the narrator sees in a similar way to Gudrun, zeroing in on small parts of her body, aiming at her as it were, as an expression of the way of seeing associated with the war. Gudrun's disengagement with the flow of life is ultimately enshrined in her desire to *look* at the wedding rather than to participate in the festivities as the locals do.

En route to the wedding, the narrator's gaze animatedly follows Ursula and Gudrun. It describes and enacts the ugly cinematograph effect which Lawrence associated with the industrial environment in *Twilight in Italy*, further alienating Gudrun from the environment. This way of seeing the town and its immediate environs at a distance 'as if seen through a veil of crape' (11) recalls a similar view of the mines in *Sons and Lovers*. Importantly, it is a way of seeing aligned

with Gudrun's as, to her, it all seems like a ghostly replica of the real world which is how the narrator sees it, too.

This geometric way of seeing characters as if they are being aimed at is evident in the church. Here, the industrial, personified by Thomas Crich's daughter, is marrying the military, personified by Tibs, the naval officer, a marriage which is reflected in the way of seeing the event. Gudrun, on arriving at the church, is seen by the watchful common people as a form in motion 'in their sight' (13). As they see her, she is reduced to a moving target at the end of their line of sight, an eyeless, military way of watching commensurate with the groom's status as a naval officer. Gudrun then watches the guests' arrival in a mode of objective curiosity, mechanically compartmentalising each one into a kodak snap. Her way of seeing dissects the scene into parts, finalising each one into a frame as it passes before her. Significantly, her way of seeing each one as a complete figure is likened to seeing a marionette in a theatre (14). Lawrence had earlier likened the cinema to pictures of wonderful marionettes (*Letters i*, 304), so her way of seeing is implicitly comparable to the way the cinematograph itself sees. Certainly, Gudrun's way of seeing the characters as if they enter and exit a window onto the diegesis echoes the modus operandi of the cinema screen. Out of sight, the characters no longer exist for her. They have flitted on and off the screen of her consciousness, adumbrating a similar effect in Jack Callcott. This way of seeing slides into the narrator's and back to Gudrun who is highly aroused by watching Gerald. The idea that she watches him in a particular luminous way is inherent in the punning reference to her lighting on him. To her, he gleams, as Clara did to Paul, and she enjoys being tormented by his gleaming beauty to the extent that she must see him again. Thus, her pleasure is derived from watching, and from watching in a distanced detached manner. He does not touch the real quick of her being, but

few things do. To judge by Ursula's response to Gudrun's lack of maternal desire for children (which is perhaps symbolic of her general sterility), Ursula has already noticed this superficiality of feeling in her sister:

'Perhaps it isn't genuine', she faltered. 'Perhaps one doesn't really want them, in one's soul - only superficially'.

(9)

Gudrun's way of seeing is appropriate to her sense of being. She feels enclosed or enveloped in the same crystalline light as Gerald. She is not engaged with a new reaction, or a transcendental discovery, and repeats a known or backward-looking nostalgic reaction upon herself, a process associated with the sensationalism she feels. The finite range of combinations or arrangements of reactions which is produced by such inward-looking sensationalism is, as Lawrence notes, analogous to the cinematograph drama:

The repeating of a known reaction upon myself is sensationalism. This is what nearly *all* English people now do. When a man takes a woman, he is *merely* repeating a known reaction upon himself, not seeking a new reaction, a discovery. And this is like self-abuse or masturbation...(sic)

There comes a point when the shell, the form of life, is a prison to the life. Then the life must either concentrate on breaking the shell, or it must turn round, turn in upon itself, and try infinite variations of a known reaction upon itself. Which produces a novelty. So

that *The Rosary* is a new combination of known re-actions - so is Gilbert Cannan's *Young Earnest* - so is the cinematograph drama and all our drama and all our literature.

(*Letters ii*, 285, qv above)

Hence Gudrun's sense of being, or not-being as Lawrence sees it, manifests itself in her way of seeing as the cinematograph does. Certainly, the symptoms of her way of seeing correlate with the sort of character whose psyche Lawrence describes as 'collapsing':

When he becomes too much aware of objective reality, and of his own isolation in the face of a universe of objective reality, the core of his identity splits, his nucleus collapses, his innocence or his naivety perishes, and he becomes only a subjective-objective reality, a divided thing hinged together but not strictly individual.

(*TH*, 211)

After Ursula's recognition of Hermione, the way of seeing develops into a series of close-ups of Hermione which cannot be Ursula's as she has not moved. Hence these close-ups are the narrator's, and they lend an expressive weight to the narrator's way of seeing Hermione. Initially, they focus on her head, hat and face, stylistically reflecting her predisposition to an intellectual, idea-driven way of living<sup>1</sup>. Her lower body is brownish grey and fixed, embodying the atrophying of her unconscious entailed by this way of living.

Ursula is morbidly fascinated by Hermione, yet this fascination does not develop into her sister's urge to see. Rather, it gives way to Hermione's point of view of the church which, in its

stultification of perception, resembles Gudrun's way of seeing more than Ursula's. To compensate for her deficiency of being, Hermione surrounds herself with intellectual armour and an aesthetic appearance, forming a sort of psychologically-protective envelope like Gudrun's. Presumably, the formation of such an envelope underlies the comparison of Gudrun to a beetle, reinforcing the image of her as a character whose ego is a shiny, impervious carapace, an image which the 'sheen' of her clothes in later chapters builds upon. Gudrun's, and Hermione's, way of seeing is antithetical to vital self-development and, in the church, Hermione looks slowly along her cheeks for Birkin, a perspective which becomes animated by her mechanical approach to the altar. The slow look along her cheeks is an amalgamation of the cinematograph's way of seeing, and the military way of aiming. Her perspective slowly elevates and tracks as it aims for Birkin. It is a way of seeing that ultimately manifests itself in the strike on Birkin with the lapis lazuli paperweight<sup>2</sup>.

Point of view cuts from Hermione's to the outside of the church and to Ursula's view of the bride's arrival. It then cuts to the crowd looking at the bride's blonde head, and her white foot stepping out of the carriage. She becomes a flow, floating beside her father. This sense of a metaphysical way of seeing contrasts with Ursula's self-appointed position as a lookout for the groom. Straining for the sight of him, she resembles a sentry whose way of looking is congruent with the military persona she is straining to see. This way of seeing differs from her earlier one, showing that she is capable of seeing in more than one way. However, her way of seeing and thinking about Birkin differs from Gudrun's way of seeing and thinking about Gerald. Ursula feels a hidden understanding between herself and Birkin which has the potential to develop, hence she wants to know him. Gudrun, however, understands Gerald in more finite terms, and prefers to see him than to know him.

The ways of seeing in the ensuing chapter, 'Shortlands', largely lack the mobility of point of view in 'Sisters'. Shortlands is, itself, seen in an acutely picturesque manner as a static *mise-en-scène* long shot with the smoke rising above it. Inside, the narrator and Birkin do most of the looking. The narrator offers a montage of the groups of people within the house, and zooms in to Hermione's face and Gerald's eyes. As for Birkin, he regards Mrs Crich in terms of bodily fragments of an absent whole, and looks at the bubbles rising in his champagne glass. The fixed perspective of Shortlands, and the lack of a dynamic, shifting point of view from the family's perspective, illustrates the family's, particularly Gerald's, inability to evolve. As Gudrun later says of Gerald, where does his 'go' go to?

After Shortlands, the narrator cuts to the classroom, where, contrariwise, there is an abundance of 'go' behind the points of view. Ursula's first vision of Birkin is mediated via a particularly plastic point of view which includes her perspective of his face, and his gaze at her. It reflects the shock or anguish at his sudden appearance, and a general depth of feeling which Birkin notes in her after he has turned on the lights. Ursula subsequently watches him inspecting the school books. She focuses more on his presence or essence than his actual corporeal self, a sort of unintellectual way of seeing which registers another reality behind the appearance of things. Ursula, the class, and the narrator all watch Hermione's initial appearance and intercourse with Birkin through a multiplicity of perspectives which narrows down to the narrator's close-up of Hermione's grey, sardonic eyes. This close-up is comparable to Hermione's own way of seeing. She looks closely at the flowers on the catkins in a strange, rhapsodic way which recalls Miriam's way of looking at the rosebush as if it were a mystic symbol. Given Hermione's lack of vital psychological



substance, her way of seeing Ursula, who embodies such substance, is, as we shall see, a measure of the distance between these two polar opposites.

Significantly, Hermione is fascinated by the minuteness of the art Gudrun produces, an art which, as Ursula says, is the product of Gudrun's looking at the world as if she regards it through the wrong end of a pair of opera glasses. It is an analogy Hermione closely relates to, presumably because it describes her own way of seeing things at a distance, exemplified by her long, detached scrutinising gaze at Ursula. It is the opposite of Ursula's way of seeing, and the fact that Hermione sees in a sort of mental, willed fashion is emphasised by her suggestion that the children should see not as she does, but 'as a whole, without all this pulling to pieces, all this knowledge' (40). As Birkin says, Hermione engages with the intellect and sees accordingly, looking at successive states of life rather than registering the vital changes in the gaps between these states.

So, like Paul in *Jordan's*, Hermione registers mainly the outside things, and it is therefore appropriate that her negative way of being is embodied in her appearance. Her close-fitting hat projects her restrictive consciousness, her 'own tight conscious world' (42). Her shoulders are held 'tight in a shrug of dislike' (44), and she wears fur, which suggests a predatoriness or deathliness in her character. She is also one of the few characters who is known to be tall. Like Gerald and Gudrun in the *hautes montagnes*, her orientation towards height suggests a predilection towards the upper centres of consciousness like the will and the eye which is implicit in Gerald's statement: 'One does have that limitless feeling. It's like getting on top of the mountain and seeing the Pacific' (86).

Importantly, Birkin criticises Hermione for wanting 'a life of pure sensation and "passion"' (42). Given Lawrence's comparison of sensationalism with the cinematograph, and Paul Morel's fetishistic way of seeing in the chapter called 'Passion' in *Sons and Lovers*, it is evident that Hermione, like Gudrun, sees in a cinematographic way. The fact that Birkin points out the deficiencies in Hermione's way of being indicates that her intellectual grasp of life lacks an instinctive awareness of its own limitations. It also calls to mind the idea that Birkin, in his acute awareness of Hermione's way of being and seeing, might have seen and lived as she does. Interestingly, Birkin, for all his criticism, has yet to see in a radically different way from Hermione, a way which continues to be exemplified by Ursula who senses the hidden richness of his physical appearance as she furtively watches him in a way Lawrence would later call 'sensual':

The eyes have, however, their sensual root as well. But this is hard to transfer into language, as all *our* vision, our modern Northern vision, is in the upper mode of actual seeing.

(*FU*, 64)

Gudrun's way of seeing, however, contains none of this sensuality, and when she sees Gerald dive into the lake in the following chapter, there is a strong sense of alienation or distance, as if the image of Gerald, rather than the real him, is the source of her arousal. And, in terms of motion and lack of colour, Gerald's appearance as a white figure diving into the visionary otherworld of Willey Water, which is wet, grey and remote, is akin to a glossy cinema image, unconnected to the observing spectators, Gudrun and Ursula.

The presentation of Gerald as a cinema image is accompanied by a fragmented and mobile way of seeing. The narrator looks at Gudrun, and describes her point of view of Gerald. The narrator then looks at Gerald, and describes his point of view of Ursula and Gudrun. The way of seeing, which cuts from one perspective to another in the mode of a cinema camera, therefore complements the prime object of perception, Gerald. His appearance, and the way he is seen, reflect his inability to develop, to make his 'go' go somewhere. Gudrun's way of being, her appearance and her way of seeing seem interconnected, too. Her will, which manifests itself in the planned desire to be the artistic creation of ordinariness rather than simply seem ordinary, is revealed in her way of closely studying Shortlands, and the need to fix it in an historical period. Thus, the characters' essential aspects are expressed by the way they are seen and the way they see. These aspects are reinforced by other parts of the narrative. Gudrun's essentially deathly, conscious grasp of life, implicit in her way of seeing, is further revealed in her dialogue with Ursula about the killing of Gerald's brother. Ursula recognises the importance of the unconscious, arguing that, behind Gerald's actions, there was an 'unconscious will' (49). Gudrun, however, denies the involvement of the unconscious and thinks of the death as either 'murder... because there's a will behind it' or as 'the purest form of accident' (ibid.). Gudrun's first statement implies that there is a connection between the conscious will and death, a connection underlined by her subsequent behaviour. Three times, she replies 'coldly' to Ursula, and then, like a corpse, 'stiffens a little' (ibid.).

So far, the analysis of ways of seeing and the mobility of point of view has focused on the narrator's way of looking at the characters, and Ursula's and Gudrun's ways of looking at each other and at other characters in the narrative. In the chapter 'In the Train', the narrator focuses

exclusively on Birkin and Gerald and, for the first time, offers sustained insight into their ways of seeing. Briefly, Gerald has a soldierly way of seeing as he keeps a watchful eye on his surroundings, running his eye 'over the surface of the life round him' (53). Yet Birkin's eyes, although narrowing in their gaze at Gerald and filling with anger, also fill with a 'warm, rich affectionateness and laughter' (59). This suggests that he can see feelingly, or empathetically, as Ursula does. As the narrator's gaze moves into Birkin's, it is evident that Birkin, while noticing the outside things like Gerald's blue eyes flaming with desire, has a deeper form of perception which senses in Gerald 'a certain beauty, a beautiful passivity in all his body, his moulding' (60).

In London, the predominant way of seeing is antithetical to the above example of Birkin's subliminal perception. It resembles a sardonic, detached way of seeing, epitomised by Gerald in the train and by his point of view of the café. The stereotypical attributes of the main object of his gaze, the Pussum, infuse her with a cinematic appeal that is manifested in her desire to pose for photographs for Lord Carmarthen, just as Louisa did for the London photographers in *Sons and Lovers*. Interestingly, within the milieu of the café which, ostensibly, contains his friends, Birkin is virtually anonymous. Gerald dominates, illustrated by the preponderance of his way of seeing. A similar weighting towards Gerald as the dominant spectator is evident in Halliday's flat. In theory, Birkin shares the flat with Halliday. In practice, Birkin is again marginalised and attention falls on Gerald.

At Breadalby, the way of seeing which typifies Gerald's perception of London converges with Birkin's and Ursula's ability to see viscerally. As in London, the way of seeing personified by Gerald initially predominates. The narrator's static opening view of Breadalby recalls the

picturesque impression of Shortlands, illustrating the stalling of vitality associated with Hermione's willed, intellectual way of living and the static social shells of people in their roles. This view gives way to Ursula's and Gudrun's point of view of the house and its grounds as seen by them from the car. As Gudrun looks at the house from the car, she sees it in the same way as she saw the wedding guests. To her, it looks complete, 'as final as an old aquatint' (82). The mix of the car's mechanical animation of her point of view with a complete way of seeing turns the image of Breadalby into a tracking shot. This way of seeing Hermione's house from a mechanically-driven perspective which frames and finalises its object of perception infuses the house with the metaphysical stasis Bergson associates with seeing cinematographically. Gudrun's way of seeing thus expresses the idea that the house is, as the narrator says, unchanged and unchanging.

The exhaustion of vitality implied by Hermione's way of living is suggested by her opening question to Ursula and Gudrun, "Are you very tired?" (83). This scene of welcoming the sisters is observed from the narrator's point of view which shifts into Hermione's gaze as she looks at them. Her gaze differentiates between Gudrun's beauty and Ursula's physical, womanly appeal. The pull Gudrun's created, garish appearance exerts on Hermione's gaze shows that Hermione's way of seeing is drawn to an objective way of considering externals which is an extension of Gudrun's way of looking at the house. Compared with the man's way of seeing which dominated the previous two chapters, this woman-to-woman gaze contains a degree of sterility. The warmth inherent in Birkin's way of looking at Gerald is absent from Hermione's and Gudrun's ways of seeing. Hermione's and Gudrun's ways of seeing reflect their cold, critical intellects which, as Ursula notes of Hermione, hinder one's workings. Ursula, for her part, has a sort of synaesthetic vision of Breadalby which contrasts with her sister's primarily visual means of relating to it during

these opening scenes. Within her vision, Ursula registers the enclosure represented by Breadalby which is a product of Hermione's knowledge-driven way of living. Her conceptualisation of life as knowledge manifests itself in her way of seeing, a manifestation which is explicit in Gudrun's consideration of Sir Joshua Malleon. Overhearing Birkin's criticism of Malleon's equation of knowledge with liberty, an equation which Birkin says leads to liberty in compressed tabloids, Gudrun sees Malleon 'as a flat bottle, containing tabloids of compressed liberty... Sir Joshua was labelled and placed forever in her mind (86). Birkin's theory of knowledge, namely that it pertains to things concluded in the past, facilitates further insight into the predominant way of seeing at Breadalby. Birkin's theory appears to relate to Bergson's comparison of the intellect's form of knowledge with the cinematograph. The intellect knows by looking at what is behind it, so it considers reality as an antecedent series of frames stretched out behind it which it examines like a stagecoach traveller who looks back over the course of his journey. The comprehension of reality as knowledge therefore involves seeing completely. Gudrun exemplifies this way of seeing which, because it is associated with the ready-made rather than the being-made, corresponds to Breadalby's prevailing sense of willed, learned knowledge. However, this mocking and objective way of seeing fails to register essential, natural beauty. As Ursula notes, 'The daffodils were pretty, but who could see them?' (87).

The objective way of seeing, and a way of seeing capable of appreciating the daffodils, come together in conflict in the form of the growing split between Hermione and Birkin. The dichotomy of their ways of seeing is embodied in Hermione's comment about the beauty of the daffodils and his retort, 'I've seen them' (88). She notes the outside beauty, whereas his comment on seeing suggests that perception is more than noting external beauty. There is a metaphysical dimension to

perception, as apprehended by Paul when he has moments of mutual corroboration with Clara, or when he feels creative and can see through to the protoplasm. The conflict between Hermione's and Birkin's ways of seeing is dramatised by her subsequent long, slow, impassive look along her cheeks at him. The sense of impassiveness in her gaze makes her look as if she is aiming at him, like a cinematograph or a soldier, to shoot him. The conflict is also dramatised in his explanation of copying the geese. The copying process allows him to empathise with the geese, to see them metaphysically<sup>3</sup>. The juxtaposition of the two ways of seeing illustrates the conflict between Hermione and Birkin, as does the narrator's way of looking at them. The narrator looks at her looking at him along her narrow, pallid cheeks, as though they were sights. After the implied shot of Hermione's face which sets up her point of view of Birkin, the narrator cuts back to a close-up of her eyes which are referred to as 'strange and drugged, heavy under their heavy, dropping lids' (89). The reference to 'strange and drugged' confirms that her mechanism of perception, her eyes, distorts her view of reality. Moreover, the heavy dropping lids suggest that her mechanism of perception is exactly that, a mechanism, which threatens to break up the continuity of perception with its shutter-like lids. From this close-up of her eyes, the narrator cuts to a shot of her bosom, and to a shot of Birkin staring back at her. The fragmentation in the narrator's way of seeing reflects the growing split between Hermione and Birkin. Importantly, it resembles Hermione's way of seeing more than Birkin's, demonstrating the predominance of this way of seeing at Breadalby. Hermione's way of seeing explains her arousal at the extravagant appearances of her guests at dinner. Her way of seeing diminishes the inherent vibrancy of what she sees, hence excessively ornamented or embellished appearances are necessitated to make an impression on her, like the ballet which she watches in her usual, willed manner.

Gerald and Birkin watch it, too, and appreciate different parts of it in different ways. As with the Pussum, Gerald is aroused by Gudrun's perversity. The common appeal of the Pussum and Gudrun to Gerald is evident in his mistaking of the wagtails carved by Gudrun for more of the African carving in which he saw the Pussum. By contrast, Birkin is drawn to Ursula by her essential womanhood, an essence which he feels unconsciously. His ability to change, which the contessa notices, is commensurate with his form of perception. As Bergson says, to sense vital change, it is necessary to project oneself into change rather than to see successive states of the change. Birkin does this, which explains his perception of Ursula's womanhood and his sympathy for Gerald as he looks at his legs. It is a rare instance of a sort of vital flow at Breadalby where reality seems to constitute a continuous series of interruptions of such flow. The lack of flow is symbolised by the silent, unchanging fish ponds, 'large and smooth and beautiful' (100). Significantly, neither Ursula nor Birkin bathes in the ponds. Per contra, positive moments are imaged by the flow of water in a stream or the natural rhythms of the sea's tides. For example, Birkin's departure from the atmosphere of willed mentality is seen by Hermione as a lapsing away 'on a sudden, unknown tide' (99).

The static, dead way of knowing that typifies Breadalby and is exemplified by a cinematographic way of seeing underlies Birkin's breakfast epiphany. He is aware that, at Breadalby, everything is given beforehand, as it is in a cinematograph film which offers only the same set of variations each time it is played. His awareness is accompanied by seeing in the way he denigrates, his gaze flicking around the room from shots of one character to another, culminating with visual epithets of Gerald's amused face, Gudrun's hostile eyes and Ursula's startled face. The exhaustion implicit in this way of knowing coalesces in his vision, causing him to leave. His way of seeing is adopted



by the narrator for the bathing scene who sees it as a cinematographic procession of people. Hermione, as she steps stiffly across the lawn, is likened to 'some strange memory' (100). The combination of the procession, with the comparison of Hermione with a memory, makes the scene look as if it is presented in terms of the cinematographic habits of the intellect as a series of frames stretching back from the present to the past. Gerald in particular resembles a cinema image: '[He] wavered and flickered, a white natural shadow' (101). The characters are seen in this manner to illustrate their inability to develop, just as Mr Morel was. The principle behind this way of seeing is voiced, ironically, by one of its main proponents, Gudrun, who notes the swimmers' resemblance to saurians who, implicitly, failed to evolve. Seeing as Gudrun does, intellectually and artificially, implies having preconceived criteria and ideas about what is seen, as the perception of reality as knowledge is based on the past and not the present or future. Hence Gerald believes he has to fulfil Gudrun's idea of a man, rather than going with the flow, as Birkin appears to do. The violent outcome of seeing as Gerald, Gudrun and Hermione do and living as they do is incarnated in Hermione's attack on Birkin which foreshadows several violent episodes between Gerald and Gudrun. The conflictual points of view which orchestrate the attack express the energy of its inherent violence and contrast with the single viewpoint used to describe Birkin's cathartic walk in the wood which is noticeably lacking in fragmented, multiple points of view, suggesting the development of a centre of consciousness in him which is deeper than the one at Breadalby.

Unlike Birkin, Gerald and Gudrun enjoy being watched, and, together with the narrator, continue to see and to enjoy seeing in a way similar to that which prevails at Breadalby. A number of points of view converge on the level-crossing in 'Coal-Dust' which exemplify these ways of seeing and

the characters' enjoyment of them. The narrator initially presents the set of the sisters' approach to the level-crossing as a *mise-en-scène* which features the signalman staring out from his hut. The *mise-en-scène* telescopes into Gudrun's point of view of Gerald whom she finds picturesque<sup>4</sup>. She enjoys his picturesqueness, his resemblance to an icon of male beauty. Her enjoyment is mediated by a cut from her opening point of view to a reverse cut of her ironic smile as she enjoys her gaze at him, and a cut back to him, presumably from her perspective, which zooms into a close-up of his blue eyes watching the distance. His appearance as a stereotypical image of male beauty gazing into the distance, disavowing the gaze of his audience, resembles Valentino's in one of his early films. Her perspective of this image passes into the narrator's and back to a close-up of her spellbound eyes through which the spectacle of Gerald subjugating the mare is seen. There is a perpetual motion to the perspective which incorporates the sense of mechanical animation driving Gerald, and the train, into the way of seeing the scene. Ursula, understanding Gerald in terms of her polar opposition to him, is repelled by the violent sight of him spurring the mare, whereas Gudrun is aroused by the spectacle of submission and domination to such an extent that she faints. Gudrun ultimately sees this spectacle vicariously through the eyes of the guard passing on the train, viewing 'the whole scene spectacularly, isolated and momentary, like a vision isolated in eternity' (112). She sees the scene from an animated perspective as a tracking shot, detached from the space and time around it<sup>5</sup>. Clearly, it is a cinematographic way of seeing which, in its animation, recalls Vertov's description of the mobility that military reconnaissance gave to photographic perception. She sees the scene in a way which, on one level, reflects the mechanism at the centre of Gerald's actions and, on another level, reflects the underlying violence of their ways of living.

Gudrun's way of seeing is paralleled by her recollection of the scene. As she looks back on the event, her focus falls fetishistically on Gerald's 'indomitable thighs [and] a sort of white magnetic domination from the loins and thighs and calves' (113). The very process of looking back as she does is part of her intellectual consideration of reality which, as was observed in 'Breadalby', bases itself on a complete, final consideration of the past. The sense of incessant mechanical motion which underlies many of the cinematographic spectacles such as the wedding, Gerald's dive into Willey Water, and the spurring of the mare, extends to the way the two workmen at the second level-crossing watch Ursula and Gudrun approach: '[T]he figures of the two women seemed to glitter in progress over the wide bay of the railway crossing, white and orange and yellow and rose glittering in motion across a hot world silted with coal-dust' (114). In terms of their glittering motion, the sisters seem to belong to the same mechanical, illuminated world represented by Gerald's electrically-lit mines. Yet their colours suggest a more natural heritage. At once, they are seen as glittering, non-stop cinematographic images, and as something more essential than such images. It is a dualistic way of seeing which attaches the women to the industrial milieu while acknowledging the idea that they can transcend this milieu. This duality is embodied in the directions Ursula and Gudrun take in the rest of the chapter. Gudrun becomes fascinated by the foul beauty of the industrial landscape and its people, finding herself aroused by this mindless, inhuman underworld. Her fascination takes the form of her way of seeing the Beldover Friday evenings as a montage of people, faces and lights. It is a way of seeing which reflects the socio-political atmosphere of the mines which 'vibrated in the air like discordant machinery' (117). The acme of this fascination and way of seeing is the cinema which she frequents and visits with her electrician friend Palmer. Gudrun's way of seeing dominates the chapter, and Ursula's

appropriation of a different way of seeing and being is evident in the absence of a developing relationship between her and Palmer, even though Palmer prefers her to Gudrun.

Ursula's way of seeing continues to be marginalised in 'Sketch-Book'. The chapter begins by tracing the similarity and dissimilarity between Gudrun's way of seeing and Ursula's. Gudrun stares fixedly at the water plants in Willey Water, whereas Ursula watches the butterflies and drifts away, unconscious, like them. Gudrun draws the water stems 'in a stupor of apprehension' (119) and is intensely aroused by her 'voluptuous, acute apprehension' (120) of Gerald. In this transcendent state, like Ursula, she connects with what she sees, feeling the plants' structure 'as in a sensuous vision' (119). It is the sort of perverse reverse of Ursula's way of seeing. Gudrun's way of seeing focuses on objects like the water-plants which are associated with a dissolute reduction of life back to its component elements. Focussing on emblems of this process of dissolution, she sees them in terms of their coldness, their concreteness, their angularity and their surface colour, features which reveal their negative quiddity. Her perverse way of seeing emblems of the process of dissolution extends to her perception of Gerald. As in previous scenes, Gerald is seen in motion, rowing the boat and rocking on the water. Gudrun enjoys making mental freeze-frames of his motion. She notes his back and moving white loins as he rows, but is more excited by the enclosure of an abstract whiteness by his action, and by the slow motion view of him arresting the boat as it drifts off, an action which encapsulates her usual mental arresting of the flow of reality into cerebro-visual images. Similarly, Gerald's point of view of her is undergirded by a stilling of perception in the form of his recollection of her. His way of seeing is also able to zoom in and out, clearly paralleling the modus operandi of a cinematograph and of a narrative film. Gudrun's and Gerald's ways of seeing, and the narrator's way of seeing them,

therefore illustrate the thematic absence of 'blood-consciousness', or blutbrüderschaft, between the characters, and the insertion into this absence of a perverse spell, later associated with the sight of each other's blood in 'Rabbit'.

After Gerald rows away, the narrator crosscuts to Ursula who has traced the source of the stream flowing into the lake to the millpond where she finds Birkin. The intercourse between Ursula and Birkin is characterised by a sensing of the visceral in each other, as in Ursula's awareness of something intensely alive in him, and his contact with a suffused fire in her. After their chance encounter with Gudrun, Gerald and Hermione reappear at the millhouse where they meet Birkin and Ursula. The event reruns, in part, the meeting with Gudrun, mixing her and Hermione's objective, knowledge-driven way of seeing with the perception of visceral features which characterised Birkin and Ursula's contact at the millpond. Importantly, Hermione asserts that Birkin sees in an irreverent, mental way; yet she is not altogether right, for he like Ursula can also see things in their wholeness.

The two ways of seeing are juxtaposed in Ursula's journey to Birkin's townhouse, and the meeting with him there. On the tram, her way of seeing is 'objective', not in the sense that it is unemotional but in the sense that it focuses outwardly on the materiality of the town as if the town is seen through an ocular lens or lens system of a dolly-mounted camera. This way of seeing is more usually epitomised by Gudrun who frequently looks at objects as if through the wrong end of opera glasses, a way of seeing which elicits perverse feelings in her. Ursula's objective way of seeing on the tram is replaced by a mystic way of seeing when she meets Birkin, which fractures as Birkin outlines his philosophy of love. His philosophy leads him to say he does not love her, a

statement which shocks her. As he philosophises, she watches him, and the narrator moves into a close-up of her troubled eyes, and then alternates to a reverse shot of his incandescent face (145). The change in the way of seeing incorporates Ursula's shocked response to Birkin's philosophy into the scene's structure. Birkin, for his part, sees only in a mystic way as he looks at Ursula here. He tells her plainly that her appeal to him is not based on visual appreciation or visual awareness of her.

After the Mino's departure, Birkin experiences visions of Ursula as quick and lambent and full of beautiful light. His visions reflect his need for a mystic communion with a woman. Significantly, as Ursula bullies him into saying he loves her, repeating the theme inherent in the Mino's treatment of the wild female cat and Gerald's treatment of the mare, Birkin's mystic visions are supplanted by the way of seeing which prevailed during these earlier instances of bullying. The narrator moves into a close-up of her eyes, then to Birkin's perspective of her eyes and on to a reverse perspective of the sardonic comprehension on his face. The ways of seeing clearly reflect the mixture of intimacy and alienation between the characters.

In 'Water-Party', the novel's pivotal chapter, the duality of perception is marginalised, and the animated, objective way of seeing which characterised 'Diver', 'Breadalby' and 'Coal-Dust' returns to prominence. The sardonic quality intrinsic to the sclerotic, objective way of seeing, epitomised by Hermione, is expressed by the sisters' laughter at the sight of their parents. The hardening of perception is also evident in the close-up of the father's eyes, which fill with rage at his daughters' mockery of him and his wife. The repeated use of such close-ups, and the reverse viewpoints they often lead to, are associated with the characters' experience of a psychological blockage to the

extent that, as in *Sons and Lovers*, the close-ups and reverse perspectives become a leitmotif for such blockage. The fracture in the continuum of perception signalled by the close-up of the father's eyes is widened by the flicking of the narrator's gaze around the action at Shortlands as the sisters arrive, showing it as a merry-go-round of thumbnail sketches rather than as a *mise-en-scène*. This way of seeing illustrates the mechanical energy of the general climate at Shortlands, and of Gerald's intellect in particular. It is also congruent with the military way of seeing, and the spirit suggested by the image and language of Gudrun's determined advance on the party (158). The mechanical energy (as opposed to the deeper, spontaneous energy of what Lawrence calls the creative soul) which underlies this way of seeing cannot develop or go anywhere. This sense of stricture is conveyed by numerous physical features at Shortlands, and by Gudrun's comment: "Policemen to keep you in, too!" (*ibid.*). The narrator's way of seeing feeds into Gudrun's way of seeing. Her way of seeing is based on an antagonism to the party so that, while she advances physically, she is psychologically backing away. Figuratively, as Ursula says earlier, Gudrun sees through the wrong end of the opera glasses, a way of seeing momentarily countered by the abstract smile of warmth in Birkin's eyes. This aspect of her way of seeing is complemented by the montage of shots in which she represents the people at the party to herself. Her way of seeing is partly paralleled by Hermione's. Hermione regards Gudrun and her family in a detached, distanced way 'as if they were creatures on exhibition' (159). Despite the parallels between their ways of seeing, Gudrun resents being seen like this by Hermione because of the superior detachment she knows such a cold gaze implies.

Gerald's introduction to the Brangwens is followed by the narrator's montage of Gerald, Birkin, Mr and Mrs Brangwen, Hermione and the sisters. It is a way of seeing which repeats the opening

whirl of sketches as the sisters arrive at the party. It follows Gerald's introduction, reinforcing the link between the kinesis of this way of seeing and Gerald's mechanical, intellectual energy, a link further strengthened by Gerald's similarity to a cinema image. Dressed in white, with his black-and-brown blazer, and looking handsome, he resembles a stereotypical image of masculinity drawn from the iconography of contemporary films and coloured like a sepia photograph or film still. From the montage and the image of Gerald, the narrator zooms into Gerald looking at Gudrun, and then into a close-up of his searching eyes. His searching eyes recall Gudrun's probing gaze at her sister in the opening chapter. This close-up suggests that he visually appreciates her, a suggestion confirmed by the roused glitter of his eyes as he watches her recounting her trip on the Thames, which is a real equivalent of the metaphorical river of dissolution. The montage and the close-ups, as well as reflecting the industrial energy of Shortlands, which is the logical product of Gerald's mechanical, intellectual energy, illustrate the military way of seeing whereby the gaze jumps from object to object and from perspective to perspective. Gudrun, as she looks at Gerald after her tale of the steamer, registers the military aspect of his character. Her distanced way of seeing is connected to her ongoing sense of alienation. As she tells Gerald, she feels a complete stranger at the party. Yet there is a more perverse aspect to her way of seeing that is manifested in her arousal at the sight of his bandaged hand. Her excitement at his injury is the equivalent to his enjoyment of the Pussum's bondage. Both Gerald and Gudrun derive pleasure from seeing other people's extremes of physical sensation, especially of pain. As usual, Ursula's more sympathetic way of seeing contrasts with her sister's and leads her to feel Gerald's pain and to be shocked rather than excited by it. Significantly, as Gudrun paddles away from Gerald, there are elements in her similar to those which appealed to him in the Pussum. She derives intense pleasure from playing the role of the



clinging childlike woman, a role which the Pussum played for real. Gerald notes this childlike aspect to Gudrun as she rows into the distance. This childishness imbues Gudrun with the visual appeal and appearance of one of the female cinema stars which Lawrence had described in 'The Crown' (*RDP*, 285, *qv* above). Gudrun, for her part, sees Gerald with military precision: 'One figure at a time occupied the field of her attention' (164). She gives the semblance of looking through a gunsight, or the viewfinder of a camera, as her focus falls on one figure at a time as it did when the guests left the church in the opening chapter.

Gudrun and Ursula row to a point where a stream enters the lake, finding a locale similar to the one where Gudrun met Gerald in 'Sketch-book' and from which Ursula began her unconscious drift to Birkin. The earlier episode highlighted the sisters' contrasting characters, a contrast intensified by this episode at the party. In keeping with the party's underlying mechanical energy, the sisters find themselves in a grove of beech trees which form 'a steel-grey scaffolding of trunks and boughs' (165), and here their ways of seeing and being are juxtaposed, emphasising the point that Gudrun's objective vision makes her a spectator of life while Ursula's sensual vision allows her to be a participant. Gudrun is aware of this contrast, and her awareness leads into a performance of Dalcroze's eurhythmics<sup>6</sup>. Gudrun's motion, the whiteness of the cotton crape she wears, the German melody she initially desires, and the frame of the trees all invite a comparison with the spectacle of Loie Fuller's Serpentine Dance, a spectacle which was filmed several times in the 1890s. Lawrence might have known about Fuller from his friend, Grace Crawford, whose father ran Buffalo Bill's Wild West show in which Fuller performed. Equally, he might have read her biography, which was published in 1913, or known of her performances for the Allied troops during the war. The hypnotic rhythm of Gudrun's waving white form certainly resembles the

image of Fuller dressed for the Serpentine in her white silk. The presentation of Gudrun as an image akin to a cinematographic one shows that her promptings of desire for a life like her sister's fail to liberate her; although she performs and Ursula watches here, in reversal of their usual relationship, she remains as an image in the frame of steel-grey scaffolding around her, 'stamping as if she were trying to throw off some bond' (166). The fact that she appears to imitate the image of Fuller, who performed for the allied troops, would link her appearance to the military spectatorship personified by Gerald at Shortlands. The desire to display herself ostentatiously, indicated at the start of the party, is the counterpart to her way of seeing, and this need is epitomised by her passion to dance before the cattle which, like Gerald and Ursula, become hypnotically fixated by her.

After Gerald's and Birkin's arrival, the narrator promptly crosscuts from Birkin and Ursula to Gerald's pursuit of Gudrun. Gudrun is seen to terrify the cattle<sup>7</sup>, as Gerald terrified his mare in 'Coal-Dust'. They both enjoy dominating, or submitting to, the opposite sex, experiencing, to borrow Birkin's words from the previous chapter, the 'tick-tack, tick-tack... dance of opposites' (153). Their relationship is one of fight, not friendship, as shown by the blow Gudrun strikes with the back of her hand, and by the way of seeing the scene of the blow<sup>8</sup>. The narrator zooms into a close-up of Gerald's eyes which, as they narrow to focus on Gudrun, encapsulate the effect of the narrator's own gaze. The narrator then cuts to Gudrun watching Gerald, and zooms into a close-up of her eyes prior to the moment she hits him. The sense of violence here is enhanced by the actual jumps from one perspective to another, so that the scene resembles a series of shocks. The pain she inflicts makes a masochistic appeal to him, which is portrayed as a shot of him, followed by his perspective as he watches her closely, followed by a reverse perspective of his

aroused eyes. The pain, and the extreme arousal it causes, lead to a relaxing of his will, and a declaration of love for Gudrun. His declaration does not trigger the lapsing out of Birkin's ideology of love. It results in a further stilling of the flow of life, signalled by the way he holds Gudrun, who is 'arrested' by his grasp, and her point of view of him in which she sees him not in terms of lambency but in terms of his 'fixed eyes, set before her' (172).

There is a brief hiatus from the focus on seeing that characterises Gudrun's and Gerald's encounter. This hiatus takes the form of the scent of the little marsh smelled by Birkin and Ursula. The reference to smell recalls Ursula's synaesthetic vision of Breadalby, yet, as with Ursula's vision, which was constrained by the dominant intellectual ambience, the smell does not trigger a sense of positive development. It causes Birkin to discourse on the dual nature of reality which, as he sees it, is composed of two currents. One current is considered as a silver flow of life, which Ursula's way of seeing senses, a way of seeing associated with her denial of being a flower of dissolution. The other current is the dark river of dissolution, still rolling on but going metaphysically backwards in negative or destructive creation which returns things to their base elements. Birkin argues that Gerald and Gudrun belong to this inverse flow of destructive creation. Their identity is imaged by the fleurs du mal, an image which suggests the return of flowers to the mud of their genesis. Birkin's dualistic conception of reality is given a Bergsonian slant by his dialogue with Ursula in which he taunts her about her belief that she is a rose of happiness. He asks her if she will be ready-made, and she gives the riposte, "No - real" (173). The dramatic opposition of real versus ready-made aligns itself with the twin currents of creation and destruction, and, importantly, seeing feelingly and seeing objectively.

The two ways of seeing are counterpointed by the sisters' responses to the lanterns lit by Birkin. From her dim and veiled perspective, Ursula appreciates the beauty of her lantern on a level deeper than that of sight alone. Conversely, Gudrun is anxious to *see* hers, and this need to appreciate it visually results in a mental arousal similar to the intellectually sexual thrill she gets from watching Gerald. The founding of Gerald's and Gudrun's bond on a need for visual appreciation is conveyed by the narrator's image of them ringed by a circle of light 'in one luminous union' (175). The cuttlefish on Gudrun's second lantern is an emblem of their cold, fixed ways of seeing in visual terms. It terrifies Gudrun, presumably because she sees herself in it, and she exchanges it for Ursula's.

The lighting of the lanterns initiates a parting of the ways and a converging of the characters most similar to each other. Ursula departs with Birkin and Gudrun with Gerald. The bifurcation into two pairs of characters, one pair which attracts, the other which polarises, offers a further contrast between ways of seeing, and emphasises the dominant, objective way of seeing at Shortlands. As the couples prepare to leave, Gerald submits to Gudrun's desire to have him to herself in the boat, a submission which excites her. Her arousal is accompanied by the narrator's perspective of Gerald's white-flannelled thighs in the circle of light cast by the lanterns. It is a way of seeing which imitates Gudrun's, as is the narrator's close-up of their ensuing kiss. The narrator sees them as a cinematograph would, looking at Gerald as a montage of parts, and looking at their kiss as a close-up. It is a way of seeing which, in the first instance, reflects the mechanical aspect of Gerald's character and, in the second instance, comments on the obscenity of Gerald and Gudrun's relationship. As illustrated by his novels and painting, Lawrence objected neither to graphic portrayals of nudity nor to demonstrations of affection per se. His objections were based

150

on whether or not he approved of what they meant. Hence, the cinematograph's portrayal of a kiss is seen as obscene because it mechanically depicts what should be a protoplasmic feeling with a cliché or a stereotype. Equally, the narrator's way of seeing Gerald's and Gudrun's kiss in the manner of a cinematographic close-up illustrates the obscenity of a relationship based not on blood-consciousness but on the ephemeral and ultimately destructive gratification of the self by visual appreciation of the other. This desire to see in an ocular way is based on a set of feelings that are already perverse, and, in its ocularity, it generates other feelings, like sensationalism, that are also perverse. This visual gratification is a kind of 'sighting' that has everything to do with power and, as the balance of power sways in the dialectic between them, so does the ability to 'sight' the other.

The connection between the narrator's close-up of the kiss and the cinematograph is reinforced by Lawrence's later comments about the obscenity of such close-ups: 'And the minority public knows full well that the most obscene painting on a Greek vase - *Thou still unravished bride of quietness* - is not as pornographical as the close-up kisses on the film, which excite men and women to secret and separate masturbation' (*PO*, 31). The narrator's way of seeing in the manner of these close-ups is paralleled by Gerald's and Gudrun's way of seeing, a way of seeing which ultimately leads to introjection and a pathological autonomy from each other; through their visual connection, Gudrun and Gerald tend to polarise, or balance in separation rather than conjunction, as Birkin and Ursula do. Their separation as they balance is clearly illustrated by Gudrun's voyeurism. As in 'Coal-Dust', her pleasure is derived from looking at Gerald and not wanting to touch the live form of his body: '[S]he only wanted to see him like a crystal shadow, to feel his essential presence' (178). To see Gerald as a crystal shadow, Gudrun is freezing him into an

image or frame of himself, as she did at the level-crossing. Gerald, though, is poised to move into a flux, to lapse out in unity with the things around him, although whether this will be creative or not is still unclear. The narrator's emphasis on Gerald's hearing indicates his readiness for this transfusion as it shows a distancing from the insistent seeing that has characterised his fixed, willed way of living.

However, the relaxation of his will allows his family's death instinct to reappear. As he nearly lapses out, Winifred's scream signals the beginning of a tragedy which sets in motion further tragedies. Her sister is drowning, an event which interrupts Gerald's imminent transfusion and triggers a process of devolution whereby Gerald moves back from this point of lapsing out into his old self and old habits. Ultimately, he becomes increasingly fixed into this old self and its associated habits as there is a tragic potential attached to transcending them; when he relaxed his will, his sister died<sup>9</sup>. Paralleling Gerald's retrogression, the narrative, which is still progressing chronologically, develops an inverse quality. Like the river of dissolution to which Gerald and Gudrun belong, it seems to run backwards by partially recreating aspects of earlier chapters. Gerald's diving into the water, dressed all in white, recalls his white figure running along the jetty to dive into the water in 'Diver'<sup>10</sup>. As he reappears, Gudrun sees him swimming like a water-rat, or a seal, an image which harks back to the image of the bathers in 'Breadalby'. The image of Gerald pushed to physical extremes excites Gudrun, and her excitement is revealed by her pornographic way of seeing him. She focuses on his loins and his back as he gets into the boat, and sees him look at the bandage on his hand. For her, these images of him constitute an 'incarnation, a great phase of life', and a 'final vision' or a 'final approximation of life' (181). The images reveal important aspects of the seeing subject, Gudrun, and the seen object, Gerald. A

pornographic way of seeing is inherently limited, since the extremes of physical sensation that it can see are, by their bodily nature, finite. This pornographic way of seeing is also cinematographic as the image of each extreme is incrementally added to the one before, thereby forming a series of frames rather than a continual vision. Gudrun's way of seeing Gerald in these images, which become progressively more extreme, turns him into a sort of pornographic film of himself. Such films, which included scenes of flagellation, bondage, genital exposure and penetration, had been made in Britain as early as the 1890s. Gudrun's way of seeing Gerald might have been inspired by such films. In these final images of him, subjugated, pushed to physical extremes and injured, Gudrun believes she has found her *ne plus ultra* of manliness. This way of seeing Gerald as a final extreme also implies that his progress is suspended, and that he will turn back on himself. Gudrun finds herself suspended, too, as she waits for him to re-emerge from the water for a second time. As he does so, she sees him increasingly devolving, from his point of lapsing out, back to seal-like and water-rat status, and finally, further back to an amphibious phase, a stage even closer to the mud from which the *fleurs du mal* grow. After Gerald has undergone this will-breaking intrinsic death, he loses his power to excite Gudrun. While watching his final exit from the water, she experiences none of the swooning associated with the earlier images of him. Birkin, too, alludes to something lost in Gerald. At the end of the night, he points out to Gerald that he wasted his best self in a futile effort to save his sister. The omnipresent process of death, vocalised by Birkin and conveyed by the dominant way of seeing, affects him and Ursula, too. Their mystic connection is lost as their soft intimacy gives way to the hardness of passion, a hardness typical of the spirit of Shortlands.

The loss of this mystic connection leaves Ursula suspended at the end of her particular line of life, oscillating between positive and negative ways of seeing. Birkin, for his part, continues to see her lambent aspects which are abstractly 'transfigured with light' (194), a light which is, however, becoming lunar and deadly as a reflection of her growing narcissism. This solipsism explains why, despite his mystic way of seeing her, she remains separate from him.

The loss of this mystic connection through passion leads Birkin to think of passion as a conscription, a military conceit identified with Gerald more than Birkin. Such terminology suggests a veering towards Gerald, who appears at Birkin's bedside during his convalescence. Yet Gerald remains as distant from him as Ursula. The ongoing distance between him and Birkin is conveyed in a significant close-up of Gerald's eyes which are as 'blue as the blue-fibred steel of a weapon' (204, qv above). The equation between the colour of his eyes and the bluing on a gun-barrel closely links his way of seeing with the military geometrification of looking at objects through a sight, a way of looking identified with the way of seeing objects as the cinematograph does. The restriction of Gerald's 'go' to the mechanical, intellectual kinesis typical of Shortlands and antithetical to the blutbrüderschaft is indicated by the narrator's cutting back and forth between close-ups of them as Gerald senses Birkin's goodness. His restraint is also suggested by the way he just touches Birkin's proffered hand, as if he is 'withheld and afraid' (207).

After this timid handshake, their dialogue seems to dissolve Gerald's resistance so that the final tone is one of togetherness. He approaches the bed, shakes Birkin's hand, and their eyes meet again. This rapprochement is underlined by Gerald's warm, almost erotic vision of Birkin on the bed which he responds to in a more positive and enduring way than he does to the images of



Gudrun<sup>11</sup>. The scene clearly reintroduces the elements of warmth between the two men from the chapter 'In the Train'.

At the end of 'The Industrial Magnate', Gerald consciously attributes his brief resurgence or flow of vitality to Birkin's warmth, or, as he puts it, Birkin's 'odd mobility and changeableness which seemed to contain the quintessence of faith' (232). In this chapter, the origins of Gerald's rigidity become clear in his family history. As a child, he was subjected to physical punishment by his nanny and father, a humiliating, physical subjugation which manifests itself in his treatment of Gudrun and his detached way of seeing. This alienation from his father was similarly felt by his mother who, excluded from her husband's world, wandered around her environs 'staring keenly and seeing nothing' (217). Mrs Crich's dissociation of seeing from feeling is her way of coping with an alienated and alienating world. This way of seeing is part of Gerald's coping strategy, as it is for Winifred who, as we shall observe, in her detached, momentaneous way of living sees as her brother and mother do. Gerald's ultimately nihilistic way of seeing and his general detached outlook seem to be a product of the social aspect of his upbringing, and the system of education he was obliged to follow. The German university he goes to, and the associated time he spent in Germany, result in a desire 'to see and to know, in a curious objective fashion' (222). The corollary to such objectivity is a need to 'try war' (ibid.), a need which further strengthens the link between the objective way of seeing, typified by the cinematograph and Gerald's mentality, and the war. At his father's request, he joins the family company and becomes part of the mining industry, an industry which interlocks automatically with his way of seeing. The vision of the great mechanism of the mines impresses itself 'photographically on his consciousness' (ibid.). He represents his vision of power to himself as a tracking shot, seeing all his initialled wagons from

an imaginary train as he enters London or Dover, and envisioning streams of miners as distorted human beings with red mouths from his slow-moving motorcar. His visions of industry are startlingly close to the way it was depicted by early documentary labour films, and the way its future was later seen by the classic German Expressionist film 'Metropolis' (1926). As the narrator says, it is a crystallised vision, synthesised of organised units into a moving whole which resembles a film. Gerald, like Mr Morel, looks at things in terms of how he can act upon them, rather than seeing them as they are. Hence, in his vision, the mystic sense of harmony intrinsic to a way of seeing feelingly is replaced with this sense of mechanical organisation, a sense which ignores human individuality and organises matter in terms of how it can be subjugated to the will. Gerald's way of seeing is based on the substitution of the mechanical principle for the organic, a substitution which subjects life to scientific principles. His representation of life to himself epitomises Bergson's concept of the intellect's cinematographic way of seeing. The trance of mechanical activity in which he lives alienates him still further from himself so that, when he looks at himself in the mirror, he sees an image devoid of the deeper qualities of the spontaneous soul, an image which appears to transmogrify these deeper qualities into an external effigy or parodic image of the soul.

Winifred sees in a similar way to her brother, and Gudrun feels mysteriously connected to her. Winifred's sang froid and indifference as she regards Gudrun during their first meeting at Shortlands infuses her gaze with the same sort of indifference which characterises Gudrun's and Hermione's way of seeing. It is a way of seeing which stultifies new or fresh happenings, transforming such occasions into spectacles rather than integrating them into an existing continuum. It is a transformation exemplified by Gudrun's way of watching the scene of her

introduction to Winifred, and by Winifred's sketch of her dog, which is 'a grotesque little diagram of a grotesque little animal' (236). The word 'diagram' is indicative of the sort of detachment of her way of seeing, and the impression that it is a comic parody of reality recalls Lawrence's sense of the cinema's transformation of people into comic, inhuman marionettes. Gerald's first sight of Gudrun at Shortlands in her role as Winifred's instructor is couched in the ethos of this way of seeing. The narrator notes Gerald's and Gudrun's eyes meeting with knowledge, reflecting a false intimacy or nervous contact between them; this contrasts with the final meeting of eyes between Gerald and Birkin in 'Man to Man' which, in its transcendent warmth, was indicative of a nascent but blocked quintessence between the two men. The detachment implicit in this way of seeing is evident in Gudrun's consideration of the flowers, which she eyes with the sort of ecstasy reminiscent of Miriam as she looked at the roses, and Hermione as she looked at the catkins. Gerald is deeply aroused by the sight of her 'reverential, almost ecstatic' (238) posture before the flowers, presumably because her downward stoop to touch them makes her look submissive. The togetherness this illusion of submission grants to Gerald and Gudrun is revealed by another meeting of their eyes. This oscillating pattern of submission and domination quickly slots Gerald into the submissive role as he worshipfully watches Gudrun walk away with Mademoiselle. There is a strong sense of fetishism in his way of watching her, again reminiscent of Paul's way of watching Clara at the station. The appeal of Gudrun's body is heightened by the soft cashmere she wears. As Gudrun walks away, although she moves, Gerald notes that under the cashmere, her body is, oxymoronically, 'still' (239). He sees her as he sees the labour of his mines, that is, in terms of a crystallised vision which fragments the real becoming of her movement into a still shot of it.

It is a way of seeing used to narrate the subjugation of the rabbit. The initial scene of Gudrun holding the struggling rabbit is witnessed by the narrator, and then by Gerald who recognises her passion of cruelty which wells up in rage at the rabbit. The passion of cruelty he witnesses is a nervous, violent allegorical image of the sort of social and sexual intercourse which becomes established between him and Gudrun. As he takes the rabbit from her to subjugate it as he did the mare, Gudrun watches Gerald's body, and this perspective of him moves into a close-up of his eyes which become metaphorically blind as a reflection of his detachment from the violence he inflicts on the rabbit. This detachment was foreshadowed by the detachment from himself in the spurring of his horse. Gudrun's close-up perspective of his eyes then shifts into his point of view of her eyes and, after the dialogue with Winifred, her point of view of him which, in turn, reverses itself to show her own dark, supplicating eyes. They have recognised the passion of cruelty in each other, and, within this passion, there is a master/slave dialectic. The continual, nervous oscillation of point of view intrinsic to the way the narrator sees the scene, and the way the characters see each other, illustrates the underlying shifts in the characters as they mentally dance from slave to master and vice versa. The scratches and scars they both have on their forearms reveal the scene to be one of initiation, and one which parodies initiation into the blutbrüderschaft, turning it into a kind of perverse, black magic version of itself. Although the characters are cut and they bleed, they don't merge out into the sort of mystic union Birkin associates with the blutbrüderschaft. Instead, Gerald and Gudrun become nervously excited by mutual illustrations of their own violent, physical sensations as they interact with the rabbit, an excitement which is implicit in the oscillation of perspective.

In the chapters from 'Water-party' to 'Rabbit', this oscillation of perspective is extremely prevalent. It is a style repeated in Ursula's observation of Birkin stoning the moon, although the alternation from one character's perspective to the other's is less frenetic and nervous than it was during Gerald's subjugation of the rabbit. After Birkin's stoning of the moon, he sees her transcendentally, recalling the suffused beauty of her eyes, and noting a golden light in her. This way of seeing culminates in a corresponding togetherness between them which, in its abstraction of the will and passion, approaches the phenomenon of lapsing out implicit in the blutbrüderschaft.

Birkin's awareness of a nascent form of this phenomenon leads him to propose to Ursula, yet the way of seeing the proposal shows it to be a farce in terms of mystic communion, a conclusion Birkin draws as he goes directly from Beldover to Shortlands to see Gerald. In reaction, Birkin feels spiritually close to Gerald, an intimacy revealed by the sensing of each other's presence. The closeness is clearly embodied in their wrestling. Although there is a contradistinction between the two - Birkin is more of a fluid force and Gerald more of an actual, physical presence - it is a contradistinction which, rather than polarising the two, facilitates a mutual physical understanding, and an interfusion of selves. This interfusion is apparent in the narrator's way of seeing them wrestle. The characters are presented as an entwined mass of limbs, seen from a unitary perspective, rather than the diverse perspectives which characterised Birkin's arrival at Shortlands, and his earlier proposal to Ursula. The real continuum they attain is evident by their loss of consciousness, and the associated loss of spatial and temporal cognisance. Their togetherness is reinforced by their mutual handclasp at the end of their bout which is stronger than Gerald's timid handshake in 'Man to man'. As Birkin says, this physical intimacy makes them

more whole, a wholeness incorporated in the narrator's way of seeing them wrestle. This wholeness fails to endure, especially for Gerald, whose rapid return to his quotidian self is suggested by his need for being attired, a need not felt by Birkin who remains staring at the fire. Moreover, the ebbing of this wholeness is shown by the return to the characters' diverse perspectives, such as Birkin's gaze at Gerald's robe and fine attire. This ebbing is caused, in part, by the return to primacy in Birkin's thoughts of Ursula who displaces his drift to Gerald. This divergence between Gerald and Birkin is also suggested by the narrator's close-up of Gerald's 'bright and puzzled' eyes (275). There is a certain blockage associated with this return to close-ups, a blockage vocalised by Gerald who cannot articulate how, if ever, he would be fulfilled by a woman.

The links between this fragmented way of seeing as close-ups and a broad spectrum of dissolution are intensified by the narration of Gudrun's arrival in 'Threshold'. The narrator looks at her eyes, and Gerald shrinking from them. Her eyes are then seen from his perspective as he squirms at the painful arousal they cause in him. It is a highly sexual way of seeing a highly sexual object. Gudrun looks directly at him, making eye contact and, through this visual connection, she invites the decadent seduction which occurs later. These diverse perspectives never attain the unity of the way Gerald and Birkin are seen wrestling. The lack of integration conveyed by this way of seeing stresses the perverse union in Gudrun's and Gerald's agreement (shaped by their hostility to Birkin) that passion is a self-abandonment. Significantly, their dialogue on marriage takes place in the car, and perspective implicitly flickers around them to provide close-ups of them, as the characters could neither be fully seen or heard, otherwise. This implicit way of seeing further emphasises the emptiness at the heart of their relationship, as does the car in which the dialogue

200

takes place. Like the motor launch on the lake, it has a mechanical heart, suggesting the sort of mechanical, intellectual will which drives Gerald and Gudrun. The dominant way of seeing, and the prevalence of such seeing, is again counterpointed, briefly, by Birkin who feels, rather than sees, the malevolence Gerald and Gudrun direct at him from behind.

The fragmented way of seeing the characters in the car alludes to the tension surrounding the notion of marriage, an allusion again made by the re-emergence of this way of seeing in conjunction with Hermione's and Ursula's discussion of marriage at Birkin's town residence in 'Woman to Woman'. In 'Excuse', the phenomenon of 'lapsing out', which represents Birkin's mystic sense of conjunction with Ursula, begins to blossom more fully. Its development is portrayed by the eclipsing of the fragmented, photographic way of seeing which predominated at Birkin's town residence and at Shortlands. At the beginning of the chapter, Birkin is divided between a nihilistic, picaresque outlook on life, and a more stoic striving for the deeper ideals he wants to realise with Ursula. The ways of seeing at this phase of the chapter reflect the delicate balance between these dual paths. The narrator seemingly sees the opening dialogue between Birkin and Ursula as a *mise-en-scène*, yet their dialogue is being conducted in a moving car, so the same sort of shifting way of seeing which narrated Gudrun's and Gerald's dialogue on marriage in the previous chapter underlies their dialogue. This shifting, mobile way of seeing, which reflects the destructiveness of Birkin's episodic, montage-like concept of life, is counterpointed by Ursula's, which belongs to the welling-up of the mystic communion. Aware of Birkin's hateful, watchful characteristics, which are congruent with the narrator's way of watching her and Birkin in the car, Ursula sees the jewels in terms of their intrinsic beauty 'as tiny fragments of loveliness' (304). The dual streams of life, exemplified by the two ways of seeing, are clearly at work in the

couple. Birkin wants the communion with Ursula, yet is tempted by the old, perverse spiritual life he had with Hermione. Ursula can see in a way which would facilitate such a communion, yet recognises a mechanical, analytic aspect in her way of being interested by people. As the tension between the ways of being and seeing climaxes, the narrator cuts between close-ups of the couple's brows and eyes to illustrate the antagonism between them. A significant shift towards the transcendent form of perception is adumbrated by Birkin's stopping of the car in the midst of their argument. It signals a drift from the mechanical principle governing Gerald and Gudrun which Ursula and Birkin feel in themselves, too. A further sign of their impending togetherness, couched in the ambivalence which characterises their argument, is the scene of Birkin watching Ursula tearing the twigs off the hedge. As he watches her fingers, he is full of tenderness and, at the same time, 'rage and callousness' (307). Unlike Gudrun's way of seeing Gerald, he makes no eye-contact with Ursula. However, until Ursula's angry departure, the transcendence between them remains unfulfilled, a point communicated by Ursula's angry retort to Birkin that the ten shillings in her purse are adequate to return her from anywhere Birkin has taken her.

Once she is out of sight, the dissolving of his obsession with spirituality and self-destruction is evident in his new way of seeing the rings. He first gave them to Ursula in a piece of screwed-up paper, a gesture recalling, in its nonchalance, Ursula's and Skrebensky's purchase of a cheap wedding ring in *The Rainbow*. After his argument with Ursula, Birkin sees the rings differently as 'tokens of the reality of beauty' (309). The change in his way of seeing, which parallels a psychological shift from complexity to simplicity and from a spiritually intellectual sense of things to a more divine or sacred one, culminates in his way of seeing Ursula. At peace with her, he visually senses the delicacy of her face, and the wonderful light in her laughing, yellow eyes. She,



for her part, is deeply aware of the abstract beauty of his eyes. The phenomenon of their communion has religiously transformed their mechanical, secular energy, typified by the narrator's former fragmented way of looking, into a fluid motion that, as they drift through the countryside in the car after the argument, is 'beautiful and transcendent' (311). The transformation from a nervous energy is ultimately embodied by Ursula's pouring of the tea at the Saracen's Head. Usually nervous and uncertain at such ceremonies, she flows in to her duty, a flow itself illustrated by the way the 'tea-pot poured beautifully from a proud slender spout' (315). En route to the Saracen's Head, Ursula sees Southwell Minster from a tracking shot point of view in the car. Her way of seeing belongs to the sense of fantasy associated with the cinematograph, as she finds herself in a magical reality. She notes that in her state of transcendence, she sees the world as a dreamworld, hence the town's golden lights, seen from the car, 'showed like slabs of revelation' (312). In this state, however, she still sees the ugly aspect of the cathedral. Seemingly, the cathedral is an emblem of false religion and, because of its falseness, it shows up in her deeply sacred sense of the world as a contrast to her transcendence. In her state of enduring satisfaction, after leaving the Saracen's Head, Ursula again sees the world transcendentally from the car, but in the constant warmth she shares with Birkin, there is no sign of the emblem of false religion, the cathedral, nor any desire to go to Shortlands and its willed, intellectual way of being and seeing. Birkin shares her lambency, and, after noting his animism as she sees him in the post office, the sense of actual, physical seeing is nullified for Ursula. The magical, mysterious tracking shot of Sherwood Forest perpetuates Ursula's sense of fantasy, a fantasy which climaxes in the dark communication Ursula and Birkin enjoy with each other which, in its purely mystical, visceral qualities, resembles the surrounding night, 'never to be seen with the eye' (320)<sup>12</sup>.

The narrator cuts from their communion to Shortlands, where Mr Crich's death and Gerald's nocturnal behaviour with Gudrun invite a series of contrasts with the denouement of 'Excuse'. The detached, alienated way of seeing, which is typical of the Crich family's willed mode of existence, characterises the climax to the father's death which is seen, with sang froid, from Gerald's perspective and his father's own. Like an Indian being tortured, Gerald wills himself to watch his father die. His willed way of seeing results in a viewing of life as a hollow shell, a way of looking without perceiving that manifests itself in his gaze at Gudrun's grotesque little sculptures. His father's dissolution is mapped onto Gerald's relationship with Gudrun, which is antithetical to Birkin's and Ursula's. On the evening when Gerald asks Gudrun to stay for dinner, there is no fire in the drawing room, an elemental lack which illustrates a similar lack between them. Gudrun cannot read his long, blank silences, an interpretative failure which reveals the potential disunity between them, a disunity which contrasts with Ursula's almost telepathic understanding of Birkin. The sense of dissolution is felt in Gerald's sense of being arrested in suspense inside himself, a stilling which contrasts with the pure, transcendental motion in 'Excuse'. It is also conveyed by his glancing at the clock, revealing a temporal fracture which highlights the underlying psychological ones. The potential divergence between him and Gudrun is contained within her submissive watching of him, and the series of close-ups which accompany her question about his father. These close-ups, and the perspectives from which they are seen, reflect the underlying dissolution and, as they are associated with the father, illustrate the tension his dying causes. Moreover, they show Gudrun taking a pained pleasure in Gerald's plight, as she did in 'Water-Party'. As shown by her point of view of him limited by the natural frame of the hearth, he is entrapped. She is also entrapped, because the sensationalistic manner of her response to this image prevents a mystic conjunction between them.

The sense of disunity conveyed by the close-ups and diverse perspectives is evident in Gerald's walk with Gudrun. He is the soldier of Hermione's discourse to Ursula. And he is fundamentally isolated from Gudrun, whom he balances perfectly in opposition to himself. The physical, tangible self, the warmth and motion of walking, the oscillation between triumph and defeat, the microcosmic bubble he finds himself in, and the dark and lonely bridge where he and Gudrun come to a standstill all contrast in terms of their firm, visible form with the fluidity between Birkin and Ursula. The close-up of their physical, sensationalistic kiss further emphasises this contrast. Their passion is an inverse one, stemming from fear and subjugation, and paralleling, in terms of its inversion, the flow between them. It is not a sort of mutual, centrifugal flow, but one where Gudrun's essence flows out of herself to fill the empty bubble of Gerald's drained being.

As with the revivification inspired by wrestling with Birkin, Gerald's conjunction with Gudrun fails to endure. The freezing of his temporary, suffused flow is portrayed by the wintry landscape he gazes at from the room of his dying father. It is also portrayed by the fracturing of perspective into crystallised shards, such as Gerald's points of view of his father's eyes, the narrator's perspective of Gerald's transfixion at his father's inhuman struggle, the narrator's close-up of the father's frenzied eye as it searches the room for help, and the eye's final, blind perspective of Gerald. In death, Thomas Crich looks untouched by life, an appearance which shows his inability to connect with the life-mysteries Birkin and Ursula uncover, and which suggests that his way of seeing was, like that of his son, blind to such mysteries. His father's death pushes Gerald to seek further support from Gudrun, an unlikely source of sustainable connection. Her lack of a life-enhancing nexus with Gerald is evident in her behaviour at the time of Mr Crich's death, and

the description of her shadowy studio after it. The impression that she parodies the vital principle of her sister's connection with Birkin is reinforced by the way she pours Gerald coffee. Ursula flowed into the pouring of the tea for Birkin, whereas Gudrun remains nervously poised with the coffee jug as she serves Gerald. Gerald has a parallel wish to serve Gudrun. This need to serve the other is, in their sadomasochistic relationship, the obverse of their desire to dominate.

The general distance between Gerald and the world around him is clear from his form of perception the night he secretly visits Gudrun at her family's house. At Shortlands, everything he sees reflects his own nihilism, turning his way of seeing into a uniform perception which echoes his military way of thinking, a way of thinking which emerges in his need to withdraw and seek reinforcements (337). Thinking like this, he has to take a direction, unlike Birkin and Ursula who were happy to go nowhere in particular. Significantly, his choice of direction leads him to the King's Head. Birkin and Ursula went to the Saracen's Head, and the 'saracen' part of the name, which refers originally to a tribe of nomadic wanderers, reflects their similar random journeying. Gerald's choice, the King's Head, points to a rigid, hierarchical structure. This rigidity is incarnated in his resolve to go to Gudrun's, a resolve which forms in his heart 'like a fixed idea' (339). In turn, this fixity surfaces in his way of seeing. The reference to his keen eyes as he gazes at the outside of the house, his spying on Birkin and Ursula in the garden, and his continually mobile point of view as he explores the house in search of Gudrun transform his gaze into that of a spy, setting out on military reconnaissance to look for reinforcements or new allies.

The way of seeing which characterised Gerald's gaze in Shortlands, and his observation of the outside of the Brangwens' house, recurs in Gudrun's bedroom, too. The connection between the

ways of seeing in each place is signalled by the diminished flame, associated with the couple's perverse desires, which burned in the studio and which also burns in the bedroom in the form of the candle. His physical fascination for her persists, as shown by the close-ups of her dilated, sexually aroused eyes, which lead to her perspectives of his boots, trousers and face. Importantly, her way of seeing registers his physical appeal, the mystic attractiveness of his outside rather than his inside. This visual connection, as before, is shown by their eye contact, a moment which implies his reverse gaze at her eyes. This time, he has come to pour the corrosive effluent of his alienation into her, and to receive a life-sustaining flow back from her. The pressure this puts on Gudrun suspends her mystically, compelling her into a deathly non-transcendent consciousness, a state suggested by the close-ups of her wide eyes as he sleeps, and by her distinct, actual sight of him as she gets up (345)<sup>13</sup>. This distinct sight of him as a beautiful, gleaming shadow, perfected in a far-off psychological distance, recalls the cinematographic image projected to her by him in the boat in 'Water-Party'. The sense of seeing him in such terms is accentuated by a reference to the clock which she repeatedly hears and which offers a temporal division parallel to the spatial divisions inherent in this way of seeing. Her nervous stimulation into superconsciousness caused by seeing Gerald like this results in a corresponding inverse running of her mind, which runs backwards to events of her childhood, creating, effectively, flashbacks. In terms of their comparison to a phosphorescent rope of knowledge, these flashbacks resemble a sequence of frames or scenes glowing and decaying in her consciousness like a film. Again, Gerald's suffusion lacks sustainability, revealed by his humiliation at dressing in front of her, and by her perspective of him dressing, a sight she also finds humiliating. Gudrun salvages the sight of his humiliation by likening herself to a workman's wife watching her husband dress, an idea which briefly restores

her passionate hateful fascination for him, a subjugating passion which results in another emphatic sight of his face's beautiful, stimulating physical features.

Divisions akin to those conveyed by Gudrun's view of Gerald's departure continue to be felt between Gerald and Birkin, too. During their discussion of Birkin's impending marriage to Ursula, Gerald half-seriously and half-jokingly suggests making it a double-barrelled affair by getting married to Gudrun at the same time. The close-up of his twinkling eyes, and the cut to Birkin looking at him steadily, incorporate the tension of this proposal into the scene, tension which arises as Gerald's proposal mocks Birkin's ideal of marriage. The tension between the men and their antithetical concepts of marriage is heightened by further close-ups. Gerald watches Birkin closely after asking his opinion on marriage, and as Gerald, like a lawyer, argues out the question of whether or not to marry, Birkin watches him narrowly 'with amused eyes' (351). Gerald's cold, critical concept of marriage, which is ultimately limiting, forces the consideration of another direction. This direction is intimated by the close-ups of his hot, constrained eyes as they look at Birkin, which suggest that the alternative to marriage with a woman is the mystic, sacred bond with a man which Birkin proposes as the additional, complementary relationship to one with a woman, and which Gerald understands to be the precursor to a mystic bond with a woman. Yet Gerald ultimately rejects Birkin's offer, and, perversely, is more elated at the rejection than he is by the offer itself.

A trace of the progressive devolution in Gerald is detectable in Birkin and Ursula too during their visit to the Monday jumble market. The hints of regression are initially suggested by Ursula's thrill at being out with the common people, a thrill formerly associated with the hot nostalgia of

200

Gudrun's nocturnal visits to the Friday night market of Beldover. Walking through the market, Ursula sees materially, looking at the goods, a way of seeing counterpointed by Birkin who, initially, looks more at the people. Birkin's way of seeing is congruent with his sense of history. Seeing the chair, he thinks of the history behind it, an apparently creative way of seeing which differs fundamentally from the modern fixation on mechanical and material seeing. Yet, as Ursula points out, to see in terms of the past is to supplant the present with the past, a backward-looking nostalgic process which, presumably, would lead to progressive devolution like Gerald's. The way forward seems to be a general denial of the tyranny of fixity, a denial inherent in Birkin's assertion that one's surroundings should be left unfinished, sketchy and unconfined. Although they try to rid themselves of the past and the present in an effort to evolve, features from Gerald's and Gudrun's relationship dog them. Ursula apprehends the man she wants to give the chair to with a frisson of attraction, a sentiment first observed in her sister's patrols of the nocturnal Beldover streets. In Ursula's case, her attraction is caused not so much by the man's actual appearance but by what the narrator later calls a suggestive gutter-presence (359). Birkin watches her struggle to explain their desire to give the chair to the man and his wife with the sort of mockery associated with Gudrun's way of seeing, a mockery evident in the narrator's close-up of his slack, ironical, mocking eyelids (358).

Ursula's and Birkin's entrapment in a world they want to disavow is expressed by Ursula's tramcar perspective of the houses after she leaves the market. It is an apocalyptic vision of distant, crowded, angular houses which imitates the ugly cinematograph effect of the men's way of seeing London from the train. Her vision of actuality contrasts with her and Birkin's vision of a higher reality, Birkin's version of which contains other people, such as Gerald and Gudrun. Ursula's

utopia has no such others, and the tension between the couple's respective concepts is illustrated by the narrator's close-ups of Birkin's knitted brows and tense face, and the close-up of Ursula's bright eyes as she looks at him.

The tension between Ursula and her father, after she announces to her family that she is to be married the following day, is similarly depicted. The narrator moves into two close-ups of Ursula's yellow and dangerous eyes as she rails against her father's bullying disapprobation. These close-ups are followed by another close-up of her father's face. After her father hits her, Ursula flees to Birkin's, where her recollection of the conflict is accompanied by another close-up of her eyes. The narrator's technique of moving into such close-ups again turns them into a collective leitmotif for such physical and mental conflict. Her tender, immanent beauty, whilst it depresses Birkin with a sense of his own experience, also awakes in him a faith and a further fundamental connection with her that transcends their old existence and sets the tone for their marriage the following day. During her subsequent dialogue with Gerald in which he seems sad at the 'loss' of Birkin to her, she suggests to Gerald that he could make himself happy by marrying Gudrun. Yet both Ursula and Gerald recognise they are asserting an ideal, social wish against a more problematic truth, and the tension between her insistence and the reality manifests itself in the narrator's close-ups of her eyes, eyes which themselves hint at a discrepancy between surface reality and a deeper, divergent one.

Ursula's largely transcendent way of seeing perceives no sacredness in the empty family house, and the past that she and Gudrun associate with it. This perception is directly counterpointed by the arrival of Birkin, in whom Ursula sees a lambent, alive presence. The couple's warmth



suffuses Gudrun so that she too enjoys Ursula's transcendent vision from the car, albeit less intrinsically. With Ursula and Birkin, Gudrun manages to conjure up a rosy picture of the old idea of marriage, an idea she subconsciously anathematizes. Without them, once she has been delivered to her lodgings in Willey Green, the old way of seeing coldly, mechanically and objectively re-emerges in the form of the clock in her lodgings which is painted with a slant-eyed face. The face moves back and forth with the ticking of the clock so that it obtrusively ogles her with a 'glad eye' (376-7). The clock incarnates the seeing in terms of divisions which belongs to the cinematograph's way of seeing, a way of seeing which resembles Gudrun's as shown by her close-up of her own bright eyes as she looks at herself in the mirror at Ursula's the following afternoon. Gudrun's perverse way of seeing, which diminishes objects and their essential values or meanings, is exemplified in her interpretation of Gerald's conversation with Birkin about the Christmas holiday. She sees the conversation as that of two men who are talking about taking out a common girl who is easy to pick up. Her perception, which is inaccurate, wilfully demeans Gerald's intentions. It also demeans her in Ursula's eyes, as she sees Gudrun as exactly this sort of 'type' (378) whom Gudrun envisages as the subject of Gerald's conversation.

The 'type' of Gudrun's imagination and Ursula's vision is personified by the Pussum, whom Gerald and Gudrun meet in the Pompadour. The café is its usual whirlpool of disintegration and inside, Gudrun's way of seeing matches the ambience. She sees everybody 'objectively' (380), watching them in a cinematographic manner as a montage of eyes and faces looking at her. She is clearly tense about the Pussum's status as one of Gerald's mistresses because, unusually, she orders an iced cocktail<sup>14</sup>, an action which makes Gerald wonder 'what was up' (382). In the Pussum, and in Halliday's reading of Birkin's letter, Gudrun sees herself and her relationship with

Gerald. Gudrun rejected the cuttlefish-lantern because she saw her own icy, willed detachment from life in it, and now, she feels she has to leave after hearing what is virtually a manifesto denouncing the flux of corruption she and Gerald follow. Certainly, the strange effect the letter has on her seems to be one of recognising herself in it, as she does not obviously take it from Halliday to spare Birkin from further humiliation, although this is suggested as an afterthought. The effect itself the letter has on her is magnified by the narrator's close-up of her flashing eyes and flushed cheeks.

The montage of faces Gudrun sees in the café is paralleled by the narrator's way of seeing the quay at Ostend as an underworld, which is represented as a montage. Ursula's and Birkin's points of view subsequently merge with this narratorial one, and the way of seeing the countryside as a tracking shot montage triggers a flashback in Ursula in which she sees the past as she sees reality from the train. This way of seeing reflects the heaviness and dreariness of the world they pass through, and Ursula's disenchantment with it. In this actual world, she has a semi-tangible vision of Birkin's eyes. The immanence of his eyes offers a world beyond the meaningless hinterland they are travelling through, a hinterland which, in its lack of signification and mystic differentiation between one object and another, resembles a film of itself.

Their arrival in the new snow-world of Innsbruck, where the hotel glows with a golden light like a home, signals an apparent change in the way of seeing. Yet, in contrast to the opening impressions of wholesomeness and the expectations of a change in perception associated with them, the way of seeing is the same as that which typified many of the moments of tension in England. Ursula's first sight of Gudrun makes Gudrun look like a monochromatic photograph of herself as she is

wearing a dark, glossy coat with grey fur. Gudrun's loss of her cool diffidence is stylistically signalled, and magnified, by the narrator's move into a close-up of her flashing eyes as she recognises Ursula. Although the sisters initially unite in this new environment, tension arises between them over Gudrun's desire to keep Birkin's letter as a memento or symbol. Seemingly, she cherishes it for its association with her display of power in *The Pompadour*, and Ursula is not pleased that she keeps the letter for reasons of self-aggrandisement. This tension foreshadows the re-emergence of the close-ups which expressed many tense moments of conflict in England. At the mention of Gerald's flirtatious behaviour in Paris, the narrator moves into a close-up of Ursula's eyes, into which a dancing light emerges as she calls Gerald a 'whole-hogger' (394). The close-up shows Ursula's excitement at the thought of Gerald's sexual vigour, and it also refers back to the close-ups of Ursula's delighted, glowing eyes at the thought of Gerald marrying Gudrun in 'Flitting' (370). The earlier close-ups portrayed an underlying tension at the thought of such a marriage, as if it might be detrimental to both Gerald and Gudrun. The present close-up, in its stylistic similarity to those of Ursula's prior dialogue with Gerald, suggests a similar sort of subconscious doubt Ursula has about him, a doubt triggered by Gudrun's tale of his licentiousness. Gudrun too is excited at the thought of such behaviour. The way of seeing which characterised Ursula's experience of travelling to Innsbruck, and these initial exchanges with Gudrun, feeds into the narrator's way of seeing the four characters' first dinner together. The narrator flicks through a montage of Gerald's and Gudrun's appearances, and cuts to Birkin's eyes as he watches them. The dominant way of seeing closely approximates that of Shortlands, Breadalby, and the other places which were associated with a cold, objective, fragmented way of seeing, affirming the point that the characters have found more of what they wanted to leave behind.

Gudrun, however, feels particularly uplifted at being out of England, as do Ursula and Gerald. Yet, in Gerald's request not be overly-critical about England, Ursula senses 'a fund of cynicism' (395). This fund shows that Gerald has found more of the personal and experiential emptiness which, presumably, he wanted to jettison. Similarly, Gudrun's letting go has gone backwards into a freezing of development, or a reduction to the 'ecstasy of sensation' as Birkin called it in his letter, as the close-ups of her excitement at recounting Gerald's sexual appeal illustrate. This nihilistic letting go is evident in her persistent questioning of Birkin regarding his hopelessness about the evolution of the English into a positive reality, as if it is her own hope of evolution she is enquiring after. The three close-ups of her dark, dilated eyes as she watches him illustrate the importance and relevance of his opinion. He concludes that there is no hope of evolution, a lack of hope which parallels her own fate and condemns her to the backward reduction of his letter, thereby ending her interest in him. Her subsequent, consumerist way of seeing Gerald exemplifies the course of her fate, the backwardness of which is clear from her comparison of him to a piece of radium, a comparison which goes back to the moments of sensationalism she enjoyed with him under the bridge in 'Death and Love'. The comparison with these moments, during which Gerald received a life-sustaining transfusion of psychic energy from Gudrun, is further validated by Birkin's perception of Gerald's triumphant, yet submissive, dependency on Gudrun. Birkin sees a sort of deathly enslavement in Gerald's arousal at her touch, an arousal amplified by the narrator's close-up of Gerald's dilated eyes. As Birkin sees it, Gudrun's touch triggers Gerald's arousal and her touch embodies, in Gerald's dependency on it, her murdering of him as it shows his addiction to her suffusions. Once they are withdrawn, he will die, freezing like a frost-bitten flower from the inside out.

Many aspects of the cold, objective way of seeing converge on the narrative in 'Snow' where they signify the freezing of the soul, a process which, to varying degrees, occurs in the characters and is, itself, visualised in the alpine environment. The first important perspective is Gerald's of Gudrun running along the snow road up to the hotel (398). It is a perspective which illustrates the isolation of their souls from each other as they polarise into opposites of the same kinetic, nervous energy. The absence of a warm, soul-communion between them is also evident in the image of their pine bedroom which, devoid of amenities and heat, ascetically encloses them like a cell, rather than a bedroom<sup>15</sup>. In his state of constant passion, Gerald watches Gudrun who, instead of returning his gaze as an indication of some, albeit visual, contact between them, is dominated and aroused by the sight from the window. Their polarisation is visually emphasised by the way they are seen separately in the form of Gerald's close-up of Gudrun's startled eyes, a close-up which reverses to one of his keen, light blue eyes, 'small-pupilled and unnatural in their vision' (401). Gerald's unnatural vision is akin to the cinematograph's as it focuses on parts of Gudrun, such as her wet eyes which dilate as she swoons in fascination at him. The solidification of their relationship at these moments of bliss is clear from the narrator's references to Gerald's metallic, rather than fluid self, and to the flame of ice in Gudrun's heart. Moreover, the narrator and Gerald see Gudrun as still and childlike, suggesting a regression that is a concomitant of Gerald's cinematographic way of seeing, a way of seeing which Lawrence, as noted above, associated with the reduction of the heroine back to childishness. The detachment of this way of seeing, which Gerald shares with Gudrun, becomes increasingly clear from Gudrun's repeated gazes at the alpine scenery from the window. Although the landscape is one of purgatorial ice, the coldness of

which corresponds to her character, she is not transfigured by it. Her sang froid, which it mirrors, keeps her divorced and debarred from it, as she is from Gerald.

In the bar, all four characters, as newcomers to the hotel, spectate from their vantage point in the corner. It is a socially alienated way of seeing which approximates the way of seeing in Gerald's and Gudrun's bedroom and, as the four characters share the same social situation of being outsiders, it extends to them all. When the professor introduces those present, we see close-ups of their eyes; and this way of seeing reflects the stress of the situation, a kind of initiation. It also abstracts the sense of each character's individual essence, and conveys a general alienation, as if no-one connects positively with anyone else. Gudrun's arousal at Gerald's violence in 'Coal-dust' recurs in her spellbound spectatorship of Loerke's performance. And the narrator's subsequent montage of the characters portrays the shrapnelled energy the place releases in them.

The energy is such that it liberates the characters from their constraints, a liberation foreshadowed by their assimilation into the mix of people. Ursula feels untrammelled and her singing, usually hesitant, becomes self-confident and, like Gudrun with Gerald, she is clearly aroused by Birkin's looking at her. In this state, she realises she does not know what he is thinking, and, in contrast to Gerald and Gudrun, their ensuing dialogue draws them together against the murderous cold, a rapprochement shown by the narrator's close-up of their kiss, richer far than the sensationalism of Gerald's and Gudrun's kiss under the bridge in 'Death and Love'. In their thematic and perceptual opposition to Gerald and Gudrun, they see the hotel from the outside, again indicating a transcendental side to their way of seeing which Gudrun, from her perspective in the hotel, failed to attain. Ursula's vision of the hotel makes her think of her past and, in comparison with her

oneness with Birkin, the past seems devalued, showing her she has evolved from it to her current state. Her distance from the past, and her pejorative vision of it, are manifested in her way of seeing it: 'There was another world, like views on a magic lantern... lit up with a common, unreal light. There was a shadowy, unreal Ursula, a whole shadow-play of an unreal life. It was as unreal, and as circumscribed, as a magic-lantern show' (409). Ursula's way of seeing splits her memory into a static series of slides which lack only the mechanical motion of a projection apparatus to string them on to a film. She therefore sees the past as an unanimated flashback, the stillness of which incarnates her perspective of it as something gone, down the abyss of personal history. Even with animation, this intrinsically fragmented way of seeing lacks the oneness with the perceived object typical of Ursula's unity with Birkin. After Gudrun's and Gerald's return to the Reunionsaal behind Ursula and Birkin, the scene is viewed from Gudrun's perspective, which she shares with the narrator, as one of 'great animation and confusion' (410). As she and the narrator see it, the group does not develop a warm connection, for the characters are held apart from each other. Loerke wants to get to know Gudrun but is kept from her by his homosexual lover as if by 'a hedge of thorns' (411).

In this climate of raw, coarse energy, Birkin is negatively transfigured. The narrator and Ursula have a close-up vision of the sardonic, licentious mockery in his eyes, a vision which fascinates her and makes her, despite her revulsion, want to yield to him, as Gudrun did to Gerald. The trauma, tension, and psychological distance brought about by this transfiguration is shown and emphasised by the close-ups of him in the Reunionsaal and the bedroom. Yet her vision of his bestiality leads to a mutual enjoyment of degradation. Presumably, here it is a question of anal sex, and their relationship, unlike that of Gerald and Gudrun, is strong enough to allow space for

the perverse without being destroyed by it. The narrator crosscuts from Ursula's thoughts to Gudrun watching Gerald in the Reunionsaal, as if to emphasise the point that Gerald and Gudrun are constrained to alternating between positions of subject and object, or master and slave, an alternation which is the inverse of Birkin's and Ursula's mutual enjoyment of degradation. This alternation is further emphasised by the close-ups in their bedroom. The lack of conjoining with the real essence of the other implied by these alternating close-ups is shown by Gudrun's watching of Gerald in the mirror behind her as she brushes her hair<sup>16</sup>. Her gaze at the mirror image of him shows that they connect with the simulacrum or facsimile of each other. The quick that is touched is a sensationalistic one, as Gudrun's arousal at her voyeuristic perspective of Gerald watching her, unaware that she is watching him, reaffirms.

The cul-de-sac this way of being and seeing ends in is portrayed by her view of the valley the following morning, a valley which, as she excitedly noted the previous night, ends in a limiting finality, 'an infolded navel' (410). Her way of seeing a birth-place as a death-place shows the deathliness of her way of seeing. Her wide-awake point of view and the glance at the watch reprise the end of 'Death and Love', a repetition which enforces the ongoing division between them. The division is also marked by her consideration of his will, whereby she sees him in the same terms as he sees matter, that is, to be acted upon; she wants to use him as a tool. This cynical, ironic aspect of her way of seeing also makes reality look spurious, robbing it of all mystery.

The perfect, static unity they attain where, with regard to each other's essential self, they are unwitting and unseeing, results in an impersonal way of seeing. When they go out tobogganing,



Gudrun seems not to register Gerald, as she has no separate consciousness for him. In this impersonality, she swoons not at the sight of him, but at the perfect motion she attains with him on the toboggan, a motion which reduces the environment to a tracking shot of metallic snow spraying out on either side of the toboggan. Her swooning is shown by the transfiguration of her eyes which, brilliant and large, are seen in close-up by the narrator. The impersonality has penetrated her arousal, as she has been excited by the motion rather than him. As the narrator says, the first days pass in an ecstasy of physical motion (421), a state which again recalls Birkin's comment in his letter about the flux of corruption reducing one to an ecstasy of acute sensation.

The detachment implicit in this way of seeing is personified by Loerke who, during an interruption to these days of motion, begins to talk to Ursula, and then to Gudrun. The master/slave relationship with his lover, Leitner, is polarising into opposites, paralleling a similar process between Gerald and Gudrun, and pointing to an intrinsic commonality between Gudrun and Loerke, a commonality which quickly manifests itself in their interaction and dialogue. He is a sculptor<sup>17</sup>, fixing things in eternity as Gudrun's imagination does. Like her, he is a detached individual, alienated from his surroundings and set in his own 'uncanny singleness' (422). Gudrun's close-up of his eyes, in which she sees the inorganic misery underlying all the belittlement of his buffoonery, mirrors his own way of seeing. This close-up is followed by the narrator's, in which Loerke's eyes are seen as 'arresting' (ibid.). There seems to be a double meaning here, as the narrator ostensibly says that his eyes are striking, but suggests, also, that his sculptor's way of seeing arrests things photographically, as did Gudrun's image of the dying Mr Crich. At the outset of his first dialogue with Gudrun, Gudrun sees him in an arresting way, noting his nervous hands. In her observation, she likens the hands to prehensile talons, a likeness

which suggests he is a throwback, retrogressively following the same river of dissolution as she and Gerald. The sense of disjointedness in their laconic series of questions and answers is a further manifestation of their way of seeing, fracturing, as it does, a flow into a series of parts. The kinetic, nervous energy of the will which inspires the freezing of a flow into such disjointedness, a freezing imaged in the snow's omnipresence, is clearly illustrated by Loerke's description of the granite frieze which is summarised as 'a frenzy of chaotic motion' (423). This frenzy, to judge from his aesthetics, is a result of sublimating an organic, creative impulse into a mechanical one. The transformation evident in his way of seeing through the two needle-points of light which constitute his eyes is mirrored by the narrator's extreme close-up of these needle-points. The visual contact between Gudrun and Loerke is perpetuated in the later close-up of Gudrun's large, grave eyes, which open him up, drawing involuntary confessions from him. Gudrun again mechanically looks at him after his recollection of his past, a way of looking echoed by the narrator's close-ups of their eyes. As with Gerald, their eyes meet as a prelude to their later, physical sensationalistic contact. For now, the focus on eyes portrays the manner of their accord, and, in its switching from one set of eyes to another, illustrates the nervous, willed energy behind Loerke's frieze. Gudrun is more aware of his power of understanding, of fixing things into eternity, than he is; she realises his ability to apprehend her living motion more than he does. This apprehension belongs to his willed effort not to be at one with anything, which is part of his appeal for Gudrun who is repelled and aroused by his physical and perceptual degradation. To Ursula, though, Loerke is ultimately a vulgarism, as he is to Gerald and Birkin, to whom he epitomises a path of disintegration beyond that travelled by either man.

Ursula and Gudrun form a triangle with Loerke, whose conversation Ursula translates and transmits to her sister. In their next meeting, more of Loerke's aesthetics are revealed. In his photogravure of the statuette, the photogravure itself illustrates his way of seeing as stills, as does his representation of the horse which, in its stiffness, embodies his vulgarisation of the organic principle. Gudrun is aroused both by Loerke's tale of subjugating the model and by his vision, to which she pays homage as it accords with her own sculptures which belittle and demystify the organic. Ursula argues that the horse is a parody of the organic, a parody which reflects Loerke and his vision of reality. To her, it is an extension of his vision of life, which is why he denies it is connected to him and says that it is pure form<sup>18</sup>. The narrator's close-up of Loerke's eyes after Ursula has said that the horse mirrors his own brutality reveals that she is right; Loerke's art is the truth about him, as Gudrun's is about her, which is why both Loerke and Gudrun subscribe to the self-defensive argument that art is absolute. Such an argument dissociates the artist from the art, a dissociation Gudrun in particular needs as she cannot face the reality of her own self, as her reaction to the cuttlefish lantern and Birkin's letter demonstrated. Gerald, too, is fascinated by the photogravure yet, unlike Loerke and Gudrun, it makes him feel barren. The idea that Loerke has replaced Gerald is evident in Gerald's feelings; he is not decadent enough to be aroused by the reproduction. Loerke clearly is, and Gudrun accords with him, as portrayed by the eye-contact and close-ups of eyes which formerly mediated her feelings for Gerald. Loerke's fetish for barely pubescent girls, epitomised by the model in the picture, matches his way of seeing. In several aspects, his way of seeing is cinematographic, and his choice of a teenage model further accords with the cinematograph as his way of seeing responds to women who are reduced to childish stereotypes.

221

Gudrun's way of seeing entails a similar response, as her captivation by the model's feet reveals. Ursula is mocked for criticising Loerke and, in her rejection of his aesthetic, exits to the pure world of snow outside. The stasis it signifies forces her and Birkin to leave, and Gerald and Gudrun are relieved at their departure. The departure crystallises the two ways of seeing and being which characterise the couples. The narrator notes the dim and easy flow in Birkin, against whom Gerald 'was intense and gripped into white light' (436). As a leaving present, Gudrun gives her sister material items, namely her stockings, which she eyes enviously even as she gives them. Her perception of Ursula's happiness supports her material way of seeing; she visually reads the brightness on Ursula's face, rather than listening to Ursula's uncertain tones. It is a way of seeing which precedes her subsequent comments on seeing the world through, rather than sensing real evolution or becoming through a transcendent perception. Her material way of seeing is again emphasised by the close-up of her steady, balancing eyes which, in their equilibrium, look at Ursula like a camera. Significantly, one of the few moments when she surpasses this way of seeing is at her sister's departure when she feels, rather than sees, Ursula's hurt resistance to the condescension of her protective patronage. Prior to Ursula's and Birkin's departure, Gerald provides an insight into seeing as he and Gudrun do. The extreme, physical sensations he has enjoyed with Gudrun have blasted his soul's eye with their intensity, forcing him to see blankly or blindly rather than feelingly. Certainly, as Birkin mentions the love he has for Gerald, Gerald looks at him strangely, abstractedly, as if a part of him is switched off from such sensitivity. From the sledge, Birkin's final perspective of Gerald and Gudrun shows them growing smaller and more isolated. It resembles a cinematographic long-shot, and illustrates the diminishment of Gerald's and Gudrun's souls. Appropriately, it also incorporates the detached, blank way of seeing Gerald mentions.

After her sister's departure, Gudrun reaches a point at which she derives no real joy from Gerald, as revealed by her arousal as she gazes at the alpine sunset, and the glowing, eternal peaks it illuminates. In her transport at this sight, she has left him behind, a departure which radically embitters him. As the void between her and Gerald grows, she finds more in common with Loerke. Her change of allegiance sets up a conflict between Gerald and Loerke, the tension of which is conveyed by three close-ups. The first is her close-up of Gerald's eyes flashing as he argues about Tripoli and Italy with Loerke, the second is the narrator's close-up of Gudrun's eyes flashing as she discloses to Loerke her unmarried status, and the third is the narrator's subsequent close-up of Gerald going white at the cheekbones. Gerald responds nobly to Gudrun's disclosure by maintaining a soldier's still, calm detachment under fire. The look of clear distance Gudrun perceives in his behaviour arouses her, causing her to lose interest in Loerke in proportion to the appeal Gerald's inaccessibility and distance make to her. The appeal of this connection quickly fades, though, and the narrator's focus falls on Loerke's perception of her.

Loerke surpasses Gerald's view of Gudrun's wants to see into the sensations of her soul where he finds a depth of sensationalism, and a critical, objective consciousness 'that saw the world distorted, horrific' (451). Given Lawrence's association between sensationalism and the cinematograph that was noted above (*Letters ii*, 285), Gudrun's distorted way of seeing the world can again be likened to a cinematographic way of seeing. Ultimately, Gudrun's way of seeing is differentiated from Gerald's as Gerald remains connected, in part, to the rest of the world whereas Gudrun and Loerke are capable of absolute detachment. This detachment from life's flow manifests itself in mocking imaginations of future destruction, or sentimental marionette shows of

223

the past. In her observation of the wedding, her way of seeing each guest as a complete figure was likened to seeing a marionette in a theatre, an analogy which recalls Lawrence's comparison of the cinema to pictures of wonderful marionettes (*Letters i*, 304, *qv* above). Gudrun's way of seeing the wedding, and her way of seeing the past, may therefore be likened to the way the cinematograph itself sees in terms of an alienated, mechanical antithesis to the soul's eye. Certainly, after her argument with Gerald about Loerke, she has a close-up view of the wolf-like power in Gerald's eyes, which is followed by one of his mechanical body. This way of seeing directly follows her psychic murder of him with her will. In her view, their dialogue on love has frozen them permanently apart, and she turns increasingly to Loerke.

Her first, ensuing dialogue with Loerke is accompanied by a montage from her point of view of his hair, forehead, skin, hands and wrists. Again, his hands seem prehensile to her, emphasising his inverse development to earlier phases of human evolution. As they talk, Loerke watches her closely and curiously, as if he is studying her to turn her into a photogravure image. This way of seeing underlines his objective nature, which Gudrun senses later in their conversation. As previously observed, his nature is matched by Gudrun's, an equivalence shown by the close-up of her wide and steady eyes looking 'full at Loerke' (458). The width and poise of her eyes make her gaze seem camera-like. It is a way of seeing echoed by the narrator's which moves into three close-ups of his eyes. First, they flicker darkly and evilly at Gudrun as he tells her that he feels understood by her. Second, as he acknowledges her physical beauty, his eyes shift into the critical, estimating way of seeing, commensurate with Gudrun's. Third, they adopt a prophetic mien as he says that their fates are entwined. These close-ups reinforce the characters' mutuality, but the sensationalism mitigates against the soul-mutuality of Birkin and Ursula. Certainly, Gudrun's

opposition to Birkin's and Ursula's positive way of living is evident in the narrator's comment:

'She never really lived, she only watched' (465).

Gerald is now totally alienated from Gudrun and Loerke, an alienation encapsulated by his distant spectacle of Loerke that leads to his wish to kill her. The perspective reveals the metaphysical distance between Gerald and the others, as well as alluding to the violence between them via its similarity to the military way of binocularising an enemy position as if to assault it. Following up his reconnaissance, Gerald attacks both Loerke and Gudrun, and his assault is conjoined to close-ups of Loerke's demoniac eyes, and Gudrun's eyes rolling back as he strangles her. These close-ups dramatise the alienation between Gerald, and Gudrun and Loerke, by showing that although he is physically close to them, psychologically, he is at war with them. The narrator's long-shot point of view of Gudrun and Loerke sitting in the snow reinforces the distance Gudrun's and Loerke's detachment places between them and others. Gerald, once he loosens his grip on Gudrun, lets go mentally, a relaxation of his will indicated by the references to the thaw in his body and his joints turning to water (472). As in 'Water-Party', his attainment of a state of fluidity is followed by tragedy, a tragedy which, this time, takes the form of his own death, rather than his sister's.

Gudrun responds coldly to Gerald's death, reaffirming her inability to change positively. Gerald's death is a by-product of her coldness, a by-product which epitomises it. As with the cuttlefish lantern, Birkin's letter, and her art, Gudrun wants to disavow projections of her own coldness, as indicated by her desire not to see Gerald's body, and to get away from the mountains. By contrast, Birkin has the warmth and the courage to look closely at the body, and to visit the actual

place of the death. As he looks at the body, he empathises with Gerald's plight, feeling that his friend froze from the inside, partly as a result of not being able to change creatively. Because Gerald could not love Birkin enough to yield to the life-mystery between them, Gerald's spirit does not live on in Birkin after his death. For Birkin, the real tragedy of Gerald's death is this failure of his spirit to endure, rather than the physical death of the body.

To summarise, the novel opens with a dialectic between a cinematographic and a non-cinematographic way of seeing. These ways of seeing are, in the first chapter, personified by Gudrun and Ursula. The cinematographic way of seeing predominates in this first chapter, as it does in virtually all of the chapters, including the last one. In many chapters, the cinematographic way of seeing is clearly identified with the narrator's. The inherent alienation of the narrator's way of seeing is a projection of Lawrence's experience of the war years. As Ursula says, art is the truth about the real world, and the magnified separation of subject from object implicit in the narrator's way of seeing reflects the distance between Lawrence and British society during the war<sup>19</sup>. In the novel's concluding chapter, the fact that this way of seeing comes to characterise Birkin's final perception of Gerald points to Lawrence's deep-seated alienation from his own friends, family and society during the war years, an alienation which ultimately seeped into his relationship with Frieda from whom he became temporarily estranged in the nineteen-twenties. This interpersonal alienation is suggested by the novel's concluding narration of Birkin's and Ursula's relationship which, in terms of the parallels it invites with Lawrence and Frieda, is its most important relationship. In addition to Ursula, Birkin needs another person, Gerald, to make his life complete. His need illustrates a lack between him and Ursula. Lawrence ultimately felt this



220

lack between him and Frieda, and tried to address it with a number of friendships from the time he began writing what was to become *Women in Love* until well after he finished it.

The cinematographic way of seeing is a conscious problematisation of the characters' relationships with their societies and each other, and it expresses the decadence of these societies. This way of seeing may undermine Lawrence's position on optical, ocular vision, turning him, in the words of Linda Williams, into one of the monsters of vision he inveighs against. However, it adds to his repertoire of social commentary by facilitating further, apposite expressions of the particular cultural and social climate generated by the war.

#### 'Women in Love': The Film

The film 'Women in Love' is preoccupied with the novel on a number of levels which are, most obviously, critical, biographical, historical, and literal. Russell's sense of what was appropriate for a film of *Women in Love* is clarified further by his preparations prior to shooting. Unhappy with Larry Kramer's screenplay, he decided to rewrite most of it, believing that all the '[g]reat, wonderful, magnificent scenes had been totally missed out' (Gomez, 1976, 80). Despite the conflict between Kramer and Russell on how to realise Lawrence's work as a film, they agreed that the novel should be a visual and philosophical re-creation of Lawrence's work in a new medium (Greiff, 2001, 78). Yet there was a persistent and underlying disagreement between a screenwriter who felt that a film should be able to express abstract ideas with words, and a director who argued that it should be able to express them with images and sound. This disagreement appears to have been productive, as the film creates analogues for the novel's prose style and, as we shall see, it creates analogues for the novel's way of seeing.

Such analogues are exemplified by the adaptation of the level-crossing scene from 'Coal-Dust'. The creation of these analogues is a product of working literally with the novel. Russell took most of the dialogue for the film verbatim from the novel, replacing outright Kramer's Americanisms like 'boxcar' and 'sidewalk'. This method extends to his creation of the film's images which are 'mostly literal rather than metaphorical delineations of the dialogue' (Gomez, 1976, 80-1). Gomez's argument that the film is a sort of literalism of the novel, rather than a 'metaphorical delineation', adds weight to the idea that the novel itself is, in Harry Moore's words, 'somewhat cinematic'. Additional support for this argument comes in the form of Richard Combs's comments on the film's 'duplication of the novel's episodic structure' (Combs, 'Women in Love', in *Sight and Sound*. v39, n1, Winter 69/70, 263). The sense that the novel is innately cinematic is voiced by the director himself who felt that Lawrence had already written ninety percent of the film's script into the novel (Greiff, 2001, 77). The novel is a life turned into a cinematographic artform, and the film is the realisation of this artform in a new medium commensurate with the way of seeing Lawrence used as an expression of his social estrangement. I will begin by analysing the intersection of the novel's ways of seeing with the film's various takes on the novel.

The mobile way of seeing which, in 'Sisters', showed Gudrun's alienation from her sister, and the narrator's separation from the diegesis, is immediately discernible in the film's opening sequences. Paralleling 'Sisters', the film features four locations, namely the Brangwens' house, the road to the church, the church itself, and the graveyard (which is a school in the novel) from which Ursula and Gudrun spectate on the wedding. In the house, Gudrun's appearance is mediated by a cut from the opening *mise-en-scène*, which focuses on the father at the table, to a medium close-up

shot of her coming through the door behind Ursula. The camera then cuts to a similar shot of the father, as seen from a perspective which is associated with Gudrun's and Ursula's. This shot/reverse shot technique accompanies a disagreement between the sisters, who want to go and watch the wedding, and their parents, who want them to stay to meet a relative. This technique is directly associated with the fracturing of the family unit, a fracturing it expresses via its own diverse perspectives. After the sisters' departure, the camera cuts between close-ups of the Brangwen parents, whose estrangement from each other is expressed by the absence of a unifying shot of them. This estrangement is initially suggested by the silence which prevails between them prior to the sisters' entrance, and it is perpetuated by the close-up of Brangwen's hands after they leave; this close-up focuses on his work, which is seen, negatively, to take precedence over his wife and daughters. There is a clear identification between the editing of this scene in the film and the editing of the opening scene in 'Sisters', which takes the form of the mobility of point of view. In the novel, this mobility belongs to Gudrun's and the narrator's alienation from the people and society of the Midlands. In the film, it detaches the narrative point of view from what is seen, and it is part of the social fracturing of the family unit.

As the sisters leave, the camera pans to follow them down the steps. It then moves backwards to keep them in focus, pivots as they turn, and tracks back with them as they walk along the street. This way of seeing is analogous to Gudrun's in 'Water Party' where, as she approaches an object physically, psychologically, she is backing away, a distancing effect realised in her way of looking at objects as if they are seen through the wrong end of opera glasses. The film's way of seeing mimics this effect of backing away, for the sisters' approach to the camera is matched by its mechanical backing away on the rails which facilitate a tracking shot. It approximates the general

227

effect of Lawrence's narrator's way of seeing, which is one of being estranged from the world described. This detachment correlates with the sisters' discussion on marriage. It is an experience neither wants, and the rejection of it as a positive experience is clearly shown by their perspective of the crying baby, a perspective which emphasises their denial of the social inevitability of being a wife and mother that marriage implies. Their alienation from this society is paralleled by that of the narrative camera which depicts their suburban redbrick environment as particularly oppressive by seeing it as an overbearing, amorphous mass of houses while the sisters walk to the tram. It is a portrait which recalls the suburban background in Lawrence's sketch 'The Rainbow' which he sent to Viola Meynell on 2 March 1915. This shot clearly shows that one of the film's takes on the novel is a biographical one - the directorial team had access to Lawrence's letters and plays and could have seen this sketch in the letter it was sent with. The music which accompanies this shot, which is the tune of 'I'm Forever Blowing Bubbles', shows that another of the film's takes is an historical one, as outlined above. The sense of the film as history is underscored by the Lloyd George graffiti, and the two soldiers whose paths intersect with the sisters as they track away from the camera. The graffiti, the soldiers and later, the military clarinet-player and the girl collecting money for victims of the Somme explicitly embody the war's presence in the film. This presence is covertly felt, as in the novel, through the mobility of point of view. It is also felt in the camera's tracking of the sisters as they walk away from the house, and then towards the trams followed by the soldiers; both shots suggest a sort of 'zeroing in' on the sisters.

The separation between subject and object conveyed by this way of seeing is identified with a third-person point of view, rather than one which belongs to a character. Through this narrative point of view, the film has a clear sense of the novel as an expression of Lawrence's alienation

230

during the war, a sense which fuses biography with history. This alienated way of seeing can be mapped on to the characters' perspectives in the tram scene. The camera's opening shot on the tram is of the miners staring back at it. Here, the miners, who are covered in coal-dust, look like the sort of ghostly replicas of life Gudrun and the narrator observed on the way to the wedding in the novel. After this opening shot, the camera slowly pans right to show Gudrun staring at the people opposite her. Clearly, the scene thematises looking, as the camera is placed at the level of the passengers' eyes and invites an identification between its way of seeing and theirs. For the miners, a cinematographic way of seeing would be a product of the personal and social alienation of working in a technological industry. For Gudrun, who is obviously distanced from her native milieu as shown by her shocked gaze at her fellow passengers, the detachment of subject from object inherent in the camera's way of seeing portrays a split between subject and object in her way of seeing, a split which emphasises her alienation from her home world.

The scenes of the wedding are introduced with a backwards zoom from the sisters in the graveyard to a wider ambit which foregrounds the wedding guests. This backwards zoom is again indicative of a distancing from the action which turns it into an observed event rather than a continual flow. An association between this way of seeing and death develops during the film. The backwards zoom is used to depict the drowned newlyweds and Gerald's body curled up in a foetal position in the Alps. The idea that spectating is a deathly activity which marginalises the observers from real, dynamic change is conveyed by the point that the sisters observe the wedding from a graveyard. The sense that the wedding is antithetical to a positive flow is evident in the way it is depicted as a series of cuts and crosscuts. The backwards pan of the guests is followed by a crosscut to Birkin and Tibs hurrying to the carriage which, in turn, is followed by a cut to the

church, which is seen above the camera. The shot resembles the one of the houses as the sisters walk to the tram. The resemblance between the two shots suggests a similar metaphysical deathliness at the wedding to that of the sisters' suburban home environment. The camera angles down from this shot of the church to frame Gerald as a head and torso, a way of seeing which also frames Hermione's first appearance. The camera's way of seeing both Gerald and Hermione recalls the narrator's way of repeatedly looking at Hermione's head and upper body in the novel, a way of seeing which, in both media, suggests that characters viewed in this way live from the upper centres of will and consciousness. In terms of cinema theory, the way the camera glides to this tight, close shot of Gerald strikes a false note. This technique has nothing to do with the deep-focus long shots associated with the realist cinema. Such a formal and stiff method of introduction seems deliberately artificial, especially as it is a technique seldom used by Russell. So the physical structure of this shot is a considered reflection of Gerald's stiff, mannered self. Unsurprisingly, this style contrasts with the way Birkin is initially shot. Instead of remaining motionless, the camera rapidly pans to keep pace with him as he goes to the carriage, a movement which, taken with his comments on lateness and unconventionality, expresses his psychological effervescence.

The contrast between this way of seeing Birkin and the way of seeing the wedding becomes more pronounced with arrival of the bride and groom. The camera cuts quickly from Laura's appearance, to Tibs's, to a close-up of Laura's face, and to another one of her face as she turns and runs towards the church. This montage of close-ups approximates Gudrun's final, complete way of observing the wedding guests in the novel. In both the film and the novel, this way of seeing illustrates the military and industrial undertones of the marriage, as it is a way of

mechanically framing the object of the gaze which is then seen from a variety of perspectives. Although the film does not overtly thematise the wedding's industrial elements, it refers to a military component via shots of the sword salute after the wedding ceremony. The presence of this martial-industrial way of seeing in the film shows that its literal take on the novel extends to the novel's cinematic way of seeing, analogues of which prevail from these early scenes onwards. As in the novel, this way of seeing forces the spectator to view the wedding from a series of perspectives which cannot be forced into a unified viewpoint and which, consequently, maintain a distance between the spectator and the diegesis. As Gerald exclaims, the marriage is a spectacle, and it is designed to be experienced as one. This sense of the specular is confirmed by the photographer who, on two occasions, is shown photographing the wedding. His way of seeing illustrates a particular way of perceiving the wedding. As we shall see, this form of perception is aligned with Gudrun in the following scenes.

The cut from Birkin talking to Hermione at the church door to the watching sisters confirms the sense of spectacle inherent in the portrayal of the scene. This cut shows that the rapid left/right pans of Laura, and then Tibs as he chases her, are taken from the sisters' perspectives. The telescoping of the narrator's perspective into the sisters' further relativises perception, and destabilises the viewpoint of the spectator. The relativisation effect is intensified by the fact that there are two spectators, Gudrun and Ursula. However, the positioning of the sisters in relation to the camera prioritises Gudrun's viewpoint. Gudrun is closest to the camera, a position which foregrounds her perspective and suggests that, as in the novel, she is more inclined to a cinematographic form of perception than her sister. The cut from the close-up of Gudrun crossing her arms to the medium shot of Ursula's comment, "Frightening" shows that Ursula hosts the

camera's perspective, too. Although there is an identification between Ursula's perspective and the camera's, her way of seeing, as in the novel, is differentiated from her sister's. To assume that the rapid left/right pans of the bride and groom are Gudrun's, the rapidity of which conveys the nervous, neurotic way of seeing associated with her in the novel, Ursula's way of seeing is, by contrast, stable and focused on the object of her gaze, as if she develops a deeper connection with what she sees than Gudrun. Gudrun's way of seeing explains why, as she says, nothing materialises; its intense focus on the material (her use of the verb 'materialise' is significant) diminishes scope for a sustainable, mystic connection with objects and people.

The cut from the close-up of Birkin to Ursula who is watching him seems to confirm the stability of her way of seeing. Her flashback to the scene based on 'Classroom' shows, as the novel later does, that her way of seeing changes, at certain moments, to the cinematographic form typical of Gudrun's way of seeing. In Ursula's flashback, her way of seeing is identified with the narrative camera's; in her mind's eye, she begins by viewing the classroom encounter from a third-person point of view. This point of view develops positively during the flashback, suggesting that she is more attached to the objects of her vision than Gudrun. Birkin's entrance to the classroom is mediated by a medium close-up of her as he enters which cuts to a shot of her as she stands in surprise. This shot cuts from her virtual point of view of him to his of her. Given their mutual pleasure at each other's presence, these cuts illustrate Ursula's pleased surprise at his arrival and, importantly, the single, animated natural life force they both share. This life-force is symbolised by the pollinating catkins, and the relevance of the catkins as a symbol is evident in the close-up of Ursula and Birkin as they talk about them. Significantly, as Birkin sketches on the board and discourses about creating a pictorial record of the facts, he is interrupted by Hermione's entrance.



The coincidence of her entrance with his discourse connects her with the way of seeing he talks about, a way of seeing illustrated by his parodic sketch of a face on the board. The extreme close-up of Hermione as Ursula rings the bell exemplifies this pictorial way of seeing, a way of seeing espoused by Hermione in her rapturous gaze at the catkins. The flashback concludes with a series of cuts from Ursula to Birkin, and from Gudrun to Gerald. Ursula has a history behind her perception of Birkin, whereas Gudrun's gaze at Gerald lacks a sense, other than a visual one, of who he is; simply, she is thrilled by the sight of him. This absence of personal history between her and Gerald makes her gaze, as in the novel, more spectacular and sensational than Ursula's. In its conflation of 'Sisters' and 'Classroom', the film creates analogues for the novel's ways of seeing, analogues which are directly related to its literal sense of the novel. The generation of these analogues by a literal take on the novel underscores the novel's cinematographic elements. Furthermore, the film's generation of images corresponding to the novel's spectacular way of seeing the diegesis from a plurality of perspectives emphasises the point that, in the novel, the narrator's experience of his world is an alienated one.

The sense of the narrator's alienation from the society portrayed by the film is also expressed in the adaptation of 'Diver'. The fade from the final scene of the wedding to Gerald running along the jetty suggests a continuity between the two scenes. This continuity takes the form of the narrator's alienation which is illustrated by the backwards zoom of Gerald swimming to the sisters talking, a backwards zoom similar to that which introduced the scenes of the wedding. The narrator's alienation from Gerald's society is incarnated in the physical distance of Gerald from the camera in the shots of him swimming. Moreover, it is conveyed by the vagueness of identity attached to perspective. After Ursula's comment about Hermione's desire to dominate, a desire

evident in her urge to see, the camera cuts to a close-up of Gerald swimming. The angle seems to match that of the sisters' perspective, yet the object is too close to the subject for this perspective to match fully. This superimposition of the narrator's perspective on to the sisters' perspective clouds the identity of who is seeing, and the loss of a consistent seeing subject in this merging of identities detaches the spectator from the diegesis. At the same time, the alternation between perspectives is creating a connection between the characters. The alternation between the medium shots of the sisters and the medium close-ups of Gerald, an alternation which depicts the sort of 'go' Ursula talks about and which is imaged in his running and swimming, suggests that the seeing subjects look at Gerald in terms of these close-ups. Although both sisters look at Gerald, Gudrun seems to identify more closely with him as, when Ursula exclaims, "It's Gerald Crich", Gudrun's response reveals she has already seen him. The privacy of her observation confers a sort of voyeurism on it, as if it has been made secretly and enjoyably. This voyeurism is attached to the way of seeing him as a set of close-ups, a way of seeing which is Gudrun's. This way of seeing suggests that she makes the sort of cerebro-visual images of him that she does in the novel. The presentation of Gerald from a fragmented and mobile point of view also reprises the way he is seen at this juncture in the novel. Ultimately, this scene suggests a parallel between Gudrun's alienated way of seeing Gerald and the spectator's detachment from the diegesis. It is a way for the spectator and the narrator to experience Gudrun's way of seeing, a way of seeing which, given its voyeurism and detachment, is clearly destructive. The film generates a mutuality between the narrator's way of seeing and Gudrun's, a mutuality frequently evident in much of the novel<sup>20</sup>.

So far, the film has adapted recognisable events from 'Sisters', 'Classroom' and 'Diver', omitting only 'Shortlands'. However, in its direct move from 'Diver' to 'Breadalby', it circumvents the

250

London milieu of 'In the Train', 'Crème de Menthe' and 'Fetish'. Russell regretted the absence of this environment in the film, yet the stichomythia of the rapidly alternating viewpoints from 'In the Train', the sardonic, detached way of seeing in 'Crème de Menthe', and Gerald's pornographic way of seeing, typified by his gaze at the Pussum in 'Fetish', are sandwiched into the adaptation of 'Breadalby'. The film's adaptation of 'Breadalby' is orchestrated through a fragmented and mobile way of seeing which mimics Lawrence's narrator's way of seeing. In this replication, the film draws further attention to the alienation of its narrator from the diegesis. The film also suggests, as the novel does, that Hermione, and occasionally Birkin, share the detachment of the narrator's way of seeing. It begins its adaptation of 'Breadalby' with a backwards zoom from Hermione as she idealises men's spiritual equality. This backwards zoom suggests a repulsion or polarisation from her, a polarisation which is aligned with Birkin who believes in the opposite of her concept of equality. The repulsion implicit in this way of seeing is matched by the focus on Hermione's sardonic glance at him whilst he theorises, the sardonicism of which shows they are equally alienated from each other. The scene is deeply fragmented into separate shots of the characters as they talk. This fragmentation emphasises their mutual alienation and the narrator's alienation from them, and reproduces the fragmentation of Lawrence's narrator's gaze at the couple as Birkin draws the geese. The backwards zoom from Ursula and Gudrun as they arrive intensifies the narrator's alienation from Breadalby. In addition to the narrator's way of seeing the scene, which seems to express a rejection of Hermione and her home, there are other elements which problematise the relationship between Birkin and Hermione. The swimming pool assumes a similar symbolic value to that of the novel's lakes and ponds as it suggests a damming of the flow between the characters, a damming illustrated by Hermione's licking of Birkin's chest after he spills his drink. This licking triggers a moment of sensationalistic passion which fails to endure.

The limitations of their passion are highlighted by the contrast with the togetherness of the newlyweds who sleep entwined with each other as Hermione leaves to dress for lunch.

The lunch, which is the film's equivalent of the dinner scene at Breadalby, is introduced as a deep-focus long-shot which cuts to Gudrun as Birkin announces the names of the guests. The initial cut to Gudrun indicates that the ensuing fragmented way of seeing the scene approximates, amongst others, her way of seeing. This way of seeing might also be Birkin's, as his voice accompanies these cuts, suggesting that his gaze flicks over the guests as he names them. Between the introductory long-shot and Hermione's departure, there are approximately thirty-two cuts. Although the film does not clarify whether the gaze is uniquely the narrator's, or whether it is shared with the characters, these cuts recreate Hermione's way of seeing which, in the novel, skips over the guests at dinner to present the scene as a montage. However, by virtue of Birkin's recital of Lawrence's poem 'Fig', the cuts to Birkin's audience infuse the fragmented way of seeing with a biographical quality, as if the skipping of the film's narrator's gaze over the audience is that of Lawrence's narrator<sup>21</sup>. The identity of the spectator shifts with Hermione's departure. After she leaves, Birkin and Gerald discuss their desires, and love, women and God. The perspective on this dialogue is ostensibly the narrator's, yet it is alternately aligned with the character opposite to the speaking character. This shuttling of perspective recreates the visual stichomythia of their conversation from 'In the train'. It also illustrates the tension between them, as they hold different views on the topics they discuss.

The mental, intellectual way of seeing which characterised lunch culminates in the ballet scene where, because of her motion, it is associated with Hermione. The preamble to the scene, which

focuses on the men's smoking, is introduced by a downward pan. This downward pan recalls the introduction of the wedding scene which was similarly introduced. The similarity between the two introductions suggests that Breadalby, like the church, is a locus for a series of interruptions to a positive flow of life, and these interruptions are incarnated in the camera's consistent cutting from one shot to another. The similarity is perpetuated by the backwards tracking shot of Birkin and Gerald as they pass from the smoking room to the drawing room for the ballet. This shot resembles the backwards zoom which introduced the wedding and Gerald swimming. It is taken from an angle which approximates that of Hermione's perspective as she entered the smoking room, reaffirming the connection between her way of seeing and the camera's, and maintaining the distance between her and Birkin evident in earlier scenes. Until the change in music, the association between Hermione's point of view and the narrative camera's point of view is strengthened by the movement they share. Ursula's and Gudrun's movements and positions lack the scope of Hermione's and, as the narrative camera adopts multiple positions, angles and focal lengths, its way of seeing is identifiable with Hermione's more than it is with the other characters'. The men are, ostensibly, the main spectators, but their relative stillness marginalises the connection between their ways of seeing and the camera's. As in the novel, the main spectator is Hermione and the main form of spectatorship is her mental, willed way of seeing, embodied by the camera's cuts and zooms which fragment and distort the scene<sup>22</sup>. The accompanying music underlines the fragmentation of this way of seeing, as its rhythm points to the division of the scene into shots which form a montage. The detachment of Hermione's cerebral way of seeing is shared by Gerald. The backwards zoom which introduces Gudrun is followed by a cut to him as he watches her. The juxtaposition of the two shots invites an identification between his way of seeing and the backwards zoom, an identification which suggests that, like Gudrun's, his gaze

metaphysically retreats from the essence of the seen object at the same time as it focuses materially on it. There is a voyeuristic element in his way of seeing, too, which is conveyed by his perspective of Tibs and Laura as they kiss on the divan. In contrast to the backwards zoom from Gudrun, there is no such zoom from Ursula as she is introduced, an absence which implies that Birkin's way of seeing her brings her closer to him than Gerald's way of seeing Gudrun. The difference between his way of seeing and Gerald's is highlighted by Gudrun's entrance to one of the shots during the ballet. When she enters, the camera again zooms back from her as Gerald looks, the backwards zoom being directly followed by a contrasting series of zooms in to Ursula as she moves to Birkin. The sense of looking at the scene from an alienated perspective diminishes towards the end of the scene. Under Birkin's direction, the pianist changes the tune from Liszt's *Marche Funèbre* to a jazz number. The change in music is accompanied by a change in the way of seeing. The dance is partially depicted as a montage of legs and feet which creates the impression that the narrative viewpoint is that of a participant rather than a spectator. The change in the way of seeing highlights Hermione's detachment from those around her, a detachment emphasised by the narrator's backwards zoom of her after the close-up of the pianist's hands.

A change from one way of seeing to another, which, in the ballet scene, was signalled by the shift in music, occurs in the following scene of Hermione's attack on Birkin. The climax to the attack, and the attack itself, are portrayed as a series of cuts which focuses heavily on close-ups of the characters. The close-up of Birkin from Hermione's virtual perspective of him as he criticises her for her will and lust for power is a realisation of the violent epistemophilia of his diatribe. The impression that she looks at him in these terms, a way of looking which, in its focus, creates the sense that she aims at him as she does in the novel, is made more pronounced by the close-up of

him as she attacks. These close-ups develop into a montage which, mimetically, illustrates the violence between them. The montage captures the frenzy of their breathing, which makes the attack sound sexual, as if Hermione is raping Birkin, an act which foreshadows Gerald's raping of Gudrun in the Alps. The frantic rhythm of the montage is replaced by a series of pans as Birkin runs from the house to the forest<sup>23</sup>. These shots are taken from a perspective consistently identifiable with the narrator's, and the consistent identity of the gaze reduces the sense of fragmentation as the camera goes from one pan to another. The effect of defragmentation is amplified by the composition of the pans. The fourth pan begins with Birkin's feet and develops into a full shot of his body and head which then becomes an image of him walking in the forest. From this image, the camera zooms to a close-up of him washing with the tree's dew. There is a strong sense of flow between the images because the camera, instead of cutting from one shot to another, changes its focal length so that each pan is a single shot composed of several images. The consistency of the spectator's identity, and the way of seeing which is in tune with the flow of events, are analogues for the novel's description of Birkin's walk in the wood which Lawrence's narrator sees from a single viewpoint. In both novel and film, the way of seeing Birkin's walk illustrates the evolution of a consciousness in him which is antithetical to the one which predominates at Breadalby. In addition to the ways of seeing which alienate the spectator from the diegesis and which show the characters alienated from each other and their environment, the film creates a way of seeing which strengthens the narrator's sympathetic connection with the diegesis, and which indicates a strengthening of a character's connection with a formerly alienated part of himself. Like the images they focus on, these ways of seeing are directly related to the novel's. The film's narrator evokes detached and sympathetic modes of perception which are analogous to those of Lawrence's narrator. The important development in the argument about the film's

generation of analogues for Lawrence's narrator's way of seeing, and for the characters' ways of seeing, is that the film shows that it is capable of a sympathetic way of seeing, as well as an alienated one.

The alienated way of seeing, which incorporates a dissociation between the film's narrator and the diegesis, is used to narrate the memorial scene. The diversity of viewpoints from which the scene is shown transforms it into a collage or montage, and infuses the way of seeing with a cubist element<sup>24</sup>. This cubistic way of seeing, typified by shots of the scene which depict it as a whole and as fragments, is commensurate with the period of war which it depicts. Contradicting the narrator's way of seeing the scene as if alienated from it is a way of seeing Ursula and Birkin which recalls the narrator's way of seeing Birkin in the previous scene. Birkin's entrance to the second elevated shot of the crowd is followed by a slow zoom into an image of him and Ursula. There is an initial sense of togetherness between them, as if Birkin has come to help, illustrated by his taking of her parcels. This sense of togetherness is amplified by the slow zoom into them, which, as it brings the narrator closer to the characters, echoes their intimacy. As in the novel, there seems to be a dialectic between an alienated and a sympathetic way of seeing. This dialectic expresses the narrator's ambivalence towards a diegesis which alienates him yet contains elements, such as Birkin's brief intimacy with Ursula, which have a positive appeal.

In the film's adaptation of 'Coal-Dust', the narrator's alienated way of seeing, typified by the multiple angles of perception in the preceding memorial scene, is repeated. The repetition of a way of seeing overtly associated with the war illustrates the underlying violence of Gudrun's and Gerald's ways of living. The repetition of this way of seeing intensifies the alienation associated



with it. This intensification takes the form of the montage based on the chapter's first level-crossing scene<sup>25</sup>. As in the novel, this montage focuses on the narrator's way of seeing the scene, and Gudrun's way of seeing Gerald. In the montage, the rapidity of the cuts and the multiplicity of perspectives destabilise perception and alienate the spectator. Within this destabilisation, there is an identification between Gudrun and a particular way of seeing. The first close-up of the sisters watching Gerald shows Gudrun's fixation on him. This fixation develops into a fascination with his violence, a fascination evident in the cuts to close-ups of Gudrun's thrilled spectatorship of him, and the cuts to reverse close-ups from her perspective of his spurs drawing blood. These cuts focus on the sadistic embodiments of his violence, embodiments which, perversely, arouse her and, conversely, repel Ursula. The depiction of her arousal via close-ups of her face and her close-ups of the horse's wounds demonstrates that her way of seeing is a product of her sensationalism which pornographically focuses on parts of the whole, a way of seeing exemplified by the narrator's. As in the novel, the merging of her way of seeing with the narrator's shows that their visual connections with the objects of perception are open to subversive forces which undermine these connections, distancing the spectator from these objects as they come into sight. The sense of these contradictory forces is exemplified by our spectatorship of the scene. After identifying with Gudrun's perspective, a perspective which facilitates a clear entry to the diegesis, the spectator is distanced from the scene by the ensuing montage. This montage also contains a sense of Gudrun's spectatorship from the point in the novel where it is ultimately identified with that of the guard, who watches the scene as he mechanically tracks by it. In the film, as her spectatorship of Gerald's sadism reaches its climax, the narrator cuts to the opposite side of the crossing, so that the action is seen only through the gaps between the wagons, a way of seeing which infuses the scene with a mechanical

fragmentation. This way of seeing is not the same as the guard's, but, by its mechanical fragmentation of spectatorship, it is evocative of the way his gaze isolates the scene into spectacular moments. The film's adaptation of this scene again illustrates its generation of analogues for Lawrence's narrator's way of seeing, and Gudrun's way of seeing, both of which inherently alienate the spectating subject from the object of the gaze by their spectacular focus on the material. These analogues epitomise Bergson's concept of cinematographic perception because their focus on the material leads only to an ever-increasing focus on fragments of the material, rather than to the sense of becoming in the interval between these fragments.

The adaptation of this first level-crossing scene from 'Coal-Dust' is conflated with the history of Gerald's involvement with the mines, narrated later in the novel in 'The Industrial Magnate'. Analogues for Gerald's photographic way of seeing the mines occur in the film's opening shot of the colliery. The narrator's shot of Gerald moving the coal-truck from the emptying machine, and the following shot of the conveyor belts, are both taken from a static position, evoking the photographic impression the mines make on his consciousness in the novel. Moreover, the third shot is a backwards tracking shot of him which parallels the conveyor belt adjacent to him. This way of seeing him recalls the novel's representation of his vision of power to himself as a tracking shot (222). In the film, the tracking shot cuts to a close-up of his father's hand giving sympathy money to Dewhurst, the collier Gerald dismissed because of his inability to work under his new regime. This close-up cuts to a reverse shot of Gerald staring at his father's action, and the reverse shot shows that the close-up of his father's hand is taken from Gerald's perspective, thereby associating the close-up with Gerald's way of seeing. This association suggests that he sees in terms of crystallised fragments, epitomised by the close-up, which his consciousness

organises into a moving whole, a way of seeing directly analogous to his way of seeing in the novel. The occurrence of this way of seeing at the mine connects it with the alienation from oneself and others inherent in capitalistic industry. The narrator's extreme close-up of Gerald's withering insistence on a more productive work than Dewhurst can offer corroborates the connection between this idiomorphic way of seeing<sup>26</sup>, a way of seeing which illustrates an intrinsic and extrinsic alienation, and the sort of industry Gerald idealises. The narrator's way of seeing Gerald's and his father's departure from the mine also contains a distancing effect. As they approach the camera, it tracks backwards and pans to the side, thereby maintaining its distance from the Criches. This scene is followed by one of them in the car surrounded by colliers. It relates to one of Gerald's visions in the novel in which he envisages streams of miners seen from the car (223). Gerald's way of seeing, like Gudrun's, merges with that of the film's narrator who, in terms of his way of seeing and the characters', incorporates a distance between subject and object by using ways of seeing analogous to those in 'The Industrial Magnate'.

By intercutting scenes based on 'The Industrial Magnate' into its adaptation of 'Coal-Dust', the film draws clear parallels between Gudrun's way of seeing Gerald at the level-crossing, and Gerald's way of seeing at the mine. The parallels between events at the crossing and the mine are symbolically confirmed by the colours of the horse at the crossing, and the car in which Gerald is driven out of the colliery. Gerald's mare is white, with red on her flanks from his spurring, and his car is white with a red interior. The narrator's way of seeing Gudrun in the scenes based on the second level-crossing scene and her nocturnal walks in Beldover modifies the way the characters are seen in the previous scenes. The second level-crossing scene is transformed from the novel's portrayal of two workmen looking at the sisters into one of two colliers washing as they gaze

lasciviously at Gudrun. The camera begins by shooting the scene as a pan which tracks slightly backwards from Gudrun and then moves into the colliers as she exits the shot. There is no sense of the fragmented montage which characterised the narrator's way of seeing Gudrun watching Gerald whip the mare. However, the camera's consistent movement accentuates Gudrun's motion, and it suggests an animation to the spectacle of her, an animation which is evident in many of the novel's cinematographic spectacles. The only cut in this scene is to one of the colliers' perspectives of Gudrun as she walks away which, like the camera's earlier movement, accentuates her motion.

The following scenes in the tunnel and at the marketplace in Beldover are also marked by a paucity of cuts. The emphasis on the continuity of editing resembles the way Birkin's regenerative experience after Hermione's attack was seen. By visualising Gudrun's experience of Beldover in this way, the film counteracts the distance between the narrator and her earlier experiences, an effect which illustrates Gudrun's connection with Beldover's Friday-night underworld. The impression that the gap between the narrator and the diegesis diminishes is conveyed by the introductory shot of Beldover where the woman outside the tavern gazes directly at the camera, a gaze which infuses the narrator with a personal presence in the narrative. The sense of the narrator's embodiment is confirmed by the way he sees Gudrun move around Beldover. The backwards tracking shot which narrates her appearance outside the tavern, the shot of the men fighting, and the shots of her and Palmer as they walk through the market to the next tavern are all filmed in freestyle, as if the camera is handheld. These shots seem to be the perspective of a spectator in the narrative. This way of seeing approximates Gudrun's way of seeing Beldover as a whirl of people, faces and lights in the novel. It also pertains to her way of seeing in

'Sketch-Book'. To explain this last point, the film's illustration of the effect of connection between Gudrun and Beldover, a connection verbalised by her comments to Gerald at the end of the scene, shows that she develops a oneness with what she sees similar to that of her sensuous vision of the water plants in 'Sketch-Book'. As in the novel, her gaze, like the film's narrator's, focuses on objects related to the process of dissolution, such as the colliers washing themselves, the lovers in the tunnel, the prostitutes outside the tavern, the brawling men, Palmer the electrician and, ultimately, Gerald and his girlfriends. By subtracting the cuts which characterised earlier scenes, the film shows that she is going with her own flow, a flow which resembles Birkin's in terms of its style but differs from his in terms of its dissolute content. In its continuity editing and the parallel between the narrator's way of seeing and Gudrun's, the film generates analogues for her perverse way of seeing, a way of seeing which, as in the novel, focuses on objects associated with her perversity.

Ways of seeing characterised by the backwards zoom, the idiomorphism of the montages, the close-ups identified with a character's perspective, and the flowing camera movements of the continuity editing are used to narrate the film's adaptation of 'Water-Party' which, as in the novel, is the film's pivotal episode, or series of episodes. As in the novel, the duality of perception is marginalised by the film's focus on analogues for the novel's objective, alienated, animated way of seeing. These analogues are evident from the film's opening shot of the party at Shortlands. This opening shot takes the form of a backwards zoom from the miners' tug-of-war, as seen through the vertical bars of the railings. The backwards zoom illustrates the narrator's distance from the scene, a distance associated, in this first instance, with the conflict illustrated by the tug-of-war and symbolised by the bars through which this conflict is viewed. A military form of conflict is

personified by the soldier behind Ursula and Gudrun as they queue to enter Shortlands, and by the other soldiers inside, such as the soldier dancing in front of Hermione and Gerald from whom the camera again zooms back. The sense of conflict is also structurally incorporated into the narrative by the multiple perspectives which the scenes at Shortlands are seen from, perspectives commensurate with the military way of looking at scenes of war. The backwards zoom is repeated in the shot of Mr Crich seated with Winifred at the head of the table. In this case, the distancing effect of the shot expresses the narrator's distaste for Mr Crich's charitable policies, earlier criticised by Gerald, which seem to underlie the annual party. The distancing effect also pertains to Laura Crich, whose appearance precedes the backwards zoom. She is linked to the military via her marriage, so the camera's zoom is expressive of the narrator's alienation from the military and the conflict associated with it, an alienation evident in the backwards zoom which introduced the wedding scenes. Furthermore, this way of seeing can be mapped on to Mrs Crich's. She views the party from behind the glass window, as if she is permanently distanced from her husband and his milieu. This way of seeing, embodied by the backwards zoom, is an analogue for her way of seeing in the novel, a way of seeing produced, as the film indicates, by her isolation from her husband's milieu.

After the opening backwards zoom of Shortlands, there are five cuts in the narrative before the shot of Gerald and Hermione dancing. The shots between these cuts resemble the merry-go-round of sketches which introduce the party in the novel. The mechanical energy of these cuts, and the novel's merry-go-round itself, are illustrated by the actual merry-go-round behind Gerald and Hermione. The couple's circular way of dancing, which mimics the merry-go-round's mechanical energy and movement, accentuates this mechanical energy by imitating it. Their way of dancing in

a pattern which imitates the merry-go-round also personifies its mechanical energy, an energy which is stylistically incorporated into the narrator's way of seeing the first encounter at the party between Gerald and Gudrun. This first encounter is seen as a rapid series of cuts in which the narrator's perspective becomes identified with the characters' so, for example, the cut from Gerald's quizzical repetition of Ursula's "Get out?" to a reverse perspective of Gudrun watching him shows that the shot of Gerald is virtually Gudrun's point of view of him, and that the reverse perspective of Gudrun is virtually his point of view of her. The camera cuts back and forth from their virtual points of view of each other during their first dialogue, and illustrates their ways of seeing each other as close-ups. The technique is repeated during their dialogue on handling a canoe, in which he expresses his prophetic fear of someone drowning in the lake, and then offers to supply a tea basket for the sisters, an offer which draws a socially affected response from Gudrun. These alternating viewpoints in the second dialogue transcend the stichomythic conflict between the characters previously associated with the narrator's way of looking at them from such viewpoints. The similarity between the characters' ways of seeing each other, and the suggestive tones at the end of the dialogue, lay a foundation for a mutual revelation. This revelation becomes increasingly clear during the party, as it does in the novel, where it is openly manifested from 'Rabbit' onwards. In these sequences based on 'Water-Party', the narrator's fragmented viewpoint feeds itself into the characters', as it does at this stage in the novel, especially with regard to Gudrun. This way of seeing repeats the film's opening whirl of thumbnail images of the party, a repetition also evident in the novel. In its fracturing of the narrator's perspective into the montages of characters' points of view, the film creates clear analogues for the novel's fragmented, objective, animated way of seeing the party. In both media, this

idiomorphic way of seeing conveys a sense of metaphysical blockage at the party which is, in a firm echo of the novel, later depicted as a sort of underworld.

Lawrence's narrator's violent way of seeing Gudrun strike Gerald is expanded by the film's narrator. In the film, this way of seeing extends to the scene of her intimidation of the cattle, which is seen in a way similar to the film's narrator's way of seeing her strike Gerald, the scenes of the blow being seen in the same way as Lawrence's narrator sees them. The expansion of this way of seeing highlights certain parallels between Gerald and Gudrun. The way of seeing her intimidation of the cattle develops into a montage which resembles the montage of Gerald subjugating the mare. The opening shots of her intimidatory dance are seen from the narrator's perspective. As in the scenes of her earlier dialogue with Gerald, this perspective shifts into hers as she dances in a way which captivates and then frightens the cattle. This shift of perspective contains a sense of the conflict between Gudrun and the cattle, as the camera repeatedly cuts from her point of view of them to a reverse shot from their perspective of her. These cuts transform the dance into a confrontation, a confrontation in which Gudrun is seen to dominate. As the camera's upward gaze at Gerald illustrated his domination of the mare, and Gudrun's idealised domination of herself by him, the upward shots of her from the herd's point of view, and the downward shots of them from her point of view, illustrate her dominance of them, a dominance which reflects her future domination of Gerald. Gudrun's desire to dominate is bonded with an opposite need to submit, or to have violence inflicted on her, as her comment about the cattle to Ursula indicates. The regretful tone of her statement about the cattle not hurting her or her sister suggests a masochistic enjoyment of such pain. The impression that there is a deathly aspect to her behaviour is conveyed by the crossing of her arms as she dances, a gesture which imitates the one of her



crossing her arms on the grave at the wedding. The way of seeing her as a long-shot silhouette against the lake's milky white surface, framed by the trees, recreates a similar image of her from the novel's narration of the party and suggests that there is an aspect to her which makes her evanesce from the film's narrator's world into a different dimension, a dimension she shares with Gerald. The resemblance between the montages of Gerald dominating the mare and Gudrun dominating the cattle highlights this dimension of domination and submission which prevails between them.

The fragmented way of seeing these events, with their many cuts, is analogous to the flow of negative evolution Birkin discourses about in the novel. Conversely, the images of Birkin and Ursula together, such as the one following Birkin's and Gerald's appearance as Gudrun triumphs over the cattle, are mostly seen as a continuous shot, a way of seeing which is analogous to the positive flow of reality described by Birkin in the novel. This continuous shot cuts to a series of shots which depicts the slap Gudrun gives Gerald, the build-up to which is seen, as in the novel, in a number of shots from different perspectives. The switching between diverse perspectives reflects the violence of Gudrun's action, and the current of violence behind it. As the film's narrator sees her, Gudrun is clearly aroused by her domination of the cattle, and she seems equally aroused in the shot of her falling at Gerald's feet. Having dominated the cattle, she submits to him, a submission illustrated by a sequence of upward shots of him from virtually her point of view, and a sequence of downward shots virtually from his point of view of her. In these shots, at one stage, she averts her eyes and turns her head from his gaze, an action which points to his power as it shows that he 'sights' her, whereas in her submission, she does not always 'sight' him<sup>27</sup>. There is clearly an internal dialectic in Gudrun between domination and submission which is expressed by

the film's narrator's way of seeing. This dialectic is connected to her perception of Gerald. Her virtual perspective of him indicates her submission, and his virtual perspective of her indicates his domination; importantly, the narrator's alternation between these perspectives joins them as a series of fades rather than cuts. The fades illustrate a continuity or flow between these perspectives which suggests the strength of the couple's perverse, negative connection afforded by their dialectic of power and sight. Their mutual close-ups in this scene, and in previous scenes, suggest their lack of positive transcendence. Instead, the narrator's way of seeing the couple as silhouettes against the lake exemplifies their negative transcendence into the sort of ghostly dimension typified by the silhouette. This dimension is symbolised by the underworld of Beldover, an underworld earlier introduced by the silhouette of Gudrun at the end of the tunnel in the film's adaptation of 'Coal-Dust'.

In contrast to the cuts and shifts in perspective which narrate Gerald's and Gudrun's interaction, the narrator again sees Birkin and Ursula from a single viewpoint which pans with them as they walk by the lake. This shot fades into one of the lantern hanging from the boat, which pans to a medium close-up of Birkin and Ursula suffused with a golden light which Birkin says he notices emanating from Ursula. The continuous way of seeing them builds on the way they are previously seen, and underlines the impression that this way of seeing them is an analogue for Lawrence's narrator's way of seeing them feelingly, a way of seeing which, in both film and novel, is expressive of the positive, evolving flow of reality they try to follow.

This unitary point of view dramatically fragments in the film's narrator's way of seeing Tibs's and Laura's drowning, and the subsequent rescue efforts. The long shots of the lake's glassy,

nocturnal surface reflecting the party lights as it is seen from the narrator's point of view, first with Tibs in view as he searches for Laura, and second, after his disappearance, reaffirm the impression that the party belongs to the same dimension as Beldover. In the film, both the party and the Beldover of 'Coal-Dust' are shown illuminated at night, as if they are depictions of an underworld unlit by daylight. This impression is reinforced by Gerald's later comment to his father that there is a current 'as cold as hell' beneath the lake's surface. In the novel, the drowning is conjoined to a sense of regression in the narrative, and this sense is incorporated into these scenes in the film. Gerald's dive into the lake resembles the earlier one in the adaptation of 'Diver'. This regression is expressed stylistically as the scene is shot as a series of cuts from multiple perspectives which recalls the narrator's way of seeing many earlier parts of the film. Moreover, the acute fragmentation of the film's narrator's point of view imitates the novel's description of Gudrun's way of seeing Gerald as a series of frames during the rescue.

The analogues for Gudrun's way of seeing the scene of Gerald's rescue efforts are followed by analogues for the novel's way of describing the mystic connection between Birkin and Ursula. Under Mr Crich's direction, Birkin, followed by Ursula, goes to open the sluice. The cuts of Birkin winding up the sluice and of Ursula watching the water cut to a lengthy continuous close-up of Birkin and Ursula which pans with them as they talk. The narrator's way of seeing them is an expression of the transcendent love of Birkin's discourse. Ursula is opposed to this concept, and wants a more immediate and concrete love. As she insists on her concept of love, the couple stop as does the pan of the camera. The abrupt interruption of the gaze's motion, and of the motion of its objects, signals a blockage of the flow between Ursula and Birkin. This blockage is caused by Birkin's resignation of his transcendent ideals of love to Ursula's insistence on a

physical incarnation of such ideals, a resignation which leads to a loss of their mystic connection. This loss is illustrated by the narrator's way of seeing their sexual encounter as a series of cuts from one close-up to another. The continuous movement of the camera as it takes each close-up illustrates the physical excitement of their passion as reflected by the camera's voyeuristic gaze. The hardness of this passion replaces the couple's mystic connection, and this hardness is reflected in the film's narrator's way of seeing them, a way of seeing analogous to Lawrence's narrator's alienated and fragmented way of seeing which predominates in 'Water-Party'. In the novel, this way of seeing expresses the limitations of such passion, and the film emphasises these limitations by cutting from Birkin's and Ursula's sexual embrace to a shot of Tibs's and Laura's corpses, which resemble the bodies of Birkin and Ursula. The trompe l'oeil match cut from Birkin and Ursula to the corpses in the mud visualises the inverse course of physical passion which leads to a metaphysical death in the mud of the fleurs du mal. The film's juxtaposition of the two different ways of seeing Ursula and Birkin at the end of its adaptation of 'Water-Party' further demonstrates its development of analogues for the novel's main ways of seeing. These analogues are woven into a dialectic where they develop different and contradictory meanings as the narrative unfolds.

The film cuts directly to its adaptation of 'Gladiatorial' from the aftermath of the drowning and Birkin's and Ursula's lovemaking<sup>28</sup>, where we felt the tragic potential of living. By cutting directly from the party to the wrestling scene, the film omits a number of chapters. However, its juxtaposition of the débâcle of Birkin's and Ursula's lovemaking with Birkin's return to Shortlands to see Gerald suggests, as the novel does, that Birkin's closeness with Gerald is a reaction to the failure, in mystic or transcendent terms, of his intercourse with Ursula. It also

suggests that Gerald's sense of responsibility for the drowning isolates him, as Birkin's arrival interrupts his apparently lonely reverie.

The film sees the wrestling scenes differently from the novel in terms of form, but similarly in terms of function. The novel sees the men's interfusion of selves by looking at them as a mass of limbs from a unitary perspective. This way of seeing mirrors the wholeness of the experience depicted. Conversely, the film sees the scene of the wrestling as a series of shots. Each shot cuts to the subsequent one to form a montage, which incorporates a diversity of perspectives. This way of seeing is interlinked to other scenes in the film. The initial sequence of cuts from Birkin's virtual perspective of Gerald to Gerald's reverse perspective of Birkin as they discuss boxing and the martial arts reflects Gerald's repressed violence, a violence revealed in their dialogue. This way of seeing resembles the way of seeing which depicted Gerald's subjugation of the mare in the adaptation of 'Coal-Dust', Gudrun's domination of the cattle in the adaptation of 'Water-Party', and Gerald's and Gudrun's dialectic of submission and domination, also in the adaptation of 'Water-Party'. The association between conflicts and this way of seeing points to the conflict between Gerald and Birkin, a conflict emphasised by the resemblance between the narrator's way of seeing this scene, and other scenes of conflict. The sense of conflict is corroborated by the upward shot of Birkin as Gerald circles him, then strikes him. This shot recalls those of Gerald on the rearing horse from Gudrun's upward gaze, and those of Gudrun from the cattle's upward gaze. This way of seeing draws the conflict from the other scenes into the scene of the wrestling. The shots of Gerald circling Birkin, and of the characters whirling as they fight, especially in the montage of Gerald's bear hug of Birkin, also recall the circular motion of the merry-go-round, personified by Gerald's and Hermione's way of dancing. The suggestion of this motion indicates a

sense of exhaustiveness in their fight, similar to the exhaustiveness implied by the merry-go-round and the dance. The montage of Gerald's bear hug, which is introduced by an elevated crane shot, contains the same association between power and sight implicit in Gerald's and Gudrun's dialectic of submission and dominance. The bear hug results in Gerald being thrown by Birkin. After the throw, the camera cuts to a close-up of Birkin looking at Gerald. The close-up indicates Birkin's superiority, and highlights his gaze, which is fixed on Gerald. The close-up of Gerald getting up after being thrown shows him in a way similar to the way Ursula and Birkin are seen to make love. The camera moves with him in this close-up, as it did in the close-ups of Birkin's and Ursula's intertwined bodies. This way of seeing builds a sense of erotic excitement into the depiction of the wrestling, yet it is an eroticism so far associated with the conflict and passion of earlier scenes, rather than a more enduring connection suggested by the flowing way of seeing Birkin after Hermione's attack, and Birkin and Ursula before their lovemaking.

On the other hand, however, there is also an inherent flow in the men's physical interaction. This flow is conveyed by the choreographic elements of their combat, which turn it into a sort of dance. The sense of choreography is heightened by the close-ups of the characters' feet and legs, which were foreshadowed by similar close-ups of the spontaneous, improvised dancing at Breadalby. The flowing, positive connection between Gerald and Birkin which seems to have been produced by the physical closeness of their combat is evident in the way of seeing the climax to their wrestling, and in the climax per se. In its shot of the men's final embrace, the camera moves flowingly from an extreme facial close-up of them to a profile shot of their faces which shows Gerald's on top of Birkin's. The camera's flowing movement, adumbrated by its moving profile of the men's arms unfolding in unison from a grip on each other's throats, suggests that they attain a

Bergsonian condition of mutual becoming or evolution through their combat. This impression is strengthened by the content of the final images of the fight. The extreme close-up shot of the combatants face-to-face generates the expectation of a homo-erotic kiss, yet their contact transcends physical passion, as the unfolding of their arms in unison illustrates. The harmony of their motion, which again resembles a spontaneous, flowing dance rather than Gudrun's eurythmic dance of dominance, suggests an interfusion of selves, an interfusion inherent in the film's narrator's flowing way of seeing the climax to the wrestling. Conflict, it seems, has yielded love; the fragmentary, idiomorphic way of seeing the start of their conflict has produced the flowing cinema of its conclusion. This will happen again in 'Excuse'.

Aside from seeing the wrestling as a dance, there are other features in the adaptation which point to the men's mystic communion. Gerald's and Birkin's unique closeness is shown by the film's narrator's evocation of it as a ritualistic secular communion. Both men stand before the fireplace with a symbolic chalice - possibly the grail of the blutbrüderschaft of being single, clear, yet balanced which Birkin desires - placed on the ledge between them. In this context, the struggles of the wrestling scene, which, as we have seen, establishes a dialectical combination of hostility and togetherness within a common male warmth, are a metaphor for the quest of this mystic union. The balance of this union, vocalised by Birkin, is depicted in the symmetry of the shot of the two men lying side by side after the fight's climax, each one with an arm stretched out. Its dynamic warmth is also symbolised by the prevalence of the firelight which illuminates most of the scene, and by the fire itself in the close-up of the two men as Birkin discourses about swearing to be true to each other.

The novel, however, shows that the men's mystic union fails to endure, and the film's ways of seeing convey a similar meaning. After Birkin's discourse about swearing to be true, he and Gerald are seen as a series of close-ups from each other's virtual perspectives in a montage of shots. This montage illustrates a conflict between their personal philosophies of love which leads to divergence, a divergence implied by Gerald's comment about not using the same words as Birkin in their concluding dialogue on fulfilment. The divergence between them is illustrated by the way they are seen separately as close-ups from each other's point of view in this montage. The movement from communion to separation is symbolised by Gerald switching on the lights, an action which illuminates the scene with the modern energy of electricity rather than the ancient force of fire synonymous with their communion. This shift from communion to separation is also symbolised by Gerald's starched shirt, which he puts on at the same time as he resumes his social persona, and by the clipped, formal tone in which he asks "Would you like a bath?" Clearly, his appearance and behaviour undercut the sensual intensity of the wrestling, and signal his inability to lapse out enduringly, an inability counterpointed by Birkin's desire to do so.

The camera cuts from the final scene in the adaptation of 'Gladiatorial' to a scene that is adapted from 'Rabbit', but occupies the position of 'Threshold' in the novel's narrative. The cut from 'Gladiatorial' to 'Rabbit' emphasises the shift from the men's mystic communion to a parody of it. This parody takes the form of Gerald's and Gudrun's relationship, and of the relationships between the Crich family. The underlying violence of the Criches' military, industrial way of seeing is evident in the opening shot of Mrs Crich's perspective of the miners coming to see her husband. This perspective, which gives the impression of aiming at the figures on the driveway, is an analogue for her detached way of seeing described earlier in the novel. The film develops the



association between this way of seeing and the violence it implies by showing that Mrs Crich's gaze is a prelude to the dogs' violent attack on the men, an attack she facilitates by releasing the dogs and encouraging them to attack. The narrator's fragmented way of seeing the attack as a montage parallels the violence it illustrates. Moreover, the rapid shuttling of viewpoint seems to embody the perverse excitement of Mrs Crich's spectatorship. The connection between the dogs' attack and Mrs Crich's spectatorship is emphasised by the cut from the close-up of her gaze to the rapid close-up pan of one of the dogs running towards the men, and by the medium close-ups of her watching the spectacle of the attack. In the second montage of the attack, the camera shows images of the dogs' savagery as close-ups in which the camera moves with the viewed object, a way of seeing which reflects the spectator's excitement. However, Mrs Crich is not the only spectator. Gerald hears the attack and runs towards it but sees only its aftermath. Gudrun, however, sees the attack from start to finish. Their shared spectatorship is demonstrated in the second montage of the attack by the cut from the camera moving with the object of its optic to the shot of Gudrun watching the attack. The association of Gudrun's spectatorship with the nervous, fragmented way of seeing the violence parallels the association between her and the novel's way of seeing the passion of cruelty embodied by Gerald's subjugation of the rabbit. The film develops an analogue for her and the novel's nervous, excited way of seeing spectacles of violence, an analogue which foreshadows her spectatorship of Gerald. The idea that this scene, and its predominant way of seeing, parodies Gerald's and Birkin's communion is upheld by the problematisation of the relationship between Mr and Mrs Crich. She is embittered by his charitable acts, seeing them as a prioritisation of work over family, whereas he sees it as his duty to aid those who sustain his industry. Each way of thinking has culminated in a personal impasse. For Mrs Crich, her husband's prioritisation of work has distanced him from her, a distance

resulting in a repressed violence which bursts out in her release of the dogs; for Mr Crich, there is a personal enfeeblement linked to his sense of duty to industry, a duty which sees organic principles replaced by mechanical ones. The wheelchair symbolises the primacy of these mechanical principles, as it does in the case of Clifford Chatterley. The distance between the couple and their ways of thinking is illustrated by the left-to-right pan of Mr Crich as he arrives in the wheelchair. The camera pans with him and past him to Mrs Crich, showing a visible distance between them which is indicative of their mutual polarisation.

The oscillating point of view associated with Gudrun's excited, nervous spectatorship of the dogs' attack extends to the narrator's way of seeing her and Gerald in the next scene. The scene begins on the balcony of an ornamental building, like a folly, where Winifred tells Gudrun about Gerald's offer to transform the building into a studio. This shot cuts to a long-shot of the building, which depicts Gerald walking from behind the camera towards the balcony. The long-shot cuts to a close-up of Gudrun and Winifred, and to their perspective of Gerald below the balcony. Winifred takes Bismarck down to Gerald, and the camera cuts to what is now Gudrun's virtual perspective looking down on Gerald looking up at her. The angle of the shot recalls other shots of more overt, violent conflicts. Via this angle, the shot shows that Gudrun occupies the position of dominance in her relationship with Gerald. By setting the scene on a balcony, the film adds to the parodic appearance of their relationship, as the portrayal of a lover on a balcony belongs to the iconography of more traditional, albeit tragic love stories, such as that of Romeo and Juliet. This shot of Gerald reverses to one of Gudrun, taken virtually from his perspective of her. These shots become close-ups of each other. The identification between each character's perspective and the following close-up is an indication of their way of seeing each other as the camera sees them,

namely as close-ups. These close-ups also depict a meeting of the characters' eyes, a meeting in which they recognise a certain passion in each other. This passion is connected with the spectatorship of the other as a close-up, and with enjoying the master-slave dialectic. Although Gudrun currently seems dominant by virtue of her elevated position, the oscillation of perspective undercuts this impression by showing that the ability to sight the other, and hence to hold power over the other, alternates between them. This way of seeing is an analogue for the novel's way of seeing the scene of Gerald's subjugation of the rabbit from a nervous, oscillating point of view, depicting the way that Gerald and Gudrun see each other while living out the decadence of their master/slave dialectic.

The film cuts from the adaptation of 'Rabbit' to one of 'Excuse', thereby inviting a comparison between Gerald's and Gudrun's ways of seeing, and Birkin's and Ursula's. This comparison shows, as in the novel, an initial similarity between the ways of seeing which diffuses into a contrast. Lawrence's narrator develops the contrast after Birkin stops the car, an event which signals a shift from a fragmented way of seeing to a transcendent one. The film's narrator develops the contrast after the cessation of Birkin's and Ursula's argument, so the car, or motorbike and sidecar as it is in film, is of less significance. The film's way of seeing the build-up to their argument, and the argument itself, is analogous to the split between a fragmented way of seeing and a transcendent one which characterises the novel's narration of the initial stages of Ursula's and Birkin's interaction in 'Excuse'. The film's backwards zooms, and cuts from one shot to another, particularly in the shot/reverse shot sequence which shows Ursula asking Birkin why he gave her the rings, are commensurate with the novel's descriptions of Ursula's analytical way of looking and Birkin's montage-like conception of life. The zooms and cuts parallel the

film's treatment of Gerald and Gudrun, so by displacing this way of seeing on to Birkin and Ursula, the narrator points to the conflict between them. The similarity between the ways of seeing is heightened by Ursula's reaction to the gift of the rings which, in its social affectation, mirrors Gudrun's response to Gerald's offer of the tea basket at the party. This fragmented, detached way of seeing is tempered by its antithesis, embodied in the narrator's zoom to Ursula as she lovingly places her head on Birkin's shoulder. The zoom, with its unity of perspective, is an analogue for Ursula's way of seeing which, in the novel, is induced by the mystic communion between her and Birkin. However, the analogues for the opposite to this way of seeing predominate until the cessation of her argument with Birkin. These analogues, namely the backwards zoom, and the editing of the scene into cuts from shots taken from different perspectives, express the discord between the couple which is vocalised in their argument. Birkin's mention of Hermione, Ursula's angry retort that if he feels he belongs with Hermione, he should go to Shortlands with her, and the ensuing diatribe outlining her detestation of Hermione because of what she stands for, are accompanied by three backwards zooms. These zooms approximate the narrator's, and Birkin's, way of seeing her in the car at the beginning of 'Excuse'.

The film's way of seeing Birkin's approach to Ursula as she continues her diatribe is, in part, analogous to her transcendent way of seeing associated with the mystic communion in the novel. The left-to-right pan of Birkin walking to Ursula, who is by the tree, suggests a continuity of perception, symbolic of the mystic communion which develops later at the millhouse. The sense of continuity is amplified by the resemblance between the way of seeing this part of the scene, and the way of seeing Birkin's positive reintegration with an alienated part of himself in the adaptation

of 'Breadalby'. This sense of continuity is further amplified by the slow zoom in to Ursula as she denounces his behaviour, and by the way of seeing her slap him. The way of seeing Ursula's slap as a single shot from a unitary perspective illustrates an underlying togetherness between her and Birkin at the same time as it depicts a violent action which contradicts this togetherness. The opposition between form and content parallels the opposition between the characters, an opposition which, as it repels, also attracts. The sense of a dynamic, productive opposition is an analogue for the tension between the ways of being and seeing which characterises the climax to the couple's row in the novel. The series of shots and reverse shots from the couple's virtual perspectives as Ursula throws away the rings is a further analogue for the novel's way of seeing the climax. This series of shots realises Lawrence's narrator's cuts between close-ups of the couple's brows and eyes, a way of seeing which, in both film and novel, illustrates the antagonism between Birkin and Ursula.

After the climax to the argument, Ursula returns to place a flower over the rings in Birkin's hands. The flower is a symbol of their intimate communion, or star-equilibrium, an equilibrium evident in the film's narrator's way of seeing it. The continuous, flowing movement of the camera earlier in the scene is repeated in the right-to-left long-shot pan of the couple arriving at the millhouse, and in the continuous pans of the camera as it shows both Ursula and Birkin moving towards the fireplace in the house. These movements imitate the novel's portrayal of Ursula's transcendent way of seeing the world from a flowing perspective after the communion with Birkin. In the film, these flowing movements climax in her communion with him, a communion seen in the image of the dreamworld she perceives in the novel. The film's way of seeing the communion, and the transcendence it generates, illustrates the nature of the couple's communion. In front of the fire,

which symbolised a similar communion between Birkin and Gerald in the wrestling scene, Ursula and Birkin are shown as close-ups, but not from each other's perspectives. The close-ups, although fragmentary, generate an intimacy which is illustrated by the slow, continuous movement of the camera which moves slowly with Birkin as he bends to kiss Ursula. The sense of positive flow is perpetuated by the fade from this shot into the dream sequence. The dream sequence is an analogue for the couple's star-equilibrium and Ursula's transcendent perception. The dream sequence begins with a cut from Birkin moving on a downward axis to Ursula moving on an upward one. This cut develops into a slow-motion sequence of their hands touching, followed by an embrace. The development from cutting to continuity re-enacts a similar one earlier in the scene, and the conspicuous flow of the soft-focus slow-motion sequence emphasises the enduring, Bergsonian sense of becoming in their communion. The positive evolution of their communion is also evident in the continuous upwards flow of the camera.

As in the novel, the film counterpoints the ways of seeing in 'Excuse' with those in 'Death and Love'. Indicative of the predominant way of seeing in the adaptation of the latter chapter is the cut from 'Excuse' which introduces the opening shot of Gerald staring out of the window, a cut which contrasts with the flowing way of seeing the dream sequence at the end of 'Excuse'. The shot of Gerald's stare draws attention to this gaze, as does the right-to-left pan of the camera which follows his gaze as he looks at his father, Winifred and the nurse. This shot cuts to a closer one of his father, and then to a close-up, both virtually from Gerald's point of view. The film's provision of this point of view illustrates, as in the novel, that he forces himself to watch his father's slow death in a way which conspicuously lacks the sense of the sacred which we saw in

Ursula and Birkin in the previous scene. The close-up of Gerald with his father in the background as Gerald narrates the scene magnifies the link between the film's way of seeing and Gerald's.

The film's narrator cuts from this scene to the drawing room where he develops analogues for Gerald's sense of internal suspense, and for Lawrence's narrator's and Gudrun's way of seeing him. Gerald's fractured speech, and the fragmentation of the scene into shots from different angles suggest a metaphysical stilling of his life. Significantly, this fragmentation is modified into a right-to-left pan, which reverses to a left-to-right pan of him as he walks around the billiard table to Gudrun. The continuous pans, which indicated a flow between Ursula and Birkin, now adopt a contradictory meaning. The slowness of the pans articulates Gerald's psychological solidification at the realisation of the void within him, a void which he vocalises to Gudrun. The reversal in the direction of the pan illustrates the negative flow, or progressive devolution, which marks the emptiness of Gerald's existence. This emptiness is clearly visualised in the image of Gerald playing a shot over the virtually empty billiard table.

The shot also points to Gerald's loneliness, a loneliness evident in the way of seeing his interaction with his mother. The shot/reverse shot montage of Mrs Crich's dialogue with her son thematises the conflict and antagonism between them, suggesting a mutual mistrust among the Crich family which distances them from each other and prevents the contact Ursula and Birkin enjoy. The close-up of her gaze as she tells her son not to bother with his father because the death will see itself through portrays the detachment and sardonicism behind her way of seeing him and his father. Ultimately, her polarisation from her husband is depicted in her point of view of the trowel falling on to his coffin, a perspective which, taken with her laughter at dropping the trowel,

confirms her dissociation from him. In the drawing room, Gerald's and his mother's ways of seeing exhibit an alienated, perverse connection which parallels the connection he shares with Gudrun. The conclusion to the drawing room scene is viewed as a shot/reverse shot montage from Gerald's and Gudrun's virtual perspectives. The oscillation of perspective reflects the oscillation of the will to power and the will to submit between them. This oscillation is verbalised in their dialogue. Gerald tries to impose his will on Gudrun by having her driven home but ultimately accedes to her wish to walk, and accompanies her. As this montage parallels the preceding one between Gerald and his mother, it suggests that the common thread of Gerald's relationships, which makes them perverse and alienating, is his will to power. Moreover, this parallel implies that Gerald sees his mother as he sees Gudrun, namely as a sexual object. Seemingly, the difficulties of living with an absent mother who leaves the child feeling empty has made him compel affection, not only from his mother but from Gudrun, too.

The film's narrator's way of seeing the scene under the bridge maintains the contrast between 'Excuse' and 'Death and Love'. The close-up of the lovers (who resemble Gerald and Gudrun) kissing passionately is, in terms of form and content, the obverse of Birkin's and Ursula's embrace in the dream sequence. This close-up cuts to Gudrun looking at the lovers, revealing that the opening shot is not a depiction of Gerald and Gudrun, but a realistic idealisation of their passion as Gudrun sees it. This idealisation is emphasised by the repetition of Gudrun's point of view of the lovers, a shot which cuts to close-up of her and Gerald kissing. Echoing the close-up of the lovers, the shot indicates that Gudrun's idealisation is being realised. The realisation is further emphasised by the cut to the next close-up of Gerald and Gudrun kissing, which shows them from the same side as the camera showed the lovers. These close-ups are analogues for the novel's way



of seeing their sensationalistic kiss. Like Lawrence's narrator, the film's narrator sees the kiss statically, thereby illustrating the impasse of their passion, an impasse also suggested by the stasis of the final close-up of Gudrun being transported by Gerald's beauty. This impasse, which is interconnected with the characters' inverse development, is incorporated into the film's way of seeing Gudrun as a shadowy silhouette as she leaves Gerald. The silhouette is similar to those of her in 'Coal-Dust' and 'Water-Party', showing that she is still trapped in the same sadomasochism with Gerald.

Significantly, their passion precedes the scene of Mr Crich's death. This scene matches Gerald's profile with Mr Crich's, a match which indicates the transference of Mr Crich's physical death, itself an incarnation of living from negative centres of being, on to Gerald. The view of father and son as profiles in the opening shot relates to the image of Gudrun as a silhouette. The resemblance between the images suggests that such passion leads to death, a process hinted at by the chapter's title 'Love and Death'. The crystallisation of Gerald's life-force, paralleled by his father's physical death, which the novel illustrates by the fragmented way of seeing this scene, is represented by the film's fragmented way of seeing the scene, too. Furthermore, this crystallisation is discernible in the film's narrator's way of seeing the funeral. The funeral is seen as a series of fragments, but, like the billiard scene in the drawing room, it is also seen continuously. The continuous way of seeing takes the form of the upwards pan to the left which follows the close-up of Winifred crying. The camera continues to pan slowly left, filming the mourners as it moves through one hundred-and-eighty degrees, until it comes to Gerald and his mother. The band's funereal rhythm emphasises the pan's slowness, and this slowness captures the dissipation of Gerald's 'go'. This dissipation which, as in the novel, causes him to seek out Gudrun at her parents' home, is

207

symbolised by the fire. In contrast to the wrestling scene, the fire burns low prior to his departure. Other points of reference to earlier scenes also signify his decline. The close-up of his hand picking up and squeezing the clay from the grave is an inversion of the close-up of Birkin's hand holding the rings and the flower. The clay also betokens the outcome of Gerald's inverse course of evolution, a course which sinks into base elements, symbolised by the clay.

The shot of the Brangwens' house, which tracks him as he moves to the steps and up to the house itself, reverses the motion of the opening scenes which portrayed Ursula's and Gudrun's departure from the house. This reversal of motion adds to the general impression of inverse development attached to Gerald and Gudrun. Gerald's sense of emptiness is also symbolised by the image of the shadow he projects on entering the house. Gerald's loneliness, which is a corollary of this emptiness, is conveyed by the repeated identification of his gaze with the narrator's. This identification is exemplified by the initial outside perspective of the house, and his point of view of the sleeping Will Brangwen. The identification with the film's narrator and Lawrence's narrator points to the voyeuristic element of his way of seeing, and his dissociation within an alienating environment.

The scene in Gudrun's bedroom contains clear analogues for the close-ups of her eyes in the novel, and for her way of seeing Gerald as fragmented parts. Gerald's two virtual perspectives of Gudrun on the bed, intercut with two close-ups of his face, incorporates the fragmentation typical of the film's way of seeing them, and their ways of seeing each other. The medium close-up of Gudrun as she removes her night-dress perpetuates the contrast with 'Excuse' in its suggestion of a pornographic, posed nakedness. The contrast is underlined by the look on her face which

hints at her resentfulness at submitting to Gerald. Her gaze is foregrounded in the medium shot of Gerald moving towards the bed while she watches, and it is embodied in the following shot which enacts her point of view of him<sup>29</sup>. Her virtual perspective of Gerald is an analogue for her way of seeing him in the novel. It is an analogue which incorporates various aspects of her way of seeing. The temporal divisions which, in the novel, were implied by the ticking clock are evident in the ticking on the film's soundtrack, a ticking which emphasises the temporal divisions undergirding the spatial ones of her inherently fragmented way of seeing. The ticking replaces the crackling of the fire which accompanied the other main scene of one of Gerald's communions, namely his wrestling with Birkin. The substitution of the fire with the clock symbolises the diminution of Gerald's elemental connection with Birkin to a more mechanical one with Gudrun. In its stasis, Gudrun's perspective of Gerald reinforces the decline in them both that is associated with their ways of seeing. The clay Gerald takes from his boots is a visual emblem of this decline; as we have seen, it signifies his inverse return from an arresting in development to a baser condition.

The narrator's way of seeing the sustaining flow he receives from her goes against the flow itself. Kneeling before her, Gerald moves his hands from her face to her breasts, and puts his face on her cleavage and his mouth on her nipple. The camera zooms back as he places his hands on her breasts, prefiguring similar zooms after the climax to Gerald's and Gudrun's lovemaking and indicating, as in previous instances a detachment or polarisation from what is depicted. The fragmented way of seeing their lovemaking, interspersed with Gerald's flashbacks of his mother's laughter, also mitigates against the flow he receives from Gudrun, a flow again suggested by the second image of his mouth on her nipple. The conflict alluded to by this way of seeing is accentuated by the music accompanying the climax of their lovemaking, which recalls that of

209

Gudrun's dance of domination in the water-party. The fade to black which follows their climax illustrates the perverse flow of this climax; the fade suggests a continuity, but a continuity culminating in a void. Clearly, the couple's relationship is a perverse, black magic opposite of the blutbrüderschaft portrayed by the wrestling scene, a scene parodied by the elevated shot of Gerald asleep on Gudrun which mimics the symmetry between Gerald and Birkin after the climax to their wrestling. The three fades to the close-ups of Gudrun's face after the climax underline the sense of parody by showing that the flow of their lovemaking, a flow enacted by the fades, nullifies Gudrun into a wakeful consciousness. The nullification is portrayed by her face itself, and by the way of seeing it as a close-up, an image which contrasts with the soft-focus medium shots of Birkin's and Ursula's equilibrium. The inherent fragmentation in which this perverse flow culminates is also suggested by the repetition of the ticking clock on the soundtrack.

In the adaptation of 'Marriage or Not' which follows that of 'Death and Love', we see the consequence of this scene. The close-up of Gerald's eyes as he asks Birkin whether he should marry Gudrun is followed by a medium shot of Birkin with his back to Gerald, a shot which cuts back to a close-up of Gerald telling Birkin that he thought Birkin was keen on marriage. The cuts from the characters illustrate the conflict between them, and this conflict is highlighted by Birkin's sitting with his back to Gerald. The way of seeing them as close-ups, especially the close-up of Gerald watching Birkin, closely approximates to the novel's way of seeing them. Like Lawrence's narrator, the film sees them in a way related to the themes of the scene and the narrative. The fact that they are seen as reflections during Birkin's discourse on the non-mystic form of marriage illustrates the lack of dimensionality associated with this form of marriage. This way of seeing contrasts with the way of seeing them as unreflected images of themselves foregrounded against

the reflected images while Birkin argues that there is another vital relationship beyond that of a man and a woman, namely that of a man and a man. The primacy of the unreflected images connected with this dialogue prioritises the blutbrüderschaft, imitating the novel's description of Gerald's initial point of view of the blutbrüderschaft as a precursor to a mystic bond with a woman. The way of seeing the characters as close-ups of a face, and a symmetrical reflection of the same face, from their virtual perspectives of each other balances the reflected image with the unreflected one. It is a way of seeing which depicts the men as a double image. In this double image, the symbolic value of each half of the image changes, so that the actual image is connected with their present selves, and with their relationships with Gudrun and Ursula which is the subject of their conversation. The reflected image, because it is displaced, symbolises the part of them related to Birkin's blutbrüderschaft which he is proposing to Gerald.

After Gerald's denial of the blutbrüderschaft, Birkin sees him as an image of his face minus the reflected image associated with the blutbrüderschaft. Conversely, Gerald's perspectives of Birkin are characterised by seeing an actual image of Birkin and a reflected one, despite his denial of the blutbrüderschaft associated with the reflected image. Gerald's way of seeing, which suggests the duality of the man-woman man-man relationships, is contradicted by his verbal denial of the blutbrüderschaft, a denial which disappoints Birkin. The tension between what he sees and says adds to the sense that he represses his bond with Birkin, as he did at the end of the wrestling scene.

The flow incorporated into the structure of the invented scene at Birkin's millhouse and which is symbolised by the stream is equally evident in the narrator's way of seeing the adaptation of 'A

Chair', which is preceded by the scene at the millhouse. There are only two cuts in the adaptation of 'A Chair', making the narrator's way of seeing the characters largely continuous. The camera cuts from the opening medium shot of Ursula and Birkin discussing the chair to a long, flowing shot which follows them down the steps, stopping as they stop to disagree, and continuing with them as they agree to a less material way of living. The flowing way of seeing is an analogue for the couple's evolutionary way of living, a way of living which, as Lawrence's narrator sees it in this chapter, is opposed to the tyranny of fixity. However, the film's analogue for the tension between Ursula's and Birkin's utopias differs from the novel. Lawrence's narrator illustrates the tension between the characters and their utopias with close-ups of their faces and eyes. The film's narrator illustrates this tension by backing away from the characters' approach to the camera as Birkin discusses his need for other people in his utopia. As opposed to the zoom into Birkin and Ursula as she kisses him in the previous scene, this way of seeing expresses a maintenance of the narrator's distance from the characters, a distance which is mapped on to the couple and reflects the tension between their opinions. The form of the film's narrator's way of seeing contradicts Lawrence's narrator's, yet it similarly conveys the ongoing tension between them.

In 'Flitting', as we shall see, the analogue for Gudrun's way of seeing is her sculpture of Gerald which typifies her mocking perception of reality. The cuts from the close-ups of Gudrun sculpting Gerald's bust to the medium shots, in reverse perspective to these close-ups, of Ursula toasting the bread reflects the conflict between them, vocalised in their discussion of Gerald. This conflict is highlighted by the contrast between their actions. Ursula is making food whereas Gudrun is mockingly sculpting her bust of Gerald. These actions recall the contrast between them in 'Sisters', where, despite an apparent picture of consanguineous unity, Lawrence's narrator depicts

Ursula stitching creatively while Gudrun angrily erases her drawing; the differences between the two actions mirror the sisters' differences. These differences permeate much of the novel, as they do in the film where, at this stage, they are illustrated by the points of view and reverse points of view which fragment the film's narrative. Significantly, Ursula's discourse about the men's brotherly relationship, and her affection for Gerald, is narrated as a continuous pan which develops into a medium shot of her and Gudrun either side of Gerald's bust. The continuity of the film's narrator's way of seeing illustrates Gerald's and Rupert's brotherliness which is one of the subjects of Ursula's discourse. Gudrun's relationship with Gerald parodies the latent sacredness of this brotherliness, and her way of seeing parodies the flowing, continuous way of seeing which characterises the film's narrator's perception of Ursula's and Birkin's mystic communion. Gudrun's way of seeing is epitomised by the bust of Gerald, which is an incarnation of her way of seeing him as an ugly diminution of his physical self. The crystallisation of perception associated with this way of seeing is evident in the form of her sculpture. The mockery embodied by the bust is also represented by her laughter which accompanies her insertion of the fettling tool into its mouth. The sense that she sees in terms of frames or fragments of a flow is conveyed after Ursula's departure by the ticking of the clock whose chronometric divisions, as in earlier scenes, parallel the spatial fragmentation implicit in her way of seeing, and in the narrator's way of seeing Ursula and Gudrun during their disagreement over Gerald's intentions for the Christmas holiday.

The film's ways of seeing in its adaptation of 'Snow' and 'Snowed up' convey the expressiveness common to its ways of seeing and the novel's. As in previous loci, the film's narrator zooms backwards from the opening shot of the sleigh. This backwards zoom is the first of several which suggest a detachment from the Alpine environment and the unnatural feelings it stimulates in the

characters. After this zoom, the film's narrator develops an analogue for Gerald's kinetic way of seeing Gudrun at the beginning of 'Snow'. This analogue takes the form of the camera's shot of the sleigh as it arrives at the hotel. The sleigh moves between the camera and the mountain and, as it does so, the camera follows the sleigh in a freestyle, handheld manner, the energy of which indicates the negative, kinetic alpine energy underlying Gerald's and Gudrun's mutual polarisation. This energy drives the transformation Gudrun outlines in her discourse about being transformed on foreign soil, a transformation which leads to an overt manifestation of violence in the form of the characters' snowfight. 'Letting go' becomes a conflict, albeit a comic one, which realises Gerald's fear of a universal 'letting go'. The negative transformation into conflict generated by 'letting go' is reflected by the narrator's way of seeing the fight. As with previous instances of non-transcendental conflict, this one is seen as a montage of shots taken from different perspectives. The film's narrator's detachment from this conflict is again captured by the backwards zoom which introduces it after Birkin's urging to let go together.

The negative energy, and the release of it which generates conflict, is clearly portrayed by the content of the film's adaptation of the Reunionsaal scenes, and the way this content is seen. The adaptation conflates the novel's way of seeing with that of Gudrun to depict these scenes as a montage. As in the novel, this montage represents the shrapnelled energy released in the characters, and it also illustrates the characters' alienation from one another. The action depicted by the montage contains two prime examples of the conflict associated with it. The medium close-up of Gudrun and Leitner shows them pausing in their dance. Loerke enters the shot and, as Gudrun turns away, he violently elbows Leitner. The shot of Ursula and Birkin kissing shows Gerald and his new-found dancing partner colliding with them. Given Birkin's response,



“Missed!”, to Gerald’s next effort at a collision, the dance becomes a friendly conflict which manifests the release of energy incarnated by the snowfight, a release of energy conveyed by the way both the snowfight and the dance are seen. Significantly, the main spectator of the dance, along with the film’s narrator, is Loerke. From the initial shot of the camera moving through the dancers to a close-up of his gaze, there are six further cuts to close-ups of him watching which, as they cut to the dance, identify this perspective too with Loerke’s. Gudrun’s gaze at the object (Loerke) left of the shot after this first close-up shows that the main focus of this perspective, a perspective which is virtually Loerke’s, and possibly Leitner’s, too, is Gudrun. Gudrun’s perspective is not given, but the reciprocation of Loerke’s gaze creates a line of sight between them which groups Loerke’s and Leitner’s way of seeing with hers and Gerald’s. The opposition of this visual and ultimately alienating connection to the organic pulse of the blutbrüderschaft is indicated by Loerke’s noiseless rhythmic clapping which embodies the mechanical principle of his gaze. Ursula’s and Birkin’s relationship, and the ways of seeing associated with it, are thematically antithetical to this mechanical principle, an antithesis encapsulated by the continuous way of seeing them as a close-up as they kiss and dance after Gerald’s failed attempt to collide with them. The continuous moving close-up, which alludes to the positive energy between Birkin and Ursula, contrasts with the slow zoom in to a close-up of Gerald kissing Gudrun on her neck, and then on her mouth in the following scene<sup>30</sup>. The scene is adapted from the scene where Gudrun brushes her hair, watched by Gerald. The film’s narrator’s close-up of their kiss is an analogue for their sensationalistic way of watching each other, the perpetual imbalance of which is conveyed by Gerald kissing Gudrun on the neck. His action belongs to the iconography of the vampiric, illustrating his need to draw energy from her as he did in the adaptation of ‘Death and Love’.

In turn, this way of seeing is counterpointed by the film's narrator's way of seeing Ursula and Birkin in the following scene. Their dialogue verbalises Birkin's impression that, without Ursula, the quick of his life would be killed by the actual and symbolic cold of the alpine environment. As he begins to speak, the camera zooms slowly back to an elevated shot of him and Ursula. His expression of his need for her sees a reversal of this zoom as the camera moves in to a close-up of their clasped hands. The outwards and inwards movement of the film's narrator imitates the pulse of life between Ursula and Birkin which is expressed by their dialogue. This pulsating way of seeing is an analogue for Lawrence's narrator's close-up of their kiss, an action which becomes a handclasp in the film. This handclasp is reminiscent of the one at the end of the wrestling scene, and as in the novel, it is an action which is far richer than Gerald's and Gudrun's sensationalistic interactions.

The warmth and intimacy of Ursula's and Birkin's bed gives way to the mountain snow in the following scene. The scene is an adaptation of the tobogganing scene in 'Snow', and the film's narrator develops an analogue for the impersonal way of seeing which predominates between Gerald and Gudrun in this scene. The long shot of the couples' arrival at the top of the slope, and the medium long shot of Gerald and Gudrun heading towards the camera which becomes a long shot of them heading away from the camera as they toboggan down the slope, expresses the narrator's detachment from them, a detachment which parallels the growing sense of alienation between them. Their point of view of the snow from the toboggan during its rapid descent is an analogue for their perception of motion in the novel. Gudrun's ecstatic response to this motion is depicted by the close-up of her in the snow, a close-up which is also an analogue for Lawrence's

narrator's close-up of her eyes at this juncture. Her arousal is triggered by the motion, and the impersonality of this arousal is evident in the film's backwards zoom from Gerald and Gudrun as he asks, "Was it too much for you?" This backwards zoom is not balanced by a compensatory zoom in, as it was in the case of the preceding bedroom scene featuring Ursula and Birkin. Given Gudrun's emotional distance from Gerald, the absence of the compensatory inwards zoom turns the narrator's way of seeing into a parallel incarnation of Gudrun's way of seeing Gerald. Her distant, mocking way of seeing is related to Loerke's, too. His virtual point of view of Gerald and Gudrun making their way to the top of the slope reverses to a shot of him laughing, which zooms back from him as he and Leitner ski away from the camera. The juxtaposition of his virtual point of view with his laughter infuses his gaze with the mockery associated with Gudrun's way of seeing in the adaptation of 'Flitting'. Furthermore, his virtual point of view of Gerald and Gudrun is distant from the objects of his gaze. This distance illustrates the voyeuristic detachment of his way of seeing which, to judge from the photogravure of his sculpture and his sketch of Gudrun in later scenes, is central to the art he produces and his artist's way of seeing.

The close-ups which exclusively mediate Gudrun's and Loerke's first dialogue point to the resemblances between their ways of seeing. The sequence begins with a close-up commensurate with Ursula's and Loerke's points of view of Gudrun behind the bars of the bannister, and reverses to a shot of Ursula and Loerke virtually from her perspective. The bars, as in previous scenes, symbolise the fundamental division between subject and object implicit in seeing as Loerke and Gudrun do. The fragmentation associated with this way of seeing intensifies after their realisation that they are both artists. The close-up of Gudrun watching through the bars after Ursula has told Loerke that her sister is an artist cuts to a close-up of Loerke asking, "What do

you do?" This close-up cuts to one of Gudrun as she says, "I'm a sculptress". The ensuing sequence of close-ups virtually abstracts Ursula, and, in the alternating perspectives of Loerke's and Gudrun's faces, the sequence implies that they see each other as these close-ups. Through its stichomythia, this series of close-ups also reflects the antagonism of their dialogue in which Loerke taunts Gudrun about her art being nothing more than 'knick-knacks for the rich' compared with his art, which is a product of the vicissitudes he has suffered. The way of seeing each other as close-ups from an arrested perspective is an analogue for their ways of seeing each other at this juncture in the novel. The film emphasises the novel's fragmentation of the scene into close-ups by adding the close-up of Loerke's feet stamping on the table to exemplify the acts of labour of his discourse, the close-up of Loerke's hand flicking the ash, and the close-up of the ash landing on Ursula's food. This ash pictorially represents the poverty of shitting in public which he recalls in his discourse. More importantly, the close-up of the hand is an analogue for Gudrun's close-up of Loerke's prehensile-like hands at this point in the novel.

The association between Gudrun's and Loerke's ways of seeing and the close-up condenses in the following scene in Loerke's bedroom which, apart from the opening shots of the sisters' entrance, is again narrated exclusively in close-ups. This way of seeing is central to their art, as the synchronicity of the alternating close-ups of Gudrun and Loerke with their dialogue on art in the previous scene demonstrated. Loerke's photogravure of his sculpture of the girl and the horse, and the stiffness of the horse itself which Ursula criticises, are embodiments of this way of seeing as stills, as they are in the novel. Gudrun's point of view shot of the photogravure as she picks it up and looks at it closely is a realisation of this way of seeing too, as it shows that she looks at the photogravure as a close-up. The close-ups of Loerke's and Gudrun's reactions to Ursula's

criticism of the sculpture are analogous to the novel's close-up of Loerke's eyes, which suggest the accuracy of her criticism. The close-up of Gudrun's eyes widening with arousal as she listens to Loerke's tale of beating the model illustrates her attraction to the sort of sadomasochism she enjoys with Gerald. The reverse close-up of Loerke as he confirms that he did beat the model connects her way of seeing as close-ups with her enjoyment of the sadomasochism Loerke narrates. The montages of close-ups which narrate the scene in the foyer and the scene in Loerke's bedroom are counterpointed by the way of seeing Ursula and Birkin in the following scene. The long shot of Ursula in the snow pans from left to right to show Birkin smoking. Both characters are kept in shot as Ursula makes her way through the snow to Birkin. The film's way of seeing evokes the continuity of the ways they are seen in previous shots. This continuity is underlined by the fact that there is only one cut in this scene. The perceptual continuity expresses the unity of the characters, a unity verbalised in their dialogue. Ursula dislikes the unnaturalness of the snow and the feelings it catalyses. She happily agrees to Birkin's proposal to go to Verona, a place which, with its association with Romeo and Juliet, symbolises the romance of the slow-motion oneiric sequence adapted from 'Excuse'. The concluding image of Ursula lying on Birkin as they kiss and embrace is emblematic of this unity which is also represented by the way they are seen.

This unity is conspicuously absent between Birkin and Gerald, and its absence is illustrated by the narrator's way of seeing their concluding dialogue. The men are seen walking towards the camera as Gerald outlines the completeness of his experience with Gudrun, and his subsequent hatred of her. His discourse is interspersed with flashback images emblematic of Gudrun's solipsistic, emasculating ecstasy. His hatred of her does not facilitate a rapprochement with Birkin, however,

as he questions Birkin's reiteration of his love for him. The emotional distance between the men is paralleled by the maintenance of the camera's distance from them. As they approach the camera, it backs away, maintaining its distance from them as in Ursula's and Birkin's disagreement over the chair. The lack of unity is also suggested by the fragmentation of what would otherwise be a continuous shot of them by the flashback images of Gudrun. This fragmented way of seeing them contrasts with their unity at the end of the adaptation of 'Gladiatorial'. The film's way of seeing them is an analogue for Gerald's numbed, distant way of seeing Birkin during their farewell in 'Snow'. In the novel, the distance implicit in this way of seeing is incorporated into Birkin's final cinematographic perspective of Gerald and Gudrun as he sees them from the sleigh. The film's narrator clearly develops an analogue for this perspective which is incarnated in his perspective from the sleigh of Gerald and Gudrun watching Ursula's and Birkin's departure. The distance between the couples portrayed by this perspective is symbolic of the divergent processes of positive and negative evolution they are living out.

The film's expressiveness continues to be evident in the adaptation of 'Snowed Up'. Its way of seeing Gerald's and Gudrun's dialogue on love is particularly expressive, as it shows Gerald troubled by his inability to love and Gudrun glorifying in an apparent ability to do so, an illusion she uses to torture him into saying he loves her. The narrator sees this dialogue from a static point of view, which illustrates the impasse the couple have reached in their relationship. This impasse, in which her torture appears to have psychically murdered Gerald, is exemplified by the way they make love, and the way they are seen to do so<sup>31</sup>. After she torments him, she goes to his bed to seduce him. As she lies on top of him, the camera zooms back in a parody of its continuous way of seeing the scene of Ursula's and Birkin's dialogue about leaving for Verona. The backwards

zoom is emblematic of their alienation, an alienation evident in the way Gudrun makes him make love. She has to take his hand and put it on her back to initiate what is seen as a deathly, violent series of moments. After Gerald rolls on top of her, the scene develops into a montage of points of view and reverse points of view. In this montage, Gudrun's first point of view of Gerald depicts him as an impassive and glassy-eyed embodiment of the psychic death she has wrought in him. This point of view reverses to his perspective of her rolling her head in a shot emblematic of her sadomasochistic, and ultimately divisive pleasure. As he penetrates her, he pins her to the bed and violently makes love to her. He seems impervious to these moments of pleasure, as her points of view of his face indicate. By contrast, his points of view of her show that the violence and detachment of his actions make her climax. These perspectives recall those of Gerald whipping the mare, and suggest he has been similarly sadistic towards Gudrun, a sadism she has enjoyed. The shared alienation of this sadomasochism is depicted by the way of seeing each other as close-ups, and by the fade to black as she climaxes. Compared with the oneiric way of seeing Ursula's and Birkin's communion, the fade illustrates the non-transcendental outcome of Gerald's and Gudrun's sadomasochism.

The way of seeing the above scene as close-ups is also used to narrate the scene of Gudrun's disclosure to Loerke about her unmarried status. In this scene, the close-ups are analogues for the novel's way of seeing this scene as close-ups from the narrator's perspectives and the characters'. The scene begins with Loerke's binocularised perspective of Gerald skiing, a perspective which epitomises the distance he maintains between himself and others. This distance is also illustrated by his colourful caricature of Gudrun which he sketches during the scene. Perspective switches around the three characters after Gerald's arrival in a depiction of the tension between Gerald and

Gudrun, and between Gerald and Loerke. After Gerald's departure, these close-ups, as in the scenes in the foyer and Loerke's bedroom, are also used to depict Loerke's and Gudrun's voyeuristic, detached viewpoints of each other which are typical of their art and which connect them. Close-ups are also used to narrate the scene of Gudrun's and Loerke's play-acting, which appears to be adapted from their sentimental, mocking shows of the past. These close-ups, the rhythm of which is emphasised by the accompanying music, reflect the energy and perversity of Gudrun's and Loerke's spectatorship. The spectacular appeal of objects is shown by Gudrun's make-up, their costumes, and the flamboyant, mechanical energy of their dances. Implicitly, this way of seeing divorces the subject from the object on a positive, fundamental level, a divorce again symbolised by the bars of the bedstead through which Loerke gazes at Gudrun. The opposition of their relationship to other communions in the film's narrative is symbolised by the candle at the end of the scene which suggests a diminishment in the fire of these communions to a parodic, miniature flame. The fade to black with which the scene concludes shows that the sensational experiences they enjoy by gazing spectacularly at each other culminate in the same negativity as Gudrun's lovemaking with Gerald. The divisiveness of this negativity, which is symbolised in this scene by the bars, is expressed in the following scene by the close-ups of Gerald and Gudrun after their argument about Loerke. The alternation of close-ups between Gerald trying Gudrun's locked door to Gudrun sighing in relief against the other side of the door to Gerald's concluding statement, "It may be over between us, but it's not finished" emphasises the division between them, a division symbolised by the barrier of the door.

Significantly, the instances of continuity in the film's way of seeing the adaptation of 'Snowed Up' occur in the final scenes of the adaptation of this chapter. These final scenes commence with



a mixture of close-ups and pans of Gudrun and Loerke as they play, drink, and converse in the snow. The pans of Gudrun dancing and Loerke following her during their dialogue about her destination illustrate a sort of harmony that seems to have arisen between them as a result of their perverse behaviour. This harmony is amplified by Loerke's suggestion that she should come to Dresden with him. The sense of togetherness, however perverse, is interrupted by Gerald's arrival. His disembodiment - he is out of shot when Loerke sees his arrival - and the mechanical motion of his hand, a motion embodied by the way he walks in later shots, confirm his intrinsic death that was conveyed in the shots of his perverse lovemaking to Gudrun. The perversity of this deathly, violent lovemaking is reaffirmed by the shots of him and Gudrun as he strangles her, shots which resemble the montage depicting their earlier intercourse. The film's perspective of him walking mechanically away through the snow merges with Gudrun's in the cut from her face in the snow as she sits up to the shot of him becoming a distant speck. This way of seeing is an analogue for the narrator's long-shot point of view of Loerke and Gudrun in the snow. In both film and novel, this perspective represents the distance Loerke and Gudrun maintain from others, a distance the film incarnates in Gudrun's perspective of Gerald. The continuity of the film's narrator's way of seeing Loerke and Gudrun re-emerges in his way of seeing the scenes culminating in Gerald's death. These scenes, which consist of a variety of close-ups and long-shots fade to the next one in the sequence. The only cut is to Gerald's flashback shot of Gudrun's silhouette which is emblematic of her solipsism, a solipsism which isolates him and drives him to his death. The continuity generated by these fades suggests a harmony between the film narrator's way of seeing and the object of his gaze, namely Gerald. This harmony is part of the power the shots exert on the viewer's sympathy, and they also seem to symbolise a harmony between Gerald and his environment. The harmony between Gerald and the snow suggests his

assimilation into a frozen state which is the culmination of his way of living and his way of seeing. The final images of him removing his glove and hat to curl into a foetal position in the snow highlight this assimilation in their suggestion of Gerald's death into his natural, frozen condition. The final backwards zoom of him, by virtue of its transformation of his body into a component of the landscape, further strengthens the evocation of his death as a crystallisation of a negative life-force which naturally solidifies.

The film narrator's continuous way of seeing Gerald's demise contrasts with his way of seeing in the adaptation of 'Exeunt'. The film's opening scene of this chapter is a series of cuts between Ursula and Gudrun during their dialogue about Ursula's return and Gudrun's plans. The narrator's close-up of Gudrun illustrates her impassiveness about Gerald's death, an impassiveness she exhibits in the novel. The film narrator's way of seeing this opening scene as a montage runs counter to his way of seeing Birkin's contemplation of Gerald's frozen corpse. The camera pans from a close-up of Gerald's face as Birkin's hand touches it across the candles to a close-up of Birkin's tear-stained face. This continuous way of seeing both men as close-ups is an analogue for the novel's description of Birkin's empathetic connection with Gerald. By panning across the candles, it incorporates the fire of the *blutbrüderschaft* into Birkin's perception of him, although this fire is greatly reduced compared to the fire which illuminated the wrestling scene. The film also develops an analogue for Birkin's material way of seeing Gerald as a mass of matter. Its penultimate shot of Birkin's vigil is a medium shot of Gerald's frozen corpse with Birkin and Ursula at either side. Compared with the intimacy and continuity of the opening close-ups, the larger scale of this shot distances the narrator from the characters and diminishes the emotional impact of Birkin's tears. The film's way of seeing the characters mirrors the novel's description of

Birkin's way of seeing Gerald's corpse, a way of seeing which in both film and novel has lost the sense of the blutbrüderschaft. Seemingly, the focus of this mystic communion is now on Birkin's relationship with Ursula, as the next scene demonstrates.

The opening shot of this scene is a medium shot of Birkin and Ursula sitting either side of the fire. The symmetry of the shot, which echoes the symmetry in the penultimate shot of the preceding scene, suggests that main theme of the shot is the mystic communion between Birkin and Ursula, a communion repeatedly symbolised by the fire which, in this instance, the narrator sees between them. However, the stichomythic montage of shots from the characters' virtual points of view of each other subverts this communion by fragmenting the narrative flow, a fragmentation which reflects the tension of their dialogue about types of love. Birkin reiterates his need for an eternal friendship with a man, a need Ursula believes to be a perversity. The extreme close-up of Birkin as he states his faith in the two kinds of love and the extreme close-up of Ursula as he does so dramatically portray the conflict between them, a conflict illustrated by the way they are seen as such close-ups rather than as a continuous image. The final extreme close-up of Ursula freezes into a still which the credits run over. This freeze-frame of her points to a stilling in her relationship with Birkin which arises from their disagreement over Birkin's need for a male friend, a disagreement which points to a lack between her and Birkin.

In conclusion, we may say that this analysis of the film's analogues for the novel's ways of seeing serves to focus attention back on the novel's style:

Russell's *Women in Love* is not a pure translation from the novel, nor is his treatment of the characters completely unaltered; but the film provides masterful and penetrating insight into Lawrence's themes, and it enriches our appreciation of the beauty and complexity of the style of both artists.

(Gomez, 1976, 87)

Lawrence himself thought that he had written the novel in a new style which turned it into 'a novel in a foreign language I don't know very well' (Young, 1999, 167). An intrinsic part of this new style is its stress on ways of seeing. For critics of Lawrence, the prime value in conducting this analysis into the film's analogues for the novel's ways of seeing is to highlight Lawrence's new emphasis on style, an emphasis corroborated by the general Modernist accentuation on the way a story is told and the frictional to-ing and fro-ing which particularly characterises the style of *Women in Love*. For film critics, the appeal of my analysis will centre on the film's visual and philosophical re-creation of a great novel. However, the re-creation is made possible by Lawrence's interest in language and form. His interest in these areas generates the ways of seeing central to the style of *Women in Love*, ways of seeing which ultimately become tropes of Modernism and Postmodernism.

## Notes

1. Frequently, the size of Hermione's head is referred to, as is the length of her face. Such repeated attention distorts the head and face and suggests that she is the victim of a cerebral process of disintegration which is 'the reverse of that epitomised by the African carving which is so 'weighty' below the loins' (Daleski, 1965, 138).

2. The attack with the paperweight reveals the inherent destructiveness of Hermione's character and the society to which she belongs (Daleski, 1965, pp.141-143). The symbolism of the attack is also contained in the instrument of attack. Hermione's weapon is crystalline and, as Howe asserts, the crystal is the allotropic form of water which, at one end of the spectrum of disorder, represents the 'mystery of ice-destructive knowledge, snow-abstract annihilation... Arctic annihilation [corresponds] to isolation' (Howe, 1977, 55).

3. Birkin's drawing appears to be based on a framework of autobiography. Lawrence, in his youth, was renowned for copying paintings (Maddox, 1994, 431).

4. Linda Williams thoroughly analyses Gerald's picturesqueness (Williams, 1992, 84).

5. Linda Williams was the first critic to analyse the cinematic elements of Gudrun's way of seeing at this point (Williams, 1992, 89). The inspiration for much of what I have written has come from her work. I have tried to develop her ideas to show the social criticism implicit in seeing as Gudrun does. It is true that, at times, Lawrence's way of writing may turn him, in the words of Linda Williams, into one of the monsters of vision he inveighs against; but more usually, they add

to his repertoire of social commentary by facilitating further, apposite expressions of a particular cultural climate.

6. The fact that Gudrun 'performs' implies a predisposition to willed, premeditated actions and responses which, according to Balbert, are her main concerns (Balbert, 1988, 93).

7. Gudrun's intimidation of the cattle might be an inversion of her fear of them, just as her aggressive desire for Gerald is an inversion of her fear of his power over her. If she is subconsciously afraid of them, her desire to chase them shows her 'sex in the head', that is, her need to relate not to the lower self but the upper centres like will and consciousness, a mentalised desire which Lawrence explains in *Fantasia* (FU, 171).

8. The fragmented way of seeing the characters separately in this scene shows the degeneration into isolation and conflict that is taking place (Hough, 1956, 83): (Holderness, 1982, 216).

9. As Howe says, Gerald's time with Gudrun precipitates a lack of control which seems to lead to Diana's death (Howe, 1977, 76).

10. As Harry Moore has observed, this repetition, which sometimes gives the effect of a backwards-running film, is one of the novel's cinematic elements (Moore in Gomez, 1976, 81).

Lawrence was aware of this repetition, arguing that it was linked with expressing natural crises in emotion, passion or understanding (WL, 486). A similar form of repetition, as outlined by

Raymond Bellour, a prominent film theorist, is also integral to the way narrative film functions (Stam, Burgoyne et al, 1992, 55).

11. The visit to Birkin, and the warmth he feels towards Birkin in this image, is part of his dependency on others. This visit foreshadows his increasing dependency on others, particularly Gudrun, and it is a dependency which ultimately kills him as he dies once she withdraws her support (Schneider, 1984, 184).

12. Leavis reckoned that the jargon surrounding Ursula's and Birkin's transcendence meant that Lawrence was uncertain 'whether a valid communication ha[d] really been defined and conveyed in terms of his creative art' (Leavis, 1955, 155). Although this thesis takes no account of Lawrence's alleged use of jargon at this stage, Lawrence clearly communicates Ursula's and Birkin's experience via an intelligible set of images.

13. This is the first of several sexual conjunctions between them which lead to fulfilment for one, but not the other. Ultimately, sex reveals their polarisation from each other (Schneider, 1984, 184). As Lawrence says, such sexual encounters are clearly a form of false coition which culminate in 'disintegration' (*FU*, 107).

14. The iciness of the cocktail incarnates Gudrun's cool, detached gaze: 'In *Women in Love*' character is conceived as being allotropic. Because the image is essentially materialistic, personality tends to behave like substance... fluidity and volatility are the other extreme [of the

allotropic spectrum] which corresponds to the state of being where the ego lapses out' (Howe, 1977, pp. 56-7).

15. Their bedroom is one of many features which symbolise the impasse they have reached: 'Near its end, [Gerald and Gudrun's] affair is a perfect static unity that is a parody of stellar equilibrium. The Alpine valley becomes an objectification of their stasis; a great cul-de-sac of snow and mountain peaks' (Howe, 1977, 61).

16. Gudrun's ritualistic gazing in the mirror seems to parallel Lacan's concept of the mirror stage. Lacan suggested that the crucial experience of childhood, and of life, is the first time a child sees his/her reflection in a mirror. The child is then captivated by his 'specular image', becoming forever alienated from his body, which from then on has less reality for him than his mirrored image. Gudrun resembles this description. In these final chapters, her body is never shown to the reader who sees only her aesthetic shell of clothing. For Gudrun, then, her mirrored image is her reality, as it was for Gerald at the end of 'Death and Love'.

17. Lawrence describes the essence of the twin arts of architecture and sculpture as being 'in utter stability ... [they have] no relationship with any other form' (*TH*, 65). The lack of evolution, and the lack of a relationship with other forms implicit in Lawrence's description of sculpture, reflects the regressiveness and detachment of Loerke's character.

18. The distance between Loerke's art and his life is part of the degeneracy of his art, and central to the appeal both he and his art make to Gudrun: 'An art which is cut off from life can be said to



be disintegrative; it is not by chance that Loerke likes the West African wooden figures, the Aztec art... and that he takes refuge with Gudrun in the suggestion of primitive art worshipping the 'inner mysteries of sensation' (Daleski, 1965, 151).

19. Although not ostensibly referring to the novel's predominant way of seeing, Sagar argues that the novel's unique style forces the reader to experience Lawrence's alienation (Sagar, 1985, 193).

20. Jane Jaffe Young notices a similar detached stance in the film, yet asserts that this stance is different from that of Lawrence's narrator (Young, 1999, 166).

21. Russell's accentuation on Birkin as the real, incarnated, historical personage of Lawrence is probably a product of the director's belief that his 'films would only be good if they were about real people or characters I believe to be real' (Gomez, 1976, 78). Russell himself notes that 'Birkin was based on some things Lawrence saw in himself' and 'the fact that I knew she [Hermione] was a real person was a real bonus' (ibid., 86). Alan Bates, who plays Birkin, actually grew a beard to convince Russell of his likeness to the author (Russell, 1991, 62). In a reaction against his earlier films, Russell also argued that: 'The characters in 'French Dressing' and 'Billion Dollar Brain' were as thin as the celluloid on which they were printed, whereas Lawrence's characters were based on real people' (ibid.).

22. Her constrained and cerebral character is also embodied by the formal, rehearsed movements of traditional ballet which, aptly, look 'burdensome [and] overplanned' (Hanke, 1984, 58).

23. This part has been called 'a splendid piece of filmmaking' (Hanke, 1984, 59). Hanke's praise of this part is based on the way the film's narrator sees the shots of Birkin in the forest as a sort of dream, an impression created by taking them with a variable length (or telephoto) lens which shifts in and out of focus as Birkin runs so that the sequence looks unreal. The sense of transition from Breadalby itself is underlined by the birdsong on the soundtrack, which is clearly contrapuntal to Liszt's macabre 'Marche Funèbre'.

24. Jane Jaffe Young notes a cubistic element in Lawrence's prose (Young, 1999, 178). This element is also detectable in the way the novel's and film's narrators see some of the scenes in their narratives.

25. Linda Williams points to the resemblances between the way the film's narrator edits this scene and the ways it is seen in the novel (Williams, 1992, 88).

26. 'Idiomorphic' is normally used in the context of describing minerals as crystals. However, in this thesis, it seems to be an appropriate expression for the characters' and narrators' fragmentary ways of seeing, given that these ways of seeing reflect a metaphysical crystallisation within the characters. The appropriateness of 'idiomorphic' to describe such a way of seeing is emphasised by the prevalence of this way of seeing at the mine, a locus for crystals of carbon, the element Lawrence associates with the base element of human character.

27. The oscillation between dominance and submission embodied in their ways of seeing each other exemplify the sort of relationship of mutual, destructive conflict they are living out (Hough, 1956, 83): (Schneider, 1984, 182).

28. The wrestling scene appealed directly to Russell: He found the novel 'a revelation and full of good things, including... incredibly, the nude wrestling scene. I saw the possibilities immediately' (Russell, 1991, 60). During shooting, the producers too became aware 'of the great potential of the scene' (ibid., 70). Oliver Reed also detected the scene's appeal, to the extent that he violently disagreed with the changes effected by the screenwriter (ibid., 67). In a demonstration of the scene's cinematic possibilities which he acted out in Russell's lounge, Oliver Reed proved his point.

29. Gudrun's way of seeing is also symbolised by the huge, angular portrait of a woman, old and impassive, which hangs over Gudrun's bed. The essence of Gudrun's emasculative power over Gerald seems to coalesce in the figure of the woman, and the way the figure is painted illustrates a cubistic, fragmentary aspect of Gudrun's way of seeing, assuming that she is the artist who painted it. Glenda Jackson, the actress who played Gudrun, also recognised the emasculating power behind the character's gaze (Zambrano, 'Women in Love: Counterpoint on Film', in *Film and Literature Quarterly*, v1, n1, Jan 1973, 50)

30. Like the environment, the slowness of the zoom is indicative of the impasse their relationship comes up against (Howe, 1977, 61).

31. In this montage, the film clearly portrays the seesaw structure of action and reaction governing the novel's account of Gerald's and Gudrun's relationship (Schneider, 1984, 182-184).

# Kangaroo

Kangaroo: The Novel

The main pointers to the cinematic ways of seeing in *Kangaroo* are the war, Lawrence's peregrinations, and his involvement with Compton Mackenzie. The montages of close-ups indicative of the war's presence in *Women in Love* recur in *Kangaroo* and, as well as conveying the conflict between characters, they are connected with Somers's alienation, a feeling common to his behaviour with everyone. After finishing *Women in Love* in 1919, Lawrence embarked on an odyssey through Europe, the South Seas Islands and Australia, ultimately coming to rest in America. The frequent moving both expresses and intensifies the deracination acutely felt in the final years of his life and reveals the same impression of rarely feeling at one with his society and his surroundings, a feeling expressed in his way of seeing it. The association between this lack of oneness and a cinematographic way of seeing is exemplified by his description of Kandy. Moreover, Lawrence's sense of the cinematographic way of seeing seems to have been given clearer resolution from his friendship with Compton Mackenzie. The idea that the deracination associated with travelling could be conveyed by a cinematographic way of seeing underlies the predominant way of seeing in *Kangaroo*.

In the novel's opening chapter, there is a clear association between Somers's alienation and the novel's cinematographic way of seeing. This association was prefigured by Lawrence's alienation in Ceylon, a place he felt lent itself to cinematographic representation because it seemed to be at a permanent distance from him (qv Introduction p.57). The split in subject/object relations implicit in cinematographic perception manifests itself in the opening chapter as an uneasy voyeurism which is characterised by perceiving the scenes from a diversity of perspectives, a way of seeing connected with Compton Mackenzie's 'art of the cinematographer' (qv Introduction p.49). The

alternation of perspectives begins with the narrator's close-up of Jack's eyebrows and eyes which cuts to his point of view of Somers and Harriett<sup>1</sup>. The sequence is repeated with a close-up of Jack's smiling face, followed by his perspective of Somers, the 'comical-looking bloke' (7), a perspective which recalls Lawrence's sense of the cinema as comic pictures of wonderful marionettes. Jack also perceives Somers as strange and foreign. The novel's cinematic way of seeing, exemplified primarily by the alternation of perspectives, is supplemented by Jack's points of view of Somers as an image of comic foreignness. Somers looks back at Jack, interrupting Jack's voyeurism and wiping the grin off his face. Somers, like Jack, is observant and, moreover, indifferent to what he sees, looking at Jack in a way which resembles Jack's way of seeing him. The psychological distance between Somers and the Australians illustrated by these ways of seeing, and symbolised by the men's indifference to Somers's need for a taxi, is similarly orchestrated later in the chapter. The Somerses' tracking shot of Sydney (10) as they make their way to Torestin reflects the city's anonymity on the face of the earth, as if it is lost in the Australian atmosphere. Moreover, Somers's tracking shot of Murdoch Street fragments it into its component houses<sup>2</sup>. His lack of oneness with the objects of his gaze is revealed by his misreading of 'Torestin' as 'Forestin'. Once Somers feels briefly secure inside the house, he has a wonderful vision of the Australian tree in the garden, yet it is a silhouette and it still feels extraneous to him. Somers's uneasy voyeurism extends to his point of view of his neighbours' gardens (12) and his nocturnal perspective of Sydney (13). As with Kandy, Somers is a spectator of a city which he feels lacks a vital or essential reality, the lack of which makes him spectate. His alienation from the city extends to the bush, as shown by his flashback to Western Australia (13-15). He feels that it watches him as if he were an alien, or a victim, an impression or delusion possibly connected to the malignant surveillance which, as 'The Nightmare' demonstrates, he was subjected to in

England. It also extends to the southern night-sky which, inverted from the patterns he is used to, makes him feel 'lonely, alien' (15).

Significantly, his next encounter with Jack is a voyeuristic one. He and Harriett peep through the hole in the hedge at Jack's dahlias. Jack appears and looks at them peeping at him. It is a similar perspective/reverse perspective to that of their first encounter. The architecture of voyeurism is a trope for Somers's nervousness about Australians and Australia. This architecture also mediates the first dialogue between the Somerses and the Callcotts. The dialogue begins with Vicky's offer of dahlias, an offer seen as a close-up from Harriett's point of view (17). Harriett calls Somers, and his appearance is seen as a close-up from the narrator's perspective, a perspective which merges into Somers's as he looks at Jack, Vicky and Harriett (18). The visual connection between the men that was established outside the guesthouse is again observed by the narrator, who notes the men's eyes meeting, and their curious gaze at each other. The restless instability of perspective is epitomised by the narrator's description of Vicky looking at Somers. The narrator looks at Vicky, his gaze flicks to Somers, and flicks back to a close-up of Vicky's eyes which becomes her perspective of Somers as she senses the weight of history behind him. The instability expresses the tension between the couples, a tension reflected by the narrator's way of calling the characters Mr Somers and Mr Callcott. Vicky's offer and Jack's gaze leave Somers alienated. As the narrator notes, this alienation is problematic for him and leads him to see Australians 'from an immense distance' (21), a way of seeing which Lawrence had also used to narrate events in *The Lost Girl* (qv Introduction p.46).

see /



This way of seeing, which is punctuated by montages of the characters, is used to narrate 'Neighbours', a chapter which is largely a miniature travelogue focussing on the Somerses as they journey to Manly, the tram terminus, St Columb and back to Torestin. A series of events, such as the shrapnel story, the boats' collision and Harriett's lost scarf vindicates Somers's initial bad-tempered attitude towards Australia, an attitude corroborated by his tracking shot en route to the tram terminus of the 'endless promiscuity of "cottages"' (25). At the beach, Somers sees it, and the people on it, as a distant panorama; and as he zooms into these people, his vision fragments into close-ups of the men's massive legs (27). His way of seeing is partly a response to the country's vacancy or emptiness, and partly, as we shall see, a product of his character. His predisposition to the distant, fragmented way of seeing helps to explain the narrator's reference to Somers's displacement of the problem of himself on to Australia (28), a problem which is, in fact, his own, typified by his way of seeing.

Coincidentally, the Callcotts are visiting Jack's sister and her second husband, Jaz Trewhella, who own St Columb, the house which appeals to Harriett. Somers and Harriett are invited for a cup of tea, but Somers's mixed feelings about Australia lead to a tense atmosphere and awkward conversation. The tension, together with Jaz's subliminal appeal, are illustrated by close-ups. Somers's general alienation extends to his treatment of Harriett, who upsets him by volunteering a volume of his writings to Jack. His upset is portrayed by the narrator's close-up of him 'looking daggers at her' (31). Somers is first roused by Harriett, and then by Jack's statement about reform. Somers feels that the need for reform is more global than Jack suggests, and the sinister acidity of his statement is conveyed by the narrator's close-up of his hard, blue eyes, a close-up which implicitly becomes Somers's close-up of Jack's brown eyes staring curiously back at him

from a pale, lean face. These close-ups illustrate the conflict between the two men, yet also suggest a sort of intimacy as Somers notices a hint of aboriginal mystery in Jack's eyes. This intimacy underlies Somers's acceptance of a lift home, as he now feels 'the halting refusals were becoming ridiculous' (32).

In the car, Somers's tracking shot of the Pacific and the bush emphasises their distance from him, a distance which contrasts with the familial bond he senses with Vicky in his close-up of her. In this bond, he detects a sensitivity in her way of seeing which 'seemed to see the wonder in him' (33). This sensitivity does not extend to her way of seeing her husband, with whom she enjoys a different intimacy which lacks the wonder of her appreciation of Somers. The groundswell of intimacy encourages Harriett to invite the Callcotts to high tea, the wholesomeness of which reflects a sense of togetherness between the couples. However, watchfulness and watchability prevail, with Jack and Victoria observant about the food and decorum, and Victoria spectacularly resembling a girl on a magazine cover (35). Somers is depressed by the conviviality, and the explanation of his depression also explains his distant way of seeing. He detests the mixing in of all the company, preferring the master/servant gulf he had seen in India which allowed him to be separate and distant, a condition which suited him because of his natural detachment. Jack, too, is reserved, but differently. The instinctive flow between him and Somers is observed by his watchful will which holds most of him aside. In this flow, Jack registers an instinctive aspect to Somers's way of seeing which considers the intrinsic, deeper parts of the self, an aspect epitomised by Somers's point of view of Jack and Victoria in which he contemptuously sees that Jack's manliness is superficial.

The separation and intimacy implicit in Somers's way of seeing Jack is evident during their dialogue in Wyewurk in 'Larboard-Watch Ahoy!' As Somers enters Wyewurk, Jack looks up and Somers sees a glow almost like love in his eyes (44). The narrator looks at Somers looking at Jack, a perspective which develops into Somers's close-up of Jack's eyes which are again glowing. These close-ups occur at the start of Jack's confiding in Somers about his politics. They illustrate Somers's sympathy with Jack, which is based on the men's common working-class background. At the same time, they suggest Somers's distance from him by showing that Somers sees him as a series of close-ups rather than sensing a deeper intimacy between them of the sort he intuited between himself and Vicky. The subject/object split felt by Somers is also shared with Harriett. Picking up the men's strange vibration, she comes into the kitchen and sees the eyes and faces of both men as close-ups, too. The distance intrinsic to her way of seeing is clear from her relief at not sharing the men's experience. Harriett and Somers are also put off by Jack's and Vicky's sudden intimacy, in which they voyeuristically observe Jack's potential licentiousness and, in a particularly detailed close-up, the Adam's apple moving in his throat as he speaks (48). The underlying conflict between Jack and Somers depicted by Somers's way of seeing Jack is visualised by the chess they played at the beginning of the chapter. The chess indicates that they like each other, but in an antagonistic way, an antagonism paralleled by Somers's ongoing war against Australian vermin that is narrated after he and Harriett discuss the Callcotts' 'lovemaking'. This separation is also conveyed by his voyeuristic long-shot perspective of Jaz's nocturnal visit to Jack.

The mixed feelings implicit in Somers's way of seeing Jack are also present in 'Jack and Jaz', a chapter which explores the similarities and differences in their ways of seeing. Somers and

Harriett feel close to Vicky as she waits for Jack in their house yet, once Jack returns, Somers imagines his return as a cartoon advertisement, a fantasy which suggests his view of Jack's unintellectuality (54). His way of thinking of Jack does not preclude the one blood he feels running between them in the subsequent game of chess. Their dialogue on trust, instinct and fate is punctuated with close-ups which again illustrate the conflict and intimacy in their relationship. The close-up of Jack's eyes as Somers asks about Jaz's nocturnal visit reveals Jack's suspicions about Somers's enquiry. The close-up of his meditative eyes as he expresses his trust in Somers, and the close-up of his questioning eyes as he surmises that a fate based on intuition brought Somers to him, reminds us that Somers distrusts him because, like Australia itself, Jack keeps an essential part of himself withheld from their intercourse. The climax to Somers's agreement to a common bond of honour with Jack is accompanied by Somers's close-up of Jack's dilated, glowing eyes, a close-up which suggests a fervour to Jack's desire and which leads to the narrator's close-up of Somers's troubled eyes (57). These alternating close-ups shows that whilst Somers agrees to a bond, there is still an underlying distance between him and Jack. This distance is indicated by the way Somers sees him and by the way the narrator sees them both, and it is verbalised by Jack's comment that in a way they are mates, and in a way, they are not (58).

En route to Jaz's, Somers's conception of Jack's way of seeing is at variance with Jack's conception of it (55). Somers thinks that Jack's acquaintances appear to dither on the screen of his consciousness as disconnected transient images, the common thread between such images being Jack's facetious attitude to the reality they represent. The distance associated with this way of seeing is emphasised by the way the three men spectate on the ferry and the harbour (60). Somers also registers a particular indifference in Jack's and Jaz's consideration of Gladys, Jaz's

stepdaughter, whom only Somers realises as a human being. In contrast to Jack, whose way of seeing is a reflection of the manly Australian attitude of caring about nothing, Jaz is shrewd, as revealed by the close-ups of his grey eyes, in which Somers sees a restless desire. Somers's supreme, sacred sense of care contrasts with Jack's insouciance and, because Jack is uncaring and, in visceral terms, unseeing, he fails to register Somers's sense of care. Jack's indifferent way of seeing triggers the sensitivity in Somers for, on returning home, 'his eyes opened once more to the delicacy of Harriett's real beauty' (66). Their ensuing thoughts and dialogue elucidate the mixed feelings behind Somers's way of seeing. Given the cultural and historical gulf between him and Jack, Somers feels that their unsupported intimacy is too flimsy to bridge it. As Harriett sees it, he embraces people and then turns away, oscillating between acting in a world of men in which he feels he has no place and falling back on her (68). Significantly, Jaz combines a detached, optical way of seeing, usually associated with Jack, with a strong current of sentience, usually associated with Somers. In a point of view shared with the narrator, he observes in detail both Torestin and Harriett qualities and manages to see the magic in her (70). The subsequent close-ups of the characters point to an optical way of relating to each other, a way which, nonetheless, allows Jaz to recognise the mystic differences between people and to recognise Harriett's innate superiority. Jaz himself contrasts this sympathetic inner vision with the Australian predisposition to 'the outside eyes' (73). The friendliness of his way of seeing is epitomised by his observation of her hands' thin skin, which precedes his comment to Harriett about needing a thick skin to survive in Australia.

Togetherhness and distance characterise the ways of seeing in 'Coo-ee', too. On the train, Vicky sees Harriett as Jaz does since she recognises a rootedness in her (75). Yet she also finds her

handsome and distant (76), an observation coupled with the narrator's close-up of Vicky's brown eyes which emphasises the separation of subject from object. This separation is evident in the Somerses' tracking shots from the train which indicate that their 'white', or European, way of seeing cannot see the invisible beauty of Australia, a place which remains temporally and spatially distant as seen 'in the flat' on a cinema screen. The separation is also evident in the narrator's close-up of Harriett arching her eyes at Jack (78). The close-up alludes to the distance Harriett vocalises in the close-up itself when she doubts she could love an Australian. The kinetic way of seeing from the train develops into a stable, unfractured way of seeing at Coo-ee. Harriett is impressed with the house's solidity, and the way of seeing the ocean is a reflection of their sense that it is more homely than Torestin. Her point of view of the Pacific (80), the perspective of it from the dinner table (81), and Somers's perspective of the coast the following morning (81-2) contrast with the collage of the journey to Mullumbimby and the township itself as they are unitary shots, taken from one position, that build the elements of their ambit into a whole, moving vision. This way of seeing is a paradigm of the realist cinema advocated by the likes of Kracauer and Bazin. Australia was a very different experience for Lawrence and may have resulted in such a way of seeing, the avant-gardeness of which looks to the future of cinema in its realist phase. This way of seeing contrasts with Somers's way of seeing the rubbish outside, which he surveys with 'colonial hopelessness' (83). It is an unsacred way of seeing, typified by the Gibson-like pictures. The lack of sacredness in this way of seeing is also evident in the general way of seeing Jack, who remains distant from others (85). In his isolation, Jack is more of a spectator than a participant, illustrated by his spectatorship of Somers bathing.

Jack's isolation is symbolised by the kingfisher Somers observes as they return from their walk (87). It wants contact, but stays just out of reach. The oscillation between contact and distance is typified by Somers's preceding perception of the weird scene of the coast which, although full of fascinating detail, remains null as it is 'all in the funeral-grey monotony of the bush' (ibid.). For now, Jack and Somers are coolly distant from one another, as Somers's distant perspective of Jack taking a dip indicates. After tea, the men return to the rocks where Jack divulges details of the diggers. Somers has mixed feelings about them; he is impressed by the idea of being a leader, yet alienated by their values and Jack's authoritarianism<sup>3</sup>. Aside from Somers's gaze at the sea, which reflects the tension between his gods and the political cause which tempts him, their dialogue curiously lacks the alternating perspectives which might be expected to reflect this tension. Indeed, this absence expresses a latent accord which affects the Somers's marriage. Harriett feels shut out by Somers's intimacy with Jack, as her gaze at them, and at her husband the following morning, shows (95). Their distance is discernible in Somers's perspective of Harriett crying (ibid.). His suppression of the sympathy for her this sight elicits in him is connected with his subscription to Jack's military, nationalistic politics. His suppression of his feelings returns to haunt him in his sleep where it takes a picturesque form; he sees the women (his mother and Harriett) who loved him rejecting him<sup>4</sup>. This dream reflects Somers's alienation, an alienation sensed by Harriett and felt in the picturesque way of seeing the women in the dream. On an actual level, Jack personifies this way of seeing. As Harriett says, he is a sentimentalist incapable of sensing the sacred (100). Somers's drift from Harriett sees Australia coming closer to them. Her awareness of Somers's alienation is followed by her beautiful and immediate vision of the Australian dawn. Somers, too, now finds an intrinsic part of Australia - its duskiness - appealing (102).

In 'Kangaroo', Somers's detachment feeds back into his relationship with Jack. At Torestin, Jack begins their dialogue by mentioning the compatibility of Kangaroo's ideas with Somers's, yet this compatibility is tempered by Kangaroo's lonely, unfeeling nature. His nature is manifested in an omniscient, detached way of seeing through his spectacles (104). Jack offers his own mateship to compensate for Kangaroo's coolness but, whilst Somers likes Jack, he still mistrusts the cause. His mistrust is followed by a close-up of Jack's face. Its nakedness perturbs Somers, and this perturbation is felt in the way of seeing Jack's face. Somers's distance is also felt in his close-up of Jack's eyes watching him fixedly after he has questioned whether they can ever be mates (105). After Somers's decision not to pledge himself to Jack, this distance is perpetuated in a close-up, shared with the narrator, of Jack's eyes 'like black holes, almost wounds in the pallor of his face' (106). These close-ups, which show Somers's distance from Jack, suggest a need for a relationship beyond Jack's bloodbrotherhood, a relationship which is akin to the mystery of lordship Somers observed in India.

Kangaroo might embody this lordship, but his sharp way of scrutinising Somers through his glasses indicates an optical, unsacred way of seeing which neglects Somers's essence. Somers sees similarly, observing Kangaroo's thighs, trousers and stomach as close-ups (108). Somers's way of seeing is alluded to in Jack's suggestion that he might be Australia's Ally Sloper (109). Sloper was the pseudonym of the cartoonist Charles Ross, and the allusion again associates Somers's perception of Australia with a cartoonist's way of seeing, exemplified earlier by the cartoon advertisement and the Gibson-like pictures. These opening perspectives express the sense of relativity mentioned by the men, as they are the points of view of a relative spectator rather



than a single, omniscient one<sup>5</sup>. However, these perspectives are absent during Kangaroo's explanation of his concept of power. On one hand, this absence points to an accord between the men. On the other, it is an incarnation of the permanence central to Kangaroo's concepts of evil and power and is evocative of an absolute, rather than a relative way of seeing him. Somers vacillates between seeing Kangaroo in different ways; he notes Kangaroo's transfigured yet physical kangaroo face after his insistence on creative change (113), and his living yet absolute beauty (114) after his insistence on the life-principle. Somers's ways of seeing illustrate his ability to recognise life's conflicting imperatives. Kangaroo lacks this ability, as shown by the narrator's perspectives of him staring abstractedly at Somers through his pince-nez with his queer eyes (115). Kangaroo's distance, which stems from his prioritisation of ideals over feelings, is maintained during his visit to Torestin. Harriett looks at him thoughtfully, without the empathy she previously had for Australia (119). Her glance at Kangaroo's waistcoat affirms the figure of him as an ideological Kangaroo carrying a young Australia in its pouch (120). Her opposition reduces him to a figure from the sort of cinematograph drama, or perhaps cartoon, that Lawrence found comic as, when she outlines the flaw in his way of loving, the narrator shows him looking comically at Harriett. The Somerses are spellbound by this spectacle, and their separation from Kangaroo is emphasised by his reverse close-up of her pale, moved hostile face (122), a perspective which detaches itself from his to become the narrator's (123). Significantly, Harriett uses an impersonal form (her letter) to subscribe to Kangaroo's cause, as if the way he fights for his cause actually subverts it by generating the impersonality he opposes. Somers has transcended this impersonality to become detached from humanity and himself, his vision of the sea emphasising this detachment and articulating his identification with a fish's iciness and isolation (125).

Somers's detachment from the men's world is also expressed in his long-shot point of view of the jetty in 'The Battle of Tongues' (126). There is a connection between spectatorship and alienation in the form of his subsequent thought about the foreignness of the perceived coal-scavengers, a foreignness which persists despite the similarities between them and the people in Somers's childhood (127)<sup>6</sup>. His uneasy relationship with Australia and its denizens is evident in his close-up of Jaz's face, which Somers cannot identify as either jeering or friendly. Somers himself says he prefers a place where he knows no-one, and his close-ups of Jaz's sardonic leer, queer grey eyes (128), and the mocking smile in those eyes (129) suggest he is maintaining his distance. Jaz, too, seems withheld from Somers, as his comment about never behaving warmly indicates. Somers observes this withheld self in his perspective of Jaz's figure; he notes something of a prisoner in Jaz's bearing, a mien which embodies the imprisonment of his soul where, Somers feels, a mystic appeal exists. Jaz sees differently from the 'thin chaps', and, by seeing Jaz's soul, Somers espouses this way of seeing which reflects the 'root-knowledge' (130) between them. Their earlier long-shot perspective of the railway on the coast-front emphasises the commonality of their experiences, which are ones of loneliness. Within this commonality, Jaz resembles Somers's double who is close yet distant from him and who embodies the difficulties of being a colonist which Somers would face if he were to stay. Despite this root-knowledge, Jaz's withholding of his inner soul repels Somers, as revealed by his close-up of Jaz's 'secretive grey eye' (ibid.). This distance is physically portrayed in Jaz's long-shot point of view of Somers walking over the rocks, and it is embodied in Jaz's unchanging eyes, seen in close-up by the narrator as Jaz watches Somers go.

This meeting contributes to Somers's sense of Australia's lack of reality and drives him back to Kangaroo. He is initially repelled by Kangaroo's appearance, and his diatribe on the inner dimension absent in Australians is watched by Kangaroo in a way similar to Jaz's way of watching Somers's departure. Kangaroo's unchanging eyes resemble Jaz's, and reveal an objectification of Somers, rather than sympathy for him. Somers's description of the Australians' struggle with the material necessities and conveniences of life elucidates this objective way of seeing; Australians see things materially in terms of how they can be used. Somers, by contrast, is aware of Kangaroo's passion, and this awareness underlies his appreciation of Kangaroo's beauty (132). The opposite, absolute way of seeing typifies Kangaroo's perception of Somers, and it is connected to his sense, contradicted by Somers, that love is the absolute 'force or mystery of living inspiration' (134). Somers's contradiction, and his argument about the power of the unconscious, is watched by Kangaroo in a manner commensurate with his intellectual concept of life. Kangaroo regards Somers with contempt, watching him round-eyed with a mask-like face from under his brows (135). Kangaroo's way of seeing denies him a sense of Somers's best self, as his close-up of Somers's impenetrable eyes shows (136). Somers's opposition to the still-passionate form of Kangaroo modifies his way of seeing, and he subsequently sees Kangaroo more objectively 'as if the glow and vibration left Kangaroo's body' (137). Indeed, on leaving, Somers's heart is devoid of emotion, and his long-shot point of view of the sea stimulates a renewed desire for isolation from humanity. Somers's quarrel with Kangaroo casts a chill over the gathering at Wyewurk, and only Vicky and Somers seem close to each other. Their togetherness is represented by a number of close-ups which emphasise Vicky's dark, bright eyes and, from Somers's perspective, her visual appeal. However, these close-ups mitigate against their intimacy as they are part of what Somers rejects as 'moments bred in the head and born in the eye... These

flashes of desire for a visual object would no longer carry him into action' (143). This distance is also manifested on the way back to Mullumbimby. On the train, Harriett starts a conversation with Evans, the Welshman. Somers says nothing, and registers him as a close-up. The close-up highlights the lack in Evans's appearance which reflects the metabolic 'thinning-down' he mentions. At Coo-ee, the distance is transposed on to Somers and Harriett. From a long-shot perspective, she watches him swim. His close-ups of the breakers heighten his identification with the isolation associated with the sea, and stress his distance from Harriett. Despite their subsequent lovemaking, his swim makes him more detached, and this detachment is again felt in his cartoonist's way of considering Australian attitudes to immigrants. Although Somers rails against the antipodean way of seeing, his cartoonist's sense of Australia seems to encapsulate the vision he criticises.

In 'Volcanic Evidence', Somers equates this outwardness with 'cinemas and excitements' (155), and his way of seeing with the Australian outward eye is part of being swept away from the inwardness of his own being. The conflict between the two directions is symbolised by the octopi stranded on the shore which, Somers realises, contrast with his own flowing back into a more inward way of being. During this state of quiet connectedness between Somers's innermost self and the universe, Jaz arrives and, as Somers begins to speak, looks at him in a quiet, steady way, appropriate to Somers's mood. As the ambience changes, and Jaz draws out the fact that Somers does not believe in Kangaroo's ability to organise a revolution and to lead the country through the aftermath, Jaz's way of seeing changes. Somers sees Jaz's light-grey serpent's eyes watching him fixedly (158), and these close-ups reflect and emphasise the tension between the men. Jaz puts to Somers the idea of a Labour revolution enforced by martial nationalism which, once Labour has

been discredited, the military leads. He suggests that Somers persuade Kangaroo to follow this course of action. After doing so, he watches Somers sharply, as Kangaroo himself did, as if the suggestion is a test of Somers's allegiance and credibility. His spectatorship, which possibly reminds Somers of the surveillance he suffered in England, subverts Somers's confidence. In his black mood the following day, he questions whether Jaz really believes in him (165). As the next chapter shows, Harriett too fails to believe in his innate lordship and mastery, such is his isolation (175).

After rowing with Harriett at the beginning of 'Diggers', Somers's panoramic long-shots of Mullumbimby and the coast express a distance between him and his environment<sup>7</sup>. This distance is expressed in Somers's response to the foliage of the mountain from where he sees the coast. The foliage belongs to a previous, lonely era, and Somers feels drawn into this fern-world, the torpor of which makes him cease to care as he looks down from the tor (178). His way of seeing without caring is typically Australian, and it is embodied by the kookaburra who is oblivious to Somers's gaze. After his encounter with the fern-world, and his experience of the manly way of seeing, Somers is closer to Jack than before as Jack, too, has a similar torpor on his mind (179). Jack's way of seeing as a spectator rather than a participant is exemplified by his spectatorship of the football match, which he watches impassively in optical close-ups. His way of gazing spellbound at the evolutions of chance is reminiscent of Bergson's description of cinematographic perception which looks at successive changed states, rather than at the essential changes between these states. Somers's and Jack's experience of this distant world is highlighted by the narrator's montage of the town (181) which transforms the town into a film of itself, the transformation pointing to its temporal and spatial distance from the spectators. Vicky is the opposite of Jack and

Somers here, as she wants to look sympathetically at the innermost life to touch its 'private mysteries' (182). The tension between the men and the women, indicated by the differences in their ways of seeing, is illustrated by their alternating perspectives of each other. The women sight the men in a long-shot from their perspective on the cliff, and Jack sights them in reverse as wispy silhouettes from his position on the shore. Jack feels threatened by Harriett, a threat suggested by the power of her initial sighting of him. This threat is elaborated by Victoria's coaxing way of scolding him, which contrasts with Harriett's fundamental European disapproval of him.

Jack's subsequent disclosures about the diggers' paramilitary infrastructure further explains why he sees as he does. The military training and rifle-practice show that the geometric objectification of objects as if they are being aimed at is a natural way of seeing for a digger. The debates staged by the diggers reveal that their philosophy or cause is not derived from unconscious promptings of desire for change, but produced by a 'slow, deliberate crystallising of a few dominant ideas' (186). This crystallisation underlies their way of seeing reality as clots rather than a flow. Moreover, their revolution seems geared towards change for its own sake rather than catalysing a real, constructive evolutionary change, beyond the range of their optical vision. The connection between the diggers and an optical, cinematographic way of seeing is highlighted by the statue of the soldier adjacent to the cinema (191). Their philosophy, and this way of seeing, vindicates Somers's earlier reservations about the integral qualities of the men Kangaroo conscripts to his cause.

Somers's lack of harmony with political figures is repeated in his dealings with Struthers in 'Willie Struthers and Kangaroo'. This lack is evident in Somers's initial way of seeing Struthers as a

close-up, and in the suspicious bitterness he sees in this close-up (193). Struthers's suspicion manifests itself in his shrewd questions, and in his watchful, judgmental demeanour. He defends socialism's lack of boldness, or 'spunk' as Somers puts it, by pointing to a general disappearance of such boldness. His defence is accompanied by another close-up, this time of the 'bitter fire corroding in his eyes' (195). Somers's criticism upsets him, and Somers's argument about why men would fight Germans but not capitalists further perturbs him, and he stares abstractedly at his desk before nervously looking up. His abstracted way of staring recalls Kangaroo's and it shows that Somers has upset them both. Yet a fighting look enters Struthers's eyes, and he argues for a bond of brotherhood between men. The argument partially appeals to Somers, and the appeal is felt in the strange glow that he sees replacing the bitterness in Struthers's eyes (197). Somers quickly recognises the danger of the argument, too. Like Kangaroo's, such love can become an absolute love, worked in a deathly way by the will. This awareness comes to Somers under Struthers's dark, watchful eyes (199), as if such a way of being surveyed makes Somers recall the absolutism implicit in the authoritarian gaze, a way of seeing which is not backed up by Somers's dark unconscious god. Indeed, Christ, the god whom Struthers envisages as supporting such passion, is antithetical to Somers's god.

Their debate is viewed by Jaz, but perspective is rarely relativised by looking through his eyes. The absence of a relative gaze suggests the absolutism implicit in Struthers's way of seeing. The absence of the stichomythia usually associated with such relativism also indicates Somers's partial desire for solidarity with a cause he responds to yet denies. The only stichomythia occurs after Struthers's appeal to Somers to show Australians how to believe in each other, when the narrator alternates between close-ups of the men (200). The alternating perspective is initially the

narrator's rather than the characters', and this marginalises tension to emphasise that Somers is moved by Struthers. Tension persists, however, and it is clarified by Somers's comment about men needing more than passion and a political god (201). The shift of the narrator's perspective into Somers's close-up of Struthers, who bears down on him, highlights Somers's sense of the oppression in Struthers's politics. The authoritarianism he detects in Struthers's gaze explains why the scene makes him recollect 'the medical-examination rooms in the war' (202).

After Somers leaves, his rejection of Struthers's politics feeds into his way of seeing Sydney. He views it as a montage which switches away from him, and then as a tracking shot from the hansom cab to show, as he thinks, that Australia 'had a wonder and a far-awayness' (203). His sense of not caring, itself typically Australian, is expressed by this antipodean way of seeing. His antipodean nature is detected by Jaz, and confirmed by Somers's comment that he feels Australian. Given Somers's way of seeing and the visual interchange with Jaz (204), the emu, who sees darkly yet alertly from a distance, embodies a way of seeing more amenable to Somers's dark god than Somers himself. Seemingly, Somers has become alienated from the way of the dark god. Yet alienation is the dark god's way for, once Somers felt its spirit, represented by the Australian interior, overcoming him in 'Diggers', his indifference to Harriett, Kangaroo and Jaz intensified. The novel, we might say, is a quest to discover how to live in a state of alienation; and Australia is a metaphor for this quest. The bricolage of its suburban coastline, and the mystery of its aboriginal interior, have their correspondence within Somers himself, and it is in the interior of the country that he finds corroboration for the work of the dark powers within himself. These dark powers are antithetical to the European, colonial spirit of Australia's outside, or coastline, personified by



Kangaroo and Jack, but perhaps not Jaz. The distance between this spirit and Somers's dark powers is indicated by Kangaroo's way of seeing Somers. He looks through his pince-nez at Somers, yet sees him more than optically as he senses the aura around him. This way of seeing is indicative of his love for Somers who, however, denies it as he feels it is general. His alienation is conveyed by a series of close-ups of Kangaroo which turns him from a whole man into a thing (210-11).

In 'The Nightmare', Somers recalls his fear of the mob-spirit in wartime England. The return of this repressed fear is triggered by his fear of Kangaroo, and the dark fear he senses in Sydney's streets. Somers's flashback to London in 1915 is shaped by his experience of the winter of 1915-1916 when 'the spirit of the old London collapsed... and became a vortex of broken passions, lusts, hopes, fears and horrors' (216). He sees the earlier London in a prototypically vorticist way as a series of scenes viewed from different angles and on different scales. The diversity is typified by the movement of his perspective from the wounded soldiers to the distant, tiny zeppelin caught in the searchlights. The human ignominy, which characterises the war-spirit, drives Somers to Cornwall where he falls under the surveillance of the military coast-watchers who are also bound up with this process of humiliation. The cinematic technology symbiotically related to military surveillance is incarnated in the form of the camera the officer suspects Somers of carrying which is, in fact, a block of salt. Somers's awareness of mechanical warfare, together with his vorticist sense of society, underlie his flashback to his first medical examination. The journey to Bodmin, and the barracks itself, are seen as a montage of snapshots. The objective, mechanical way of seeing this montage is typified by his neighbour's jeering perspective of Somers's thin legs (219), and by Somers's own sense of the world seen as a timeless greyness

through darkened glass (220), ways of seeing which contrast with the lifting of the grey glaze from Somers's eyes as he leaves the barracks. His rejection by the military makes him a stranger amongst the other men, yet naturally, his isolated soul drives him into separation from this collective body out of fear of its collectivity. His separation results in the distanced way of seeing experienced in Australia and exemplified here by his long-shot perspectives of the postman and the policemen from the cottage (222).

Somers's despair of the military mob-spirit makes him want to leave England for America. After posting the passports, his sense of the death of his own country manifests itself in his way of seeing the land as an arrested vision, silvery and static (225). Cinematographically, he represents the country to himself to reflect the primacy of the war-spirit over the former positive spirit of place. This war-spirit is also conveyed by Somers's montage of his and Harriett's actions as he vicariously imagines the spies seeing them (227). The continual surveillance contributes to his sense of guilt, his acknowledgement of which is followed by Harriett's long-shot of the sinking ship, and Somers's own long-shot of the wrecked Spanish coal-vessel, as if these events were manifestations of his own wrongdoing from which he distances himself. He copes with the monstrous war-spirit by distancing himself from it too, a distance clearly felt in his travelogue montage of the journey to the Midlands and back. However, Somers's second military rejection stimulates him into a positive way of seeing Harriett's real beauty (231), a vision which foreshadows his way of seeing her in 'Jack and Jaz'. Somers retreats from the death of his country into a sort of Cornish blood-consciousness which facilitates a sensitive understanding of life antithetical to that of the Teutonic consciousness, embodied by Harriett and epitomised by the military surveillance. Again, Somers's state of being fails to endure as it is interrupted by the

covert search of the cottage, and the officer's arrival the following day. These events alienate him, as they make him watch objectively 'with a cold eye' (242). They also upset the police sergeant, who provides another perspective on the search from his troubled eye (243). The scene flickers and jumps cinematographically, and Somers's upset intensifies the objectification of his way of seeing, transforming the men from real human beings to things, as it transmogrified Kangaroo at the end of the previous chapter. Somers is ordered to leave Cornwall, and his departure destroys the security he enjoyed there. The loss of this security is felt on the train to London where Somers's death in his beliefs results in a remoteness and a curious lack of visual perception, illustrating his numbness.

The surveillance which Somers experienced in Cornwall dogs him as he moves around England. As in Western Australia, this sense of being watched isolates and alienates him to the point that he empowers himself by literally looking back, sharply watching the mob to keep it at bay (250-1). His third medical examination encompasses the subject/object split typical of such spectatorship. Somers regards the collier's figure as devoid of life-meaning, and sees the athletic young man's figure as 'a piece of furniture waiting to be sat on' (252). There is also a gap between the old military buffers and the objects of their perception. It is expressed by referring to these examination scenes as an operetta. Moreover, the derision and the jokes attached to their spectatorship recall Lawrence's sense of the cinematograph as a comic mockery, the sense of which infuses Somers's perception of Australia, too. This way of seeing is obviously embodied by the young medical aide who humiliatingly considers Somers as 'a sight of a human scarecrow' (254). Somers's revenge on this system, whose optical way of seeing ridicules him and neglects his essential self as Kangaroo's did, is to look back at it with its own watchfulness, a way of

seeing which prevents him from becoming a victim. This watchful, detached way of seeing characterises his perspectives of Harriett as she leaves for Germany and of England as he leaves for Italy. Seemingly, his way of coping with the war-spirit, by making himself remote from it, has had repercussions on his marriage and his identity as, after the war, he feels remote from both his wife and his mother country. His sense of a similar remoteness in Australia, triggered by the impression of being spied upon in Mullumbimby, brings back this memory of the war 'like a volcanic eruption' (259). Somers explores the reasons for the eruption in the following chapter, "Revenge!" Timotheus Cries' and thinks that it has a dual cause. First, it is a product of denying the anger and fear the war triggered. Second, it is a reflex of the instinctive, passional self which, desecrated and sold by the war, explodes like a bomb.

In 'Bits', Somers's way of seeing in his remoteness is characterised by the style of the *Bulletin*. Its composite form, and its concise, laconic style, epitomised by the cartoon of the lady and the girl which itself exemplifies the spirit of Australian labour, make an appeal to him. This appeal is based on the representation of 'the momentaneous life of the continent' (272). Somers acutely feels the fatalism behind this momentaneity after reading the paper, to the extent that he no longer attaches particular significance to his involvement with Kangaroo, Jack or Jaz. His restlessness drives him to visit Wolloona. Here, his unease is expressed by the continual variations in his perspective which lead to a snapshot montage of Main Street (272), long shots of the far-off gum trees and the farther-off blue hills (273), and close-ups of the people and the bungalow gardens (ibid.). These variations generate an impression of visual rootlessness which reflects the absence of physical, psychological and social foundations in Australia, an absence symbolised by the foundationless houses of his perspective. After the loss of his hat, which makes his claim to innate

superiority appear ridiculous, the country looks particularly aloof from his perspective on the bus (275). His perspective stresses the gap between him and Australia, a gap which is also felt in his close-up montage of the eyes, faces and bodies of his fellow travellers. His way of seeing them focuses on the continual thread of their niceness and gentleness, a continuity which points to their lack of innate, sacred separateness or differentiation. This lack is conveyed by the cinematographic way of seeing them which would stultify any sense of innate difference between these people. His lack of oneness with the land and the people, evident in the way of seeing them, is noted by Harriett, too, as she reads her Nat Gould paperback (278). Somers's rejection of the sympathetic side of society, embodied by the travellers on the bus, sees him returning to the absolute bedrock of his dark, isolate self. The way that Somers preaches about this recoil from the world leads the narrator to liken the novel to a gramophone (280). Given Lawrence's grouping of the gramophone with film on the grounds that it was an artificial form of entertainment incapable of preserving the spirit of the original, the comparison is surprising. However, the comparison suggests that the most effective way of conveying an empty, outward spirit of place like that of Kandy or Australia is with a mechanical artform, typified by gramophone and film. In his state of recoil, Somers views the whole of humanity as lifeless people, mechanically assembled from bits, no greater than the sum of their bits. No matter how many times these parts are assembled and reassembled, the whole fails to live essentially whereas the fly's or spider's eye Somers imagines, which is also composed of several thousand facets, contrastingly sees and lives.

The terse, laconic cartoonist's way of seeing that appealed to Somers in 'Bits' is used to introduce 'Jack Slaps Back', which opens with sketches of stereotypes. The point of view which ranges over these sketches characterises the way of seeing Jack's visit, too, repeatedly shifting

from one character's perspective to another's. Somers's first perspective of Jack adumbrates their conflict; Somers starts as he sees him, as if he has seen an enemy (286). His perspective zooms into a close-up of Jack's eyes, seemingly objectifying him along a metaphysical gunsight. Jack hangs back and the two men remain aloof; the distance between them is illustrated by Somers's way of seeing him, the aversion of his face from the Somerses, and the narrator's close-up of his inchoate eyes. The inchoateness of Jack's eyes suggests they are only partly in existence, a state which reflects the lack of dimensionality of his stereotypical, Australian image, and his suppression of emotion. During the men's argument, Jack is roused by Harriett's mocking, witty attack on Somers. Jack's excitement is revealed by a close-up of his eyes, mouth and nose, a close-up which shows the tension between him and Somers. As Jack looks from Harriett to Somers to ascertain how much they know about the quarrel with Kangaroo, his voice adopts a tone of watchfulness. Briefly, Jack and Harriett unite against Somers and, in this alliance, he seems distant from them. Harriett feels uneasy at Jack's sudden turn of intimacy in this alliance, yet she cannot bridge the distance to her husband whom she consistently watches in her desire to be rescued by him. After the alliance, Somers sees Jack as the narrator did, sensing a frightening malevolence in Jack's inchoate eyes (289, 290). His observations make him draw back from what Jack stands for, and his retreat is illustrated by further close-ups of Jack's eyes, and by his aggressively defensive reciprocation of Jack's gaze. As in England, Somers's reciprocation of the military gaze is associated with doubts about his support for a military cause; after Somers looks back at Jack's eyes, Jack accuses him of being a spy. This accusation opens up a gulf between Somers and other human beings, a gulf which allows him to look Jack squarely in the eyes and to stare him down after the questions raised about his integrity.

Somers experiences a similar alienation en route to the labour meeting in 'A Row in Town'. The frogs' weird mechanical noises recall those of Ceylon's fauna whose capacity to alienate was also expressed by a cinematographic point of view. This way of seeing re-emerges after the morning meeting as a reflection of Sydney's hollowness and of the failure of Kangaroo's and Struthers's politics to recognise the life-mystery essential to Somers's philosophy of governance. Somers's disillusion is evident in his point of view of the harbour where nothing retains a positive reality and the ships resemble memory images (305). His sense of this unreality is connected to the people's magic harmlessness which has yet to be broken into a nightmare. This sense is emphasised by his montage of the city which conveys his mirage-like impression of the world (307). In a Proustian way, the taste of the custard-apple also contains his sense of the city's saccharine utopia, a sense which contrasts with the evening meeting's wild events. The close-up of the spellbound Struthers being counted out by the diggers highlights his aboriginal way of seeing, a way of seeing which shows that it is an unusual moment (313). The diggers disavow his aboriginal gaze, and Somers's too. The disavowal illustrates the diggers' isolation from the spectators which is caused by their perverse counting-out of Struthers<sup>8</sup>. Seemingly, this outburst is co-ordinated by Kangaroo's mental consciousness which bends the vertebral consciousness of the mass-spirit to its will. The explosive rage associated with this control of the lower self by the upper self is felt in the Gertleresque whirl of the narrator's perspective which embodies the violence of a 'mob with many centres' (314), a whirl which is partially repeated in the reportage (320)<sup>9</sup>. Somers is also tempted to let go, but refrains, and his reticence sidelines him as a spectator through whose eyes Kangaroo's arrival and the exploding bomb are seen. Somers's spectatorship is a concomitant of his alienation from everyone, an alienation particularly felt in the numerous

close-ups of Jack. Intoxicated by the violence and the murders, he is little more than an image to Somers, a perception which emphasises the distance between their states of mind.

This distance is similarly orchestrated in 'Kangaroo is Killed'. Kangaroo's suppression of the unconscious in the name of love entails its perverse return as bullets in his marsupial pouch, the stench from his intestines symbolising this rottenness of his lower self<sup>10</sup>. His way of seeing alludes to this decay, as he is unable to sense the beauty of the shells which are associated with the sea, Somers's locus for the isolated soul. Somers's close-ups of Kangaroo show him to be like Jack, strange and frightening (323). As with Jack, the close-ups indicate Somers's detachment from Kangaroo, which is also felt in the repugnance with which Somers takes his hand. Somers remains remote at the thought of Kangaroo's love, the intellectual power of which is conveyed by the close-ups of his eyes on Somers's face (325, 326). Somers's distance is briefly counteracted by a close-up perspective of Kangaroo in which he is beautifully transfigured, repeating Somers's ambivalence towards Kangaroo. He doesn't want to love Kangaroo or anyone else, yet he acknowledges that he came to see him out of love. Somers's wish nevertheless to deny this love is emphasised by Kangaroo's close-up of his eyes which are abstracted by thought rather than love (326). Their ways of seeing each other reflect the distance between them. In Somers's case, his perspective adumbrates his right to isolation, to draw back in rejection as Lawrence did in Ceylon, where such a withdrawal was also illustrated by a certain way of seeing. Somers's distance from the world, caused by his retreat to his own isolate being on the shore, is evident in his long-shot perspective of the dolphin family (329), the self-responsibility of the urchin boys he identifies with (330), and his montage of the coast (331). It is also evident in his perspective of the watching octopus, which is an image of the repellent, observant body of humanity trying to entice him into



its love. Significantly, in the soulless isolation which underlies his distant way of seeing, Somers finds a new dimension of life in the pause between his carings. This dimension is part of his individual soul's connection to his dark god, and belongs to a will-to-evolve, not dissimilar in character or source to the *élan vital*. Yet Somers's ongoing way of looking at Kangaroo is at odds with his will-to-evolve, as if Kangaroo's physical and metaphysical deathliness is clarified by an appropriately deathly way of seeing. During his second visit when Kangaroo seems to be killed by Somers's denial of his love, this way of seeing takes the form of Somers's fragmentary close-ups of his discoloured lips (334), his eyebrows and eyes (335), and his face which seems to rear up like a striking snake (336, 337). Kangaroo, too, repeatedly watches Somers and the nurse, the close-ups of his eyes again pointing to the prominence of his mental consciousness which, as Somers notes, is sulking itself to death as it cannot have its way with love. Jack also watches these scenes, his spectatorship reinforcing his powerlessness over Kangaroo's fate. Somers's stinginess over love, as Jack calls it, seems to result in another cinematographic vision, since the people outside resemble 'pasteboard figures shifting on a flat light (338). The gulf between him and humanity implicit in this vision is highlighted by his tender blood-consciousness for the animals in the zoo, with whom he enjoys a communion that has otherwise largely become a self-contained call and answer in his own soul, this self-containment making him feel a 'non-human human being' (341).

Once Somers ceases to care about Australia, he begins to love it, as the final chapter shows. However, his ranging cinematographic eye confirms that, like Lawrence's Ceylon, its remoteness still lends itself to being seen cinematographically. His cinematographic perception is emphasised by his tracking shot of the wattles (354) which suggests the temporal, spatial and cultural distance

of Australia's beauty. Somers's detachment intensifies in his final vision of his departure as the vision is itself detached cinematographically into its own remoteness (357). As the novel progresses, Somers's growing alienation from Australia and certain parts of himself is illustrated by this way of seeing which is an incarnation of Lawrence's idea that the effect of being in certain countries like Ceylon, and here, Australia, is best conveyed by a cinematographic point of view<sup>11</sup>.

### 'Kangaroo': The Film

Lawrence's cinematographic presentation of Australia consists of alternating perspectives, close-ups, long-shots, tracking shots and the architecture of voyeurism which all serve to characterise Somers's alienation. Of these features, the one which overtly preoccupies Burstall is the close-up, as he argues that the most beautiful views of Australia 'are often the close-ups of bark, stones, ferns, etc.' (Benson, 1983, 24). In addition to Somers's alienation, the film thematically focuses on the novel's mateship, typical of Australian society. The rituals of mateship have been central to Burstall's other films, and he felt that Lawrence accurately characterised such rituals<sup>12</sup>. His request to Larry Kramer, who co-screenwrote 'Women in Love', to work on the script was motivated by an interest in mateship. Burstall felt that Kramer, who is openly homosexual, would be able to explore the novel's relationship between political leadership and masculine love. Significantly, Burstall also sees the novel biographically, a conceptualisation which generates a respectful, if simplified, translation of it, (Greiff, 2001, 188). His biographical take on the novel is highly relevant to the film's representation of its ways of seeing, as the novel's cinematographic expression of Somers's alienation is closely related to Lawrence's experience of Ceylon and Australia as an outsider.

The film begins with a sustained showing of credits on a black background set to Dvorak's Lento, the heterogeneity of the media reflecting a society alienated from itself in which men's 'functions are severed from each other even within each individual' (Eisler, 1951, 74). This alienation is a predominant part of Somers's experience of English society, an experience which the film foregrounds by placing 'The Nightmare' at the beginning of its narrative. In this episode, the theme of alienation is vocalised by the publisher's comment that Somers has alienated himself from his public. Somers has alienated himself from the prevailing war-spirit, too, as the opening scene demonstrates. This scene conflates the lieutenant's visit to Sharpe's cottage with the officer's arrival to search Somers's house. What is most interesting about this conflation is its emulation of the novel's ways of seeing in these scenes. As in the novel, the presence of the military heralds a fragmentary effect. Before the lieutenant's entrance, Somers and Harriett are shown in the cottage from an unfragmented point of view. The lack of fragmentation is emphasised by Somers singing in harmony with Harriett's piano-playing, and by the fire and warmly-lit interior which symbolise the couple's togetherness. The tone of this introductory scene contrasts with the fragmentation associated with the military's arrival. As in the novel, there are exchanged, virtual points of view between the officer, Harriett and Somers. Harriett's virtual point of view of the officer in the doorway recalls her point of view of the detective at Sharpe's. The reversal of this point of view to the officer's virtual perspective of her shows that both parties 'sight' each other as they do in the novel, reflecting the conflict between them. The scene's fragmentary style, typified by the close-up of the lieutenant's hand searching the drawer or the officer's appropriation of Somers's notebook, which are both emblems of the military's hunting out of the secret, personal self, is characteristic of the uneasy relationship of mutual distrust between Somers and the newly militarised state. It also embodies the lieutenant's montage at Sharpe's rented

house, and, in its close-ups, Somers's way of watching the soldiers with a cold eye when they raid his own house. Significantly, once the officer and his louts have gone, the scene returns to the integrative style of the film's overture to depict Harriett in a medium long-shot with the fire behind her.

Somers's third call-up forms the basis for the other main scene in the adaptation of 'The Nightmare'. In the novel, the call-up is preceded by Somers's feeling that he sharply watches the mob to keep it at bay, a way of seeing which overtly manifests itself in his reciprocation of the military gaze in the recruiting-hall. The film focuses on Somers's gaze, too. Somers's nakedness is inspected by the military and the medical gaze and, as he is being examined for tuberculosis, the camera pans slightly left and zooms into his face. His stare is emphasised by the zoom, and it is given a shape in the series of shots and reverse shots which depicts his brief dialogue with the military interviewer. The close-up of Somers, as he is told he describes himself as a writer, cuts to a reverse virtual close-up point of view of his interlocutor which shows that Somers sees similarly to the way he is seen. This close-up way of seeing characterises his dialogue with his publisher, too, suggesting that it is part of his disillusionment with and alienation from England. Furthermore, the close-ups of Somers in these scenes, while illustrating that he is seen in a particular way which is commensurate with the gaze he is subjected to in the novel, also reflect his oppression. Their limited ambit is a representation of the walls closing in on him, a process visualised by the novel's reference at the end of this chapter to Poe's *The Pit and the Pendulum*.

Significantly, the positioning of 'The Nightmare' in both novel and film is different, but equally important to each narrative. It emerges halfway through the novel as an illustration of the return

of the repressed. Burstall, however, places his adaptation of this chapter at the beginning of the film, as part of an overall effort to create a heightened symmetry between England and Australia<sup>13</sup>. Certainly, as part of this symmetry, Burstall chose a colonial scriptwriter capable of rendering Somers's experience of being outside everything, of belonging to neither the English society he inherits nor the Australian society he adopts: "I wanted him [Evan Jones] because coming from Jamaica he's a colonial, so he knows about the British, and I wanted the insights of an outsider about Australia" (Baum, 'The Roo With A View', in *The Guardian*, 13/11/86, 15).

The alternation of perspectives which characterises Somers's experience as an outsider in the taxi scene in 'Torestin' features in the film, too. However, the film emphasises Jack's and Harriett's spectatorship. The close-up of Jack's observation of the Labour march shows his eyes flicking upwards, and the following upward-looking perspective of Harriett shows that she is the object of his gaze. After Harriett's long-shot point of view of the march, this perspective of her is repeated, and it cuts to a close-up of Jack to reaffirm his spectatorship. Jack and Harriett both watch Somers, too, and there are three shots, virtually from her point of view, of the taxi driver as Somers argues over the fare with him. The absence of his perspective accentuates his status as an outsider, and reflects his disempowerment, which is immediately felt in his marriage as it is Harriett who corrects him over his misreading and mispronunciation of 'Torestin', and who seizes the initiative in decorating the house and interacting with the Callcotts. Although doubly foreign herself - she is neither Australian, nor British - Harriett comes from a family with a strong military tradition. Jack, too, belongs to this martial culture, and their connections with the war are highlighted in the shrapnel scene. This martial tradition explains why, initially, they are the main spectators who 'sight' those around them. The observation of Somers from different perspectives

is also an expression of his separateness from his wife and Australian society. Clearly, the novel contains an inherently relative point of view which the film is realising and using as an expression of the themes in its narrative. The fragmentary way of seeing is integral to this relativism re-emerges in the first scene in the house where it illustrates the Somerses' differences. Until Somers places his hat on the sideboard, the scene is viewed as a single, flowing shot. However, his disagreement with Harriett about decorating is stylistically paralleled by the fragmentation into separate close-ups of the characters. This way of seeing them characterises the narration of their dialogue in the garden, where Somers vocalises their differences with his sarcastic comment about Harriett's pretensions to a grander colonial society. The fragmentary shot/reverse shot structure also narrates their first dialogue with the Callcotts where, as in the novel, it illustrates Somers's distance from his neighbours. This distance is particularly felt in the backwards tracking shot of Somers walking away from Harriett and Vicky as he laments Harriett's neighbourliness; theoretically, this is his perspective of them if he were to look back, and it expresses his alienation.

Somers's friendliness towards Jack and Jaz in the pub contrasts with his distance from his wife, a distance also depicted when he reads the newspaper article to her. This friendliness contrasts with the enmity between the diggers and the socialists, which is a theme introduced in the pub. The enmity is visualised by the fight between the unemployed digger and the socialist raffling a chicken, and it is dramatised by the stichomythic way of seeing it. Somers's viewpoint is incorporated into this stichomythia. It is part of his uneasy, voyeuristic relationship with Australians, the unease of which was previously illustrated by his culture shock when reading the newspaper. Yet his face, shown in a reverse shot, also portrays a sort of recognition in his surprise at the fight, as if such conflict is an ongoing manifestation of the familiar war-spirit of England. In

the adaptation of 'Neighbours' which follows the fight, the film develops Jack's character, and the theme of male comradeship associated with him<sup>15</sup>. It begins with a shot of the shrapnel Jack expectorated. Burstall adds a photo of Jack in his military regalia which suggests his visual appeal, and points to Jack's manly, soldierly persona. At dinner, Harriett comments on Australian manliness, saying that it seems very manly not to care. This comment is grafted on to dialogue borrowed from the novel to stress Jack's uncaring, manly image, as is the line taken from one of Lawrence's letters. In the film's second dinner scene, Harriett paraphrases Australian insouciance as 'Happy-go-lucky dont-you-bother we're in Austrylia' (*L iv*, 271). This emptiness, personified by Jack, is also conveyed by his way of seeing. His objectification of Harriett in the opening scene in Sydney, and the stichomythia of the fight scene as he looks on, suggest a photographic way of seeing represented by the photograph of him. A contrast between the Somerses and the Callcotts is created by splicing a scene from 'Torestin' into 'Neighbours'. This contrast again points to the emptiness of the Australian characters. After the first dinner at Wyewurk, Somers and Harriett return home where, in a passage from 'Torestin', Somers voices his thoughts on the lack of class distinctions in Australia. The visceral subject of the dialogue, coupled with the bedroom's soft lighting, create an intimate ambience ideal for focusing on the inner self. In a scene based on the Somerses' visit to the beach, the subsequent shot returns to 'Neighbours' where Vicky's frivolity with Jack contrasts their relationship with the depth of the Somerses' marriage. The contrast between the deeper, European consciousness and the external, superficial consciousness of the Australians is also built into the film's pattern of alternating between interior, private scenes dimly lit with lamps or coal fires (like the bedroom scene) and external, public scenes that are sun-drenched or garishly illuminated (like the beach scene).

Within this alternation, the film again highlights the novel's technique of exchanged points of view. Both dinner scenes show characters in medium close-ups from a point of view that virtually belongs to another character. A precise example of this technique occurs during the dialogue between Somers and Harriett. Harriett insists to Jack that Somers has examples of some of his writing to lend. Somers counters that it will only bore Mr Callcott, and as the argument fluctuates between them, the camera shows the speaking partner - alternately Somers and Harriett - from a viewpoint just to the side of the silent partner. This technique fragments any complete viewpoint, showing the characters singly or as social 'bits', rather than as a communal whole. It thus replicates a particular style, and the effects of this style, in the novel.

Like 'Sons and Lovers' and 'Women in Love', 'Kangaroo' develops analogues both for the novel's fragmented and complete ways of seeing. Compared with earlier shots of Jack and Somers which tended to imitate the novel's fragmentary, exchanged point of view sequences, the introductory shot to 'Larboard Watch Ahoy' shows the two men as a whole. Its unitary style suggests a spirit of togetherness between them, foreshadowing their discourse on mateship in Wyewurk. Burstall uses this style to perpetuate the sense of harmony in Wyewurk, too. The scene in the house opens with a shot of Harriett and Vicky singing, and the camera, rather than fragmenting this scene into an exchange of points of view, circles around them as they sing. The shot's sense of unity is paralleled by the harmony of the two women singing together and the soft lighting creates a sense of intimacy complementary to the characters' closeness, as it did in the Somerses' warmly lit bedroom in Torestin.



Burstall dims the light further for the men's dialogue in the kitchen to reflect their developing mateship. To emphasise their mateship, Jack says, in a line from the novel: "Shake, I knew that we was mates" (46). Yet there are aspects to Jack's character which lie athwart this relationship. In both novel and film, he believes that it was fate that brought Somers to him. Jack's belief in fate, and his derisive attitude to women - as in the novel, he treats them as stereotypes, saying, "The women will keep up their throat-stretching for quite a time yet" (44) - are typical features of the authoritarian persona. In the novel, Somers is drawn to this persona, yet he continues to feel distant from Jack. The film conveys a similar scenario. The men's dialogue and gestures show their intimacy, but the fragmentation of the scene into point of view shots in which the characters are shot in separate frames suggests division.

In the novel, Lawrence juxtaposes this mateship scene with the one of Jack's sudden intimacy with Vicky, the rapid shift of Jack's attentions from Somers to Vicky resembling a montage. Burstall replicates the shift from one sequence of shots to another, and the shift in both novel and film shows how Jack can turn his affection on and off and on again as he goes from Somers to Vicky, an ability which, in the film, evokes the novel's description of his way of seeing his acquaintances as transient images. The film's adaptation of this chapter's conclusion, where Somers spies on Jaz's nocturnal visit, has already been inserted at the end of 'Neighbours'. In its place, the film shows the Somerses returning to Torestin, as Lawrence does, but the spying scene is substituted by shots of Somers recording Jack's 'Fifty mile-an-hour' comment in his diary. Somers's previous entries on volcanoes and earthquakes can also be read here. The shot of Somers writing, as well as his appearance, set him up as a portrait of Lawrence. Burstall's accentuation on Somers as Lawrence harks back to a similar process effected on Birkin by Ken Russell. Russell was drawn to

Lawrence's characters because they were based on real people, including Lawrence himself, and asserted that his films would only be good 'if they were about real people or characters I believe to be real' (Gomez, 1976, 78). Burstall's biographical focus on Somers as Lawrence and Harriett as Frieda betrays a similar ethos<sup>16</sup>. Significantly, the conflation of biography and fiction which shows Somers writing *Kangaroo* facilitates a parallel between Somers's way of seeing and Lawrence's. As his close-ups of Harriett demonstrate, Somers sees cinematographically, a way of seeing which is an analogue for Lawrence's experience of Ceylon and Australia which he fictionalised in *Kangaroo*.

The film goes directly from 'Larboard Watch Ahoy' to 'Kangaroo', bypassing the togetherness and distance of the ways of seeing in 'Jack and Jaz' and 'Coo-ee'. However, in its adaptation of 'Kangaroo', the film generates analogues for Somers's and Kangaroo's cinematographic ways of seeing each other, and gestures to the psychological distance associated with such perception. By juxtaposing these ways of seeing with similar ones in 'Larboard Watch Ahoy', the film shows that these ways of seeing predominate in Somers's interactions with Australians. The adaptation of 'Kangaroo' begins with a shot of Somers and Jack moving away from the camera on Jack's motorbike as they enter the grounds of Kangaroo's residence. This shot cuts to one of them approaching the camera inside the grounds. The movement away from the narrator outside the grounds towards the narrator inside suggests a distancing from Somers's domesticity with Harriett in the previous scene and a psychological shift towards Kangaroo's politics. The move towards mateship is further imaged in the shots of Somers and Jack arriving and entering the house which, as in previous shots of them together, point to their intimacy. After the military herald on the soundtrack which accompanies their entrance, the integrative way of seeing is

replaced by a montage of virtual points of view, beginning with the one virtually from Somers's angle of Kangaroo descending the stairs which gives the impression, as the novel says, that he is really tall; it also suggests his predisposition to the will and the intellect, the upper modes of consciousness which drive him in the novel. These initial close-ups lead to one of the Chinese servant which tracks across the table through further close-ups of Kangaroo, Jack and Somers. The narrator's tracking shot perspective is analogous to Somers's tracking shot perspectives throughout the novel. In the novel, the tracking shots express a distance between Somers and Australia. Here, the tracking shot is a precursor to the shifting perspective of Kangaroo's and Somers's dialogue, through which we feel the distance between Somers and Australia, as personified here by Kangaroo. This distance is conveyed by their way of seeing each other as close-ups, a way of seeing which is a dual analogue for Kangaroo's way of scrutinising Somers through his glasses and for Somers's way of seeing Kangaroo in close-up bits. The distance is evident in their dialogue, too; Somers, despite showing a tacit interest in Kangaroo's cause, remains noncommittal. The interchange of viewpoints also shows that Kangaroo is more of a spectator, and Somers more of a listener. As Somers speaks, his virtual point of view of Kangaroo shows that Kangaroo watches him closely before asking whom Somers is spying for. Conversely, as Kangaroo speaks, his virtual point of view of Somers shows Somers listening and gazing downwards before asking where Kangaroo would lead Australia. The contrast between the two shots suggests, as the novel does, that Somers is an object of military surveillance in Australia, as he was in England.

The interchange of perspectives between the narrator's, Somers's and Kangaroo's is also an analogue for the relativistic way of seeing which the novel uses to narrate the opening part of their

first meeting. The fact that the film narrates their entire meeting with this fragmented way of seeing amplifies Somers's potential opposition to Kangaroo by abstracting the complete way of seeing from the scene which, in the novel, was indicative of Kangaroo's absolute love and Somers's possible accord with such love. The way of seeing the following scene, adapted from Somers's dialogue with Harriett in 'Jack and Jaz', illustrates more of an accord between Somers and Harriett, even when they are angry with each other, than there is between Somers and Kangaroo. The montage of virtual viewpoints which narrates and reflects their differences over Somers's involvement with Jack and Kangaroo is interspersed with the narrator's shots of them together, the most poignant of which is the medium shot of both of them as Somers picks up the vegetables. The following close-up of his hand is an image of the bits that their relationship fragments into, a process contradicted by this shot of them together where, despite his anger, he helps her. The ways of seeing the scene suggest that their relationship oscillates between togetherness and distance, whereas Somers's relationship with Kangaroo has yet to develop a sense of genuine intimacy.

Following their argument, the Somerses, accompanied by the Callcotts, depart for Coo-ee on the train. The film's tracking shot of the Australian interior from the train replicates the shots in the novel which showed Somers's view of the flat, framed wall of the Australian interior tracking past him during the train-ride. The montage style in the previous two scenes re-emerges, too. The camera cuts from the tracking shot of the interior back to shots of Harriett, Somers and Jack as they talk of Australia. This montage allows the director to show Jack's reaction to Somers's comment that for Australia to have a true identity, someone must water the country with their blood. Jack's reaction reveals that this violent image touches on a nerve, as if it were emblematic

of the diggers' *raison d'être*. As in the novel, the montage in this scene, and the two previous scenes, contrasts with the way Coo-ee and its coastal environs are presented.

The couples' arrival at Coo-ee is filmed in a deep-focus long-shot that emulates the style of Lawrence's narrative at Coo-ee. The deep-focus long-shot recurs in Harriett's gaze at the sea, too. The framed sun, sea, sand and swell look as they are described in the novel. To emphasise the change in mood catalysed by the switch from montage to long-shots, Burstall sets this shot to a piece of music used repeatedly in the film, Dvorak's *Lento*. The soaring violin melody of this piece was 'adapted from a birdsong Dvorak heard in the Iowa woodlands' (*The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, Vol.5, Ed. Stanley Sadie, 781). It counterpoints the military herald which accompanied Somers's entrance to Kangaroo's, and evokes a more wholesome spirit of place at Coo-ee which is symbolised, too, by Harriett's deep breath of relaxation as she gazes at the sea. Indeed, Harriett vocalises her happiness in the next scene in the house where a sense of harmony is created in a shot of her and Somers which, instead of fracturing the couple into segments of montage, shows them in double profile.

In the novel, the move to Coo-ee is linked with a revival of the inner, emotional self antithetical to Jack's mode of existence. Lawrence alters the style of his narrative to mirror this change, and so does the film, which switches from montage to deep-focus shots. The film highlights the change using some of the dialogue in the house, too. In the novel, Vicky's character is part superficial Australian, and part something deeper. The film brings out Vicky's visceral character at Coo-ee to show that the house has a spirit of place more connected with the inner life than Sydney or the hinterland. Vicky's quest for an inner self is revealed in her awareness of it in the Somerses, and

her statement that she is always trying find out what she feels. Unsurprisingly, she doesn't expect Jack, the outer man, to tell her how she feels. Jack is marginalised at Coo-ee in the novel, and the film does the same. This scene of Vicky's wish to know how she feels puts Jack on the side of the frame, and primarily focuses on the Somerses and Vicky, reaffirming Coo-ee as the milieu of the visceral self. Again, the film develops analogues for the novel's fractured and complete ways of seeing, and these analogues, particularly the fractured montages, begin to acquire a weight of expression by being repeated in thematically similar situations. The montages of exchanged points of view are largely attached to Somers's differences with figures of authority, his wife and Australians. The close-up way of seeing implicit in these exchanged points of view expresses Somers's alienation from these people, as it does in the novel, reinforcing the argument that the film's way of seeing recreates the novel's sense of distance around Somers.

The scenes at the camp are adapted from Jack's references to the diggers' military infrastructure in 'Coo-ee'. During Jack's and Somers's visit to the camp, the film creates an analogue for the diggers' geometric way of seeing which is implicit in Jack's later reference to rifle-practice in 'Diggers'. The way of seeing Somers as medium long-shots and long-shots as he walks through the bush is an illustration of the diggers' way of looking at him through their rifle sights as he approaches the camp, a way of seeing also embodied in the close-up of the diggers crewing the machine gun. The way these long-shots of Somers in the forest track down like a gunsight being brought to bear on a target emphasises Somers's objectification, an objectification which also occurs in his sharp perspectives of the guards as they take aim at him. The psychological distance between subject and object associated with this way of seeing is evident in the backwards zoom from the blindfolded Somers as he is brought into the camp. The sense that this way of seeing

fragments the image it sees is conveyed by the alternating perspectives of Jack and Somers during Jack's explanation of the diggers' rationale. Seemingly, these perspectives are the narrator's, but the sequence cuts to a shot of Kangaroo looking through his binoculars which suggests that this objective, fractured way of seeing as if through a magnified frame is his, a way of seeing analogous to his optical way of looking at Somers through his pince-nez in the novel.

Significantly, a similar way of seeing in exchanged, virtual close-ups of each other narrates the Somerses' following dialogue at Coo-ee about 'politics and red-hot treason'. The commonality of ways of seeing suggests that while Somers is tempted by Kangaroo's cause, he remains detached from it, and this detachment also characterises his marriage where it appears to have been aggravated by his political involvement. Seemingly, his detachment is temporarily suspended during his next meeting with Kangaroo. The meeting is based on the latter part of his first dialogue with Kangaroo in 'Kangaroo'. In the novel, Kangaroo's diatribe on evil is followed by Somers's transcendent vision of him, as if Kangaroo's passion has compensated for his ideals. The film's analogue for this way of seeing is the zoom into close-up of his face as he speaks of Australia. This shot cuts to Somers watching, and the cut associates his spectatorship with the zoom, an association which expresses Kangaroo's momentary appeal to him. Significantly, the remainder of their dialogue on obedience, evil, fighting and propaganda is narrated with exchanged virtual point of view shots which express the men's intrinsic differences, differences which manifest themselves in Somers's questions and ongoing lack of commitment. The film also develops an analogue for Kangaroo's way of seeing Somers. In the novel, Kangaroo does not reciprocate Somers's visceral way of seeing; he simply stares at Somers abstractedly through his pince-nez. A similar scenario exists in the film. Somers's gaze implicitly zooms into Kangaroo,

registering his appeal, whereas Kangaroo's reverse shots of Somers see him as a close-up, illustrating Kangaroo's rigid, intellectual way of considering him. The rigidity of his perception is paralleled by the rigidity of his thought, revealed by his failure to improvise an answer to Somers's aphorism: "Blind poets are out of fashion".

The fractured, fragmented style of this political scene is used during Somers's visit to Willie Struthers which follows. By moving to this adaptation of the opening scene of 'Willie Struthers and Kangaroo', the film bypasses three chapters and juxtaposes Somers's earlier visits to Kangaroo with his first visit to Struthers. This juxtaposing of the visits emphasises the sense of two causes bidding for Somers's soul, a theme which is further emphasised by Kangaroo's later comment about an auction for Somers's soul. Somers ultimately rejects the love asked for by Kangaroo and the love offered by Struthers<sup>17</sup>. His rejection is incorporated into the film's way of seeing his interaction with both figures as montages of exchanged virtual points of view, a way of seeing which reflects, as in the novel, his lack of harmony with them. The same fragmented style of these political scenes spills over into the next scene at Coo-ee between Somers and Harriett which shows that Somers's marriage is as problematic for him as his relationship with the politicians. During Harriett's subsequent invented visit to Kangaroo, this disjointed style is again found when she tells Kangaroo he is simply a fascist. It is also evident in the following invented scene at Coo-ee during her dialogue with Somers. However, it is replaced with a more integrative, continuous way of seeing when Struthers invites him to be a voice for the Labour movement. The flowing shot of Struthers, Somers and Jaz cuts to a close-up in the printroom which slowly zooms into Struthers as he speaks of the brotherhood of man. The flow and the zoom are analogues for Somers's positive way of seeing Struthers in the novel when he is touched



by Struthers's sense of love. The brotherhood Struthers talks about in the film is imaged in his reverse shot of Somers and Jaz in which the objects of his gaze move in a parallel way, as if their spirits are in unison.

Somers's visit to Struthers is followed by another visit to Kangaroo, adapted from 'The Battle of Tongues'. The montage style synonymous with Somers's distanced interaction with Kangaroo recurs, and it is accompanied by analogues for their objective ways of seeing each other as their differences crystallise. When Somers questions the integrity of Kangaroo's supporters, Kangaroo is seen from a long-shot virtual point of view from behind Somers's shoulder. This way of seeing him contrasts with the initial exchanged close-ups, and Kangaroo's physical distance illustrates the psychological distance implicit in the close-ups. This distance is intensified by Somers's tendency to look down or away from Kangaroo, which reveals a disavowal of himself as the object of Kangaroo's attention. As Kangaroo becomes more passionate, they see each other as extreme close-ups, which is analogous to Somers's appreciation of Kangaroo's beauty in this chapter. However, Somers remains noncommittal, and his position is depicted by Kangaroo's extreme virtual close-up which backs away as Somers apologises. The theme of detachment is amplified by the narrator's close-up of Somers's articulation of his sense of the dark god as it shows that the characters' viewpoints have been replaced by the narrator's, a procedure which distances the spectator from the narrative. This distance is further amplified by the scene's final long-shot of Somers. It seems to be Kangaroo's, and expressive of the alienation between him and Somers, but Kangaroo walks into the shot which then emphasises the distance between the narrative and the spectator, a distance which alludes to the personal and political anticlimax between Kangaroo and Somers narrated in the scene<sup>18</sup>.

This scene's keynote elements of division and isolation are repeated at Wyewurk. In the novel, Somers's and Vicky's flirting was highly watchable, and it is one of this scene's main features. Vicky, in her chiffon dress, catches the eye in particular. She is the object of Somers's gaze, as Harriett is of Jack's. Indeed, all four characters watch each other, and the whole scene is surveyed by Jaz. This layering of gazes points to the absence of a positive connection between the characters - all they can do is look at each other, or speak facetiously as Harriett and Jack do. Again, an index of their separateness is the scene's fragmentary style. The characters are never seen together in a single, unifying community shot. Instead, they are shown from what are, virtually, other characters' viewpoints. The scene concludes with a solo shot of Vicky pondering Somers's rejection of her offering of herself to him. This shot is emblematic of the theme of isolation, suggesting that despite the characters' efforts at forging a vital interchange, they are left snatching at shadows.

The next scene creates an analogue for Harriett's long-shot point of view of Somers from the cliff. In the film and the novel, because of his political involvement or because his character is structured so, Somers diverts his emotions away from Harriett and appears, at times, impersonal and uninvolved with his marriage. In the novel, this impersonality is reflected in the distance between them that Harriett's long-shot of Somers in the sea illustrates. In the film, her long-shot of Somers entering the sea depicts his inclination to solipsism, too. Her spectatorship of his diminishment to a speck in the ocean expresses his detachment from her during the swim which is felt in the novel, despite their subsequent lovemaking. The film incorporates this detachment into their lovemaking by alternating between long-shots and close-ups throughout this scene. This

technique achieves a subtle effect of climax, and it also suggests an oscillation between communion and impersonality, a state seemingly recommended by Lawrence and symptomatic of their ship of marriage being at sea, as he puts it<sup>19</sup>. The distance illustrated by the long-shots persists in the following scene, too, which is a dramatisation of the dialogue in 'Harriett and Lovatt at Sea in Marriage'. The fade from the lovemaking scene to this one connects the two scenes, and the connection is vocalised in their dialogue which suggests that the distance on the beach has become a condition of their marriage, a condition triggered by Somers's insistence on his innate lordship and illustrated again by a long-shot of him as he enters the bush.

The film omits 'Diggers' and goes directly to Somers's dialogue with Kangaroo in 'Willie Struthers and Kangaroo', again inviting a parallel between Somers's personal and political relationships. The ways of seeing in the film show that one of its interpretations of the novel is as a narrative in which these relationships are intertwined. Its adaptation of Somers's dialogue with Kangaroo captures the sense of distance between the two characters expressed by the novel's ways of seeing. The opening scene shows them seated on opposite sides of Kangaroo's desk, and the symmetry of their physical opposition foreshadows their differences. These differences are again conveyed by the exchange of virtual point of view shots which accompany Somers's support for Struthers, and which are an analogue for Somers's way of seeing Kangaroo at the end of this chapter as a series of close-ups which fragment him. Kangaroo's way of touching Somers is a visualisation of their differences. It is not a gentle, sympathetic touch. Like a fly in the web of Kangaroo's will-to-love, Somers is virtually imprisoned by Kangaroo's grip, and asks to be freed. And Somers's alienation is perpetuated when, like his textual counterpart, he averts his eyes from Kangaroo's gaze. Their distance is vocalised in their dialogue, too. Kangaroo, like the lawyer he

is, asks, as in the novel, what Somers's case against him is. Somers avers that it is not a case, but an instinct. Kangaroo's way of touching Somers, and his critical, intellectual sense of what Somers calls an instinct, manifest themselves in his way of seeing Somers's departure after he has advised him to leave Australia. Kangaroo is the onlooker watching Somers disappear, just as he is in the novel, and the physical distance between the voyeur and the object of his gaze emphasises the psychological gulf separating him and Somers. This last long-shot of Somers's exit makes him look lonely or isolated, and confirms Harriett's comment to him in the previous scene: "[You're] just a forlorn and isolated little creature without even a dog to kick at". Interestingly, the long-shot of Somers's disappearance into the bush after his argument with Harriett parallels the long-shot of his exit from Kangaroo's. The parallel re-emphasises that he is as lonely in his marriage as he is in his political world; as Harriett says in the next scene, adapted from 'Jack Slaps Back', his quarrelling with Kangaroo is almost marital.

By going directly to 'Jack Slaps Back', the film omits 'The Nightmare', which has been shifted to the opening of its narrative, "'Revenge!' Timotheus Cries' and 'Bits'. However, the terse, laconic cartoonist's way of seeing in 'Bits' and 'Jack Slaps Back' is incorporated into the film's adaptation of Jack's solo visit to Coo-ee. The narrator's long-shot perspective of his arrival prefigures the distance between Jack and Somers conveyed by the fractured sequence of exchanged, virtual point of view shots analogous to the shifting point of view and close-ups which characterise the opening of 'Jack Slaps Back' and the men's subsequent interaction. The frequency of shifts increases as the argument intensifies, illustrating their conflict and developing an analogue for the cartoonist's rapid exchange of frames implicit in the novel's way of seeing the opening of this chapter. A sign of Somers's status as an alien in the potentially fascistic state of

Australia is that, as in England's militarised society, he is called a 'spy', this time by Jack. To reinforce the comparison between Somers's position as an outsider in both countries, the film shows Jack going through Somers's papers as the military police did in England. One shot in particular points to the resemblance between Australia and England. The close-up of Jack's hand flicking through the books repeats the close-up of the detective's hand searching through Somers's bureau in Cornwall. This scene seems to signify a break with Jack's cause, as, in the aftermath, Somers is more intimate with Harriett, and this intimacy is illustrated by the continuous way of seeing their dialogue about leaving Australia.

The film's adaptation of 'A Row in Town' develops the way of seeing in 'Jack Slaps Back' to express the diggers' withheld, violent selves bursting forth. It also includes an analogue for Somers's distant point of view of the harbour and his montage of the city, which takes the form of his long-shot perspective of the Labour march. The close-ups of Struthers's speech resemble the novel's, and Jack's disavowal of Somers's gaze indicates the distance between the diggers and the spectators. When the violence begins, and the audience becomes a many-centred mob, the film's style changes from stable shots of the hall to one which, as in the novel, shows fleeting, fragmented bits of the action. The sense that Somers is unable to join the action and can only watch it from the sidelines is conveyed, too. There are several shots of Somers watching the fighting, and the final shot of these scenes is an emblem of Somers's watchful nature. The rioting around the injured Kangaroo is shown from Somers's point of view, and then Somers is shown in a reverse shot, disempowered and distant, watching it. His offer of a *witness* statement to the police affirms his position as a spectator rather than a player. Furthermore, like the novel, the film focuses on the theme of violent eruptions from the repressed self. Using close-ups of the

instruments of violence - a meat-hook, chains, bats - that the diggers take from under their clothes, it thematises the violent emergence of this self. To emphasise this theme, the bomb is shown as a close-up which turns it into a symbol of the authoritarian persona. Personified by Jack, this persona is always on a short fuse, willing to find an excuse for letting repressed violence erupt. The film goes beyond the novel's reportage of Jack's violence, too, by showing actual scenes of the men whom he assaults and adding a scene of him punching Somers to the ground, thereby creating further emphasis on the violence generated from the repressed self. In parallel with Somers, his political behaviour manifests elements of his personality at work in his marriage. On returning home, as in the novel, there is a clear menace in his voice when he warns Vicky not to stir.

The film's analogues for the Gertleresque whirl of the narrator's perspective which, in both film and novel, embodies the violence it illustrates add an interesting perspective to the adaptation. During Struthers's speech, the camera crosscuts rhythmically to scenes grafted on to the novel's account of the speech. These added scenes show a growing phalanx of police in and around the hall, apparently under the authority of Kangaroo in his military regalia. The build-up and rhythm of this sequence seems to imitate the famous sequence on the Odessa steps in 'The Battleship Potemkin'. The implicit parallel between Australia and Soviet Russia shows that the film stylistically and historically sees the riot as a crucial moral juncture in the formation of national identity. As Somers says, Australia will not be truly Australia until someone has watered the country with their blood.

Somers's detachment, which is conveyed by the image of him as a spectator to the violence, characterises his interaction with Kangaroo in the adaptation of 'Kangaroo is Killed'. As in the novel, the close-ups of Kangaroo from Somers's virtual point of view suggest a detachment that is vocalised in their dialogue, and the reverse close-ups of Somers are an illustration of the intellectual aspect of Kangaroo's love. Their discord, as in previous encounters, is reflected by portraying the dialogue as a montage. The discord is emphasised by the film's analogue for Somers's sense of drawing back from Kangaroo, which takes the form of the cut from Somers's virtual close-up of Kangaroo's face as he shouts he is dying to the narrator's medium shot of Somers getting up from the bed which pans left as Jack and the nurse enter. The change in scope as perspective switches from Somers's to the narrator's parallels Somers's actual and psychological withdrawal from Kangaroo. Importantly, the final shots of the scene create a further analogue for Kangaroo's optical, detached way of seeing. The close-up of Kangaroo as he says he is leaking cuts to a reverse close-up of Somers, and a reverse close-up of Jack. These separate close-ups of Somers and Jack recall the way he implicitly saw them through his binoculars in the film's scene of the diggers' camp and suggests that he sees with a similar separation from the objects of his gaze, which are fragmented by it, as he did through binoculars, a way of seeing which highlights the distance between him, his supporters, and Somers. As in the novel, Somers's dislocation from the world is conveyed by the following shots of the diggers, and of him on the shore. The shot of the diggers is an analogue for his sense of unreality as he leaves Kangaroo's. The flat, pasteboard figures of the diggers in the background ignore Somers, and they seem a flat image on the periphery of the shot and the margins of his experience. The next shot of Somers on the edge of the shore is an extreme long-shot, which expresses his self-containment and the distance from humanity associated with it. This distance is also evident in the shot of the

Somerses leaving Coo-ee which is filmed as a continuous backwards pan from them. The continuity reflects the togetherness between the Somerses and Jaz, and the distance the narrator maintains from the Somerses evokes the distance Somers maintains between himself and others which is alluded to by Jaz's comments about Somers going around the world looking for things not to give in to. This way of seeing is an analogue for Somers's remote, final vision of his departure, as is the final long-shot of the Somerses being driven to the harbour.

As with the films of *Sons and Lovers* and *Women in Love*, the film of *Kangaroo* highlights the inherent expressiveness of the novel's ways of seeing. The film also reproduces the connection between these ways of seeing and the themes of the novel's narrative and, by doing so, emphasises this connection. In both film and novel, the ways of seeing remove the readers/spectators from the narrative, and generate an alienating effect which focuses on the characters of the narrative, and the readers/spectators, as detached observers of environment and society. The film therefore gives us a faithful interpretation of Lawrence's experience of Australia as set down in *Kangaroo*, an experience foreshadowed by his visit to Ceylon. Despite his rejection of Mackenzie's ideas about travelling to the Pacific and making a film record and a film novel of the journey, the analysis of the ways of seeing in the novel and the film suggests that Lawrence incorporated a cinematographic way of seeing into the novel. Moreover, this way of seeing, and its connection to his alienation, are clearly illustrated by the film.



## Notes

1. Brenda Maddox notes the camera-like qualities of these perspectives (Maddox, 1994, 412).
2. The montage of the opening scene and this fragmented tracking shot point to a cultural emphasis on fragmentation which the novel shares with *Ulysses*. Lawrence read a serialisation of *Ulysses* in Italy, and the fragmentation shared by both novels points to montage as the form of modern narrative:

I will consider as extremely pertinent to the development of a modernist narrative the theories and practice of Eisenstein, in particular the notion of montage.

(Cohen, 1979, 9)

Certain British and American novelists, such as Stephen Crane, Henry James, Joseph Conrad, and Ford Madox Ford... strove to apply to their medium the techniques of fragmentation and changing perspective we associate with the impressionist painters.

(Ibid., 33)

3. For a full discussion of the authoritarian persona with specific reference to *Kangaroo*, see *D.H. Lawrence and the Authoritarian Personality* (Mensch), Chapter 6.
4. Somers's betrayal of the female principle by his belief in male comradeship is felt in this dream (Swigg, 1972, 348).

5. Lawrence refers to a relativistic aesthetic in *Fantasia* (*FU*, 180). He also equates relativity with the novel as an artform (essay quoted in Worthen, 1979, 137).

6. Lawrence's alienation belongs to a tradition in Australian writing whereby the landscape is viewed as hostile to European consciousness (Maddox, 1994, 317).

7. In *The Lost Girl*, Alvina's photographic way of seeing points to her alienation, too (*LG*, 291).

8. For a full discussion on disavowal and distance in the cinema, see *Sex in the Head* (Williams, 1992, 87).

9. As Meyers notes, Lawrence 'excelled in portraying violence... [for example] the political riots in Kangaroo' (Meyers, 1987, 157). ital

10. There is an argument that Kangaroo's love makes him a devouring mother figure, and that the bullets in his pouch, like Mrs Morel's tumour, are emblematic of an attack on this love (Ruderman, 1984, 107, 111).

11. Part of this way of seeing is the narrative's focus on outsiders: '[It] blend[s] a deep interest of thought with astonishing vividness in externals' (unsigned review, *Times Literary Supplement*, 20/9/1923).

12. Burstall's opinions of Lawrence's version of mateship were printed in *The Guardian* (Baum, 'The Roo With A View', in *The Guardian*, 13/11/86, 15).

13. The symmetry focuses on the similarities between Australia and England, particularly the parallels between wartime England and Kangaroo's military nationalism (Peter Kemp, in *The Independent*, 4/12/86, 12).

14. Cohen argues that films offer the most graphic demonstration of the continually changing point of view which came to prominence during this period of growing relativism in all fields (Cohen, 1979, 80). The nature of characters, which continually shifts with the position of the observer, is also discussed by Alter (Alter, 1975, 157).

15. As noted earlier, this theme and the associated violence are among Burstall's favourites (Benson, 1983, 16). His preoccupation with mateship and violence is corroborated by John Walton's portrayal of Jack which won several plaudits (Taubin, 'Animal Crackers', in *Village Voice*, 24/3/87, 56, initialled review, *Washington Post*, 15/5/87, 2).

16. Judy Davies, who played Harriett, said that it was her favourite role to date (Baum, 'The Roo With A View', in *The Guardian*, 13/11/86, 15). Many of Harriett's aspects that drew favourable comments were commensurate with Frieda's character (Annan, 'Kangaroo', in *The Sunday Telegraph*, 7/12/86, 19, Maslin, 'Australian Politics in Lawrence's 'Kangaroo'', in *The New York Times*, 13/3/87, 12, Green, 'Kangaroo', in *Today*, 7/12/86, 29).

17. Hough argues that Somers's rejection of both figures in the novel makes him resemble Dostoevsky's figure of the Grand Inquisitor (Hough, 1956, 112).

18. The narrator's perspective suggests a disapprobation of Somers's inability to commit himself to anything which his character is frequently in danger of incurring (Schneider, 1984, 220).

19. Burstall has a history of handling sexuality (Benson, 1983, 16). He has been praised for the sex scenes in 'Alvin Purple' and 'Petersen' (Palmer, 'He Just Blunders On', in *The Melbourne Sun*, 20/12/73, Bennet, 'Petersen Takes Us On Another Step', in *The Melbourne Age*, 2/11/74). This history underlies his understanding and presentation of the Somerses' lovemaking in this scene.

## Bibliography.

Alldritt, K. *D.H.Lawrence and the Visual Imagination*. London: Edward Arnold 1971.

Alter, R. *Partial Magic*. Berkeley & London: University of California Press 1975.

Andrew, J.D. *The Major Film Theories*. London: Oxford University Press 1976.

Annan, G. 'Kangaroo', in *The Sunday Telegraph*, 7/12/86.

Apollinaire, G. 'Les Mamelles de Tirésias', in *Oeuvres en prose complètes*. Paris: Gallimard 1993, c1977.

Balazs, Bela. *Theory of the Film*. Arno Press and New York Times: New York 1972.

Balbert, P. *D.H.Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*. Basingstoke: Macmillan 1988.

Baldanza, F. 'Sons and Lovers: Novel to Film as a Record of Cultural Growth', in *Literature and Film Quarterly*, v1, n1, Jan.1973.

Balfour, A.J. 'Creative Evolution and Philosophic Doubt' in *The Hibbert Journal*, v10, 1911-12.

Barthes, R. *Image, Music, Text*. London: Fontana 1977.

Baum, C. 'The Roo With A View', in *The Guardian*, 13/11/86.

Baxter, J. *An Appalling Talent: Ken Russell*. London: Michael Joseph Ltd. 1973.

Bazin, A. 'What is Cinema?', in *Major Film Theories*. London: Oxford University Press 1976.

Beja, M. *Film and Literature*. New York & London: Longman 1979.

Bell, M. *Literature, Modernism and Myth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1997.

Benjamin, W. 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproductions', in *Illuminations*.  
London: Fontana Press 1973.

Bennet, C. 'Petersen Takes Us On Another Step', in *The Melbourne Age*, 2/11/74.

Bennet, C. 'Fair Fist of Knuckles', in *The Melbourne Age*, 17/9/79.

Benson, J. *A Tim Burstall Biography*. Pamphlet in British Institute of Film Archives, circa 1983.

Berger, J. *Ways of Seeing*. Harmondsworth: Penguin 1972.

Bergson, H. *Creative Evolution* (1906). This translation London: Macmillan 1928.

Blanchard, L. 'Lawrence, Foucault, and the Language of Sexuality', in *Longman Critical Readers: D.H.Lawrence*. Ed. P.Widdowson. Harlow: Longman 1992.

Blanchard, L. 'Love and Power: A Reconsideration of Sexual Politics in D.H.Lawrence', in *Modern Fiction Studies*, v21, n3, 1975-6.

Bluestone, G. *Novels Into Film: The Metamorphosis of Fiction Into Cinema*. Berkeley: University of California Press 1961.

Bowen, E. *The Last September*. Harmondsworth: Penguin 1952.

Bowen, E. 'Why I go to the cinema', in *Footnotes to the Film*. Ed. C.Davy. London: New York: Oxford University Press, 1937. (Acknowledgement due to Linda Williams as I first discovered this work through *Sex in the Head*.)

Bradbury, M. and MacFarlane, J. (eds.). *Modernism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin 1976.

Brewer, Rev. E.C. *A Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*. London: Odhams Press Ltd. 1929.

Brewster, B. *Theatre to Cinema: Stage Pictorialism and the Early Feature Film*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1997.

- Brewster, Earl and Achsah (eds.). *D.H.Lawrence: Reminiscences and Correspondence*. London: Secker 1931.
- Burns. *Nature and Culture in D.H.Lawrence*. London: Macmillan 1980.
- Cardiff, J. *Magic Hour: The Life of a Cameraman*. London: Faber and Faber 1996.
- Carswell, C. *The Savage Pilgrimage*. London: Chatto and Windus 1932.
- Carter, F. *D.H.Lawrence and the Body Mystical*. No publisher listed. 1972.
- Caughie, J. (ed.). *Theories of Authorship*. London: Routledge in Association with the British Film Institute 1988.
- Chipp, H. *Theories of Modern Art*. Berkeley: University of California Press 1968.
- Christie, I. and Taylor, R. (eds.). *Eisenstein Rediscovered*. London & New York: Routledge 1993.
- Christie, I. 'Women in Love', in *Sight and Sound*, v39, n1, Winter 1969/70.
- Clark, L.D. *The Minoan Distance*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press 1980.



- Clarke, C. (ed.). *D.H.Lawrence - The Rainbow and Women in Love*. London: Macmillan 1969.
- Cohen, K. *Film and Fiction: The Dynamics of Exchange*. New Haven: Yale University Press 1979.
- Combs, R. 'Women in Love', in *Sight and Sound*, v39, n1, Winter 1969/70.
- Cowan, J. *D.H.Lawrence and the Trembling Balance*. University Park & London: Pennsylvania State University Press 1990.
- Daleski, H.M. *The Forked Flame: A Study of D.H.Lawrence*. London: Faber & Faber 1965.
- Dante, Alighieri. *The Divine Comedy*. This translation London: Pan Books Ltd. 1981.
- Davis, J. *D.H.Lawrence at Thirroul*. Sydney, New South Wales: W.Collins 1989.
- Denby, D. (ed.). *Film 70/71: An Anthology by the National Society of Film Critics*. New York: Simon and Schuster 1971.
- Denitto, D. 'All Passion Spent', in *The English Novel and the Movies*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co. 1980.
- Dentith, S. *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*. London: Routledge 1994.

355

Dervin, D. *A Strange Sapience: The Creative Imagination of D.H.Lawrence*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press 1984.

Draper, R.P. (ed.). *D.H.Lawrence: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1970.

Du Bose, M. 'Manners of Men From Outback', in *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13/7/79.

Durgnat, R. *Sexual Alienation in the Cinema: The Dynamics of Sexual Freedom*. Studio Vista Publishers, produced by November Books Ltd 1986.

Easthope, A (ed.). *Contemporary Film Theory*. London: Longman 1993.

Elam, D. *Feminism and Deconstruction - Ms. en Abyrne*. London: Routledge 1994.

Eisenstein, S. *Film Form* (1929). New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co (trans. Jay Leyda) 1949.

Eisenstein, S. *On the Composition of the Short Fiction Scenario*. Calcutta: Seagull Books and Eisenstein Cinema Club 1984.

Eisler, H. *Composing for the Films*. London: Dobson 1951.

Featherstone, M., Hepworth, M. and Turner, B. (eds.). *The Body - Social Process and Cultural Theory*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. 1991.

Feinstein, E. *Lawrence's Women: The Intimate Life of D.H.Lawrence*. London: HarperCollins 1993.

Fernihough, A. *D.H.Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1993.

Forbes, J. 'The Rainbow', in *Monthly Film Bulletin*, v.57, n. 672 Jan. 1990.

Friedman, L (ed.). *Fires Were Started: British Cinema and Thatcherism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1994.

Fulton, A.R. *Motion Pictures: The Development of An Art from Silent Films to the Age of Television*. Oklahoma: Oklahoma University Press 1960.

Gertner, R. 'Sons and Lovers', in *Motion Picture Herald*, v220, n2, 9th July 1960.

Giannetti, L. *Understanding Movies, 4th Edition*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs 1987.

Gide, A. *Journal (1889 - 1839)*. Paris: Éditions de la Nouvelle Revue Française 1939.

Godard, J.L. *Godard on Godard*. London: Lorrimer Publishing Ltd. 1967.

Gomez, J. 'The Elusive Gold at the End of *The Rainbow*: Russell's Adaptation of Lawrence's Novel', in *Literature and Film Quarterly*, v.18, n.2, 1990.

Gomez, J. *Ken Russell*. London: Frederick Muller Ltd. 1976.

Gombrich, E.H. *The Story of Art*. London: Phaidon 1970.

Gow, G. 'Women in Love', in *Films and Filming*, v.16, n.4, Jan. 1970.

Grant, B. 'The Body Politic: Ken Russell in the 1980s', in *Fires Were Started: British Cinema and Thatcherism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1994.

Green, W. 'Kangaroo', in *Today*, 7/12/86.

Greiff, L.K. *D.H.Lawrence Fifty Years on Film*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press 2001.

Hacker, J. and Price, D. *Take 10: Contemporary British Film Directors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1992.

Hanke, K. *Ken Russell's Films*. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press 1984.

Hart, H. 'Sons and Lovers', in *Films in Review*, v.11, n.7, Aug./Sep. 1960.

Holbrook, D. *Where D.H.Lawrence Was Wrong About Women*. Lewisburg [Pa]: Bucknell University Press. London: Associated University Presses 1992.

Holderness, G. *D.H.Lawrence - History, Ideology and Fiction*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan; Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press 1982.

Hough, G. *The Dark Sun*. London: Duckworth 1956.

Howe, M.B. *The Art of Self in D.H.Lawrence*. Athens: Ohio University Press 1977.

Humma, J.B. *Metaphor and Meaning in D.H.Lawrence's Later Novels*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press 1990.

Hyde, G.M. *Macmillan Modern Novelists: D.H.Lawrence*. Basingstoke: Macmillan 1990.

Joyce, J. *Ulysses*. New York: Random House 1961.

Kemp, P. 'Lawrence Reports From Down Under', in *The Independent*, 4/12/86.

Klein, M. and Parker, G. (eds.). *The English Novel and the Movies*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co. 1980.

Landow, G. 'Lawrence and Ruskin: The Sage as Word-Painter', in *D.H.Lawrence and Tradition*.

Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press 1985.

Lapsley, J. 'K.O. Winner to Tim Burstall', in *Sydney-Sun Herald*, 15/7/79.

Lawrence, D.H. *Aaron's Rod*. Ed. Mara Kalnins. London: Penguin 1995.

Lawrence, D.H. *Apocalypse*. Ed. Mara Kalnins. London: Penguin 1995.

Lawrence, D.H. *The Boy in the Bush*. Ed. Paul Eggert. London: Penguin 1995.

Lawrence, D.H. *The Complete Poems of D.H.Lawrence*. Ed. Vivian de Sola Pinto and Warren Roberts. London: Heinemann 1964.

Lawrence, D.H. *England, My England and Other Stories*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1988.

Lawrence, D.H. *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. No editor listed. London: Penguin 1986.

Lawrence, D.H. *The First 'Women in Love'*. Eds. John Worthen and Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998.

Lawrence, D.H. *Kangaroo*. Ed. Bruce Steele. London: Penguin 1997.

Lawrence, D.H. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Ed. John Lyon. London: Penguin 1990.

Lawrence, D.H. *Letters*. 7 vols. Eds. James Boulton, George Zytanick, Andrew Robertson, Warren Roberts, Elizabeth Mansfield, Lindeth Vasey, Margaret Boulton, Gerald Lacy and Keith Sagar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1979 - 1991.

Lawrence, D.H. *The Lost Girl*. Ed. John Worthen. London: Penguin 1995.

Lawrence, D.H. *Phoenix*. Ed. Edward McDonald. London: Heinemann 1936.

Lawrence, D.H. *Phoenix II*. Ed. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore. London: Heinemann 1968.

Lawrence, D.H. *Pornography and Obscenity*. No editor listed. London: Faber and Faber 1929.

Lawrence, D.H. *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious*. No editor listed. London: Penguin 1986.

Lawrence, D.H. *The Rainbow*. Ed. Mark Kinkead-Weekes. London: Penguin 1995.

Lawrence, D.H. *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays*. Ed. Michael Herbert. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1988.

501  
Lawrence, D.H. *Selected Short Stories*. Ed. Brian Finney. Harmondsworth: Penguin 1989.

Lawrence, D.H. *Sons and Lovers*. Eds. Helen Baron and Carl Baron. London: Penguin 1994.

Lawrence, D.H. *Studies in Classic American Literature*. No editor listed. London: Penguin 1971.

Lawrence, D.H. *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1985.

Lawrence, D.H. *The Trespasser*. Ed. Elizabeth Mansfield. London: Penguin 1994.

Lawrence, D.H. *Twilight in Italy and Other Essays*. Ed. Paul Eggert. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1994.

Lawrence, D.H. *Twilight in Italy*. With an Introduction by Richard Aldington. London: Heinemann 1956.

Lawrence, D.H. *The White Peacock*. Ed. Andrew Robertson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1983.

Lawrence, D.H. *Women in Love*. Eds. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen. London: Penguin 1995.



Lawrence, D.H. *The First Women in Love*. Eds. John Worthen and Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998.

Leavis, F.R. *D.H.Lawrence: Novelist*. Harmondsworth: Penguin 1955.

Lodge, D. *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. London: Routledge 1990.

Mackenzie, C. *My Life and Times Octave Five: 1915-1923*. London: Chatto and Windus 1966.

Maddox, B. *The Married Man: A Life of D.H.Lawrence*. London: Sinclair-Stevenson 1994.

Malcolm, D. 'Kangaroo', in *The Guardian*, 4/12/86.

Maslin, J. 'Australian Politics in Lawrence's 'Kangaroo'', in *The New York Times*, 13/3/87.

Mauss, M. *The Gift*. London: Cohen and West 1954.

Mensch, B. *D.H.Lawrence and the Authoritarian Personality*. Basingstoke: Macmillan 1991.

Merrild, K. *With D.H.Lawrence in New Mexico A Memoir of D.H.Lawrence*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. 1964.

Metz, C. *Psychoanalysis and the Cinema: The Imaginary Signifier*. Basingstoke: Macmillan 1982.

Meyers, J. (ed). *D.H.Lawrence and Tradition*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press 1985.

Meyers, J (ed.). *The Legacy of D.H.Lawrence*. Basingstoke: Macmillan 1987.

Milton, C. *Lawrence and Nietzsche: A Study in Influence*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press 1987.

Montgomery, H.B. (ed.). *The Kinematograph Year Book and Directory 1915*. London: Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly Ltd., Heron & Co. 1915.

Montgomery, R.E. *The Visionary D.H.Lawrence: Beyond Philosophy and Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1994.

Moore, H. *A D.H.Lawrence Miscellany*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press 1959.

Moore, H. 'Lawrence and the Flicks', in *Literature and Film Quarterly*, v1, n1, Jan. 1973.

Moynahan, J. *The Deed of Life*. Princeton N.J: Princeton University Press 1963.

Murray, E. *The Cinematic Imagination*. New York: Ungar 1972.

Murray, Peter and Linda (eds.). *A Dictionary of Art and Artists*. Harmondsworth: Penguin 1968.

Nehls, E. (ed.). *D.H.Lawrence: A Composite Biography*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press 1959.

Nietzsche, F. *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. London: T.Fisher Unwin 1908.

Nixon, C. *Lawrence's Leadership Politics and the Turn Against Women*. Berkeley & London: University of California Press 1986.

Nochlin, L. *The Politics of Vision: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Art and Society*. London: Thames and Hudson 1991.

O'Neill, J (ed.). *Maurice Merleau-Ponty: Phenomenology, Language and Sociology: Selected Essays of Maurice Merleau-Ponty*. London: Heinemann Educational 1974.

Palmer, H. 'He Just Blunders On', in *The Melbourne Sun*, 20/12/73.

Panofsky, E. *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Harmondsworth: Penguin 1970.

Phillips, G. 'Ken Russell's Two Lawrence Films: *The Rainbow and Women in Love*', in *Literature and Film Quarterly*, v25, n1 1997.

Pinion, F.B. *A D.H.Lawrence Companion*. London: Macmillan 1978.

Pinkney, T. *D.H.Lawrence*. Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf 1990.

Poe, E. 'The Fall of the House of Usher', in *The Works of Edgar Allan Poe (vol.2)*. New York & London: Harper 1900.

Poe, E. 'The Pit and the Pendulum', in *The Works of Edgar Allan Poe (vol.2)*. New York & London: Harper 1900.

Poplawski, P. *Promptings of Desire*. Westport & London: Greenwood Press 1993.

Preston, P. and Hoare, P. (eds.). *D.H.Lawrence in the Modern World*. Basingstoke: Macmillan 1988.

Quinn, A. 'The Rainbow', in *Empire*, n.5, Nov. 1989.

Richardson, R. *Literature and Film*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press 1969.

Ross, C. 'Three New Films And A Look At Our Movie Future', in *The Sun*, 3/3/82.

- Ruderman, J. *D.H.Lawrence and the Devouring Mother*. Durham N.C: Duke University Press 1984.
- Russell, K. *Ken Russell - The Autobiography: Altered States*. London: Bantam Books 1991.
- Russell, K. *The Lion Roars: Ken Russell on Film*. Boston: Faber and Faber 1994.
- Russell, K. *Fire Over England: The British Cinema Comes Under Friendly Fire*. London: Random House (UK) Ltd. 1993.
- Rycroft, C. *A Critical Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*. London: Penguin 1995.
- Sadie, S. (ed.). *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians 6th Edition*. London: Macmillan Publishers & Washington DC: Grove's Dictionaries of Music 1980.
- Sagar, K. *The Art of D.H.Lawrence*. London: Cambridge University Press 1966.
- Sagar, K. *D.H.Lawrence: Life into Art*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England. Viking/Penguin Books 1985.
- Schneider, D. *D.H.Lawrence: The Artist as Psychologist*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas 1984.

Shorter, E. *From Paralysis to Fatigue*. New York: Macmillan 1992.

Siegel, C. *Lawrence Among the Women*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia 1991.

Simpson, J.A. and Weiner, E.S.C. (eds.). *Oxford English Dictionary 2nd Edition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1989.

Smith, W.G. 'Sons and Lovers', in *Films and Filming*, v6, n10, July 1960.

Stallybrass, P. and White, A. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. London: Methuen 1986.

Stam R., Burgoyne R., and Flitterman-Lewis, S. (eds.). *New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics*. London: Routledge 1992.

Swigg, R. *Lawrence, Hardy and American Literature*. London: Oxford University Press 1972.

Taubin, A. 'Animal Crackers', in *Village Voice*, 24/3/87.

Turner, J. (ed.). *The Dictionary of Art*. London & New York: Macmillan Grove 1996.

Vachon, M. *Puvis de Chavannes*. Paris: Braun, Clement 1895.

- Virilio, P. *War and Cinema: The Logistics of Perception* (1984). This translation London: Verso 1989.
- Whelan, P. T. *Myth and Metaphysic in The Rainbow and Women in Love*. Ann Arbor MI: UMI Research Press 1988.
- Widdowson, P. (ed.). *Longman Critical Readers: D.H.Lawrence*. London & New York: Longman 1992.
- Widmer, P. *The Art of Perversity*. Seattle: University of Washington Press 1962.
- Williams, L. *Sex in the Head: Visions of Femininity and Film in D.H.Lawrence*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf 1992.
- Williams, R. *The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists*. London: Verso 1989.
- Willsdon, C. 'Puvis de Chavannes', in *The Dictionary of Art*. London & New York: Macmillan Grove 1996.
- Wollen, P. *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*. London: Thames and Hudson 1960.
- Worthen, J. *D.H.Lawrence and the Idea of the Novel*. London: Macmillan 1979.

Young, Jane Jaffe. *D.H.Lawrence on Screen: Re-Visioning Prose Style in the Films of The Rocking-Horse Winner, Sons and Lovers, and Women in Love*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing 1999.

Zambrano, L. 'Women in Love: Counterpoint on Film', in *Film and Literature Quarterly*, v1, n1, Jan. 1973.



## Filmography

### 'Sons and Lovers'

#### Production Facts.

Directed by Jack Cardiff.

Produced by Jerry Wald.

Associate Producer Tom Morahan.

Screenplay by Gavin Lambert and T.E. Clarke.

Director of Photography Freddie Francis.

Editor Gordon Pilkington.

Assistant Director Peter Yates.

Casting Director Nora Roberts.

Costume Director Margaret Furse.

Assistant Art Director Lionel Couch.

Composer Mario Nascimbene.

Production Company Twentieth Century Fox.

Cinemascope.

Cert. A., released July 16th 1960.

Running Time 100 minutes, 8,890 frames.

#### Cast List.

*Paul Morel*, Dean Stockwell.

*Morel*, Trevor Howard.

*Mrs Morel*, Wendy Hiller.

Clara Dawes, Mary Ure.

Miriam Leivers, Heather Sears.

William, William Lucas.

Arthur, Sean Barrett.

Mr Pappleworth, Donald Pleasance.

Henry Hadlock, Ernest Thesiger

Mrs Leivers, Rosalie Crutchley.

Baxter Dawes, Conrad Philips.

Mrs Radford, Elizabeth Begley.

Louisa, Rosalie Ashley.

Factfile as compiled by W.G.Smith, editor of *Books and Bookmen* and published in *Films and Filming*, v6, n10, July 1960.

**'Women in Love'**

**Production Facts.**

Directed by Ken Russell

Produced by Larry Kramer

Screenplay by Larry Kramer

Distributed by United Artists

BBFC Certificate X

Running time 130 mins., 11,672 ft.

Released December 1969

Cast List.

*Rupert Birkin* Alan Bates

*Gerald Crich* Oliver Reed

*Gudrun Brangwen* Glenda Jackson

*Ursula Brangwen* Jennie Linden

*Hermione Roddice* Eleanor Bron

*Mr. Tom Brangwen* Michael Gough

*Mrs. Anna Brangwen* Norma Shebbeare

*Mr. Thomas Crich* Alan Webb

*Mrs. Crich* Catherine Wilmer

*Winifred Crich* Sarah Nicholls

*Lupton* Christopher Gable

*Contessa Nike Arrighi*

*Loerke* Vladek Sheybal

*Leitner* Richard Heiffer

*Minister* James Laurensen

*Palmer* Michael Graham Cox

'Kangaroo'

Production Facts

Director - Tim Burstall

Producer - Ross Dimsey

Production Company - Filmways (Australia)

Screenplay - Evan Jones

Photography - Dan Burstall

Music - Nathan Waks

Released by Cineplex Odeon Films

Running Time 105 mins.

BBFC Classification - R

Released April 24th, 1986

Cast List.

*Richard Lovatt Somers*, Colin Friels

*Harriett Somers*, Judy Davis

*Jack Callcott*, John Walton

*Vicky Callcott*, Julie Nihill

*Kangaroo*, Hugh Keays-Byrne

*Jaz*, Peter Hehir

*Willie Struthers*, Peter Cummins