POWER, Arthur. 1974. *Conversations with James Joyce*. Ed. C. Hart. London: Millington.
RABATÉ, Jean-Michel. 1991. *James Joyce, Authorized Reader*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins U. P.
SAID, Edward. 1994. *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. London: Vintage.
SCHORK, R. J. 1998. *Greek and Hellenic Culture in Joyce*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
SEIDEL, Michael. 1976. *Epic Geography: James Joyce's 'Ulysses'*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton U. P.
SENN, Fritz. 1983. "Foreign Readings". In Peterson, R. F., A. M. Cohn and E. L. Epstein. (eds.). *Work in Progress: Joyce Centenary Essays*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois U. P.: 82-105.
SPIELBERG, Peter. 1962. *James Joyce's Manuscripts and Letters at the University of Buffalo: A Catalogue*. Buffalo: University of Buffalo.
STUPARICH, Giani. 1948. *Trieste nei miei ricordi*. Milan: Garzanti.
SVEVO, Italo. 1994. "La "Triestinité" d'un grand écrivain irlandais: James Joyce". In Jacquet, C. and J. M. Rabaté. (eds.). *La Revue des lettres modernes: Joyce et l'Italie*. Paris: Lettres Modernes: 15-20.

THE ODYSSEY OF D. H. LAWRENCE: MODERNISM, EUROPE AND THE NEW WORLD

PETER MARKS
UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

On February 2, 1922, in an Italian restaurant in Paris, an Irish writer was delivered of a son, *Ulysses*. Swaddled in Greece's national colours, the prodigious infant bore on its rump the birthmark "Trieste-Zurich-Paris", a record of James Joyce's travels during the seven year gestation period. On that same day, in Taormina, Sicily, D. H. Lawrence was planning a journey: "I'm tired of here", he wrote to S. S. Koteliansky, "You know that I must go away, away, away" (Roberts, Boulton and Mansfield 1987: 185). While the multinational cluster of associations situated *Ulysses* firmly within Europe, Lawrence's proposed travels involved leaving that continent. He had recently completed *Aaron's Rod*, proclaiming it to Thomas Seltzer as "the last of my serious English novels —the end of *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love* line" (Roberts, Boulton and Mansfield 1987: 92). But *Aaron's Rod* also signalled for Lawrence his own estrangement from the Europe in which he had spent several years after the end of the First World War. "I am tired of Europe", he told Seltzer, "it is somehow finished for me —finished with *Aaron's Rod*" (Roberts, Boulton and Mansfield 1987: 93). "Away" in the first instance meant Ceylon, and later in February Lawrence and Frieda set sail, appropriately enough, on the "Osterley". The odyssey begun would not see them return permanently to Europe for four years.

Expatriates function as something akin to modernist identikit figures, so that one might easily imagine the docks and railway terminals of Europe permanently seething with writers, painters, musicians, and *poseurs*. Even if the reality was more humdrum, Europe nevertheless enjoyed an unprecedented intermingling of global talent in the early years of this century. Travel broadened individual and collective minds: cubism might begin in Paris,

Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies 20 (1999): 223-234

vorticism in London, and dadaism in Zurich, but the cross-pollination of "isms" and groups quickly generated new hybrids. Nor was the interaction limited to the arts. William Everdell cites the example of the physicist Niels Bohr, writing a "classic paper on the atom in English while teaching in his native Denmark, publishing it in a [British] journal [...] under the guidance of a New Zealander who had made his scientific reputation in Ontario, Canada, by extending the work of a Polish woman living in Paris" (Everdell 1997: 2-3). Given this fecund intellectual environment, Lawrence's departure from Europe appears puzzling; certainly it goes against the modernist trend. Yet, though he left Europe, it remained a central source and focus for his work, if only as a sign of what he rejected. Where Joyce, in *Ulysses*, reincorporates Ireland into the European context (and vice versa), Lawrence, in such provocative works as *Aaron's Rod* and *Kangaroo*, interrogates Europe's self-assured claim to cultural centrality.

Lawrence and Joyce saw themselves as exiles, and both imagine writers who explicitly reject their homeland; yet the difference between their fictional exiles warrants attention. Stephen Dedalus famously promises, in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, to express himself "using for my defense the only arms I allow myself to use —silence, exile, and cunning" (Joyce 1992a: 259), while Richard Lovatt Somers, in *Kangaroo*, "had made up his mind that everything [in Europe] was done for, played out, finished, and he must go to a new country. The newest country: young Australia!" (Lawrence 1997a: 13). Joyce's young artist, at the beginning of the century, opts for the vigour and cultural sophistication of a dominant Europe. Twenty years later, Lawrence's older writer escapes a continent eviscerated by war. Intriguingly, *Ulysses* records that the young Stephen will be 38 by 1920 (Joyce 1992b: 663), making him an exact contemporary of Somers in the world of *Kangaroo*; but the contrast between the urgent confidence of Stephen and the traumatised questing of Somers marks the passage from innocence to experience played out across the teenage years of the century. Though *Ulysses* was written between 1914 and 1921, its geographic and temporal co-ordinates preclude any consideration of the First World War. Joyce in a sense evades the calamity that dictates the mood, content and structure of *Aaron's Rod* and *Kangaroo*, a war for Lawrence which "smashed the growing tip of European civilisation" (Lawrence 1971a: 307).

Both writers were exiles in a loose sense, though Lawrence's claims are the more robust. As Richard Ellmann notes, Joyce "was neither bidden to leave nor forbidden to return, and after [his] first departure he was in fact to go back five times". Ellmann subtly suggests that "exile" might be a useful ploy, for "like other revolutionaries, [Joyce] fattened on opposition and grew

thin and pale when treated with indulgence" (Ellmann 1982: 109). Lawrence's flight from England in 1919 followed disastrous war years in which he was subjected to police surveillance and the possibility of military call-up, attempted unsuccessfully to emigrate to America, endured the suppression of *The Rainbow* and the rejection of *Women in Love*. After 1919, he rarely returned to England. Both writers rate inclusion in Terry Eagleton's *Exiles and Emigrés*, Eagleton seeing Lawrence as a paradigmatic figure, "the archetypal modern exile" (Eagleton 1970: 191). Eagleton considers the "odd paradox" that the dominant writers in modern English literature are "foreigners and emigrés: Conrad, James, Eliot, Pound, Yeats, Joyce" (Eagleton 1970: 9). The exception is Lawrence, an exile for Eagleton by dint of his working-class background, "a culture which [...] belonged and yet was excluded, both foreign and familiar" (Eagleton 1970: 17). The consequent tensions afford Lawrence the objectivity of the outsider, but one enhanced by the intimate perspective of the insider. Lawrence's class upbringing, Eagleton argues, provides "a continuous, often unconscious critique of [England's] dominative middle-class mode" (Eagleton 1970: 192), his exile remaining in its essence one from England. For Eagleton, the problems of Lawrence's life "lay in his own society, and while Australia and New Mexico could provide momentary release and experiment, they could offer no enduring solution" (Eagleton 1970: 218). Suggestive though it is, this argument ignores works such as *Aaron's Rod* and *Kangaroo*, which develop critiques of class and culture well beyond English and even European shores. The dismissal of Lawrence's travels as "rootless, frustrated wanderings" (Eagleton 1970: 191) belittles journeying of Homeric scope and crucial significance. Ulysses spent ten years returning home; Lawrence took longer and travelled further, and he never returned.

Lawrence does adopt the perspectives of insider and outsider, but applies these beyond England. Even his early novels, set predominantly in England, gesture to a larger world. Tom Brangwen marries a Polish woman in *The Rainbow*, one who comes to think in English, but whose "long blanks and darknesses of abstraction were Polish" (Lawrence 1997b: 50). And significantly, as Kate Flint argues, Lydia brings a European consciousness of the social history of women, which she passes on to Ursula Brangwen, "thus tacitly placing English social change in a broader European context" (Lawrence 1997b: xv). Ursula palpably feels the interplay of contexts in the "Continental" chapter of *Women in Love*, the sight of a farmhand near Ghent station reminding her of "how far she was projected from her childhood, how far was she still to go! In one life-time one travelled through aeons" (Lawrence 1987: 390). Nor is she alone in recognising the transformative

effect of Europe, Gudrun later enthusing, "I am so transported, the moment I set foot on a foreign shore. I say to myself "here steps a new creature into life"". Gerald opposes this egocentric critique, but Birkin counters that any love for England is "a damnably uncomfortable love: like a love for an aged parent who suffers horribly from a complication of diseases, for which there is no hope" (Lawrence 1987: 395). This portrait of England as the terminally sick man of Europe differs fundamentally from Lawrence's next novel, *Aaron's Rod*, by virtue of the dislocating impact of continental war, and a resulting "violence of the nightmare released now into the general air" (Lawrence 1995: 5). In *Aaron's Rod* that general air smothers the whole of Europe.

Kate Flint's observation that *The Rainbow* draws in part from Lawrence's interest in futurism (Lawrence 1997b: xiii), suggests the international traffic in ideas which was such a signal feature of European modernism. But this interest of itself does not allow Lawrence to be classified unproblematically as a modernist. One barrier lies in the ambiguity and complexity of the term itself, features which account for some of its critical utility. A loose, baggy monster of twentieth-century criticism, modernism roamed primarily in the cosmopolitan centres of Europe and America, but it came, as one might expect from such a creature, without a philosophy. This allows "modernism" both to include and to be distinguished from such related, though much smaller beasts as vorticism, imagism, surrealism, futurism and dadaism. Lawrence's connections to various of these "isms" have been traced by critics: Mark Kinkead-Weekes confirms Lawrence's temporary interest in futurist ideas (Kinkead-Weekes 1996: 121-124), and Michael Wilding argues that, in *Kangaroo*, Lawrence draws on "the resources of dada and surrealism, on the modernist commitments to spontaneity" (Wilding 1980: 176). Lawrence's inclusion in imagist anthologies, and his initial championing by Ezra Pound, would seem to assure his "modernist" credentials. Especially in his writing before *Aaron's Rod*, however, he might more easily be termed a "modern", for, though he was included in imagist anthologies, he was the only writer also to appear in volumes of Georgian poetry —a form of guilt by association. And, while Ezra Pound rated him in the forefront of new writers in 1913, he later dismissed Lawrence as an "Amygist", and transferred his prose allegiances to Joyce (Kinkead-Weeks 1996: 134-135). Nor was he considered by Wyndham Lewis one of the "men of 1914", that wonderful testament to modernist myth-making which included Lewis himself, Eliot, Pound and Joyce.

Excluded from this select band, Lawrence often remains a liminal figure in modernist studies, Bonnie Kime Scott arguing that "D. H. Lawrence

departs from the "men of 1914"" (Scott 1995: 162). She classifies him instead as a "Male Modernist Other". Mark Levenson, though he amends the *dramatis personae*, also places Lawrence in the wings, arguing that modernism "is associated with Pound, Hulme, Ford, Lewis and Eliot; Joyce, Woolf and Lawrence loom on the periphery" (Levenson 1984: vii). Levenson's study closes at 1922, the year of *Ulysses*, *Aaron's Rod*, and *The Waste Land*, and Levenson includes a detailed examination of Eliot's masterpiece. But the parameters of his analysis preclude lengthy discussion of Joyce or Lawrence, for in addition to a foreshortened historical perspective, Levenson restricts himself geographically to English modernism. Or, more accurately, to London modernism: "Hulme, Pound, Lewis, Ford and Eliot did not just inhabit London within the same few years; they engaged in active debate and frequent interchange; they formulated positions with one another and then against one another; they quarrelled and were reconciled" (Levenson 1984: x-xi). Levenson correctly identifies the dynamic, combative field of London modernism, one occasionally fought in by Lawrence himself. But by 1922, as Eliot figuratively gazes over the deadened English capital and the shards of European civilisation, Lawrence literally is nowhere to be seen. He had written his last "English" novel in Italy, and was working in Australia on a "queer sort of quite different novel" (Roberts, Boulton and Mansfield: 1987: 259). Whereas Eliot's diagnosis of Europe's cultural maladies was fashioned in and focused on the continent's economic centre, Lawrence's judgements were transmitted from the far-flung New World, the unreal city of Sydney.

Peter Nicholls in fact casts doubt on the importance of the London-based "men of 1914" to European modernism. For Nicholls, although it "became temporarily a metropolitan "vortex" for Pound, Lewis and Eliot [...] London's contributions to the history of the avant-garde —imagism and vorticism— proved to be moments rather than movements, short-lived phases in a more complex history" (Nicholls 1995: 166). He adds that such modernism "issued a call to order in the name of values that were strictly anti-modern, though it did so by developing literary forms which were overtly modernist" (Nicholls 1995: 167). Nicholls fashions a contentious argument; Levenson clearly feels that London's contribution was considerable, and Malcolm Bradbury argues for its centrality to English language modernism (Bradbury 1991: 172). Whatever the truth, Bradbury suggests at least a linguistic limit to modernist hybridity. Mapping on to Europe the antagonisms and divisions Levenson detects in London modernism would unsettle the sense of unfettered, unproblematic cultural exchange within European modernism. Nicholls suggests that this might

indeed be significant; making a point similar to Eagleton, he notes that none of the "men of 1914" was born in England, and that consequently "their various contributions to a common modernism were [...] highly sensitive to questions of exile and cultural displacement" (Nicholls 1995: 166). Such concerns lie at the heart of *Aaron's Rod* and *Kangaroo*, novels that deal in distinct ways with exile and displacement. Beyond the level of content, both works illustrate Lawrence's attempts to experiment with the novel form, make it new, to use Pound's slogan/ mantra. McDonald Daly argues that Lawrence succeeds to the extent that *Kangaroo* enjoys a relationship to postmodernist fiction (Lawrence 1997a: xiv).

Aaron's Rod begins in the familiar Lawrentian territory of a Midlands coal mining community, following Aaron Sissons' journey of self-discovery and refashioning through London, to Italy. In London his gnomic acquaintance Rawdon Lilly spurs him on, declaring that a "new place brings out a new thing in a man" (Lawrence 1995: 103). Lilly departs for Europe, and Aaron follows, experiencing the apparent truth of that philosophy. Though feelings of displacement pepper his journey through London and Europe, in Florence he divines "a new self, a new life-urge rising inside himself" (Lawrence 1995: 212). The new place offers a degree of completion, Aaron sensing that in Florence he had "arrived", that he had "reached a perfect centre of the human world" (Lawrence 1995: 212). Within the crushing masculine metaphysic of the novel, "human" accords almost exclusively with "male", but even this patriarchal paradise is lost by novel's end. *Aaron's Rod* closes amidst political, sexual, and psychological uncertainty; the perfect European centre cannot hold, and the belief in a conclusive arrival is exposed as naive. With the breaking of Aaron's totemic flute, the embodiment of independent, masculine creativity, "there was nothing ahead: no plan, no prospect [...]. The only thing he felt was a thread of destiny attaching him to Lilly" (Lawrence 1995: 288). Uncompromising guru that he is, Lilly snaps that dependent thread, opting for a potential new self in a new place outside Europe: "I would very much like to try life in another continent, among another race. I feel Europe becoming like a cage to me" (Lawrence 1995: 291). Within the confines of *Aaron's Rod*, this remains only a prospect, one not fulfilled until Lawrence's first major "post-English" work, *Kangaroo*.

That Lilly rather than Aaron envisages transformation through exile speaks to their different levels of self-awareness. Aaron appropriately flowers in Florence, while Lilly (as his name signals, the finished article) denounces Europe and "this whole little gang of Europeans". Yet Lilly's rejection comes with the understanding that the little gang has "exterminated all the people worth knowing" (Lawrence 1995: 97). This brief critique of genocidal

European action prefaces Lilly's extended, racist classification of the earth's peoples into "vermin" ("the Chinese and Japs and orientals altogether") and "higher types" ("Aztecs and the Red Indians"). The hierarchy has a crucial temporal dimension, the higher types largely having been exterminated. Lilly declares, "they hold the element I am looking for —They had living pride [...]. All the rest are craven— Europeans, Asiatics, Africans" (Lawrence 1995: 97). Certain Africans are later granted status above the craven by Lilly, who is discovered "reading the fantasies of a certain Leo Frobenius", a German ethnologist who posited a pre-Hellenic African civilisation linked to Atlantis. Fantasies they may be, but they remain intensely alluring for Lilly, profound in their contrast to present-day Europe: "In silence, the strange dim noise of London sounding below, Lilly read on about [...]. [t]he old Africans! And Atlantis! Strange, strange wisdom of the Kabyles! Old, old dark Africa, and the world before the flood!" (Lawrence 1995: 110). The rapt tone does not diminish Lilly's racism, his critique of Europe depending on championing exterminated or extinct groups. But it echoes *Women in Love*, where Birkin's memory of the statuette of an African woman (Lawrence 1987: 252-254) prompts the belief that the figure "knew what he himself did not know. She had thousands of years of purely sensual, purely unspiritual knowledge behind her" (Lawrence 1987: 253). Lawrence repeats the manoeuvre in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, where Frobenius makes another appearance (Lawrence 1961: 6), and a lost pagan world is conjured in which "men lived and taught and knew, and were in complete correspondence over all the earth" (Lawrence 1961: 7).

The appropriation of non-European culture regularly acts as a modernist marker. The authors of *The Empire Writes Back* argue that "Modernism and the sudden experiment with the artistic forms of the dominant bourgeois ideology [...] [are], in part, products of the discovery of cultures whose aesthetic practices and cultural models were radically disruptive of the prevailing European assumptions" (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1989: 156), citing the example of Lawrence's inclusion of African art in *The Rainbow* (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1989: 156-157). Mark Kinkead-Weekes contends that African sculptures influenced the imaginative structure of *Women in Love* (Kinkead-Weekes 1996: 437). Less benevolently, Edward Said includes "the audacious scholarship of Leo Frobenius" as one contribution to the formation of European "conceptions of primitivism [...] tribalism, vitalism, originality" as regards Africa and Africans (Said 1993: 233). Said's view better accounts for *Women in Love* and *Aaron's Rod*, in which Lilly's contempt for twentieth-century Europe depends on a fantasised ancient Africa. In terms of the whole novel, however, Lilly's ideas are

interludes; they do not effect, and certainly do not radically disrupt, European aesthetic practices. That disruption comes not from outside, but from within, Lawrence employing the relatively ancient European form of the picaresque.

Critics attack the aimlessness of *Aaron's Rod*'s structure, Terry Eagleton for example suggesting that, along with *Kangaroo*, it is "signally incapable of evolving a narrative, ripped between fragmentary plot, spiritual autobiography and febrile didacticism" (Eagleton 1978: 160). This view too readily conflates novels that adopt distinct aesthetic devices, but also damns both works in terms they seem designed to reject. Evolving a narrative underpins Eagleton's assumption that Lawrence is essentially an "organicist", and should be assessed against organicist criteria. On these terms, almost necessarily, both novels fail. But Janet Ruderman argues that Lawrence consciously chooses the picaresque in frustration at the limitations of organic form. She cites *Women in Love* as prefiguring this formal development: "Why strive for a coherent satisfied life?" thinks Birkin, "Why not drift in a series of accidents —like a picaresque novel? Why not?" (Lawrence 1987: 302). Ruderman takes Lawrence's next work, *Aaron's Rod*, as the enactment of this desire, the formal looseness functioning deliberately, as an analogue for "the chaos of Europe and the disintegration of human relationships" in a postwar world (Ruderman 1984: 92). One of modernism's signature tactics, the redeployment of old forms in the deracinated context of postwar Europe, allows Lawrence simultaneously to test the boundaries and resilience of the novel while offering a critique of European culture. As Steven Vine argues, "The critical power of Lawrence's writing [...] conspires with the annihilating force of the War by undermining the foundations of the old world —and generating the possibility of the new" (Lawrence 1995: xx). Lawrence's next novel, *Kangaroo*, situates itself literally in the New World, investigating the possibility of renewal outside Europe, while continuing to undermine Europe's cultural foundations. The title of Lawrence's contemporaneous essay, "Surgery for the Novel —or a Bomb" signals that, in the case of Europe and the novel, he metaphorically opts for the bomb.

Lawrence's incendiary blast lacerates the "serious" novels of Proust, Richardson and Joyce for their self-conscious obsession with self-consciousness: "One has to be self-conscious at seventeen [...]. [but] if it is still continuing at forty-seven, it is obvious senile precocity" (Lawrence 1971b: 190). Against this, Lawrence argues the need for the novel "to have the courage to tackle new propositions without using abstractions" (Lawrence 1971b: 193). *Kangaroo* certainly tackles propositions bravely, directly confronting the expectation and complacency of its readers: "If you don't like the novel, don't read it". Since the reader instinctively guesses what is

happening to characters not being described, *Kangaroo* challenges: "what more do you want to know", while admitting that "Chapter follows chapter, and nothing doing". And all this on the same page (Lawrence 1997a: 284). More aggressively than *Aaron's Rod*, *Kangaroo* consciously rejects organicism. John Worthen classifies it as a modernist work (Worthen 1979: 143), while MacDonald Daly argues that Lawrence "goes further than the word "modernist" suffices to describe". For Daly, the novel's "metafictional asides" are "more usually associated with the postmodern novel", and he plausibly compares *Kangaroo* with John Fowles's *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (Daly in Lawrence 1997a: xx). Lawrence clearly was aware of *Kangaroo's* subversive novelty, describing it to friends as "weird" and "rum" (Roberts, Bouton and Mansfield 1987: 255, 257). But though he was writing *Kangaroo* in Australia, Lawrence's critical eye was still trained on Europe. He expected little acceptance for his "quite different novel", guessing that "Even the Ulysseans will spit at it" (Roberts, Boulton and Mansfield 1987: 275). Lawrence had not in fact read *Ulysses* when he made the comment. Worthen suggests that he heard of its renown nonetheless, and though "he took *Ulysses* to be the epitome of the advanced and sophisticated modern novel", Lawrence felt that *Kangaroo* "was modern in a way that would inevitably provoke resistance" (Worthen 1979: 141). Lawrence clearly felt that he was doing something necessary and different, more vital than Joyce's extended adventure into self-consciousness. One might see this difference expressed even in the manner of their composition: Lawrence wrote *Kangaroo* in fewer weeks than Joyce took years to complete *Ulysses*.

As Peter Nicholls suggests, modernist texts often explore exile and displacement. But this exploration can take very different routes and arrive at different destinations: the fringes of Europe in *Ulysses*, the antipodes in *Kangaroo*. Such locational differences modify the degree and effect of the displacement. For while, in distinct ways, Stephen and Bloom are outsiders in Dublin, that city still functions as a kind of "home" for each. From the opening pages of *Kangaroo*, Harriet and Somers, as Europeans, are obviously, and perhaps irretrievably, alien. In Sydney, Richard is instantly marked out as "foreign looking"; Harriet might be "Russian"; both are seen as possibly German. Whatever their nationality, they are recognised, and come to recognise themselves, as "different from other people" (Lawrence 1997a: 7-8). But the sense of displacement is not regenerative, as it is in *Aaron's Rod*. Where Aaron Sissons had felt in Florence the sense "of having reached a perfect centre of the human world", Somers in *Kangaroo* repeatedly reels from the shock of displacement, exploding in tirades against Sydney's

"Englishness", "all crumbled out into formlessness and chaos", its people enjoying "[n]o inner life, no high command, no interest in anything, finally" (Lawrence 1997a: 27). In such passages, the cultural and spiritual dislocation Somers experiences refigure life in Australia as a "new crucifixion"; Europe, by contrast, seems a paradise. In these terms Somers functions as a repentant sinner: "Oh God, to be in Europe, lovely, lovely Europe that he had hated so thoroughly and abused so vehemently, saying that it was moribund and stale and finished. The fool was himself" (Lawrence 1997a: 20). By the time they prepare to leave the country, Harriett "*loathed* Australia, with wet, dark repulsion" [original emphasis] (Lawrence 1997a: 351). But these bouts of hatred for Australia and its people are leavened by wildly positive judgements, such as Harriett's claim five pages after the previous outburst that "if I had *three* lives, I'd wish to stay. It's the loveliest thing I've *ever* known" [original emphasis], after which she and Richard sit silently, contemplating "wonderful Australia" (Lawrence 1997a: 356).

These at times almost psychotic, alternating displays of love and loathing register the exile's acute if sporadic sense of displacement. But they must be judged in relation to the Somers' more virulent rejection of Europe. Much of the attack upon Australia depends on an acute sense of disappointment, Harriett's "[u]ndying hostility to old Europe" contrasted with her "undying hope of the new, free lands. Especially this far Australia" (Lawrence 1997a: 352). The extended flashback chapter, "The Nightmare", provides the explanation for this hatred, one signalling a central difference between the Englishmen Richard Somers and Aaron Sissons. Aaron had not been through the war (Lawrence 1995: 57), and that innocence in part allows his meandering journey through Europe. Somers, on the other hand, while not a combatant, has experienced in war-time England the knowledge "of what it was to live in a perpetual state of semi-fear: the fear of the criminal public and the criminal government" (Lawrence 1997a: 212). Somers' acute sense of terror is all the more menacing for occurring in England itself: "It was in 1915 the old world ended. In the winter of 1915-1916 the spirit of the old London collapsed, the city, in some way, perished, perished from being a heart of the world, and became a vortex of broken passions, lusts, hopes, fears and horrors" (Lawrence 1997a: 216).

By a bitter though important irony, Somers' feelings of internal displacement in England are heightened by the suspicion (based in part it seems on the fact that he wears a beard) that he is a foreigner. The wound inflicted by this case of mistaken national identity is all the more brutal since Somers sees himself as "One of the most intensely English little men England ever produced, with a passion for his country, even if it were often a

passion of hatred" (Lawrence 1997a: 223). Branded a foreigner, he renounces England, singing German folksongs to himself, and cursing "the military *canaille*. *Canaille*! *Canaglia*! *Schweinerei*! He loathed them in all the languages he could lay his tongue to" (Lawrence 1997a: 233). Yet Europe, though its languages provide temporary relief and release from oppressive England, has also been permanently traumatised by the nightmare. Australia offers the promise of escape and renewal precisely because Europe as a whole is "done for, played out, finished". And though Australia fails to live up to that promise, no return to Europe is contemplated. Richard and Harriett Somers embark for another new place, the Americas. *Kangaroo*, which begins with the completion of the voyage to Australia, itself a rejection of Europe, ends with the beginning of a new voyage further into the New World. The odyssey refigured in Joyce's epic ends with an emphatic "yes"; but neither Richard nor Harriett Somers experiences such a climax, instead being draped by symbolic markers of displacement, the last streamers of the ship on which they sail into exile "blowing away, like broken attachments, broken" (Lawrence 1997a: 358).

Kangaroo offers not culminating arrival, but further exploration. Lawrence's next novel, *The Plumed Serpent*, would be set in Mexico, itself a site of exile and displacement for Kate Leslie. One could locate these three novels as milestones on a longer journey of aesthetic and cultural discovery, adding *Lady Chatterley's Lover* to the itinerary so as to suggest the inevitability of Lawrence's return "home" to England. But this imposes an overarching teleology that the novels as separate entities resist. And it undervalues the individual significance of work such as *Aaron's Rod* and *Kangaroo*. Both are modernist experiments in form, and both mount interrogations of European culture in itself and in relation to the large and enigmatic New World. *Kangaroo* and *Aaron's Rod* end perplexingly, their characters preparing for physical and spiritual journeys away from Europe that are exhilarating precisely because their outcomes are largely unknown and unknowable. These novels challenge confidence in the centrality of European culture while they explore the limits of the novel as a viable form in a modernist world. In "Surgery for the Novel —or a Bomb" Lawrence writes: "*What next*? That's what interests me. "What now?" is no fun any more"[original emphasis] (Lawrence 1971b: 193). In plotting this course Lawrence opts for active exploration over static contemplation, the challenging sea over the comforting port, and the likelihood that such a literary odyssey would never be completed.

WORKS CITED

ASHCROFT, Bill, Gareth GRIFFITHS and Helen TIFFIN. 1989. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge.

BRADBURY, Malcolm. 1991. "London 1890-1920." In Bradbury, M. and J. McFarlane. (eds.) *Modernism: A Guide To European Literature 1890-1930*.

EAGLETON, Terry. 1970. *Exiles and Emigrés*. London: Chatto and Windus.

---. 1978. *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory*. London: Verso.

ELLMANN, Richard. 1982. *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford U. P.

EVERDELL, William. 1997. *The First Moderns: Profiles in the Origins of Twentieth-Century Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

JOYCE, James. 1992a. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. London: Minerva.

---. 1992b. *Ulysses*. London: Minerva.

KINKEAD-WEEKES, Mark. 1996. *D. .H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile 1912-1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.

LAWRENCE, D. H. 1961. *Fantasia of the Unconscious* and *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*. London: William Heinemann.

---. 1971a. *Movements in Modern European History*. London: Oxford U. P.

---. 1971b. "Surgery for the Novel —or a Bomb". In Inglis, A. A. M. (ed.). *A Selection From Phoenix*. Harmondsworth: Penguin: 189-193.

---. 1987. *Women in Love*. Eds. D. Farmer, L. Vasey and J. Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.

---. 1995. *Aaron's Rod*. Ed. M. Kalnins. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1997a. *Kangaroo*. Ed. B. Steele. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

---. 1997b. *The Rainbow*. Ed. K. Flint. Oxford: World Classics.

LEVENSON, Michael H. 1984. *A Genealogy of Modernism: A Study of English Literary Doctrine 1908-1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.

NICHOLLS, Peter. 1995. *Modernisms: A Literary Guide*. London: Macmillan.

ROBERTS, Warren, James T. BOULTON and Elizabeth MANSFIELD. (eds.). 1987. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, vol. iv. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.

RUDERMAN, Judith. 1984. *D. .H. Lawrence and the Devouring Mother: The Search for a Patriarchal Ideal of Leadership*. Durham, N.C.: Duke U. P.

SAID, Edward. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage.

SCOTT, Bonnie Kime. 1995. *Refiguring Modernism (vol 1): The Women of 1928*. Bloomington: Indiana U. P.

WILDING, Michael. 1980. *Political Fictions*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

WORTHEN, John. 1979. *D. H. Lawrence and the Idea of the Novel*. London: Macmillan.

D. H. LAWRENCE, GERMAN EXPRESSIONISM, AND WEBERIAN FORMAL RATIONALITY

H. U. SEEBER
UNIVERSITY OF STUTTGART

I

"The book frightens me", wrote D. H. Lawrence on 7 November 1916 about *Women in Love* (1920), "it is so end of the world. But it is, it must be, the beginning of a new world, too" (Coombes 1973: 109). This mode of interpretation, mythical as it is and based on the history of apocalyptic thinking, is more than simply a sign of Lawrence's desperate situation during the First World War and of his growing interest in religious and occult ideas. It points towards a significant relationship between his work and the thought and art of the expressionist decade between 1910 and 1920. It was during this time that *The Rainbow* (1915) and *Women in Love* (1920), both written under strong German influence, were conceived. "The model of the two phases", says Christoph Eykman, "the end of the world and the birth of a new, purified humanity, can almost be seen as a topos of expressionist poetic art" (1974: 48).

The expressionist revolt looked towards the overthrow of bourgeois technological civilisation. Its ideal, free-floating artist placed his faith not in any institution or political movement, but rather in the inner "transformation" and "transcendence" of the individual. The artist's task was to penetrate the dissembling surface to the inner, substantial "core" of life. He must be both critic of the actual and evangelist of the potential —a mission which Lawrence's own work espoused.[1] Throughout Lawrence's writings we can detect that "aura of corruption" spoken of by Kurt Pinthus in the preface to his anthology *The Twilight of Humanity*, "the presentiment that the order of humanity built solely on the mechanical and the conventional is about to collapse" (in Rötzer 1976: 436). Absent from his

Miscelánea: a Journal of English and American Studies 20 (1999): 235-258