ANNA STEGH CAMATI

'OTHER' LIFE

A PARALLEL BETWEEN LAWRENCE AND HUGHES

Dissertação para obtenção do Grau de Mestre, Área de Concentração: Literaturas de Língua Inglesa, do Curso de Pós-Graduação em Letras. Setor de Ciências Humanas, Letras e Artes da Universidade Federal do Paraná.

CURITIBA
1978

PROFESSOR ORIENTADOR
Doutor HERIBERTO ARNS

Titular de Literatura
Norte-Americana da
Universidade Federal
do Paraná.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to acknowledge our debth to our tutor for his unceasing aid, encouragement and guidance during this research. Our special gratitude also goes to all those who have contributed to make this work possible.

CONTENTS

		Page
	Resumo	v
	Abstract	vi
1.	Introduction	1
2.	*Weltanschauung* and Poetic Theory	11
2.1.	Intuition as the Source of Creativity	14
2.2.	Analogy between 'Mobile Reality' and the Process of Artistic Creation	26
2.3.	Flora and Fauna as Manifestations of the *Élan Vital*	33
2.4.	Loss of Vitality in Humanity	41
2.5.	'Creative Strife' within the Animal Kingdom	48
2.6.	'Animal Consciousness' Directed toward Action	58
3.	Hughes's Animal Tropes of the 'Non-Human' and the 'Dark Unknown' in Man	68
3.1.	The Horse: Symbol of 'Phallic Consciousness'	71
3.2.	The Bull: Symbol of 'Providential Black Blood'	82
3.3.	The Bear: Symbol of the 'Pristine Unconscious'	89
4.	Conclusion	95
	Bibliographical References	100

RESUMO

O estudo da cosmovisão de Hughes, inspirada em Lawrence e remontando a Bergson, abre novas perspectivas não exploradas pelos críticos, evidenciando aspectos inéditos em sua poesia. Da mesma maneira que Lawrence, Hughes procura ir além das aparências exteriores, revelando o próprio processo vital, que é captado somente em raros momentos de percepção intuitiva.

O objetivo principal de sua poesia é salientar como realidades 'outras' as criaturas do mundo não-humano, destacando-as como receptáculos da poderosa força vital existente no universo. Insiste em celebrar a vitalidade dos pássaros, animais e plantas, porque considera o homem demasiadamente automatizado, fato que o impede de viver. Os indícios de degeneração que vê no homem moderno, Hughes os atribui à excessiva mecanização, que reduziu o homem a um autômato, interrompendo o contacto vital com as outras criaturas vivas.

Estas idéias, que Lawrence expõe nas obras em prosa, i.e., ensaios, cartas, relatos de viagens, especulações filosóficas, romances e contos são retomadas por Hughes em sua poesia, constituindo não apenas a principal fonte de inspiração, como também a base de sua visão do mundo.

Na primeira parte desta dissertação é colocada em relevo a filosofia de Bergson, que foi assimilada e re-interpretada por Lawrence e Hughes, servindo de fundamentação metafísica para a obra de ambos.

Na segunda parte traçamos o paralelo existente entre o simbolismo animal de ambos os autores, demonstrando que as metáforas animais de Lawrence, que representam forças instintivas e intuitivas, estão também aparentes em Hughes, evidenciando sua habilidade em dar nova forma ao material em que se inspirou, bem como provando que maior compreensão do pensamento de Lawrence possibilita novos enfoques na poemática de Hughes.

ABSTRACT

By examining Hughes's vision of the world, which derives from Lawrence and can be traced back to Bergson, new perspectives not yet explored by critics have emerged, revealing new aspects of his poetry. Like Lawrence, he attempts to go beyond the world of external appearances, rendering the very process of life, which may be perceived only in certain moments of intuitive awareness.

The main purpose of his poetry is to reveal the sheer, unknowable 'otherness' of the non-human cosmos, presenting living creatures as vessels of the life-force which pervades the universe. He also insists on the superior 'otherness' of birds, beasts and plants, since he considers that man is automatized and therefore unable to live. This slackening of vitality he attributes to the spreading nightmare of mechanized society, which has reduced man to an automaton, setting him apart from the natural process of life.

These ideas, which are expounded by Lawrence in his discursive writings, namely his essays, letters, accounts of travels, works of a speculative nature, novels and tales, re-emerge in Hughes's poetry, serving as both the principal source of creativity and as a basis for his *Weltanschauung*.

In the first part of this dissertation Bergson's philosophy, which is absorbed and re-interpreted by both authors is presented as a metaphysical rationale for their world-view.

In the second part Lawrence's animal tropes of the 'non-human' and the 'dark unknown' in man, which re-emerge in Hughes are discussed, showing the artistic use to which the borrowings are put, as well as giving evidence that an insight into Lawrence sheds new light on Hughes's animal poetry.

1. INTRODUCTION

The most important figure of recent developments in poetry in Britain today is Ted Hughes, whose work from the very outset showed no connections whatsoever with 'The Movement'[1] of the 1950's. Although he had been at Cambridge with Thom Gunn and other writers associated with the so-called 'Movement', his poetry developed in a completely different direction; hence he was not included in Robert Conquest's 1956 anthology New Lines.[2] Due to his originality, he is widely taken to be the most outstanding individual[3] poetic talent that has appeared in England since the war. His reputation was already established with The Hawk in the Rain, his first book; however, it was through Crow, one of his latest volumes of poetry, that he received a great deal of critical acclaim, distinguishing himself as a poet of first rank, "a worthy successor to the great English poets of the first half of the century, Yeats, Lawrence and Eliot"[4].

In connection with Hughes's earlier achievements,[5] which comprise three books of poetry, The Hawk in the Rain (1957), Lupercal (1960), and Wodwo (1967),[6] a set of names such as Hopkins, Yeats, Wilfred Owen, Dylan Thomas and D.H. Lawrence, have constantly been invoked by a number of critics, who are unanimous in affirming that although Hughes is indebted to these writers, he has remained sufficiently individual, since he completely transforms the material or ideas he draws upon.[7] Among the writers mentioned, D.H. Lawrence is recognized to be a major influence,[8] since Hughes's indebtedness to him has been acknowledged not only by numerous

⇒

critics, but by the poet himself. Speaking about influences, in an interview with Egbert Faas[9], Hughes declared: "Lawrence I read entire in my teens ... except for all but a few poems. His writings coloured a whole period of my life". Furthermore he once commented that when he first read Lawrence's biography, he had the impression he was reading about his own life. Besides personal traits and affinities, he discovered that his personality had been formed under similar conditions as that of Lawrence's; at Mexborough, in South Yorkshire, he was compelled to lead a double life[10], one with the townboys, mainly sons of miners and railwaymen, and the other in a nearby farm with woods and a lake, where, as he himself declares "the division of body and soul"[11] began for him.

However, in Hughes's case, it is not only a question of affinity, since the Lawrentian themes and motifs, as well as the imagery, do not occur randomly, but can be clearly delineated in that part of his poetry which concerns birds, beasts and plants.[12] It is our aim to show that Hughes not only shares affinities with Lawrence, but was directly influenced by him; since, in addition to channeling Lawrentian themes and motifs into his own poetry, he also absorbed part of his *Weltanschauung*, with which he had familiarized himself in his teens. It is possible, that even before reading Lawrence, Hughes had already intuited the cosmovision implicit in his poems; nevertheless, it seems unquestionable that he enriched his own vision through Lawrence. Thus it can be said that the kinship between the two authors is primarily philosophical; although there are in Hughes's poetry thematic echoes of Lawrence's prose, on the whole, however, these borrowings are less significant than the Lawrentian cosmic perspective which is embodied in the poems.[13]

It is important to state that Hughes's poetry differs radically from that of Lawrence; the latter's best poetry in Birds, Beasts and Flowers cannot be equalled to that of Hughes, since he was primarily a prose

⇒

writer, and described animals and plants in a much more convincing way in his discursive writings, namely his essays, letters, accounts of travels, works of speculative nature, novels and tales.

In part two and three of this work, we intend to demonstrate that Lawrence's prose serves both as the principal source of creativity, providing the basic part of the materials for Hughes's poetry, and as a basis for his world-view.[14] This does not mean that Lawrence affected Hughes's work as a whole; the former's influence can be detected mainly in the poetry concerning the organic world, animal and vegetal.

The material the poet absorbed from Lawrence can be regarded as *Rohstoff*, serving as a substratum for his poetry, since he has enough artistry to transform the source he draws upon, giving it new artistic form, crystallizing the thematic substance into excellent poetry. Due to the "creative transmutation"[15] the artist imparts on his work, although we can notice the relations between the finished literary products, there is no trace of imitation apparent, since the style and artistic form the poet uses are completely his own.

Hughes's work has merited serious critical attention on the part of scholars, critics and reviewers, and in the last decade dozens of different articles have came out in literary magazines and literary supplements of newspapers. Concerning these articles, we found that a number of critics have noticed similarities of some kind between the work of Lawrence and Hughes, but none of them has engaged to undertake a study in depth on this particular issue.

In 1967, J. M. Newton[16], takes note of this fact, commenting that

> an admirer also has to admit to the more sceptical that, although Lawrence didn't write poems as good as Hughes's best and clearly has a very different tone and temper of mind, Hughes essential subject-matter is very like subject-matter of Lawrence's.

Although Newton admits that the poet's strength relies on his indebtedness

⇒

to Lawrence, in the body of his essay, he tries to relate him to the meta physical tradition of poetry, not pursuing the idea of influence. In the same year, Brian John, in discussing the element of violence in Hughes, mentions that in two poems, Bullfrog and Bull Moses, we "are given images reminiscent of D. H. Lawrence"[17]. Both images that he picks out can be related to the Lawrentian concept of 'dark powers' that are locked inside a creature; nevertheless, the author limits himself in only mentioning these two images, since the purpose of his essay is to justify the element of violence in Hughes's poetry.

Already in 1971, P. Strauss analyses in detail the poem The Bear, taking each stanza separately, in a sense paraphrasing each of them to scrutinize their meaning. He concludes that all the ideas he suggested do not lead to unity, although it seems to him that the unity of the poem is unquestionable. He further adds that he finds it

> most profitable to think of the bear as a gathering complexity of knowledge, that is becoming so complete in its way that it is driving back to the spot of darkness, the unknown in man that enables him to be creative, or feel himself at all alive.[18]

Concluding his analysis, he asserts that in invoking the 'dark unknown' in man, he has got Lawrence at the back of his mind, as Hughes must have had in many of his poems. However, Strauss does not develop the point he raised, nor does he link the question to Lawrence's philosophy.

The first book of criticism on Ted Hughes came out only in 1975. It is a general appraisal of the totality of his work written by Keith Sagar[19], who sees a close relation between Lawrence and Hughes in a number of poems, mainly in Lupercal, Hughes's second volume of poetry. Quoting some passages from Lawrence's prosework, he attempts to track the origin of part of the poet's subject matter. Nevertheless, he does not examine the poems in detail as well, nor does he make an exhaustive analysis of the cosmovision implied, since his main purpose is to make a

⇒

general assessment of the whole of Hughes's work. Sagar's affirmation, concerning the question of influence, is further corroborated by Claude Rawson, who in The Times Literary Supplement[20] review of Keith Sagar's The Art of Ted Hughes agrees that Mr. Sagar is right in insisting on "Lawrence's presence in Hughes".

In the second book of criticism on the poet, which appeared in the following year, A. Bold[21] proclaiming his originality affirmed that

> previous celebrants of nature have, like G. M. Hopkins, marvelled at the variety of animals; or like Lawrence, seen them as analogous to man. Hughes, however, deliberately puts man at a disadvantage compared with animals.

It seems to us that through this statement Bold is over-simplifying the issue, since Lawrence's animal poetry is much more than a simple analogy in human terms. On the other hand, Hughes was not the first to put man at a disadvantage compared with animals; Lawrence had done this long before him, leaving his point very clear in his discursive writings.

This critical review on the question of influence, demonstrates that a number of critics have noticed Lawrentian traces in Hughes's work; however, none of them has done an exhaustive analysis in order to find out whether there is a confluence of basic thought between both writers, nor have they tried to track the sources of the poet's subject matter. This study, therefore, will first examine the philosophy and isolate the basic philosophical position that Lawrence and Hughes present in their work. Without trying to impose a rigid philosophical system on the artists, it will show the aesthetic view of both writers, which can be traced back to a common source: the process philosophy of Bergson.

However, by quoting Stallknecht[22], we would like to make clear, that

> as ideas pass from one mind to another, change, and often radical change, is bound to take place in their structure, orientation and mode of reception. (...) Prominent among these

⇒

> stand the mutations that ideas most usually undergo as they pass from thinker to artist. The poet and the philosopher may be said to entertain the 'same' idea, but it is most important to remember that the poetic or literary development of an idea is often imaginative, figurative or metaphorical in nature ...

Thus, we might speak of unorthodox Bergsonism in Lawrence and Hughes, since Lawrence read Bergson in his own peculiar way, while Hughes, on the other hand, reinterpreted what he absorbed from Lawrence, wholly transforming the details. We may point out that like Bergson, both writers' world view emphasizes the mobile reality, intuition and the *élan vital*, but borrowing Stallknecht's words[23], we must be aware that they transfer Bergsonism "from one medium of thought and feeling to another and reshape its major concepts in doing so".

Next, this study will examine in detail Hughes's animal tropes of the 'non-human' and the 'dark unknown' in man; demonstrating that the poet selected as the thematic substance of his animal poetry, aspects that have already been widely discussed and objectified by Lawrence in his prose writings.

The critical question, then, is the problem of Hughes's merits; we aim to show how the Lawrentian themes and motifs are realized by Hughes and disclose the artistic use to which the borrowings are put. What we offer is not an exhaustive catalogue of all of Hughes's animals and animal images: we restrict ourselves to selecting samples of material that embody the cosmological implications mentioned before. The critical focus of the present study is to give evidence, as clearly as possible, that an insight into Lawrence gives new dimensions to Hughes's work, shedding new light on the artistry of the poet, inasmuch as his animal poetry can be better understood from a Lawrentian perspective.

The approach chosen for our purpose, is to make a thematological analysis to provide an understanding of Hughes's animal figures in the

⇒

world he projects, enabling us, at the same time, to reveal the Lawrentian sources he used, as well as to disclose the cosmology pervading the poems.

⇒

NOTES

[1] Elizabeth JENNINGS surveying the contemporary poetic scene in Great Britain, explains that in the 1950's there was a reaction against the complexities in modernist poetry. A group of poets, vaguely called 'The Movement', wanted a native poetic tradition, which was to be anti-heroic, anti-romantic and anti-pretentious. As these writers had in common a kind of clarity, discipline and honesty, celebrating ordinary things and feelings and using traditional rhyme-schemes and rhythms, they were hustled into a group often very much against their own will. (JENNINGS, E. A Group Disperses. In: ___. Poetry To-day. London, Longmans Green, 1961. p. 9-21.)

[2] 'The Movement' or 'New Lines' poets (those represented in Robert Conquest's anthology), among them Philip Larkin, Kingsley Amis, John Wain, Thom Gunn, Donald Davie, Robert Conquest, John Holloway, D. J. Enright, and Elizabeth Jennings, later developed away from the group, each of them following a different direction. (JENNINGS, p. 12.)

[3] Concerning individuality it is interesting to note that in the same way as Hughes, Lawrence never did associate with poetic schools or movements. Although he occasionally published poems in the 'Imagist' and 'Georgian' anthologies, he did not belong to either group.

[4] SAGAR, K. The Art of Ted Hughes. Cambridge, University Press, 1975. p. 1. Sagar's opinion about Ted Hughes, concerning his status among contemporary English poets is further corroborated by critics as different as A. Mollema, Alan Brownjohn, J. M. Newton, P. Strauss, among others.

[5] This study will be limited to Hughes's early poetry, namely his first three volumes of poetry, since the Lawrentian penetration can be detected up to Wodwo only. From Crow onwards, Hughes followed a different path, which will not concern our study.

[6] HUGHES, T. The Hawk in the Rain. London, Faber & Faber, 1976. 59 p. Lupercal. London, Faber & Faber, 1973. 63 p. Wodwo. London, Faber & Faber, 1972. 184 p. All references and quotations from Hughes's poetry are taken from the editions stated above, hereafter cited in the text in parentheses as HR, L, and W, followed by page numbers.

[7] This has been observed by such critics as K. Sagar, B. John and others. (SAGAR, p. 1. JOHN, B. Ted Hughes: Poet at the Master Fulcrum of Violence. Arizona Quarterly, 23:5, Spring 1967.)

[8] Lawrence is recognized to be a great formative influence, not only on Ted Hughes, but on a great number of writers in the twentieth century. M. L. Rosenthal, A. Alvarez, Julian Moynahan, Desmond Hawkins and other

⇒

critics share this view. In his introduction to a collection of Lawrentian pieces, Desmond HAWKINS affirms that Lawrence "is one of the originators, one of the principal sources, of our time; there are few subsequent writers who do not acknowledge their indebtedness to Lawrence's previous explorations". (HAWKINS, E. ed. D. H. Lawrence's Stories, Essays and Poems. London, Everyman's, 1967. p. vii.)

[9] FAAS, E. Ted Hughes and Crow. London Magazine, 10(10):12, Jan. 1971.

[10] Lawrence's character had also been formed under similar circumstances. He also felt the sharp contrast between the Nottinghamshire colliery town of Eastwood and the Haggs farm: the sordid industrial centre and the lovely old agricultural England, a bewildering mixture of nature and anti-nature.

[11] HUGHES, T. The Rock. In: SUMMERFIELD, G. ed. Worlds: Seven Modern Poets. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1974. p. 126.

[12] Lawrence wrote one book of poetry entitled Birds, Beasts and Flowers, which was later included in the edition of his complete poems. (PINTO, V.S. & ROBERTS, W. eds. The Complete Poems of D.H.Lawrence. London, Heinemann, 1972. v.1. p. 275-414.)

[13] J. T. SHAW aptly defines the concept of influence, remarking that it must be sought in many different manifestations: "Influence is not confined to individual details or images or borrowings or even sources — though it may include them — but it is something pervasive, something organically involved in and presented through artistic works." (SHAW, J.T. Literary Indebtedness and Comparative Literature Studies. In: STALLKNECHT, N.P. & FRENZ, H. eds. Comparative Literature: Method & Perspective. Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press, 1971. p. 91.)

[14] Shaw further specifies that: "Influence, to be meaningful, must be manifested in an intrinsic form, upon or within the literary works themselves. It may be shown in style, images, characters, themes, mannerisms, and it may also be shown in content, thought, ideas, the general *Weltanschauung* presented by particular works. (...) The influence of literary works upon literary works is perhaps the most convincingly demonstrable type, and perhaps aesthetically the most interesting". (SHAW, p. 92-3.)

[15] This technical term has been coined by Ulrich WEISSTEIN, who differentiates influence from imitation, corroborating Shaw's affirmation that "in contrast to imitation, influence shows the influenced author producing work which is essentially his own". (WEISSTEIN, U. Influence and Imitation. In: ___. Comparative Literature and Literary Theory. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1973. p. 31.) Shaw further asserts that an author's literary debts do not diminish his originality, since originality should not be understood in terms of innovation. He points out that "what genuinely moves the reader aesthetically and produces an independent artistic effect has artistic originality, whatever its debts. The *original* author is not necessarily the innovator or the most inventive, but rather one who succeeds in making all his own, in subordinating what he takes from others to the new complex of his own artistic work". (SHAW, p. 86).

⇒

[16] NEWTON, J.M. Ted Hughes's Metaphysical Poems. Cambridge Quarterly, 2:402, Fall 1967.

[17] JOHN, p. 11.

[18] STRAUSS, P. The Poetry of Ted Hughes. Theoria, 38:45, 1971/72.

[19] SAGAR, P. 36-60. Sagar is also a Lawrentian critic; he has also made a general appraisal on Lawrence's work, writing a book entitled The Art of D.H. Lawrence. Cambridge, University Press, 1966. 267 p.

[20] RAWSON, C. The Flight of the Blackbird. Times Literary Supplement (3862):324, 1976.

[21] BOLD, A. Thom Gunn & Ted Hughes. Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd, 1976. p. 48.

[22] STALLKNECHT, N.P. Ideas and Literature. In: ___ & FRENZ, p. 154.

[23] Ibid., p. 159.

□

2. *WELTANSCHAUUNG* AND POETIC THEORY

During the first quarter of the century Bergsonian philosophy exerted a great appeal on many writers, who saw in Bergson's theories an escape from the prevailing finalistic, mechanical view of the world. Among these, the psychologist William James made public his great admiration for Bergson, calling his metaphysics in Creative Evolution "a real wonder".[1] Although working independently, James had arrived at similar conclusions, since his analysis of consciousness seems to supplement the theory of duration.[2] T.E. Hulme, aesthetician and poet, also reacted enthusiastically to reading Bergson in 1911. He suggested that the philosophy of the French intuitionist is an aesthetic approach to life, since his theories tend to evoke a response from the artistic temperament in general, due not only to his attractive metaphysics, but also to his poetic style rich in suggestive imagery and characterized by a rhythmic flow of words. Hulme, who has been acknowledged by E. Pound as the leader of the initial 'Imagist' movement, promulgated the Bergsonian concepts in the artistic environment, through his various critical essays on Bergson and his translation of *Introduction à la Métaphysique*, thus enabling many English poets to realize in the French metaphysician an expression of their own awareness of 'flux'.[3]

Although Lawrence did not belong to the 'Imagist' group, it is known that he maintained sporadic contact with it, thus getting familiar with Hulme's aesthetics. Therefore, we might assume that Lawrence absorbed his general outlook and poetic style directly through his readings on

⇒

Bergson[4], as well as indirectly through Hulme's essays. However, as the purpose of this study is to demonstrate how Lawrence reshaped the major concepts of Bergsonian philosophy in order to formulate his own poetic theory, the question of direct or indirect influence is outside the scope of this investigation.

The agreement between Lawrence's conception of reality and Bergson's ideas has also been noted by P. Sandoval, who further claims that there is a relation between Lawrence's method of composition and Bergson's intellectual system, favouring direct intuition as a means of attaining knowledge; nevertheless, he does not investigate this point, since he thinks that the question it too far-reaching to be answered in his study, as he is more concerned with analysing the movements and tendencies at the turn of the century, which influenced Lawrence's poetic style and techniques.[5]

What we propose in our study, is a close examination of Lawrence's speculative writings, which will clearly indicate that he borrowed the central ideas of his world-view, most of his aesthetic terminology as well as a great deal of his imagery from the French metaphysician. Although he would rather not admit it, his *Weltanschauung* is in many ways similar to that of Bergson, being at times, identical.

We further intend to give evidence that Hughes also shares the same philosophical impulses, and that his aesthetic view equally rests upon the durational pattern which reveals the inner reality of things. As Hughes himself has admitted that Lawrence coloured a whole period of his life, it is most probable that these ideas came to him through indirect derivation: the appeal of Lawrence's work led him to renew his own poetic expression, differentiating him from all the other poets of his generation. In the context of the observations which will follow, we intend to demonstrate that much new light can be thrown on Lawrence's and Hughes's aesthetic theories, by studying them in relation to Bergsonian philosophy.

⇒

NOTES

[1] See Irwin EDMAN's Foreword to Bergson's Creative Evolution, where he makes a retrospect of the popularity that this work has attained. (Bergson, H. Creative Evolution. Westport, Greenwood Press, 1977. p. ix.)

[2] Here we can see that Bergson's theories were, in fact, a manifestation of the *Zeitgeist*, since William James independently manifested the same tendencies in his work.

[3] See William PRATT's Introduction to an anthology he edited, called The Imagist Poem, in which he traces the influence that Hulme exerted on the 'Imagist' group. (PRATT, W., ed. The Imagist Poem. New York, Dutton, 1963. p. 11-39.)

[4] Reading Bergson in 1913 (A. Mitchell's translation of Creative Evolution came out in 1911), Lawrence found him "dull" and "a bit thin". Nevertheless his philosophical ideas and terminology, as well as his imagery, incontestably indicate the Bergsonian influence. (MOORE, H.T., ed. The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence. London, Heinemann, 1970. v.2, p. 203.)

[5] SANDOVAL, P. D.H. Lawrence: A Study of his Poetic Theories. Ann Arbor, Xerox University Microfilms, 1977. p. 162-3. Thesis Ph.D. University of Michigan, 1968. Furthermore, a number of critics briefly mention that Lawrence's aesthetic theory is founded upon the Bergsonian evolutionist organic philosophy.

□

2.1. INTUITION AS THE SOURCE OF CREATIVITY

Concerning mode of composition, the primary intention of D.H.Lawrence was to immerse himself completely in the stream of 'durational flux'[1], so as to apprehend the inner reality of things as against their crystallized surface. In the same way as Bergson, he emphasizes that there is more than one way of knowing reality, distinguishing between two modes of cognition: "spiritual-mental" and "instinctive-intuitive" consciousness[2], denominating the latter of these "blood-knowledge"[3], which he defines as pristine, immediate consciousness,[4] prior to mentality, and which roughly corresponds to the Bergsonian concept of intuition. He also admits that through intuition we can apprehend "the source, the issue, the creative quick"[5]; however, while Bergson relates the life-impulse to the spirit[6], he professes a connection between the physical[7] and the source of life.

Although Lawrence and Bergson have been labelled anti-intellectualists, because of their apology of intuition, they do not undermine the importance of the intellect. Bergson, who believes intelligence and instinct are opposite and complementary, and intuition is instinct "that has become disinterested, self-conscious, capable of reflecting upon its object and of enlarging it indefinitely"[8], recognizes an interdependence between these two ways of cognition: despite the fact that intuition illuminates the intellect, it "will be communicated only by intelligence"[9]. He further explains that "our duration can be presented to us directly in an intuition", but can be suggested only indirectly by images; comparisons and metaphors will suggest what cannot be expressed.[10]

⇒

Lawrence corroborates these ideas, when he testifies that a real work of art "requires the activity of the whole imagination" which, for him, is "that form of complete consciousness in which predominates the intuitive awareness of forms, images, the physical awareness" [11].

Like Bergson, who claims that in the course of evolution intuition has been sacrificed in humanity in favour of the intellect,[12] Lawrence also assumes the flow of pristine consciousness is waning, since modern people "cannot feel with the whole imagination. They can see the living body of imagery as a blind man can see colour. The imaginative vision, which includes physical intuitional perception, they have not got" [13].

Whenever Lawrence refers to physical intuitional perception, he speaks of his "demon" [14], meaning the creative impulse that urges him to produce. A. Alvarez, in a personal memoir in The Savage God, attributes to Ted Hughes a similar "immediate physical apprehension" of things, affirming that he seemed to be "in touch with some primitive area, some dark side of the self which had nothing to do with the young literary man" [15]. Apart from this emphasis on the physical, the intuitive perception on which the creative ability of both poets rests, possesses the same characteristics as the Bergsonian intellectual intuition. Despite the fact that their poetry differs radically from one another, evidence will be shown of an agreement of ideas on a basic level.

Bergson asserts that concerning the two ways of knowing, intellect implies going all around the object, stopping at the relative; while intuition means entering into it, thus attaining the absolute.[16] He sees humanity as being too deeply rooted in habit and the utilitarian process, due to the fact that consciousness, in man, is pre-eminently intellect, which "shows us less the things themselves than the use we can make of them" [17], tending to classify and label beforehand, scarcely looking at the object, being interested only in which category it belongs to.[18] Ar-

⇒

tists, he continues, constitute an exception, since "when they look at a thing, they see it for itself, and not for themselves"[19], thus casting away ready-made concepts and penetrating into the essence of a thing. Regretting the fact that "the 'thing-in-itself' escapes us", since to "comprehend it, we would need an intuitive faculty which we do not possess"[20], he acknowledges that fortunately some privileged minds like those of creative artists, are apt to light up "the darkness of the night in which the intellect leaves us"[21], stirring the embers of a fire almost extinguished in order to disclose the "ever-recurring novelty, the moving originality of things"[22].

The French philosopher explains that, in turning our attention "aside from the part of the universe which interests us from a practical viewpoint and turning it back toward what serves no practical purpose"[23], we can develop a supplementary attention,[24] which will enable us to transcend ourselves, thus placing us within the concrete "flow of duration"[25], within the object itself. He calls this procedure an 'effort of intuition'[26], which, according to him, consists of an act or several "acts of attention"[27], that will enable us to follow the radical novelty in each moment of evolution. For each new object, he observes, it is necessary to make an absolutely "new effort"[28] of attention, since "one blade of grass does not resemble another blade of grass any more than a Raphael resembles a Rembrandt"[29]. At length, he alludes to the something more the artist needs, to get down to the work of literary composition itself, which he defines as "an effort, often painful, immediately to place oneself in the very heart of the subject"[30], meaning the intuitive impulsion which once seized carries the artist forward of itself.

This literary treatment of intuitive perception must have appealed to Lawrence, since he formulates his aesthetic theory on the philosophical premises outlined by Bergson. In his essay Chariot of the Sun, he de

⇒

scribes the method of artistic creation as an intuitional effort:

> The essential quality of poetry is that it makes a new effort of attention and 'discovers' a new world within the known world.[31]

He reiterated this statemant in Etruscan Places, speaking of a special kind of concentration, referring to it as "an act of pure attention"[32] which implies a discovery. What distinguishes poesy from poetry, according to him, is not the parade of forms and technique: the essential quality of poetry is "the breath" in which "the living chaos stirs", and the poetic act is "an act of faith, pure attention, and purified receptiveness"[33].

Reiterating Bergson, he believes that living intuition "saves us from the strain of the monos, from homogeneity and exaltation and forcedness and all-of-a-pieceness, which is the curse of human consciousness", recognizing that "the act of attention is not so easy"[34], requiring a great strain on the part of the artist. He refers to the reputed innocence of the aesthetic moment, stressing that to achieve a rapport with reality, man must recover a state of naïvetē, which, as Bergson also puts it, is a disposition for the genius, a state in which purity of spirit, sensitive awareness and intense eagerness to portray an inward vision are preponderant. He maintains that

> this naïvetē is the opening of the soul to the sun of chaos, and the soul may open like a lily or a tiger-lily or a dandelion or a deadly nightshade or rather like a paltry chickweed flower, and it will be poetry of its own sort. But open it must. This opening, and this alone, is the essential act of attention, the essential poetic and vital act.[35]

In this passage, it is evident that Lawrence seeks an intuitive contact with things, in an effort to establish a living relationship with them. His definition of art, corroborates his philosophical standpoint, enunciating the principle of complete identification between the artist

⇒

and his object: "Art is a form of supremely delicate awareness and atonement – meaning at-one-ness, the state of being at one with the object"[36]. Through this dynamic rapport with things, he sees natural objects "like a vision", thus developing what he calls "visionary awareness"[37]; he learns about them by experiencing them, and it is through this dwelling in things that he is able to seize reality from within, capturing and expressing what an ordinary person cannot see: the 'thisness or haecceitas'[38] of a thing, that which is unique, distinguishing it among all other things, which in his own terminology he calls "otherness"[39].

Examining Hughes's poetry and discursive writings, we can easily detect a certain correspondence between his ideas and Lawrence's concept of 'aesthetic atonement', since he also insists on a creative meeting of poet and phenomena. In his poem Wodwo (W 183), he presents to us a creature, possessing both an animal instinct and a human intellect, trying to establish a sympathetic contact with another creature, penetrating its interior and identifying with it, so as to apprehend its essence:

> Why do I find
> this frog so interesting as I inspect its most secret
> interior and make it my own?

In Poetry in the Making, Hughes gives a theoretical explanation of his belief in 'aesthetic at-one-ness', claiming that in order to unveil the poignancy of "otherness"[40] of a thing, you have to "live it. (...) look at it, touch it, smell it, listen to it, turn yourself into it"[41]. Further on, he declares that "poetry is not made of thought or casual fancies. It is made of experiences which change our bodies and spirit"[42]. These statements call to mind Bergson's and Lawrence's conjectures, differentiating something "thought" from something "lived"[43]; furthermore, the correspondence between 'durational flux' and "inner duration' is also underlined: while we concentrate to capture the moving reality, we ourselves also change without ceasing with the experience we accumulate.[44]

⇒

Elsewhere, in Poetry in the Making, Hughes analogy of fishing to writing can be inferred, comparing the poet to a fisherman at a pond. The process of probing into the depths of the lake in order to catch the fish, for him, is similar to exploring the intuitive resources submerged in the deepest pool of our mind. He refers to the fisherman's "concentrated excitement"[45], whose whole being rests on his activity, "very alert, so that the least twitch of the float arrives like an electric shock"[46] to him. By "feeling"[47] the jerkings of his float, the fisherman becomes "aware, in a horizonless and slightly mesmerized way, like listening to the double bass in orchestral music, of the fish below there in the dark". At every moment his "imagination is alarming itself with the size of the thing slowly leaving the weeds"[48] and approaching his bait.

In the same way as the fisherman establishes a connection with the fish through his line, feeling its life whenever the float jerks, the poet also engages in a sympathetic contact with his object, seizing its essence by means of renewed 'efforts of attention'. Furthermore, the electric shocks of the fisherman correspond to the "mental coruscation" or "aesthetic response" of the poet;[49] while the twitchings of the float drive the former to act, the intuitional impulsion compels the latter to write.

Both activities require great concentration, the pool and the blank page being the "arena of apprehension and unforseeable events"[50]. The purpose of both is "to bring up some lovely solid thing like living metal from a world where nothing exists but those inevitable facts which raise life out of nothing and return it to nothing"[51]; as in the fishing activity in which the fish is still alive when caught, the poet is also eager to grasp a living thing.

Hughes's metaphorical explanation of the intuitive method makes sense, because the imagery of fishing carries appropriate connotations,

⇒

since it implies fathoming underneath the surface to feel the teeming life of the depths, as well as establishing a direct connection and capturing the object alive.

Hughes intends to break into the sunken intuitive life, circumventing the cognitive mind or intellect with its preconceived ideas. Considering the "inner life" as the world of "final reality", he nevertheless reckons that "the thinking process" or intellect helps us "to break into that inner life and capture answers and evidence to support the answers out of it" [52]. Concluding, he emphasizes that if we do not develop the 'supplementary attention' referred to, then the intuitive potencies tend to lie submerged in us, "like the fish in the pond of a man who cannot fish" [53].

⇒

NOTES

[1] The idea of durational flux is conveyed in Creative Evolution: "The universe *endures*. The more we study the nature of time, the more we shall comprehend that duration means invention, the creation of forms, the continual elaboration of the absolutely new ...". (BERGSON, p. 14.)

[2] LAWRENCE, D.H. Introduction to his Paintings. In: ___. Selected Essays. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1966. p. 308.

[3] LAWRENCE, D.H. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur. In: ARNOLD, A. ed. The Symbolic Meaning: The Uncollected Versions of *Studies in Classic American Literature*. London, Centaur Press, 1962, p. 60. In a letter to Ernest Collings, written in 1913, Lawrence makes clear what he wants to convey by 'wisdom of the blood': "My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds. But what our blood feels and believes and says, is always true ... ". (MOORE, v.1, p. 180.) Kenneth INNIS, in his study about Lawrence's bestiary, comments that he wonders whether the actual blood of man, of which Lawrence speaks incessantly in diverse prose-works, is to be conceived consubstantially with the 'real' invisible blood, which is life and consciousness. (INNIS, K. D.H.Lawrence's Bestiary: A Study of His Use of Animal Trope and Symbol. Paris, Mouton, 1971. p. 21.)

[4] Bergson also refers to intuition as "immediate consciousness". (See BERGSON, H. The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics. New York, Philosophical Library, c 1946. p. 32.)

[5] Lawrence's 'creative quick' roughly corresponds to the Bergsonian *élan vital*. (LAWRENCE, D.H. Poetry of the Present. In: PINTO & ROBERTS, v.1, p. 183.) As Bergson, Lawrence also believes that life can be apprehended only through living intuition, which is at "the origin of life" itself. Hence, the interpenetration of duration, intuition and vital impetus. (See BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 284.)

[6] For Bergson, the chief function of intuition is the "direct vision of the mind by the mind", being "mind itself, and, in a certain sense, life itself ... ". (BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 292.)

[7] Lawrence, on the other hand, relates intuition to the physical. In an essay on Nathaniel Hawthorne, he states: "Man has two distinct fields of consciousness, two living minds. First, there is the physical or primary mind, a perfect and spontaneous consciousness centralizing in the great plexuses and ganglia of the nervous system and in the hind brain. Secondly, there is the ideal consciousness, which we recognise as mental, located in the brain". (ARNOLD, The Symbolic Meaning, p. 135.) It must be kept in mind, however, that Lawrence's metaphors of poetic insight cannot be accepted as literal truth or a program of metaphysics.

⇒

[8] BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 194.

[9] BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 42. He adds that "intuition is more than an idea; nevertheless in order to be transmitted, it will have to use ideas as a conveyance".

[10] Ibid., p. 42 & 168.

[11] LAWRENCE, Selected Essays, p. 334. By 'imagination' Lawrence means: "instinct, intuition, mind, intellect all fused into one complete consciousness, and grasping what we may call a complete truth, or a complete vision, a complete revelation in sound".

[12] In Creative Evolution, BERGSON alludes to the gradual vanishing of intuition in the course of evolution: "In the humanity of which we are part, intuition is, almost completely sacrificed to intellect. It seems that to conquer matter, and to reconquer its own self, consciousness has had to exhaust the best part of its power". He maintains that intuition, in modern man, has been reduced to a "lamp almost extinguished, which only glimmers now and then, for a few moments at most". (p. 291-2.)

[13] LAWRENCE, Selected Essays, p. 314.

[14] See Lawrence's Preface to Collected Poems: "... that my real demon would now and then get hold of me and shake more real poems out of me, making me uneasy". (PINTO & ROBERTS, v.1, p. 27). In The Creative Mind, BERGSON says that it is impossible to reduce intuition to a formula; to exemplify his point he speaks of "the demon of Socrates", asserting that "in speculative matters intuition often behaves as the demon of Socrates in practical life", i.e., restraining the mind from accepting ready-made concepts imposed by the intellect. (p. 109.)

[15] ALVAREZ, A. The Savage God: A Study of Suicide. London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972. p. 24. It is interesting to note that Alvarez had also been a Lawrentian critic: his description of Hughes's 'dark side of the self' corresponds to Lawrence's 'demon'. He attributed to Hughes an "unusual creative intelligence and awareness".

[16] BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 159.

[17] Ibid., p. 138. He further explains that "intelligence has contracted habits necessary for every-day living; these habits, transferred to the domain of speculation, bring us face to face with a reality, distorted or made over, or at any rate, arranged; but the arrangement does not force itself upon us irresistibly; it comes from ourselves; what we have done we can undo; and we enter then into direct contact with reality". (p. 28-9.)

[18] Ibid., p. 138. His affirmation that the normal development of intellect takes place "in the direction of science and technique", is corroborated by Lawrence and Hughes; the former claims that "art is treated all wrong. It is treated as if it were a science, which it is not", while the latter insists that in the making of a poem, you cannot proceed "as if you were working out mental arithmetic". (p. 78. LAWRENCE, D.H. Making Pictures. In: ROBERTS, W. & MOORE, H.T. eds. Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works by D.H. Lawrence. London, Heinemann, 1968. p. 605. HUGHES, T. Poetry in the Making. London, Faber & Faber, 1975. p. 18.)

⇒

[19] BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 138.

[20] Ibid., p. 28. Lawrence also believes that the 'thing-in-itself' is not perceived by most men: "The thing in itself! Why, I have never met a man who was anything but what he had been *told* to be. Let a man be a man-in-himself, and then he can begin to talk about *Ding an Sich*. Men may be utterly different from the things they now seem. And then they will behold, to their astonishment, that the sun is absolutely different from the thing they now see, and that they call 'sun' ". (LAWRENCE, D.H. The Crown. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 415.)

[21] BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 292.

[22] BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 105.

[23] Ibid., p. 138.

[24] Ibid., p. 79. By "supplementary attention", Bergson understands "the attention that the mind gives to itself, while it is fixed upon matter, its object". He further adds that this conversion of attention can be methodically cultivated and developed.

[25] Ibid., p. 138.

[26] Ibid., p. 178.

[27] BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 5. Bergson says that when we fix our attention on the continuity of life, we tend to perceive separate moments, since "it might be said of life, as of consciousness that at every moment it is creating something". (p. 34.)

[28] BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 175.

[29] Ibid., p. 103.

[30] Ibid., p. 199.

[31] LAWRENCE, D.H. Chariot of the Sun. In: MCDONALD, E.D. ed. Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence. London, Heinemann, 1967. p. 255.

[32] LAWRENCE, D.H. Etruscan Places. London, Heinemann, 1956. p. 55.

[33] MCDONALD, p. 259-60. Like Bergson, Lawrence uses the metaphor of the "invisible breath" that bears things — the vital impetus itself. (See BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 142.)

[34] MCDONALD, p. 261.

[35] Ibid., p. 261. For Lawrence, 'soul' is not a Platonic abstraction, distinct from life, but identified with it. The "opening of the soul to the sun of chaos", thus, refers to the apprehension of life through living intuition.

[36] LAWRENCE, Making Pictures. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 605. His definition of art implies intuitive awareness; in the same way as Bergson he wants "a vision which is scarcely distinguishable from the object seen, a knowledge which is contact and even coincidence". (BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 32.)

⇒

[37] ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 605. Due to the characteristics mentioned, such critics as J.C. Oates and S. Gilbert have labelled Lawrence's art as 'visionary poetry'. K. Sagar has also referred to Hughes as a 'visionary poet'.

[38] Here again Bergsonian echoes reverberate, since the philosopher also refers to that "*sympathy* by which one is transported into the interior of an object in order to coincide with what there is unique and consequently inexpressible in it". (BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 161.) However, the question of the uniqueness of things had already attracted the religious philosopher John Duns Scotus, who distinguishes between the 'common nature' and 'the individual entity' in the structure of all beings. The distinctive presence of both man and natural objects he attributed to an individual entity, which he called 'haecceitas', responsible for the contraction and limitation of essence, determining the 'common nature', so that one thing becomes this ('haec') thing, an individual reality. (VIER, R. S. Francisco e Pensamento Medieval. In: SILVEIRA, I. et alii. Nosso Irmão São Francisco de Assis. Petrópolis, Vozes, 1975. p. 228.) The principle of individuality of things further appealed to many imaginative writers, such as the poet G.M. Hopkins and the Romantics in general.

[39] LAWRENCE, Hector ... . In: ARNOLD & MOORE, p. 60.

[40] Repeatedly Hughes refers to the uniqueness of things, at times borrowing Lawrence's terminology. In a poem entitled Egg-Head, the word "otherness" appears in connection with the poet's wondering at the distinctive features of a leaf. (HR 35)

[41] HUGHES, Poetry in the Making, p. 18.

[42] Ibid., p. 32.

[43] Bergson states that concerning artistic creation, the object must be "*felt* rather than *thought*". (See BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 189.) This notion is corroborated by Lawrence, who in his introduction to The Dragon of Apocalypse, condemns what he calls "accepted ideas or thought-forms". He wants "*complete* imaginative experience, which goes through the whole soul and body", explaining that "by *experience*, we should feel the sun as the savages feel him, we should 'know' him as the Chaldeans knew him, in a terrific embrace. But our experience of the sun is dead, we are cut off. All we have now is the thought-form of the sun". (See MCDONALD, p. 297-8.)

[44] Bergson says that in the same way as reality "our personality, which is being built up each instant with its accumulated experience, changes without ceasing". Hence it follows that from this survival of the past "consciousness cannot go through the same state twice". (BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 8.)

[45] HUGHES, Poetry ... , p. 61. By "concentrated excitement", the poet has in mind what Bergson and Lawrence call 'efforts of attention' or 'supplementary attention', since 'to concentrate' implies "to fix one's powers, efforts, or attentions on one thing". (THE NEW Merriam-Webster Pocket Dictionary. New York, Pocket-Books, 1971. p. 101.)

[46] HUGHES, Poetry ..., p. 60.

⇒

[47] Ibid., p. 18. Hughes affirms that to produce real poetry you must get "the feel" of live things.

[48] Ibid., p. 60. Hughes uses fishing imagery to convey the method of his artistry. His description is analogous to what Bergson calls the intuitive method, which consists in keeping "as close to the original as possible, to probe more deeply into its life, and by a kind of spiritual auscultation, to feel its soul palpitate". (BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 175.)

[49] See LAWRENCE, Selected Essays, p. 314.

[50] HUGHES, Poetry ... , p. 61. Here again the Bergsonian notion of reality and art as being "continuous creation of unforseeable novelty" reverberates. (BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 104.)

[51] HUGHES, Poetry ... , p. 61. The Lawrentian concept of reality as a process of continual destructive-creative flux, which will be explained in the next section, is to be detected here.

[52] Ibid., p. 57. As Bergson and Lawrence put it, he also believes that art requires the activity of the whole 'imagination' — implying complete consciousness in which intuitive awareness predominates. In his essay on Nathaniel Hawthorne, Lawrence reiterates this belief: "In the highest art, the primary mind expresses itself direct, in direct dynamic pulsating communication. But this expression is harmonious with the outer or cerebral consciousness". (ARNOLD, p. 136.)

[53] HUGHES, Poetry ... , p. 58.

□

2.2. ANALOGY BETWEEN 'MOBILE REALITY' AND THE PROCESS OF ARTISTIC CREATION

Bergson has compared the world to a work of art, incomparably richer, nevertheless, than that of the greatest artist, since nature is "the generator of new species as novel and original in form as the design of any artist"[1]. Lawrence, on the other hand, makes a parallel between the work of art and nature, defining his poetry not as something finished, but constantly in the making, analogous to the process of creative 'Becoming'.

In his essays and correspondence, Lawrence makes explicit his concept of reality as flux, postulating that life is incessant movement and change:

> Life is not a question of points, but a question of flow. It's the *flow* that matters. If you come to think of it, a daisy even is like a little river flowing, that never for an instant stops.[2]

Here we see that he borrows not only the idea of the Bergsonian 'durational' pattern, but also the image of a 'flowing river'[3], conveying the unbroken continuity of evolution. However, while Bergson concentrates mostly on the creative aspect of duration, Lawrence considers reality as a process of continual destructive-creative flux:

> Life, the ever-present, knows no finality, no finished crystallization. The perfect rose is only a running flame, emerging and flowing off, and never in any sense at rest, static, finished. (...) A water-lily heaves herself from the flood, looks around, gleams, and is gone. We have seen the incarnation, the quick of the ever-swirling flood. We have seen the

⇒

> invisible. We have seen, we have touched, we have partaken of the very substance of creative change, creative mutation. [4]

As Lawrence attempts to capture the notion of 'process', he sets up the foundations of an art with a metaphysical basis, poetry which concerns "the moment, the quick of all change and haste and opposition: the moment, the immediate present, the Now" [5]. What he calls "the quick of Time" [6] corresponds to the Bergsonian 'duration' or 'real time': the bubbling up of the stream of time at every instant corroborates the idea that each moment of our lives "is a kind of creation" and that "we are creating ourselves continually" [7]. His denial of staticism and perfection makes him reject a vision of poetry which stresses completeness and consummateness, an art which he calls poetry of the "past" and "future", like the "treasured gem-like lyrics of Shelley and Keats" [8], derived from a static conception of the universe. He repudiates fixed rules and ready-made concepts, since he advocates a kind of poetry which attempts to render the original as closely as possible, following the pulsations of the protean nature of reality in a process of discovery or disentanglement.[9] Such poetry, being "instantaneous like plasm" has "no finish". Possessing "its own *nature*, it cannot be restricted to rules, but "its law must come new each time from within" [10].

This concept of capturing a moment in time, is also defended by Ted Hughes, who in Poetry in the Making compares the writing of a poem to hunting:

> The special kind of excitement, the slightly mesmerized and quite involuntary concentration with which you make out the stirrings of a new poem in your mind, then the outline, the mass and colour and clean final form of it, the unique living reality of it in the midst of general lifelessness, all that is too familiar to mistake. This is hunting and the poem is a new species of creature, a new specimen of the life outside your own.[11]

⇒

As in the process of hunting, in which the hunter focusses his attention on the sinuosities of the movements of his prey, which constitute "an uninterrupted up-surge of novelty" [12], since he cannot predict the direction his object will pursue; each concentration [13] of the poet will empower him to "follow the undulations of the real" [14], seizing the very movement of the inward life of things. Thus, through an intuitional effort, perceiving the radical change of form in each moment of creation, the poet has the power to recapture not static instants, but 'moments of flowing time', in which continuity and unforseeability are foremost.

This theory of writing, which Hughes calls "the process of raid, or persuasion, or ambush, or dogged hunting or surrender" [15], is illustrated in one of his poems entitled The Thought-Fox (HR 14), which is a concrete example of this aspect of the poet's capturing or creating his subject-matter alive on paper. He reveals the creative attitude in action, comparing the making of a poem to the discovery of a moving fox behind the bushes.[16]

The opening of the poem shows us the poet trying to capture something alive in a 'moment of flowing time':

> I imagine this midnight moment's forest:
> Something else is alive
> Beside the clock's loneliness
> And this blank page where my fingers move.

Having concentrated his attention on a forest and some live thing, through various 'renewed efforts', he identifies a nose, two restless eyes, footprints and a moving body:

> Cold, delicately as the dark snow,
> A fox's nose touches twig, leaf;
> Two eyes serve a movement, that now
> And again now, and now, and now [17]
>
> Sets neat prints into the snow
> Between trees, and warily a lame
> Shadow lags by stump and in hollow
> Of a body that is bold to come

⇒

These are, as Hughes explains in Poetry in the Making, the "stirrings", "outline", "mass and colour";[18] the poet is collecting "those elusive or shadowy thoughts"[19] which press upon the mind during the creative act.

In the last stanza, we see the poet being seized by a 'sudden impulsion', achieving intuitive at-one-ness with the object:

> Till, with a sudden sharp hot stink of fox
> It enters the dark hole of the head.
> The window is starless still; the clock ticks,
> The page is printed.

The poem thus ends with definite knowledge of the fox: the poet has accomplished the "clean, final form"[20] of it; the blank page referred to in the first stanza is printed. This corroborates the Bergsonian notion about the making of a work of art — from the moment the poet has the precise idea of the poem he intends to compose, the poem is done.[21]

The concluding image of the fox going to earth as though into the poet's head, suggests the fusion of consciousness and reality, of intuition and intelligence: being at 'one' with the object, the poet apprehends its essence feeling the "sudden sharp hot stink of fox", thus completing the process of artistic creation.

As Hughes uses the specific example of animals and hunting to devise his aesthetic theory, he speaks of capturing "a spirit, a creature", putting forward the notion of the poem as an "unique living reality" in the midst of "general lifelessness", "a new species of creature, a new specimen of the life outside your own".[22] Hence he conveys his aim to recapture the inner flux of things and not only "the hardened outer shell"[23], in Bergsonian terms, we could say that he intends to "unfasten the cocoon" and "awaken the chrysalis"[24].

In a commentary about his poem Wodwo, Hughes declares that it is

⇒

about a creature that is just discovering that it is alive in the world ... a sort of half-man half-animal spirit of the forest"[25], trying to find out what relationship exists between itself and the flux around it. Some critics have also considered Wodwo as a metapoem, a description of the poetic process, since the creature in its fathoming into the depths of life,[26] uses the same method involved in artistic production. Keith Sagar suggests that the creature in the poem can be identified with its creator, as he reckons that

> Hughes is a wodwo in all his poems, asking the same questions of the world in which he finds himself, looking at that world and its creatures to discover where he ends and the other begins, and what relationship exists between the naked self and the 'endless without-world of the other'[27].

As both Lawrence and Hughes ascertain that reality is to be captured in immediate experience as flux and to be grasped by intuition, their art could be termed as 'process poetry'[28], since artistic creation implies 'creative evolution'[29]; while absorbed in the excitement of discovery the poet is himself evolving as in the activity of hunting, but unlike hunting, the aim of such poetry is not to kill the creature, but to capture it alive.

⇒

NOTES

[1] BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 103.

[2] LAWRENCE, D.H. Do Women Change? In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 542. Elsewhere, he relates the dynamicity of the universe to the ocean: "The universe is like Father Ocean, a stream of all things slowly moving. (...) Each thing, living or unliving, streams in its own odd, intertwining flux (...) All moves ...". (LAWRENCE, D.H. Art and Morality. In: MCDONALD, p. 525.)

[3] See BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 186. "... there is only a single duration which carries everything along with it, a river without bottom and without banks and flowing without assignable forces in a direction one cannot define."

[4] LAWRENCE, Poetry ... In: PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 182. As Bergson, Lawrence rejects finality and mechanism.

[5] Ibid., p. 183. By "immediate present" Lawrence wants to convey a moment of flowing time along the continuum of Becoming. In Creative Evolution, Bergson makes it clear that when we fix our attention on the continuity of life, we tend to perceive separate moments, since life is at every moment "creating something new". (p. 34.)

[6] LAWRENCE, Poetry ... In: PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 183. While Bergson compares life to an impetus or explosive force, which he calls *élan vital*, Lawrence through his metaphorical usage of 'quick', also gets the same meaning of a vital impulsion, since 'quick' connotes life and movement.

[7] BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 9.

[8] LAWRENCE, Poetry ... In: PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 182.

[9] See Lawrence's description of the method of artistic creation, referred to in the previous section.

[10] LAWRENCE, Poetry ... In: PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 185.

[11] HUGHES, Poetry ..., p. 17. The title of Hughes's book dealing with the poet's art — Poetry in the Making — is significant, since it implies an art that is constantly in the making, rather than the finished product.

[12] BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 18.

[13] What Hughes wants to convey by 'concentration' has already been expounded in the previous section.

⇒

[14] BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 31.

[15] HUGHES, Poetry ..., p. 57.

[16] The poems makes it evident that, in the same way as Lawrence, Hughes also holds that creation implies 'discovery'.

[17] The repetition of the word 'now', as well as the emphasis on a moment of flowing time in the first stanza ("I imagine this midnight moment's forest"), corroborates Lawrence's notion of what he calls poetry of "the moment, the immediate present, the Now". (See LAWRENCE, Poetry ... In: PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 183.)

[18] HUGHES, Poetry..., p. 17.

[19] Ibid., p. 58. This brings to mind Bergson's speculations about discoveries of intuitional origin, stating that "an idea which has sprung from an intuition ordinarily begins by being obscure", however, the clarity manifested at the end surpasses intellectual understanding. (The Creative Mind, p. 35.) Lawrence also holds that 'the blood' is wiser than the intellect.

[20] HUGHES, Poetry ..., p. 17.

[21] See BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 21. "... in the case of a work of art, for from the moment that the musician has the precise and complete idea of the symphony he means to compose, his symphony is done."

[22] HUGHES, Poetry..., p. 17 & 19.

[23] BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 27. In Sons and Lovers, Paul Morel speaking about painting also makes a contrast between the 'shimmering protoplasm' from within, and the 'stiffness' of exterior shape: "the shimmering protoplasm in the leaves and everywhere, and not the stiffness of the shape. That seems dead to me. Only this shimmeriness is the real living. The shape is a dead crust. The shimmer is inside really". (LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1964. p. 189.)

[24] BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 17.

[25] HUGHES, Poetry ..., p. 62.

[26] See explanation about 'sympathetic contact' already referred to in the previous section.

[27] SAGAR, The Art of Ted Hughes, p. 98.

[28] The foundations of their poetic theories are to be found in Bergson's 'process philosophy'.

[29] See correspondence between 'durational flux' and 'inner duration' expounded in the previous section.

□

2.3. FLORA AND FAUNA AS MANIFESTATIONS OF THE *ÉLAN VITAL*

A number of critics have agreed that Lawrence's art represents a development of Romanticism, pointing out, however, that an element of novelty is introduced by him, since the concern and familiarity with non-human behaviour is totally lacking in Romantic poetry. V.S. Pinto in her Introduction to The Complete Poems of D.H. Lawrence affirms that Lawrence carried forward the work of the great Romantics, especially that of Words worth, reckoning that

> The Romantics neglected the animal world and the sexual element in nature, and tended to confuse the apprehension of the life of nature with the quiet contemplation of landscape. Lawrence aims at a more complete nature poetry which will include birds, beasts, fishes and even insects as well as vegetable life.[1]

In his choice of subject-matter and in his treatment of it, Hughes's art represents the most faithful presentation of individual non-human life in English poetry since Lawrence:[2] the living organism means the same thing for both writers. Unlike the Romantics, they do not project themselves into creatures, nor interpret them; but assert for them a legitimate place in the world, allowing them to exist in flesh and blood in their own right. While Lawrence manifests himself against the "nasty anthropomorphic lust"[3] of the Romantics, who tried to spread their ego over nature, Hughes maintains that in contemplating the energies of natural beings, the poet must look at them from "their own point of view"[4], respecting their "strange nature, their strange kind of life"[5].

Lawrence takes it for granted that even a flower has its own peculiar identity, its "floweriness"[6] being the quality of otherness which

⇒

to be expressed has to be gathered into himself as blood-knowledge: its vital properties or "blood-being" [7] can only be revealed through the "blood-sympathy which allows and accepts this otherness as an enriching, a joy"[8], referred to already.

Although both writers recognize the difficulty to apprehend, and the inadequacy of words to express the pulse of the life-force[9] embodied in creatures, that which constitutes the "horsiness of a horse" [10] or the "crowiness of a crow" [11], they strive to render them as they really are and not as man thinks they ought to be.[12]

It is in his ability to perceive the ineffable qualities of the inner life of flora and fauna that Hughes approaches Lawrence: in his poems he also evokes the strong vital force in birds, beasts and plants, these species being characterized as incarnations of vitality, or, speaking in Bergsonian terms, manifestations of the *élan vital*. When accused of being a mere '*voyeur* of violence' by several critics,[13] he explained that his poems "are not about violence but vitality. Animals are not violent. They're so much more completely controlled than man. So much more adapted to their environment..." [14].

In Skylarks (W 168-71), Hughes recognizes that the birds are 'other' and non-human life centres. He does not idealize them in the Romantic fashion, but reveals them as creatures of muscle, blood and bone, putting forth all their strength in their struggle against the elements and the gravity of the earth, being "Barrel-chested for heights, / Like an Indian of the high Andes". The concentration of the life-force in the larks is in their muscles, necessary for struggling, for ballast and for survival, supplanting life like a deadly missile:

> A whippet head, barbed like a hunting arrow,
>
> But leaden
> With muscle
> For the struggle

⇒

Against
Earth's centre.

And leaden
For ballast
In the rocketing storms of the breath.

Leaden
Like a bullet
To supplant
Life from its centre.

In the fourth section of the poem, Hughes identifies the larks with living sparks of nature's "bonfire"[15], which burns on throughout the ages, creatures "quick with life"[16], compelled by the life-force drive to obey compulsions without understanding:[17]

Like those flailing flames
That lift from the fling of a bonfire
Claws dangling full of what they feed on

The larks carry their tongues to the last atom
Battering and battering their last sparks out at the limit-

As Lawrence puts it, Hughes does not see the birds "in their 'little singing angel' aspect of modern sentiment. He has the more ancient vision. He sees their dark, primitive, weapon-like souls. He sees how they start and flash their wings darkly, in the spontaneous wonder of the retraction into isolation, or in a kind of vindictive self-arrogance"[18]. He sees them "squealing and gibbering and cursing", pursuing their tremendous irresistible drive.

In An Otter (L 46-7), Hughes also celebrates the creature's inbuilt store of endless energy, translated in its ingenuity of movement, effortlessly crossing from sea to sea in three nights, seeking contact with the lost pristine world in which it was engendered:[19]

Wanders, cries;
Gallops along land he no longer belongs to;
Re-enters the water by melting.

Of neither water nor land. Seeking
Some world lost when first he dived, that he cannot come at
since,

⇒

Takes his changed body into the holes of lakes;
As if blind, cleaves the stream's push till he licks
The pebbles of the source; from sea

To sea crosses in three nights

Being predator and prey at the same time, while it devours the trout in the watery element, on firm ground it is pursued by the hunters' trained dogs, having to hide for hours in the water among plants, with only its nostrils reaching the air in order to survive:

The hunt's lost him. Pads on mud,
Among sedges, nostrils a surface bead,
The otter remains, hours.

Hughes depicts the otter as a dual creature, of "neither water nor land", possessing a 'mental' and a 'blood-being':

In double robbery and concealment -
From water that nourishes and drowns, and from land
That gave him his length and the mouth of the hound.
He keeps fat in the limpid integument

Reflections live on. The heart beats thick,
Big trout muscle out of the dead cold;
Blood is the belly of logic; he will lick
The fishbone bare.

The description of the thickening of the otter's blood, 'knowing' the proximity of the trout without seeing it, echoes Lawrence who also holds that in the animal "blood is the belly of logic", since it "knows within the dark, passionate belly"[20], knowing at once, in dark mindlessness.

Hughes's view of a number of small plants shows the strong vital force of the vegetable kingdom. In Thistles (W 17), he conveys how enduring these weeds are; although they are insistently crushed down by brute force, they rise again:

Against the rubber tongues of cows and the hoeing
hands of men
Thistles spike the summer air
Or crackle open under a blue-black pressure.

Every one a revengeful burst
Of resurrection, a gasped fistful

⇒

Of splintered weapons and Icelandic frost thrust up

From the underground stain of a decayed Viking.

The extraordinary piercing strength of the thistles, is conveyed through such words as 'spike', 'crackle open', 'pressure', 'burst', 'grasped fistful' and 'thrust up', which reinforce the inner pressure or dynamic of the plants. Furthermore, the image of 'splintered weapons' suggesting explosive force propelled violently is reminiscent of Bergson, who has compared the vital impetus to a "shell, which suddenly bursts into fragments, which fragments, being themselves shells, burst in their turn into fragments destined to burst again, and so on for a time incommensurably long"[21]. Through this image the quality of endurance is also conveyed, since, the thistles

Then they grow grey, like men.
Mown down, it is a feud. Their sons appear,
Stiff with weapons, fighting back over the same ground.

In comparing the life-thrust of the thistles to men, mentioning the ancient tribe of the ferocious Vikings to provide a metaphor of the tremendous vitality observable in these small weeds, Hughes alludes to the eternal 'feud' of living creatures struggling for survival, implying, as Bergson has put it, that "the rest of nature is not for the sake of man: we struggle like the other species, we have struggled against other species"[22].

Thus, the running motif at the heart of these poems has a metaphysical implication: each different centre of life is a manifestation of the original vital impetus which generates incessantly, bringing forth a multiplicity of creatures, each of them remaining distinctive and unique. This acceptance of 'otherness' makes the poet get away from the human-centered viewpoint, endowing him with an awareness of the greater reality in which man is involved.

⇒

NOTES

[1] PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 12.

[2] Daniel HOFFMANN claims that Hughes "brought into English verse an animal ferocity unknown since the death of Lawrence". (HOFFMANN, D. Talking Beasts: The "Single Adventure" in the Poems of Ted Hughes. Shenandoah, 19: 49, Sum. 1968.)

[3] LAWRENCE, D.H. Love Was Once a Little Boy. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 456. In the same essay he makes a reference to Wordsworth, asserting that when he described a primrose, he didn't recognize its "primrosy identity", "he didn't leave it with a soul of its own. It had to have his soul. And nature had to be sweet and pure, Williamish. Sweet-Williamish at that! Anthropomorphized! Anthropomorphism, that allows nothing to call its soul its own, save anthropos: and only a special brand, even of him!" (ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 447 & 449.)

[4] HUGHES, Poetry ..., p. 16.

[5] Ibid., p. 39.

[6] LAWRENCE, Love ... In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 448. What Lawrence calls 'floweriness' constitutes the essence of the flower, the spark or 'quick' of life itself (in Bergsonian terms — the life-force or *élan vital*), that permits growth and development of a unique creature. (See also BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 98.)

[7] MOORE, p. 393. By 'blood-being' Lawrence refers to the "instinct in creatures such as bees, or ants, or whales, or foxes, or larks", which is "the sure and perfect working of the primary mind in these creatures. All the tissue of the body is all the time aware. The blood is awake: the whole blood-system of the body is a great field of primal consciousness". (See ARNOLD, p. 135.) This corresponds to the Bergsonian notion of animal awareness: "The instinct that animates the bee is indistinguishable , then, from the force that animates the cell, or is only a prolongation of that force". (BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 183.)

[8] LAWRENCE, Hector ... In: ARNOLD, p. 65.

[9] Bergson also refers to the difficulty of expressing that which is living, alluding however to the possibility of recapturing the vital impetus within us and other beings, depending on a body of knowledge on data of living experience and sure intuition, already referred to in previous sections. (See BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 33.)

[10] LAWRENCE, Etruscan ..., p. 72. Contemplating the wall paintings in the tombs of the ancient Etruscans, Lawrence muses: "These archaic

⇒

horses are so perfectly satisfying *as* horses: so far more horse-like, to the soul, than those of Rosa Bonheur or Rubens or even Velazquez, though he comes nearer to these: so that one asks oneself, what, after all, is the horsiness of a horse? What is it that man sees, when he looks at a horse? — what is it, that will never be put into words?"

[11] In Poetry in the Making, Ted HUGHES reveals a similar concern: "There are no words to capture the infinite depth of crowiness in the crow's flight". (p. 119.)

[12] In Etruscan Places, LAWRENCE says that we must guard against "thinking how things *ought* to be, when already they are quite perfectly what they are". (p. 43.)

[13] See SAGAR, The Art of Ted Hughes, p. 34. There has been a whole controversy between Rawson and Hainsworth as to whether or not Hughes celebrates violence for its own sake. More recently, however, such critics as K. Sagar, J.M. Newton, and J. Gitzen have referred to his poems as celebrations of energy. (See GITZEN, J. Ted Hughes and the Triumph of Energy. Southern Humanities Review, 7 : 73, 1973.) J. Gibson, analysing the thematic substance of the whole body of Hughes's poetry, points out that in Lupercal there are a number of poems dealing with the recognition and celebration of the life-force. However, in the same way as the other critics, he does not relate the life-force theme to the Bergsonian philosophy. (GIBSON, J. A Thematic Analysis in Ted Hughes's Major Works. Ann Arbor, Xerox University Microfilms, 1977. 317 p. Thesis. Ph. D. University of Northern Colorado, 1974.)

[14] HUGHES, T. Ted Hughes on Himself. In: LUCIE-SMITH, E. ed. British Poetry Since 1945. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1971. p. 390. Hughes made these assertions in an interview with John Horder in 1965.

[15] Referring to Hughes poem Ghost Crabs, Keith SAGAR explains that 'bonfire' originally meant 'bone-fire', referring to the Heraclitian fire (Heraclitus also founded his philosophy on 'flux') — the creative sparks which carry life forward. (See SAGAR, The Art of Ted Hughes, p. 68.)

[16] LAWRENCE, Etruscan ..., p. 35. It has already been mentioned that Lawrence's creative 'quick' corresponds to the Bergsonian life-force. Hughes uses the Lawrentian terminology in his poem A Woman Unconscious, where he speaks of "the quick of the earth burned out". (L 15.)

[17] Animal 'instinctive behaviour' will be discussed in detail later on.

[18] LAWRENCE, Hector ... In: ARNOLD, p. 64. Lawrence sympathizes with Hector St. John Crèvecoeur's vision because it corresponds to his own vision. Notice the Lawrentian topos, identifying the birds with explosive force ('weapon-like souls'), which is also apparent in Hughes's Skylarks, comparing the birds to a 'leaden bullet'.

[19] There is an implication, here, that in the course of evolution, the otter has changed its original form and function. This notion corroborates Bergson who claims that "species pass through alternate periods of stability and transformation. When the period of 'mutability' occurs, unexpected forms spring forth in a great number of directions". (BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 71.)

⇒

[20] LAWRENCE, Hector ... In: ARNOLD, p. 67.

[21] BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 109. The image of 'splintered weapons' is also reminiscent of what Lawrence calls 'weapon-like' force, already referred to. This topos has thematic continuity in a number of Hughes's poems.

[22] Ibid., p. 289. Lawrence speaks in a similar vein in his Study of Thomas Hardy, when he says that man "must be born to the knowledge that other things exist beside himself, and utterly apart from all, and before he can exist himself as a separate entity, he must allow and recognize their distinct existence". (In: MCDONALD, p. 453.) In the Etruscan es says, he also refers to the interdependence of all living creatures, referring to the endurance of the grass of the fields: "It is the grass of the field, most frail of all things, that supports all life all the time. But for the green grass, no empire would rise, no man would eat bread: for grain is grass; and Hercules or Napoleon or Henry Ford would alike be denied existence". (LAWRENCE, Etruscan ..., p. 29.)

□

2.4. LOSS OF VITALITY IN HUMANITY

The revolt against science, materialism and mechanism that finds expression in many writers in the twentieth century, indicates the great influence that Bergson exerted not only in France, but in many other countries. By insisting on 'creative life', he protests against mechanized force, which in his opinion withers the vital impulses in man, since it makes him lose contact with the rest of living organisms. He also advanced the idea that in the course of evolution man has had to give up valuable goods, such as instinct and intuition, because of the excessive development of the intellect, holding that these "losses are represented by the rest of the animal world, and even by the vegetable world, at least in what these have that is positive and above the accidents of evolution"[1].

There is some point of comparison here between the view of the French philosopher and that of Lawrence and Hughes, since their diagnosis of modern man also stresses the loss of vitality as being an inevitable consequence of mechanization and industrialism and the of the fact that man has set himself apart from the natural process of life.

Lawrence overtly manifests his aversion for modern civilization, claiming that man has become enslaved by the machine and "imprisoned within walls of accomplished fact, experience, or knowledge"[2]. He feels "there is too much automatic consciousness"[3] in the world, responsible for the waning of potentialities in man, preventing him from establishing a vital rapport with other life forms. Claiming that men have degenerated in their stupid visionlessness since the cave-men[4], he refers to the ancient

⇒

tribe of the Etruscans as intensely alive people. Visiting some Etruscan tombs, which are decorated with paintings on the walls, he detected in those remains of a lost civilization a "touch of vital life" and a "certain naturalness and feeling"[5], which he could not find in the present. The figures in those paintings seemed to dance: those old silhouette forms were charged with "vital movement"[6], as if the "*blood* continued to beat"[7]. Affirming that "the dancing Etruscan spirit is dead"[8],he implies the slackening of vital power in modern man, who "is never spontaneous, as we imagine the thrushes or the sparrow-hawk, for example, to be spontaneous"[9]; he cannot live by instinct, because he has degenerated into a "domesticated thinking animal"[10].

This view is also shared by Ted Hughes, who believes that the vitality apparent in animals is also locked inside man, but, unfortunately there is no outlet for it in "this tame corner of civilization"[11]. Therefore, like Lawrence, he has turned away from the man-made world to the wonder of nature, exploiting the primary struggles of the natural realm[12], which for him represents the vitalistic way of life, contrasted with the unvitalistic modern world of man. He affirms the superior 'otherness' of non-human nature, living to the full and in complete naturalness, their superiority consisting not only in their lack of mental consciousness, but also greater bodily strength and vigour as well as extraordinary fertility and swiftness.

In Thrushes (L 52), this idea of spontaneous animality is set in contrast with man's indecisions, to which Hughes refers as "indolent procrastinations" and "yawning stares". He describes the birds as being instinctively ruthless in satiating their appetites; with an unhesitating "bounce" and "stab" they snap up worms and insects, as if they were driven by some "bullet and automatic purpose"[13]. By comparing instinct to a perfect instrument, the poet refers to their admirable "natural abil

⇒

ity to use an inborn mechanism"[14], stressing its

> efficiency which
> Strikes too streamlined for any doubt to pluck at it
> Or obstruction to deflect.

Here Hughes refers to the simplicity of function of the instrument that the animal finds at hand when it needs it, since 'streamlined' means 'simplified'. His reference to the efficiency of instinct echoes Bergson, who has defined the inborn mechanism of animals as an instrument presenting "like all the works of nature, an infinite complexity of detail combined with a marvellous simplicity of function", which "does at once, when required, what it is called upon to do, without difficulty and with a perfection that is often wonderful".[15]

In the confrontation between man and bird, the poet affirms the superiority of the thrushes, since they are not troubled by the sicknesses of man's mind, not knowing either hesitation or remorse:[16]

> With man it is otherwise. Heroisms on horseback,
> Outstripping his desk diary at a broad desk,
> Carving at a tiny ivory ornament
> For years: his act worships itself — while for him,
> Though he bends to be blent in the prayer, how loud and
> above what
> Furious spaces of fire do the distracting devils
> Orgy and hosannah, under what wilderness
> Of black silent waters weep.

In Hawk Roosting (L 26), again man is put at a disadvantage, since the bird, charged with ferocious vitality, kills for a purpose, while man is capable of gratuitous acts of violence and cruelty, which he wraps up in what the poet calls "falsifying dreams" and "sophistries", always finding an excuse for his follies:

> I sit in the top of the wood, my eyes closed.
> Inaction, no falsifying dream
> Between my hooked head and hooked feet:
> Or in sleep rehearse perfect kills and eat.

The hawk is shown as a creature obeying its life-force drives, claiming that killing is its unassailable right, as it is the most efficient

⇒

means to meet its energy requirements:

> I kill where I please because it is all mine.
> There is no sophistry in my body:
> My manners are tearing off heads -
>
> The allotment of death.
> For the one path of my flight is direct
> Through the bones of the living.
> No arguments assert my right:

In an interview, Hughes commented that his hawk has been accused of "being a fascist ... the symbol of some horrible totalitarian genocidal dictator"[17], when in fact, it is simply satisfying the demands of its animal nature. What constitutes animality for him, corresponds to Bergson, who claims it is "the faculty of utilizing a releasing mechanism for the conversion of as much stored-up potential energy as possible into 'explosive' actions"[18].

To Hughes, the more spontaneous the animal, the more admirable, since in man he encounters a deprivation of vital impetus. Calvin Bedient[19] points out that the poet considers the primitive man and the artist as exceptions of this degenerative process. He refers to the poem November (L 49), in which we see a primitive tramp perfectly integrated in the natural flow of life, and to Thrushes (L 52), in which the perfected instinct of the birds — their "bullet and automatic purpose" — is compared to something in Mozart's brain. This striking comparison refers to that which is extraordinary in the brain of a genius; his 'demon' or 'intuitive self' that carries him away, enabling him to produce spontaneously and without effort in the manner of the bird. Thus, the spontaneous activity of the bird and the creative power of the supreme artist are seen as one, a unity from which ordinary men are excluded, not participating in the life-flow necessary among living creatures.

What Lawrence and Hughes have in common is that they both consider they have a mission to carry out. They see the artist as a saviour[20],

⇒

constantly striving to unveil the energies of the cosmos so as to permit humanity to regain the lost connections with living things. Thus, the creative artist partakes in the life-renewing process of the universe, being the recipient of a revelation coming directly from the life-force, i. e., through the life-participation of the artist the normal relations of the universe are restored.

⇒

NOTES

[1] BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 290.

[2] LAWRENCE. The Crown. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 397.

[3] LAWRENCE, D.H. Him With His Tail In Mouth. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 430. It must be kept in mind that Lawrence was a bitter opponent of industrialism, which, he believed, had destroyed the harmony between man and nature, on which a healthy civilization depends. Furthermore, these ideas are closely related to the theme of the conflict between instinct and intellect, since he considers that excessive cerebration has led to mechanization, which in turn has lessened the life-impulse in man.

[4] Ibid., p. 434.

[5] LAWRENCE, Etruscan ..., p. 31.

[6] LANGER, S.K. Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art Developed From Philosophy in a New Key. London, Routledge & Paul, 1973. p. 175. Speaking of "*dance motifs*", Susanne LANGER claims that "*dance gesture*" is "*seen and understood* as vital movement". She also refers to the actual behaviour of animals, which is not art, but simply vital movement, becoming art only after having been imagined and expressed by the creative artist, then becoming a symbolic form. (p. 175.)

[7] LAWRENCE, Etruscan ..., p. 75. Lawrence affirms that the 'symbolic forms', which represented the vital movement of men, animals and birds, were so perfectly drawn, that one could detect the Etruscans' art of living in them.

[8] Ibid., p. 73.

[9] LAWRENCE, D.H. On Human Destiny. In' ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 623-4.

[10] Ibid, p. 623.

[11] HUGHES. Ted Hughes On Himself. In: LUCIE-SMITH, p. 390. Hughes asserts that the vital force the reader observes in his poems is the same he "sees when he looks into his own head. Mostly these powers are just waiting while life just goes by and only find an outlet in moments of purity and crisis, because they won't enter the ordinary pace and constitution of life easily. In fact, they have a hard time in the modern world. People are energetic animals and there's no outlet in this tame corner of civilization". This notion of 'taming' is also developed by Lawrence in one of his essays: "Tameness, like alcohol, destroys its own creator.

⇒

Tameness is an effect of control. But the tame thing loses the power of control, in itself. It must be controlled from without. Man has pretty well tamed himself, and he calls this tameness civilization". (LAWRENCE, D.H. The Novel and the Feelings. In MCDONALD, p. 757.)

[12] In his autobiographical essay The Rock, HUGHES declared: "What excites my imagination is the war between vitality and death, and my poems may be said to celebrate the exploits of the warriors of either side". (In: SUMMERFIELD, p. 126.)

[13] The life-force drive of animals associated with a weapon-like instrument to convey tremendous power, is a recurrent image in Hughes's poetry.

[14] BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 154. Bergson explains the natural ability to use an inborn mechanism as follows: "Now, does an unintelligent animal also possess tools and machines? Yes, certainly, but here the instrument forms a part of the body that uses it; and, corresponding to this instrument, there is an *instinct* that knows how to use it".

[15] Ibid., p. 155.

[16] To convey the sicknesses of man's mind, Lawrence uses the image of a 'grinding mill': "He ground his ideas in the slow ponderous mill of his heavy cranium". (In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 623.)

[17] FAAS, p. 8. He also affirms that what he "had in mind was that in this hawk Nature is thinking. Simply Nature".

[18] BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 132-3.

[19] BEDIENT, C. On Ted Hughes. Critical Quarterly, 14: 107, 1972.

[20] According to Lawrence "whoever can establish, or initiate a new connection between mankind and the circumambient universe is, in his own degree, a saviour. Because mankind is always exhausting its human possibilities, always degenerating into repetition, torpor, *ennui*, lifelessness. When *ennui* sets in, it is a sign that human vitality is waning, and the human connection with the universe is gone stale". Quoting great inventors, philosophers and creative artists, he points out that they are responsible for "a vast release of energy", which is important to re-establish the life-flow necessary among living creatures. (LAWRENCE, D.H. Aristocracy. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 478.) According to Hughes, the poet, endowed with creative energy, also releases energy, thus invoking "the bigger energy, the elemental power circuit of the Universe". To him poetry "is nothing if not that, the record of just how the forces of the Universe try to redress some balance disturbed by human error". (FAAS, p. 7-9). The views of both writers corroborate Bergson, who also suggested that the intuition of seers, saints and poets opened new roads and perspectives, giving creative impulse which is necessary to restore the harmony between man and nature.

□

2.5. 'CREATIVE STRIFE' WITHIN THE ANIMAL KINGDOM

Disgusted by the war, which he considered mad and obscene, Lawrence observed that killing is admissible if it is natural as among animals[1], but hateful when reduced to heartless slaughter in senseless competition for power[2]. Although he does not allude to the necessity of killing or to the eating habits of animals in his poems, he widely discusses these ideas in his fiction and essays, where he expresses his admiration for predatory birds and beasts which for him are things of beauty[3], since they represent dynamic life-forms in constant conflict[4], being part of the destructive-creative principle of the universe:

> The tiger, the hawk, the weasel, are beautiful things to me; and as they strike the dove and the hare, that is the will of God, it is a consummation, a bringing together of two extremes, a making perfect one from the duality.[5]

Lawrence insists on the integration or balance of universal forces, which for him constitute the basis of the vital process. In his essay The Crown, he makes explicit his theory of antinomies, formulating his male-female dichotomy, which for him represents the dual universal principle, and which he successively metamorphosed in new terms, such as mind vs. body, intellect vs. blood, light vs. dark, love vs. law and others.[6] In the essay mentioned, the antinomies are objectified in the lion, standing for our 'dark' nature and the unicorn our 'light'[7], two equal forces fighting for supremacy. What matters is not the victory of one over the other, but the fight[8] in itself, since Lawrence believes that 'creative strife' is necessary to maintain the natural balance of the universe. Stat

⇒

ing that "the dark wants light, and the light wants dark"[9], he implies that "consummation into oneness" or "wholeness" of being[10], can only be reached through a balance of opposing forces. Although he recognizes that such fulfilment is rarely achieved by man, because he has voluntarily cut himself apart from the natural order, he stresses the need to strive towards it, since he holds that cessation of conflict in the world would mean its destruction.[11]

Considering Lawrence's dualistic universe within which birds and beasts of prey assume an outstanding position, the observations he makes in Etruscan Places give us a clue to the understanding of his viewpoint. The proper relation between the opposites within the animal kingdom is described by Lawrence as "polarity of action"[12]:

> The leopard and the deer, the lion and the bull, the cat and the dove, or the partridge, these are part of the great duality, or polarity of the animal kingdom. But they do not represent good action or evil action. On the contrary, they represent the polarized activity of the divine cosmos in its animal creation.

Here the opposition is seen as an actual combat. Lawrence believes that "a tiger knows no consummation unless he kill a violated and struggling prey"[14], and that it is robbed of its "ecstasy in the flesh"[15], by the non-resistance of the opposite pole. He differentiates the killing of the tiger from that of a butcher or of carrion birds who feed on putrescence, affirming that there is no consummation for the butcher or the vulture since there is no strife implied. The tiger's action is affirmative because devouring is its very "*raison d'être*"[16], it

> devours because it is consummated in devouring, it achieves its absolute self in devouring. It does not devour because its unselfish conscience bids it so, for the sake of the other deer and doves, or other tigers.[17]

A parallel between man and beast is implied in this passage: Lawrence suggests that man is worse than the most ferocious beast, since he uses

⇒

the faculty which distinguishes him from animals to engender hideous crimes, for which he always tries to find an excuse. While the tiger's impulse is instinctive and natural, the plottings of man's mind are conscious and therefore "unforgivably wrong" [18].

Hughes's position comes very close to Lawrence's in Crow's Table Talk[19], where he compares and constrasts the action of the tiger, who devours creatures to absorb vitality[20], with the effect of the machine guns[21], showing the opposition between mechanized, brute force and vital impetus. He alludes to the fact that mechanized force has exhausted man's natural potencies; as he is not tiger-like any more, he tends to simulate the action of the tiger, fitting himself out with machinery through which he emits his cruelty. Assuming the tiger's nature and need of being, man expresses his lust for cruelty, using the faculty which distinguishes him from the animal for his own destruction and the destruction of others. In his mad desire to exercise power arbitrarily, man loses respect for life; having become as mechanical as the hideous machine he has constructed, he sees the dead only in terms of statistics:

> The tiger kills hungry. The machine-guns
> Talk, talk, talk across their Acropolis.
> The tiger
> Kills expertly, with anaesthetic hand.
> The machine-guns
> Carry on arguing in heaven
> Where numbers have no ears, where there is no blood.
> The tiger
> Kills frugally, after close inspection of the map.
> The machine-guns shake their heads,
> They go on chattering statistics.

Hughes puts emphasis on the difference between the killing of the tiger and that of the machine-guns, which he considers one of the horrors planned by the human intellect. He points out that the action of the tiger is positive and beautiful, since it has a natural right to devour the flesh of lower creatures to accumulate vital power. Being the expression of a vital need, in fact, its very '*raison d'être*', the action of the ti

⇒

ger is creative, while the effect of the machine-guns is destructive, responsible for massive slaughter, killing blindly and mechanically for unreasonable purposes:

> The tiger kills by thunderbolt:
> The god of his own salvation.
> The machine guns
> Proclaim the Absolute, according to morse,
> In a code of bangs and holes that makes men frown:
> The tiger kills with beautiful colours in his face,
> Like a flower painted on a banner.
> The machine-guns
> Are not interested.
> They laugh. They are not interested. They speak and
> Their tongues burn soul-blue, haloes with ashes,
> Puncturing the illusion.

The machine-gun is presented as an image of anti-life and corruption, being a vehicle that not only destroys, but also maims and cripples. Like Lawrence, Hughes also calls attention to the horror beyond horrors of human beings 'caught up', 'tangled' and 'torn' in machinery[22], causing disgust and bringing misery:

> The tiger
> Kills and licks its victim all over carefully.
> The machine-guns
> Leave a crust of blood hanging on the nails
> In an orchard of scrap iron.

The tiger's 'consummation' is contrasted with man's frustration. The poet insists that the tiger and the machine are not wrong[23] because they cannot think, but he accuses man of being terribly wrong, always trying to hide his violence beneath a civilized façade of manners, arguments and morality:

> The tiger kills
> With the strength of five tigers, kills possessed.
> The machine-guns
> Permit themselves a snigger. They eliminate the error
> With a to-fro dialectic
> And the point proved stop speaking.

Throughout the poem, Hughes emphasizes the tiger's enormous strength, courage and velocity, killing "hungry" and "frugally","with the

⇒

strength of five tigers", since it is compelled by its predatory nature to absorb life into its own life to reach "blossoming"[24] or fullness of being:

> The tiger
> Kills like the fall of a cliff, one-sinewed with the earth,
> Himalayas under eyelid, Ganges under fur -
> Does not kill.
>
> Does not kill. The tiger blesses with a fang.
> The tiger does not kill but opens a path
> Neither of life nor of death:
> The tiger within the tiger:
> The tiger of the earth.
>
> O tiger!
> O brother of the viper! O beast in blossom!

In the end of the poem a cosmic vision of the tiger is presented. It is seen as an expression of the divine cosmos in its animal creation. In the same way as Lawrence, Hughes identifies the living God with nature: the tiger, finding fulfilment in its natural being is "the god of his own salvation"[25].

By associating the tiger with the earth and the serpent, Hughes also echoes Lawrence. In an attempt to find adequate 'objective correlatives' for his creative principle, Lawrence identifies the earth's 'protoplasmic' energy with the source of life: his metaphorical "dark sun"[26]. is the earth seen as a 'living' and cosmic element. Being dual in nature, it possesses at once a malevolent and benevolent character, since it offers both food and death.[27] Thus, life and death are inextricably locked in a causal relationship[28], being counterparts of a single reality. Furthermore, Lawrence explains that the dargon or serpent symbol stands for 'vivid' life or 'potency'[29], because of the close relationship of the dragon and the serpent to the "source of potency, the dark, lurking intense sun at the centre of the earth"[30]. These symbols embody his 'Kosmodynamos', which, as he himself puts it, the modern philosophers call "*Élan Vital*"[31]. ⇒

The chtonian[32] characteristics that Hughes lends to his tiger, make it appear as a 'creative God', a symbol of potency representing the polarized activity of the cosmos. Achieving its perfect 'happiness of necessity', it is 'most vividly' alive. And as it partakes of the vitality of the cosmos, it becomes part of the life-renewing process; it is 'life-creating and life-sustaining'[33], since the integration or balance of forces is the key to the whole vital process.

⇒

NOTES

[1] In a letter to the Brewsters in 1921, Lawrence claims that dynamic energy must be expressed: "Leave me my tigers, leave me my spangled leopards, leave me my bright cobra snakes, and I wish I had poison fangs and talons as good. I *believe* in wrath and gnashing of teeth and crunching of coward's bones". (In: MOORE, v. 2, p. 652.) Notice the emphasis on 'teeth' and 'claws' — the natural weapons of attack of the animal, expressing its activity. 'Teeth' and 'claws' standing for the animal's instruments of combat, are also recurrent images in Hughes's poetry.

[2] Lawrence considers man the most ferocious of all predators; while the animal kills purposefully using a natural instrument, man invents and manufactures artificial machinery to kill with for unreasonable purposes. In Twilight in Italy, he expresses his horror of mechanized force, saying that the machine is "the great reconstructed selfless power", which "dominates and cows us, we cower before it, we run to serve it". But at the same time, "we want to be warlike tigers. That is the horror: the confusing of the two ends. We warlike tigers fit ourselves out with machinery, and our blazing tiger wrath is emitted through a machine. It is a horrible thing to see machines hauled about by tigers, at the mercy of tigers, forced to express the tiger. It is a still more horrible thing to see tigers caught up and entangled and torn in machinery. It is horrible, a chaos beyond chaos, and unthinkable hell". (LAWRENCE, D.H. Twilight in Italy. London, Heinemann, 1956. p. 40-1.)

[3] Valuing what he calls "*living* beauty", Lawrence holds that life and beauty are as inextricable as life and consciousness. (See Lawrence. Sex Versus Loveliness. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 528.) Bergson also claims that consciousness is co-extensive with universal life. (See BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 204.)

[4] In his Preface to the section entitled Reptiles in Birds, Beasts and Flowers, LAWRENCE states: "Homer was wrong in saying 'Would that strife might pass away from among gods and men!' He did not see that he was praying for the destruction of the universe; for, if his prayer were heard, all things would pass away — for in the tension of opposites all things have their being —". (In: PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 348.) The Prefaces of the diverse sections are obscure prose pieces usually bearing thematic hints to the section's poems that follow. They are usually made up of observations and injunctions from the pre-Socratic thinkers stitched together by Lawrence's own words. These philosophical fragments he chose from a book given to him by Bertrand Russel that much delighted him, John Burnet's Early Greek Philosophy. In the passage above, Herakleitos is represented: "War, then, is the father and king of all things, in the world as in human society (fr. 44); and Homer's wish that strife might cease was really a prayer for the destruction of the world (fr. 43)." (See BURNET, J. Early Greek Philosophy. London, Adam & C. Black, 1975. p. 164.) The first edition of this book came out in 1892.

⇒

[5]LAWRENCE. The Crown. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 407. It must be kept in mind that for Lawrence every part of the universe is a manifestation of God. Various critics have agreed that he identifies God with the whole natural order seen in reverence and wonder. He believes that whenever a creature finds fulfilment in its natural being it is God. In the essay stated above, he expresses this credo: "The true God is *created* every time a pure relationship, or a consummation out of twoness into oneness takes place. So the poppy flower is God come red out of the poppy plant". (p. 412.)

[6]Various critics have drawn detailed charts, in which they list a great variety of names referring to this dichotomy. (See HOUGH, G. The Dark Sun: A Study of D.H. Lawrence. London, Duckworth, 1975. p. 224. DALESKI, H.M. The Forked Flame: A Study of D.H. Lawrence. London, Faber & Faber, 1965. p. 30.) Graham HOUGH says that Lawrence, in order to find an adequate 'objective correlative' for his principle of duality adopts a method that "is probably the only one for an unprofessional philosopher — that of multiplying instances"; therefore he "recurs again and again to his dichotomy, under a great variety of names". (p. 224.)

[7]DALESKI has pointed out that Lawrence identifies 'light' with intellect or 'mental consciousness' and 'dark' with intuition or 'blood-consciousness'. (See p. 35.)

[8]For Lawrence, fight is the '*raison d'être*' of each of them, since fight is life itself. In The Crown, he asserts that the lion must always be in strife with the unicorn, because a victory for either side brings life to an end: "But think, if the lion really destroyed, killed the unicorn: not merely drove him out of town, but annihilated him! Would not the lion at once expire, as if he had created a vacuum around himself? Is not the unicorn necessary to the very existence of the lion, is not each opposite kept in stable equilibrium by the opposition of the other? (...) They would both cease to be, if either of them really won the fight which is their sole reason for existing". (In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 366.) Graham HOUGH has suggested that Lawrence's theory of polarity can be compared with Jung's concept of integration. (See p. 227). In fact, Jung's observation that "the counterbalancing of the lion and the unicorn in Britain's coat of arms stands for the inner stress of balanced opposites finding their equilibrium in the centre", is very similar to Lawrence's ideas. (See CIRLOT, J.E. A Dictionary of Symbols. London, Routledge & Paul, 1971. p. 12.) However, it is important to state that theories of antinomies date from remotest antiquity. Hence, Lawrence's concept of duality can also be related to the Yin and the Yang of Chinese philosophy: the dynamic male principle opposed to the passive, female principle. (See CIRLOT, p. 47.) Concerning Greek philosophy, Empedokles advanced the Love and Strife duality, maintaining that the function of Love is to produce union, and of Strife to break it up again. (See BURNET, p. 232.) Furthermore, Herakleitos had also seen in phenomena a harmony of opposites in tension, concluding that War is foremost. (See BURNET, p. 163-4.) This vision of Strife as being a dominant and 'creative force' is also revived in the view of Bergson, who insists that life tendencies are "at once mutually complementary and mutually antagonistic". He exemplifies his viewpoint referring to the duality of vegetable and animal life, as well as of intelligence and instinct, which in spite of being incompatible and antagonistic are complementary to each other. (See BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 149.) Therefore, although Lawrence relies on various sources to formulate his theory of antimonies, the opposition he established between 'mental' and 'blood' consciousness can be directly related to

⇒

Bergsonism. Like Bergson, he holds that we are dual creatures, and that we must strive to achieve 'wholeness' of being by means of establishing a relation between the opposites.

[9] LAWRENCE. The Crown. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 375. In the same essay, he affirms that we are incomplete, "moulded upon an eternal void, a Want". (p. 367.) These ideas call to mind Bergson's observations on incompleteness. Referring to the two ways of knowing, he states that "a complete and perfect humanity would be that in which these two forms of conscious activity should attain their full development". (BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 291.) Lawrence believes that by means of conflict and strife, the balance of opposites may be achieved between individuals, and between psychic forces within the individual. In Fantasia of the Unconscious, he speaks of "dynamic psychic polarity between the individual himself and other individuals concerned in his living". (LAWRENCE, D.H. Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious. London, Heinemann, 1961. p. 55.)

[10] LAWRENCE. Hector ... In: ARNOLD, p. 55.

[11] Echoing Herakleitos, Lawrence believes that there must be no cessation from the conflict. "Remove the conflict and there is collapse, a sudden crumbling into universal nothingness". (See LAWRENCE. The Crown. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 368.)

[12] LAWRENCE. Etruscan ..., p. 56.

[13] Ibid., p. 56.

[14] LAWRENCE, D.H. Twilight ..., p. 38.

[15] Ibid., p. 36.

[16] Ibid., p. 38.

[17] Ibid., p. 41. In his essay on Fenimore Cooper's Anglo-American Novels, LAWRENCE explains: "Between the beast predative and the beast ruminative is a balance in polarity, and the destruction of either pole is a destruction of both in the long run". (In: ARNOLD, p. 80.)

[18] LAWRENCE, Twilight ..., p. 41.

[19] HUGHES, T. Crow Wakes. Woodford Green, Poet & Printer, 1971. p. 11-2.

[20] In one of his essays, Lawrence states: "The primary way, in our existence, to get vitality, is to absorb it from living creatures lower than ourselves. It is thus transformed into a new and higher creation. (LAWRENCE, D.H. Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 469.)

[21] Lawrence affirms that man tends to confuse cause and effect. Although he is different from the tiger, he assumes its nature and need of being. And because he is not tiger-like any more, he constructs machines which are supposed to emit the tiger's wrath for him. This confusing of the two ends results in chaos and disaster.

⇒

[22] See LAWRENCE's comment on the disastrous effect of the machine-guns. (Twilight ..., p. 41.)

[23] Hughes corroborates Lawrence in his view that "the tiger is not wrong, the machine is not wrong, but we, liars, lip-servers, duplicate fools, we are unforgivably wrong". (See LAWRENCE, Twilight ..., p. 41.)

[24] In Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine, LAWRENCE speaks of the 'bloom of aliveness', which makes creatures unique and 'nonpareil', using the word 'blossoming' to convey fullness of being. (In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 471.)

[25] By describing the tiger as "the god of his own salvation", fulfilment in its natural being is implied — which makes it clear that Hughes agrees with Lawrence that a creature completely integrated in nature is God. Moreover, the allusion to the Himalayas and to the sacred river Ganges is significant, since the Himalayas suggest 'unattainable heights' and the river Ganges connotes 'divinity'. Like Lawrence, Hughes also holds that 'for man, as for flower and beast and bird, the supreme triumph is to be most vividly, most perfectly alive". (See LAWRENCE, D.H. Apocalypse. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1975. p. 125.)

[26] Lawrence's metaphorical concept of the 'dark sun' is founded upon ancient beliefs. The pre-Olympian Greeks believed in spirits or deities dwelling under the earth who cause new crops to grow in the spring, but are also figures of unspeakable dread and aversion who visit death upon men. (See CIRLOT, p. 46.) Furthermore, he also inspired himself in a similar belief of the Hopi Indians, who shared this double vision of the Greeks that the earth offered both food and death.

[27] He explains the meaning of his metaphorical 'dark sun' in Mornings in Mexico, where he describes the symbolical meaning of the Hopi Snake Dance: for the Hopis the snake was sacred because of its proximity to the sacred earth, which offered both life and death — their rituals were in honour of the "terrific, dread, and causeful dark sun which is at the earth's core", that which sent them "food or death". (LAWRENCE, D. H. Mornings in Mexico. London, Heinemann, 1956. p. 76.)

[28] In the same way, tiger and prey are also locked in a causal relationship, the tiger's perfect happiness implies the sacrifice of the other pole.

[29] See LAWRENCE, Apocalypse, p. 90.

[30] LAWRENCE, Mornings ..., p. 68.

[31] LAWRENCE, Apocalypse, p. 91.

[32] 'Chton' is the Greek word for earth.

[33] Lawrence says that in remote times the serpent was seen as "life-bringer, life-giver, life-maker, vivifier". (LAWRENCE, Apocalypse, p. 92.)

□

2.6. 'ANIMAL CONSCIOUSNESS' DIRECTED TOWARD ACTION

Lawrence attributes to animals and plants a sort of 'pristine consciousness'[1], common to all living creatures including man, believing that the fundamental law of animal life is the orientation of consciousness toward action:[2]

> The singing of the lark is direct expression from the whole primary or dynamic mind. When a bee leaves its hive and circles round to sense the locality, it is attending with the primary mind to the surrounding objects, establishing a primary *rapport* between its own very tissue and the tissue of adjacent objects.[3]

Referring to the common nature of different life-species who fight for survival devouring lower forms of life[4], he discusses the important part played by food in terms of existence:

> Wherever man establishes himself, upon the earth, he has to fight for his place, against the lower orders of life. Food, the basis for existence, has to be fought for (...). Food, food, how strangely it relates man with the animal and vegetable world! How important it is! And how fierce is the fight that goes around it. (...). In nature, one creature devours another, and this is an essential part of all existence and being.[5]

Concerning the function of the higher animals' method of alimentation, Lawrence agrees with Bergson, holding that through the ingestion of food they are supplied with potential energy, which is then converted into action.[6] Mentioning the fierce bird and the great cat[7] amongst the higher animals, Lawrence discusses their peculiar consciousness, that is basically 'innate or instinctive knowledge', immediately elaborated into movement at the instant it is needed.[8] He further corroborates Bergson asserting that in the animal the different organs are perfected to the

⇒

extent of their requirements. To illustrate his viewpoint, he refers to a common feature noticeable in predatory birds and beasts, namely the acuteness of their visual organs, which enables them to sense and recognize their prey instantaneously, and which has developed to such a degree of perfection to correspond to their functional need:[9]

> Those animals which, like cats, wolves, tigers, hawks, chiefly live from the great voluntary centres, these animals are, in our sense of the word, almost visionless. Sight in them is sharpened or narrowed down to a point: the object of prey. It is exclusive. And thus they see unthinkably far, unthinkably keenly.[10]

This peculiar way of knowing which predatory animals have is also made evident in some of Ted Hughes's poems, in which he describes the carnivores' feeding habits.[11] He depicts these creatures as 'living' and conscious: dynamic life-centres interacting with other centres of life.

In Hawk Roosting (L 26), he penetrates the consciousness of a hawk in order to apprehend its distinctive 'mode of being'. The hawk's consciousness is revealed through its self-dialogue, in which it asserts that its search for food is sure and unfailing due to the acuteness of its eyes, which are 'sharpened' and 'narrowed' down to the point where the 'life-heart' of its prey beats, since the "one path" of its flight is "direct / Through the bones of the living".

In the poem Thrushes (L 52), he defines the birds' impulse as a "bullet and automatic purpose", which is immediately translated into action. Like the hawk, they strike guided by their "poised / Dark deadly eye"[12], killing worms and insects with an instant deadly stab:

> Terrifying are the attent sleek thrushes on the lawn,
> More coiled steel than living — a poised
> Dark deadly eye, those delicate legs
> Triggered to stirrings beyond sense — with a start, a bounce, a stab
> Overtake the instant and drag out some writhing thing.

⇒

The word 'stab' is placed in isolation into a new line to convey directness of sight; the birds' "single point of vision"[13] is an expression of their functional need, since it permits them to spot and seize their prey instantaneously and without error. In comparing the thrushes to "triggered" "coiled steel", Hughes implies an analogy between bird and fire-arm, which can be discharged simply by pulling a trigger.[14] Thus he equates the 'acted knowledge' of the bird to the perfected mechanism of a gun, in which complexity of detail is combined with simplicity of function.

Lawrence is also called to mind in Hughes's portraits of predatory cats. In his poem The Jaguar (HR 12), he reiterates the idea of acuteness of sight in predators, presenting a caged jaguar as a creature "blind" to everything else but that which the instincts of its body demand. As Lawrence has put it, the eyes of a great cat in bondage cannot see

> except with the light from within itself, by the light of its own desire. Its own white, cold light is so fierce that the other warm light of the day is outshone, it does not exist. So the white eyes of the tiger gleam to a point of concentrated vision, upon that which does not exist. Hence its terrifying sightlessness. The something which I know I am is hollow space to its vision, offers no resistance to the tiger's looking. It can only see of me that which it knows I am, a scent, a resistance, a voluptuous solid, a struggling warm violence that it holds overcome, a running of hot blood between its jaws, a delicious pang of live flesh in the mouth. This it sees. The rest is not.[15]

Like Lawrence, Hughes also emphasizes the jaguar's sightlessness; it is oblivious of his cage as is the visionary of his cell, feeling only "the bang of the blood in the brain":

> the crowd stands, stares, mesmerized
> As a child at a dream, at a jaguar hurrying enraged
> Through prison darkness after the drill of his eyes
>
> On a short fierce fuse. Not in boredom -
> The eye satisfied to be blind in fire,
> By the bang of blood in the brain deaf the ear -
> He spins from the bars, but there's no cage to him

⇒

> More than to the visionary his cell:
> His stride is wilderness of freedom:
> The world rolls under the long thrust of his heel.
> Over the cage floor the horizons come.

Hughes places emphasis on the blazing eyes of the jaguar, which express its fiery raging nature. Lawrence asserts that the eyes of predatory cats are transfigured though "ecstasy in the flesh"[16], explaining that this is

> the acme of the flesh, the one superb tiger who has devoured all living flesh, and now paces backwards and forwards in the cage of its own infinite, glaring with blind, fierce absorbed eyes at that which is nothingness to it.[17]

Hughes depicts the jaguar as a raging potency with its own peculiar consciousness. Possessing a surplus of dynamic energy that has to be expended, it is shown as unaccommodating. Though caged, the jaguar "spins from the bars", "hurrying enraged" before the eyes of the mesmerized crowd. What keeps the jaguar moving in contrast to the other caged animals cannot be controlled by the environment of the cage: in its wild 'ecstasy' it transcends its imprisonment, not even knowing that the cage is there.

In Second Glance at a Jaguar (W 25), the Lawrentian influence can be detected again in Hughes's borrowing of some specific physical details to describe his jaguar, presenting it as a creature whose consciousness and energy is concentrated at the base of the spine, which corresponds to Lawrence's claim that

> in the tiger and the cat the power-centre is at the base of the spine, in the sacral ganglion. All the tremendous sense of power and mastery is located in these centres of volition, there where the back is walled and strong, set blank against life.[18]

Hughes suggests that "the living will", "the living mind" of the jaguar is in its slender loins, in the node of the spinal cord:[19]

⇒

> Skinfull of bowls, he bowls them,
> The hip going in and out of joint, dropping the spine
> With the urgency of his hurry
> Like a cat going along under thrown stones, under cover,
> Glancing sideways, running
> Under his spine.

The emphasis on the word 'spine' in this context, suggests that the jaguar walks with its "consciousness concentrated at the base of its spine", while its mind is subjugated and submerged,[20] since its head

> Is like the worn down stump of another whole jaguar,
> His body is just the engine shoving it forward,
> Lifting the air up and shoving on under,
> The weight of his fangs hanging the mouth open,
> Bottom jaw combing the ground.

The image of the jaguar's head resembling a "worn down stump" is very similar to Lawrence's description of the tiger's skull:

> His head is flattened as if there were some great weight on the hard skull, pressing, pressing the mind into a stone, pressing it down under the blood, to serve the blood. It is the subjugate instrument of the blood.[21]

Furthermore the image of "another whole jaguar" compressed in the creature's head, places great emphasis on the urgency of body and blood, since such compression suggests that the mind is reduced almost to nil. Hughes sees the jaguar as "an ancient symbol of Dionysus"[22]; as Lawrence has also put it, a creature that achieves fullness of being "in the supreme ecstasy of the flesh, the Dionysic ecstasy"[23], since it can no more escape from the wheel of life than the hawk or the eagle or any living creature can.

Ingli James has suggested that concerning the portraits of Hughes's animals, one tends to have "an impression of lifelessness, of counterfeit animals of wood, stone or metal", which lack "that quivering intensity, that darting of eye and palpitation of flesh that is so characteristic of the animal world and without which there can hardly be life: for instinct, after all is a form of life, and to that extent is not pure mechanism,

⇒

though it may look like it to a superficial observer"[24]. What James fails to see is that Hughes, far from being a superficial observer, has a profound knowledge of animal life and consciousness, since in his portraits of animals he shows a profound insight into the inner life of birds and beasts, describing these creatures in their full particularity. The comparisons he draws between 'animal instinct' and 'perfected instruments' are appropriate, since comparisons and metaphors are the most effective means of conveying that which is 'living' and therefore difficult to be expressed in words. Lawrence and Bergson have also compared the animals' instrument of action to a perfected 'weapon' or 'tool', which does not mean that they identify instinct with pure mechanism, since they show an intense awareness of 'other' life, accompanied by a prodigious power of rendering their experience in terms of literary art. Similarly, Hughes is also sensitively aware, not merely conceptually aware, of the profound life-force whose rhythms the natural creature obeys.

⇒

NOTES

[1] In Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious, Lawrence refers to the "nature of pristine consciousness which lies integral and progressive in every functioning organism". He further affirms that "we are forced to attribute to a star-fish, or to a nettle, its own peculiar and integral consciousness". (LAWRENCE, Fantasia ..., p. 214.) This corroborates Bergson, who also speaks of animal and plant consciousness. (See BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 124.)

[2] BERGSON observes that "in the animal, all points to action, that is, to the utilization of energy for movements from place to place. (...) the organism as a whole tries to attract as much energy as possible to those points where the locomotive movements are effected". (Creative Evolution, p. 133.)

[3] LAWRENCE. Nathaniel Hawthorne. In: ARNOLD, p. 135. In Lawrence's terminology, 'primary or dynamic mind' and 'pristine consciousness' mean the same thing.

[4] BERGSON also speaks of the natural dependency of animals on plants and lesser animals, of man on animals and plants, and of plants on solar energy. (See Creative Evolution, p. 118.)

[5] LAWRENCE. Reflections ... In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 465. In the same essay, he reinforces his viewpoint, claiming that the importance of food makes itself evident, if we consider the enormous size of the food-apparatus in the animal: "The same when one skins a rabbit and takes out the inside, one realizes what an enormous part of the animal, comparatively is intestinal, what a big part of him is just for food-apparatus; for *living on* other organisms". (p. 465.)

[6] In Creative Evolution, BERGSON gives a detailed explanation of the important part played by food among the higher animals. (See p. 134-5.)

[7] Kenneth INNIS presents a complete chart of the hunter-victim dichotomy which can be detected in Lawrence's writings, and which in part, can also be found in the work of Ted Hughes. (See p. 40.)

[8] BERGSON affirms that "the most perfect instinct of the insect is accompanied by gleams of intelligence, if only in the choice of place, time and materials of construction: the bees for example, when by exception they build in the open air, invent new and really intelligent arrangements to adapt themselves to such new conditions". Nevertheless, he reckons that "it is instinct still which forms the basis of their psychical activity". He defines instinct as being "the faculty of using an organized natural instrument" which involves "innate knowledge (potential or un-

⇒

conscious, it is true), both of this instrument and of the object to which it is applied. Instinct is therefore the innate knowledge of a *thing*". (Creative Evolution, p. 157 & 166.)

[9] BERGSON widely discusses the question of form and function of the higher animals' visual organs in Creative Evolution. He asserts that "the vision of a living being is an *effective* vision, limited to objects on which the being can act: it is a vision that is *canalized*, and the visual apparatus simply symbolizes the work on canalizing. (...) For this reason, no matter how distant two animal species may be from each other, if the progress toward vision has gone equally far in both, there is the same visual organ in each case, for the form of the organ only expresses the degree in which the exercise of the function has been obtained". (p.104-7.) He exemplifies his viewpoint, discussing "the simple pigmentary masses of a lower organism" and "the marvellously perfected eye of the bird". (p. 107.)

[10] LAWRENCE. Fantasia ..., p. 61. LAWRENCE advanced a four-fold scheme of perception and plexuses to explain the important part played by what he calls "physical or primary mind, a perfect and spontaneous consciousness centralizing in the great plexuses and ganglia of the nervous system and in the hind brain". He makes a radical distinction between this way of cognition and what he calls "ideal consciousness, which we recognize as mental, located in the brain". (See ARNOLD, p. 135.) He claims that in the same way as the animals, we have "two primary centres of consciousness: the "upper" and the "lower" centre. In each of these, we have a "sympathetic centre primal in activity and knowledge and a corresponding voluntary centre". On the lower plane (located in the abdomen), there is the "solar plexus" (sympathetic centre), and the corresponding "lumbar ganglion" (voluntary centre). On the upper plane (located in the breast), we have the "cardiac plexus" (sympathetic centre), and "near the spine, by the wall of the shoulders", we have the corresponding "thoracic ganglion" (voluntary centre). (Plexuses, Planes and so on. In: LAWRENCE, Fantasia ..., p. 29-50.) This 'pseudo-scientific' theory (which evidently does not correspond to literal truth) shows Lawrence's eagerness to demonstrate that there is consciousness of some kind that is not mental, and that "the body is awake and alive, and in the body the great nerve-centres are active, active both in knowing and in asserting". (In:ARNOLD, p. 55). Lawrence's theory roughly corresponds to what Bergson calls "sensory-motor system" which is the same in man and the animal, and which he defines as "the cerebro spinal nervous system together with the sensorial apparatus in which it is prolongued and the locomotor muscles it controls". (See BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 138.) In Fantasia of the Unconscious, LAWRENCE points out that the eye perception of predatory beasts is directed by the "voluntary centres", the "lumbar ganglion" which is the centre of "singleness and separate identity", and the "thoracic ganglion" which "acts as the powerful voluntary centre of separateness and power". (p. 30-2.)

[11] In his Interview with Egbert Faas, Hughes declared that although there are people who "find the behaviour of the hawk 'horrible'", or any "reference to violent death 'disgusting'", the 'life-mode' of predatory creatures is only an expression of the natural rhythms that creatures must follow. (FAAS, p. 6.)

[12] Hughes's reference to the thrushes' keen 'dark' vision bears Lawrentian connotations, since 'dark' represents one of the poles of

⇒

Lawrence's antinomies, which stands for the 'primary or dynamic mind', the 'pristine consciousness' common to all living creatures.

[13] LAWRENCE. Fantasia ..., p. 61.

[14] Here Hughes corroborates BERGSON who states that the animal can get "at any moment, the amount of work it needs for its action, simply by pulling a trigger". (See Creative Evolution, p. 127.)

[15] LAWRENCE, D.H. The Lemon Gardens. In: ___. Twilight ..., p. 37.

[16] Ibid., p. 36. Lawrence makes clear his idea of 'transfiguration through ecstasy of flesh' in the same essay: "The tiger is the supreme manifestation of the senses made absolute. This is the

'Tiger, tiger, burning bright,
In the forests of the night'

of Blake. It does indeed burn within the darkness. But the *essential* fire of the tiger is cold and white, a white ecstasy. It is seen in the white eyes of the blazing cat. This is the supremacy of the flesh, which devours all, and becomes transfigured into a magnificent brindled flame, a burning bush indeed. (...) Like the tiger in the night, I devour all flesh, I drink all blood, until this fuel blazes up in me to the consummate fire of the Infinite. In the ecstasy I am infinite, I become again the great Whole, I am a flame of the One White Flame which is the Infinite, the Eternal, the Originator, the Everlasting God: in the sensual ecstasy, having drunk all blood and devoured all flesh, I am become again the eternal Fire, I am infinite". (p. 36.) Here Lawrence again reiterates the idea that if a creature finds fulfilment in its natural being, it is God, becoming part of the life-renewing process.

[17] Ibid., p. 37.

[18] LAWRENCE, D.H. The Two Principles. In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 237. According to Lawrence, the activity of the great cat is also directed by the centres of volition. He stresses the tiger's 'physical' consciousness, located in the ganglia and affective nerve-centres of dynamic 'flux'. In the same way as the fierce bird, its 'energy' and 'will' are concentrated in its body rather than its head. In the essay mentioned above, he states that "it is from the ganglia of the spinal system that the *will* acts in direct compulsion, outwards. (...) from the lumbar ganglion and from the sacral ganglion acts the great sensual will to dominion". (p. 237.)

[19] Hughes's description of the jaguar's body brings to mind Lawrence's observations: "The will lies above the loins, as it were at the base of the spinal column, there is the living will, the living mind of the tiger, there in the slender loins. That is the node, there in the spinal cord". (See LAWRENCE, Twilight ..., p. 36.)

[20] LAWRENCE, Twilight ..., p. 36.

[21] Ibid., p. 36.

[22] In his Interview with Egbert Faas, Hughes declared that his jaguar symbol can be seen in a number of ways, such as "the ancient symbol of Dionysus since he is the leopard raised to the ninth power". (FAAS, p. 8.)

⇒

LAWRENCE, Twilight ..., p. 37.

JAMES, G.I. The Animal Poems of Ted Hughes: A Devaluation. Southern Review, 2 (3): 199-200, 1967.

□

3. HUGHES'S ANIMAL TROPES OF THE 'NON-HUMAN' AND THE 'DARK UNKNOWN' IN MAN

In a number of his animal poems Hughes invokes the non-human psyche, the world of sub-human instincts and the unconscious areas of the psyche, aspects that are widely objectified in Lawrence's discursive writings.[1] When one examines the long line of Hughes's animal prototypes, a number of poems emerge in which the animal is presented as an 'extended metaphor' or seen as a 'creative symbol'.[2] In these poems we notice Lawrence's animal tropes and symbols re-emerging in Hughes.

The poem The Bear is an 'extended metaphor' of the 'dark unknown' in man, embodying Lawrence's concept of the 'pristine unconscious' made explicit in Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious, where he describes his realization of the strange forces at work within man.

The poems A Dream of Horses and The Bull Moses, as well as his episodic story The Rain-Horse are also fraught with Lawrentian thematic implications, showing individual quests for connection with the life-forces embodied in nature, in which the human characters long for apocalyptic experience and rebirth to recover their 'pristine self' frustrated by modern life. While the horse stands for untamed instinctual life, unimpeded by mind and not degenerated into domestication, the bull comes to reveal the primal life-force subdued, but ready to explode at any moment. In these poems the animals become metaphors for the 'creative' energies of the universe: the unquenchable life-force which lies submerged in man, since the excess of automatic consciousness has severed him from the natural process of life. However, Hughes believes that these

⇒

latent powers in man are bound to come to the surface again, if the normal relations of man and the universe are restored. Like Lawrence, he insists on the re-emergence of the primal self in man, suggesting that he can recover his lost potentialities through direct 'creative' contact with the living forces outside him, as well as by yielding to the subconscious urge of life inside him.

The change wrought in human beings through this sympathetic relationship with the natural order and its creatures can be related to the idea of process of Bergson: the natural 'flux' acting on human consciousness brings about change,[3] since the life-force observable in nature is transferred to man, making him recover his balance and opening new perspectives of 'creative' life.

⇒

NOTES

[1] Lawrence's interpretations of these aspects of the human psyche bear a close similarity to the work of C. Jung. It is known that he read this author enthusiastically, since Jung's ideas were much more compatible with his own than Freud's.

[2] The term 'creative symbol' has been coined by Kenneth INNIS, who adapts and paraphrases Eliseo Vivas' concept of 'constitutive symbol', defining it as " 'a creative synthesis of empirical matter' in one commanding image which, irradiated from within, brings newness of perception and 'manifests itself in dramatic and moral terms'. Analysis does not exhaust the symbol's meaning since that to which it refers is, in some obscure way, itself identical with the object perceived and the experience of perceiving. In effect, the infinite is in the finite". As a powerful example he mentions Ursula's apocalyptic horses in The Rainbow. He further makes it explicit that he has called "Lawrence's kind of symbol 'creative' rather than 'constitutive', since creative both sounds more like normal English and conveys a greater sense of dynamic shaping". (p. 15.)

[3] Interaction between 'durational flux' and 'inner duration' already referred to in previous sections. (See BERGSON, Creative Evolution, p. 8.)

□

3.1. THE HORSE: SYMBOL OF 'PHALLIC CONSCIOUSNESS'

A significant animal that emerges in Hughes's poetry is the horse; not only in the poem A Dream of Horses, but also in the episodic prose-story The Rain-Horse[1], suggesting the 'dark' pristine powers that man has lost. In both the poem and the story the horse bears similarities to its Lawrentian forerunners: to the dream of horses in Fantasia of the Unconscious, to the recurrent red stallion in The Boy in the Bush, Sons and Lovers and St. Mawr, as well as to the apocalyptic animals in The Rainbow.

The horse-trope exemplifies 'phallic consciousness'[2] in Lawrence's bestiary, becoming a metaphor of potency, 'blood' and organic life on a symbolic level. In a sense it is that part of man's self which is locked in and encircled by his automatic consciousness[3]. Two comments in his philosophical writings show what exactly the horse suggests to Lawrence. In Fantasia of the Unconscious, it is established in the sympathetic mode[4], as a type of blood consciousness, carrying phallic associations of passion and power:

> ... the horse's eye is bright and glancing. His curiosity is cautious, full of terror, or else aggressive and frightening for the object. The root of his vision is in his belly, in the solar plexus. And he fights with his teeth, and his heels, the sensual weapons.[5]

He further clarifies the significance of the trope in Apocalypse, where he alludes to the horse-symbol that emerges from the deep recesses of our unconscious, which stands for "surging potency and power of movement, of action, in man"[6]:

⇒

> Horses, always horses! How the horse dominated the mind of the early races, especially of the Mediterranean! You were a lord if you had a horse. Far back, far back in our dark soul the horse prances. He is a dominant symbol: he gives us lordship: he links us, the first palpable and throbbing link with the ruddy-glowing Almighty of potence: he is the beginning even of our godhead in the flesh. And as a symbol he roams the dark underworld meadows of the soul. He stamps and threshes in the dark fields of your soul and mine. The sons of God who came down and knew the daughters of men and begot the great Titans, they had 'the members of horses', says Enoch.[7]

In Fantasia of the Unconscious, Lawrence refers to man's "persistent, passionate fear-dream about horses", in which

> He suddenly finds himself among great, physical horses, which may suddenly go wild. Their great bodies surge madly around him, they rear above him, threatening to destroy him. At any minute he may be trampled down.[8]

According to his interpretation this dream bears 'phallic' or sensual connotations, since

> there is a great impression of the powerful, almost beautiful physical bodies of the horses, the nearness, the rounded haunches, the rearing. (...) It is a great sensual reaction at the sacral ganglion, a reaction of intense, sensual, dominant volition. The horse which rears and kicks and neighs madly acts from the intensely powerful sacral ganglion. But this intense activity from the sacral ganglion is male: the sacral ganglion is at its highest intensity in the male.[9]

Alluding to the degenerative state of modern man with his repressed male sensual nature, he explains that "the horse-dream refers to some arrest in the deepest sensual activity in the male", insisting that it reveals the secret yearning for "liberation and fulfilment of the deepest and most powerful sensual nature" of the spontaneous self.[10]

The same symbolism of the horse-dream discussed by Lawrence, is reiterated in Hughes's poem A Dream of Horses (L 21-2), in which we see a groom, who acting as the spokesman for all his mates, tells us about their oniric experience. There is clear indication in the poem that the dream is an eruption from the unconscious, since the groom speaks of "darkness" that "gulfed beyond the palace-gate", and of "plunging of horses"

⇒

to the rim of their eyes that "strove for the shapes of the sound". The dream-like atmosphere of this description is clear enough, and as 'palace' is also symbolic of the unconscious[11], it becomes plain that the images of the horses spring from the turbulent depths of the human unconscious.

The horses are seen as emblems of instinctual power and passion, energies which in spite of being atrophied in man come to the surface in dreams or in contact with some force that evokes this side of his nature. They are sources of superior vitality for which the grooms secretly yearn; in a sense they desire identification with what the horse represents:

> And we longed for a death trampled by such horses
> And every grain of the earth had hooves and mane.

Here there is the same image of being "trampled down" by "great physical horses"[12], loaded with phallic connotations that Lawrence has evoked in Apocalypse. The horses' power of movement and action is expressed by such verbs as "batter", "cannon", "trample" and "quarter", while their physical presence and wildness is conveyed by the stamping of their hooves which reverberates in the grooms' head[13], denoting their intense physical reaction and their subconscious longing for liberation and accomplishment of their sensual nature.

The theme of apocalyptic fulfilment through the horse-symbol is emphasized in the poem through an insistent repetition of the word 'horses', which is mentioned fourteen times in twenty-seven lines.

In the last stanza there is an equation of the fire of the Apocalypse and the circling of the hooves of horses,[14] in which death and resurrection of the body is implied:[15]

> Now let us, tied, be quartered by these poor horses,
> If but doomsday's flames be great horses,
> he forever itself a circling of the hooves of horses.

The ending of the poem alludes to an intensification of natural power, to man's newly-awakened consciousness of that part of his self that can be

⇒

equated with organic life and potency and which transforms him into a balanced individual, freeing him from his condition of arrest.

In one of his episodic stories called The Rain-Horse (W 45-55), Hughes concentrates again on the horse metaphor that he developed in A Dream of Horses. In the story the horse is also seen as a "symbol of the strong animal life in man" [16]. Like Lawrence, he sets "the tremendous *non human* quality of life" [17] against the tamed human world. As he himself has put it, the story and the poem are "intended to be read together, as parts of a single work" [18], since they are complementary to each other.

Keith Sagar has suggested that The Rain-Horse is "an exercise in the Lawrence manner, drawing heavily on Ursula's encounter with the horses at the end of The Rainbow" [19]. To establish the similarities between both horse-episodes important thematic and stylistic implications must be pointed out. It will be shown that the experience with the horses that both characters have is basically the same, but that the effect produced is radically diferent.

Some critics have argued whether the horses that Ursula is harried by are concrete and real or can be seen as a projection of the unconscious.[20] It can be said that both interpretations are valid, which also applies to the Rain-Horse, since the horses are both independent realities and intimately connected with the character,[21] representing the turbulent sensual impulses that erupt from his unconscious.

Beside its emblematic side, Hughes's story can also be considered as an individual quest for connection with the pristine forces embodied in nature. Like the horse-episode in The Rainbow it has a strong apocalyptic colouring.[22] Both scenes are pre-eminentely ritualistic: in The Rainbow the ritual of the horses that "were up against" [23] Ursula represents her ordeal before apocalyptic rebirth; while in The Rain-Horse the ritual persecution of the horse that "was definitely after" [24] the protag

⇒

onist also strikes him in a way so as to reveal to him an important part of his self, namely his animal instinct, which had been dormant in him up to that point.

Although both protagonists present feelings of desperation with modern society, intuiting that they must escape to something more alive, they shrink from the contact with the horses, trying to fight or run away from them[25], not being aware that they are trying to avoid something that is part of their own self. When they expose themselves to weather and rain amidst the animal world both feel discomfort; Ursula yearns to go "back to stability and security"[26], while the male protagonist feels that "he had come too far"[27] and that "he wanted nothing but to get away from it as quickly as possible"[28]. The interior tumult[29] which both characters experience is projected outside them, not only in the nightmarish horse-encounter, but also in the landscape and weather-condition. Rain is an important element, which reinforces the apolcalyptic atmosphere of both episodes, since there is an implication of the cleansing waters of the flood which precede rebirth.[30]

In both episodes we perceive the writers'ability to evoke the deepest "spirit of place"[31]. Both characters enter an alien wild territory, far from the ordered world to which they belong. The feeling for landscape is evoked as motion, force and process,[32] since what is important is not the landscape in itself, but the change it accomplishes in the characters once they get in contact with it. The horses which represent forces rejected by modern society, are an integral part of the natural order in its unceasing mutation.

As each of the protagonists is depicted as being an instance or a consequence of the principle of progressive devitalization, their penetration into alien territories represents their unconscious desire to achieve their wholeness lost by the growing impoverishment of their lives, to be

⇒

recovered through close contact with a universe not yet deprived of its vitality. The ritual of the horses, being similar to a dance,[33] represents the vigorous strong-bodied liveliness that modern life has frustrated. Like Lawrence, Hughes also places emphasis on the startling physical presence of the horse: its "heavy body", the "immense supple of powerful motion", the "spattering of its hooves", its "lips lifted back from the long yellow teeth", and its powerful "flank shining in the hard light".[34]

A state of stupor befalls both protagonists at the termination of their experience; Ursula "sat on the fence leaning back against the trunk of the thorn tree, motionless ..." [35] while the male protagonist "just sat staring at the ground" [36]. This is a state which generally precedes awareness or apocalyptic rebirth. In The Rainbow, Ursula has an intuition of regenerating power in her vivifying encounter with the wild horses. She apprehends something positive through the experience, a possibility of 'creative life' or fullness of being, which is further evinced by her vision of the rainbow with which the book ends.[37] Hughes's story, however, ends abruptly with the statement that the man felt "as if some important part had been cut out of his brain" [38], which leads us to conclude that instead of becoming 'whole', the experience only serves him to recover a "savage energy" [39]. The metaphor of the foxes [40] reinforces the point that instead of attaining fullness of being the man has simply become animal-like: by recovering his animal instinct he has lost his human reason.

Ursula's hope strongly contrasts with the protagonist's hopelessness. The comparison between both stories evinces the difference between reconnection with the mystery of the cosmos and reversal to savagery. Hughes's attitude of ironic pessimism in The Rain-Horse strongly contrasts with the creative perspective of Lawrence's vision in The Rainbow. Nevertheless, the congruity of the two episodes in both subject and design is extremely striking, so much so that occasionally particulars from one

⇒

episode can help to point out an illuminating correspondence in the other.

⇒

NOTES

[1] In the Author's Note of his book Wodwo, Hughes states that his stories "may be read as notes, appendix and universified episodes of the events behind the poems, or as chapters of a single adventure to which the poems are commentary and amplification. Either way, the verse and the prose are intended to be read together, as parts of a single work".(W 9).

[2] In one of his letters, LAWRENCE refers to "the old phallic awareness and the old phallic insouciance": the warm, free and spontaneous physical consciousness of living beings. He sets 'phallic consciousness' in opposition to what he calls 'sex in the head' which is repulsive to him, since it involves "intellectual reactions reflected down on to the physical process". (In: MOORE, p. 1048 & 1064). He considers the 'phallic reality' not only as an instinctive dimension, but as a vital force springing from the existential nucleus, seeing sex as a vital life-urge on which the equilibrium of man and woman depends. (See ARNS, H. A Consciência Fálica Existencial, na Teoria Literária de D.H. Lawrence. Letras, (17): 138-9, 1969.)

[3] In Sex Versus Loveliness, LAWRENCE speaks of the "deep psychic disease of modern men and women", namely the excess of automatic consciousness which has atrophied the instinctive and intuitive life. He asserts that we are deprived of the joy of life, "because we deny sex and beauty, the source of the intuitive life and of the insouciance which is so lovely in free animals". (In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 528). In Apocalypse, he makes clear that the animal stands for that part of man's self that is locked in and encircled by his automatic consciousness, referring to the "animal difference and potency, its hinterland consciousness which circles round the isolated consciousness of man". (See p. 48.)

[4] In The Two Principles, LAWRENCE affirms that the solar plexus is the centre of all the sympathetic system: the great centre of 'blood-consciousness', to which he refers as "our most powerful dark conscience". (In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 236.) Affirming that the seat of consciousness in the horse is in the solar plexus, he sees it as a type of 'blood-consciousness', echoing Jung who also considers the horse as a "symbol for the mother", expressing "the magic side of Man, 'the mother within us', that is, intuitive understanding". (See CIRLOT, p. 152.)

[5] LAWRENCE, Fantasia ..., p. 61.

[6] LAWRENCE, Apocalypse, p. 61.

[7] Ibid., p. 60-1. Notice the primordial associations of passion and power that are involved in Lawrence's explanation; he adapts the historic associates of the symbol in his own peculiar way.

⇒

[8] LAWRENCE, Fantasia ..., p. 167.

[9] Ibid., p. 168. Notice Lawrence's emphasis on the phallic beauty of the horses.

[10] Ibid., p. 168. Again Lawrence inspires himself in Jung, who holds that "wild horses often symbolize the uncontrollable instinctive drives that can erupt from the unconscious — and that many people try to repress". (See JUNG, C.G. et alii. Man and His Symbols. London, Aldus Books, 1964, p. 174.) The horse is seen by Lawrence as a universal or archetypal symbol, which Jung calls 'symbol of transformation'. (See CIRLOT, p. xxxiv-xxxv.)

[11] See CIRLOT, p. 248.

[12] See LAWRENCE, Fantasia ..., p. 167.

[13] "There shook hooves and hooves and hooves of horses:" / (...) "a quake of hooves" / (...) "As every grain of the earth had hooves and mane" / (...) "he forever itself a circling of the hooves of horses". (L 21-2.)

[14] According to Jung the circle corresponds to the "ultimate state of Oneness". (See CIRLOT, p. 47.)

[15] The horses become archetypal, because of their transformational function.

[16] LAWRENCE, Etruscan ..., p. 108.

[17] In a letter to Gordon Campbell, LAWRENCE writes: "We want to realise the tremendous *non-human* quality of life — it is wonderful". (See MOORE, p. 291.)

[18] See (W 9).

[19] SAGAR, The Art of Ted Hughes, p. 78. He further reports that Hughes had read The Rainbow in a camping tent in a field. By coincidence a heavy rainstorm fell during the night and he heard some horses charging about. He also mentions that there were several other sources for The Rain-horse, including a recurrent dream when Hughes was a boy. (p. 165.)

[20] See Barr's review concerning the interpretation of several critics on the episode of the horses at the end of The Rainbow. (Barr, W. The Metaphor of Apocalypse in the Novels of D.H. Lawrence. Ann Arbor, Xerox University Microfilms, 1977. p. 119-20. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Michigan, 1973.)

[21] Hughes makes a direct allusion to unconscious eruptions on the protagonist's mind, when he states that the horse's "whinnying snort and the spattering of its hooves seemed to be actually in his head ...". (W 51.)

[22] Frank Kermode interprets the episode in The Rainbow in apocalyptic terms, asserting that the horses that Ursula encountered "stand for the lost potency of civilization" as well as for "the sexual terrors of the kind associated with them in Fantasia of the Unconscious". He further mentions that Lawrence's discussion of the horse in Apocalypse establishes a

⇒

direct connection with Revelation". (See KERMODE, F. D.H. Lawrence and the Apocalyptic Types. In: ___. Continuities. London, Routledge and Paul, 1968. p. 131.)

[23] LAWRENCE, D.H. The Rainbow. London, Heinemann, 1961. p. 488.

[24] The Rain-Horse. (W 52.)

[25] Ursula tries to circumvent the horses, by climbing into the boughs of an oak-tree and dropping down the other side of the hedge, while the protagonist in Hughes's story armed himself against the rain-horse with stones which he threw at it several times.

[26] LAWRENCE, The Rainbow, p. 486.

[27] The Rain-Horse (W 45).

[28] Ibid., p. 46.

[29] In The Rainbow, LAWRENCE refers to Ursula's "gathering restiveness, a tumult impending within her". (p. 485.) In The Rain-Horse, HUGHES also mentions the protagonist's interior apprehension: "Not that he had looked forward to any transfiguring experience. But he had expected something, some pleasure, some meaningul sensation, he didn't quite know what. (...) Then, suddenly, impatience with a whole exasperating swarm of little anxieties ..." (W 45-6).

[30] Hughes even speaks of the "healing drops" of water that roll over the body of the man. (W 55.)

[31] See LAWRENCE's essay The Spirit of Place, in which he says that every locality has "its own great spirit of place. (...) different places on the face of the earth have different vital effluence, different vibration, different chemical exhalation, different polarity with different stars, call it what you like. But the spirit of place is a great reality ...". (LAWRENCE, D.H. Studies in Classic American Literature. London, Heinemann, 1964. p. 5-6.) In his autobiographical sketch called The Rock, HUGHES evinces the reality of place of his native moorland in Yorkshire, describing "the peculiar sad desolate spirit" that helped to form his character. (In: SUMMERFIELD, p. 125.) In Poetry in the Making, he also mentions the importance of feeling "the unique atmosphere of some place", referring to a poem by Sylvia Plath, which is not merely a description of the moors, "but of what it feels like to be walking over them". (p. 80-1.)

[32] Bergson's idea of process comes to the foreground in this technique, since change and movement in the individual are concerned: the vitality of the cosmos is transferred to man.

[33] The dance-ritual of the horses symbolizes vital movement, since the horses are seen as centres of vital force. (See LANGER, 174-5.)

[34] The Rain-Horse. (W 49-55.)

[35] LAWRENCE, The Rainbow, p. 489.

[36] The Rain-Horse. (W 55.)

⇒

[37] For LAWRENCE the rainbow is a symbol of 'consummation' or fullness of being, because it represents the balance of opposing forces, since its iridescence is "darkness at once and light, the two-in-one". (In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 373.)

[38] The Rain-Horse. (W 55.)

[39] Ibid. (W 53.)

[40] "He remembered three dead foxes hanging in a row from one of the beams, their teeth bloody" (W 55). The metaphor of foxes is expressive of base attitudes.

□

3.2. THE BULL: SYMBOL OF 'PROVIDENTIAL BLACK BLOOD'

Hughes's poem The Bull Moses is markedly Lawrentian not only in thematic construction, but also in rhetorical and metaphoric suggestiveness. Captured in all its non-human primitiveness, the bull reminds us of the "Providence Bull" in St. Luke[1], as well as of Lawrence's descriptions of the bull-trope in Apocalypse and Fantasia of the Unconscious. Having been deprived of its natural environment and subdued to the procreative function to serve mankind, its natural life has become stunted and deformed. Fenced in by man it is no more the leader and protector of the herd; nevertheless sparks of the primal life-force still emanate from its massive body, which will burn like a flame[2] if his proving-ground is restored to it.

Like the horse, Lawrence establishes the bull in the sympathetic mode; but unlike it, "in the bull the centres of power are in the breast and shoulders. The horns of the head are symbols of this vast power in the upper self"[3]. Inside his breast these potencies are like a great furnace:

> Thud! Thud! Thud!
> And the roar of black bull's blood in the mighty passages of
> his chest.
> Ah, the dewlap swings pendulous with excess.
> The great, roaring weight above
> Like a furnace dripping a molten drip
> The urge, the massive, burning ache
> Of the bull's breast.
> The open furnace-doors of his nostrils.[4]

In the poem St. Luke, Lawrence emphasizes the primal attributes of the bull, describing its breast that was at one time "a fortress wall, and

⇒

the weight of a vast battery", while its "living forehead" was "a wall, a bastion"[5].

In Apocalypse, Lawrence discusses "the old symbol of horns" that was "the symbol of power,originally divine power that came to man from the vivid cosmos"[6]. In St. Luke he compares the bull's horns to "the gold horns that bud on Moses' forehead"[7] thus equating it with the 'Progenitor' or 'Father'[8], referring to it as "the father of substance, the Providence Bull"[9]:

> Horns,
> The golden horns of power,
> Power to kill, power to create
> Such as Moses had, and God,
> Head-power.[10]

Then Lawrence reveals the full extent of degradation to which natural life has been subjected with the ascendancy of Christianity[11], that tends to abstract from the carnal world:

> Since the Lamb bewitched him with that red-stuck flag
> His fortress is dismantled
> His fires of wrath are banked down
> His horns turn away from the enemy.[12]

He affirms that the bull is no longer fully alive — having suffered degradation it does not exert its enormous power any more. Lawrence laments the domestic state of the bull, which tends to toil passively in the procreating function at the service of mankind:

> He serves the Son of Man.
>
> And hear him bellow, after many years, the bull that serves
> the Son of Man.
> Moaning, booing, roaring hollow
> Constrained to pour forth all his fire down the narrow sluice
> of procreation
> Through such narrow loins, too narrow
> Is he not over-charged by the dammed-up pressure of his own
> massive black blood[13]

Seeing the bull as the "massive Providence of hot blood"[14], Lawrence suggests that it may recover its potentialities if it is restored to its

⇒

natural environment. At the end of the poem he insists on the restoration of the natural order of things,[15] urging the bull to recover its primal function as leader and protector of the herd:

> Let him remember his horns, then.
> Seal up his forehead once more to a bastion,
> Let it know nothing.
> Let him charge like a mighty catapult on the red-cross flag,
> let him roar out challenge on the world
> And throwing himself upon it, throw off the madness of his
> blood.
> Let it be war.[16]

The same idea of loss of potency because of lack of proving-ground is developed by Hughes in The Bull Moses (L 37). The very title of the poem suggests an equation of the bull with the 'Progenitor' or 'Father'. The physical description of the bull is also reminiscent of Lawrence, since Hughes insists on the impressiveness of its massive forehead ("the brow like masonry"), the powerful dorsal source of voluntary power ("the deep-keeled neck"), and the breast that houses a furnace ("the warm weight of his breathing" as well as "the hotly-tongued mash of his cud").

Hughes also suggests that the bull, although reduced to mere function, still preserves its potential for godliness and power, which the boy who hoists himself onto the half-door of the byre intuits:

> A hoist up and I could lean over
> The upper edge of the high half-door,
> My left foot ledged on the hinge, and look in at the byre's
> Blaze of darkness: a sudden shut-eyed look
> Backward into the head.

The setting and circumstances described at the beginning of the poem also remind us of an incident narrated by Lawrence in one of his short-stories, entitled The Blind Man.[17] The boy at the stable-door experiences the same thing as the blind man's wife Isabel who tries to find her husband in the barn. Although the boy cannot see the bull, perceiving nothing but darkness all around him, his senses register very strongly the bull's presence:

⇒

Blackness is depth
Beyond star. But the warm weight of his breathing,
The ammoniac reek of his litter, the hotly-tongued
Mash of his cud, steamed against me.
Then, slowly, as onto the mind's eye -
The brow like masonry, the deep-keeled neck:

Although he can see nothing because of the enveloping darkness, like Isabel he is startled by the ammoniac smell and warmth of the animals, feeling the invisible but fecund atmosphere of the "hot animal life"[18].

The metaphorical expression "blaze of darkness" conveys a rich darkness full of life-potencies. Hence, both scenes can be seen as ritual communion with the powers of 'darkness'[19] since Isabel and the young boy are carried away with the pulse of the life that beats inthe bull's blood. The lives of both protagonists are 'widened and deepened'[20] in connection with the 'other' pulse of the life-force in the bull. The young boy for a moment communes with the non-human world, when he succeeds in glimpsing those forgotten potencies the bull represents.

Hughes describes the bull's potencies as "the locked black of his powers", since they are locked within its consciousness, and beyond the world of human consciousness:

Something come up there onto the brink of the gulf,
Hadn't heard of the world, too deep in itself to be called to
Stood in sleep.

The bull's blindness in relation to the external world, conveys the idea that although it is now domesticated, segregated from its natural environment, it still preserves its powers in potential, the unquenchable life-force that no "ring of brass through his nostrils" can withhold:

Each dusk the farmer led him
Down to the pond to drink and smell the air,
And he took no pace but the farmer
Led him to take it, as if he knew nothing
Of the ages and continents of his fathers,
Shut, while he wombed, to a dark shed
And steps between his door and the duckpond;
The weight of the sun and the moon and the world hammered
To a ring of brass through his nostrils.

⇒

Although the bull has been deprived of its primal wildness, now functionally toiling in the service of increase, "as if he knew nothing/ Of the ages and continents of his fathers", the poet hints at the possibility of a return to a condition in which the natural order of things will have ascendancy again:

> He would raise
> His streaming muzzle and look out over the meadows,
> But the grasses whispered nothing awake, the fetch
> Of the distance drew nothing to momentum
> In the locked black of his powers. He came strolling gently back
> Paused neither toward the pig-pens on his right,
> Nor toward the cow-byres on his left: something
> Deliberate in his leisure, some beheld future
> Founding in his quiet.

Hughes refers to a time when the bull will rebel against the ceaseless ritual of procreation, breaking the ring of brass in his nostrils, defying routine and acquiescence. By extension, the poem also contains an appeal to man, entreating him to restrain from the mechanicalness of modern life and return to a more natural state of greater vitality, in closer contact with the living universe.

⇒

NOTES

[1] See LAWRENCE's St. Luke in the section called The Evangelistic Beasts in Birds, Beasts and Flowers. (In: PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 325-7.)

[2] LAWRENCE alludes to the bull's degradation; in metaphoric language he compares its primitive condition to a 'burning altar' and its present state to a 'burning hearthstone' only. He refers to its primitive powers as follows:

> It was always an altar of burnt offering
> His own black blood poured out like a sheet of flame over his fecundating herd
> As he gave himself forth.
> But also it was a fiery fortress frowning shaggily on the world
> And announcing battle ready.

[3] LAWRENCE, Fantasia ..., p. 168.

[4] See PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 326.

[5] Ibid., p. 325-6.

[6] LAWRENCE, Apocalypse, p. 112.

[7] Ibid., p. 112.

[8] Jung has also suggested that the bull is a "symbol for the father". (See CIRLOT, p. 35.)

[9] See PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 327.

[10] Ibid., p. 326. In the same way as Moses who had "power to kill, power to create", which was given to him by God to provide guidance and care for his people, the bull also exerts this double function, as it not only leads but also protects the herd from its natural enemies.

[11] An accurate account of Lawrence's views on Christianity has been supplied by Graham HOUGH in a section of his The Dark Sun, entitled The Quarrel with Christianity. (See p. 240-54.)

[12] See PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 327.

[13] Ibid., p. 327.

[14] In his poem He-Goat, LAWRENCE affirms that it "is not fatherly, like the bull, massive Providence of hot blood". (In: PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 382.)

⇒

[15] In the Preface to his section The Evangelist Beasts in Birds, Beasts and Flowers, LAWRENCE insists on the necessity of restoring the natural order of things. He also emphasizes the need of restoring the animal principles in man: "Oh put them back, put them back in the four corners of the heavens, where they belong, the Apocalyptic beasts. For with their wings full of stars they rule the night, and man that watches through the night lives four lives, and man that sleeps through the night sleeps four sleeps, the sleep of the lion, the sleep of the bull, the sleep of man and the eagle's sleep. After which the lion wakes, and it is day. Then from the four quarters the four winds blow, and life has its changes. But when the heavens are empty too, man sleeps no more like the lion and the bull, nor wakes from the light-eyed eagle sleep". (See PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 319.) The 'Evangelistic Beasts' sequence is composed of four poems in which Lawrence incorporates specific Biblical phrases, putting both the Gospel and the conventional bestiary strictly to his own uses.

[16] See PINTO & ROBERTS, p. 327. In this poem the idea of 'creative strife' comes to the foreground again. As the bull does not protect its herd against its natural enemies any more (such as wolves and other predators) a slow degeneration process sets in. In the poem, the prayer for war ('Let it be war') echoes Herakleitos, who claimed that War is fore most.

[17] LAWRENCE D.H. The Collected Short-Stories. London, Heinemann, 1974. p. 326-42.

[18] Ibid., p. 331. "She reached at last the just visible door of the stable. There was no sign of light anywhere. Opening the upper half, she looked in: into a simple well of darkness. The smell of horses, and of warmth was startling to her, in that full night. (...) Nothing came from the darkness. She knew the rain and the wind blew in upon the horses, the hot animal life. (...) she was aware of the presence of the dark hindquarters of the horses, though she could not see them, and she was afraid. Something wild stirred in her heart."

[19] Again Hughes evokes the powers of 'darkness' which Lawrence insistently refers to throughout his work. Like Lawrence, he also uses the word 'dark' in connection with the rich life-potencies that man has lost.

[20] In Aristocracy, LAWRENCE refers to the natural relation of living things. Speaking of his cow Susan, he affirms that his life is "widened and deepened in connection with her life, throbbing with the other pulse, of the bull's blood". (In: ROBERTS & MOORE, p. 480.)

□

3.3. THE BEAR: SYMBOL OF THE 'PRISTINE UNCONSCIOUS'

In the poem The Bear the parallel to the Lawrentian 'pristine unconscious' at once suggests itself, since Hughes seems to equate the unconscious with "the spontaneous life-motive"[1] discussed by Lawrence in Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious. The bear becomes an 'objective correlative' of the life-force observable in nature, which according to Lawrence also exists in man and is the real unconscious.

The historic associations of the bear-symbol explain why Hughes chose this animal to objectify his idea of the unconscious. "*Ursus* the Bear connected with the word *Orsus* (a beginning), is said to get her name because she sculptures her brood with her mouth (ore). For they say that these creatures produce a formless foetus, giving birth to something like a bit of pulp, and this the mother-bear arranges into the proper legs and arms by licking it."[2] Furthermore, "in alchemy, the bear corresponds to the *nigredo* of prime matter"[3], being consequently also considered a symbol of the unconscious. In the light of these observations it can be said that Hughes's metaphor for the unconscious is appropriate, since the bear not only stands for 'ore' or the '*nigredo* of prime matter', but is also related to creative force, giving shape to prime matter.[4]

In Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious Lawrence makes clear his own concept of the unconscious which radically differs from the Freudian.[5] The latter, in his opinion is a cellar of horrors "in which the mind keeps its own bastard spawn"[6]. To Lawrence, the true unconscious is much more than a layer or stratum of the psyche; it is the very life-force itself,

⇒

the essence of individuality. The life-force is an objective, external force moving through the universe, and that part in us that participates in the life-force is the unconscious, which is "the creative-productive centre, the quick, both of consciousness and organic development"[7].

Lawrence defines the unconscious as that "essential unique nature of every individual creature, which is, by its very nature, unanalysable, undefinable, inconceivable. It cannot be conceived, it can only be experienced, in every single instance"[8]. Lawrence believes that the only way we can apprehend the force in ourselves – the unconscious – is to experience it in the objective world through 'sympathetic' contact with living creatures in moments of intensity or epiphany. By experiencing the life force, the unconscious, in the external world, we also come to experience the unconscious in ourselves, since we come to see ourselves as an inextricable part of the universal forces that underlie all life.[9]

Hughes's poem The Bear (W 41) is a demonstration of what Lawrence meant by experiencing the unconscious. He attempts to objectify, verifying beliefs and values in objects and creatures external to him.

In the first stanza of the poem there is a straightforward metaphoric identification of beast with a level of consciousness far beneath mental consciousness:

> In the huge, wide-open, sleeping eye of the moutain
> The bear is the gleam in the pupil
> Ready to awake
> And instantly focus.

While Lawrence has compared the unconscious to a dark continent, a pristine Africa full of wild beasts inside us,[10] Hughes makes an analogy between the unconscious and a dark cavern that is inhabited by a wild beast. Lawrence affirms that we are afraid of "the original dark forest within us" and that "we may wish to exclude this inbounding, inleaping life". However, he holds that if we refrain from too much automatic

⇒

consciousness, the voice of "the innermost rays, the first messengers, the primeval honourable beasts of our being"[11] will echo, turning into full speech. The same idea is conveyed by Hughes in the first stanza, where he says that the mountain cave is the pupil in the sleeping eye of the mountain, while the cave-bear is "the gleam of the pupil"[12], i. e., the living spirit of the mountain, representing that inner light locked inside each living organism, which may come to the surface at any moment.

In the second and third stanzas of the poem the 'collective unconscious'[13] is metaphorically described, reminding us of Jung's idea of the collective experience of humanity stored up in the deepest stratum of our psyche:

> The bear is glueing
> Beginning to end
> With glue from people's bones
> In his sleep.
>
> The bear is digging
> In his sleep
> Through the wall of the Universe
> With man's femur.

The next stanza, in which the bear is equated with a deep 'well', brings to mind Lawrence's description of the unconscious as being "the well-head, the fountain of real motivity"[14], where "our life bubbles up in us, prior to any mentality"[15]:

> The bear is a well
> Too deep to glitter
> Where your shout
> Is being digested.

The allusion to the "shout being digested" refers to the "renewal in the quick centre of creative life in individual creatures"[16], since people and the whole cosmos would wear out and disintegrate if such creative vitalism were lacking.

The image of the 'river' where people bend to drink connotes the vital 'flux' that is necessary to renovate us, making us feel alive and providing us with full knowledge: ⇒

The bear is a river
Where people bending to drink
See their dead selves.

The 'dead selves' suggest automatic consciousness, which Lawrence considers "the dead end of life", "the terminal instrument of the dynamic consciousness", since "it transmutes what is a creative flux into a certain fixed cipher" [17].

There are more connotations of 'darkness' in the following stanza, in which the unconscious is compared to a dark forest that is cross-cut by rivers, suggesting the source of life that is deep inside our being:

The bear sleeps
In a kingdom of walls
In a web of rivers.

The allusion to the bear's hibernation reiterates the idea of pristine consciousness asleep within us, since modern man seems to be afraid of the primal rich potencies locked inside him.

The function of the 'creative' unconscious is further clarified by the reference to the 'ferryman'. In the same way as the ferryman that leads people to the other side across the water, the function of the unconscious is to bring life to the 'dead land' in which automatic consciousness has left us:

He is the ferryman
To dead land.

His price is everything.

The last line of the poem reinforces the importance of the 'dark pristine Africa' inside us, of which modern man is afraid, but in which salvation lies, since it is from the 'pristine unconscious' that the flow of intuitional awareness streams, connecting us with other living organisms and engendering the 'creative flux' which constitutes the very essence of life.

⇒

NOTES

[1] LAWRENCE, Fantasia ..., p. 208. "What then it the true unconscious? It is not a shadow cast from the mind. It is the spontaneous life-motive in every organism. Where does it begin? It begins where life begins."

[2] WHITE, T.H. ed. The Book of Beasts: Being a Translation from a Latin Bestiary of the Twelfth Century. London, J. Cape, 1969. p. 45.

[3] See CIRLOT, p. 23.

[4] As Hughes holds that the unconscious is the fountain of life and creativity, the connotations which the bear-symbol suggests are highly significant.

[5] Freud defines the unconscious as a psychic state or area, where impulses, desires and ideas exist that are suppressed and disowned by the conscious state. He holds that the whole body of repressions make up our unconscious. Although Lawrence wholly modifies the details, his concept of the unconscious is nearer the Jungian theory.

[6] LAWRENCE, Fantasia ..., p. 204.

[7] Ibid., p. 215.

[8] Ibid., p. 211.

[9] Here again Lawrence corroborates Bergson who says that "between our consciousness and other consciousnesses the separation is less clear cut than between our body and other bodies" and that we can recapture "through consciousness the vital impetus within us "and other creatures. (See BERGSON, The Creative Mind, p. 32-3.)

[10] LAWRENCE, D.H. The Novel and the Feelings. In: MCDONALD, p. 755-60. Like Lawrence, Hughes identifies beasts with the 'pristine'.

[11] Ibid., p. 756-9.

[12] The word 'gleam' means 'beam or ray of light'. Like Lawrence, Hughes defends the point that full knowledge is contained mainly in the unconscious.

[13] JUNG, C.G. The Collective Unconscious and Archetypes. In: ELLMANN, R. & FELDELSON Jr., C. eds. The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds of Modern Literature. New York, Oxford University Press, 1965. p. 641. "If it were permissible to personify the unconscious, we might call it a collective human being combining the characteristics of both sexes, transcending

⇒

youth and age, birth and death, and, from having at his command a human experience of one or two million years, almost immortal. If such a being existed, he would be exalted above all temporal change; the present would mean neither more nor less to him than any year in the one hundredth century before Christ; he would be a dreamer of age-old dreams and, owing to his immeasurable experience, he would be an incomparable prognosticator. He would have lived countless times over the life of the individual, of the family, tribe and people, and he would possess the living sense of the rhythm of growth, flowering and decay."

[14] LAWRENCE, Fantasia ..., p. 204.

[15] Ibid., p. 208. "We must discover, if we can, the true unconscious, where our life bubbles up in us, prior to any mentality. The first bubbling life in us, which is innocent of any mental alteration, this is the unconscious. It is pristine, not in any way ideal. It is the spontaneous origin from which it behooves us to live."

[16] Ibid., p. 216.

[17] Ibid., p. 246.

□

4. CONCLUSION

Hughes's vitalist vision of the universe, which is apparent in his poetry, is closely related to the Lawrentian doctrine,[1] in which the life-force principle plays a major role. Although a number of critics have suggested that there are similarities between Lawrence and Hughes, none of them has made a full study to verify such influence. Only one or two were specific at all, and even they did not write about the similarities at any length.

A survey of the findings of this study will demonstrate that we can distinguish two main categories of poetry in which Lawrence's themes and motifs re-emerge in Hughes and within which birds, beasts and plants appear meaningful in his art. First, there is a substantial body of realistic-descriptive poetry in which Hughes describes the living organism as 'other', trying to express the essential 'hawkness' of hawk,'jaguarness' of jaguar, 'thistleness' of thistle. The preservation of the 'otherness' of the non-human makes us believe in the creatures as perceived; living, 'nonpareil' things and not mere analogues. In these poems he also compares and contrasts the vitalistic world of animals with the devitalized world of man, putting man at a disadvantage in relation to the animal, and insisting on the peripheral position of man in the world. Secondly, there is a minor body of poetry which could be labelled as metaphorical poetry, in which the animal emerges as an 'extended metaphor' embodying Hughes's vitalistic beliefs and values, or is seen as a 'creative symbol' with strong apocalyptic colouring.

⇒

In the first part of this study we have attempted to show how Bergsonism provides a clue to the understanding of the creative impulse behind Hughes's theory of poetry. Like Lawrence, he projects the idea of the *élan vital* artistically, since his poetry embodies a sort of nature philosophy, a study of life in all its manifestations, revealing the deep life-forces and inexplicable drives that are equally present in man, animal and plant. He emphasizes, however, that in man these rich 'dark' potencies are locked in and submerged due to excessive automatic or mental consciousness, which has lessened the life-impulse in man and as a consequence of which his vitality is waning.

An examination of Hughes's most representative poems has helped to show the penetration of Bergson's thought which he had absorbed from Lawrence and which constitutes the basic thematic substance of his work. The belief in the dynamic organization of life and consciousness, the opposition between intuition and intellect, the consideration of each problem in its individuality, the denial of staticism and perfection, the opposition towards automatism and spiritual mechanism, the necessity of vital relationship between man and reality and the affirmation that man is losing vitality are the main aspects of Hughes's vision of the world, in the light of which new perspectives not yet explored by critics emerge, paving the way for a better understanding of his poetry.

Hughes creates a fresh world, one which incites discovery. Although he is not an innovator, he succeeds in giving new dimensions to the ideas he draws upon, imprinting on them his distinctive mark and making them all his own. Echoing Lawrence, he insists on the non-rational tension in the creative process, claiming that to perceive the extraordinary the poet must see 'feelingly', that is to say, all the instinctive and intuitive faculties through which we establish a sympathetic contact with the world are exercised in poetry. His major effort is directed towards es

⇒

tablishing a relationship with the world outside himself:[2] a relationship that entails blood-contact and joy, which explains why his art is a disturbing art, so foreign to ordinary experience. Insisting on the 'fluid act of attention', which Lawrence has widely referred to in his discursive writings, he develops a kinetic awareness which enables him to enter into life's domain seizing the very movement of the inward life of things, recapturing not static instants but moments of flowing time. Although the similarity to Lawrence's view of poetry is striking, Hughes completely metamorphosed the material he borrowed, since he gave it new artistic form, expounding his poetic theory in metaphorical language in a small number of poems dealing with the poet's art, providing insight into the creative process in action. The same is true of his poetry dealing with the natural realm, where his descriptions of the more elemental 'modes of being' of birds, beasts and plants, although reminiscent of Lawrence's observations in his prose-work, are completely *sui generis* due to Hughes's difference of treatment and of emphasis. Although the central ideas are the same, the details are almost wholly transformed, giving new life and colour to Hughes's poems.

The second part of this study presents a synthesis of Lawrence's animal symbolism discussed mainly in his non-fiction, which re-emerges in Hughes's works. The parallel at once suggests itself, because Hughes not only identifies beasts with the 'pristine', but also associates 'darkness' and 'blackness' with potency, 'blood' and organic life. Like Lawrence, he sees the animal as an apocalyptic restorer of 'blood-consciousness', representing salvation for modern man.

In the Foreword to Fantasia of the Unconscious, Lawrence lists some of the sources of inspiration for his own work. He asserts that although a number of authors impressed him, he derived only hints and suggestions from them, since once seized by the creative impulse he "pro

⇒

ceeds by intuition"[3]. Lawrence's comment on influence is also valid in relation to Hughes; he also transcends himself during the creative act, when oblivious of the sources of his inspiration, by intuition he brings forth new images of magic awareness which we call art.

⇒

NOTES

In Hughes's work, poetry and doctrine co-exist, since he offers a *Weltanschauung* in his poems, in the same way as Lawrence. In his Foreword to Fantasia of the Unconscious, LAWRENCE states that "art is utterly dependent on philosophy: or if you prefer it on a metaphysic. The metaphysic or philosophy may not be anywhere very accurately stated and may be quite unconscious, in the artist, yet it is a metaphysic that governs men at the time, and is by all men more or less comprehended, and lived". (p. 9-10.)

[2] In HUGHES's autobiographical sketch entitled The Rock, he asserts that his poems are "attempts to prove the realness of the world" and of himself in this world, "by establishing the realness" of his relation to it. (In: SUMMERFIELD, p. 126.)

[3] LAWRENCE, Fantasia ..., p. 5-6. "I am no 'scholar' of any sort. But I am very grateful to scholars. I have found hints, suggestions for what I say here in all kinds of scholarly books, from the Yoga and Plato and St. John the Evangel and the early Greek philosophers like Herakleitos down to Frazer and his 'Golden Bough', and even Freud and Frobenius. Even then I only remember hints — and I proceed by intuition."

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

1. ALDINGTON, R. Portrait of a Genius, But... London, Heinemann, 1950. 367 p.

2. ALVAREZ, A. The New Poetry. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1962. 245 p.

3. ___. The Savage God: A Study of Suicide. London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1972. 250 p.

4. ARNOLD, A. The Symbolic Meaning: The Uncollected Versions of *Studies in Classic American Literature*. London, Centaur Press, 1962. 264 p.

5. ARNS, H. A Consciência Fálica Existencial, na Teoria Literária de D. H. Lawrence. Letras, (17):131-9, 1969.

6. BARR, W. The Metaphor of Apocalypse in the Novels of D.H. Lawrence. Ann Arbor, Xerox University Microfilms, 1977. 348 p. Thesis Ph. D. University of Michigan, 1973.

7. BEAL, A. D. H. Lawrence. London, Oliver & Boyd, 1968. 128 p.

8. ___. Selected Literary Criticism. London, Heinemann, 1967. 435 p.

9. BEDIENT, C. On Ted Hughes. Critical Quarterly, 14:103-21, 1972.

10. BERGSON, H. Creative Evolution. Westport, Greenwood Press, 1977. 453 p.

11. ___. The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics. New York, Philosophical Library, c 1946. 252 p.

12. BOLD, A. Thom Gunn & Ted Hughes. Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd, 1976. 136 p.

13. BURNET, J. Early Greek Philosophy. London, Adam & C. Black, 1975. 375 p.

14. CIRLOT, J. E. A Dictionary of Symbols. London, Routledge & Paul, 1971. 419 p.

15. DALESKI, H. M. The Forked Flame: A Study of D. H. Lawrence. London, Faber & Faber, 1965. 319 p.

16. DRAPER, R. P. ed. D. H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage. London, Routledge & Paul, 1972. 377 p.

⇒

17. DYSON, A.E. Ted Hughes. Critical Quarterly. 1 (3) : 219-26, 1959.

18. ELLMANN, R. & FEIDELSON Jr., C. The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds of Modern Literature. New York, Oxford University Press, 1965. 953 p.

19. FAAS, E. Ted Hughes and Crow. London Magazine, 10(10):5-20, Jan. 1971.

20. GIBSON, J. A Thematic Analysis of the Poetry in Ted Hughes's Major Works. Ann Arbor, Xerox University Microfilms, 1977. 318 p. Thesis. Ph. D. University of Northern Colorado, 1974.

21. GILBERT, S. M. Acts of Attention: The Poems of D. H. Lawrence. London, Cornell University Press, 1972. 327 p.

22. GITZEN, J. Ted Hughes and the Triumph of Energy. Southern Humanities Review. 7:67-73, 1973.

23. GREGORY, H. D. H. Lawrence: Pilgrim of the Apocalypse. New York, Grove Press, 1957. 118 p.

24. HAINSWORTH, J. D. Ted Hughes and Violence. Essays in Criticism. 15: 356-59, July 1965.

25. HAMBURGER, M. The Truth of Poetry: Tensions in Modern Poetry from Baudelaire to the 1960's. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1972. 374 p.

26. HAWKINS, D. ed. D. H. Lawrence's Stories, Essays and Poems. London, Everyman's Library, 1967. 412 p.

27. HOFFMANN, D. Talking Beasts: The 'Single Adventure' in the Poems of Ted Hughes. Shenandoah, 19:49-68, Sum. 1968.

28. HOUGH, G. The Dark Sun: A Study of D. H. Lawrence. London, Duckworth, 1975. 265 p.

29. HUGHES, T. Crow Wakes. Woodford Green, Poet & Printer, 1971. 27 p.

30. ___. The Hawk in the Rain. London, Faber & Faber, 1976. 59 p.

31. ___. Lupercal. London, Faber & Faber, 1973. 63 p.

32. ___. Poetry in the Making. London, Faber & Faber, 1975. 124 p.

33. ___. Wodwo. London, Faber & Faber, 1972. 184 p.

34. INNIS, K. D. H. Lawrence's Bestiary: A Study of his Use of Animal Trope and Symbol. Paris, Mouton, 1971. 207 p.

35. JAMES, G. I. The Animal Poems of Ted Hughes: A Devaluation. Southern Review. 2(3):193-203, 1967.

36. JENNINGS, E. Poetry To-day. London, Longmans Green, 1961. 71.p.

37. JOHN, B. Ted Hughes: Poet at the Master Fulcrum of Violence. Arizona Quarterly, 23:5-15, Spring 1967.

⇒

38. JUNG, C. G. The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. London, Routledge & Paul, 1975. 451 p.

39. ___ et alii. Man and His Symbols. London, Aldus Books, 1964. 320 p.

40. KERMODE, F. Continuities. London, Routledge & Paul, 1968. 238 p.

41. ___. Lawrence. London, Fontana, 1973. 156 p.

42. LANGER, S. K. Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art Developed From Philosophy in a New Key. London, Routledge & Paul, 1973. 431 p.

43. LAWRENCE, D. H. Apocalypse. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1975. 126 p.

44. ___. The Collected Short-Stories. London, Heinemann, 1974. 791 p.

45. ___. Etruscan Places. London, Heinemann, 1956. 115 p.

46. ___. Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious. London, Heinemann, 1961. 249 p.

47. ___. Mornings in Mexico. London, Heinemann, 1956. 82 p.

48. ___. Selected Essays. Harmondsworth, Penguin. 351 p.

49. ___. Sons and Lovers. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1964. 511 p.

50. ___. Studies in Classic American Literature. London, Heinemann, 1964. 168 p.

51. ___. Twilight in Italy. London, Heinemann, 1956. 168 p.

52. ___. The Rainbow. London, Heinemann, 1961. 495 p.

53. LEAVIS, F. R. D. H. Lawrence: Novelist. London, Chatto & Windus, 1955. 318 p.

54. LUCIE-SMITH, E. ed. British Poetry Since 1945. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1971. 412 p.

55. MCDONALD, E. D. ed. Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence. London, Heinemann, 1967. 852 p.

56. MEYER, H. Die Weltanschauung der Gegenwart. Paderborn, F.Schöningh, 1949. 571 p.

57. MOLLEMA, A. Mythical Elements in the Poetry of Ted Hughes. Dutch Quarterly Review of Anglo-American Letters. 1:2-24, 1972.

58. MOORE, H.T. ed. The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence. London, Heinemann, 1970. 2 v.

59. ___. The Life and Works of D. H. Lawrence. London, Unwin, 1963. 247 p.

⇒

60. MOYNAHAN, J. The Spirit of Eastwood. Times Literary Supplement. (3834):990, Sept. 1975.

61. THE NEW Merriam-Webster Pocket Dictionary. New York, Pocket-Books, 1971. 692 p.

62. NEWTON, J. M. Ted Hughes's Metaphysical Poems. Cambridge Quarterly, 2:395-402, Fall 1967.

63. OATES, J.C. New Heaven, New Earth: The Visionary Experience in Literature. London, Gollancz, 1976. 307 p.

64. PINTO, V. S. & ROBERTS, W. eds. The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence. London, Heinemann, 1972. 2 v.

65. PRATT, W. ed. The Imagist Poem. New York, Dutton, 1963. 128 p.

66. ROBERTS, W. & MOORE, H. T. eds. Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works by D. H. Lawrence. London, Heinemann, 1968. 640 p.

67. RAWSON, C.J. The Critical Forum: Ted Hughes and Violence. Essays in Criticism. 16:124-29, Jan. 1966.

68. ___. The Flight of the Blackbird. Times Literary Supplement. (3862):324, Mar. 1976.

69. SAGAR, K. The Art of D. H. Lawrence. Cambridge, University Press, 1966. 267 p.

70. ___. The Art of Ted Hughes. Cambridge, University Press, 1975. 213 p.

71. SANDOVAL, P. D. H. Lawrence: A Study of his Poetic Theories. Ann Arbor, Xerox University Microfilms, 1977. 269 p. Thesis. Ph. D. University of Michigan, 1968.

72. SCULLY, J. ed. Modern Poets on Modern Poetry. London, Fontana, 1973. 285 p.

73. SILVEIRA, I. et alii. Nosso Irmão São Francisco de Assis. Petrópolis, Vozes, 1975. 291 p.

74. SINNIGE-BREED, A. Plucking Bark: An Interpretation of Ted Hughes's 'Wodwo'. Dutch Quarterly Review of Anglo-American Letters. 10: 15-20, 1972.

75. STALLKNECHT, N. P. & FRENZ, H. Comparative Literature: Method & Perspective. Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press, 1971. 368 p.

76. STRAUSS, P. The Poetry of Ted Hughes. Theoria,38:45-63, 1971/2.

77. SUMMERFIELD, G. ed. Worlds: Seven Modern Poets. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1974. 288 p.

⇒

78. WEISSTEIN, U. Comparative Literature and Literary Theory. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1973. 339 p.

79. WHITE, T. H. The Book of Beasts: Being a Translation From a Latin Bestiary of the Twelfth Century. London, J. Cape, 1969. 296 p.