



The Consciousness of D. H. Lawrence

An Intellectual
Biography

Daniel J. Schneider

"Very important and useful"

—Richard Ellmann

THE CONSCIOUSNESS
OF D. H. LAWRENCE
AN INTELLECTUAL BIOGRAPHY

DANIEL J. SCHNEIDER

UNIVERSITY PRESS OF KANSAS

FOR JAMES,
GEOF, AND SANDY

© 1986 by the University Press of Kansas
All rights reserved

Published by the University Press of Kansas
(Lawrence, Kansas 66045), which was organized
by the Kansas Board of Regents and is operated
and funded by Emporia State University, Fort
Hays State University, Kansas State University,
Pittsburg State University, the University of
Kansas, and Wichita State University

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Schneider, Daniel J., 1927-
The consciousness of D. H. Lawrence.
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
1. Lawrence, D. H. (David Herbert), 1885-1930—
Criticism and interpretation. I. Title.
PR 6023.A93Z8658 1986 823'.912 85-29415
ISBN 0-7006-0285-2

Printed in the United States of America
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

THOUGHT

Thought, I love thought.
But not the jiggling and twisting of already existent ideas
I despise that self-important game.
Thought is the welling up of unknown life into consciousness,
Thought is the testing of statements on the touchstone of the conscience,
Thought is gazing on to the face of life, and reading what can be read,
Thought is pondering over experience, and coming to a conclusion.
Thought is not a trick, or an exercise, or a set of dodges,
Thought is a man in his wholeness wholly attending.

—D. H. Lawrence

PREFACE TO THE PAPERBACK EDITION

This book was written chiefly for general readers who wish to deepen their understanding of the development of Lawrence's thought and feeling over the course of his lifetime. The title of the book echoes Richard Ellmann's *The Consciousness of Joyce*; the word *consciousness* here, as in Ellmann's fine study, denotes "the movement of the mind both in recognising its own shape and in maintaining that shape in the face of attack or change." I have sought to lay bare Lawrence's incessant, all-absorbing, and passionate effort over a lifetime to develop a religious alternative to contemporary skepticism or outworn belief.

The importance of this religious alternative has been underscored by Scott Sanders, who argues eloquently that Lawrence was a leader in a contemporary revolution in thought: the shift to a "resacralization of nature," to the view that man must come to see himself in relation to the "eternal creative mystery" from which he derives. He must surrender his ego and learn to act in accord with what Lawrence calls "the inflow of power from the unknown"; he must not make the profound error of mistaking the lighted circle of his consciousness for the whole of reality, or the human will for the will of the cosmos. At a time when, as Sanders says, "the inherited notion of conquering nature, the arrogance of reason, the anthropocentrism of thought, threaten our existence," Lawrence's view assumes unparalleled importance.

I wish to thank the many critics of the book, who responded on its publication with warmth and, on occasion, with some incisive criticism. A few critics have asked for a clearer distinction between "blood consciousness" and "phallic consciousness." Blood consciousness is the whole of the vital impulses springing from "the blood." As Lawrence's theory of the unconscious indicates, these impulses are both "sympathetic" and "voluntary": on the one hand, they prompt the individual to enter into a sympathetic relationship with others, to unite with the whole of being, and to create the unified wholes that are found in art. On the other hand, they prompt the individual to assert his independence, to withdraw from and to resist others, to hold himself supreme. Phallic consciousness is simply the sympathetic half of blood

consciousness: the "sexual" or "phallic" half, which is attracted to others and draws together with them in a kinship of warm sympathy. Blood consciousness comprises both "power" and "love"; the phallic impulse is the "love" impulse alone. Blood consciousness reflects the central conflict in the universe, both the attraction and the repulsion that Lawrence took to be fundamental in the rhythm of the cosmos and of the psyche; phallic consciousness is the unifying consciousness based on attraction alone. In stressing phallic consciousness toward the end of his life, Lawrence hoped to check "the individualist illusion" that divides men and women from each other and from the cosmos; but he recognized that the voluntary promptings were built into nature and were essential to the balance of the healthy man.

Other critics missed a treatment of *Mr. Noon*, a novel that had not been published when the manuscript of this book was completed. I have endeavored to correct that omission at the end of chapter 2; and because my research on Lawrence since 1985 has revealed further influences on his thought, I could wish that I had said more about Richard Jefferies or Zelia Nuttall.

Lawrence described his *Study of Thomas Hardy* as "a sort of *Story of my Heart: or a Confessio Fidei*," and as Jefferies stressed his desire for "the fullest soul life," Lawrence was to stress the human desire for "maximum of being." Both writers emphasized the importance of freeing oneself from the narrow circle of existing ideas and of journeying into the Unknown; and both stressed the assimilation of the circumambient universe—the elements of earth, air, fire, and water—as a means to achieve fullness of being. Both rejected evolution and emphasized the distinct, separate nature of the individual. Both celebrated the life of the body and of the senses. And in both there is a curious natural supernaturalism that arises from their participation in the *nunc stans*—the eternal life which is the present. It is fair to say that Lawrence found in Jefferies a spirit and some of the key ideas that were significant to him as he wrote the story of *his heart*.

The influence of Zelia Nuttall was prominent in the writing of *The Plumed Serpent*. In reviving the mysteries of Quetzalcoatl, Lawrence drew heavily on the research of this able scholar, whom he had met in Mexico. Nuttall's *Fundamental Principles of Old and New World Civilizations* develops a thesis that Lawrence responded to with enthusiasm—the thesis that primitive religion, both of the old world and of the American continent, recognized the "fixed immutable laws governing the universe, attained by long-continued observation of Polaris and the 'Northern' constellations." What attracted Lawrence most to this thesis was that it stressed the duality in nature, the "everlasting antagonism between the powers of sky and of the earth, or light and darkness, and other opposites which suggested themselves naturally, or were artifi-

cially created by the fertile mind of man" (Nuttall, 26). And this conception of duality was symbolized in the god Quetzalcoatl, "who dwells in heaven and is the lord of the earth; . . . who is our celestial father and mother, great lord and lady" (32). Quetzalcoatl embraces both the god of the Below or female region and the god of the Above or male region. Lawrence, having already developed almost the same idea in *The Rainbow*, seizes on Nuttall's opposition. Quetzalcoatl becomes the lord of the two ways, who stands between "the day and the night," between "increase" and "destruction," between "love and strife" (PS, 195, 196). Everywhere, as L. D. Clark has pointed out, Lawrence works with the symbolism of the Below and the Above. And Lawrence picks up Nuttall's observation that there were "two suns, a young day sun and an ancient night or black sun" in the primitive Mexican religion (13). The black sun Lawrence sees as the female origin of all, "that made the sun and the world, and will swallow it again like a draught of water" (PS, 134). It is both tomb and womb, both dark and the sun, for it is the homogeneous oneness out of which all things come, an unconsciousness and yet fecund with promise. Quetzalcoatl sleeps in the "Dark Eye, / Behind the sun"; his rebirth brings him into the light. Jesus, however, becomes "bone" and returns to the darkness because it is the will of nature—a will that combines death and life, the destructive and the creative process. It is once again the Heraclitean duality of Fire and Water, the Empedoclean duality of love and strife, the Spencerian duality of action and reaction that Lawrence sees as governing the universe with "fixed immutable laws."

PREFACE

This book was written chiefly for general readers who, on this centennial of the birth of D. H. Lawrence, wish to deepen their understanding of the development of Lawrence's thought and feeling over the course of his lifetime. The events of Lawrence's life are well known to specialists; but insight into Lawrence's inner life of thought and emotion alters our grasp of these facts (for there *are* no facts, as Nietzsche observed, but only interpretations); and in several instances, because of the focus of this study, I have stressed influences on and emphases in Lawrence's thought that have necessarily received less attention in the broader biographies by Harry T. Moore, Richard Aldington, Emile Delavenay, and others.

The title of my book echoes Richard Ellmann's *The Consciousness of Joyce*; and the word *consciousness* here, as in Ellmann's fine study, denotes "the movement of the mind both in recognizing its own shape and in maintaining that shape in the face of attack or change." I have sought to lay bare Lawrence's incessant, all-absorbing, and passionate effort over a lifetime to develop a religious alternative to contemporary skepticism or outworn belief. For readers unfamiliar with the major biographies of Lawrence, I have included at the beginning of each chapter a chronology of some important events in Lawrence's life. In the text I assume a general familiarity with these events so that I may focus on the preoccupations of Lawrence's consciousness at various stages in his development. Chapter 1, for example, examines his early sense of life—his intuitive response to nature, his "resonance to the All" (which Pierre Teilhard de Chardin calls "the keynote of pure poetry and pure religion"), and his strong feminine or maternal sympathies, together with his unusual sense of responsibility. Chapter 2 stresses the conflict between his adolescent and postadolescent loves and his growing sense of a mission in life and his fear of not being able to carry out his mission. Chapter 3 traces the incubation of his beliefs—the chief influences on his thought from 1900 to 1912—and the early syntheses of his imagination. In Chapter 4, his marriage and his "coming through" are examined in relation to his newly clarified understanding of his "philosophy" and of his religious mission. Chapters 5 and 6 deal with the severe threats to his

beliefs during World War I and with his struggle to remain positive as he lost the support of his friends and became increasingly isolated. Chapter 7 reviews his postwar efforts to define a positive alternative to the dead beliefs of a dying civilization and his continuing affirmation that "I am I." Chapters 8 and 9 trace his efforts during the last seven years of his life to define the nature and operation of consciousnesses that were fundamentally different from Western "ideal" or "mental" consciousness—the blood consciousness and the phallic consciousness, which he believed can bring men together again despite their living in an age of fragmentation of egoistic individualism. Events in Lawrence's life are subordinated to the tracing of these vital movements of his consciousness—the creative excitements, the surges of joy and confidence, the disillusionments and humiliations—all of these being reflected in his unremitting meditations on his "philosophy," that ever-expanding body of insights that has so often seemed inconsistent or illogical to critics who have not grasped his thought in its wholeness.

Biographical and critical studies of Lawrence, though usually recognizing his religious nature, frequently ignore that nature as a shaping force in his life. For example, his relationship with his mother is explained, *tout simplement*, as oedipal, without much thought about the unique roles that mother and father assume for the religious person. Lawrence's early loves and the whole ordeal of his "coming through" from a painful adolescence to an uneasy marriage are not referred to the deep fear that Erik H. Erikson has noted in the religious man—the fear that women, the mother included, constitute a threat to his inviolacy and to the accomplishment of his mission. Lawrence's quarrels with his friends are too seldom referred to the religious man's fear and distrust of those who would seduce him away from his life "in the infinite." Again, Lawrence's reading needs to be related to his religious quest—his effort to ground his religious philosophy on solid scientific information as well as on the critical revaluation of all values made necessary by the new ideas in anthropology, in comparative religion, and in psychology.

The failure to appreciate Lawrence's religious nature at all stages of his life has led to subtle but significant distortions not only of his psychology but also of the emphases of his work. Although Emile Delavenay's massively and expertly researched biography and critical study envisions a limited sympathy with Lawrence's religious nature, Delavenay concludes, "Flight, not revolt, is the keynote of [Lawrence's] work: flight into the anonymously divine creative instinct, into the song of eternal rebirth; flight from social responsibility; from painstaking construction of a world of stable relationships: flight into art . . ." (522). But "flight" may well be the religious man's effort to remain inviolate in

an impure world, and "flight from social responsibility" a refusal to cooperate with an evil system which Lawrence saw as based on egoistic rivalry, selfishness, and the profit motive. All Lawrence scholars must be grateful to Delavenay for his immense labors; his achievement is unparalleled; yet subsequent scholars, having a deeper sympathy with Lawrence's purposes and with the means Lawrence took to achieve those purposes, must inevitably reassess every influence on his life and work. For instance, in Delavenay's account of the influences on Lawrence, there are some forty references to Houston Stewart Chamberlain and some twenty to Otto Weininger; Delavenay refers only twice to Herbert Spencer and only four times to William James, yet the latter two's influences were at least as strong as Chamberlain's or Weininger's.

In recreating Lawrence's consciousness, the biographer is given a mighty assist by Lawrence himself: few writers have laid bare the movements of their minds as precisely and as honestly as did Lawrence, for whom it was an article of faith that one must not suppress one's deepest thoughts and feelings. But inevitably there is much of his inner life about which he does not speak, and a technique of inference is needed to assess his response to experiences and reading that he does not discuss. That technique is exhibited strikingly in Delavenay's *D. H. Lawrence and Edward Carpenter*. There is no direct evidence that Lawrence either read Carpenter or was influenced by him, but when one considers not only the intellectual climate of Lawrence's maturation but also the ideas that most spurred his enthusiasm in his youth—the rebellion against Victorian morality, capitalism, and middle-class conformity; the embrace of a new naturalism; the idea of regeneration through new love relationships—the possibility of a Carpenter influence is suggested. When one finds, moreover, that a cluster of ideas in Carpenter's books is also found in Lawrence—the idea of the *égoïsme à deux* of married couples, of the interchange of vital elements in love, of woman as providing the center and balance for the adventuring male, of a sympathetic system of nerves as the seat of the emotions—possibility becomes probability. To be sure, one can find many of the same ideas in Bernard Shaw (whose *Man and Superman* Lawrence considered to be "very good"), but Delavenay's claim for Carpenter's influence seems to be justified by the coalescence of internal evidence, even though no direct evidence proves that Lawrence read Carpenter or spoke of Carpenter's ideas.

Sometimes the biographer needs a sixth sense, but there is nothing mysterious about the process of inference. A sixth sense is at bottom a sense of probability, the intuition that such a man, with such a temperament and such interests, at such a period of his life, and in such

an intellectual climate, would be likely to see and respond strongly to such-and-such elements in his experience. To appreciate Lawrence's response, biographers of the Inner Life must try to learn his habits of thought; his sense of importance; the principle of selection that operates characteristically in his experiences. And the biographer must cultivate his own "negative capability"—his ability to imagine life as Lawrence imagined it, to understand it and respond to it as Lawrence understood and responded to it.

In this centennial year of Lawrence's birth, a new biography of his consciousness may deepen understanding of his importance for a world that more than ever needs to counter the threat of its ideal will-to-power and its consequent deep *ressentiments*.

I am especially indebted to Lawrence's biographers and to the many critics who have studied his thought with care. Harry T. Moore's *The Priest of Love* is invaluable, as is Emile Delavenay's *D. H. Lawrence: The Man and His Work*. I have profited too from Richard Aldington's *Portrait of a Genius, But—*, Edward Nehls's *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*, Norman Page's *D. H. Lawrence: Interviews and Recollections*, and from the work of such scholars as Paul Delany, George A. Panichas, James C. Cowan, H. M. Daleski, Colin Clarke, F. R. Leavis, and many others—so many that I cannot hope to indicate my debt to all of them.

To James C. Cowan I am especially indebted for a wise, thorough, and invariably helpful reading of the manuscript. In Richard Ellmann, my old mentor, I have lost a friend to whom I was indebted for support and for a splendid example.

The John C. Hodges Better English Fund, managed by the English Department of the University of Tennessee, provided travel money for me to do research at the Humanities Research Center of the University of Texas at Austin. I am grateful to the fund's administrators and to the Humanities Research Center for their kind assistance.

The Office of Graduate Studies and Research of the University of Tennessee provided a stipend that made it possible for me to devote an entire summer to the study of Lawrence.

The University of Tennessee's Lindsay Young Award enabled me to appreciate the significance of Lawrence's experience in the Southwest and to examine the Lawrence collection at the Zimmerman Library of the University of New Mexico. To Joseph Trahern, chairman of the English Department; Robert Landen, dean of the Humanities; and Ralph Norman, vice-chancellor of the University of Tennessee, I am indebted for thoughtfulness and kindness that much facilitated my work.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN CITING WORKS BY D. H. LAWRENCE

- | | |
|--------|--|
| A | <i>Apocalypse</i> . Introduction by Richard Aldington. New York: Viking Press, Compass Books, 1966. |
| AR | <i>Aaron's Rod</i> . Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1950. |
| BB | <i>The Boy in the Bush</i> , with Mollie L. Skinner. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1972. |
| CL | <i>The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence</i> , edited by Harry T. Moore. 2 vols. New York: Viking Press, 1962. |
| CP | <i>The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence</i> , edited by Vivan de Sola Pinto and Warren Roberts. 2 vols. New York: Viking Press, 1964. |
| CSS | <i>The Complete Short Stories</i> . 3 vols. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1980. |
| EP | <i>Etruscan Places</i> . In "Mornings in Mexico" and "Etruscan Places." London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1956. |
| FU | <i>Fantasia of the Unconscious</i> . In "Fantasia of the Unconscious" and "Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious." Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1977. |
| Huxley | <i>The Letters of D. H. Lawrence</i> , edited by Aldous Huxley. New York: Viking Press, 1932. |
| K | <i>Kangaroo</i> . New York: Viking Compass, 1976. |
| L | <i>The Letters of D. H. Lawrence</i> , edited by James T. Boulton. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, 1981, 1984. |
| LCL | <i>Lady Chatterley's Lover</i> . New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1957. |
| LG | <i>The Lost Girl</i> . Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1950. |
| MEH | <i>Movements in European History</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925. |

- MM *Mornings in Mexico*. In "*Mornings in Mexico*" and "*Etruscan Places*." London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1956.
- MN *Mr. Noon*. New York: Viking Press, 1985.
- Plays *The Complete Plays of D. H. Lawrence*. New York: Viking Press, 1966.
- PS *The Plumed Serpent*. New York: Vintage Books, Inc., 1951.
- PU *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*. In "*Fantasia of the Unconscious*" and "*Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*." Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1977.
- R *The Rainbow*. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1976.
- SCAL *Studies in Classic American Literature*. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1977.
- SL *Sons and Lovers*. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1979.
- SM "*St. Mawr*" and "*The Man Who Died*." New York: Random House, Vintage, 1959.
- SS *Sea and Sardinia*. In *D. H. Lawrence and Italy: "Twilight in Italy," "Sea and Sardinia," Etruscan Places*." New York: Viking Press, 1972.
- T *The Trespasser*. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1955.
- TI *Twilight in Italy*. In *D. H. Lawrence and Italy: "Twilight in Italy," "Sea and Sardinia," "Etruscan Places"*. New York: Viking Press, 1972.
- WL *Women in Love*. New York: Random House, Modern Library, 1950.
- WP *The White Peacock*. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1955.

CONTENTS

<i>Preface to the Paperback Edition</i>	vii
<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Abbreviations Used in Citing Works by D. H. Lawrence</i>	xv
1 The Religious Sense of Life	1
2 The Oedipal Problem and the Young Bachelor	17
3 Lawrence's Early Beliefs and Novels (1901-12)	47
4 Love and Rebirth: <i>Sons and Lovers</i> and <i>The Rainbow</i>	69
5 Construction and Destruction: World War I and <i>Rananim</i>	88
6 The Going Apart: <i>Women in Love</i> and "The Reality of Peace"	109
7 The Search for Wholeness	129
8 Blood Consciousness	152
9 Phallic Consciousness	176
<i>Selected Bibliography</i>	195
<i>Index</i>	203

1

THE RELIGIOUS SENSE OF LIFE

1885: Born 11 September at Eastwood, Nottinghamshire; **1891–98:** attends Beauvale Board School, Eastwood; early sense of wonder; influence of “the old England of the forest and agricultural past”; early manifestations of maternal sympathy; early associations, chiefly with girls; tendency to withdraw from male competition—the “only boy with paints”; influence of Congregational Chapel; **1893:** friendship with George Neville begins; **1898:** wins County Council Scholarship to Nottingham High School; **1898–1901:** attends Nottingham High School; **1901:** stricken with pneumonia; **1901:** at Haggs Farm, with the Chambers family, he experiences “a new life” (a model for his Utopian Rananim?); friendship with Alan Chambers.

Flame is the image his friends often used to describe the man whose emblem was the phoenix. “The spirit of flame,” said Lady Ottoline Morrell. “His swift and flamelike quality,” said Catherine Carswell. “A flame burning on,” said Aldous Huxley. That the flame was “genius” and that there was something almost preternatural about D. H. Lawrence’s aliveness, sensitivity, awareness, and responsiveness—these conclusions have become commonplaces. But how explain the “genius” of D. H. Lawrence? Explanations collapse before the mystery of heredity—his inheritance from his parents not only of extraordinary intelligence and imagination but also of a stubborn vitality that spurned lethargic compromise with an irreverent world. Whatever his temperamental heritage, however, a unique concatenation of circumstances shaped his nature and, to a degree, accounts for his conduct.

Perhaps the most important of these circumstances was that Lawrence’s extremely delicate health, as a small child, precluded all possibility of his entering into rough-and-tumble boyish rivalry. Five years younger than his brother Ernest, seven years younger than George, his oldest brother, Lawrence was not thrust into an intense rivalry with his male siblings. Pale, thin, the youngest boy, he was, in a sense, in a privileged position: “We all petted and spoiled him from the time he was born,” said George; “my mother poured her very soul into him” (Nehls, 1:17). Nor was the father insensitive to the boy’s frailty: as Lawrence noted in his autobiographical *Sons and Lovers*, the father was

"always very gentle if anyone were ill" and "particularly lavish of endearments" to his thin, pale child.

The child responded warmly to this outpouring of warmth. Norman Douglas said that Lawrence had a "naturally blithe disposition" (Nehls, 2:14), and many, like May Chambers or Catherine Carswell, found him "merry" or "gay" (Nehls, 3:555; Carswell, xxiii). Treated with sympathy and tenderness, he responded "in full measure," as his friend William E. Hopkin observed (Nehls, 1:23). It would also be true to say that he responded in kind. Early in life he showed a sensitivity to the feelings of others, a tenderness and feminine responsiveness and sympathy, that set him apart from other boys. It was a sympathy that extended beyond his immediate family and, indeed, beyond the human world—a sympathy manifested not only in his artist's ability to feel the being of other forms of life but also in his highly developed maternal impulse to take responsibility for others, particularly for the weak or the burdened or handicapped.

His uncanny attention and responsiveness to nature has been stressed by almost all who knew him. His sister Ada's comment is typical: "Not a flower, tree or bird escaped Bert's notice, and he found wonderful adventure in seeing the first celandine or early violet" (Nehls, 1:14). His older sister, Emily, added: "He was so quick, he could notice things that you would just walk past and never see. He always noticed it" (Nehls, 1:14). William Hopkin noted that "even as a youth he seemed to see things differently from other folk, and his descriptions were often unusual but illuminating" (Nehls, 1:24). Later in Lawrence's life, Aldous Huxley and Lady Cynthia Asquith called attention to the same remarkable awareness and responsiveness. Lady Cynthia Asquith said:

I don't believe anyone could have been in Lawrence's presence for two minutes without being struck by his difference from other people. It was not a difference of degree; it was a difference of kind. Some electric, elemental quality gave him a flickering radiance. Apart from this strange otherness, one could see at once that he was preternaturally alive. . . .

You couldn't possibly be out of doors with Lawrence without becoming aware of the astonishing acuteness of his senses, and realising that he belonged to an intenser existence. Yet to some degree—and this was your great debt to him—he enabled you temporarily to share that intensified existence; for his faculty for communicating to others something of his own perceptiveness made a walk with him a wonderfully enhanced experience. In fact it made me feel that hitherto I had to all intents and purposes walked the earth with my eyes blindfolded and my ears plugged.

So receptive, so alert was he to every outdoor sight and sound, that I had the impression that he must know what it was like to be a bird or a wild animal—could feel himself inside the skin of anything living. (Nehls, 1:207-8)

Aldoux Huxley's comment is similar:

To be with Lawrence was a kind of adventure, a voyage of discovery into newness and otherness. . . . He looked at things with the eyes, so it seemed, of a man who had been at the brink of death and to whom, as he emerges from the darkness, the world reveals itself as unfathomably beautiful and mysterious. . . . He seemed to know, by personal experience, what it was like to be a tree or a daisy or a breaking wave or even the mysterious moon itself. He could get inside the skin of an animal and tell you in the most convincing detail how it felt and how, dimly, inhumanly, it thought. (Nehls, 3:172-73)

This astonishing ability to respond to, and to feel, the inner life of other living things, which is reflected in his extraordinary gift for mimicry, is what Keats had in mind when he spoke of the poet's "negative capability"—a capacity (which is opposite to self-assertion or "positive" capability) to enter empathically into other human beings or other forms of being, indeed to *become* those other forms. Keats does not explain this gift any more than calling it "empathy" explains it. It seems to be connected with a sense of the sheer miracle of being—the sense of wonder that Lawrence defined as "the religious element inherent in all life." All things are precious because they are manifestations of a divine energy, a sacred mystery. Nothing exists that does not manifest this immanent power and glory. All derives from the great source; all is accordingly deserving of respect or reverence. Nothing is intrinsically despicable or ignoble, and one's own life is not intrinsically superior to the life of other forms of being. Keats defined the poet as "that man who with another man is equal"; perhaps he could have added that the poet is that man who with all other forms of being is equal—equal in sharing the divine spark. Was it that sense of the oneness and affinity of all things that Lawrence had in mind when he referred to himself as a "mystical" child with a "fervent private religion"? One cannot be sure. His early reverence for life is certainly suggested by a report by May Chambers, who asked him if he had seen the violets in the woods near the farm; Lawrence replied, "'Am I blind? Why, we were ever so careful not to tread on any'" (Nehls, 3:562). Something similar is suggested in the anecdote told by Mabel Thurlby Collishaw, who played with Lawrence as a child: "Bertie talked to the flowers, and I told him, 'You are potty.' He would look at me, and then I'd say quickly, 'No, you are *not* potty,' because I thought he would cry" (Nehls, 1:29). The anecdote calls attention not only to Lawrence's sense of a connection with other