own developing attitudes to marriage and relationships between men and women.

In view of Lawrence's statement, 'There was a lot of the original draft that I couldn't have bettered'¹, it seems logical to argue that in the version we know best, at least he thought he was improving his earlier draft.

Endnotes


*Peter Preston*

As the title of Rosemary Sumner's thought-provoking book suggests, there are many routes to modernism; and they do not all lead to the same destination. 'Modernism' emerged as a literary term in the 1960s as a way of describing the changes in literature from 1880-1930. None of the writers it was used to describe would have called themselves modernists, although they might have admitted to being Imagists, Vorticists or Futurists. To cover such a range of practices, the term had to be commodious (although it could also be prescriptive and exclusive) and encompass both the 'dry', concentrated modernism of Pound or Eliot and the more fluid, impressionistic writing of Woolf or Dorothy Richardson. Among its putative contexts are Darwinism, urbanisation, the rise of mass culture, scientific and technological developments and psychoanalysis. It has been seen as both democratic and elitist, socialist and fascist. Recently, post-modernism has encouraged us to pluralise the concept, and to find interest and energy on the borders where its differing practices contend.

Rosemary Sumner is aware of these complexities without spending a great deal of time on definitions or the conflicts within modernism. She is concerned with how Hardy, Lawrence and Woolf 'push out the boundaries of the novel, extending it into unknown regions of the universe and the psyche' (xiii). Where Joyce creates puzzles which given the right key can be solved, they create mysteries, are interested in 'the inconsistent, the irrational, the unresolved, the unknown' (p.2), and are drawn to indeterminacy and multiplicity. Their characters, like Elizabeth-Jane in *The Mayor*
of Casterbridge, experience ‘the chaos called consciousness’; they debate and struggle for words; often they desire self-extinction, or are fascinated by the possibility of what Woolf called ‘the world without a self’. Exploration takes them both inward to the dark forest of the soul, and outward to a contemplation of their relationship with a seemingly indifferent cosmos, in the process exhibiting what Sumner considers a key element of the modernist enterprise: ‘The mingling together of the everyday with unknown regions, whether of mind or universe’ (p.21).

This introductory argument is followed by a series of close readings: there are four chapters largely on Hardy, two on Lawrence, and three that are transitional or comparative. There is some degree of overlapping between the chapters, and the resulting sense of an argument folding back on itself in order to gain fresh impetus in a different context appears to be part of Sumner’s intention. Unfortunately, however, this technique does not always succeed, and what might be intended as a fruitful revisiting looks like repetition, an impression that intensifies as the book goes on: some key quotations, for instance, appear several times. This may be to do with the origins of some chapters as periodical essays, in which Rosemary Sumner had necessarily to set out a brief résumé of her main argument before proceeding to a detailed reading of a particular text. The text also seems heavily weighted in favour of Hardy (on whom she has written well in an earlier book), and this adds to the impression of repetitiveness.

Nonetheless, Sumner’s readings – a combination of scrupulous attention to the text and unexpected comparisons with later writers – suggest ways in which Hardy, for instance, prefigures many of the preoccupations of writers and artists like Camus, Beckett or the Surrealists. She argues that the use of new cosmological knowledge in *Two on a Tower*, where the universe is seen as having no affinity with humanity, is related to Camus’ definition of the Absurd: ‘the divorce between man and his life, the actor and his setting’ (p.28). Hardy’s habit of seeing from unusual points of view, and his notion of art as a disproportioning reality, are linked with the Surrealists, while his ideas about intensity of perception can be related to Heidegger. In his late fiction Sumner finds a Flaubertian challenge to the linearity of narrative, pointing out that Proust thought *The Well-Beloved* anticipated his own experiments with time, and she associates the mathematical element in the novel’s structure with Cubism, seeing it as an example of ‘the modernist urge...towards multiple perspectives – both fragment and flow, both divisions of clock and continuity of perspective’ (p.86).

The chapters on *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* pay close attention to Lawrence’s language, taking their key from his remarks, in the ‘Foreword’ to the latter novel, about the ‘struggle for verbal consciousness’. He described work on *The Rainbow* as ‘Writing in a foreign language I don’t know very well’ (quoted p.107), but Sumner argues strongly for the success of Lawrence’s language in the novel. For her, its rhythms and repetitions ‘reflect the competing and contradictory forces within the psyche, its fluidity, its complexity, its instability’ (p.125). In *Women in Love*, Lawrence’s language is subjected to more severe tests, as it dramatises the characters’ struggles for articulacy and explores the divisions between feeling and intellect. All the main characters of the novel are divided, Gerald most radically and destructively so, while even as Birkin argues for wholeness he experiences duality. It is inevitably a novel of negatives and interrogatives, in which even the maintenance of a steady omniscient narrative voice becomes impossible. This is a good point, but it is a pity that Sumner does not extend her argument to point out how the narrative voice falters, challenges and argues with the reader in the novels of the 1920s, particularly *Mr Noon*, *Aaron’s Rod* and *Kangaroo*. 
It is in the search for harmony that Sumner finds a link between Lawrence and Woolf. She argues that Woolf’s concern with the shape of her novels derives from her fear of allowing chaos to intrude. Threatened disharmony in *Mrs Dalloway* is tentatively restored by Peter Walsh’s final vision of Clarissa, while the closure of *To the Lighthouse* is almost too neat and controlled. Between the Acts ‘contains and expresses both discord and harmony’ in ‘a violently oscillating form’ (155), and Miss La Trobe’s experimental ‘ten minutes of now’ ‘leads out of the world into the whole of life’ (p.157). Like Hardy, Woolf wished to escape from the traditional concept of realism. Both are conscious of the unimaginable stretches of geological time: as Knight in *Two on a Tower* hangs from a cliff eye to eye with a trilobite, he feels time opening before him ‘like a fan’; and in the ‘Time Passes’ section of *To the Lighthouse* ten years easily become millennia. Both Hardy and Woolf allow their protagonists erratic thought patterns, although the latter makes more conscious efforts to render the inner consciousnesses of his characters mimetically, where Hardy stands at one remove.

All three writers are conscious of the mysteriousness of their characters. That essential otherness – symbolised by the old lady of whom Mrs Dalloway only ever has glimpses, through a window – marks Hardy’s work and is dramatised in the conflict between Lawrence’s characters. There is a great deal we don’t know about Sue, Tess, Jude, Angel or Bathsheba. Some of that unknowing was resolved by changes in the culture: Lawrence and Woolf were able to open doors against which Hardy could only beat his fists. Yet much of what they explore remains beyond the consolations and tidy structures of plot, beyond beauty, beyond language. In a way, what Sumner’s book defines and celebrates is a kind of heroism, a determination to carry on, a willingness to confront and work with the frightening, the challenging and the unknown, both within and beyond ourselves.


**Paul Poplawski**

This is a collection of previously published essays by Doherty dealing mainly with Lawrence’s major novels (*Sons and Lovers*, *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*) and including one essay on the short fiction (concentrating on *The Fox* and *The Virgin and the Gipsy*, with some brief comments on *The White Stocking* and ‘Daughters of the Vicar’). However, the stated aim of the book is not to provide self-contained intensive readings of any of these texts, but to explore the underlying patterns of Lawrence’s fictional rhetoric in general, focusing especially on the functions of metaphor and metonymy in the shaping of plots, characters, and themes. In Doherty’s own words:

> [The] general object of meditation is the total Lawrentian oeuvre...Its specific focus is on the major rhetorical figures (metaphor and metonymy), not primarily as linguistic devices, but as narratological tropes. It explores their plot-making capacities, their power to project character-types, to locate gender positions, and to discriminate motifs and themes (sex, death, psychosis, and cosmic space are among the central motifs that the book investigates). (p.2)

This study of the ‘narratological tropes’ of metaphor and metonymy is effectively what is meant by the word ‘tropological’ in the book’s sub-title, and theories of rhetoric provide the underpinning principles of the book’s ‘theorizing’ of Lawrence. These principles are sketched out in an introduc-