

ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND THEORY OF LITERATURE

AIVA TAMOŠAITIENĖ

4th year student of English Philology

The Semantics of Friendship
in David Herbert Lawrence's Novel "Women in Love"
BACHELOR THESIS

Research adviser
Assist. Monika Gruslytė

Šiauliai 2010
CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
II. THE PECULIARITIES OF D. H. LAWRENCE’S LITERARY WORKS.....	7
III. MANIFESTATIONS OF FRIENDSHIP.....	10
IV. THE SEMANTICS OF FRIENDSHIP IN D. H. LAWRENCE’S NOVEL <i>WOMEN IN LOVE</i>	15
4.1. The Sisterly Friendship between Ursula and Gudrun Brangwen.....	15
4.2. The Ambiguous Friendship between Gerald Crich and Rupert Birkin.....	18
4.3. The Shifting Friendship between Ursula Brangwen and Rupert Birkin.....	21
4.4. The Fatal Friendship between Gudrun Brangwen and Gerald Crich.....	27
V. CONCLUSIONS.....	33
SUMMARY.....	34
SANTRAUKA.....	36
SOURCE.....	38
REFERENCES.....	38
ANNOTATION.....	40
ANOTACIJA.....	40

I. INTRODUCTION

David Herbert Lawrence (1885-1930), an English poet, novelist, short story writer and painter, was a prominent person in the 20th century English literature. He was born in central England, Eastwood, Nottinghamshire in 1885. D. H. Lawrence started his career as a novelist with *The White Peacock* in 1911. The writer's second novel *Sons and Lovers* published in 1913 was based on his childhood experience. Other D. H. Lawrence's famous novels include *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, which were perceived as very contradictory by the writer's contemporaries. These novels in one or another way deal with the problems of men and women relationships.

The story revealed in the novel *Women in Love* discloses relationships among four main characters, i.e. the sisters Ursula and Gudrun Brangwen, and two men – Rupert Birkin and Gerald Crich, as well as the alternations of their inner worlds. Moreover, friendship is one of the main themes of this literary work by D. H. Lawrence. As the friendship relationships are inevitable in people's lives, it is interesting to examine what are the characteristic features of female and male friendships, as well as the friendships between people of the opposite sex. Furthermore, D. H. Lawrence's works reflect the changes in the English society of the early twentieth century. According to the literary critic Fiona Becket, D. H. Lawrence constructs the history of his characters around specific historical events and social changes, such as the "changes in levels of prosperity and aspiration around social classes" and female emancipation (2002:143). Thus, it is also important to explore the peculiarities of friendships between people belonging to different social classes.

The **object** of the present research is D. H. Lawrence's novel *Women in Love*. This literary work was first published in 1920 and underestimated by the writer's contemporaries. Since D. H. Lawrence's death in 1930 the novel has gained more attention from academic critics and other scientists. In recent years an interest in this writer and his novel *Women in Love* has risen. Such literary critics as David Ellis consider it as "the most profound and rewarding" novel by D. H. Lawrence (Ellis, 2006: 18).

The aim of the present research paper is to explore the semantics of different kinds of friendship relationships among the characters of D. H. Lawrence's novel *Women in Love*.

The semantics of friendship in this research paper will be considered as manifestations of female and male friendly relationships. In the sphere of literary criticism semantics has been widely researched by such scientists as Kenneth Burke in *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1950) and *A Grammar of*

Motives (1955), William C. Dowling in *The Senses of the Text: Intensional Semantics and Literary Theory* (1999), etc. According to *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (2008), semantics¹ is “the philosophical or linguistic study of meanings in language”, but this approach will be attempted to be investigated in the paper on literature. Thus, the present paper focuses on the semantic aspect of friendship, i.e. on the implications and manifestations of friendly relationships among the characters of the novel rather than on the forms of friendships.

The following objectives have been set in order to achieve the aim:

1. To discuss the characteristic features of Lawrence’s novels.
2. To review various manifestations of friendship.
3. To analyze the novel *Women in Love* from the aspect of semantics of female and male friendship in the novel.
4. To reveal the place of friendship relations in the plot of the novel.

As D. H. Lawrence is one of the most discussable writers of the early twentieth century and his novels are analyzed all over the world, *Women in Love* also has gained much attention. The researches on this novel were conducted by such literary critics, as Richard Beynon in *D. H. Lawrence: The Rainbow, Women in Love*, Sarah Cole in *Modernism, Male Friendship, and the First World War*, Fiona Becket in *The Complete Critical Guide to D. H. Lawrence*, Alastair Niven in *D. H. Lawrence: the Novels*, Paul Poplawski & John Worthen in *D. H. Lawrence: a Reference Companion*, Dolores LaChapelle in *D. H. Lawrence: Future Primitive*, and David Ellis in *D. H. Lawrence’s Women in Love – a Casebook*. However, in Lithuania the novel has not gained much attention yet. The article in Lithuanian *D. H. Lawrence* by Almantas Liudas Samalavičius has been published in *Pokalbiai apie anglų rašytojus* (ed. A. Petraitytė) in 1999. The research *Mental Process Verbs in “Women in Love” by D. H. Lawrence* has been conducted by Solveiga Sušinskienė & Monika Gruslytė in 2006 in the field of linguistics. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to perform a research from the point of view of friendly relationships among the main characters of the novel. Thus, it is the **relevance** of the work.

The following **methods** have been applied in the present research:

1. The method of descriptive analysis enabled to carry out a review of various manifestations of friendship.

¹ "Semantics" *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Chris Baldick. Oxford University Press, 2008. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. Šiauliai County Povilas Visinskis Public. 19 May 2010
<<http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t56.e1032>>

2. The method of close reading enabled the author of the present paper to perform an interpretation of the analysed text.

The structure of the work: The study consists of an introduction, the main part, which includes three sections, conclusions, summaries in English and Lithuanian, and a list of references.

The introduction presents the novel *Women in Love* by D. H. Lawrence which deals with the peculiarities of the relationships among female and male characters and their inner worlds. Also the aim and the objectives of the present research paper are defined in the introduction. The main body of the study consists of three parts. The characteristic peculiarities of D. H. Lawrence's works and various manifestations of friendship are presented in the first two theoretical parts of the study. They provide a theoretical background for the analysis of semantics of friendship in the novel, which is presented in the third, i.e. practical part of this research. The present study also contains conclusions, Lithuanian and English summaries and annotations as well as the list of references.

II. The Peculiarities of D. H. Lawrence's Literary Works

The beginning of the twentieth century was marked by a huge amount of changes in the United Kingdom as well as in all over the world. The period continued reforms in social sphere. According to *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century English Literature* (2004), growing cities and new technological inventions stimulated the sense of novelty. The development of various technologies was increasing and such things as telephones, automobiles, airplanes and motion pictures were coming into use. Thus, lives of people were changing and “the consciousness of change was heightened by the turn of the century followed soon after by the death of Queen Victoria” (Marcus & Nicholls, 2004: 198). Unfortunately, this century was also marked by the two World Wars and the period of economic weakness between them known as the ‘Great Depression’. The twentieth century was a period of “a distinct change in thought, behaviour, and cultural production” which was influenced by the two World Wars and by the artistic concerns of modernism (Milne, 1999: 494). It was an international literary and cultural movement. The dates when it flourished are in dispute. Few scholars claim that it started before 1860 and lasted until the end of the World War II. According to *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (1999), in England modernism was most active and fruitful from early in the 20th century and in the 1920s and 1930s.

Modernism initially began in Europe's capitals: London, Milan, Berlin, and Paris. According to M. Drabble (2000), each national experience of this movement is unique. She states that the beginning of modernism in English literature “is associated with the French influenced movements, such as naturalism, Symbolism, Decadence and Aestheticism” (Drabble, 2000: 698). The editor of the *Literary Movements for Students* (Milne, 2009: 495) asserts that “modernism is defined by its rejection of the literary conventions of the nineteenth century and by its opposition to conventional morality, taste, traditions, and economic values”. Moreover, Milne (2009) claims that the roots of modernism are not only in the rapidly changing technology but also in the theories of such thinkers of the nineteenth century as Freud, Marx, Darwin, and Nietzsche.

Modernism in literature revealed “a breaking away from established rules, traditions and conventions, fresh ways of looking at man's position and function in the universe and many experiments in form and style” (Cuddon, 1999: 515-516). Furthermore, some critics claim that modernist writers break narrative frames and very often put the emphasis on “characters' consciousness, unconsciousness, memory and perception” rather than to the plot events (Drabble, 2000: 682). Drabble (2000) also describes the modernist novel as often non-chronological, with sudden jumps in the representation of time.

The beginning of the twentieth century was rich of famous British writers, such as R. Kipling, J. Conrad, J. Galsworthy, S. Maugham, and G. B. Shaw. Important modernists include T. S. Eliot, J. Joyce, V. Woolf and D. H. Lawrence. V. Woolf and D. H. Lawrence, though very different in the environment they depict, were psychological novelists much influenced by Freud (Drabble, 2000). According to Drabble (2000: 683), “Woolf is experimental in technique and narrative structure, and focused in subject matter”, while Lawrence is “traditional in narrative form but poetic and emotional in his style and daring in his subject matter, especially concerning sexual relations”, in works like *Sons and Lovers* (1913), *The Rainbow* (1915), and *Women in Love* (1920).

According to *The Hutchinson Encyclopedia of Literature* (2006: 717), Lawrence tried to create “a new kind of novel with a structure and content so intense that it would reflect emotion and passion more genuinely than ever before”. However, the advancement of modern technologies threatened Lawrence’s “ideal of the complete, passionate life” (ibid). Lawrence and his novels evoked a lot of fuss in the English society which in the early twentieth century still was much accustomed to the moral norms of Victorian period. Many of his works were criticized and even censored because the writer expressed his beliefs that sexual instincts are natural to human nature.

Lawrence’s novel *Sons and Lovers* (1913) is an autobiographical account of his early years. It is considered to be “the first English novel with a truly working class background, and certainly Lawrence’s first major novel” (Drabble, 2000: 951). However, after Drabble (2000), later the writer thought he had been too harsh writing about his father in this work.

Lawrence’s next novel *The Rainbow* (1915) was considered improper because of writer’s frankness about sex and the usage of swear-words and the book was seized by the police (Drabble, 2000). However, despite the writer’s constant troubles with the law, a literary critic Jeff Wallace in his *Introduction* (1999) to Lawrence’s *Women in Love* claims that “Lawrence had established a reputation as a faithful yet experimentalist observer of the life of rural and working-class communities” (Wallace, 1999: VIII). It should be mentioned that the two novels – *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* developed from a single project called *The Sisters*. According to Poplawski (1996), in 1915 Lawrence decided to separate it into two separate books and made lots of corrections later.

According to the literary critic R. Beynon (1997), it was a problem for Lawrence to find a publisher for *Women in Love* because of a scandal that led his previous novel *The Rainbow*. The problem was that a publisher should have been “courageous enough to face possible prosecution or risk association with the sequel to an obscene novel” (Beynon, 1997: 24). Consequently, Lawrence printed *Women in Love* privately in the USA after several years after its completion. Later the book with some changes was published in Britain but, as literary critic Becket (2002) claims, despite all the alterations the writer was almost prosecuted for the novel’s content.

The novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover* was probably the most controversial because it caused a sensation in contemporary English society. By then Lawrence had already been known as a writer who dealt with the matters of sexuality in an uncomfortably direct manner (Ellis, 2007). The book contained expletives together with detailed and poetic descriptions of sexual union; therefore it was banned and became unpublished in England until 1960 (Drabble, 2000). However, Lawrence printed this novel privately in Florence in 1928. According to Drabble (2000), Lawrence's special interest in sexuality led to the fact that the book was published in London only in a censored form in 1932.

The above mentioned novels were the most important and contradictory fiction works written by D. H. Lawrence. It should not be argued that Lawrence's reputation did not stand very high at the time he was living. Only after his death in 1930 this writer became more and more popular. Other critics, such as A. Niven admit that Lawrence "enlarged the English novel as no contemporary was able to do" (Niven, 1978: 8). Nowadays literary critics, such as Black (1986) admit that the times have changed and Lawrence's works do not cause so much shock any more. According to the literary critic Beynon (1997), right after Lawrence's death the English language press predicted that his works will be valued more highly in the future than they had been during his life.

As D. H. Lawrence was one of the first English modernist writers, his works were usually received with shock and opposition. The writer himself suffered because of it but kept on writing on the same concerns and in his own manner and style. One of the most popular themes in Lawrence's works was the relationship between men and women. The following chapter of the present research paper deals with various manifestations of friendship.

III. Manifestations of Friendship

The concept of friendship has been widely discussed in philosophy by such famous thinkers as Plato, Aristotle, etc. Friendship is perceived more or less differently by every human being. For instance, after Aristotle, as referred to by E. Carpenter, “friendship is a thing most necessary in life, since without friends no one would choose to live, though possessed all of other advantages” (Carpenter, 2007: 40). Thus, it would be difficult to imagine the existence of any person without having friends. A famous American philosopher Henry D. Thoreau asserted that “there is on the earth no institution which friendship has established; it is not taught by any religion” (Thoreau, 2005: 12). It means that the ability to make friends and to maintain that relationship comes from every human being’s inner world. The authors of *The Book of Positive Quotations* present plenty of the definitions of friendship. For instance, they quote the American author David Grayson: “Friendship is neither a formality nor a mode; it is rather a life” (Cook, 2007: 149). These words prove that such relationships like friendship are very natural for human beings and they do not need to learn it.

Warm relations between people usually naturally transform into deeper ones than a simple acquaintance. However, people should have something in common in order to keep in touch. For example, Plato claimed that “friendship is a universal love which grows out of more particular, affective attachments” (Scudder & Bishop 2001: 60). Nevertheless, friends must be loyal and reliable and trust each other in order to prevent their friendship from evanescence. According to the philosopher Jasper Adams (Adams, 1837), people must be patient and tolerant towards other people or their behaviour that they disapprove if they want to remain friends. It could be claimed that people have to accept their friends with all their vices, as well as with their virtues.

The eminent philosopher Aristotle claimed that there are three kinds of friendship, i.e. utility friendship, pleasure friendship and the perfect one. After Aristotle, as referred to by Pangle (2003), in friendships of utility each loves other person only incidentally or even does not precisely love another person at all but only his own good. The second kind of friendship – the friendships of pleasure, according to Aristotle are common to young people, who live by their emotions and whose desires change rapidly (ibid). However, he also admits that they are short-term relationships but “as long as they last they are warm and heartfelt, and the friends do cherish one another’s company” (Pangle, 2003: 40). Finally, the best form of friendship after Aristotle, is when “partners love each other for themselves, cherishing each other for their characters and not for some incidental benefit that they provide each other” (Pangle, 2003: 43). Nevertheless, in contrast to Aristotle, the French philosopher Mointagne claimed that in order to build a perfect friendship so many coincidences are needed that it would be a fortune to do it once in three hundred years

(Pangle, 2003: 64). Thus, it must be admitted that friendship plays a great role in people's joyful and meaningful life. However, this kind of relationship between people can be discussed in a more detailed way dividing it into several sorts of friendship, for example – the same sex and the opposite sex friendships.

What concerns friendship between people of opposite sexes, there are various opinions about the possibility of such friendships. For example, Caroline Simone, a feminist treats it specifically. She claims that “the aim of friendship is befriending: encouraging and helping others in fulfilling their conceptions of their desires” (Scudder & Bishop, 2001: 50). Simone (Scudder & Bishop, 2001) regards love as a threat to friendship, but she believes that developing intergender friendships is worth the risk. However, she admits that most love relationships are treated as relationships between men and women and most friendships are treated as relationships between men and men and women and women (ibid). In contrast, the American essayist Joseph Epstein criticises feminists who assume that “men bring nothing but low motives to their relations with women” and he hopes that this kind of thinking is disappearing (Epstein, 2006: 131). He also claims that friendship between a man and a woman “like any other kind of friendship, is not possible without a basis in goodwill and trust” (ibid). Epstein implies that the disappearance of feministic point of view to intergender friendships would only improve this kind of male-female relationships.

However, it is an eternal question if it is possible for people of different sexes to have a casual friendship without getting involved into sexual affair. Various scientists argue that love may be defined as a fusion of desire and friendship (Ellis, 2008). It means friendship inevitably enters into erotic sphere and it is an implication that friendship between young, healthy and attractive people of opposite sex tends to involve sexual emotion (Ellis, 2008: 264). Similarly, after German philosopher F. Nietzsche as referred to by Epstein, “women can form friendship with men very well; but to preserve it – to that end a slight physical antipathy will probably help” (Epstein, 2006: 129). Thus, it means that people of opposite sex can become and remain friends only if they lack sexual attraction to each other. In contrast, American essayist Epstein in his book *Friendship – an Expose* quotes another writer, Letty Cottin Pogrebin, who claims that “love is always enlarged when two lovers have a friendship, while friendship is usually diminished when two friends become lovers” (op. cit, 131). Nevertheless, it is still possible that relationship between people who have physically intimate relationships can grow into friendship.

Friendship also plays a very important role in marriage. If two people start their relationship from friendship they tend to know each other's vices and virtues and accept them, while those who start from romantic love usually idealise their partner (Scudder & Bishop, 2001). In the latter case relationships may become ruined or fail when partners stop romanticizing each other.

Social scientists claim that men and women within a culture are more alike than they are different. Moreover, on such dimensions as verbal intelligence and friendliness, there are more differences within a sex than between the sexes. There are men who are friendlier in their nature than most women and *vice versa* (Beall & Sternberg, 1993). Therefore the conclusion can be made that friendliness does not depend on a person's gender.

Another important aspect in the opposite sex friendships is the difference of social classes. The beginning of the twentieth century was the time of changes in England. It affected even the division of social classes. They became less important for people who struggled to change the established norms of Victorian period. The perfect example is the characters of Lawrence's *Women in Love*. The sisters Brangwen come from a working class background, while the male characters are of a higher social status. However, it does not prevent their relationships from further development.

According to literary critic Ellis, "if an alternative social structure is to offer real freedom, it must be based on solidarity, shared vision, loyalty, and friendship" (Ellis, 2006: 186). The novel *Women in Love* proposes this alliance start with Birkin and Gerald but there is an obstacle of class difference for their friendship (Ellis, 2006). Existing class divisions would probably make close friendship between Gerald and Birkin very problematic, if not impossible. The same is with the friendship between Gerald and Gudrun. The novel works to resolve or deflect this problem with a variety of contradictory responses. "The text shows its anxiety about class in a number of ways: it places characters in a social hierarchy yet omits Birkin from it" (Ellis, 2006: 186). Clearly, Gerald and Birkin occupy different steps on the social ladder. According to Ellis (2006), although Birkin's social position remains obscure, it is obvious that Gerald, the heir to a mining fortune, belongs to a distinctly higher stratum than Birkin who is the school inspector. Therefore the main characters of the novel *Women in Love* deny the barriers of social classes and prove that friendship does not depend on a person's social status.

Friendship in Lawrence's novel *Women in Love* is interlinked with love very much, no matter what kind of relationships to discuss about, the male or the female friendship. Traditionally, in the past "friendship was primarily a masculine virtue" (Pahl, 2000: 122). According to Pahl (2000), from the Old Testament to the ancient Greece male friendship was praised. In modern literature of the early twentieth century D. H Lawrence was the first writer who wrote about quite intimate relationship between men. However, Professor Todd Migliaccio in his article claims that the "traditional belief is that men are less able and less interested than women in self-disclosing to others, constantly struggling to develop intimacy with friends and family" (Migliaccio, 2009: 226). In modern English literature of the early twentieth century D. H Lawrence was the first writer who wrote about quite intimate relationships between men. An independent scholar Dolores LaChapelle

in her book quotes Lawrence's letter written in 1919, where the writer states; "I believe in a 'manly love' the real implicit reliance of one man on another; as sacred a unison as marriage: only it must be deeper, more ultimate than emotion and personality" (LaChapelle, 1996: 76). Literary critic Sara Cole in her book *Modernism, Male Friendship, and the Great War* asserts that Lawrence idealized male intimacy and with his works he demanded "social order to accommodate and embrace masculine bonds" (Cole, 2003: 185). Nevertheless, the friendship between the two young men in Lawrence's novel *Women in Love* was considered ambiguous and even homoerotic. Famous literary critic Ellis (2006) suggests that the main male characters of this novel feel the strong bond between them the first time they meet. Their further relationships develop into ambiguous ones when Birkin offers a friendship for Gerald "whereby both men can combine resources, their reserves of sanity and hope, in mutual trust and commitment" (Sagar, 1966: 87). Literary critic Niven admits that Gerald and Birkin exist as moral opposites and "their physical affinity unites them while their values tend to pull them apart" (Niven, 1978: 106). According to literary critic Beynon, "the primary function of male friendship in Lawrence's world: the step beyond marriage which makes marriage possible, the break-through to a fuller life which Lawrence tried to project, in a dozen different ways, in any of his novels" (Beynon, 1997: 67). Thus, the deeper analysis of male friendship in the novel *Women in Love* will be accomplished in the practical part of the present paper.

It is also important to analyze the peculiarities of female friendships. According to the literary critic Cole, this kind of "friendship has its own specific history, its own tropes and narrative devices, its own literary past" (Cole, 2003: 15). However, Cole (2003) also claims that only in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century relationships between women as well as the works of women writers became in the center of attention. The main themes in women literature were friendship, alliance, animosity and disconnection, and others important in female community (Cole, 2003). Since 1990 the role of women after the epoch of Victorian England has gained more attention of scholars (Marcus & Nicholls, 2004). The 'New Women' – i.e. "women who challenged both the conventions of Victorian sexual ideology and the orthodoxies of the marriage plot in a variety of ways and for a variety of reasons", have been recognized once again as central figures in turn of the twentieth century debates about gender, race, class, national identity and the 'progress' of modernity (Marcus & Nicholls, 2004: 69-70).

In Lawrence's novel *Women in Love* there are two main female characters – the Brangwen sisters. Ursula and Gudrun Brangwen are "emancipated women who, in professional independence, freedom of ideas and morals, and the demand for a vote, proclaim new conceptions of womanhood" (Preston & Hoare, 1989: 128). Although the sisters are very different in their nature, they maintain friendly relationships with each other. Professor of English Peter Balbert in his article claims that

“in the early scenes of *Women in Love* there is an appealing sense of nurturant affection and energetic striving” in Ursula “which Lawrence instructively contrasts with the cynical, materialistic outlook of Gudrun” (Balbert, 1985: 270). Thus, the essential thing for their friendship is the possibility to share their attitudes towards life, marriage and other things although those attitudes may totally differ.

To sum up, friendship is a complex phenomenon. Its diversity is displayed through the survey of philosophers’, literary critics’, sociologists’ and essayists’ approaches: female friendship (Balbert, Preston, Hoare), homosexual male friendship (Ellis, Beynon, Niven, Sagar, Pahl), and intergender, or opposite sex, friendship (Scudder, Bishop, Epstein, Beall, Sternberg).

After carrying out the analysis of scientific works on friendship a great variety of its manifestations has been observed. Friendships of female and male characters of Lawrence’s novel *Women in Love* will be analysed more explicitly in the following part of this research paper.

IV. The Semantics of Friendship in D. H. Lawrence's Novel *Women in Love*

4.1. The Sisterly Friendship between Ursula and Gudrun Brangwen

D. H. Lawrence's novel *Women in Love* starts with the illustration of two Brangwen sisters who are making their handiworks and talking about life, marriage and other things important for them. The first chapter is called *Sisters* because the reader gets acquainted with the main female characters of the story. Ursula and Gudrun are very different although they are of similar age: "Ursula twenty-six, and Gudrun twenty-five" (Lawrence, 1996: 20). In appearance the sisters have something in common, like "the remote, virgin look of modern girls" (ibid). Moreover, Lawrence emphasizes that Gudrun is a "very beautiful, passive, soft-skinned, soft-limbed" woman. The author stresses the difference between the sisters by stating that Gudrun's "look of confidence and diffidence contrasted with Ursula's sensitive expectancy" (ibid). Their characters and manners are also different and the reason of that could be the fact that Gudrun "had spent several years, working at an art-school, as a student, and living a studio life" in London (ibid). While the other sister Ursula stayed at home working in the local school and did not get much influence of the big city life as her sister did. However, both sisters are not satisfied with their parents' home and the local environment. Gudrun tells her sister that when she came back she felt "completely out of" home (Lawrence, 1996: 23). And Ursula is frightened of her feelings to "the sordid, too-familiar place" and "the milieu, the whole atmosphere and condition of this obsolete life" (ibid). The author highlights sisters' attitude towards the town when Gudrun compares it to "a country in an underworld" where "everything is a ghoulish replica of the real world, a replica, a ghoul, all soiled, everything sordid". Hence the sisters share a similar attitude towards their home and its surroundings although Ursula keeps her frightening thoughts in her mind and Gudrun expresses them loudly.

The Brangwen sisters have a little bit different attitudes towards marriage although both of them agree that marriage will be "the inevitable next step" (Lawrence, 1996: 21). Ursula admits that she had a lot of proposals but she rejected all of them. She says she would get married only if she was "tempted" and then she would "marry like a shot" (Lawrence, 1996: 20). Here the author shows the sentimentality of her character. And in this case the other sister's character is shown as totally different because Gudrun claims that she would marry only "if there did happen to come along a highly attractive individual of sufficient means" (ibid). These different attitudes towards marriage disclose that Ursula is a sensitive and emotional person while Gudrun is rational and even materialistic. These features of the sisters are also reflected in their opinion about each other and

their behaviour. Ursula always tries to please her sister and sometimes it even looks as if she was afraid of her. When the two young women are talking about marriage, Gudrun's cold voice and almost open hostility breaks all Ursula's thoughts about children and a "dazzled, baffled look" comes to her face (Lawrence, 1996: 21). Lawrence reflects Ursula's sensitivity claiming that she was "always having that strange brightness of an essential flame that is caught, meshed, contravened" (ibid). However, she admires her sister Gudrun "with all her soul" (Lawrence, 1996: 22). Ursula sees her sister as a very charming woman, "so infinitely charming, in her softness and her fine, exquisite richness of texture and delicacy of line" (ibid). Accordingly, Ursula's obedience and passiveness are very important for the friendship of these sisters. Peaceful and friendly relationship between them would probably be impossible if they were very similar in their natures and if Ursula could resist Gudrun's will.

Friendship between the two sisters is perfectly reflected in the chapter called *Water-Party*. Ursula and Gudrun are going to the party and their parents are walking in front of them. Suddenly the sisters start joking and laughing at their mother's appearance and clothing which "were always rather odd, and as a rule slip-shod, yet she wore them with a perfect ease and satisfaction" (Lawrence, 1996: 184). The fact that their mother does not understand what is wrong shows the generation gap between the parents and the daughters. And the sisters share the same point of view in this case. Their fun and laughter proves the sisterly relationship between them.

The same chapter of the novel continues with the reflection of friendship between the Brangwen sisters. They canoe to the remote place where a tiny stream flows into the lake and the first thing they do is throwing off all their clothes and swimming naked in the water. In that place, where nobody can see them, the sisters feel really free and happy. Lawrence proves it by saying: "When they were together, doing the things they enjoyed, the two sisters were quite complete in a perfect world of their own" (Lawrence, 1996: 193). Ursula's sensitive nature reacts to this feeling of happiness with a song and she starts singing. And then Gudrun feels ill at ease because she "feels herself outside. Always this desolating, agonized feeling, that she was outside of life, an onlooker, whilst Ursula was a partaker, caused Gudrun to suffer from a sense of her own negation, and made her, that she must always demand the other to be aware of her, to be in connection with her" (Lawrence, 1996: 193-194). This desire to taste a real life is so strong that it seems that Gudrun is not thinking about herself and her sister's health. She starts dancing in front of cattle, although she "was usually frightened of" them (Lawrence, 1996: 195). Consequently, from this scene of the novel friendship between the Brangwen sisters starts changing. In the same chapter *Water-Party* Ursula gets in resentment against her sister because Gudrun overbears her again. This time men are involved into it as Gudrun together with Gerald Crich "assume a right over her, a precedence" (Lawrence, 1996: 205).

Further in the novel the attitudes of the sisters are becoming more and more different and their relationship also change. It could be claimed that their relationships with men influence this feeling distance between the two women. Ursula becomes stronger and does not want remain in the shadow of her sister. She feels that her sister is not always right and “this finality of Gudrun’s, this dispatching of people and things in a sentence, it was such a lie” (Lawrence, 1996: 304). And here in the novel the estrangement between the two sisters begins. Lawrence proves this by saying that “Ursula began to revolt from her sister” (ibid). Ursula’s attitude towards her sister Gudrun also changes and she does not admire her anymore. Now she thinks that “Gudrun is really impudent, insolent, making herself the measure of everything, making everything come down to human standards” (ibid). Thus, the relationship between the sisters in the chapter called *Moony* absolutely differs from that depicted in the beginning of the novel. However, it does not mean that Ursula and Gudrun quarrel about something. They hide all discontents and dissatisfactions and only the author reveals them through their inner thoughts. What concerns Gudrun, in the chapter called *Flitting*, “when she compared herself with Ursula, already her soul was jealous, unsatisfied” (Lawrence, 1996: 427). Gudrun realizes that she is jealous because she herself wants the thing she was always denying – “the wonderful stability of marriage” (ibid).

As the end of the novel approaches, the two sisters meet during the voyage and this meeting looks a little bit weird for others because of the unusual “delight of the sisters in each other” (Lawrence, 1996: 445). Later they talk about their new clothes and experiences but avoid unpleasant subjects. It intensifies the feeling of alienation of the sisters. During the voyage Ursula notices that her sister looks “strange, exotic, satiric” and she feels uneasy because of it (Lawrence, 1996: 447). Eventually, Ursula decides to leave Tyrol together with Rupert. When she tells her sister about this decision, Gudrun perceives “she admired and despised her sister so much, both” (Lawrence, 1996: 495). Ursula feels uncomfortable when hears the sister’s “voice clanging with false benignity” (ibid). After this separation both sisters feel free at last. They meet again only after Gerald’s death. This scene of their meeting shows Ursula’s sensitivity again, as she cries because of Gerald, “the tears running down her cheeks” (Lawrence, 1996: 536). But Gudrun can’t “escape the cold devil of irony” and her face looks “cold, pale, impassive” (ibid). The only thing she thinks about is Ursula’s “right behaviour” – the one that Gudrun herself couldn’t conduct (ibid). This meeting is the final point in the friendship of these sisters. As the novel comes to the end, the author mentions only the fact that they correspond with each other but Gudrun never writes anything particular about herself.

However, despite all the changes in the sisterly friendship between Ursula and Gudrun, they feel quite close to each other. Ursula even can’t stop calling her sister ‘prune’ while they have

common conversations. This diminutive is the evidence of Ursula's sweet temper and of true sisterly friendship.

To sum up, the sisterly friendship between Ursula and Gudrun Brangwen is constantly changing until it becomes a distant one. This is evidenced by such things as a sharing of similar attitudes, spending time together in the beginning and Gudrun's jealousy because of her sister's successful marriage and their estrangement in the end of the novel.

As the novel progresses the author pays less attention to the relationship between the Brangwen sisters and in the second half of the novel he focuses on the relationships of couples. Thus, the opposite sex friendships will be analyzed further in this research paper and the next chapter deals with male friendship.

4.2. The Ambiguous Friendship between Gerald Crich and Rupert Birkin

There are two main male characters in Lawrence's novel *Women in Love* – Gerald Crich and Rupert Birkin. Friendship between them could be called ambiguous because there is a feeling that the two men have something more in common than a simple and casual friendship. The author reveals it perfectly in the end of the second chapter called *Shortlands*. Gerald Crich and Rupert Birkin are having a rather passionate conversation during a wedding party at the Criches' home, at Shortlands. Their talk about women and marriage develops into something similar to a quarrel and there appears "a pause of strange enmity between the two men" (Lawrence, 1996:48). Lawrence admits that these two men "intended to keep their relationship a casual free-and-easy friendship" although both of them knew that "the heart of each burned for the other. They burned with each other, inwardly" (ibid). Thus, the author of the novel exposes intimate spiritual relationships between the male characters almost in the very beginning of the story.

However, there is a problem which could prevent their friendship – that is the difference of social classes between these men. Rupert Birkin is the school inspector who has to travel a lot and his life seems "uncertain, without any definite rhythm, any organic meaning" (Lawrence, 1996: 69). Gerald Crich comes from a wealthy family that owns a mining company. The friendship between these two men proves that young English people of the early twentieth century are already free of old norms of social classes. When Birkin in the *Breadalby* chapter notes that "class-barriers are breaking down" it looks that Gerald is indifferent of those barriers because he feels "uneasy under the slightly jeering tone of the other"(Lawrence, 1996: 114).

The scene that reflects spiritual friendship between Gerald and Rupert is depicted in the chapter called *In the Train*. The title reflects the location of further events. Rupert and Gerald meet accidentally in the train going to London. They start talking about things that are important in their lives. Then the author explains that “Gerald was held unconsciously by the other man. He wanted to be near him, he wanted to be within his sphere of influence” (Lawrence, 1996: 75). In this scene the author also reveals how much Gerald admires Birkin. He values such features of his friend as “the quick-changing warmth and vitality and brilliant warm utterance” (ibid).

Similar situation repeats in the chapter called *Breadalby* when after a conversation about women the two men again feel “a strange tension of hostility” (Lawrence, 1996: 118). Lawrence admits: “They always kept a gap, a distance between them, they wanted always to be free each of the other”. Thus, the conclusion could be drawn that both Gerald and Rupert feel some kind of attraction towards the other but they try to keep their relationship in the terms of a simple friendship. However, the author always notes that after such talks about life, marriage or women, “a strange tension between them” and at the same time – “a curious heart-straining towards each other” appears (ibid).

The chapter *Man to Man* is very important in revealing Gerald’s and Birkin’s spiritual closeness. At first the author shows Birkin’s attitude towards women and coupling: “He wanted so much to be free, not under the compulsion of any need for unification, or tortured by unsatisfied desire” (Lawrence, 1996: 232). When Gerald comes to visit Birkin, it is obvious again that the two men have “a deep, uneasy feeling for each other” (Lawrence, 1996: 234). However, they are very different in their nature, as Birkin is “clever, whimsical, wonderful but not practical enough” and Gerald feels that “his own understanding” is “much sounder and safer” (ibid). In this chapter the most important moment is when Birkin proposes a suggestion to his friend “to swear to love each other <...> implicitly, and perfectly, finally, without any possibility of going back on it” (Lawrence, 1996: 240). But after that Gerald looks “mistrustful, resenting the bondage, hating the attraction” he feels for his friend (ibid). And Birkin keeps pleading for this alliance where they would “stand by each other – be true to each other – ultimately – infallibly – given to each other, organically – without possibility of taking back” (ibid). However, Gerald says he should understand it better and doesn’t give an answer. Then Birkin feels there is “a strange sense of fatality in Gerald”. He also understands that there is “the insistence on the limitation” in Gerald which bores Birkin as he himself doesn’t possess it (ibid).

The friendship between these two men develops quickly until eventually it involves physical closeness. The chapter called *Gladiatorial* is very important while it reveals the ambiguous unification of Gerald and Birkin. The scene when they wrestle “swiftly, rapturously, intent and mindless at last” implies homosexual intimacy between the two men (Lawrence, 1996: 311). After

that they speak with “long spaces of silence between their words” as if they were thinking of what had happened (Lawrence, 1996: 313). Then Birkin expresses his opinion about their relationship: “We are mentally, spiritually intimate, therefore we should be more or less physically intimate too – it is more whole” (ibid). This time Gerald agrees that “it’s rather wonderful” to him (ibid). Both men also agree that they feel “freer and more open now” and that is what they want (Lawrence, 1996: 314). Birkin now also expresses his admiration of Gerald’s physical appearance. Lawrence asserts that “this was another of the differences between them” as “Birkin was careless and unimaginative about his own appearance” and Gerald was “scrupulous in his attire” and “expensive too” (ibid).

Thus, the physical contact between Gerald and Rupert and their spiritual closeness could make their friendship complete. However, it does not develop into real homosexual relationship between them. The reason is that Birkin announces that he is going to marry Ursula Brangwen and Gerald does not understand him. Birkin claims he believes “in *additional* perfect relationship between man and man – additional to marriage” (Lawrence, 1996: 402). But Gerald contradicts because he can’t “see how can they be the same” (ibid). Birkin tries to explain that those relationships should not be “the same – but equally important, equally creative, equally sacred” (ibid). However, Gerald asserts he can’t “*feel it*” although he understands that Birkin believes in a male friendship which could be spiritually equal to marriage with a woman (ibid). Thus, this mutual misunderstanding extinguishes their spiritual friendship.

The novel moves on unfolding mostly the relationships of the couples and only in the very ending the author returns to the friendship between the male characters. In the chapter called *Continental* the author of the novel asserts that the relationship between these men has changed and they are quite distant now. “There was a queer, indefinable hostility between the two men, lately. Birkin was on the whole dim and indifferent, drifting along in a dim, easy flow, unnoticing and patient, since he came abroad, whilst Gerald on the other hand, was intense and gripped into white light, agonistes. The two men revoked one another” (Lawrence, 1996: 492).

The last chapter of the novel is called *Exeunt* and the title refers to Gerald’s death. Birkin comes to see his dead friend and thinks that “Gerald might still have been living in the spirit with Birkin, even after death. He might have lived with his friend, a further life” (Lawrence, 1996: 541). When some time passes after the funeral Birkin’s wife Ursula asks him if he misses Gerald and if she is not enough for him. And the man answers that he “wanted a man friend, as eternal as” Ursula and Birkin are eternal. He explains that he imagines a “complete, really happy” life only with another “sheer intimacy” in it, such as an “eternal union with a man too” (Lawrence, 1996: 542).

To sum up, the ambiguous friendship between Gerald Crich and Rupert Birkin depicted in the novel *Women in Love* is quite unusual. At first both men seem to be close because of their spiritual

understanding and friendship. And then Birkin persuades Gerald that they need something more to maintain a complete friendship – that is physical closeness. However, this homosexual experience doesn't lead them to superior kind of friendship because Gerald can't bear the fact that Rupert wants their friendship to be an additional relationship to his marriage.

The second half of the novel focuses mostly on the relationships between Rupert and Ursula, as well as the friendship between Gerald and Gudrun. Thus, next chapters of the present paper will analyze friendships between these couples.

4.3. The Shifting Friendship between Ursula Brangwen and Rupert Birkin

After analysing the friendships between the female and between the male characters of the novel it is necessary to turn the attention to friendships between the opposite sex characters. This chapter of the present paper will focus on the friendship between Ursula Brangwen and Rupert Birkin.

In the first chapter of the novel Lawrence discloses that these two characters are already familiar to each other. The author states: "She [Ursula] wanted to know him [Birkin] more. She had spoken with him once or twice, but only in his official capacity as inspector. She thought he seemed to acknowledge some kinship between her and him, a natural, tacit understanding, a using of the same language" (Lawrence, 1996:34). It means that Ursula feels quite close to Birkin although she doesn't know him very well yet.

The chapter called *Class-room* tells about their unexpected meeting face-to-face. It discloses Ursula's confusion when she suddenly sees "the face of a man" near her (Lawrence, 1996: 49). What concerns Birkin, he admires Ursula: "He looked at her with a new pleasure, feeling gay in his heart, irresponsible" (ibid). This feeling of rapture encourages him to help Ursula with her duty and he starts giving her advices how to teach her pupils better. This scene of the novel could be considered as the beginning of the friendship between Ursula and Birkin. However, another woman, Hermione Roddice, interrupts them and after a long conversation Ursula is left alone. "A spasm of anger and chagrin went over Ursula. His [Birkin's] face set. As he bade good-bye, as if he ceased to notice her" (Lawrence, 1996: 60). Ursula feels resentment against both, Birkin and Hermione, and probably there are two reasons for it. Firstly, she is disappointed that Birkin left with the woman she despises. It seems that Hermione has some kind of influence on him. And secondly, she is upset because Birkin said good bye in such a way as if Ursula was not there. The author's last statement in this chapter is: "And then she began to cry, bitterly, bitterly weeping: but whether for misery or

joy, she never knew” (ibid). It reveals the fact that Ursula is really confused and does not understand her own feelings yet.

The next time when Ursula and Birkin meet each other is depicted in the chapter *Breadalby*. It is the name of the house owned by Hermione Roddice, which is always full of guests. Ursula and her sister Gudrun come to stay there for the second time already. However, their opinion about the atmosphere is not very positive. Ursula admires the surroundings but she is unhappy “in the spirit” (Lawrence, 1996: 103). The reason for it could be the fact that Hermione appears, “with amazing persistence, to wish to ridicule” Birkin “in the eyes of everybody” (ibid). And Birkin is “down in the mouth” because of Hermione’s unpleasant behaviour with him (ibid). However, later the atmosphere is defused when the women start dancing. Birkin enjoys looking at Ursula’s dance: “She [Ursula] was rich, full of dangerous power. She was like a strange unconscious bud of powerful womanhood. He [Birkin] was unconsciously drawn to her. She was his future” (Lawrence, 1996: 112). Birkin perceives that he likes Ursula very much, he feels free and happy with her. It is evident when he starts dancing “rapidly and with a real gaiety”, he is glad he can “get free from the weight of the people present, whom he” dislikes (ibid).

It is important to notice that Hermione Roddice and Rupert Birkin were quite close for a few years and now, with Ursula’s appearance in his life, it is evident that their relationships are over. The scene in the novel when Hermione attacks Birkin with “the ball of jewel stone” (Lawrence, 1996: 127) ends any closeness between them. And now there is only “a complete estrangement between them” (Lawrence, 1996: 131). Birkin is finally free to build a new relationship with Ursula.

The development of the friendship between Ursula and Birkin is depicted in the chapter *An Island* when they meet accidentally near “the bright little stream” (Lawrence, 1996: 145). At first they turn over the boat “with combined efforts” and then float it to the island (Lawrence, 1996: 148). The feeling of collaboration between the couple appears and they start talking about various things sitting in the place of “their retreat on the island” (Lawrence, 1996: 149). Their conversation is so much embracing that both of them seem to be “oblivious of everything but their own immersion” (Lawrence, 1996: 150). The couple starts talking about love and here the difference of their attitudes towards this feeling is obvious. Birkin claims he doesn’t “believe in love at all” (Lawrence, 1996: 153). He claims: “Love is one of the emotions like all the others – and so it is all right whilst you feel it. <...> It is just part of human relationships, no more” (ibid). However, Ursula refuses to believe Birkin and tries to persuade him that love is something more than he considers. This conversation about love evokes dual feelings in Ursula. She hates and admires Birkin at the same time: “There was his wonderful, desirable life-rapidity, the rare quality of an utterly desirable man; and there was at the same time this ridiculous, mean effacement into <...> a prig of the stiffest type” (Lawrence, 1996: 154). Moreover, Birkin feels

similarly, he feels “arrested in wonder and in pure, perfect attraction” (ibid). And then “a beam of understanding between them” appears (Lawrence, 1996: 155). Both of them are finally calm and peaceful. They start talking about the flowers in the same mood until Ursula mentions Hermione again. Birkin assures her that their relationships with that woman are “over, finally – a pure failure, and never could have been anything else” (Lawrence, 1996: 157). He claims that there is only one thing he wants – “freedom together” (ibid). However, Ursula wants to feel love from Birkin but she doesn’t say it aloud yet. She also doesn’t answer when Birkin says that they know each other well already. It seems that some kind of animosity against the man arises in Ursula’s inner world. Her sympathy with Hermione Roddice in the chapter *Carpeting* strengthens this feeling. The two women unexpectedly agree in their opinion about Rupert Birkin but very quickly after that they begin “mutually to mistrust each other” (Lawrence, 1996: 168). At the same time Ursula tries “to feel at one with Hermione, and to shut off from Birkin” (Lawrence, 1996: 169). Ursula is tortured with twofold feelings for Birkin. She is hostile to him but she also feels the bond existing between them. This woman is irritated because of the fact that Birkin understands her very well. It is enough for him to look at her and it seems that he knows her thoughts. It is evident in the previously mentioned situation with Hermione: “Birkin looked up at them. Ursula hated him for his cold watchfulness. But he said nothing” (Lawrence, 1996: 168). The second time when he guesses her thoughts is depicted in the beginning of the chapter called *Mino*. Ursula gets an invitation for a cup of tea from Birkin. He invites both Brangwen sisters but Ursula decides to go alone and doesn’t even tell her sister about the invitation. When she comes to Birkin’s place and tells that Gudrun couldn’t come, “he instantly” guesses why (Lawrence, 1996: 171). This insight of Birkin confirms the bond existing between the couple. Moreover, Ursula goes on this visit with a purpose to clear their relationships with Birkin. They discuss the things important for them such as friendship and love and this discussion develops into a quarrel. Birkin claims that if they “are going to make a relationship, even of friendship, there must be something final and irrevocable about it” (Lawrence, 1996: 171). Ursula does not agree with his ideas, such as: “Ultimately <...> there is something else. But, ultimately, there is no love” (ibid). He tries to explain it like that: “What I want is a strange conjunction with you [Ursula] <...> not meeting and mingling <...>; but an equilibrium, a pure balance of two single beings: – as the stars balance each other” (Lawrence, 1996: 174). Ursula does not understand what Birkin wants from her if he does not love her. While talking about relationship Birkin compares people with the stars. He keeps on trying to persuade Ursula that his thoughts are right. “One must commit oneself to a conjunction with the other – forever. But it is not selfless – it is a maintaining of the self in mystic balance and integrity – like a star balanced with another star” (Lawrence, 1996: 179). However, Ursula is a woman that does not like such kind of comparisons. She is more down to earth than her friend. She claims she does not

trust him when he drags in the stars and if he “were quite true it wouldn’t be necessary to be so far-fetched” (ibid). Consequently both of them are weary of this conversation and they calm down again when Birkin asks Ursula to tell about her family. Her story bridges the couple again and Birkin seems “to warm and comfort his soul at the beautiful light of her nature” (Lawrence, 1996: 180). After that he finally surrenders and admits he loves Ursula.

Apparent friendship between Ursula and Birkin is depicted in the chapter called *Water – Party*. Birkin’s behaviour with the Brangwen family is obviously very pleasant and polite: “he took off his hat and smiled at them with a real smile in his eyes” (Lawrence, 1996: 186). It seems that he is sincerely happy to see Ursula and her family at the party: “His eyes smiled full of natural warmth” (ibid). In the same chapter there is also a conversation between Ursula and Birkin depicted which is again related to their relationship and love. But it is probably the first time when it develops quite evenly and doesn’t evolve into a row. The reason could be that Ursula is calm, she listens to Birkin’s thoughts and doesn’t argue with him: “Ursula listened, half attentive, half avoiding what he said. She seemed to catch the drift of his statement, and then she drew away. She wanted to hear, but she did not want to be implicated” (Lawrence, 1996: 217). This is how the shifting or alternating friendship between Ursula and Rupert Birkin step by step unfolds in the novel.

In the next chapter it seems that Ursula does not understand herself and she even does not know what she wants from life. She suddenly realizes that she hates Birkin but she doesn’t know what the reason for this feeling is. “Her whole nature seemed sharpened and intensified into a pure dart of hate. She could not imagine what it was. <...> It was like a possession. <...> It was not temporal, her hatred, she did not want to do anything to him, to have any connexion with him” (Lawrence, 1996: 229-230). After such drastic change in Ursula’s emotions it seems that it is the end in her relationship with Birkin. But what concerns him, the man is sure that it is not over yet. “He knew that Ursula referred back to him. He knew his life rested with her” (Lawrence, 1996: 231). He is strong in his beliefs and wants Ursula to accept them too. “And he wanted to be with Ursula as free as with himself, single and clear and cool, yet balanced, polarized with her” (Lawrence, 1996: 232). Both of them become so busy with themselves and then a pause in the friendship between these people emerges.

The chapter called *The Industrial Magnate* begins with the author’s observation that “it seemed to Ursula that Birkin had gone out of her for the time, he had lost his significance, he scarcely mattered in her world” (Lawrence, 1996: 244). It is really interesting how Ursula’s attitude and emotions change again.

After quite a long break in their relationship Birkin leaves to France and does not write to anybody about himself. Ursula now feels otherwise than before. “Ursula, left alone, felt as if

everything were lapsing out. There seemed to be no hope in the world. <...> She was hard and indifferent, isolated in herself” (Lawrence, 1996: 282). It proves that she is missing Birkin and their friendship. She is also longing for love. “A terrible desire for pure love overcame her again” (Lawrence, 1996: 283). One night she accidentally meets Birkin near the lake. Their calm and peaceful talk as usually develops into a troubled one. And then Birkin admits that both of them are wrong: “While ever either of us insists to the other, we are all wrong. But there we are, the accord doesn’t come” (Lawrence, 1996: 290). Finally they conciliate feeling “peace and heavenly freedom” together (Lawrence, 1996: 291). Birkin is happy “just to fold her and kiss her gently, and not to have any thoughts or any desires or any will, just to be still with her, to be perfectly still and together, in a peace that was not sleep, but content in bliss” (ibid). And now again it seems that there will be no more arguments between these two people who are happy to be together. However, this peace does not last long. Ursula is infuriated when Birkin comes to propose her and talks with her father at first. She feels as if both of them are forcing her to accept Birkin’s proposal which “has nothing to do with” her (Lawrence, 1996: 301). Birkin leaves her home and he is also angry because of such Ursula’s reaction.

Ursula’s opinion changes after few days when she understands that her sister has too much influence on her. “So she withdrew from Gudrun and from that which she stood for, she turned in spirit towards Birkin again” (Lawrence, 1996: 305). However, it is not so easy for her to suppress her animosity towards Birkin when they are getting into arguments again. Ursula still feels some kind of jealousy because of Birkin’s relationship with Hermione although she denies it: “I – *jealous!* You *are* mistaken in least of Hermione, she is nothing to me” (Lawrence, 1996: 350). This scene is depicted in the chapter *Excuse*. And here Ursula becomes angry, goes away and returns back to Birkin as always. There is only one difference – all of these actions are accomplished in a shorter time than usually. After their reunion Birkin again feels peace and relief. “The old, detestable world of tension had passed away at last, his [Birkin’s] soul was strong and at ease” (Lawrence, 1996: 354). At last both of them perceive that they are happy only being together. Birkin fulfils Ursula’s desire and admits that he loves her. Equally, Ursula accepts Birkin’s point of view towards their relationship. It means that both of them finally agree that the bond between them is something more than simply love.

Birkin’s proposal to quit from their jobs also strengthens their friendship and mutual understanding. Ursula agrees to quit from school and it seems that there is no hostility in her anymore. After the night they spend together in Birkin’s car one may think that they understand each other from one glimpse. It is depicted in the very ending of the *Excuse* chapter: “They looked at each other and laughed, then looked away, filled with darkness and secrecy” (Lawrence, 1996: 366). Eventually these two people stop struggling only for their individual beliefs

and try to create their future together. However, at first Ursula hesitates about the marriage and Birkin waits patiently for her decision. One day she announces her family that the wedding is tomorrow and unexpectedly receives a backlash from them, especially from her father. She runs away and goes to Birkin's place where he welcomes and soothes her. After the couple finally gets married they spend most of the time together: "She [Ursula] stayed with Birkin in his rooms, or at the Mill, moving with him as he moved" (Lawrence, 1996: 420). They communicate only with the other couple, Gudrun and Gerald, and look very happy together.

As the novel progresses the author does not present any more arguments and reunions among this couple. Birkin and Ursula go on a trip and are rejoicing because of a new world waiting for them. "In Ursula the sense of the unrealized world ahead triumphed over everything" (Lawrence, 1996: 440). Her sister Gudrun notices the incredible friendship of Ursula and Birkin: "She [Gudrun] envied them some spontaneity, a childish sufficiency to which she herself could never approach. They seemed such children to her" (Lawrence, 1996: 456).

However, the author states that Ursula and Birkin "were never *quite* together, at the same moment, one was a little left out" (Lawrence, 1996: 492). Probably it was the main condition for their friendship that one of them had always to make a step back. The representation of their friendship in this novel comes to the end in a bright and hopeful mood: "Nevertheless she [Ursula] was glad in hope, glorious and free, full of life and liberty. And he was still and soft and patient, for the time" (Lawrence, 1996: 492).

However, the novel ends with a sad conversation between Ursula and Birkin after Gerald's death. Birkin acknowledges that he needs a male friend in his life in order to "make it complete" (Lawrence, 1996: 542). Ursula doesn't argue and just questions him why she is not enough for him and tries to persuade Birkin that it is impossible to have "two kinds of love" at the same time (ibid).

To conclude, it must be stated that the friendship between Ursula Brangwen and Rupert Birkin is a very complicated one. Their relationship shifts up and down very frequently and unexpectedly until they bear with the fact that one of them must always yield in order to maintain their friendship. Therefore this friendship between a woman and a man could be called a shifting friendship.

The next chapter of this paper analyzes friendship between other main characters of the novel – Gudrun Brangwen and Gerald Crich.

4.4. The Fatal Friendship between Gudrun Brangwen and Gerald Crich

Friendship between Gudrun and Gerald depicted in Lawrence's novel *Women in Love* starts very slowly. In the beginning the woman notices this handsome man and a strange thing happens in her inner world. "Gudrun lighted on him at once" (Lawrence, 1996: 27). After a moment she is sure she will know Gerald more. "She was tortured with desire to see him again, a nostalgia, a necessity to see him again, to make sure it was not all a mistake, that she was deluding herself, that she really felt this strange and overwhelming sensation on his account, this knowledge of him in her essence, this powerful apprehension of him" (op cit., 27-28). However, they meet each other eye-to-eye only after some time while staying at Hermione's house Breadalby. Gerald seems to be curious about Gudrun and starts asking his friend Rupert Birkin about the Brangwen sisters. He learns that Gudrun is an artist and questions his friend about her works of art.

The episode of a casual chat between Gudrun and Gerald could be treated as the beginning of their friendship. Gerald makes an approach to this woman as he already understands how important she is in his life. "The flavour of her slang was piquant to him. Whether he would or not, she signified the real world to him. He wanted to come up to her standards, fulfil her expectations. He knew that her criterion was the only that mattered" (Lawrence, 1996: 123). Gerald acknowledges that Gudrun's opinion becomes significant for him and he strives "to come up to her criterion, fulfil her idea of a man and a human being" (ibid). Meanwhile Gudrun admires Gerald even when his behaviour with his horse is rather rude. She looks "at him with black-dilated, spellbound eyes" (Lawrence, 1996: 133).

However, the author of the novel admits that there is also a calculation in Gudrun's rapture: "Gerald was her escape from the heavy slough of the pale, underworld, automatic colliers" (Lawrence, 1996: 143). Here the problem of different social classes is implied as Gerald comes from a wealthy family in contrast to Gudrun. However, the unconscious magnetic attraction exists between them as well. Lawrence states: "The exchange of feeling between them was strong and apart from their consciousness" (ibid). Moreover, different social status seems unimportant for Gerald. It is proved by his behaviour with the parents of Gudrun at the party which is depicted in the chapter *Water-Party*: "He [Gerald] too was introduced to the Brangwen parents, and immediately he spoke to Mrs Brangwen as if she were a lady, and to Brangwen as if he were *not* a gentlemen" (Lawrence, 1996: 187). Gerald's politeness with Gudrun's mother shows that he values

his relationship with Gudrun and wants to make a good impression for her parents. His ability to communicate with Mr Brangwen as if they were of the equal status also shows his flexibility.

In the chapter called *Sketch-book* the bond establishing between these characters is described. Suddenly Gerald sees Gudrun as if he were a clairvoyant: “He saw her a dangerous, hostile spirit, that could stand undiminished and unabated” (Lawrence, 1996: 145). The author states: “The bond was established between them, in that look, in her [Gudrun’s] tone. In her tone, she made the understanding clear – they were of the same kind, he and she, a sort of diabolic free-masonry subsisted between them. Henceforward, she knew, she had her power over him” (ibid).

The friendship between Gudrun and Gerald starts developing more quickly during the water party. Gudrun’s question about his injured hand evokes warm feelings between them. “The curious way she [Gudrun] skirted round the subject sent a new, subtle caress through his [Gerald’s] veins” (Lawrence, 1996: 191). And later Gudrun’s unexpected behaviour with the cattle provokes Gerald’s concern. She tries to hunt and scare away the cattle and Gerald warns her that it is dangerous. But Gudrun in her soul feels “an unconquerable desire for deep violence against him” (Lawrence, 1996: 199). She slaps Gerald in the face and this action makes his heart “almost to bursting with a great gush of ungovernable emotion” (ibid). The burst of their emotions leads to conciliation when Gudrun softly asks the man not be angry and he confesses that he is in love with her. The bond between them strengthens when they come back to their boats and compel Ursula to exchange the lanterns. It seems then that they “assume a right over her, a precedence” together (Lawrence, 1996: 205). However, Gerald also lets Gudrun to assume control over him. “By her tone he could tell she wanted him in the boat for herself, and that she was subtly gratified that she should have power over them both. He gave himself, in a strange, electric submission” (ibid). The author shows how well this couple feels together while describing their states of minds. What concerns Gudrun, she “did not want to touch him, to know the further, satisfying substance of his living body. He was purely intangible, yet so near. <...> she only wanted to see him, like a crystal shadow, to feel his essential presence” (Lawrence, 1996: 207). While Gerald’s “mind was almost submerged, he was almost transfused, lapsed out for the first time in his life, into the things about him. <...> It was like a pure, perfect sleep, his first great sleep of life” (Lawrence, 1996: 207-208). However, the calm and peaceful mood is suddenly dispersed when Gerald’s sister falls into the water and the searching begins. Gerald jumps out of the boat and Gudrun remains sitting “sick at heart, frightened of the great, level surface of the water, so heavy and deadly”

(Lawrence, 1996: 212). She feels lonely because of that “terrible, cold separation of suspense”, a separation from Gerald (ibid). The author in this scene implies the future of his characters by stating that “He [Gerald] was not like a man to her [Gudrun], he was an incarnation, a great phase of life. <...> And she knew it was all no good, and that she would never go beyond him, he was the final approximation of life to her” (Lawrence, 1996: 211). Thus, after the tragic event in Gerald’s family the development of his friendship with Gudrun stops for a while.

As the novel progresses, after some time the Criches ask Gudrun to come and help Gerald’s little sister with drawing and modelling. And Gudrun accepts the invitation although she has already decided to leave her hometown. She claims that her decision to go to the Criches house is influenced only by her curiosity “to see what it is like” (Lawrence, 1996: 270). The meeting of Gudrun and Gerald wakes their gentle feelings for each other. This woman’s smile is very pleasant for the man. The author states: “It filled him with ease to see her” (Lawrence, 1996: 275). Both of them are full of emotions seeing each other after a long time. They perceive each other from one glimpse as if they were old friends. “They stood together in a false intimacy, a nervous contact. And he was in love with her” (ibid). Meanwhile, the scene with a rabbit is similar to the scene with the horse depicted in the beginning of the novel because of the brutality in human behaviour with the animals. Gudrun and Gerald unconsciously like this demonstration of human powers. “This was a league between them, abhorrent to them both. They were implicated with each other in abhorrent mysteries” (Lawrence, 1996: 279).

Later in the novel Gudrun gets a suggestion from the Crich family to come and arrange a studio where she could work and teach Gerald’s little sister Winifred. After thinking about all pros and cons she decides to accept it. “She was quite willing, given a studio, to spend her days at Shortlands. She disliked the Grammar School already thoroughly, she wanted to be free” (Lawrence, 1996: 319). Moreover, she is a clever woman and understands that Gerald wants “her to be attached to the household at Shortlands” and uses Winifred “as a stalking-horse” (ibid). However, she likes the girl, admires Gerald’s father and uses this opportunity not only because of the friendship with Gerald but also because it is beneficial for her. Thus, her materialistic nature is implied here. After coming to Shortlands Gudrun quite often communicates with Gerald’s father who is seriously ill and almost dying. She admires the old man for his “self-possession and control” and behaves with him very pleasantly and politely (Lawrence, 1996: 328). However, she can’t show him how she really feels seeing him dying. What concerns her relationship with Gerald, it develops

into a passionate “subterranean desire to let go, to fling away everything and lapse into a sheer unrestraint, brutal and licentious” (Lawrence, 1996: 329). Though, both of them restrain from intimate relationship yet.

The thing very important for their friendship is sharing similar attitudes and beliefs related to love and marriage. Both of them contradict Birkin’s thoughts that “you can find an eternal equilibrium in marriage, if you accept the unison, and still leave yourself separate, don’t try to fuse” (Lawrence, 1996: 333). In contrast, Gudrun states that she believes “in love, in a real *abandon*” and Gerald agrees with her (ibid).

Meanwhile, Gerald is waiting for his father’s death and it tires him very much. However, the author states: “There was no escape – he was bound up with his father, he had to see him through” (Lawrence, 1996: 368). This expectancy even arouses fear in him. It could be perceived as an implication to Gerald’s future: “He was afraid of some horrible collapse in himself” (Lawrence, 1996: 368). In this state Gerald loses control of his daily life and his fair leads him to Gudrun. He is searching for comfort in a friendship with her. “In this extremity led him to Gudrun. He threw away everything now – he only wanted the relation established with her” (Lawrence, 1996: 369). Moreover, “she [Gudrun] felt as if she were caught at last by fate, imprisoned in some horrible and fatal trap” (Lawrence, 1996: 372). Nevertheless, Gudrun feels how hard it is for Gerald and makes a friendly suggestion to help him although she doesn’t know herself how to do it properly. Gerald states that he doesn’t want help. He wants only sympathy: “I want somebody I can talk sympathetically. That eases the strain” (ibid). Gerald also claims that Birkin doesn’t give him this sympathy. It means that Gerald needs a friend and in this case a male friend isn’t enough for him. After this conversation he accompanies Gudrun home and tries to regain his inner balance with her. Gerald is rapt in his thoughts while Gudrun feels very comfortably in his embrace. The only thing she asks him is how much he cares for her. However, the man is “startled by his own declaration” that Gudrun is everything for him. It seems that Gerald recovers right after their intimate closeness: “he is full of the strength and the power of living desire” (Lawrence, 1996: 380). However, after his father’s funeral Gerald feels very badly and lonely again: “he was like a man hung in chains over the edge of abyss. <...> He was frightened deeply, and coldly, frightened in his soul. He did not believe in his own strength anymore” (Lawrence, 1996: 385). The reason why he goes to look for Gudrun lies in his inner state of soul, as he thought “he must seek reinforcements. He did not believe in his own single self any further than

this” (ibid). Gerald knows that only physical intimacy with Gudrun can grant him rest and peace and it leads him to her home at night. However, she understands that “they would never be together” although she feels an “overwhelming tenderness to him” and, at the same time, “a dark, understirring <...> jealous hatred” (Lawrence, 1996: 395). In the end of this chapter called *Death and Love* the author implies again that the friendship between these two characters is somehow fatal and it is going to end unhappily: “She wished his warm, expressionless beauty did not so fatally put a spell on her, compel her and subjugate her. It was a burden upon her, that she resented, but could not escape” (Lawrence, 1996: 397).

Further in the novel the friendship between Gerald and Gudrun is approaching to destruction. While going on a trip they come to London to a café that Gudrun dislikes. However, it seems that she is proud that people are looking at her sitting there with Gerald.

After coming to Tyrol the relationship between them is quite friendly although both of the characters feel discontent in their souls. They look happy in a new place but the author contrasts: “He and she were separate, like opposite poles of one fierce energy” (Lawrence, 1996: 451). It strengthens the impression that harmonious friendship is impossible between them. Even while being together they feel alone, for example Gerald: “Already felt he was alone. She was gone. She was completely gone, and there was icy vapour round his heart” (Lawrence, 1996: 453). This discontent in friendship with Gerald leads Gudrun to the relationship with the other man, Herr Loerke. He is an artist too and Gudrun is attracted to him because of interesting conversations about art which she could never maintain with Gerald. Meanwhile Gudrun and Gerald are step-by-step alienating. After Ursula and Birkin leave Tyrol, Gudrun feels that the conflict with Gerald is getting stronger and stronger. As the author states, it was “a vital conflict <...> which frightened both of them (Lawrence, 1996: 498). There are a lot of things in Gerald’s behaviour which annoy Gudrun. “As they grew more used to each other, he seemed to press upon her more and more. <...> he began to ignore her female tactics, he dropped his respect for her whims and her privacies, he began to exert his own will blindly, without submitting to hers” (ibid). While Gerald feels irritated because of Gudrun’s self-dependence and “isolation she had draw round herself” (ibid). In this chapter called *Snowed Up* the author perfectly reveals Gerald’s confusion. After various thoughts and doubts he becomes possessed with “a strange obstinacy. He would not go away from her whatever she said or did. A strange, deathly yearning carried him along with her” (Lawrence, 1996: 503-504). However, after some time Gerald claims he is going to leave and Gudrun plans to outsmart him and

to leave separately. Nevertheless, the day that should be the last for them in Tyrol is the final day in Gerald's life. The conflict with Gudrun and her new friend Herr Loerke could be claimed to be the final point in the destruction of friendship between him and Gudrun. After that Gerald drifts along the snowfield until there is no more strength in him. The ending of this chapter is really dramatic: "He was bound to be murdered, he could see it. This was the moment when the death was uplifted, and there was no escape. <...> he wandered unconsciously, till he slipped and fell down, and as he fell something broke in his soul" (Lawrence, 1996: 534).

To conclude, the friendship between Gudrun Brangwen and Gerald Crich is a very difficult one. Although there are almost no quarrels between them, their relationship doesn't succeed. Their friendship doesn't develop into harmonious relationship, it is step-by-step destroyed. Moreover, the author implies that the friendship between these characters is going to end in some kind of misfortune or even disaster allows to call it a fatal friendship.

V. CONCLUSIONS

1. D. H. Lawrence was one of the first English modernists who experienced a lot of backlashes from the contemporary society which tried to suppress his novels from publishing. However, he didn't surrender and kept on writing on the themes related to human relationships which were very important for him and had to be declared.
2. Friendship is a complex phenomenon. Philosophers, literary critics, essayists, sociologists propose diverse approaches for investigation of semantics of the phenomenon.
3. The sisterly friendship between the Brangwen sisters is changing from a closely relationship to a distant one. This change is mostly influenced by Ursula's friendship with Rupert Birkin and Gudrun's envy because of their happy marriage in contrast to her misfortunate relationship with Gerald Crich.
4. The ambiguous homosexual friendship between Gerald Crich and Rupert Birkin doesn't develop into a harmonious one because of their different beliefs and attitudes towards relationships.
5. The shifting friendship between Ursula Brangwen and Rupert Birkin is constantly changing because of the opposition in their natures. However, these characters manage to create a true friendship in their marriage.
6. The fatal friendship between Gudrun Brangwen and Gerald Crich comes to the end with the man's death. They do not manage to maintain their friendship because both of them struggle to dominate in their relationship.
7. The friendship relations predetermine the plot of the analysed novel.

THE SEMANTICS OF FRIENDSHIP IN D. H. LAWRENCE'S NOVEL "WOMEN IN LOVE"

SUMMARY

Key words: *D. H. Lawrence, "Women in Love", semantics of friendship, female and male friendship*

David Herbert Lawrence (1885-1930) was a prominent English modernist whose novels mostly expose various themes of human relationships. Many of his novels were initially suppressed from printing due to the openness in the narrative, which was not acceptable in England of the early twentieth century.

The object of this research paper is the novel *Women in Love* by D. H. Lawrence. The aim is to explore the semantics of different kinds of friendship relationships among the characters of the novel. To achieve this aim, the following objectives have been set: to discuss the characteristic features of Lawrence's novels; to review various manifestations of friendship; to analyze the novel from the aspect of semantics of female and male friendship in the novel; to reveal the place of friendship relations in the plot of the novel.

The method of descriptive analysis enabled to carry out a review of various manifestations of friendship. The method of close reading also has been used in order to perform interpretation of the novel.

After carrying out the research, the following conclusions have been drawn:

1. D. H. Lawrence as one of the first English modernists experienced a lot of backlashes from the contemporary society which tried to suppress his novels from publishing. However, he didn't surrender and kept on writing on the themes related to human relationships which were very important for him and he wanted them to be declared.
2. Friendship is a complex phenomenon. Philosophers, literary critics, essayists, sociologists propose diverse approaches for investigation of semantics of the phenomenon.
3. The sisterly friendship between the Brangwen sisters is changing from a closely relationship to a distant one. This change is mostly influenced by Ursula's friendship with Rupert Birkin and Gudrun's envy because of their happy marriage in contrast to her misfortunate relationship with Gerald Crich.
4. The ambiguous homosexual friendship between Gerald Crich and Rupert Birkin doesn't develop into a harmonious one because of their different beliefs and attitudes towards relationships.

5. The shifting friendship between Ursula Brangwen and Rupert Birkin is constantly changing because of the opposition in their natures. However, these characters manage to create a true friendship in their marriage.
6. The fatal friendship between Gudrun Brangwen and Gerald Crich comes to the end with the man's death. They do not manage to maintain their friendship because both of them struggle to dominate in their relationship.
7. The friendship relations among the characters predetermine the plot of the analysed novel.

DRAUGYSTĖS SEMANTIKA D. H. LAWRENCE'O ROMANE „MYLINČIOS MOTERYS“

SANTRAUKA

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: *D. H. Lawrence'as, „Mylinčios moterys“, draugystės semantika, moterų ir vyrų draugystė*

Davidas Herbertas Lawrence'as (1885-1930) – įžymus anglų modernistas, kurio romanai dažniausiai atskleidžia įvairias žmonių santykių temas. Daugelį šio rašytojo romanų iš pradžių buvo draudžiama spausdinti dėl pernelyg atviro pasakojimo būdo, nepriimtino XXa pradžios Anglijai.

Šio darbo objektas – D. H. Lawrence'o romanas „Mylinčios moterys“. Tikslas – iširti skirtingų draugystės rūšių tarp romano veikėjų semantiką. Norint pasiekti šį tikslą buvo iškelti šie uždaviniai: aptarti Lawrence'o romanams būdingus bruožus; apžvelgti įvairias draugystės apraiškas; ištyrinėti romaną vyrų ir moterų draugystės semantikos aspektu; nustatyti draugiškų santykių svarbą romano siužetui.

Darbe panaudotas aprašomosios analizės metodas padėjo apžvelgti įvairias draugystės apraiškas. Atidžiojo skaitymo metodas padėjo atlikti romano interpretaciją.

Atlikus tyrimą padarytos tokios išvados:

1. D. H. Lawrence'as, būdamas vienas pirmųjų anglų modernistų, patyrė nemažai priešiškos reakcijos iš tuometinės visuomenės, kuri bandė drausti jo romanų leidimą. Tačiau rašytojas nepasidavė ir toliau rašė temomis, susijusiomis su žmonių tarpusavio santykiais, kurios jam pačiam buvo labai svarbios ir, jo manymu, turėjo būti viešai skelbiamos.
2. Draugystė yra sudėtingas reiškinys. Filosofai, literatūros kritikai, eseistai ir sociologai pateikia įvairius požiūrius šio reiškinio semantikos tyrinėjimams.
3. Seserų Brangwen santykiai kinta tol, kol jų artima draugystė pavirsta į santūrią. Šį pokytį labiausiai įtakoja Ursulos draugystė su Rupertu Birkinu ir Gudrunos pavydas dėl judviejų laimingos santuokos, priešingos jos pačios nesėkmingiems santykiams su Geraldu Crichu.
4. Dviprasmiška homoseksuali draugystė tarp Geraldo Cricho ir Ruperto Birkinio neperauga į harmoningus santykius todėl, kad jų įsitikinimai ir požiūriai į tarpusavio santykius išsiskiria.
5. Nuolatos besikeičianti Ursulos Brangwen ir Ruperto Birkinio draugystė įtakojama skirtingos jų prigimties. Vis dėlto šie romano veikėjai sugeba sukurti tikrą draugystę santuokoje.

6. Lemtinga Gudrunos Brangwen ir Geraldo Cricho draugystė baigiasi vyro mirtimi. Šiems veikėjams nepavyksta išlaikyti draugystės kadangi abu siekia dominuoti tarpusavio santykiuose.
7. Draugiški santykiai tarp veikėjų nulemia analizuoto romano siužetą.

1. Lawrence, D. H. *Women in Love*. London: Penguin Books, 1996.

REFERENCES

2. Adams, J. *Elements of Moral Philosophy*. Cambridge: Folsom, Wells & Thurston, Printers to the University, 1837.
3. Balbert, P. Ursula Brangwen and 'The Essential Criticism': The Female Corrective in *Women in Love*. *Studies in the Novel*. Fall85, Vol. 17 Issue 3. Retrieved 7 January, 2010 from Humanities International Complete.
4. Baldick, C. *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford University Press, 2008. Retrieved 19 May 2010 from *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. Siauliai County Povilas Visinskis Public. <<http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t56.e1032>>
5. Beall E.A. & Sternberg J.R. *The Psychology of Gender*. London & New York: Guilford Press, 1993.
6. Becket, F. *The Complete Guide to D. H. Lawrence*. Routledge: London & New York, 2002.
7. Beynon, R. *D. H. Lawrence: The Rainbow, Women in Love*. Cox & Wyman Ltd., 1997.
8. Black, M. *D. H. Lawrence, the Early Fiction: a Commentary*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1986.
9. Carpenter, E. *Iolaus: An Anthology of Friendship*. Forgotten books, 2007.
10. Cole, S. *Modernism, Male Friendship, and the Great War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
11. Cook, J. *The Book of Positive Quotations*. Minneapolis: Fairview Press, 2007.
12. Cuddon, J. A. *The Penguin dictionary of literary terms and literary theory*. London: Penguin Books, 1999.
13. Drabble, M. *The Oxford Companion to English literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
14. Dowling, C. W. *The Senses of the Text: Intensional Semantics and Literary Theory*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.
15. Ellis, D. *D. H. Lawrence's Women in Love – a casebook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
16. Ellis, D. *Introduction: D.H Lawrence. Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Complete and unabridged. Ware: Wordsworth Editions, 2007.
17. Ellis, H. *Studies in Psychology of Sex*, Vol. 6, Part B, Part 2. BiblioBazaar, 2008

18. Epstein, J. *Friendship: An Expose*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2006.
19. LaChapelle, D. D. H. *Lawrence – Future Primitive*. University of North Texas Press, 1996.
20. Lackey, M. D. H. *Lawrence’s Women in Love: A Tale of the Modernist Psyche, the Continental „Concept“, and the Aesthetic Experience*. *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. 2006, Vol. 20 Issue 4. Retrieved 7 January, 2010 from Humanities International Complete.
21. Marcus, L. & Nicholls P. *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
22. Migliaccio, T. *Men’s Friendships: Performances of Masculinity*. *Journal of Men’s Studies*. 2009, Vol. 17 Issue 3. Retrieved 17 February, 2010 from Humanities International Complete.
23. Milne, I. M. *Literary Movements for Students*. London: Gale, Cengage learning, 2009.
24. Niven, A. D. H. *Lawrence: the Novels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
25. Pahl R. *On Friendship*. Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
26. Pangle, L. *Aristotle and the Philosophy of Friendship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
27. Poplawski, P. D. H. *Lawrence: a Reference Companion*. Greenwood Press: Westport, 1996.
28. Preston, P. & Hoare P. D. H. *Lawrence in the Modern World*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1989.
29. Sagar, M. K. *The art of D. H. Lawrence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
30. Samalavičius, A. L. D. H. Lawrence. In *Pokalbiai apie anglų rašytojus* (ed. A. Petraitytė). Vilnius: Pradai, 1999. P. 289-316.
31. Scudder R. J. & Bishop H. A. *Beyond Friendship and Eros: Unrecognized Relationships between Men and Women*. State University of New York, 2001.
32. *The Hutchinson Encyclopaedia of Literature*. Oxon: Helicon Publishing, 2006.
33. Tilghman, C. *Unruly Desire, Domestic Authority, and Odd Coupling in D. H. Lawrence’s Women in Love*. *Women’s Studies*, 2008, Vol. 37 Issue 2. Retrieved 7 January, 2010 from Humanities International Complete.
34. Thoreau, H. D. *Friendship*. Adamant Media Corporation, 2005.
35. Wallae, J. *Introduction: D.H Lawrence. Women in Love. Complete and unabridged*. Ware: Wordsworth Editions, 1999.

ANNOTATION

Aiva Tamošaitienė, *The Semantics of Friendship in David Herbert Lawrence’s Novel “Women in Love”*.

Bachelor Thesis, research adviser Assist. Monika Gruslytė, Šiauliai University, Department of History and Theory of Literature, 2010, 40p.

ANOTACIJA

Aiva Tamošaitienė, *Draugystės semantika Davido Herberto Lawrence'o romane „Mylinčios moterys“*.

Bakalauro darbas, vadovė asist. Monika Gruslytė, Šiaulių universitetas, Literatūros istorijos ir teorijos katedra, 2010, 40p.