UNIVERSITY OF PARDUBICE
FACULTY OF ARTS AND PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND AMERICAN STUDIES

Forbidden Sexuality in the Early Twentieth Century Literature: E.M.Forster, D.H.Lawrence and Forrest Reid

Thesis

Author: Dita Kelbelová
Supervisor: Michael M. Kaylor, M.A., Ph.D.

2006

UNIVERZITA PARDUBICE
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
KATEDRA ANGLISTIKY A AMERIKANISTIKY

Zakázaná sexualita v literatuře počátku dvacátého století: E.M.Forster, D.H.Lawrence a Forrest Reid

Diplomová práce

Autor: Dita Kelbelová
Vedoucí: Michael M. Kaylor, M.A., Ph.D.

2006

Prohlašuji:

Tuto práci jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplívající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., autorský zákon, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Souhlasím s prezenčním zpřístupněním své práce v Univerzitní knihovně Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 28.06.2006

Dita Kelbelová

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Mr. Michael M. Kaylor M.A., Ph.D., who provided me with valuable assistance and constructive help and criticism, as well as some essential material on the topic.

Special thanks to Josef Hynek, my family and friends for their continued encouragement and support.

Abstract

The four works analysed in the paper have one thing in common: they have all been stigmatised, in one way or another, by prejudices of the society they were created in. The aim of this paper is to trace the influences that shaped the works and their further history before they could have been or after they had been published. The paper primarily centres around the British novelist E.M. Forster.

In the first chapter, social climate of the first half of the twentieth century is analysed, with regard to the issue of same-sex relationships and the ways homosexuality was dealt with in fiction. The following chapter concerns Forster's posthumously published homoerotic novel *Maurice*, and draws analogies to *Lady Chatterley's Lover* by D.H. Lawrence, both in the main themes and the obstacles that hindered their publication. Another way of treating a tabooed topic is presented by two short stories: "The Story of a Panic" by E.M. Forster and "Pan's Pupil" by Forrest Reid. Unlike the two novels, the short stories speak in allusions which allowed for their uncensored publication.

Finally, the outcomes of the analyses provide a supportive argument for the decision of many gay authors of the period, such as Forster and Reid, to remain silent about their sexual orientation and outwardly accept the norm of the time.

Souhrn

Všechna čtyři díla, rozebíraná v této práci, mají jeden společný znak: všechna byla nějakým způsobem poznamenána předsudky vládnoucími ve společnosti, ve které vznikla. Cílem této diplomové práce je prozkoumat vlivy, které díla ovlivnily, a zmapovat okolnosti, které zkomplikovaly jejich vydání. Práce se věnuje zejména dílu britského spisovatele E.M. Forstera.

První kapitola se soustředí na společenské klima západní Evropy v první polovině dvacátého století, s přihlédnutím na problematiku homosexuálních vztahů a homosexuality v soudobé literatuře. Následují kapitola rozebírá Forsterův posmrtně vydaný román *Maurice* a porovnává ho s románem *Milenec Lady Chatterleyové* od D.H. Lawrence. Hlavním tématem rozboru jsou překrývající se témata obou románů a překážky, které bránily jejich vydání. Povídky „The Story of a Panic" od E.M. Forstera, a „Pan's Pupil" od Forresta Reida nabízejí jiný pohled na tabuizované téma: homosexualita je v nich zmiňována jen nepřímo a v narážkách. Jedině díky tomuto přístupu mohla obě díla být vydána v době svého vzniku.

Závěry vyvozené z těchto rozborů pak slouží jako podpůrný argument pro rozhodnutí mnoha homosexuálních autorů popisované éry, jako byli E.M. Forster a Forrest Reid, nepřiznat se veřejně ke své sexuální orientaci a navenek se přizpůsobit normě dané dobou.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

"If I had to choose between betraying my country and betraying my friend I hope I should have the guts to betray my country" (Forster, "What I Believe", webpage). Thus runs one of the most famous lines by E.M. Forster, letting the reader know what exactly his relationship to friendship was. About this issue, Forster's biographer P.N. Furbank notes that friendship was "the central occupation of his [Forster's] life" (II 295). Forster was never too tired of meeting new people and of getting to know them; as Furbank claims, Forster greatly feared loss of affection for human relationships (II 282).

Thanks to his vigour in this field, he also acquired many acquaintances among artists and fellow writers. Thus he blended one passion with another – literary criticism. It is especially from his letters that we can learn how he approached other writers — commenting on their works, discussing his own writings, and exchanging ideas about writing and literature in general. In this way, he got to know people who were gradually to become his close friends, such as T.E. Lawrence, Forrest Reid, D.H. Lawrence, and Siegfried Sassoon.

Some of Forster's friends were also let into the author's lifelong secret: his sexual orientation. It is necessary to add, however, that most of them were also homosexuals, as all of the writers already mentioned. His homosexuality remained concealed from the public (and even his mother) until after his death in 1970, which was when his homoerotic writings were published. This fact may seem incredible, considering how famous Forster was, especially in his later years, and it shows how loyal and/or cautious he and his friends were in a time of severe prosecution of

homosexuals, particularly stigmatized after the Oscar Wilde trials. There were many other homosexuals among Forster's friends, and, though some of them were less secretive about their orientation, it was unthinkable for them to express their attitude towards same-sex love openly. Therefore, they usually managed this by the private circulation of their writings among small groups of friends. This was true for Forster as well; his selection over whom he introduced into the most private part of his life was rather strict. Thus, the only audience, as well as source of feedback and criticism for his unpublishable writings, was formed by his friends — artists and Bohemians often sharing the same experience.

As stated earlier, Forster was among those who decided not to "come out", taking into consideration the consequences of such an act. He was well aware not only of Wilde's fate but also of the recent development (or better to say, stagnation) of legislation in this sphere; and, from time to time, he was warned by a new and sensational homosexual-conduct witch trial taking down not only the defendant but also his friends and family (Martland 11). He was reproached for such a decision, both during his life and after his death, blamed for not using his authority to speak out in favour of gay rights and law reform. Andrew Hodges and David Hutter do not hesitate to call Forster the "Closet Queen of the Century" (*With Downcast Gays*, webpage). However, they are bold enough to state this as members of the post-Wolfenden[1] generation.

[1] Wolfenden Report: a 1957 British government study officially entitled the *Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution* [...] [which] recommended that homosexual behavior between consenting adults in private no longer be criminalized in England (Summers, webpage). The report was commissioned in 1954, and was carried out by a committee of seventeen people. As it turned out, "the committee condemned homosexuality as immoral and destructive to individuals, but

In the atmosphere which tabooed open treatment of same-sex themes, it was quite understandable that the artists influenced one another, working similar ideas in their own way. Forster was not an exception. It is one of the main aims of this paper to track the mutual influences of Forster and some of his close friends on each other's works, concentrating on writings with a homoerotic content or works which, though published, were scandalous at the time of their origination. The first pair of works to be analyzed are "The Story of a Panic" by Forster and "Pan's Pupil" by Forrest Reid, two short stories published at the beginning of their authors' careers. The second comparison is carried out between Forster's posthumously published *Maurice* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* by D.H. Lawrence, in Britain first published unexpurgated thirty years after the author's death. If we take into consideration that the short stories were published in the first decade of the twentieth century, it is evident that they are not explicit about the issue of homosexuality; on the other hand, the novels dealt with sexuality too openly either to have been published during the author's lifetime or to have been published without problems and accusations of obscenity. Analysis of different approaches to censored topics is another objective of the paper. The outcome of the analyses should serve as a supportive argument to the decision of E.M. Forster and many of his contemporaries to remain silent about their sexual orientation.

A part of the first chapter is devoted to the issue of homosexuality as perceived in the first part of the twentieth century, to the way contemporaneous

---

concluded that outlawing homosexuality impinged on civil liberties and that private morality or immorality should not be 'the law's business'" (ibid).

intelligentsia put up with the impossibility to speak up freely or even to accept homosexuals for what they really were — not perverts or mentally ill people locked in madhouses and miles away from every-day life. This was the picture created by pseudo-scientific studies carried out at the end of the nineteenth century, studies which gained immense popularity thanks to their fantastic and seemingly groundbreaking revelations. Serious studies, based on statistics and thousands of interviews, were far more boring for the general public; they were also far more threatening, for they showed that homosexuals actually are commonplace people living next door — politicians, clerks or shop-keepers unrecognisable by hideous looks and repulsive behaviour.

For a more thorough understanding of the mutual influences of the stated works and treatment of tabooed topics, literary analysis is used in the paper, as is investigation into the social background of the authors and the common restraints that shaped their writings.

2. The Pink Triangle: Same-sex Love in the First Half of the Twentieth Century

"I'm an unspeakable of the Oscar Wilde sort" (*Maurice* 139), exclaims the eponymous hero helplessly, in a talk to Dr. Barry who is incapable of deciphering the young man's hints at what his problem is. Uttered in a moment of resignation, the assertion shows just how openly one could talk about being homosexual in the first decade of the twentieth century. Times have changed, true. However, Forster's observation is not completely out-of-date. Even in 1984, when homosexuality was no longer criminalised in a majority of countries, Gayle S. Rubin commented that "sexual speech is forced into reticence, euphemism, and indirection" ("Thinking Sex", *Reader* 19).

This chapter will consider the Western concept of homosexual identity, a concept which started to emerge in eighteenth-century *urban* Britain (Johnson, "Homosexuality", webpage). For the very first time, same-sex relationships were undisputably labeled as "characteristic of a particular group or subset of persons" (Mondimore 4). As John D'Emilio suggests:

> Gay men and lesbians have not always existed. Instead, they are a product of history, and have come to existence in a specific historical era. Their emergence is associated with the relations of capitalism – more specifically, its free labor system. ("Capitalism & Gay Identity", *Reader* 468)[1]

[1] This approach is based on the *constructionist* theory which claims that "sexual roles and behaviors arise out of a culture's religious, moral, and ethical beliefs, its legal traditions, politics, aesthetics, whatever scientific or traditional views of biology and psychology it may have, even factors like geography or climate" (Mondimore 19). Opposed to this view is *essentialist* approach, rather suggesting that "there is an innate quality in individuals, stable and

Analogically then, the term homosexual was young at the beginning of the twentieth century; it was used for the first time in Germany in 1869[1]. However, long before that, gay communities existed in large cities, so that the term itself was not brought up by the community itself but coincided with the rise of psychoanalysis and research into sexual behaviour. Substantial questions followed, such as: Is homosexuality inborn or dependent on the social environment? Is it a deviation and a mental illness? Can it be cured?

British laws remained considerably untouched by this psychoanalytic upheaval; and, throughout the first half of the twentieth century, it held homosexual relationships to be criminal. Until the 1960s[2], no radical changes were implemented in the legislation which was formed in the Middle Ages, based on a particular Christian interpretation of the teachings of the Stoics and complemented with suitable Bible citations. The Bible also provided the term "sodomy" used for any unnatural sexual act, including same-sex intercourse and sex with animals (Mondimore 22). Though gradually "sodomy" ceased to be punished by death, severe sentences of years of hard labour were still common at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century.

In Germany, the part of the law criminalising homosexuality was called Paragraph 175. In the 1930s, when

---

unchanging over their lifetime, which drives their erotic life irresistibly toward their own sex" (Mondimore 20).

[1] Used in a political pamphlet by Karl Maria Kertbeny intended to protest the inclusion of Prussian sodomy statutes in the constitution of a unified German state. The term, as contemporary scholars have indicated, was a clumsy neologism combining elements of both Latin and Greek, as did other nineteenth-century European medical nomenclature. It appeared for the first time in English in 1892 (Johnson, "Homosexuality", webpage).

[2] Homosexuality was legalised in Britain in 1967.

the rest of Europe toiled toward the legalisation of homosexual acts in private, German law intruded deeper into one's privacy by extending the paragraph to cover also "kissing, hugging, or even homosexual fantasies" (Gianoulis, webpage), emphasizing the danger posed by the effeminate men who were weakening the strength of the chosen race. The Nazi theory behind this fear was the following:

> Tracing the origins of the Third Reich back to the ancient Romans, Nazi historians promulgated the idea that the Romans encouraged homosexuality in the Greeks in order to conquer them. The theory blamed the decline of the Roman Empire on the 'spread' of homosexuality. (Mondimore 215)

As it was impossible to prove one's orientation, denouncements had to suffice, and revealed gay men were labeled with a pink triangle in a similar manner as the Jews or other minorities. Also comparable was their fate in concentration camps during World War II[1]. However, post-war compensation was far from similar. Mondimore claims that "the persecution of homosexuals as part of that truth [about Holocaust] was largely ignored. [...] Persons imprisoned by the Nazis for homosexuality were not entitled to the reparation payments other victims received" (Mondimore 217). Western society was not willing to discuss tabooed topic, even in such a case, giving its silent consent to what had happened.

The fact that this omission was not mere unfortunate mistake proved not ten years later in the United States — a country which Petr Třešňák ironically refers to as the

[1] Rictor Norton even states that the homosexual prisoners were among the groups treated worst in the camps, and quotes one of survivors: "The inmates with the pink triangles never lived long, they were exterminated by the SS with systematic swiftness" ("One day they were simply gone", webpage).

nation that "learned most from the past mistakes" ("Holocaust", Respekt 14/2006, my transl.). During the post-war period, alarming analogies to the Nazi theory about the fall of the Roman Empire occurred:

> During the McCarthy period, A. Kinsey and his Institute for Sex Research were attacked for weakening the moral fiber of Americans and rendering them more vulnerable to communist influence (Rubin, "Thinking Sex", *Reader* 7-8).

Alfred C. Kinsey looked into the diversity of human sexual behaviour. His research, among other things, highlighted the fact that a vast number of Americans had same-sex sexual experiences. Obviously, the USA could not have afforded to be looked upon as a nation whose men are effeminate and weak. Therefore, homosexuality was used to suit political aims again.

Such distortion of facts profiting from general condemnation of same-sex relationships was present also in Britain. When D.H. Lawrence published *The Rainbow* in 1915, it was swiftly banned for its "lewd content" (Curtis 106), containing depictions – even if negative - of a homoerotic relationship. Ken Newton suggests that the topic of homosexuality in the novel was only picked as an easy target to get rid of an inconvenient book:

> "The outcry of the conservative press made much of sexual 'filth' but was probably as much animated by outrage at Lawrence's disenchantment with modernity and militarism, some critics arguing that such a book would undermine the moral health of the nation in a time of war" (Newton, webpage).

Even in lesser cases, homosexuality was similarly abused: to bring down an inconvenient person, his family and friends (a carelessly open letter or simple gossip

serving as the ultimate proof); to keep public in constant fear. As shown above, the connections drawn between sexuality and politics were often nonsensical and stitched with a very thin thread of logic.

Though writing openly and approvingly about homosexuality was almost unthinkable — for censorship, although inconsistent, was powerful (Martland 24) — novels with descriptions of or allusions to same-sex eroticism emerged in the eighteenth century, at the time the genre of the novel itself appeared. The impossibility of free speech was dealt with in several ways which proved rather time-resistant. One of the ways was seeming condemnation, first appearing in regard to John Cleland's *Fanny Hill* or *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1749) (Stanton, webpage). The acceptability of this way of treatment of such a topic was supported indirectly many years later by Lord Birkett, a British judge who commented on the obscenity trial concerning Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness*. He stated that the real reason for the book being banned was not its open depiction of lesbianism, but the simple fact that it "had not stigmatised this relationship as in any way blameworthy" (as quoted in Collecott 54). Forster himself admits that *Maurice* would have been publishable if it had had a bad ending (*Maurice* 218). However, he further states that "a happy ending was imperative" and that he "shouldn't have bothered otherwise" (ibid 236). In addition, Forster's reasons for not publishing the book were related to the topic of homosexuality in the novel in general. In a letter to Christopher Isherwood, he reveals his fear over "the effect publication would have on a working-class friend and sometime sexual partner, Bob

Buckingham, then a married policeman with a young son"[1] (Martland 137).

Another possibility – more common one - to avoid being persecuted was to write in allusions, ambiguously and indirectly, but suggestively enough for the target audience. This is also the case of the two short stories discussed in this paper – "The Story of a Panic" and "Pan's Pupil". To perfection was this attitude brought by the phenomenon known as Camp, in its substance with difficulty describable style, marked by Susan Sontag for its "love of the exaggerated, the 'off,' of things-being-what-they-are-not" (webpage). Significantly, the work of the time's greatest representative of High Camp Ronald Firbank, was published between 1905 and 1926 without any problems, dismissed by many critics as unimportant ("Ronald Firbank", webpage). This was not an uncommon occurrence: the well hidden meanings caused seeming incompleteness of the works, which were judged correspondingly as inferior - such was the price for the possibility of publishing fiction that concerned tabooed topics. This was also the case of the work of John Addington Symonds[2]. Rictor Norton notes:

> In order to publish, Symonds developed a set of code words to point to his secret subject [...]: "unutterable things," "valley of vain desire," "the impossible," "Chimaera," "Maya" are the phrases that recur throughout the sonnet sequences in *New and Old* (1880), *Animi Figura* (1882), *Fragilia Labilia* (1884),

[1] The remark "and sometime sexual partner" is in contradiction to P.N. Furbank's account of Forster's and Buckingham's relationship. He reports that it was not until Forster suffered his first stroke in his eighties and thought he might die that he revealed his homosexuality and his feelings for Buckingham to him and his wife, taking them both aback (Furbank II, 319-320). Even after this event, there is no mention about their relationship being physical.

[2] J.A. Symonds (1840-1893), another influential figure in Forster's life, "a pioneer in the field of gay rights; he was the first modern historian of (male) homosexuality, and the first advocate of gay liberation in Britain" (Norton, *The John Addington Symonds* webpage).

> and *Vagabunduli Libellus* (1884). He wished to stake his reputation as a poet upon these volumes, but he dared not provide the key to unlock their meaning. Each volume was received by the critics with varying degrees of indifference, ridicule, or abhorrence. ("The Life of John Addington Symonds", webpage)

After E.M. Forster's death in 1970, when his sexual orientation became publicly known, all his actions were re-examined in the new perspective, all his novels were re-read with the prospect of revealing latent homosexuality in all the writings published during his life. Surprisingly, not all voices on the part of gays acknowledged the new fact with approval. It was not only Hodges and Hutter mentioned in the introduction, who blamed Forster for treason on gay community: the writer and journalist Angus Wilson, who made several interviews with Forster, saw "lack of moral courage" in Forster's decision (as quoted in Martland 10). However, the attack of Hodges and Hutter was one of the fiercest. They call Forster a traitor, and claim that by remaining silent about his homosexuality, he failed in the role of "a moralist and social commentator" (webpage). Further, they conclude that "it was his reputation that he guarded and gay people whom he betrayed" (ibid). They state that in such a time as the 1950s, when the recommendations of the Wolfenden Report were being raised to debate and brushed off again and again, homosexuality was not a private thing, let alone in case of someone so famous and influential as Forster (ibid). Strangely, in 1970s, the two authors of the pamphlet return to certain aspects of the Victorian morals, which did not distinguish between one's private doings and public duty (Stansky 126). Their attack continues:

> So readily does the gay community accept that homosexuality is a secret and individual matter that Forster took it for granted that his privileged status as the Grand Old (heterosexual) Man of English Letters would never be threatened by the public revelation of his homosexuality by any of those gay people who confidentially knew of it. (webpage)

If we consider that most of Forster's friends who knew about his homosexuality were gays themselves, their unuttered statement testifies much more accurately about the potential consequences of "coming out" in the discussed period than an after-battle shout of the two activists. Forster, in return, remained silent about the fact that many of his friends were homosexual. Even when Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson died and Forster was writing his biography, he revered Dickinson's privacy and completely ommitted the fact that Dickonson was a gay (Furbank II 176). In a sense, he in fact was made to choose, and remained loyal to his friends.

In further reading of *With Downcast Gays*, one finds out that Hodges and Hutter either assumed that Forster, as a respected figure, would have enjoyed some special kind of immunity, or they were willing to sacrifice him for the greater good of the gay community: they were well aware of the fact that the inter-war years "still lay within the aftermath of the Wilde trials: the homosexual dark ages when gay people were no longer ignored, but actively persecuted" (Hodges, webpage), and admit "cring[ing] before the gloating reports of the homosexual witch-hunts that were a feature of life into the early sixties" (ibid).

Arthur Martland opposes the assertion that Forster said nothing about homosexual law reform in public, pointing out his article called "Society and the Homosexual: A magistrate's figures", which was published in

The New Statesman and Nation in 1953 (13). Forster did comment on the issue as any other, holding to his beliefs, but remaining outwardly uninvolved personally. His role of an unbiased "social commentator" is of appreciable importance, and can be supported also by his participation in the obscenity case concerning *The Well of Loneliness* in 1928. When Forster learned about the case, he wrote a petition, and persuaded other writers and intellectuals to sign it. Although he though the novel "ill-written and pretentious" (Furbank II 153), he fought for the book being published, for the simple fact that, according to him, the book was "suppressed not for indecency, but simply because of its theme" (ibid 154). In an article he wrote together with Virginia Woolf, Forster continues:

> The subject-matter of the book exists as a fact among the many other facts of life. [...] It forms, of course, an extremely small fraction of the sum-total of human emotions [...]; nevertheless, it exists, and novelists have now been forbidden to mention it [...] May they mention it incidentally? Although it is forbidden as a main theme, may it be alluded to [...]? [...] And is it the only taboo, or are there others? What of the other subjects known to be more or less unpopular in Whitehall, such as birth-control, suicide, pacifism? May we mention these? We await our instructions! (as quoted in Furbank II 154)

Furbank adds that "from now on he [Forster] would be heard on the censorship issue, and, by extension from this, on civil liberties generally" (II 155). Forster was not silent; only, he did not sustain his ideas by publicly claiming to be a part of the minority he defended. It is questionable to what extent such a step would really be supportive to the cause. More likely, it would silence a voice which was gentle yet no less vigorous – a combination that granted it would be listened to.

3. "Only Connect...": The Optimistic Obscenity in *Maurice* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*

When published in 1971, *Maurice* instantly caught the attention of the critics as a homosexualised version of D.H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. The debate over whether or not the two authors influenced one another is still not settled. However, as more and more material by and about Forster appeared, it seems probable that his novel was great inspiration for D.H. Lawrence, not vice versa.

Forster met Lawrence for the first time in 1915 and they struck up immediate friendship. As Furbank observes, Forster admired how human and personal (II 5) this "sandy haired passionate Nibelung" was (as quoted in Furbank II 5), thus naming two qualities the novelist appreciated most. Soon after this event they started to exchange their works and saw much of each other discussing them. During one such visit, a quarrel between the two arose, Lawrence vehemently talking about the need of revolution and attacking Forster for the way of life he leads. The argument was overcome only after heavy correspondence, and intervention of Frieda Lawrence and Lady Ottoline Morrell. Nevertheless, the quarrel was a blow to their friendship, and, as Furbank notes, by this time "their relationship developed as far as it ever would" (II 12). He further records that "Forster thought Lawrence too un-self-aware" and that he "ignored his own homosexual side" (ibid).

Considering all that had happened, and Forster's observation, would Forster be still open enough to Lawrence to have him read *Maurice*? It is generally known that the authors held each other in great esteem, continuing to correspond and criticise each other's works. Forster always

spoke in favour of Lawrence, and, after his death, he wrote that it is "to say straight out that he was the greatest imaginative novelist of our generation" (Furbank II 163). It is necessary to add here, however, that Forster was very proficient in dividing his private life from the public one, which included literary criticism. Further, it can be argued that the fact that they remained on close terms as writers, does not mean Forster let Lawrence read *Maurice*. A similar situation occurred when Leonard Woolf suggested to him to have his wife Virginia read the novel. As Furbank notes, Forster "found an excuse for refusing" (II 19); though it cannot be judged with certainty to what degree Forster's misogyny worked here.

For one thing, the argument with Lawrence made him more open in "expressing feeling" and letting his close friends[1] read the manuscript of his discrediting book (ibid 13). The circle of Forster's friends let into the secret grew over the time, still, only Claude J. Summers mentions with certainty that "D.H. Lawrence was among many of Forster's friends and associates to read the novel in typescript" ("E.M. Forster", webpage). Dixie King in her essay "The Influence of Forster's *Maurice* on *Lady Chatterley's Lover*" is not that assured but similarly claims that "a little digging [...] provides external and internal evidence to suggest that Lawrence both read *Maurice* and drew upon it heavily as the source for *Lady Chatterley's Lover*" (*Contemporary Literature* 69). What she suggests is that Forster gave *Maurice* to Lawrence during one of the first visits, still in turmoil over just finished and highly personal book and sensing sympathy in a person he esteemed (70).

[1] Namely they were Edward Dent, Forrest Reid and Lytton Strachey. All of them were homosexuals.

Arthur Martland does not deny all the similarities that have been drawn between the two novels, nevertheless, he seems more inclined to a notion that King dismisses in her article:

> It might be argued that some of these intersections in setting, plot, characterization, and the dynamics of character relationships have more to do with the cultural and literary milieu Forster and Lawrence shared than with any link established or suggested between the two writers. (80)

Forster himself touches on the topic slightly in his Terminal Note to *Maurice*:

> He [Alec Scudder] is senior in date to the prickly gamekeepers of D.H.Lawrence, and had not the advantage of their disquisitions, nor [...] would they have had more in common than a mug of beer. (219)

It seems that even among such restricted audience as *Maurice* had, the analogy between *Maurice* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* had been voiced. By this assertion, Forster states the obvious fact that his character, which originated in 1914, could not have possibly been inspired by Lawrence's Mellors, as *Lady Chatterley's Lover* was written between 1926 and 1928, in the same year published privately in Italy. He also tells us that his intentions with the character of the gamekeeper were completely different from those of Lawrence. Nevertheless, he seems to take for granted that Lawrence was acquainted with his novel and therefore feels obliged to speak about the issue. The most peculiar thing about Forster's comment is the pluralisation of the 'gamekeeper'. It is true that Mellors is not the only Lawrence's gamekeeper — in *The White Peacock*, he introduces a character of Annable, a "talkative

gamekeeper" (Moore 294). John Middleton Murry[1] observed that it is this character that Mellors is primarily based upon. Moore brings this genealogy even further and, marveling about Lawrence choosing a profession of gamekeeper for the two figures, states that "Annable seems to be a reincarnation of Tregarva, the philosophical gamekeeper in Charles Kingsley's *Yeast* [1851]" (ibid). In relation to Forster, the year of publication of *The White Peacock* is noteworthy. The book came out in 1911, which is two years before Forster even commenced work on his novel. Research of one of Forster's biographers, Nicola Beauman, suggests that this is not just Forster's misdating. Based on the original draft of the Terminal note, she dates the novel to 1910 (as quoted in Martland 152) — not 1913 as stated in the initial sentence of the published Terminal note — which would fully explain Forster's note on Lawrence's "gamekeepers". The year 1913 seems more plausible, however, when we consider Forster's intense work on *Howards End* during the summer and autumn of 1910, as well as his diary entry written a year later, about his "weariness of the only subject that I both can and may treat — the love of men for women and vice versa" (as quoted in Furbank I 199). If Beauman is correct, this note would oddly come in midst of Forster's work on *Maurice*.

Whether or not Lawrence was acquainted with Forster's novel, their literary milieu is undoubtedly similar. One of the definite influences on both of their works is the roaring voice of the self-educated "savage", Walt Whitman (1819-1892). The "need of comrades" (Whitman 93) in his poem "In Paths Untrodden" clearly echoes in Maurice's dream about a "friend" for whom he could die, with whom the

[1] John Middleton Murry (1889 – 1957) – a literary critic and editor of *Athenaeum*, a weekly literary review founded in 1822.

"world would count nothing" (*Maurice* 26). As Martland proposes, it is the "athletic love" (Whitman 93) with all of its physicality that Maurice seeks (142). Ultimately, he and Alec turn away from "all the standards hitherto publish'd, from the pleasures, profits, conformities" to find refuge in the greenwood and "the life that does not exhibit itself, yet contains all the rest" (Whitman 93).

In his *Studies in Classic American Literature*, Lawrence comments on Whitman's celebration of "manly love", calling it the "extremest love, [...] which alone can create a new era of life" (414). He does not give up on marriage between men and women, but rather sees love between comrades as an extension of this, "the final progression from marriage" and "the last seedless flower of pure beauty, beyond purpose" (ibid); and, as such, it should be "utterly sacred, since it has no ulterior motive whatever, like procreation" (415). In these statements, he does not simply analyse a literary text, his ideas merge with Whitman's, his use of Whitman's poetry allowing him to affirm something he strongly believes in. Still, it is an unanswered question among critics as to whether or not Lawrence was bisexual; however, as regards homosexuality in his works, King presents John Edge's argument that "Lawrence's betrayal of his father through his mother led to a compensatory identification with strong, male figures" (66). This is certainly true about the character of Mellors.

Further, Lawrence refers to Whitman as "the one man breaking a way ahead. Whitman, the one pioneer. And only Whitman. [...] Ahead of Whitman, nothing. Ahead of all poets, pioneering into the wilderness of unopened life, Whitman" (155). In "Song of Myself", Whitman confidently states:

> Through me forbidden voices,
> Voices of sexes and lusts, voices veil'd and I remove the veil,
> Voices indecent by me clarified and transfigur'd.
>
> I do not press my fingers across my mouth,
> I keep as delicate around the bowels as around the head and heart,
> Copulation is no more rank to me than death is.
>
> I believe in the flesh and the appetites,
> Seeing, hearing, feeling, are miracles, and each part and tag of me
> is a miracle. (Whitman 44)

In a similar way, Lawrence in *Lady Chatterley* wants to "startle people out of what he called mob habit, such as prudery, and into an individual state" (Moore 291), calling for the celebration of the body, not machines and pure reason. Lady Bennerley, Clifford's aunt, remarks that "if civilization is any good, it has to help us to forget our bodies" (69). Tommy Dukes foretells the fall of civilisation and concludes that "the only bridge across the chasm will be the phallus" (ibid).

At one point, Lawrence quotes Whitman's "O Captain! My Captain!" (173), which the latter wrote after Abraham Lincoln had been assassinated. However, the author filters the initial line ironically through Clifford's feelings, letting him misquote[1] and thus completely change the meaning and mood of the original, depreciating it from an intense blend of triumph and grief, to pompousness.

Both E.M.Forster and D.H.Lawrence were also greatly influenced by Edward Carpenter (1844-1929), the advocate of simple life who "developed a strongly personalised brand of

[1] The opening line of the poem reads: "O Captain! my captain! our fearful trip is done" (Whitman 266), whereas Clifford replaces "splendid" (173) for "fearful".

Socialism" (*Cambridge University Press* webpage), a "believer in the Love of Comrades" (*Maurice* 217), and the author of several publications about homosexuality. Himself a homosexual, he bought a little farm in Millthorpe, Derbyshire and lived there with his lover George Merrill. With his naturalness, candidness as well as emphasis on instinct over rationality, together with the ideals he professed as stated earlier in the paragraph, he may also seem a possible and common model for the two gamekeepers. For Forster, one of his visits to Millthorpe indeed was the initial and most important inspiration. He gives the account of the experience in the Terminal Note:

> It must have been on my second or third visit to the shrine that the spark was kindled and he [Carpenter] and his comrade George Merrill combined to make a profound impression on me and to touch a creative spring. George Merrill also touched my backside — gently and just above the buttocks. [...] The sensation was unusual [...] It was as much psychological as physical. It seemed to go straight through the small of my back into my ideas, without involving my thoughts. If it really did this, [...] [it] would prove that at that precise moment I had conceived. (*Maurice* 217)

Forster says it was the idea of "Love of Comrades" that drew him to Carpenter then. At the time he was struggling with literary sterility and sexual frustration and was seeking help. Eventually, he "approached [Carpenter] [...] as one approaches a saviour" (ibid). In *Lady Chatterley*, we can find different traces of Carpenter's ideas. Lawrence clearly approved of Carpenter's condemnation of industrialization, and his decision to abandon his earlier upper-middle-class existence in favour of simple, almost Thoreauvian way of life. Lawrence seems much more radical than Forster when it comes to bourgeoisie. In the final

dialogue between Maurice and Clive, Forster suggests possible co-existence of the middle and lower classes. This attitude is more visible in his *Howards End* (1910) with its motto "Only connect...." (1). Martland observes that "Forster proposed that the various social classes unite and progress together towards the future as a wholly new society, envisaged along the lines proposed by Carpenter" (154). Lawrence's Sir Clifford, on the other hand, represents bourgeoisie as a sort of a dead-end, and as such Connie leaves him in the musty, lifeless manor surrounded by the forest that symbolises the "old England" (40) to the landlord.

Both writers comment on the gap between the classes in the discussed novels, primarily using the main characters for the purpose. Sir Clifford Chatterley as well as Clive Durham represent upper-middle class and even aristocracy with all its traits, the two gamekeepers are their counterparts from the working class. Maurice Hall and Constance Chatterley, though also middle class, seem to stand in between. The interconnection of the characters is nevertheless dealt differently. As described in the previous paragraph, Clifford is "not in touch" (*Lady Chatterley* 15), and "altogether rather supercilious and contemptuous of anyone not in his own class" (ibid). Further, though he regarded himself a "rebel [...] even against his class" (10), it is a fashionable rebellion fully accepted by the class. Clive Durham brings the rebellion further, though his relationship with Maurice is only platonic and he "become[s] normal" (*Maurice* 104) eventually. It is he who sets off Maurice's liberation. Durham exceeds the frame of manly friendship supported in the environment of the college — the "communion of souls" (Dowling 65) in "a world where perfervid friendships

between undergraduates [...] were commonplace if not quite unremarkable" (ibid 86). When Clive sits at Maurice's feet and the latter strokes his hair, it is only said that "in the world of their friends this attracted no notice" (46). However, during a translation class, the students are advised to omit the reference to "the unspeakable vice of Greeks" (50). It is Durham who suggests Maurice should read Plato's *Symposium*, yet ultimately proposes not to fulfill the ideal of Platonic love with both its spiritual and physical aspect, and wants to keep the relationship "platonic" in the modern sense of the word, explaining much later to Maurice that "the sole excuse for any relationship between men is that it remain purely platonic" (213).

Once he enters marriage, we can see that his attitude towards sex is similar to that of Clifford, for whom, even before he was wounded and paralyzed, "the sex part did not mean much" (*Lady Chatterley* 12), being "merely an accident" and "not really necessary" (ibid). After the wedding night which proves a disaster due to Anne's ignorance and despite Clive's consideration, the two settle in a routine where sex is shut away from the rest of their lives, voiceless and invisible, ignorant to "the reproductive and digestive functions" (*Maurice* 144). Clive's conclusion on the sex matter is as sterile as Clifford's:

> He had never itched to call a spade a spade, and though he valued the body the actual deed of sex seemed to him unimaginative, and best veiled in night. Between men it is inexcusable, between man and woman it may be practised since nature and society approve, but never discussed nor vaunted. (ibid)

When we digress from seeing the two characters as symbols for the declining ruling class, we find out that the authors treat them in rather a contradictory way as

personalities. D.H. Lawrence, though merciless to bourgeoisie, sympathises with Clifford in his condition, empathically depicting his struggle not to die inside as he seems dead externally, as well as his helplessness and dependence on the mechanical chair. This was perhaps partly because of his own health problems at the time he was writing the novel[1]. Forster, on the other hand, after having used Clive as a preparatory stage of Maurice's salvation, seems to shrink the character only to the image of the class he represents.

It is on the estates of Clifford and Clive that Connie and Maurice meet the two gamekeepers. Both of them are handsome, as Connie and Maurice duly observe, though physical appearance and masculinity are much more stressed in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. In the exposition to the relationships, the main characters are somehow scared by a potential change, however unsatisfactory their present lives are. When seeing Scudder for the first time, hugging two maids, Maurice's sensation caused by the sight is altogether unpleasant — the scene is a mocking display of his inadequacies. He feels envious, "cruel and respectable" (*Maurice* 145). To Connie, Mellors' first emergence seems even like "the sudden rush of a threat out of nowhere" (*Lady Chatterley* 43).

The fact that both writers use a working-class character to liberate Connie and Maurice from the prejudices and constraints of their own class is not incomprehensible. The characters present intuition and openness in sexuality as opposed to the over-intellectualized and convention-bound bourgeoisie. For

[1] In 1925, he came down with malaria and tuberculosis on his visit to Mexico. After a severe illness, he recovered, but never completely and was limited by the condition to the end of his life.

Forster, the grounding for such choice may be found both in his readings and his experience. Edward Carpenter notes in *The Intermediate Sex* that

> perhaps the true Democracy rests, more firmly than anywhere else, on a sentiment which easily passes the bounds of class and caste, and unites in the closest affection the most estranged ranks of society. It is noticeable how often Uranians of good position and breeding are drawn to rougher types, as of manual workers, and frequently very permanent alliances grow up in this way, which although not publicly acknowledged have a decided influence on social institutions, customs and political tendencies — and which would have a good deal more influence could they be given a little more scope and recognition. (webpage)

Though at the time of his work on *Maurice*, these notions were more of an ideal for Forster, he was to experience such "sentiment" on his own, as would some of his friends. Forster was well aware of the inclinations imposed on people by their class, which made the gap more obvious in every-day life. In a letter to his friend, J.R. Ackerley, he advised him on such a matter when Ackerley got into trouble in his relationship with his working-class lover:

> The standards which are so obvious to you are very remote to him and his class [...] And by standards I mean not only conventional methods of feeling. He can be quite deeply attached to you and yet suddenly find the journey up too much of a fag. It is difficult for us with our middle class training to realize this, but it is so. (as quoted in Furbank II 162)

Having written this in 1930, he must have had a significantly different set of experiences than in 1913, affected also by the slow social change in this field. Despite his reservations and the numerous changes in the novel, however, he left the ending unchanged, thus giving

credit to the Carpenterian utopia. His dedication "To a Happier Year" clearly refers to the day when the "alliances" would indeed "be given a little more scope and recognition" (Carpenter, webpage).

Although D.H. Lawrence's alterations to *Lady Chatterley* were carried out in a much shorter period (he finished the book within two years), they are far more radical. In an Introduction to the 1993 Groove Press publication of the novel, Mark Schorer describes the change of tone in the three versions Lawrence wrote:

> The first *Lady Chatterley* is [...] dark, and [...] written under the pall of recently experienced English gloom; the second [...] leaps out of the dreariness of the first, with a strong infusion of lyric feeling and natural vitality [...]; [in] the third [...] there is a sharpening of intellectual issues and a deepening of pathos. (25)

In the outlined development, we can see that Lawrence gradually came nearer to the mood and tone of *Maurice*. The change can be well demonstrated on the character of the gamekeeper. In the first version, Mellors (called Parkin here) is described as follows: "The skirts of his big coat flapped [...] He was once more going to take the world by the nose. [...] He strode with a grand sort of stride, baggy coat-tails flapping. The son of man goes forth to war!" (as quoted in Schorer 27). As regards class, Lawrence places him much further from Connie than in the final version. Parkin is not willing to give up his Communist ideals (ibid) and the ending, though open, leaves almost no space for hope for the two. Mellors' description in the final *Lady Chatterley* is considerably altered: "A man with a gun strode swiftly, softly out after the dog. [...] He was a man in dark green velveteens and gaiters...

the old style, with a red face and red moustache and distant eyes. [...] He might almost be a gentleman" (43,44). Lawrence further bestows him not only with the manliness connected to his army past, but also with a touch of gentility and frailty as well as sensitivity and, significantly, an accent without any traces of dialect, when he pleases (44). Lawrence employs changes in Mellors' language as one of the means of demonstrating the development of the gamekeeper's relationship to Lady Chatterley in a pride-insecurity-relief scheme. At first, Mellors uses the "broad vernacular" (81) to show his distance from his masters and his unwillingness to deal with them. Later, when he becomes Lady Chatterley's lover, he uses it to remind Connie of the gap between them. Finally, he lets go, speaking dialect when making love to Constance (160). The relationship of Constance and Mellors in the final version of *Lady Chatterley* is one of two people with similar experience meeting when they have both already resigned and seek solitude. Furthermore, Mellors is presented here as a working-class man who nevertheless once was treated as an equal to a middle-class officer. Such treatment makes a more optimistic ending, closing up with "a hopeful heart" (283), more plausible.

In Alec Scudder, we see no such similarity of experience to that of Maurice; he seems a tabula rasa when he encounters Maurice. Further, Forster, in order to maintain the "illusion of life" (Lago & Furbank 26), does not reveal much of Alec's viewpoint, thus making him more remote. Consequently, the salvation in *Maurice* appears to be one-sided.

As already stated, the two eponymous heroes stand between the upper-middle and the working class. Since public school, Maurice is described as "mediocre" (25),

an archetype of an Englishman, "a middling man of the middling middle class" (Hartree, *Paragraph* 128), able-bodied yet with no capacity for intellectual talk, which he dismisses as "charming nonsense" (*Maurice* 86) while listening to Clive. Though keeping the relationship of Maurice and Alec cross-class, Forster minimises the gap between the two protagonists, realising perhaps the limitations of the "democratizing potential of men's love for men" (Norton, "Class-based Erotics", webpage). Norton argues:

> For aristocrats the key feature of such relationships may be the excitement of "slumming it" — in which "democratization" played no part. The middle-class idealization of cross-class relationships and the sentimentalizing of working-class persons goes beyond the mere fetishization of their bodies. This is a thoroughly middle-class (rather than aristocratic) ideology. (ibid)

Constance, similarly, is educated but lacks the feminist features of a modern independent woman, being rather presented as a "ruddy, country-looking girl with soft brown hair and sturdy body [...]. She [...] seemed just to have come from the native village" (6).

Moving from characters to places, the two novels are set in three basic environments: the college, the manor, and the wood, or a secret refuge in a forest. It is at college where the two eponymous heroes learn about their sexuality, however wrong or unsatisfactory the outcomes are. In both cases, sex is wrapped in an intellectual coat of endless talk. Constance and her sister Hilda, complying with the rest of the modern free young women, regard sex as something which is performed exclusively for sake of men, "a sort of a primitive reversion and a bit of an anti-climax" (*Lady Chatterley* 7) that endangers woman's freedom.

Freedom is what they crave for, but freedom in which independence equals alienation and intimacy is substituted by talk:

> Neither was ever in love with a young man unless he and she were verbally very near: that is unless they were profoundly interested, TALKING to one another. The amazing, the profound, the unbelievable thrill there was in passionately talking to some really clever young man by the hour, resuming day after day for hours (8).

Once Connie lives through real intimacy with Mellors, she does not need to use talk as a substitute: "She hated words, always coming between her and life" (87).

When Connie returns home from the college at the beginning of the First World War, she becomes a member of the Cambridge group[1], a group of young intellectuals who "gently mocked at everything, so far" (9), where she encounters Clifford Chatterley.

For Durham, on the contrary, intellectual debates are the only way he can get closer to Maurice. Still, when they do become more intimate, he is unable to get over his fear of "vex[ing] either God or Man" (*Maurice* 68) and sticks to the talk when unnecessary. Maurice, who is more affectionate in the relationship, mistakes this fear for sensibleness (91), though he does not comprehend Clive's interest in Greece: "The stories of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, of Phaedrus, of the Theban Band were well enough for those whose hearts were empty, but no substitute for life. That Clive should occasionally prefer them

[1] Lawrence seems to "gently mock" the Cambridge Apostles as well as the Bloomsbury group, whose initial members recruited from the former. The Apostles, or The Cambridge Conversazione Society, was founded in 1821 and it was an exclusive secret society, known for its open attitude towards homosexuality and opposition to Victorian beliefs (Endres, webpage). E.M. Forster was a member of both groups.

puzzled him" (99). In fact, the "stories" are the only way for Clive to "make sense of their sexual predicament" (Martland 143). Unable to interconnect the intellectual and the lived, Clive is inevitably disappointed when he finally visits Greece, and consecutively turns to the only certainties he has – England and a status in his class: "He saw only dying light and a dead land. He uttered no prayer, believed in no deity and knew that the past was devoid of meaning like present, and a refuge for cowards" (*Maurice* 104).

While the two relationships flourish in the environment of the college or the intellectual background advocating freedom of a sort, they start deteriorating once they are shut in the thick walls of the manors, Penge and Wragby Hall. The two mansions symbolise the Englishness the owners so much depend upon, as well as "stifled sexuality" (King, *Contemporary Literature* 68). As anachronisms, both manors are decaying, unaired buildings. While Penge is leaking (*Maurice* 149), Wragby Hall, described from Connie's point of view, is an antiseptic Victorian mausoleum:

> The housekeeper had served Sir Geoffrey for many years, and the dried-up, elderly, superlatively correct female... you could hardly call her a parlour-maid, or even a woman... who waited at the table, had been in the house for forty years. Even the very housemaids were no longer young. It was awful! [...] All these endless rooms that nobody used, [...] the mechanical cleanliness and the mechanical order! [...] No warmth of feeling united it organically (*Lady Chatterley* 16).

In the last part of the description, Lawrence managed to interconnect the outdated values of nineteenth-century Britain and the fear of alienation typical for

the twentieth century. A description very similar in tone can be found in "The Machine Stops" (1908), Forster's dystopian story dealing with the over-use of technology and deterioration of body and mind, which was written as a reaction to H.G. Wells' novels. In the opening of the story, one finds:

> Imagine, if you can, a small room, hexagonal in shape, like the cell of a bee. It is lighted neither by window nor by lamp, yet it is filled with a soft radiance. There are no apertures for ventilation, yet the air is fresh. There are no musical instruments, and yet, at the moment that my meditation opens, this room is throbbing with melodious sounds. An armchair is in the centre, by its side a reading-desk—that is all the furniture. And in the armchair there sits a swaddled lump of flesh—a woman, about five feet high, with a face as white as a fungus (1).

In Wragby Hall, neither ventilators nor soft lights, subduing any need of the inhabitant for contact with nature or another human being, are accessible — Clifford's substitutes are the stories he writes, stories which Connie's father regards dismissively: "As for Clifford's writing, it's smart but there's nothing in it. It won't last..." (17). Vashti, the inhabitant of the "bee cell", is lulled into indifference and obedience to the totalitarian Machine: Clifford is similarly soothed by the quasi-success of his stories into the desired state of being important and living a life that is worthwhile. For Connie, such achievements equal nothingness: "All the many busy and important little things that make up the grand sum-total of nothingness" (52).

The forest, finally, is a refuge where all the prejudices fall, a place remote both from public school and machinery, connected with "independent spirit" and "imagination" (King, *Contemporary Literature* 78). As

King notes, Clifford, lacking these two qualities, is inevitably helpless in the woods, his wheelchair going off (ibid). Similarly, Clive's side-car stops without any obvious reason among the fields during his and Maurice's day of stolen leisure (73). In the case of Clifford, Connie and Mellors have to push the wheelchair. Connie, concerned about gamekeeper's health, kisses his hand at one moment, and later reflects that "this bit of work had brought them much closer than they had been before" (180). This "sense of kinship", as Martland observes (142), is also present between Alec and Maurice during a cricket match:

> They played for sake of each other and of their fragile relationship — if one fell the other would follow. They intended no harm to the world, but so long as it attacked they must punish, they must stand wary, then hit with full strength, they must show that when two are gathered together majorities shall not triumph. And as the game proceeded it connected with the night and interpreted it. (*Maurice* 176)

King sees the boathouse in *Maurice* and the hut in *Lady Chatterley*, both hidden in the heart of the woods, as "symbols of forbidden sexuality that is affirmed" (King 78). In 1914, the "greenwood" (*Maurice* 218) was the only place of such affirmation, and the protagonists turn to it in the end, concluding that "they must live outside class, without relations or money" (208). In the Terminal note to *Maurice*, Forster admits that this is one of the reasons why the novel dates most:

> It belongs to England where it was still possible to get lost. [...] Our greenwood ended catastrophically and inevitably. Two great wars demanded and bequeathed regimentation which the public services adopted and extended, science lent her aid, and the wildness of our island [...] was stamped upon and built over and patrolled in no time. (221)

Writing his novel in 1928, D.H. Lawrence was well aware of the fact that the greenwood exists no more and the refuge the forest offers to Lady Chatterley and Mellors is only temporary. Further, through Clifford he indicates the kitsch that the image of forest and nature in general has become for modern man: a "perfect... untouched" (*Lady Chatterley* 40) place to get sentimental about but ultimately to remain out of touch with and feel unsafe in.

Another theme that intertwines through both novels is the notion of the "undeveloped heart", as Forster called it in "The Notes on the English Character" (5), the incapability to express emotions which he ascribes to the rigidity of the British public-school system's over-emphasis on the ideal of "manliness", constructed at the end of the nineteenth century, at the expense of feeling (Hartree, *Paragraph* 130). In *Lady Chatterley*, the ground of such an absence of emotion is found in industrialization, a dependence on machines, and consequent alienation. Industry is omnipresent in the novel, intruding even to the thick-walled manor of Wragby: "When the wind was that way, which was often, the house was full of the stench of this sulphurous combustion of the earth's excrements. [...] And even on the Christmas roses the smuts settled persistently, incredible, like black manna from skies of doom" (13). Again, this image highlights the tomb-like atmosphere of Wragby, the impossibility for anything organic surviving there. Lawrence develops this theme in Chapter XI during which Connie takes a motor ride through the industrial Midlands. In revulsion, Connie observes the "utter absence of the instinct for shapely beauty which every bird and beast has, the utter death of human intuitive faculty" (142). As with the other main themes of *Lady Chatterley*, Lawrence lets Connie repeat this thought

several times, thus maintaining his "preaching voice" throughout the novel.

Forster claims that the heart is merely undeveloped, not cold ("The English Character", *Abinger Harvest* 5), and further sees that "the supremacy of the middle classes is probably ending" (ibid 15) – an observation made sixteen years after he had awaken Maurice from his public-school emotional sleep. Lawrence, another eight years later, follows up Forster's musings over the future of the English character, and gloomily concludes that "the England of today [...] was producing a new race of mankind, over-conscious in the money and social and political side, on the spontaneous, intuitive side dead, but dead" (*Lady Chatterley* 143).

Lawrence does not make any prophetic judgments about industry. Nevertheless, he is sceptical about any change in the development, and clearly identifies in it — long before Van Valen — the Red Queen Principle[1]: "To keep industry alive there must be more industry, like madness" (200).

When Lawrence finished his last novel, he wrote in a letter to the painters Earl and Achsah Brewster that it is "*absolutely* improper, in words, and so really *good*, I hope, in spirit" (as quoted in Mehl,ed. xxv). As it turned out, the public reception of the novel went along exactly the same route as Lawrence's own evaluation. The "*absolutely* improper" in the novel caught the attention of censors

[1] In Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking-Glass,* the Red Queen says to Alice: "[...] it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that" (26). Professor Leigh Van Valen reworked this notion into the Red Queen Principle (1973), which states that "for an evolutionary system, continuing development is needed just in order to maintain its fitness relative to the systems it is co-evolving with" (as quoted in Heylighen, webpage). Analogously, England has to produce more just to keep up with other countries. The Principle is often applied to the armament industry.

immediately, and for the next thirty years, the novel could not have been published in Britain unexpurgated. And, it was the "spirit" that finally wan free publication for the novel. Till 1959, publication of a novel which was found "obscene" – which often covered open and approving depiction of same-sex relationships – was impossible. In this year, an amendment to the Obscene Publications Act enacted that a work found obscene may nevertheless be published if its "literary merit" is proven. *Lady Chatterley's Lover* Trial in 1960 was the test case of this law – it was carried out as the first one after the law came into force. E.M. Forster was one of the thirty five witnesses to comment on the literary merit of the novel, judging it "very high" (Furbank II 312), and he was "elated when the trial went in favour of Penguin Books" (ibid) who published the book.

Heterosexual relationship has always been approved of and, though not always in the worldly sense, encouraged, in the Western civilisation, and yet, a novel that celebrates such relationship had to wait for its uncensored publication for thirty years, till 1960. Same-sex relationship, on the other hand, was reluctantly legalised in 1967, given rather an orange light than a green one. In 1914, would an expurgated edition of *Maurice* do the trick?

4. "Private Road": The Hidden Plots in "The Story of a Panic" and "Pan's Pupil"

The two short stories to be analysed in this chapter underwent no such tumult as the two novels. E.M. Forster published his first short story, "The Story of a Panic", in the *Independent Review*[1] in 1904, and the only hitch that marked the publication was a complaint of the editor about poor punctuation (Furbank I 113). *Church Times* dismissed the story as "hopelessly foolish" (ibid) and perhaps expressed the opinion of general public. Indeed, the story is full of fantastic, inexplicable occurrences, there is a character dying for no obvious reason, and a young, highly dislikeable hero who, moreover, goes insane.

Forster himself called his early short stories "fantasies" (*The Celestial Omnibus* v) - he often confronts his bewildered characters, as well as readers, with the supernatural bursting in without warning and leaving the stage with no rational explanation. For some of the characters, bound by conventions of the English society and unwilling to admit anything that goes beyond their public-school education, such occurrence is incomprehensible to the degree of denying it through vague realistic interpretations. As Forster remarks, even readers may not accept the situation established by the author: they defy the fantastic intrusion in the otherwise believable and commonplace world and simply refuse to "pay something extra" (*Aspects of the Novel* 104).

Not for all readers was the short story mere gushing whimsy. In the circle of Forster's friends, comprising mostly intellectuals open to homosexuality if not

[1] A monthly, founded in 1903 by a group of Forster's friends from Cambridge (Furbank I 107).

straightforward homosexuals, a more susceptible reading of the Pan story was bound to be proposed. The homoerotic interpretation was voiced by Charles Sayle, "a rather squeaky Cambridge aesthete and bibliographer" (Furbank I 113). Conspiratorially, he referred to Maynard Keynes about the hidden plot of the story:

> Having... how should he put it... having had an unnatural act performed upon him by a waiter at the hotel, Eustace commits bestiality with a goat, then when he has told the waiter how nice it all has been, they try it on with each other again. (ibid)

While an average Edwardian reader would no doubt be appalled by such impropriety, Sayle was "amazed..., [...] horified... and *longing* to meet the author" (as quoted in Furbank I 114). Forster, at hearing this, was outraged. However, many years later, he admitted that Sayle was right, though the sexual aspect of the story was unintentional (ibid).

"Pan's Pupil", the first short story of a Belfast writer Forrest Reid, is similarly ambiguous, and, its jocose smokescreen of insignificance caused that it attracted even less attention when published in 1905, and was put out again only a hundred years later. Reid, also a homosexual, retained the tone throughout his work, threading a thin line between the still-publishable and the candid. Fiona Richards duly remarks that "Reid narrowly escaped being branded as a Uranian writer" (255), due to the main themes of his prose: "The boy, the garden and the encounter with pagan divinity which can occur when those two things are brought together" (James i). In broader context, the equivocality of the stories and the unconcern of the public for their potential impropriety demonstrate the overall divergences in the Edwardian era, "the freest

of times, [...] the most stifling of times" (Wittington-Egan, *Contemporary Review* 201).

The two authors got to know each other personally in 1912. P.N. Furbank gives a record of the genesis of their friendship: In 1912, Forster read one of Reid's novels, *The Bracknels*, and was so impressed that he wrote a letter to Reid. Reid was acquainted with Forster's work and answered warmly, full of praise on *The Celestial Omnibus*, a collection of short stories by Forster which also included "The Story of a Panic". Soon after that they met and remained on very close terms until Reid's death in 1947 (I 210, 211). Furbank also mentions Forster's efforts to draw the attention of critics to Reid's work (II 63), as well as financial support Forster provided for his friend (II 130).

Whether or not Reid knew Forster's Pan story in 1905 when having written "Pan's Pupil", is questionable. It is true that he went to Cambridge at the time, and therefore could have had easy access to the story, as it was published in the *Independent Review* the same year. In some sources, one can even find a direct claim that during his studies he indeed was influenced by Forster, or more precisely, "was encouraged to write by E.M. Forster" (Pierce 361). Considering the dating of the two mentioned letters, in which the authors addressed each other as "Sir", and Reid, in mild astonishment, expresses his delight over getting a letter from "the same E.M. Forster who wrote *The Celestial Omnibus*" (Furbank I 211), such information may be dismissed as unreliable. However, as this misinformation is only mentioned in materials on Reid, it can be assumed that some sort of connection, at least on Reid's part, really existed already in 1905.

"The Story of a Panic" and "Pan's Pupil" have much in common and a question of influence of one over another,

their themes and the way of their treatment, is intriguing to follow for several reasons. On one level, they demonstrate one flow in the current of the contemporary literature, both in form and the use of the supernatural. As Colmer notes, "1880-1920 mark the great period of the short story" (28), and Forster himself recalled years later that the theme he dealt with was "in the air" at the time (as quoted in Colmer 29). These facts may have served as a sort of distraction from the hidden plots of the stories, which, in this sense, introduced nothing new to the literary scene. On the contrary, they accorded with the fading popularity of the Romantic sentimentality, with its "worship of nature, and consoling pantheism" (ibid), as well as the resurrection of Greek myths.

There is another aspect that integrates the short stories in the period literature – the employment of genius loci. Colmer states that the notion of the spirit of place was mainly popularised by travelogues, naming the series of *Guides* by Baedekr and *Sketches and Studies in Italy and Greece* by John Addington Symonds as widely read ones (26). He suggests that it was the latter in particular, which helped "popularize an approach to [...] landscape that stressed the importance of the *genius loci* and the eternal moment" (ibid). In all of Reid's fiction, genius loci undoubtedly plays an important role. Forster, on the other hand, denied any general influence of the spirit of place upon his work, or any significant use of it; nevertheless, in "The Story of a Panic", he admits the opposite. In the Introduction from 1946 to his collection of short stories he lets us take a look at how genius loci stirred his imagination:

> I think it was in the May of 1902 that I took a walk near Ravello. I sat down in a valley, a few miles

> above town, and suddenly the first chapter of *The Story of a Panic* rushed into my mind as if it had waited for me up there. I wrote it out as soon as I returned to the hotel, and thought it was complete. A few days later I added some more to it until it was three times as long — its present length. (*The Celestial Omnibus* v, vi)

The power of the spirit of place is equally present in the story itself, enhancing the eponymous panic in a group of vacationers while they are having a picnic in a valley visited by their creator. John Colmer claims genius loci to have influenced also Forster's early fiction (26), while Martial Rose does not hesitate to generalise that "place and story are often linked if not inseparables in Forster's work" (32). In any case, it was the spirit of place that launched Forster into the career of a writer: "Italy, which he [Forster] had been slow to love, had at last done a great thing for him. It had told him that one could live in the imagination; and he knew for certain that he was a writer" (Furbank I 93).

In the context of the work of both novelists, the stories are substantial for another reason: in both of them, the main themes to echo in the rest of their authors' writings, already have taken unmistakable shape. Virginia Woolf, in her essay on Forster, names the principle antimonies that form the backbone of his fiction: "timidity, wildness; convention, freedom; unreality, reality. These are the villains and heroes of much of his writing" ("The Novels of E.M. Forster", *The Death of a Moth*, *University of Adelaide* Webpage); and all of these are already present in "The Story of a Panic".

On another level, the short stories may serve as examples of one way in a few that enabled writers to publish homoerotic (though implicitly) pieces of fiction in

a time when such outlets were considered improper - their authors, in a less distinguished way, were labeled as perverts to be shut away in asylums, or better, prisons. Although both authors were at the beginning of their writing careers, they fully used the potential of double audience. In this chapter, the short stories will be analysed from the point of view of each.

In "The Story of a Panic", we are brought in the story by a voice of a middle-aged, middle-class narrator who is married and has two daughters (4). In a sense, he is the most credible narrator imaginable. He proves this further when he claims to be a "plain, simple man, with no pretensions to literary style" (3), by which he should win even more sympathies. Finally, to add to the growing anticipation of the "simple" reader, the narrator proudly announces that he "can tell a story without exaggerating" (ibid). However, immediately afterwards, in the second paragraph, Forster almost mischievously lets the narrator stuff "delightful place", "delightful hotel", and "charming people" (ibid) all into one rather short sentence. Further in the story, after the extraordinary experiences in the wood, the narrator even admits that "importunate truth-telling, which brings only bewilderment and discomfort to the hearers, is, in my opinion, a mistake" (19). For Forster, such narrator is the best tool he can employ to criticise the shortcomings of middle-class Englishmen lacking any imagination, prejudiced, and sticking to convention and Victorian values; on the other hand, in his ignorance and wrong interpretation of the events, unwittingly, Mr. Tytler encourages the reader to depend more on the unsaid.

In the same manner, through narrator's eyes, we encounter the hero of the story, a boy called Eustace.

Mr.Tytler claims he is “fond of boys as a rule” (4), as they present the bright manly future of the British Empire, and “was quite disposed to be friendly” (ibid) to the lad. However, as Eustace proves to be the direct contrast of the public-school ideal, Tytler finds him “indescribably repellent” (ibid). Eustace cannot swim, and, horribly enough, is afraid of water — “a boy afraid! — and of course I said no more” (ibid).

Besides Eustace, there is another character which the narrator excludes from the “charming people”. It is Mr. Leyland, an artist. In this very point, the author seems to concur with the narrator; nevertheless, a difference in their attitude can be traced. While Mr. Tytler does not like Leyland simply for the way he behaves, considering him “conceited and odious” (ibid), for Forster, the character symbolises the art-for-art’s-sake attitude, which the writer did not identify with. When the rest of the party express their enjoyment of the view over Ravello, Leyland scornfully names all the deficiencies of the scenery as a piece of art:

> ‘Look, in the first place’, he [Leyland] replied, ‘how intolerably straight against the sky is the line of the hill. It would need breaking up and diversifying. And where we are standing the whole thing is out of perspective. Besides, all the colouring is monotonous and crude.’ (6)

Mr. Tytler would be willing to ignore this statement, but when Leyland continues that they “all confuse the artistic view with the photographic” (7), he is obliged to tell the reader that “poor Rose had brought her camera with her, so I thought this positively rude” (ibid). Politeness and good manner is all that matters to him.

For both characters, nevertheless, nature is something more or less inanimate, similarly to Clifford Chatterley's perception of the forest surrounding his estates. It is not surprising that it is Leyland who leads the fleeing party (12) overwhelmed by the "repose" of Nature (10), and he objects to returning to the clearing when they find out Eustace is missing (13). Finally, it is Leyland again who breaks Eustace's whistle (17). The narrator describes his own fear, but, retrospectively, his greatest concern is that for a moment he had lost his dignity: "And it was no ordinary humiliation that survived; for I had been afraid, not as a man, but as a beast" (12). Such lapse in self-control is unacceptable for an Englishman.

In his intellectual snobbery, it is also Leyland who first talks about Pan: "It is through us, and to our shame, that the Nereids have left the waters and the Oreads the mountains, that the woods no longer give shelter to Pan" (9). Thereupon the vicar, Mr. Sandbach, states that "Pan is dead" (ibid), expressing the age-old effort of Christians to kill Pan in minds of his worshippers, as he is the embodiment of sin. Pan is a pagan god connected with free spirit, intuition, and sexuality (Roe, webpage). Roe argues that pagans had no notion of sin or guilt, whereas early Christian faith was built upon these two. Therefore, when the effort to extinguish the pagan god proved unsuccessful, the god was turned into Satan for Christians (ibid). Significantly, the image of the Devil gradually reappeared in folktales, transformed into a mischievous but altogether good-natured imp, partially returning back to the image of Pan.

Forster plays with the pagan-Christian diffusion in the character of Eustace. St. Eustachius was a pagan Roman general who converted to Christianity after a revelation

during a hunting trip, in which he was told he would be suffering for Christ. He and his family were baptised, but afterwards, Eustachius was recalled to duty by Trajan. When he refused to sacrifice to idols after a great victory, the whole family was burned in a bronze bull (Mershman, webpage). Forster returns Eustace to his pagan roots: he faces him with Pan, frees him from the burdens of shame and sin, and, metaphorically, of the martyrdom for martyrdom's sake. Ironically, Forster refers to the historical figure in the debate about Pan:

> 'How very interesting,' said Rose. 'I do wish I knew some ancient history.'
> 'It is not worth your notice,' said Mr. Sandbach. 'Eh, Eustace?' (9)

The "Panic" in the title of the story comprises one of qualities that were attributed to Pan, "the god of woods and fields who was the source of mysterious sounds that caused contagious, groundless fear in herds and crowds, or in people in lonely spots" (*Online Etymology Dictionary* Webpage). Indeed, Mr. Tytler recounts: "I became terribly frightened, more frightened than I ever wish to become again, frightened in a way I have never known either before or after" (11). When the vacationers return to the clearing, they find goat-like footmarks and other signs which seem to give evidence of Pan's visit — or Satan's, as they believe. Forster hints at the former option of Pan seducing Eustace by plentiful but rather inconspicuous symbolism. As the party approaches Eustace, the narrator sees "one of those green lizards dart out from under his [Eustace's] shirt-cuff" (14) — to Romans, lizards were symbols of death and resurrection. Further, the flowers Eustace picks on the way back are cyclamen and acanthus,

the former known for its use as an aphrodisiac and therefore taken as a symbol of lust, the latter representing immortality.

Pan was the pagan god of nature; he protected flocks and sheperds, was the patron of bee-keeping, music. One of many features that were attributed to the horned god was lustfulness — he seduced many a nymph and young shepherd. In the story, the Italian waiter Gennaro is taken as Pan's incarnation. He tries to seduce Eustace, but it is only after the boy is confronted with the god in his essence in the woods, that he can tell Gennaro "'ho capito', [...] the Italian for 'I have understood'" (22). Further, Gennaro, being rather a means for the god than a character on his own, dies in the end of the story in quite a silly way, but inevitably, having fulfilled his role. Robert K. Martin and George Piggford apply the meaning of Pan, which is "all", to the sexual context, stating that "Pan points to the pan-sexuality that Eustace adopts, discovering polymorphous pleasure that can communicate at least the suggestion of bestiality" ("Queer, Forster?", *Queer Forster* 5). This statement brings us back to Charles Sayle's interpretation of the story. The depiction of sexual intercourse in the story is far from explicit, however, for a reader such as Sayle, there are certain hints more graphic than the symbols mentioned above: Eustace's hand is "convulsively entwined in the long grass" (14), but, strangely, not accompanied by an expression of horror to be expected after such an experience but a "peculiar smile" (ibid), incomprehensible for the narrator. Mr. Tytler also observes that, on their way back to the hotel, Eustace walks with pain (17). For Mr. Sandbach and any other unsuspecting and devoted Christian, the inevitable deduction follows that the pain comes from the terrible encounter with the Devil.

To a reader like Sayle, a far more pleasant cause of the pain is bound to pop up into mind. The narrator does not pursue idle thoughts of this kind, and, after they reach the spot where they had left their donkeys and he prevents Eustace from "mount[ing] one of them and rid[ing] all the way home" (17,18), he contentedly records that the boy finally "stepped out manfully" and "was at last taking some pride in his personal appearance" (18).

The story concludes with Eustace's escape into the woods, after he had awoken almost all visitors at the hotel. The narrator, in his usual sensible way, tries to stop him, even by bribing Gennaro to bring the boy back, but fails:

> And as soon as his bare feet touched the clods of earth he uttered a strange loud cry, such as I should not have thought the human voice could have produced, and disappeared among the trees below. (38)

Though in more elemental manner, Eustace's escape can be seen as a predecessor of the escape of Maurice and Alec, of the retreat to a place that acknowledges human nature. In "The Story of a Panic", however, the hero returns to the society — several times throughout the story, the narrator mentions Eustace's future career and "the photographs of him that are beginning to get into the illustrated papers" (14,15). The Panic experience provided him with the "disquieting smile" (15), enabled him to return to and live in the society with all its restrictions, and fortified him against the stiffness and prejudice of such people as Mr. Tytler.

In "Pan's Pupil" by Forrest Reid, same-sex eroticism is even more covert. Reid creates a dream-like atmosphere of a poppied summer day blurred in memory by occasional

slumbers in which dreams blend with reality and some things are forgotten, but not lost. The boy feels "supremely lazy and happy" (1), and by the voice of the god Pan he is "awakened from his reverie" (2). The narrator seems to be affected by the drowsiness as well; partly, his point of view interlaces with the boy's, partly he seems enchanted by the boy as he plunges into the verdure of the garden. Such style of narration creates the impression of ages lived-through in a few minutes, and therefore of many things unsaid and unexplained.

Unlike Forster's narrator, the one in "Pan's Pupil" does not want to educate the boy and lead him safely into the world of adults; rather, he watches him silently and as if re-experiencing through him something he once knew. In this sense, the voice of the narrator mingles with the author — James notes that "the childhood encounter with a pagan idyll in a garden setting is something which Reid experienced in some way in his own boyhood and which became a sort of personal foundation myth for him in the rest of life" (i).

Therefore, Reid views the god Pan through the boy's eyes, not as a mischievous and horny creature but as an ageing demi-god of a mythic realm devoid of naughtiness but rather maintaining a "half-smiling tenderness" (3). Unlike Forster, who never reveals whom Eustace met in the wood and Pan is at work in the story more as a spirit, Reid presents Pan in flesh and blood and evokes the spiritual resurrection the boy undergoes:

> [The boy] shut his eyes and clenched his hands tightly; and his soul seemed to be drawn out from his body, and in a few minutes to live through endless ages. But gradually, through the darkness, he saw the breaking of a dawn — a light reaching back — back into the morning of a world. He saw a country-side rich

> with green grass and slender flowers. [...] He saw the first beauty of the earth [...] He saw, in forest glades, fauns and nymphs dancing under the red harvets moon [...] And he knew that from all these things he had drawn the strength of his life [...]. (4)

The moment, followed by Pan blessing the boy by resting his hand on his head (ibid) is reminiscent of baptism, though the ceremony, unlike the Christian one, does not grant immortality – the "sense of loss" (Alderson, "Desire and Nostalgia", in *Territories of Desire* 40) and the vision of death is an inherent part of Pan: "For just a moment Pan's voice had seemed to send the hush of twilight into his soul; but the sunshine conquered again, and the simple instinct of youth" ("Pan's Pupil" 4).

In his unknowingness, the boy likens Pan to Christ, asking the former why he could not also live for ever (ibid). Surprisingly, Reid's Pan does not oppose the boy's idea, and seems only a little affected by what Christian church turned him into, with certainty only recalling that "in the past his priests tore down my altars. They tore down my altars, and yet I am to-day the spirit of the earth, and I am worshipped in the beauty of each passing hour" (ibid). For Christ, he feels more of sympathy, or even pity, than grudge, calling him "a philosopher rather than a god, a poet, a dreamer, a lover of the flowers and gardens and of life untroubled by riches and the cares of the world" who was "slain by his own disciples" (ibid).

Reid's short story is very condensed and leaves certain things unsaid. Throughout his work, Reid had no intention of explaining. In the repeating themes of his fiction, never overtly homoerotic, James rather sees an effort of an author "working and re-working a personal experience in a number of different forms seeking perhaps a

degree of self-understanding through artistic expression" (ii). The "different forms" did not include a more explicit depiction of homosexuality, as they did in Forster's *Maurice* or his posthumously published short fiction. Furbank even records Reid's reaction to *Maurice*, which Forster sent him "with trepidation, fearing that he [Reid] might be shocked" (II 14). As it turned out, "in fact the physical love-making in the novel, though shadowy, did shock him, or at all events did not suit him" (ibid). The note that Reid "claimed never even to have realized that Forster was homosexual" (ibid) demonstrates further how different was Reid's and Forster's perception of their homosexuality. While Reid strove for finding the ideal of male friendship regardless the time he lived in, Forster's effort was to integrate same-sex love into the contemporary social background, gradually abandoning the Greek ideal and the theme of salvation. As regards *Maurice* and its "dramatized conflict between competing models of same-sex desire" (Martin, "Introduction", *Queer Forster* 19), it seems that Reid identified with Clive's "elitist idealism" rather than "radical socialism and feminism" (ibid) represented by the relationship of Maurice and Alec. It is not mere chance then, that the second part of Reid's autobiography is called *Private Road* (1940) — Clive uses this phrase when he explains to Maurice how Desire affects one's appreciation of Art:

> There seem two roads for arriving at Beauty — one is in common, and all the world has reached Michelangelo by it, but the other is private to me and a few more. We come to him by both roads. (*Maurice* 86)

The two roads also apply to the two short stories. Regarding "The Story of a Panic" and "Pan's Pupil", the two

points of view, two possibilities of interpretation, complement each other, and, when both present, mirror the entirety of the stories. The reviewer mentioned at the beginning of the chapter was devoid of the access to the private road, and the incomplete view influenced his judgement. However, in the first decade of the twentieth century, there existed hardly any other way in which homoeroticism could have been dealt with in fiction. Had the critic been showed the small gates to the private roads in the stories, the authors would have had to tread a very wide public road of condemnation.

5. Conclusion

The issue of obscenity was implemented in the British law in 1727, when Edmund Curll was convicted for publication of *The Nun in her Smock or Venus in the Cloister*, which depicted lesbian relationships. The case created a precedent for similar cases for the next two hundred years (Keane 23). *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, on the other hand, was the novel to test a significant change in the law in 1959. The Obscenity Law Act included publications with homoerotic content — *The Well of Loneliness* was judged and subsequently banned under the same law, thirty years before the change arrived. However, perception of same-sex love, as such, differed, which is demonstrated by the considerably slower progress in the "sodomy law" which in its earliest form occurred in the sixteenth century. Homosexual relationships between consenting adults (and in private) were legalised only in 1967.

E.M. Forster and his contemporaries represent one of the last generations of gays in the United Kingdom who could have been legally prosecuted for their sexual orientation. Forster is one of the most famous closeted homosexuals; the posthumously revealed fact about his homosexuality was emphasised by the fame and reputation he had gained throughout his life and this complete view turned many a critic and gay activist against the novelist. He was easy — and tasty — prey, and the debate over his "treason" blocked out the full perspective of the time with many other artists and public figures having made exactly the same decision.

Martland recalls the Oscar Wilde Trial and states that "Wilde never wanted to be outed, and if he could have kept his homosexuality as secret as Forster did, he would have

been quite happy to do so" (Martland 10). In connection to literature, Joseph Cady claims that "most homosexual writing before the early twentieth century could be thought of as in part an exercise in self-censorship" (webpage). He further focuses on "more pointed forms of self-censorship in which homosexual authors withheld frank homosexual writing from publication, actually erased the homosexual content from their texts, or publicly denied their homosexuality" (ibid), and names an array of famous writers who fall into this category: George Gordon, Lord Byron (1788-1824), Walt Whitman (1819-1892), John Addington Symonds (1840-1893), Walter Pater (1839-1894), A.E.Housman (1859-1936), Gertrude Stein (1874-1946), D.H.Lawrence (1885-1930), Marcel Proust (1871-1922), and, of course, E.M.Forster (1879-1970). Forrest Reid (1875-1947) can be added to this list, too.

The four works analysed in this paper demonstrate specific examples of self-censorship as mentioned by Cady, or censorship, in case of *Lady Chatterley*. As the analysis shows, all the works have to some extent been influenced by the imagined feedback of potential readers, or its absence. Such influence is a common one; but, concerning the tabooed topic discussed, it gains importance, in many cases having rather a restrictive effect over the works.

The two short stories, "The Story of a Panic" by Forster and "Pan's Pupil" by Reid, were meant for publication; one of the audiences, therefore, was to be critics and the public. The writers provide all that could be expected, plus they do so in their unmistakable style, Forster with his wit and sharp observations on human characters, Reid through the character of a "sensitive boy" (James i) who seems to be disengaged from the regular matters of ageing and our understanding of time altogether.

And yet this audience has been strangely neglecting these short stories. The other part of the audience, watching the show from the backstage, is supposedly easier to approach. However, the access path cannot be the shortest one, as the writer is always being reminded of the boundary between the permitted and the tabooed. The two authors managed to interweave the two points of view into a comlex whole, skilfuly keeping them balanced.

Lady Chatterley's Lover, on the contrary, speaks very frankly. D.H. Lawrence's novel has an undiferentiated audience — the author's intention was not to conform to the conventions of time and please critics but to incite the readers to re-evaluate the conventions on their own. He published the novel privately at first, and in Italy, which was much more open to sexuality, even homosexuality, at the time, than Britain. He was aware that Britain would have to wait for the free publication of the novel for some time.

Regarding Forster's *Maurice*, the issue of audience is a problematic one. Or rather, there is no audience which Forster would have had in mind when writing the novel. He needed to write it but concluded that it could not be published "until my death or England's" (as quoted in Furbank I 259). Therefore, he had to depend only on his own experience and evaluation, lacking the mirror of a pontential reader's point of view. It is certain that the novel would have been different if Forster had considered its publication and had taken into account a reader: perhaps a prejudiced critic or, on the contrary, a similarly closeted gay struggling with his "curable condition". Free of the latter, paradoxically, the novel enabled a rather precise period picture of such a struggle – with all the doubts about naturality of being gay caused by the Church and quasi-scientific studies, as well as a

certain amount of idealization and naïveté on part of a person who, in time of writing the novel, had no personal experience with an intimate — and cross-class — homosexual relationship. Forster seems to have realised the value of the novel written in this manner. On the matter of class and the concluding part of the novel he notes:

> I have worked on it cautiously as I gained new experience being very careful not to make it my own experience. I was in 1914 ignorant in this way of class — it stimulated my imagination, that was all. [...] But I tried to keep him [Alec] as the dream which turned into the scare and then into the mate. I was always determined not to end sadly — as we were saying, it is not worth while. (Lago & Furbank 159)

Though he later was considering publication of the novel, finally, taking into consideration the reputation of his close friends, especially Bob Buckingham, he decided to arrange for its publication after his death. In 1948, he wrote to Christopher Isherwood that he was "ashamed at shirking publication but the objections are formidable" (ibid 231).

The similarity of themes and their treatment, as presented in the paper, also adds to the puzzled question of why Forster gained the title "Closet Queen of the Century" (Hodges, webpage). There seems to be no particular reason why he should be taken out of the outlined context, and attacked for having refused to accept the role of a martyr and saviour of the gay community. Separation of one's privacy from their public duties is a step forward, not vice versa. The portrayal of the forbidden in Forster's, Lawrence's and Reid's works illustrates the ways that, during the Edwardian period, authors attempted, as best they could, to make their private lives or fantasies textual, despite opposition posed from the outside.

6. Résumé

Počátkem dvacátého století docházelo ve Velké Británi k podstatným společenským změnám. Společnost opouštěla zažité hodnoty viktoriánské éry a v odbobí edwardiánském se je snažila nahradit hodnotami novými, často ale tato snaha paradoxně vyústila v utvrzení konzervatismu, kterému se bránila.

Tato diplomová práce se věnuje tématu tabuizované sexuality – a především homosexuality - právě v tomto období. Edwardiánská éra je pojmenována podle krále Edwarda VII. a nejčastěji se datuje podle odbobí jeho vlády, tedy od roku 1901 do roku 1910. Někdy ale bývá prodloužena až k roku 1912, který symbolizovalo potopení Titaniku a následná deziluze z dokonalosti výtvorů lidstva na poli technologie, nebo k době první světové války, 1914-1918. Tato práce přesahuje až k roku 1928, kdy byl poprvé publikován kontroverzní román D.H. Lawrence *Milenec Lady Chatterleyové*. Skrze důsledky morálky nastolené na přelomu století mapuje osud rozebíraných děl a jejich autorů do roku 1971, kdy byl posmrtně vydán román E.M. Forstera *Maurice*; v širším smyslu je toto období ve znamení vzniku a prvotního rychlého rozvoje Gay a lesbického hnutí.

Zákony upravující sexuální chování jedinců ve společnosti a otázku pobuřující a škodlivé literatury se ve velké Británii vyvíjely velmi zvolna, částečně i proto, že byly založeny na zvykovém právu, které přetrvávalo celá staletí. První zmínka o sexuálním styku mezi jedinci stejného pohlaví se objevuje v šestnáctém století v zákoně o sodomii, a i když první polovina devatenáctého století zaznamenala poslední popravy kvůli tomuto zločinu, ve Velké Británii byla homosexualita dekriminalizována až v roce 1967, a do té doby byla tvrdě stíhána a potírána.

Cenzura děl s potenciálně nemravným a společnosti škodlivým obsahem čekala na svůj zákon déle: v roce 1727 byl prvním případem vytvořen precedent, který v nezměněné podobě přetrval do roku 1959. Tehdy dodatek ke stávajícímu zákonu stanovil, že díla, i přesto, že byla shledána jako obscénní, mohou být publikována, pokud se prokáže jejich kulturní přínos. Kniha, která tento zákon jako první využila ve svůj prospěch, byl *Milenec Lady Chatterleyové*.

Román D.H. Lawrence si zájem cenzorů vysloužil otevřeným popisem sexuálního styku a hojným používáním nepříliš cudných výrazů. „Nemravnost" Lawrencova románu ale není samoúčelná – autor skze ni kritizuje prudérnost anglické společnosti a provokuje k novému pohledu na primitivní podstatu člověka, oproštěnou od předsudků zakořeněných hloboko v psychice člověka, vychovaného v této době. Lawrence si byl vědom nevhodnosti své knihy a skutečnosti, že v Anglii román vyjít nemůže. Publikoval ho soukromě v Itálii; v Anglii kniha vyšla značně okleštěná a teprve nakladatelství Penguin Books ji vydalo bez úprav po vyhraném, výše zmíněném, procesu.

Díla s homosexuální tematikou nejenže čelila stejným problémům, ale navíc obracela pozornost ke svým autorům. Většina soudobých umělců se rozhodla tajit svou sexuální orientaci před veřejností a tématu homosexuality se ve svých dílech úplně vyhýbali, transformovali je v přijatelné vztahy heterosexuální, odkazy na zakázané téma umně šifrovali, nebo svá díla jednoduše nevydali. To je i případ E.M. Forstera a Forresta Reida, jak ukazují díla rozebíraná v této práci. Můžeme k nim nicméně přiřadit i D.H. Lawrence, který raději vynechal prolog ke svému románu *Women in Love*, který příliš otevřeně hovořil o homosexualitě hlavního hrdiny, a v románu *Rainbow* ukazuje lesbickou lásku v negativním světle.

Povídky „The Story of a Panic" E.M. Forstera a „Pan's Pupil" Forresta Reida skrývají homoerotiku pod rámec témat, která byla v edwardiánské době častá. Kritici a veřejnost lehké náznaky nedokázali rozpoznat a zdánlivá neúplnost povídek je buď znechutila, nebo nad ní mávnuli rukou.

Forsterův román *Maurice* naopak popisuje zakázanou lásku otevřeně a se všemi aspekty, které k ní v daném odbobí patřily. Hlavní hrdina často pojmenovává homosexualitu jako nemoc a v zoufalství se snaží „vyléčit", podle rad doktorů a pseudovědeckých studií, které měly v prvním rozpuku psychoanalýzy velkou oblibu. Také bojuje s předsudky středního stavu a bojí se, že by ho jeho milenec z dělnické třídy mohl vydírat. Nakonec ale přijímá homosexualitu jako přirozenou a nedělitelnou součást své osobnosti. Román tedy homosexualitu neodsuzuje, naopak se snaží začlenit ji do kontextu charakteristických znaků anglické identity. To je jeden z hlavních důvodů, proč Forster váhal s jeho vydáním.

Za svou mlčenlivost byl po své smrti mnohokrát napadán, ač není žádnou výjimkou mezi umělci a známými osobnostmi své doby. Někteří jeho odpůrci mu vyčítají, že se veřejně nepostavil za práva gayů a nevyužil svou reputaci k tomu, aby popostrčil zamrzlou legislativu. Podobné případy ale spíše naznačují, že ani Forsterova pověst humanisty a obhájce lidských práv by nezabránila jeho pádu.

V současnosti je trendem objevovat latentní homosexualitu v leckterém románu napsaném před rokem 1967. Má to svůj důvod. Forster a Reid nebyli jediní spisovatelé, kteří se nechtěli vzdát tématu, které jim bylo tolik vlastní, ale společenská tabu podpořená nekompromisními zákony jim neumožňovala hovořit o něm otevřeně. Proto si našli úzkou pěšinu vedoucí k zakázanému místu.

7. Bibliography

Abelove, H., M.A. Barale, and D.M. Halperin, ed. Gay and Lesbian Studies Reader. London: Routledge, 1993.

Alderson, David. "Desire As Nostalgia: The Novels by Alan Hollinghurst". In *Territories of Desire in Queer Culture: Refiguring the Contemporary Boundaries*. Manchester: Manchester University Press 2001. 29-48.

Carroll, Lewis. *Through the Looking-Glass*. 1st World Library 2004.

Collecott, Diane. *H.D. and Sapphic Modernism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999.

Colmer, John. *The Personal Voice*. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Curtis, Vanessa. *Virginia Woolf's Women.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press 2002.

D'Emilio, John. "Capitalism and Gay Identity". Abelove 467-478.

Dowling, Linda. *Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian England*. New York: Cornell University Press 1994.

Forster, Edward Morgan. *The Aspects of the Novel*. London: Penguin Classics, 2000.

---. *Maurice.* London: Penguin Classics, 1971.

---. *Howards End*. New York: Spark Publishing/SparkNotes 2003.

---. "The Machine Stops". Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing 2004.

---. "Notes on the English Character". In *Abinger Harvest*. New York: Harvest/Harcourt Brace & Co. 1966. 3-15.

---. "The Story of a Panic". In *The Celestial Omnibus and Other Stories*. New York: Vintage Books, 1976. 3-39.

Furbank, P.N. *E.M. Forster. A Life.* 2 vols. New York: Harcourt 1981.

Hartree, Anne. "A Passion that Few English Minds Have Admitted: Homosexuality and Englishness in E.M. Forster's *Maurice*". Paragraph 7 (1996): 127-138.

James, Callum. *Introduction*. In "Pan's Pupil". Portsmouth: Callum James 2005. i-ii.

King, Dixie. "The Influence of Forster's *Maurice* on *Lady Chatterley's Lover*". Contemporary Literature 23, 1 (1982): 65-82.

Lago, Mary, and P.N. Furbank ed. *Selectes Letters of E.M. Forster, Volume Two 1921-1970*. Cambridge: Belknap Press 1985.

Lawrence, David Herbert. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. New York: The New American Library 1962.

---. *The First and Second Lady Chatterley Novels*, ed. Dieter Mehl and Christa Jansohn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2002.

---. *Studies in Classic American Literature*. Ed. Ezra Greenspan, Lindeth Vasey, and John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003.

Martin, Robert K., and George Piggford. "Introduction: Queer, Forster?". In *Queer Forster*, ed. Robert K. Martin and George Piggford. Chicago: Chicago University Press 1997. 1-28.

Martland, A. *E.M.Forster: Passion and Prose*. London: Gay Men's Press, 1999.

Mondimore, F.M. *Natural History of Homosexuality*. London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Moore, Harry T. "*Lady Chatterley's Lover*: The Novel as Ritual". In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. New York: The New American Library 1962.

Pierce, David ed. *Irish Writing in the Twentieth Century: A Reader*. Cork: Cork University Press 2000.

Richards, Fiona. "'An Anthology of Friendship': The Letters from John Ireland to Father Kenneth Thompson". In *Queer Episodes in Music and Modern Identity*, ed. Sophie Fuller and Lloyd Whitesell. Chicago: University of Illinois Press 2002. 245-270.

Rose, Martial. *E.M. Forster*. London: Evans Brothers Ltd. 1970.

Reid, Forrest. "Pan's Pupil". Portsmouth: Callum James 2005.

Rubin, Gayle S. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality". Abelove 3-44.

Schorer, Mark. "Introduction". In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. New York: Groove Press 1993. 7-35.

Stansky, Peter. *On or About December 1910: Early Bloomsbury and Its Intimate World*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press 1997.

Třešňák, Petr. *Holocaust as Business Artefact*. (Holocaust jako kšeft). Respekt 14 (2006): 22.

Whitman, Walt. *Leaves of Grass and Selected Prose*. ed. John Kouwenhoven. New York: Random House 1950.

Wittington-Egan, Richard. "The Edwardian Literary Afternoon: Part One". Contemporary Review 276 (2000): 201.

Internet sources:

Endres, Nikolai. "Cambridge Apostles". GLBTG web. 3 Nov. 2005. New England Publishing Associates. 25 May 2006 <www.glbtq.com/social-ciences/cambridge_apostles.html>

Cady, Joseph. "Censorship". GLBTG web. 25 May 2005. New England Publishing Associates. 26 Jun 2006 <www.glbtq.com/literature/censorship.html>

Carpenter, Edward. *The Intermediate Sex: A Study of Some Traditional Types of Men and Women,* 1909. 1998. Paul Halsall. 25 Nov. 2005 <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/pwh/carpenter-is.html>

"Edward Carpenter 1844–1929". Cambridge University web. 2006. 20 May 2006 <http://www.cambridge.org/us/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=0521019591>

Gianoulis, Tina. "Pink Triangle". GLBTQ web. 3 Mar. 2004. New England Publishing Associates. 10 Apr. 2006 <www.glbtq.com/social-sciences/pink_triangle.html>

"Firbank, Ronald". Knitting Circle web. 13 July 2003. South Bank University. 20 Apr. 2006 <http://myweb.lsbu.ac.uk/stafflag/ronaldfirbank.html>

Forster, E.M. "What I Believe". Geocities web. 5 Mar. 2006 <http://www.geocities.com/dspichtinger/otexts/believe.html>

Heylighen, F. "The Red Queen Principle". Principia Cybernetica web. 2 Dec. 1993. 31 May 2006 <http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/REDQUEEN.html>

Hodges, Andrew, and David Hutter. *With Downcast Gays. Aspects of Homosexual Self-oppression.* Hodges & Hutter 1974. 2002. A. Hodges. 10 Jan. 2006 <http://www.outgay.co.uk/intro.html>

Johnson, Matthew D. "Homosexuality". GLBTQ web. 11 Apr. 2005. New England Publishing Associates. 4 Apr.2006 <www.glbtq.com/social-sciences/homosexuality.html>

Keane, Ronan et al. *Consultation Paper on the Crime of Libel.* The Law Reform web. Aug. 1991. 25 Jun. 2006 <http://www.lawreform.ie/publications/data/volume10/lrc_65.html>

Mershman, Francis. "Sts. Eustachius and Companions". Catholic Encyclopedia web. 6 Oct 2005. K. Knight. 15 Jun 2006 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05627a.htm>

Newton, Ken. "The Rainbow". The Literary Encyclopedia web. 1 Nov. 2002. 11 Apr. 2006 <http://www.litencyc.com/php/sworks.php?rec=true&UID=10539>

Norton, Rictor. "The Life of John Addington Symonds". Rictor Norton web. 6 Nov. 1999. 22 Jun 2006 <http://www.infopt.demon.co.uk/symonds.htm>

---, ed. "Class-based Erotics". Rictor Norton web. 24 Jan. 2003. 24 Jun. 2006 <http://www.infopt.demon.co.uk/class.htm>

---, ed. "'One day they were simply gone': The Nazi Persecution of Homosexuals". Rictor Norton web. 21 Dec. 1999. 11 Jun. 2006 <http://www.infopt.demon.co.uk/nazi.htm>

"Panic", etymology of. Online Etymology Dictionary web. Nov. 2001. Douglas Harper. 15 Jun 2006 <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?l=p&p=2>

Roe, Anthony. "The Great God Pan". The White Dragon web. 1999. 15 Jun 2006 <http://whitedragon.org.uk/articles/pan.htm>

Sontag, Susan. "Notes on 'Camp'". Pages.zoom web. 20 Apr. 2006 <http://pages.zoom.co.uk/leveridge/sontag.html>

Stanton, Michael N. "Novel: Gay Male". GLBTQ web. 12 Jul. 2005. New England Publishing Associates. 11 Apr. 2006 <www.glbtq.com/literature/novel_gay.html>

Summers, Claude J. "E.M. Forster". GLBTQ web. 25 Oct. 2005. New England Publishing Associates. 14 May 2006 <www.glbtq.com/literature/forster_em.html>

---. "Wolfenden Report". GLBTQ web. 27 Jul. 2005. New England Publishing Associates. 21 Jun. 2006 <www.glbtq.com/social-sciences/wolfenden_report.html>

Woolf, Virginia. "The Novels of E.M. Forster". In *The Death of a Moth*. University of Adelaide web. 21 Jun. 2004. 5 Jun. 2006 <http://etext.library.adelaide.edu.au/w/woolf/virginia/w91d/index.html>

ÚDAJE PRO KNIHOVNICKOU DATABÁZI

Název práce	Forbidden Sexuality in the Early Twentieth Century Literature: E.M.Forster, D.H.Lawrence and Forrest Reid
Autor práce	Dita Kelbelová
Obor	Učitelství anglického jazyka
Rok obhajoby	2006
Vedoucí práce	Michael M. Kaylor, M.A., Ph.D.
Anotace	Diplomová práce se zabývá otázkou cenzury v daném období. Na čtyřech konkrétních dílech ukazuje, jakým způsobem autoři zpracovávali tabuizovaná témata týkající se lidské sexuality a jak byli sami ovlivněni persekucí v této oblasti.
Klíčová slova	E.M. Forster D.H. Lawrence Forrest Reid Homoerotic Fiction Censorship Obscenity in Literature