



HAL
open science

Metaphors for the Masses: D.H. Lawrence on Stickiness, Insects and Democracy

Shirley Bricout

► **To cite this version:**

Shirley Bricout. Metaphors for the Masses: D.H. Lawrence on Stickiness, Insects and Democracy. *Études Lawrenciennes*, 2022, D. H. Lawrence and the People, 54, 10.4000/lawrence.3170 . hal-04387021

HAL Id: hal-04387021

<https://univ-montpellier3-paul-valery.hal.science/hal-04387021>

Submitted on 23 Feb 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Metaphors for the Masses: D.H. Lawrence on Stickiness, Insects and Democracy

Shirley Bricout

**Electronic version**

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/lawrence/3170>

DOI: 10.4000/lawrence.3170

ISSN: 2272-4001

Publisher

Presses universitaires de Paris Nanterre

Brought to you by Université Paul Valéry Montpellier 3

**Electronic reference**

Shirley Bricout, "Metaphors for the Masses: D.H. Lawrence on Stickiness, Insects and Democracy", *Études Lawrenciennes* [Online], 54 | 2022, Online since 16 December 2022, connection on 23 February 2024. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/lawrence/3170> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/lawrence.3170>

This text was automatically generated on February 16, 2023.



The text only may be used under licence CC BY-ND 4.0. All other elements (illustrations, imported files) are "All rights reserved", unless otherwise stated.

Metaphors for the Masses: D.H. Lawrence on Stickiness, Insects and Democracy

Shirley Bricout

- 1 Central to Lawrence's artistic output is the articulation of the potential threat to individuality posed by the masses, or the people, in the context of profound industrial and socio-political change, which, in his view, culminated in the outbreak of the First World War. Like his modernist contemporaries, Lawrence registers, in his works, the anxiety that José Ortega y Gasset was to expose in *The Revolt of the Masses*, in 1930. Ortega's eloquent phrase "the triumph of hyperdemocracy," which encompasses how "the mass acts directly, outside the law, imposing its aspirations and its desires by means of material pressure" (18), foregrounds the need for linguistic creativity to negotiate spreading socio-political views and behavior.
- 2 Similarly, Lawrence's own relentless exploration of the encroachments of the masses on the individual entails renewing language, across literary genres, in order to voice his ambivalent response to emerging visions of democracy. Although Whitman's democratic utopia based on brotherly love, derived from his interest in phrenology, arrested Lawrence's attention without winning his wholehearted support, in his novels and essays, Lawrence adopts, with a twist, the poet's vocabulary when he discusses his commitment to "En-Masse" democracy. As will be shown, the connotations of the term "mass" fluctuate to suit Lawrence's purpose, and, when qualified, as in "sticky masses," the phrase itself eventually "sticks," becoming one of his linguistic idiosyncrasies.
- 3 Lawrence also probes contemporary scientific developments that found in eusocial insects, such as bees and ants, the tropes to discuss human interactions. Insects have appeared in literature from classic times as symbols of profitable industry and selfless cooperation, however since the end of the nineteenth century, the paradigm of their teeming numbers has percolated into the apocalyptic worlds of science fiction (for instance, *The Empire of the Ants* by H.G. Wells, 1905) and, more painfully, has depicted crippling dehumanization in war narratives and poems. Siegfried Sassoon, for instance,

resorted to an entomological trope to convey his acute distress in his *Diaries*: “The soldier is no longer a noble figure. He is merely a writhing insect among this ghastly folly of destruction” (133). Lawrence’s writings are not found wanting in insect imagery; on the contrary, as Rachel Murray rightly remarks in *The Modernist Exoskeleton: Insects, War, Literary Form*, “Lawrence’s body of work plays host to an array of entomological sensations that are suggestive of the infiltration of individual life by a threatening multitude” (63).

- 4 Both Whitman’s specific idiom that seeks to outline “a new, incipient social relation” (Warren 50) and entomologists’ analogies will be shown to provide Lawrence with metaphors and imagery to articulate his resistance to contemporary democratic visions. In this way, the dynamics of language, and notably its reflexivity, offers Lawrence the means to address contemporary issues, which still resonate with us today. According to Ted Cohen, metaphor is “the language’s intrinsic capacity to surpass its own (putative) limits. It is the abiding device for saying something truly new – but something curiously new, for it is made out of already existent meaning” (184). By focusing, therefore, on Lawrence’s modernist earnestness to renew language, a fresh reading of his tropes and imagery related to stickiness and insects will foreground the nexus between artistic creativity and intellectual probing that extends throughout his “thought adventure” (K. 222).

The masses

- 5 A perusal of Lawrence’s works reveals that the term “mass” undergoes a shift in meaning at different times of his career, since, in the earlier novels, it describes a large amount of a substance of indefinite shape, then, as Lawrence’s democratic vision of the self matures, “mass” is to be understood as a large anonymous group of people. Indeed, in *The White Peacock*, the term “mass” depicts nature when, for instance, the “towzled mass of faded pink chrysanthemums” (35) gives way to the recurrent “great rounded masses of cloud” (126). “Mass” and “masses” first designate people in Lawrence’s fourth novel, *The Rainbow*, and more specifically in the chapter titled “First Love,” when Ursula wonders,

Why, oh why must one grow up, why must one inherit this heavy, numbing responsibility of living an undiscovered life? Out of the nothingness and the undifferentiated mass, to make something of herself! But what? In the obscurity and pathlessness to take a direction! But whither? (263, emphasis mine)

- 6 The fragmented sentences which convey Ursula’s interior monologue conjure up a chaotic state, a prelude to creation or birth. The “undifferentiated mass” from which she is to emerge resonates, therefore, with the Bible narrative of creation according to which “the earth was without form and void” (Genesis 1: 2). But in this excerpt from *The Rainbow*, “mass” also suggests the idea of people, as opposed to Ursula as an individual. Sustaining this idea, Anton Strebensky, the artist whom she meets and falls in love with, brings the young woman a sense of “large masses of humanity” (R 272), and when they take a ride on a merry-go-round at a fair, they ride “proudly, gallantly over the upturned faces of the crowd, moving on a higher level, spurning the common mass” (R 275).
- 7 Ironically, in the course of the one chapter, “First Love,” the meaning of “mass” becomes more specific, as Ursula gains awareness as a distinct individual. The term

ultimately refers to the people as a mass, sometimes as a mob, with derogatory connotations reminiscent of the paradigmatic modernist divide between the elite and the popular, identified by F.R. Leavis in *Mass Civilisation and Minority Culture*, published in 1930 (12-30).¹ Moreover, similarly emphasizing the potency of language in his controversial *The Intellectuals and the Masses* (1992), John Carey draws from *The Revolt of the Masses* by Ortega y Gasset, also published in 1930, to suggest that the mass is a conceptual construct reliant on this very divide. “Its function, as a linguistic device,” Carey writes, “is to eliminate the human status of the majority of people – or at any rate, to deprive them of those distinctive features that make users of the term, in their own esteem, superior.” Although Carey finds in Lawrence’s works evidence of the Nietzschean idea that “mass existence cannot properly be called life” (Carey 78), for Lawrence the divide may not be so clear-cut since his quest consists in positioning himself, his *self*, in relation to the masses. In “Pornography and Obscenity,” he asks whether his reaction to the mob is individual or “am I merely reacting from my mob-self?” (238).

- 8 Finally however, from 1916 onwards, the term “mass” undergoes a further shift in Lawrence’s fiction and essays which has, so far, drawn little critical attention. No longer used as an isolated and variously qualified noun, it is more often met within a specific word pair that couples the term “mass” with the adjective “sticky” or a phrase conveying the idea of stickiness. For instance, Lawrence writes of the war, in a letter dated 26 June 1916,

Even this glamour of camaraderie, which is the glamour of Homer and of all militarism, is a decadence, a degradation, a losing of individual form and distinction, a merging in a *sticky male mass* [...] I could not bear it (*L. ii.* 618, my emphasis)

- 9 A combination of these terms is also found in his last novel, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, where, speaking of the bond of love, Connie declares: “Perhaps only people who are capable of real togetherness have that look of being alone in the universe [...]. The others have a *certain stickiness, they stick to the mass*” (271, emphasis mine).
- 10 I argue that this ultimate shift occurred as Lawrence resumed reading Walt Whitman’s collection *Leaves of Grass* which, according to Jessie Chambers, “was one of his great books” (122). The poems had left a deep impression on Lawrence who, for instance, quotes some lines from “I saw in Louisiana a Live-Oak Growing” in *The White Peacock* (171, see also *SCAL* xxvi). In January 1917, following their time together at Christmas in Cornwall, Lawrence wrote to his American friend, and subsequent literary agent, Robert Mountsier, requesting that he send a list of works by American authors, among whom Whitman, with a view to writing essays about “American classics.” His very personal and penetrating essays were first published in the *English Review* between November 1918 and June 1919, and later collected, in a revised form in 1923, under the title *Studies in Classic American Literature*. The essay devoted to Walt Whitman prompts my contention that Lawrence’s sustained interest in the American poet’s vision of democracy is directly related to the emergence of the phrase “sticky masses” in his writings.

From adhesiveness to stickiness

- 11 Walt Whitman endeavored to promote a balance between the self and the masses that he describes in the opening lines of the 1871 version of his poem “One’s-Self I Sing”:

One’s-Self I sing, a simple separate person,
Yet utter the word Democratic, the word En-Masse. (Whitman 1965, 1)

- 12 The second line offers a striking instance of how Whitman’s argument is grounded in the reflexivity of language, as registered in the accumulation of the performative verb “utter,” the repetition of “word,” the capitalization of “Democratic,” and the borrowing of “En-Masse” from French (see Warren 49-51).²

- 13 Similarly, in his long pamphlet, *Democratic Vistas* (1871), Whitman addresses the contradictions of democracy in the United States and envisages love as a force that binds and fuses humanity. Here, synonymia (emphasized) is grounded in the reflexivity of language to convey his thought process,

Not that half only, individualism, which isolates. There is another half, which is
adhesiveness or love, that fuses, ties and aggregates, making the races comrades, and fraternizing all. (Whitman 1964, 381, my emphasis)

- 14 The idea of “adhesiveness,” also highlighted in this passage, is fundamental in Whitman’s utopia. The concept is derived from phrenology, which studies the conformation of the skull as indicative of mental faculties and traits of character. Phrenology was promoted in Europe by the German doctor Franz Joseph Gall (1758-1828) and, later, by the Scottish lawyer George Combe (1788-1858), and enjoyed great, though controversial, popularity in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Combe, in particular, evidenced adhesiveness as a function of the brain that triggers devotion, friendship and love. Phrenology was, of course, fraught with eugenic implications.

- 15 Walt Whitman’s primary contact with the theory was through American phrenologists Orson and Lorenzo Fowler and Samuel R. Wells who founded the newspaper *Life Illustrated: A Journal of Entertainment, Improvement and Progress*. The periodical was one of the earliest to review *Leaves of Grass* and later published its second edition (see Lynch 84). The Fowlers wrote extensively about adhesiveness in their periodicals emphasizing gregariousness and sociability, what they called “brotherly love” (Lynch 85), same-sex attraction and love being considered a “result of excessive adhesiveness” in phrenological terms (Lynch 82). Lorenzo Fowler “read” Walt Whitman’s head and revealed an immense potential for adhesiveness. In a 1931 article called “Walt Whitman and His Chart of Bumps,” Edward Hungerford suggests that the reading had such an effect on Whitman that it “was to inspire, or at least corroborate with the authenticity of science, an altering conception of himself” (366).

- 16 Whitman’s interest in phrenology led him to construct a social project based on a new vision of democracy where the idea of adhesiveness is a working force in the balance between the self and the masses. Indeed, Whitman advocated male to male comradeship as the foundation of a democratic society based on love.

- 17 Lawrence must have been aware of this pseudo-scientific background when he wrote his essay devoted to the American poet.³ Besides Whitman’s poems, it is highly probable that he read *Democratic Vistas*, which was included in the edition of *Leaves of Grass* that he had received from Mountsier (SCAL xxx, Sagar 88). Lawrence, however,

voices his resistance to the utopia by demoting the very idea of adhesiveness. Indeed, to refute Whitman's ideal, he destabilizes language and opts for the more derogatory term "stickiness" when he explores in his own fiction the political implications of Whitmanesque democratic adhesiveness. *Kangaroo*, published in 1923, is the novel where Lawrence discusses most extensively a society based on love. Lawrence's alter-ego, Somers, rejects love as a social bond that party leader Ben Cooley, alias Kangaroo, strongly advocates, stating that he is "against the whole sticky stream of love, and the hateful will-to-love," and then elaborates on the imagery of stickiness saying, "It's a sort of syrup we have to stew in and it's loathsome [...] as if one were only a cherry in the syrup" (K 209).

- 18 Contrary to adhesiveness, which hinges on "ardent strength of attachment and warmth of friendship" (Lynch 82), stickiness denotes attraction *and* repulsion akin to viscosity, the viscous pertaining both to aberrant fluid and melting solid whose paradigms French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre draws upon to problematize the feeling of compromised integrity and overwhelming adulteration when confronted with the contingency of things. In *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre provides us with a striking consideration of viscosity, sometimes translated as sliminess, when he writes, "I suddenly understand the snare of the slimy: it is a fluidity which holds me and which compromises me" (776), also stating, "In the very apprehension of the slimy there is a gluey substance, compromising and without equilibrium, like a haunting memory of *metamorphosis*" (777, italics in the original). Interestingly, Sartre includes honey, glue and pitch in "the great ontological region" of viscosity (779). In this light, Lawrence's opting emphatically for stickiness can be read as a warning against "the snare" of adhesiveness, translated in socio-political terms as democracy.
- 19 In *Aaron's Rod*, published in 1922 just before *Kangaroo*, "pitch" supplies a simile to depict a crowd of demonstrators taking to the streets in Milan. Aaron looking down from a balcony "could hardly see anything but hats and shoulders, uneasily moving like boiling pitch away beneath him. But the shouts began to come up hotter and hotter" (AR 183-84). In this highly musical novel, Lawrence plays with the polysemous term "pitch" which can also qualify sound, as in "The voices rose in pitch and derision" (AR 184). In spite of this astute antanaclasis, the imagery of stickiness prevails to convey how, like boiling pitch spewed out from the hellish iron works, the proletarian masses pour out into the streets in a plea for a democratic voice while Aaron remains aloof, both spatially and ideologically.
- 20 Moreover, revealing the extent to which the imagery of stickiness is prevalent in his fiction from 1916 onwards, in *Mr. Noon*, first drafted in 1920, Lawrence similarly spells out this rejection of compromise and his endeavor to preserve his self separate from the masses. The imagery of stickiness is enhanced with that of the swamp, as in "Not the horrible *sticky merge* of like things [...] Oh heaven, save me from a *morass* of people all alike to one another" (MN 186, emphasis mine). The same derogatory imagery of stickiness crosses the boundary of literary genres when, in a later essay, "Pornography and Obscenity," published in the *Criterion Miscellany* in November 1929, Lawrence inveighs against the "sticky universal pitch that [he] refuse[s] to touch," explaining "you accept the majority, the mob, and its decisions, or you don't" (237).
- 21 Thus, the imagery picked up when discussing Whitman's ideas becomes one of Lawrence's own linguistic idiosyncrasies; it "sticks" in his phrasings, across genre boundaries. In fact even currently, stickiness provides the lexicon to convey communal

identity: one will talk about culture as being the “glue” of society, persisting metaphors are said to “stick,” and, today, websites boast high numbers of faithful visitors calling them “sticky communities.” But Lawrence’s use of stickiness, like Sartre’s, evidences a trap that, according to him, the individual should stay clear of. Therefore paradoxically, Lawrence appropriates and demotes language, creating not a metaphor that may be shared with the masses, as a community, but his own unique and recurrent expression of resistance and rejection.

- 22 However, Lawrence does use a popular metaphor to express an acute sense of his working-class background, *i.e.* to acknowledge the mining community he originated from. Indeed, the title of the posthumously published “The Fly in the Ointment” borrows from the Ecclesiastes (10:1, “Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour,” the image of a drowned insect stuck in liniment. Written in 1910 as “The Blot” and revised in 1912-1913, the short story focuses on a young teacher disturbed by a thief as he was writing to his girl-friend. The teacher’s sudden awareness of the youth’s squalid background leaves a blot on his mind that dissipates his mood for writing a love-letter. Foregrounding the narrator’s ambivalence, John Worthen offers an interesting cue when he points out that, in the first version of the story, Lawrence seems to ask who the fly in the ointment is (236). Is it the young thief stuck in his destitute background, or is it Lawrence, the teacher, a blot in the educated class? The ointment is thus redolent of the “syrup” mentioned above.
- 23 The imagery of the title “The Fly in the Ointment” merges stickiness and insects, “obscene insects,” a phrase from the essay “The Crown” (294), also being a recurring trope for the masses in Lawrence’s works and letters (see *L ii.* 331, 520, 542).

Insects

- 24 Flies, bugs, beetles and vermin appear recurrently in Lawrence’s texts to depict groups of adverse people; for instance, in the play *Touch and Go*, “vermin” designates industrialists, like Mr Barlow, who, according to a spokesman for an angry mob, profit financially by “liv[ing] on the sweat and blood of the people” (420-21). The noun morphs into a verb (“I’ll vermin you!”) when Mr Barlow’s son, Gerald, takes to literally kicking the offender away. Gerald’s verbal reply to the spokesman neatly blends literal and figurative meanings, culminating in a zeugma that draws attention simultaneously to language and physical confrontation: “I’ll vermin you! – I’ll put my foot through your phrases” (421).
- 25 When Lawrence discusses democratic ideals, eusocial insects, such as ants and bees, qualify to epitomize a constrainingly organized community.⁴ Lawrence’s ant and bee imagery develops with the advent of entomology, which engages in the study of insects to better understand human interactions and, in some cases, as Charlotte Sleigh suggests in *Six Legs Better: A Cultural History of Myrmecology*, to promote “a social ideal to which humanity should strive” (11). The first International Congress of Entomology was held in Brussels in 1910 and, in 1913, the British entomological committee was renamed the Imperial Bureau of Entomology. Similar developments took place in the field of melittology, from the Greek, *melitta*, bee.
- 26 Lawrence kept abreast of the spreading epistemologies derived from studies of eusocial insects, sensitive as he was to their ideological, linguistic and narrative potential. In *Women in Love* (135) and *The Ladybird* (209), the characters allude to experiments carried

out by leading French naturalist Jean-Henri Fabre (1823-1915), whose home was called “La Fourmilière” (the Ant Colony). In 1919, Lawrence read *The Naturalist on the River Amazons* by H.W. Bates, who devotes a chapter and the frontispiece of his seminal work to ants (Sagar 89).

- 27 By Lawrence’s time, ants had become a case-study for scientists to better “model” aspects of human life (Sleigh 11). The American entomologist, William Morton Wheeler (1865-1937), drew connections between the mass behavior of ants and of humans based, notably, on the predominant role of the workers as a caste providing food. Therefore, as Sleigh explains, the biologists’ metaphor used to describe a process in nature acquired “sticky edges – cultural resonances that reach beyond its immediate application to the natural world and suggests all kinds of unintended connections [...]. In this way the metaphor goes on to shape new exploration, experimentation, and representation” (14-5). In fact, social and political agendas became increasingly attached to the science of entomology which fashioned a new epistemological view of human society, as instantiated by Wilfred Trotter’s stark conclusions on crowd psychology, drawn from analogies with the hive and ant colony in *Instincts of the Herd in War and Peace*, which Lawrence read the year it was published, in 1916 (Sagar 86). As Simon King points out in *Insect Nations*, “It is, then, language itself, rather than the masses, which ‘swarms’ in the modern world,” concluding, “ants become transformed into tropes in language at the same time that language is used to describe in precise, scientific terms, the life of ants” (22-3).
- 28 Wheeler is mentioned in Aldous Huxley’s *Point Counter Point* (1928), one of the novel’s characters, Philip Quarles, having studied several works by the entomologist (Huxley A. 438), presumably *Ants: Their Structure, Development and Behavior* (1913) and *Social Life Among the Insects* (1923) (see Meckier 77). Lawrence must have had no difficulty in placing a scientist as renowned as Wheeler in the field of myrmecology when he read *Point Counter Point* in 1928. In fact, all of Aldous Huxley’s novels percolate scientific data and question its social implications (see Meckier 59-60). His older brother, Julian, became a biologist in the footsteps of their grand-father, T.H. Huxley, greatly esteemed for his work on evolution. Lawrence met the brothers in 1915, through Lady Ottoline Morrell, and saw them again later in *Les Diablerets*, in Switzerland, in 1928 (Huxley J. 160). In her comparative study of Julian Huxley and Lawrence, titled “Romantic Ethologies,” Caroline Hovanec explores these meetings to show how both men “saw animals as creatures of instinct and emotion” (33).
- 29 But I suggest that, in the interval, Lawrence and Julian Huxley stayed connected in unexpected ways. Besides books such as *The Individual in the Animal Kingdom* published in 1912 and *Philosophical Ants*, a humorous fable written in 1922, Julian Huxley published regularly in the *English Review* and other periodicals to which Lawrence either contributed or in which his own books got reviews. So Lawrence must have come across Julian Huxley’s scientific articles. For instance, a letter to Fredrick Carter, dated 3 June 1924, reveals that Lawrence expected to receive a copy of the *Beacon*, a short-lived periodical in which Carter had just published part of *The Dragon of the Alchemists* and to which Julian Huxley contributed (see L v. 49).⁵ Julian Huxley’s research on insects, and ants in particular,⁶ led him, like other entomologists, to develop an interest in eugenics since some ant societies eliminate any wounded or diseased individuals, putting the survival of the nest first. Lawrence’s own ideas about a “natural aristocracy,” which appear throughout his works, carry such undertones.

- 30 Therefore, the puns that hinge on ant imagery in Lawrence's works are not merely an echo of Nietzsche's "ant-hill trumpery" (205), they also incorporate the myrmecologists' quest for "a metaphor" to explain human behavior (see Sleight 14-5). In *Kangaroo*, Lawrence's voice blends this time with that of Ben Cooley, who distinguishes his democratic vision, based on love, from a great ant-like society founded on utilitarianism. Turning the masses into a metonymy for constraint and submission, Cooley spurns the "ant-heap" (K 121) with its "antish trick" (122) and "ant-tactics," (123) asserting that one must remain "apart from all antics and ant-tricks" (123). The repetition of the puns is empty, mechanical, regulative and frustrating, like the sort of society Lawrence/Cooley shuns. The vocally challenging combinations of successive short syllables, as in "antish trick," "ant-tactics," "antics" and "ant-tricks," showcases Murray's astute suggestion that "Lawrence's writing explores the bristling excitations generated by these epidermic encounters between self and swarm through the form of the text," an encounter likened to the "cutaneous hallucination known as formication (from the Latin *formicāre*, to move like ants)" (63).
- 31 Just like the stickiness of masses, the ant-like society compromises individual integrity, and that's why Cooley is fighting to keep true to himself despite being "stung and stung and stung again," and he believes that, thanks to "the flame" that burns in his heart as a separate individual, he is now immune, that "their poison is innocuous, and the formic acid of social man has no effect on [him]" (K 122). The metaphors of fire and ant-heap blend to voice his profound disgust at a utilitarian society and its compulsions, sketching an apocalyptic pyre of figurative ants that is at times read, with hindsight, as heralding Nazi eugenic ideology.
- 32 Similarly, other entomological puns, related to bee imagery, map out the characters' outlook on democracy. In *Aaron's Rod*, like his counterpart, Ben Cooley, in *Kangaroo*, Lilly inveighs against "the ideal of unity and unanimity – all the lot – all the whole beehive of ideals – [that have] all got the modern bee-disease, and gone putrid, stinking" (280-81).⁷ Consistent with these examples, in *Kangaroo*, Somers's homophonic play on the biblical "Beatitudes" and "Bee attitudes" instils triviality into the religious reference to challenge social uniformity (K 282-83). In a fit of indignation, Somers deconstructs the title traditionally given to a passage of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew V), in that, by evoking the paradigm of eusocial insects' impersonal submission, his pun undermines a founding text of Christian society. Of course, the use of apian imagery to describe a well coordinated society harks back to Homer, Aristotle and Virgil, but Lawrence gives it a new twist when he derives the derogatory simile from the biblical Beatitudes. Indeed, by reordering letters, and language, Lawrence reorders the world to suit his ideal and to denounce the epistemological stance which positions a social order over the individual.
- 33 Entomological tropes and sticky imagery both function as critical tools to depict the subordinated masses from which, according to Lawrence, the self must remain isolated. The effect of the trope is thus to turn the masses into a metonymy for social-political constraints and submission. Thus, capitalizing on the figurative resources of language, Lawrence never wavered in his quest to find how, "out of nothingness and the undifferentiated mass, [he could succeed in making] something of [him]self" (R 263). The nexus between artistic creativity and intellectual probing is, however, critically overshadowed when the views expressed resonate with eugenic ideologies, in particular those which later found horrendous political outlets.

- 34 But Lawrence's thought adventure can manifestly be read as deliberately tending to its breaking point when sticky imagery and entomological tropes warn of the encroachments of the masses on the self. To stay clear of what he believed to be a socio-politically viscous snare, Lawrence attempted to define his own concept of a democratic society whose elected few would join in Kangaroo's metaphorical rallying cry "A bas les fourmis!" (K 122).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Auden, W.H. "Bestiaries Are Out," in *Collected Poems*. London: Faber & Faber, 2007, 738.
- The Bible: The Authorized King James Version with Apocrypha*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Carey, John. *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1880-1939*. London: Faber & Faber, 1992.
- Chambers, Jessie. *D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Record*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965.
- Cohen, Ted. "Figurative Speech and Figurative Acts," in *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. Ed. Mark Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981. 182-99.
- English Review*. March-August 1921. 29 January 2020. <<https://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/webbin/serial?id=englishreview>>
- Hovanec, Caroline. "Romantic Ethologies: D.H. Lawrence and Julian Huxley," in *Animal Subjects: Literature, Zoology, and British Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. 117-58.
- Hungerford, Edward. "Walt Whitman and His Chart of Bumps," in *American Literature*, 2 (1931). 350-84. 26 January 2020. <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2920158>>
- Huxley, Aldous. *Point Counter Point*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1954.
- Huxley, Julian. *Memories*. Vol. 1. London: Allen & Unwin, 1973.
- King, Simon. *Insect Nations: Visions of the Ant World from Kropotkin to Bergson*. Ashby-de-la-Zouch: Inkermen Press, 2006.
- Lawrence, D.H. *Aaron's Rod*. Ed. Mara Kalnins. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Lawrence, D.H. "The Crown," in *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays*. Ed. Michael Herbert. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 251-306.
- Lawrence, D.H. "Fly in the Ointment," in *Love Among the Haystacks and Other Stories*. Ed. John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. 49-53.
- Lawrence, D.H. *The Fox, The Captain's Doll, The Ladybird*. Ed. Dieter Mehl. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Lawrence, D.H. *Kangaroo*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Lawrence, D.H. *Lady Chatterley's Lover and A Propos of "Lady Chatterley's Lover,"* Ed. Michael Squires. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Lawrence, D.H. *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, vol. II, June 1913-October 1916*. Ed. George J. Zytaruk and James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Lawrence, D.H. *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, vol. V March 1924-March 1927*. Ed. James T. Boulton and Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Lawrence, D.H. *Mr Noon*. Ed. Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Lawrence, D.H. "Pornography and Obscenity," in *Late Essays and Articles*. Ed. James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 233-53.

Lawrence, D.H. *The Rainbow*. Ed. Mark Kinkead-Weekes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

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

Lawrence, D.H. *Touch and Go. The Plays*. Ed. Hans-Wilhelm Schwarze and John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Lawrence, D.H. *The White Peacock*. Ed. Andrew Robertson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Lawrence, D.H. *Women in Love*. Ed. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Leavis, F.R. *Mass Civilisation and Minority Culture*. Cambridge: The Minority Press, 1930.

Lynch, Michael. "'Here Is Adhesiveness': From Friendship to Homosexuality." in *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Autumn, 1985), 67-96. 9 January 2020.

< <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3827566>>

Meckier, Jerome. "Quarles among the Monkeys: Huxley's Zoological Novels," in *Aldous Huxley*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2010. 59-77.

Murray, Rachel. *The Modernist Exoskeleton: Insects, War, Literary Form*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. Trans. Thomas Common. Ed. Joslyn T. Pine. USA: Dover Thrift, 1999.

Ortega y Gasset, José. *The Revolt of the Masses*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1932.

Sagar, Keith, ed. *A D.H. Lawrence Handbook*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. Trans. Hazel E. Barnes. New York: Washington Square Press, 1992.

Sassoon, Siegfried. *Diaries, 1915-18*. London: Faber & Faber, 1983.

Sleigh, Charlotte. *Six Legs Better: A Cultural History of Myrmecology*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2007.

Smart Set, 68 (May-August 1922). 29 January 2020.

< <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000677968>>

Sultzbach, Kelly. *Ecocriticism in the Modernist Imagination: Forster, Woolf, and Auden*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Warren, James Perrin. *Walt Whitman's Language Experiment*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990.

Whitman, Walt. "Democratic Vistas," in *Prose Works*. Vol. 2. Ed. Floyd Stovall. New York: New York University Press, 1964. 361-426.

Whitman, Walt. *Leaves of Grass: Comprehensive Reader's Edition*. Ed. Harold W. Blodgett and Sculley Bradley. New York: New York University Press, 1965.

Worthen, John. *D.H. Lawrence: The Early Years 1885-1912*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

NOTES

1. This division is contemporary with the coining of the word "highbrow," first recorded in print in 1884 and popularized in 1902, a term derived from the phrenological belief that intellectuals had a larger forehead (a neologism emphasized by Leavis who comments, "'High-brow' is an ominous addition to the English language," 16-17).
2. In *Walt Whitman's Language Experiment*, focusing on "ami(e)," "élève," "ensemble," and so on, Warren argues that "Whitman borrows the French words to designate a relationship for which the English [Saxon] vocabulary has no term," and thus he "spiritualizes the language and its users" (50).
3. Later, in 1925, Lawrence received a book by phrenologist Havelock Ellis (Sagar 99).
4. For a more detailed discussion of insects from different perspectives, including the poem "Mosquito" (1920), see Murray's chapter "Formication: D.H. Lawrence" (61-94).
5. Julian Huxley's long essay titled "The Control of the Life-Cycle" was serialized in the *English Review* between March and June 1921. In the May 1921 issue Lawrence's war poems are mentioned in an article devoted to Richard Aldington (405). Moreover Lawrence published "The Blind Mind" in the *English Review* dated July 1920 (22-41), the issue in which Aldous Huxley's poem "Leda" is reviewed (94); Aldous Huxley's short story "The Gioconda Smile" was printed in the August 1921 issue (88-117), where Lawrence's poems "Medlars and Sorb-Apples" and "Pomegranate" were also published (81-83). In the July 1922 issue of the *Smart Set*, *Aaron's Rod* and "The Lost Girl" are discussed (143) and the publication of *A Virgin Heart* by Remy de Gourmont, translated by Aldous Huxley, is announced (144).
6. While writing *The Science of Life* with H.G. Wells, Julian Huxley included so much information on ants that he was required to cut most of it out: "I had indeed been so carried away by my interest in social insects that I produced this 'monster' of 150,000 words, but it clearly had to be cut; and cut I did, though it was a painful operation, I utilized the surplus portions to produce a little book on *Ants and Termites*" (Huxley J. 164).
7. It is interesting to note that W.H. Auden, who voiced his admiration for Lawrence's poetry, claims, in his poem "Bestiaries Are Out" (1964), that, although bees stood as social models in the past, generating mellittological tropes, now that "Research has demonstrated how / They actually behave, they strike us / As being horribly unlike us" (Auden 738). Kelly Sultzback suggests that, in these lines, "the human-oriented words 'behave' and 'being' audibly play on the insect-oriented 'beehive' and 'bee-ing'" (162).

ABSTRACTS

This article considers how Lawrence finds in the dynamics of derogatory imagery the means to express his alienation from the masses. From 1916 onwards, the term “masses” is often paired with the adjective “sticky” in Lawrence’s works, an addition that is shown to relate to Lawrence’s reading of Walt Whitman. The American poet advocated democracy based on brotherly love as a political implementation of the phrenological idea of adhesiveness. The lexical shift from adhesiveness to stickiness, then, voices Lawrence’s ambivalent response to Whitmanesque democracy. Similarly, in a few of his novels, the narrative voice, following the advent of entomology, taps into zoomorphism to find in eusocial insects, such as bees and ants, the tropes to discuss human interactions. Lawrence kept abreast of entomological views, including those of his friend Julian Huxley, and thanks to puns and derogatory imagery, he destabilizes language in order to question contemporary collective assumptions about society and democracy.

INDEX

Keywords: masses, democracy, phrenology, entomology, alienation

AUTHOR

SHIRLEY BRICOUT

Shirley Bricout is affiliated to the University Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3, EMMA (France). Her field of research is D.H. Lawrence and the Bible. The translation into English of her first book was released in 2015 under the title *Politics and the Bible in D. H. Lawrence's Leadership Novels* at the Presses universitaires de la Méditerranée. She also wrote the dictionary entry devoted to Lawrence in *La Bible dans les littératures du monde* (The Bible in World Literature), published in 2016 and contributed a chapter to the recently published *Edinburgh Companion to D.H. Lawrence and the Arts* (edited by Catherine Brown and Sue Reid). She has guest-edited a special issue of the *Journal of the Short Story in English* devoted to Lawrence and has contributed articles and book reviews to academic journals in France, the UK and India.