인문논총 제78권 제3호 (2021.8.31), pp. 15~45
[DOI] https://doi.org/10.17326/jhsnu.78.3.202108.15

"Form" as Norm?:

A Postcolonial Reading of D. H. Lawrence's "Introduction to These Paintings" and Some Other Late Writings*

Ryu, Doo-Sun**

[ABSTRACT]

D. H. Lawrence's critique of formalism, presented by Clive Bell in *Art* (1914) or Roger Fry in *Cézanne: A Study of His Development* (1927), is so remarkable that Lawrence can be said to prefigure post-colonial studies by several decades. In this study, Lawrence's "Introduction to These Paintings" (1929) is read as a parody of the then-dominant aesthetic theories that proffered "significant form" as a kind of Eurocentric norm. In order to contextualize this piece, I reference *Sketches of Etruscan Places* (1927) as well as *Lady Chatterley's*

* 이 논문은 서울대학교 인문학연구원이 지원한 집담회의 성과임.
This essay is an expanded version of my position paper presented at "D. H. Lawrence, Distance and Proximity: Virtual, International Symposium," 10~14 July 2021.

** Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Seoul National University

주제어: D. H. Lawrence, "Introduction to These Paintings," *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, Significant Form, Modernism, Postcolonialism, Eurocentrism
D. H. 로런스, 「이 회화작품들에 대한 소개」, 『에트루리아 지역 스케치』, 의미 있는 형식, 모더니즘, 탈식민주의, 서구중심주의

Lover (1928). My discussion expands upon postcolonial studies such as Homi Bhabha's notion of "cultural difference" and Gayatri Spivak's concern with subalterns. However, rather than applying postcolonial theories to Lawrence, I would like to conduct a dialogue between them and Lawrence. Thus positioning Lawrence as a fulcrum between modernism and postcolonialism, I hope to redress Lawrence's current reception—that, although he differs considerably from contemporaneous modernists, his postcolonial attitudes have not been fully discussed—by revealing that the then-dominant formalism is no less than an advocate of significant form as a Eurocentric norm. I also hope to "supplement" postcolonial studies by exploring the ways in which Lawrence discloses what is lacking in this otherwise-useful vantage point, that is, considerations of the alternatives he felt indispensable.

1.

In this essay, I will take a look at Lawrence's "Introduction to These Paintings" as well as *Sketches of Etruscan Places* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* from the postcolonial perspective in order to examine the ways in which Lawrence questions the so-called formalistic tendencies, often shared by Lawrence's contemporary modernists, as one of the most dominant aesthetic ideologies of that time. Thus, this essay aims to show that Lawrence presages postcolonial theoreticians' criticism of Eurocentrism, or the belief in the West as the norm. Specifically, Lawrence's critique of formalism, as advocated by critics such as Clive Bell or Roger Fry, is so remarkable that Lawrence can be said to prefigure postcolonial studies by several decades.

Focusing on his late writings in particular, I read Lawrence's "Introduction to These Paintings" as a parody of then-dominant aesthetic theories, as represented by Bell's *Art* and Fry's *Cézanne: A Study of His Development*,[1] theories that, I argue, proffer "form" as a kind of Eurocentric norm. In order to contextualize this piece, I also reference both *Sketches of Etruscan Places* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, all of which resulted from Lawrence's encounters with cultural Others.[2]

The publication dates of these writings show how closely they are connected. "Introduction to These Paintings" came out in 1929, two years before *Sketches of Etruscan Places* and rather late in Lawrence's life, after he had already written several essays about the genre of the novel in the mid-1920s and *Mornings in Mexico*, published in 1927. *Lady Chatterley's Lover* interferes in the middle; however, while he was working on its third version, Lawrence visited Etruria earlier that year, the result of which was *Sketches of Etruscan Places*. Very near the end of his life, Lawrence wrote "Introduction to These Paintings," directly stimulated by reading Fry's *Cézanne*, which came out in 1927 (Fernihough 117), but which, I believe, also refers back to Clive Bell's *Art*, published in 1914.[3]

---

1) On December 21, 1928, Lawrence wrote to his friend S. S. Koteliansky: "Could you ask any one of the book-sellers to send me *at once*, with the bill, a copy of Roger Fry's *Cézanne* book? It would make a good starting point for me to write a good peppery foreword against all that significant form piffle" (*L* 7 82).

2) Lawrence left Europe in 1922 to wander around the world, making the "savage pilgrimage," as Lawrence himself called it, and before he returned to Europe in 1925, where he stayed permanently until his death in 1930. In the essay, I call this period later Lawrence, which is distinguished from earlier Lawrence in that the former discusses formalism from the political point of view.

3) Lawrence often revisits these subjects. For instance, *Women in Love* stages interesting scenes regarding aesthetic theories in its latter part, including the debate

I have two specific aims in this essay: first of all, suspecting that Bell's and Fry's formalism might be associated with the violence of obliterating all kinds of differences that might exist among races, I argue that their stances regarding form as norm or standard can be considered Eurocentric. Thus, I would like to give a political edge to the formalistic tendencies shared by Lawrence's contemporary modernists, particularly when I consider Lawrence's mockery of "significant form" in "Introduction to These Paintings." According to Lawrence, although significant form may look like a purely formal expression, it is in fact the result of the imposition and, consequently, the imperialistic feature, of its representative aesthetic, which he elaborates on in *Sketches of Etruscan Places*. Therefore, I will relate *Sketches of Etruscan Places* to "Introduction to These Paintings," combining the aesthetic and political aspects of the issue of significant form, giving it a postcolonial interpretation. I will also mention *Lady Chatterley's Lover* as a space in which Lawrence puts this topic on the stage, making suggestions about the sense of "touch" in real life and Cubism, whose implications are discussed in the novel.

I believe Lawrence might have endorsed Homi Bhabha's "cultural difference," as opposed to "cultural diversity," agreeing with Bhabha that cultural differences cannot be unified at all.[4] Furthermore, Gayatri Spivak's concerns about subalterns, who cannot "represent"—in the political sense of the word[5]—themselves, give useful insights into my postcolonial read-

---

between Ursula and Gudrun and Loerke.

4) See also Lawrence's letter written on October 1, 1929, where he emphasizes the importance of "queer *otherness*" with reference the "Etruscan things" (*L* 7 508). Likewise, *Sea and Sardinia* (1921) and *Mornings in Mexico* (1927) provide invaluable statements about the issue of differences.

5) Spivak distinguishes its two, that is, "political" (*vertreten*) and "aesthetic" (*darstellen*)

ing of Lawrence's "Introduction to These Paintings" in relation to *Sketches of Etruscan Places* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.[6]

My second aim in this essay is to conduct a dialogue between Lawrence's writings and Bhabha's and Spivak's postcolonial studies, to highlight both their similarities and their differences. For example, I would like to point out that Bhabha's cultural difference does not go into its content. Almost the same would be true of Spivak, who worries about the possibility of epistemic violence when trying to give voice to the subalterns. In contrast, Lawrence does not mind distinguishing one culture from another in terms of its content, by including a discussion on, say, the sense of "touch" he found in the tombs of the Etruscans.[7] In other words, instead of reinforcing a reductive, and consequently Eurocentric, significant form as norm, Lawrence proposes the sense of touch as an alternative, thus relating it to his contention in "Introduction to These Paintings" that the culmination of Cézanne's art is witnessed when Cézanne embodies the "appleyness of an apple" in only a few paintings.

Thus, by positioning Lawrence as a fulcrum between modernism and postcolonialism—or, more precisely, by providing a postcolonial reading of Lawrence and the prevailing modernism of his day—I hope to contribute to both modernism studies regarding Lawrence and to postcolonial studies.

---

senses (*A Critique of Postcolonial Reason* 257-64).

6) In his most recent essay about "Introduction to These Paintings," Jeff Wallace does not mention anything about the relationship between "Introduction to These Paintings" and *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, although he points out that "Lawrence contests this version of abstraction by reapplying the concept not to Cézanne's painting but to the critical gesture that Fry and Bell enact" (9).

7) "Here, in this faded etruscan painting, there is a quiet flow of touch that unites the man and the woman on the couch" (*SEP* 54).

2.

I will look at “Introduction to These Paintings” first, because, although written later, it offers a fuller exploration of Lawrence’s aesthetic philosophy that we see in *Sketches of Etruscan Places*. Whereas much of *Sketches of Etruscan Places* deals with Lawrence’s appreciation of the Etruscan tombs that survived Roman destruction,[8] “Introduction to These Paintings” addresses the issue of “form” more obviously, ridiculing Bell’s notion of significant form and its political implications. Lawrence’s mockery of contemporary aesthetic theorists is so caustic that critics and scholars have certainly pointed out the differences between Lawrence and Bell or Fry. However, I am afraid the political implications of those differences have not been fully explored. I would like to take a look at a critic like Anne Fernihough, who aligns Lawrence with Fry or Bell, even calling Lawrence a plagiarist, insists that it was Fry who greatly influenced Lawrence: “A close comparison of Fry’s monograph with Lawrence’s ‘Introduction,’ however, reveals what barely falls short of substantial plagiarism, on Lawrence’s part, of Fry’s argument, both on a general and on a more detailed level (117). I admit that Lawrence would endorse part of what Fry wrote about Cézanne, especially his analysis of the “dramatic” qualities of Cézanne’s paintings (*Cézanne* 46).[9] However, she seems to

8) For instance, “The Romans took [the Etruscans] out of life” (*SEP* 56). Earlier in the same book, Lawrence wrote, “Why this lust after imposing creeds, imposing deeds, imposing buildings, imposing language, imposing works of art?” (33).

9) According to Laura Marcus, Lawrence might have received an insight for the “appleyness of an apple” from Fry’s “‘treeness of the tree’” he coined in his introduction to the catalog of the 1910 Post-Impressionist Exhibition” (7). She also says, “As Fernihough points out, Lawrence used, without irony, the term ‘aesthetic

overlook the fact that Lawrence questions the processes of abstracting a standardized significant form from all kinds of different "forms."[10]

The above does not imply that Lawrence was not interested in form; indeed, form was a lifelong interest. Since Lawrence often revisits earlier ideas, I will consider briefly early Lawrence's ideas on form, before I take a look at how later Lawrence examines formalistic tendencies. First of all, historic contextualizing of the notion of form seems necessary, including, for instance, what was meant by "form" without the adjective "significant" during Lawrence's lifetime. As stated earlier, formalistic tendencies have been accepted as a representative characteristic of modernism. However, although Lawrence did not seem to share the conventional meaning of form common among his contemporary modernists, he was as keenly interested in form as any of them. But his own ideas were considerably different from theirs, and his definition of form might sound peculiar.[11] For Lawrence, form in its contemporary sense is problematic, as we see in his "German Books: Thomas Mann," a book review on the German writer,

---

emotion' in two further essays on art, 'Pictures on the Walls' and 'Making Pictures,' in an argument that seems much indebted to Bell's *Art*" (7).

10) It is possible to connect this "significant form" with "a thesis, a theory" (*SEP* 171), and other examples of impositions. In the same light, the following excerpt from *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, which witnesses a culmination of Lawrence's parody of Bell and Fry, offers a postcolonial intuition as well: "Art is still to us something which has been well cooked—like a plate of spaghetti. An ear of wheat is not yet 'art.' Wait, wait until it has been turned into pure, into perfect macaroni" (*SEP* 164). See Lawrence's letter—"Myself, I don't care a button for neat works of art" (*L* 5 200)—he wrote to defend himself against Carlo Linati, who, according to the note on her in the Cambridge *Letters*, "presents Lawrence as a writer whose imaginative intensity exceeds his capacity for thematic and structural control" (*L* 5 200). See also Neil Roberts on Lawrence's "break with the well-made poem" (82).

11) For Lawrence's idea on the "form" of *Sons and Lovers*, see *L* 1 476-77.

where he separates form from "style," which, he contends, is subjective, and makes a negative comment on Mann's emphasis on form. In reference to his "Tonio Kröger," Lawrence criticizes his "craving for form," pointing out that the "craving" is closely related to Mann's doubtful attitude toward life and claiming that, although Mann deals with life, that life is "stale" ("German Books" 313). Mann's sense of form is, according to Lawrence, especially doubtful because too much of the writer's will is imposed on it, thus damaging the balance with "the stuff he writes": "[the] will of the writer to be greater than and undisputed lord over the stuff he writes, which is figured to the world in Gustave Flaubert" ("German Books" 308).

Lawrence could not emphasize the importance of "balance" or "equilibrium" too much, as when he found fault with contemporary modernism, which, he thought, failed to strike a balance. Almost the same might apply to his aesthetic theories, which, I think, are closely related with modernism. It is for the same reason that Lawrence might have thought Bell's focus on form to be another example of extremism, which upsets the balance.[12)]

Since I am trying, in this essay, to look at the aesthetic issue from a political, that is, postcolonial, viewpoint, I hope that my approach will distinguish itself not only from Fry's and Bell's but also later scholars'. For instance, Bell's *Art* seems to present significant form as an aesthetic term: a combination of "form and design," by means of which certain emotions and feelings are evoked in the viewer: "In each, lines and colours com-

12) Lawrence was interested in "balance" or "equilibrium" throughout this life, beginning with 1908 (*L* 1 96-97). See also S*ketches of Etruscan Places* 57, 64, and "Him With His Tail in His Mouth" ("Him With His Tail" 314-15).

bined in a particular way, certain forms and relations of forms, stir our aesthetic emotions" (*Art* 17).[13] Lawrence went against the grain, against what was commonly meant by significant form, especially when he criticized it for its "abstracting," which in turn reveals their fundamental differences with regard to the definition or function of art: whereas art for Bell, after the process of abstracting, boils down to significant form, for Lawrence, significant form leads nowhere because abstracting results in the loss of all different "forms," that is, all differences. Hence, Lawrence mocks significant form, associating it with high religiosity, or "aesthetic ecstasy" ("Introduction" 199), to use Lawrence's own expression.[14]

That being said, from the postcolonial point of view, Lawrence's "Introduction to These Paintings" opposes Bell's and Fry's claims because he thought their offer of form was a kind of Eurocentric norm: one of the most remarkable examples is detected when Bell uses it as a universal term, insisting that it might apply to any culture in the world, not just an individual work of art: "Sophia and the windows at Chartres, Mexican sculpture, a Persian bowl, Chinese carpets, Giotto's frescoes at Padua, and the masterpieces of Poussin, Piero della Francesca, and Cézanne?" (*Art* 17).[15] Instead, I contend that exactly the opposite seems to be true, that

13) This is how Bell defines "significant form": "when I speak of significant form, I mean a combination of lines and colours (counting white and black as colours) that moves me aesthetically" (20).

14) See also Richardson and Ades: "Critics of an intellectual bent, such as Clive Bell and Roger Fry, mistaking the chaos for a new insubstantiality, rose up to evangelize it in the name of 'aesthetic ecstasy' and 'significant form'" (443).

15) I am afraid that this has been misinterpreted, one of which is found in the case of Urmila Seshagiri who insists, quoting Bell, that "significant form democratizes the aesthetic experience because 'we need bring nothing with us from life, no knowledge of ideas and affairs, no familiarity with its emotions'" (71).

is, significant form or "Pure Form" is a result of the suppression of individual "forms," which might lie among different races, making possible the above-mentioned enforced "universalization."[16)]

> Purify yourself of all base hankering for a tale that is told, and of all low lust for likenesses. Purify yourself, and know the one supreme way, the way of Significant Form. I am the revelation and the way! I am Significant Form, and my unutterable name is Reality.
>
> ("Introduction" 199)

Thus, "Introduction to These Paintings" is not merely a treatise on aesthetics but also a political pamphlet, and I argue that significant form can be said to be one of the results when conquerors obliterate differences.

Now let us turn to *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, where, as I said, significant form is given political meanings more evidently than in the later essay on art, in order read the travelogue with the help of postcolonial theoreticians, including Bhabha and Spivak. From the postcolonial point of view, *Sketches of Etruscan Places* distinguishes itself from other contemporary travel writings, which often fall prey to Orientalism, as defined by Edward Said, in that, for instance, instead of seeing the so-called "primitives" as childish, *Sketches of Etruscan Places* witnesses Lawrence's refusal to attribute childishness to other peoples and cultures, suggesting

16) When Virginia Woolf points out Fry's "universalizing" desire, she seems to qualify it in her biography of him (1940): "He was going to 'apply his theories of esthetics to the visual art of the whole world, in roughly chronological sequence, from Egypt to the present day.' He was going at last to crystalise the mass of ideas that had been accumulated in his mind ever since, as a young man he had gone to Rome" (*Roger Fry* 287). I think Woolf's perception might apply to Bell as well in the passage from his *Art* more than two decades ago.

that Lawrence was sentient about the stereotype.[17] Lawrence even dissolves the binary between child and adult, which makes it possible for him to avoid the evolutionary model, unlike contemporary modernists.[18]

Spivak's interest in subalterns as the marginalized overlaps with the primary significance of *Sketches of Etruscan Places*: the Etruscan culture, including language, had been completely destroyed by the Romans. Spivak's subalterns might refer to native informants or new immigrants, depending on their historical contexts. However, if the problem of imperialism is taken into account, subalterns can also be said to refer to a group of people from the rest, such as Lawrence's Etruscans, as long as they were the conquered.

Spivak's discussions on subalternity are relevant not only because she, like Lawrence, is interested in the "vanished" subalterns, but also because she considers the possible epistemic violence committed when scholars from the West desire to "represent"—again, in the political sense of the word—the rest in their own terms, that is, in Western terms. As readers of *Mornings in Mexico* might remember, Lawrence shares this concern with Spivak; and Spivak's comments concerning subalterns can also apply to the

17) Said says, "Many terms were used to express the relation: Balfour and Cromer, typically, used several. The Oriental is irrational, depraved (fallen), childlike, 'different'; thus the European is rational, virtuous, mature, 'normal' (*Orientalism* 40). In contrast, Lawrence seems to dissolve the binary between child and adult differently, as in the following: "[The ancients] were like children: but they had the force, the power and the sensual *knowledge* of true adults. They had a world of valuable knowledge, which is utterly lost to us. Where they were true adults, we are children; and vice versa" (*SEP* 125).

18) Fanon and Said are also anticipated in *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, when Lawrence's writing suggests that the identity of the weaker is constructed by the stronger. For instance, against the historians' framing of the Etruscans as being "vicious," Lawrence retorts, "Who isn't vicious, to the enemy?" (*SEP* 9). See also Fanon: "what is often called the black soul is a white man's artifact" (*Black Skin, White Masks* 6).

Etruscans because, like subalterns, they cannot "represent" themselves. It is at this point that Spivak advises those who wish to give voice to subalterns to realize that neither European historians nor elite nationalist counterparts, as in India, are reliable (Morton 50). Like Spivak, Lawrence was fully conscious that he had to face this kind of predicament.[19] Whereas Spivak's question is "Can the Subaltern Speak?", Lawrence's question in *Sketches of Etruscan Places* is, How is it possible to represent the Etruscans, who have vanished. The Etruscans, just like the subalterns, lack those who can represent them adequately. Although multiple historians have written about the Etruscans, they were of no great help: for instance, one of the Western scholars denied the Etruscans' very existence: "a great scientific historian like Mommsen hardly allows that the Etruscans existed at all. Their existence was antipathetic to him" (*SEP* 9).[20] Unlike Said's usual Orientalists, who depend on previous scholarship without seriously questioning its validity, Lawrence emphasized the importance of experience,[21] and he wanted to share his experience of Etruscan art with his readers in *Sketches of Etruscan Places*. Aware that the Romans had "wiped out" (*SEP*

19) According to Spivak, European historians were not reliable, but even after independence, elite nationalist historians ignored this group of people, too. Either way, the subalterns had been kept mute, and the Subaltern Studies group recently tried to give voice to them, reversing what the histories registered about them, which Spivak finds also questionable because reversal only leads to legitimation: "A careful deconstructive method, displacing rather than only reversing oppositions (such as between colonizer and colonized) by taking the investigator's own complicity into account" (*A Critique of Postcolonial Reason* 244).

20) See also Lawrence's letter to Else Jaffe (May 26, 1926): "Mommsen hated everything Etruscan, said the germ of all degeneracy was in the race" (*L* 5 465). For Western scholars on Assyrian art, see Lawrence's *Apocalypse* (87-89).

21) David Ellis also mentions the importance of experience for Lawrence (187, 187n).

20) anything Etruscan except for the tombs, as I said, Lawrence visited them before he wrote it, confirming the importance of experiencing them before making insightful statements about them.

Lawrence, also like Spivak, was fully cognizant of the danger of the effort to give voice to subalterns. In this context, *Sketches of Etruscan Places* is also suggestive since it shows how difficult it is to represent the marginalized and how easy to eliminate the differences between races. *Sketches of Etruscan Places* is similar to "Introduction to These Paintings" on the matter of suppressing differences, when Lawrence questions the Western aesthetic represented by Bell and Fry, in that both critics are pejoratively implied, although *Sketches of Etruscan Places* does not mention Bell or Fry directly. Therefore, let us take a look at the issue of "differences" in detail. First of all, what is most noteworthy about Lawrence's attitude toward differences is that they cannot be gulfed easily since they are incompatible.[22] The word "abstraction" is meaningful in this context. It appears in "Introduction to These Paintings," but its parallel is "systemazation" in *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, where Lawrence poses a question, both rhetorically and ironically, "Why must all experiences be systematized?" (*SEP* 171).[23]

---

22) Lawrence's interest in differences had been anticipated in earlier writings. For instance, Birkin of *Women in Love* claims about "intrinsic difference between human beings" (*WL* 209). However, it is roughly post-*Women in Love* that Lawrence approached differences rather politically, giving up on the idea of hierarchy among cultures. In this context the phrase "insuperable differences" (12) from *Sea and Sardinia* is meaningful because, instead of adopting the evolutionary model, Lawrence approaches the issue in terms of differences.

23) For the same reason, Lawrence did not like the idea of "museumizing": "Museums, museums, museums, object-lessons rigged out to illustrate the unsound theories of archaeologists, crazy attempts to coordinate and get into a fixed order that which

Lawrence emphasizes that these differences had been abolished by force in *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, where Lawrence himself writes more obviously about the importance of both individual experiences and collective ones, including races. He writes of the Romans' conquest of the Etruscans and their cultures in *Appendix I* to *Sketches of Etruscan Places*:

> But it is inevitable that the harmoniously-developing race will get smashed when an inharmoniously-developed race gets started with a rush. It is like letting the pigs in the garden. They produce a desert, and the gardening has to begin all over again.
>
> (*SEP* 260)

Lawrence continues, "to get any idea of the pre-Roman past, we must break up the conception [of] oneness and uniformity, and see an endless confusion of differences" (*SEP* 261). For Lawrence, what is most relevant are the results of the conquest, and the previous comments show his firm belief that one needs to pose a fundamental question about the "normal," standardized culture imposing itself on the conquered. Lawrence thus argues that the Etruscan culture was devastated by the Romans before it had to completely submit to the dominant official Roman culture, that is, "form" as meant by Bell and Fry.[24]

---

has no fixed order and will not be coordinated! It is sickening? Why must all experience be systematised" (*SEP* 171). See also *Sea and Sardinia*: "Life is then life, not museum-stuffing" (140). Spivak shares this idea with Lawrence, although the context is different: referring to Devi's treatment of the aboriginal in her story "Pterodactyl," she writes, "The aboriginal is not museumized in this text" (145). Related to this, Mark Sanders writes about Spivak's interest in the "ethical" aspect of Devi's story (19).

24) Like Lawrence, I do not distinguish Bell and Fry. In his book on Cézanne, Fry

As is well known, Bhabha distinguishes cultural difference from cultural diversity in *The Location of Culture* (34),[25] and I believe Lawrence might have endorsed cultural difference rather than cultural diversity: consider that Lawrence's word "incompatible" (*SEP* 171) even finds its counterpart in Bhabha's "incommensurable," often used in his book.[26]

---

emphasizes "crystallisation" (*Cézanne* 76) of the forms in Cézanne's paintings. Fry also emphasizes geometrical elements in them: "It is characteristic of Cézanne's method of interpreting form, thus to seize on a few clearly related, almost geometrical elements, and then on top of this clearly held framework, to give to every part of the contour the utmost subtlety of variation which his visual sensibility could discover and his nervous drawing record" (75). By contrast, Laura Marcus argues that, "If it is inaccurate to draw an absolute divide between the aesthetics of Bloomsbury and of Lawrence, it is also important to note that Fry's and Bell's positions were not identical. "Significant Form" was Bell's phrase, and Fry made, in a number of his writings, some of his own qualifications to Bell's insistence on the radical autonomy of the aesthetic sphere and aesthetic response" (7)

25) "If cultural diversity is a category of comparative ethics, aesthetics or ethnology, cultural difference is a process of signification through which statements of culture or on culture differentiate, discriminate and authorize the production of fields of force, reference, applicability and capacity" (*The Location of Culture* 34). See Eleanor Byrne, who maintains that Bhabha is calling for "a re-evaluation of any concept of cultural diversity around either some form of relativism, or transcendent universal category" (33). See also David Huddart for Bhabha's "postcolonial perspective" in general: "The post-colonial perspective is an uncanny one, and unsettles the self-definition of Western modernity, which has imagined itself to be separate from other cultural formations" (89).

26) Lawrence and Bhabha are also similar in that their approaches are historical: just as Bhabha deals with the situation after decolonization, so Lawrence refers to his contemporary modernists, not just to the Etruscans after their conquest by the Romans. Lawrence's emphasis on the violent replacement of "an endless confusion of differences" by "oneness and uniformity" lines him up with Bhabha when he contrasts the "pedagogical" and the "performative" within a nation in the "Dissemination" chapter of *The Location of Culture*. Similarly, prefiguring Bhabha by several decades, Lawrence stressed the importance of "lesser souls," rather than

In this light, we can cast a sideward glance at Fernihough, who speaks of Lawrence's "affinities with Cubism" (117) before she claims that Picasso's paintings were not satisfied with what the camera can do (119-20), which is understandable, but less understandable as soon as she links Lawrence and Cubism for multi-perspectivism. Almost the same would be true with a critic such as Amit Chaudhuri, as long as he associates it with what he finds in Cubism, that is, multiple perspectives (137). Lawrence truly urged the necessity of more than one perspective, but I would argue that Lawrence put his emphasis on the possible balancing between the two eyes: "mackerel's eye, as well as man's" (qtd. Fernihough 120-21). In addition, Lawrence might have questioned Fernihough's and Chaudhuri's understanding of Cézanne's greatness if it originates from the significance of geometrical forms, even though the later history of art did not follow the line as Lawrence wished.[27] My interpretation, unlike Fernihough's or Chaudhuri's, is that Lawrence's insistence on multiple eyes needs to be read as a warning against the danger of anthropomorphism, rather than as an insistence on the necessity of multi-perspectivism. Thus I argue that what matters most for Lawrence is not the number of pairs of eyes, but "a whole new marriage of mind and matter" ("Introduction" 206).

Again, this idea was not abrupt, but a continuation or development of

---

the authorized, but reduced, "one great soul": "The whole thing was alive, and had a great soul, or *anima*: and in spite of one great soul, there were myriad roving, lesser souls" (*SEP* 57).

27) See also Richard Verdi, who argues that Fry admits that "[a number of Cézanne's still lifes] embody the formal principles that govern the painter's designs which, as Cézanne indicated, constantly strive after the geometric regularity of the sphere, the cone and the cylinder" (546).

what Lawrence presents in "Study of Thomas Hardy," where he criticizes "geometric abstraction of the bottle" ("Study" 75). It should be noted, however, that back then Lawrence did not relate it to the question of race or imperialism, judging by the fact that he was speaking of Italian Futurists' tendencies.[28] In *Women in Love*, Lawrence also finds fault with geometry's possible oversimplification: "Every problem could be worked out, in life as in geometry" (417), but it was not until Lawrence wrote *Sketches of Etruscan Places* that his interest in the race question became much keener. In *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, Lawrence deploys an interesting image of "omelette" to parody Bell's or Fry's significant form—"You'll have that formless object, an omelette" (*SEP* 171)—sarcastically offering it as what has lost its own "form," or difference.[29] Therefore, I argue that an omelette, as a version of significant form, is made possible only by ignoring and consequently suppressing all the "incompatibles" mentioned earlier.

This "omelette" image also has a history, referring back to Lawrence's 1921 book *Sea and Sardinia*, which confirms that the reductiveness of Bell's significant form is parodied even earlier than *Sketches of Etruscan Places* or "Introduction to These Paintings," since Bell's book was published in 1914. In fact, the "lemonade crystals" from the Sardinia travelogue refers to a state when differences have been suppressed, leaving "crystals" only: "Think of all the lemonade crystals they will be reduced to" (12).[30]

---

28) This is also anticipated in Lawrence's 1914 letter, where he relates "Latin nature" with "form" (*L* 2 162-63).

29) "If you make an omelette out of a hen's egg, a plover's, and an ostrich's, you won't have a grand amalgam or unification of hen and plover and ostrich into something we may call 'oviparity.' You'll have that formless object, an omelette" (*SEP* 171).

30) Therefore, an "omelette" might be a development of the "lemonade crystals,"

What is really remarkable about *Sketches of Etruscan Places*'s re-introduction of the crystal image is its political implications. Now Lawrence expands on it, by adding the race or Empire problem to the original, thus giving it a postcolonial edge.

3.

So far, we have seen that Lawrence's critique of contemporary formalistic tendencies has much in common with what postcolonial theorists such as Bhabha or Spivak say about one of the tasks of imperialism: destroying other peoples' cultures, thereby obliterating any differences that might exist among different cultures. In relation to the Etruscans in particular, as far as Bhabha is concerned, we have seen that cultural difference was what was destroyed by the Romans, whose art in turn became the representative Western art: "The Romans took [the Etruscans] out of life," which has resulted in "Romanized Etruscans of the decadence" (*SEP* 131). Moreover, Lawrence would have agreed with Spivak's warning not to impose anything onto the conquered, if we consider all the impositions made

---

although in a different context. Both refer to a state where "insuperable differences," to quote Lawrence's own expression in *Sea and Sardinia* again, have disappeared. For the sharply contrastive image of crystal, see Fry's *Cézanne*: "more and more [Cézanne] resigned himself to accepting the thing seen as the nucleus of crystallization in place of poetical inspiration" (10), and "Here the crystallization of the form is complete" (76). The "crystal" image appears in Lawrence's "Preface to *New Poems*" written in 1919, when Lawrence praises Walt Whitman's free verse, contrasting Whitman with English Romantic poets such as Keats or Shelley: "We do not speak of things crystalised and set apart. We speak of the instance, the immediate self, the very plasm of the self. We speak also of free verse" (649).

by the West onto the rest, bearing in mind all the cautions Lawrence himself gave in writings such as *Mornings in Mexico*.[31]

However, Lawrence parts with both Bhabha and Spivak as soon as he begins to speculate on the "content" of what had disappeared in Etruscan art. In contrast to Bhabha and Spivak, who warn us to stop lest we run the risk of speaking on behalf of the marginalized, Lawrence *does* take further steps to give voice to that race and its culture. Thus, an important difference between the two is found in their respective attitudes towards the marginalized, victims of the impositions made by the conquerors, in terms of specific cultural characteristics. Since the role of Bhabha's cultural difference is limited to that of emphasizing the importance of maintaining it between two different cultures, the following discussion will center on Spivak.

Certainly, Lawrence is similar to Spivak in that neither searches for "lost origins": Lawrence, like Spivak, definitely said that the past cannot be restored, claiming that only Fascists seek for it (*SEP* 30-31).[32]

---

31) "The Indian way of consciousness is different from and fatal to our way of consciousness. Our way of consciousness is different from and fatal to the Indian. The two ways, the two streams are never to be united. They are not even to be reconciled. There is no bridge, no canal of connexion. / The sooner we realise and accept this, the better, and leave off trying, with fulsome sentimentalism, to render the Indian in our own terms" (*MM* 61). It is in this context that Lawrence, who, watching the Etruscan remains with his own eyes rather than repeating what his armchair anthropologists said, speculates on the "impossible," to use Spivak's term, because it had "vanished."

32) Lawrence distrusted the concept of "origins" in general because he believed that one cannot figure out what the origin was. Interestingly, Lawrence shares something with Spivak on a "lost" culture: Spivak appreciates Mahasweta Devi's reluctance to retrieve it by giving voice in an attempt to represent them on their behalf. In particular, in speaking of the ending scene of Devi's story, Spivak maintains that

Therefore, it should be admitted that Lawrence's stance is not greatly different from Spivak's in her reading of Mahasweta Devi's stories. However, one of the greatest differences between the two is found when Lawrence *did* want to do something more with the Etruscans. Specifically, Lawrence marks the sense of touch as one of the distinctive features of Etruscan art. This marking is significant for two reasons. First of all, Lawrence experienced for himself the Etruscan tombs, without acceding to what had been written about them by scholars available then. In other words, Lawrence did not follow the steps taken by the Orientalists, as presented by Edward Said. Thus, Lawrence's marking was made on what of Etruscan culture had survived the devastation by the Romans. Secondly, and more important than the first, it is the result of Lawrence's interest in the "truth of today" (*SCAL* 14), by which I mean that Lawrence presents it as an alternative to contemporaneous modernist art and aesthetic theory, rather than as an effort to restore the past.[33] In other words,

---

its nostalgic tone is counterpointed by the very last sentence, which is just descriptive and brief, almost resembling the protagonist's succinct style as reporter, contributing much to the construction of that part "without succumbing to the nostalgia for lost origins" (146). This is confirmed by the fact that, as soon as the story ends, Spivak quotes what Devi said about the arbitrariness of the "ancestral soul": "the idea of ancestral soul is almost my own" (196). Also in her essay on Coetzee's *Foe*, Spivak sees Friday as a native, who withholds his secrets, despite a Western woman's efforts to encourage or force him to reveal them. Just like Devi, according to Spivak, Coetzee does not let Friday be interpreted by the whites" (*A Critique of Postcolonial Reason* 190).

33) The main interest of *Sketches of Etruscan Places* does not lie in what Etruscan culture might have been, but in what relevance Etruscan art might have for Lawrence's contemporary culture. Likewise, "Introduction to These Paintings," a writing about an alternative aesthetic, is a critique of the dominant aesthetic of his contemporary modernists, including Cubism.

Lawrence's interest in the sense of touch accounts for much of his own aesthetic, especially in his reservations about the dominant aesthetic theory's focus only on eyesight. One of the most important reasons Lawrence looked back, if ever, was that he thought something had gone wrong with modernist art. What Lawrence in turn aspired to was giving an interpretation of Etruscan culture to his contemporary modernists.

In this context, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, especially the third edition, introduces both the sense of touch and geometrical forms, closely connected with the significant form found in "Introduction to These Paintings." In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Lawrence tests the importance of touch in life, as depicted in Connie and Mellors's physical relationship, which, as scholars agree, resulted from Lawrence's visit to the Etruscan tombs.[34] For this essay, the novel is also significant in that it dramatizes one of Lawrence's critiques of Cubism and, by extension, modernism. I do not think that it is a coincidence that the novel introduces Cubism with Duncan Forbes inviting Mellors to show his Cubist works,[35] and the gamekeeper expressing his reservations about the art belonging to Forbes, who seems to be a believer in the aesthetic theory proposed by Fry or Bell: "His art was all tubes, valves, and spirals, and strange colours, ultramodern," and it is "a personal cult, or a personal religion" (*LCL* 286).[36] Such comments re-

34) Simonetta de Filippis, the editor of the Cambridge Edition of *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, writes, "The concept of touch, in the sense of physical and pre-mental communication, is a major theme of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (xxxi). It is notable that de Filippis calls it a "notion," not just a sense. Joori Lee reads the novel, seeing the touches as "affective touches" in her essay "Affective Touches: Cézanne's Tactile Apples and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*."

35) Regarding Lawrence's 1915 visit to Duncan Grant, see Ellis, who argues that in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the painter is presented "in a less sympathetic light" (392).

mind us of what Lawrence wrote about abstract art and its high religiosity, the "aesthetic ecstasy" quoted above from "Introduction to These Paintings," where the abstractions are generally criticized.

Lawrence instead presents the sense of touch as an alternative to contemporary art and its aesthetic founded on geometrical forms, often proffered as the norm not only as an aesthetic, but also as a political, alternative. In this light I take a look at the sense of touch Lawrence found as one of the most outstanding characteristics in Etruscan art.

Let us return to "Introduction to These Paintings," which connects *Sketches of Etruscan Places* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, to understand Lawrence's continuous emphasis on the sense of touch, in contrast with the aesthetic based on geometrical forms. *Sketches of Etruscan Places* makes more direct statements about the Empire issue in terms of touch, but it cannot be denied that "Introduction to These Paintings" *does* introduce words regarding the sense of touch—such as "palpable" (202), "tangibly" (212), and "solid" (217), in addition to the word "touch" itself (214, 217). Thus confirming the connection between *Sketches of Etruscan Places* and "Introduction to These Paintings," I would like to relate this emphasis on touch to the problem of Empire in "Introduction to These Paintings," where the sense of touch takes on another significance with respect to contemporary aesthetic, contrasting itself with the sense of sight, which Lawrence finds contemporary modernist artists stressed exceedingly. As a new artistic trend during Lawrence's lifetime that he strongly positions himself against, the sense of sight can be properly explained only by the introduction of Kodak cameras, which, according to Lawrence, can capture

36) It is admitted that his art is "with a certain power, even a certain purity of form and tone," though (*LCL* 286).

the "fronts" (212) only, resulting in "flatness," which Lawrence finds questionable. Lawrence provides an alternative to this trend in "Introduction to These Paintings," using certain of Cézanne's paintings as examples.

An exploration of the ways in which the sense of touch is related to Cézanne's paintings requires comparative interpretations of Cézanne's paintings made by Lawrence and Bell or Fry. Lawrence's suggestion about a political note in his high evaluation of Cézanne in "Introduction to These Paintings" differs considerably from Bell's and Fry's. It is true Bell and Fry had as high a regard for Cézanne as Lawrence, but we should notice their different reasons: Bell and Fry focus on the contribution Cézanne made to the development of later formalism, one of whose versions is Cubism, in which significant form plays a crucial role. In other words, for Bell and Fry, Cézanne was primarily a formalist.[37] In sharp contrast, Lawrence admired a few of Cézanne's paintings mainly because only they succeeded in striking a balance between mind and matter, which suggests his opinion that this balance was something contemporaneous artists failed to achieve. That is why Lawrence criticized them for their flat art based on geometrical forms. It is for the same reason that Lawrence depreciated some painters, including Italian Futurists, who describe the human body as if it were mechanical.[38] Thus, I argue that, only when we see Cézanne's paintings

37) See also Fry: "It is to the effect that natural forms all tend to the sphere, the cone and the cylinder" (*Cézanne* 52).

38) Similarly, also in *Sketches of Etruscan Places* Lawrence positions the sense of touch in opposition to the "idea, concept, the abstracted reality, the ego" (203). Earlier, Lawrence expressed his ambivalence concerning Italian Futurists in his "Study of Thomas Hardy": "So that when I look at Boccioni's sculpture, and see him trying to state the timeless abstract being of a bottle, the pure geometric abstraction of the bottle, I am fascinated. But then, when I see him driven by this desire for the male complement into portraying motion, simple motion, trying to give expression

as an alternative to art founded on geometrical forms can Lawrence's high evaluation of Cézanne be correctly understood. Unlike Bell or Fry, Lawrence wanted the body to exist as such, emphasizing Cézanne's importance by paying attention to the "matter," but only as much as the artist's "mind," mentioned earlier. This explains why Lawrence complained that contemporary modernist painters like Matisse put too much emphasis on the artist's mind as a new way of dealing with the matter, which, according to Lawrence, is no less than the malaise of "egocentrism."[39]

Instead of reductive "form," which Bell and Fry considered a Eurocentric norm, Lawrence's high approval of Cézanne in "Introduction to These Paintings" culminates when he writes about Cézanne's "appleyness of an apple" in his paintings, including not only still life paintings with apples but also the portrait of Madame Cézanne particularly in read dress and Card Players with two figures (212). The expression "appleyness of an apple" might sound somewhat vague, but I think it contains within it a fundamental question about artistic representation. This phrase has two earlier iterations. First of all, Lawrence's readers are reminded of the phrase the "Looliness" of *Women in Love* (235), as well as a scene from near the end of the novel, when a hot debate is staged among Ursula, Gudurn, and Loerke about how to represent a horse. (Of course, the tone of the latter is less serious than the former.) Then we have the "horsiness of a horse," which appears in *Sketches of Etruscan Places* (127), where the Etruscan horse paintings are contrasted with other

---

to the bottle in terms of mechanics, I am confused" ("Study" 75).

39) In my forthcoming essay on Lawrence and modernism, I explore the ways in which Lawrence critiques the version of contemporary modernists by characterizing it as literature of the "pitch of extreme consciousness" (*SCAL* 12).

Western horse paintings. The "horsiness of a horse" situates itself between the "Looliness" of *Women in Love* and the "appleyness" of "Introduction to These Paintings," but *Sketches of Etruscan Places* reveals its post-colonial significance more clearly than the other two; its version presents the painting of horses as a symbol of Etruscan art, that is, the art of the conquered, in opposition to official Roman art, imperial and "Greekified" (*SEP* 52), and epitomized as Western.[40] For Lawrence, the Etruscan horses have more to do with "real" horses. Some might think Lawrence speaks of verisimilitude established on faithful representation, but this is not the case; Etruscan horses, according to Lawrence, are different from the horses that can be captured through Kodak cameras. More importantly, they do not share much with Plato's Idea, which in turn rubs shoulders with Bell's and Fry's significant form.[41] For Lawrence, Etruscan horses have "the odd spontaneous forms that are never to be standardized" (42), which explains why they are "perfectly satisfying *as* horses: so far more horse-like, to the soul, than those of Rosa Bonheur or Rubens or even Velasquez" (127). Thus, I argue that Lawrence's interest in the "vanished Etruscans" and their culture is postcolonial in that it shows the ways in which the art of the conquered has been systematized into "a grand amalgam or unification" (171).

---

40) Lawrence called it "Greek rationalism" (*SEP* 59). In his letter to Frederick Carter written in October 1929, Lawrence refers to "the great pagan vision," which has "none of that boring Greek 'beauty'" (*L* 7 508). In contrast, Fernihough does not distinguish Greece and Etruria when she writes, "Lawrence and Heidegger both try to argue that in ancient cultures like those of Greece and Etruria people were somehow able to respond to 'Being' spontaneously and openly" (138).

41) Ellis considers Bell and Fry's theories "Platonic," as when he relates Cézanne and Plato's Idea (464, 465-66).

Setting up all its political implications in *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, Lawrence returns to this issue of representation in "Introduction to These Paintings," when he, seemingly from an aesthetic viewpoint, brings up the "appleyness of an apple" and writes about the balance between mind and matter that Cézanne succeeded in striking in a few of his paintings. I say "seemingly" because, even when Lawrence praises Cézanne's unprecedented achievements, claiming that these were made possible when some of his paintings faithfully listened to the painter's command, "Be an apple!" ("Introduction" 211), Lawrence positions himself in sharp contrast to Fry's appreciation of Cézanne as formalist and their common emphasis on significant form as Eurocentric norm.[42] Lawrence's "Introduction to These Paintings" reaffirms what he had said about anti-Platonism in *Sketches of Etruscan Places*, when he asserts, "Cézanne's apple is a good deal more than Plato's Idea ("Introduction" 203).

In conclusion, I have tried to redress the current reception of Lawrence: although he differs significantly from contemporaneous modernists, his postcolonial attitudes have not been fully discussed. In addition, I have tried to "supplement" postcolonial studies by exploring the ways in which Lawrence discloses what is lacking in this otherwise useful vantage point, that is, considerations of the alternatives Lawrence felt indispensable.

---

42) Lawrence even questions the directions taken by Matisse or Vlaminck by claiming that, "They are Cézanne abstracted again" ("Introduction" 204), losing the sense of touch, he found both in Etruscan tombs and Cézanne's successful paintings. See also Jack Stewart, who contends that "Fry's vitalist vision finds life in formal structures rather than in object" (166).

Bibliography

【논 저】

Bell, Clive. 1958. *Art*. New York: Capricorn.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Byrne, Eleanor. 2009. *Homi K. Bhabha*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chaudhuri, Amit. 2003. *D. H. Lawrence and “Difference.*” Oxford: Oxford UP.

De Filippis, Simonetta. 2002. “Introduction.” *Sketches of Etruscan Places*. Ed. Simonetta de Filippis. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. xxi–lxxiii.

Ellis, David. 1998. *D. H. Lawrence: The Dying Game 1922-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Fanon, Frantz. 2008. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto.

Fernihough, Anne. 1993. *D. H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Fry, Roger. 1960. *Cézanne: A Study of His Development*. New York: Noonday.

Huddart, David. 2006. *Homi K. Bhabha*. London: Routgledge.

Lawrence. D. H. 1980. *Apocalypse and the Writings on Revelation*. Ed. Mara Kalnins. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (*A*)

_____. 1968. “German Books: Thomas Mann.” *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence*. Ed. Edward D. McDonald. New York: Viking. 308–13. (“German Books”)

_____. 1988. “Him With His Tail in His Mouth.” *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine and Other Essays*. Ed. Michael Herbert. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 305–17. (“Him With His Tail”)

_____. 2004. “Introduction to These Paintings.” *D. H. Lawrence: Late Essays and Articles*. Ed. James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 182–217. (“Introduction”)

_____. 2002. *Lady Chatterley’s Lover and “A Propos of Lady Chatterley’s Lover.”* Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 2002. (*LCL*)

_____.1979. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence. Vol. 1: 1901–13*. Ed. George J. Zytaruk and James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (*L 1*)

_____. 1981. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence. Vol. 2: 1913–16*. Ed. George J. Zytaruk and James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (*L 2*)

_____. 1989. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence. Vol. 5: 1924–27*. Ed. James T. Boulton and Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (*L* 5)

_____. 1993. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence. Vol. 7: 1928–30*. Ed. Keith Sagar and James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (*L* 7)

_____. 2009. *Mornings in Mexico and Other Essays.* Ed. Virginia Crosswhite Hyde. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (*MM*)

_____. 2013. "Preface to *New Poems*." *Poems. Vol. 1*. Ed. Christopher Pollnitz. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 645–49. ("Preface")

_____. 1997. *Sea and Sardinia*. Ed. Mara Kalnins. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (*SS*)

_____. 2002. *Sketches of Etruscan Places*. Ed. Simonetta de Filippis. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (*SEP*)

_____. 2003. *Studies in Classic American Literature*. Ed. Ezra Greenspan, Lindeth Vasey, and John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (*SCAL*)

_____. 1986. "Study of Thomas Hardy." *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*. Ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 3–128. ("Study")

_____. 1987. *Women in Love*. Ed. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey, and John Worthen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (*WL*)

Lee, Joori. 2018. "Affective Touches: Cézanne's Tactile Apples and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*." *D. H. Lawrence Studies*, 26.2: 67–90.

Marcus, Laura. 2014. "Bloomsbury Aesthetics." *The Cambridge Companion to the Bloomsbury Group*. Ed. Victoria Rosner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 162–79.

Morton, Stephen. 2003. *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. London: Routledge.

Richardson, John Adkins and John I. Ades. 1970. "D. H. Lawrence on Cézanne: A Study in the Psychology of Critical Intuition." *The Journal of*

Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 28.4: 441–53.

Roberts, Neil. 1995. “Lawrence, Imagism and Beyond.” *British Poetry, 1900-50: Aspects of Tradition*. Ed. Gary Day and Brian Docherty. London: St. Martin’s, 81–93.

Said, Edward W. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.

Sanders, Mark. 2006. *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: Live Theory*. London: Continuum.

Seshagiri, Urmila. 2004. “Orienting Virginia Woolf: Race, Aesthetics, and Politics in *To the Lighthouse*.” *Modern Fiction Studies*, 50.1: 58–84.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Stewart, Jack. 1999. The Vital Art of D. H. Lawrence: Vision and Expression. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP.

Verdi, Richard. 2009. “Roger Fry’s ‘Cézanne, a Study of His Development.’” *The Burlington Magazine*, 151.1277: 544–47.

Wallace, Jeff. 2016. “Educability and Art: D. H. Lawrence, Paul Cézanne, Herbert Read.” Études Lawrenciennes [Online], 47: 1–20.

Woolf, Virginia. 1968. *Roger Fry: A Biography*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

원고 접수일: 2021년 7월 26일
심사 완료일: 2021년 8월 15일
게재 확정일: 2021년 8월 15일

초 록

규범으로서 ‘형식’?

— D. H. 로런스의 「이 회화 작품들에 대한 소개」와 몇몇 후기 저작에 대한 탈식민주의적 읽기

유 두 선*

클라이브 벨의 『예술』과 로저 프라이의 『쎄잔』에서 주창된 형식주의에 대한 D. H. 로런스의 비판은 탈식민주의 논의를 수십 년 앞선다는 점에서 주목할 만하다. 이 논문은, 로런스의 에쎄이 「이 그림들에 대한 소개」를 유럽중심적인 규범으로서 ‘의미 있는 형식’을 제시하는 당시 주류 모더니스트 미학이론에 대한 패러디로 읽고, 또 문맥을 살피기 위해 비슷한 시기에 쓰여진 『에트루리아 지역 스케치』와 『채털리부인의 연인』을 함께 다룰 것이다. 이 논의가 바바의 ‘문화적 차이’라는 개념과 가야트리 스피박의 서발턴 개념 등 탈식민주의 관점을 들여오고 있지만, 단순히 탈식민주의 이론을 로런스에 적용하기보다는 이들과 로런스 사이의 대화를 모색할 것이다. 이렇듯 로런스를 모더니즘과 탈식민주의 사이의 지렛목으로 활용함으로써, 이 논문은 ‘의미 있는 형식’을 중심으로 한 로런스 당시의 형식주의가 이것을 유럽중심적인 규범으로 제시한다는 점을 드러낸다. 그리하여 지금의 로런스 수용 문제—즉, 로런스가 당대의 모더니스트들과 상당히 다름에도 불구하고 그의 모더니즘이 보이는 탈식민주의적 요소가 충분히 논의되지 않았다는 점—를 시정하고자 한

* 서울대학교 영어영문학과 교수

다. 여기에 더해 이 논문은 로런스가 탈식민주의 이론을 ‘대리보충’했다는 주장을 펼치고자 한다. 로런스 스스로는 이러한 형식주의에 대안을 모색하는 것이 필요하다고 판단했지만, 나름대로 유용한 탈식민주의 논의에는 이 모색이 결핍되었기 때문이다.