

# “Blood” in D.H. Lawrence and O. Wilde

Motofumi Nakayama

Lawrence and Wilde found something special in “blood.” Lawrence had a firm belief in “blood” symbolizing primitive “daemoniac” energy. Lawrence’s blood operates as energy to encourage one to transcend individuality and acquire “a greater life.” With profound insight, he asserts that an invisible world of “blood-consciousness” underlies the visible world. Wilde too stresses “blood” as seen in “The Nightingale and the Rose,” “The Happy Prince,” or “The Selfish Giant.” The “blood,” which is inseparable from death, is without fail shed for the sake of others; it is the so-called sacrificial one. He sees beauty and truth in the moment life sparkles at its maximum. Both of them turn their eyes to and recognize great values in things invisible, which the “blood” represents. They were distrustful of society in which they lived, and irritated with the people who believed in practical worth or who are always self-conscious, never forgetting themselves. Almost all their works serve as critique of the times in which they lived. The “blood” they describe is different in quality, but they are in common in that they find in the “blood” great significance and a clue to the truth of life which is usually unseen on the surface of ordinary life.

**Key Words** : blood, blood-consciousness, mental consciousness, sensuality, beauty, truth

---

## I Introduction

Lawrence and Wilde are fundamentally different in quality from each other, but they had profound distrust of society in which they lived. Almost all their works function as harsh criticism of the material or mechanical civilization. Besides, interestingly enough, they are common in extraordinarily strong interest in blood. The blood serves as an essential criterion when they look at things. Lawrence has the so-called belief in “blood,” which symbolizes primitive “daemoniac” energy and works as an opposing conception to the “intellectualism” in his works. The blood drives one to transcend one’s individuality and to be united with others. On the other hand, the “blood,” in Wilde, symbolizes the idea of “beauty” or “truth,” and is often linked with death in the end of the stories. The blood described in his stories is the sacrificial one shed for the sake of others. Wilde’s blood is more realistic and tragic than

Lawrence's. Yukio Mishima is quite similar to Wilde in that "blood" is inseparable to death. Both of them commonly admit "beauty" in conducts at the risk of lives. Yet the "blood" in Mishima, though he is not discussed here, is far more realistic than that in Wilde, so that we can sense its warmth and smell.

Lawrence and Wilde describes "blood" in their own ways, but they have commonality in that they found significance in blood. Here the discussion is conducted on what they saw in "blood," paying special attention to the way they describe "blood" in their works.

## II Transcendence of Blood over Mental Consciousness

*Women in Love* is the first novel in which Lawrence took blood positively and seriously, though he had already shown interest in it in *The Rainbow*. Later, this is to take more concrete shape in *The Plumed Serpent*, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, and *The Man Who Died*. Here the discussion traces the intention hidden in the description in *Women in Love* in which the concept of blood is manifested. At first, we should direct our attention to the scene where the present situation of education biased toward intellectualism is severely criticized by the hero Birkin in Chapter III "Class-room." He delineates the reason why we are trapped in such situation, referring to Hermione's animalism as just "the animalism in the head":

Because you haven't got any real body, any dark, sensual body of life. You have no sensual body. (42)

The phrases "real body" or "sensual body" distinguish Lawrence from other writers and at the same time, prove his peculiarity. This "body" is, without doubt, not a visual flesh, but its "sensuality." That is what everyone used to have, and has now lost totally. Here is Birkin's idea shown like:

"It (i.e., sensuality) is the great dark knowledge you can't have in your head—the dark involuntary being. It is death to one self—but it is the coming into being of another." (43)

To be brief, the "sensuality" is "the great dark knowledge," which we cannot acquire in

the head, and implies the breaking of the little shell of “individual” and the attainment of “the dark involuntary being.” Furthermore, it is demolishing the walls of one self, becoming one with another:

“But how? How can you have knowledge not in your head?” she asked. “In the blood.” He answered; “when the mind and known world is drowned in darkness. — Everything must go—there must be the deluge. Then you find yourself a palpable body of darkness, a demon—” (43)

Ursula, who lives in the world of realistic consciousness, cannot accept what Birkin states. His idea is far beyond reality and far beyond her, too. His statement lies beyond reach of her reasonable thinking. Apart from Ursula’s understanding, calm and careful contemplation of Birkin’s statement leads us to understanding that gaining knowledge “in the blood” is that we lose “the mind and known world” and enter into the unknown world, where “The mind and known world” draw back and “a palpable body of darkness” makes its appearance. Birkin calls it as “a demon,” which is an incarnation of primary, wild, dynamic life beyond rational criteria. Its features are indicated through the perception of Ursula: she admits in Birkin’s thin body the “physical attractiveness,” (44) “a curious hidden richness,” (44) and “the powerful beauty of life itself,” (44) which account for the peculiarities of the attributes of “a demon.” Especially, “the powerful beauty of life itself” tells us the characteristic of “the actual sensual being.” Gaining blood-knowledge is identical to discarding intellectual consciousness and conscious real world, which suggests that one exists in the world different from where the usual world finds itself; that one lives in the invisible world contrasting to the visible world. Whether or not they could regain “a demon” depends on if they could “release themselves and live in another world.” (45) Lawrence’s “blood” insinuates the demoniac traits that life itself intrinsically has, and symbolically shows the richness, beauty, and unconsciousness of flesh.

The discourse on “blood” is also found in Chapter “Man to Man.” Gerald visits Birkin when he is totally depressed over the failure of proposal of marriage to Ursula. Birkin holds “the problem of love and eternal conjunction between men,” (206) which he recognizes as “a necessity inside himself all his life.” He knows that they both trust and love each other. Suddenly he proposes that they should pledge each other:

“You know how old German knights used to swear a Blutbrüderschaft,” he said to

Gerald, with quite a new happy activity in his eyes. Make a little wound in their arms, and rub each other's blood into the cut?" said Gerald. "Yes—, ... — That is what we ought to do. ..." (206)

The above demonstrates what the author intends by "blood." The importance of "blood-knowledge" is in one sharing "one blood with another," going beyond individuality. However, as Birkin himself adds, "No wounds, that is obsolete," he does not mean real bloodshed. He favourably regards Gerald as "the physical, animal man" (207), but he is never blind to the fact that he incarnates in "one form of existence, one knowledge, one activity, a sort of fatal halfness." Gerald is naturally endowed with animality which Hermione is not and at the same time, is limited to "one form of existence." That is the very reason why Birkin is attracted to and simultaneously repulsed by Gerald: he has fondness for and "contempt" of and "boredom" with Gerald. He sees in this Blutbrüderschaft a possibility to surpass the limitation of individuality, which is connoted in Birkin's additional statement "that is not sloppy emotionalism." "An impersonal union that leaves one free" indicates his firm belief that the "blood-recognition" and "blood-conjunction" is not just temporary, but an everlasting union that enables human being to be liberated from a narrowly-limited existence. Having his curiosity aroused in the oath of blood, Gerald dare not to grasp Birkin's hand, being urged to retain himself rather than is fascinated to head forward to the proposal from Birkin.— "Gerald just touched the extended fine, living hand as if withheld and afraid." (207)

And there is an occasion of the pledge being realized in Chapter "Gladiatorial." Gerald is completely swayed with "ennui" soon after he achieved success in rationalizing the coal mine. Birkin advises Gerald to indulge in the "fighting" as a means to get out of his stagnation. The following is the scene showing how they are absorbed in "fighting," half naked in their upper body :

... they discussed methods, they practiced grips and throws, they became more accustomed to each other, to each other's rhythm, they got a kind of mutual physical understanding. And then again they had a real struggle. They seemed to drive their white flesh deeper and deeper against each other, as if they would break into a oneness. ... So the two men entwined and wrestled with each other, working nearer and nearer. Both were white and clear, but Gerald flushed smart red where he was touched, and Birkin remained white and tense. He seemed to penetrate into Gerald's

more solid, more diffuse bulk, to interfuse his body through the body of the other,  
...(270)

The strife exhausts Birkin, putting him into the state of unconsciousness. This is the physical unconsciousness he, who is always conscious, experiences for the first time.— “The world was sliding, everything was sliding off into the darkness. And he was sliding endlessly, endlessly away.” But not only Birkin suffers the loss of sense, but Gerald does also.— Gerald, however, was still less conscious than Birkin. Gerald never forgets himself even for a short time, keeping a careful eye on his surroundings. Yet now he, as a physical man, is lost in the fight. The scuffling helps them to release themselves from the daily consciousness, break the walls of self, and reach “a oneness.”

Again he recoils from Birkin, just as he was hesitant toward the Blutbrüderschaft when Birkin proposed it for the first time. As they are lying prostrate on the floor, exhausted from the hard grappling, Birkin, who came to himself earlier than Gerald, tries to raise himself by the hand:

It (i.e., Birkin’s hand) touched the hand of Gerald, that was lying out on the floor. And Gerald’s hand closed warm and sudden over Birkin’s, they remained exhausted and breathless, the one hand clasped closely over the other. It was Birkin whose hand, in swift response, had closed in a strong, warm clasp over the hand of the other. Gerald’s clasp had been sudden and momentaneous. (272)

Gerald, who is afraid of casting off the consciousness he is covered with, cannot help feeling fear of leaving himself to the “touch.” It is quite natural that his “clasp” ends in being “sudden and momentaneous.” But he appreciates the positive influence caused by the scuffling. The following is the scene where they reflect the “fight” they indulged themselves in. Birkin states his idea of the necessity of bodily touch like:

“... One ought to wrestle and strive and be physically close. It makes one sane. “You do think so?” “I do. Don’t you?” “Yes,” said Gerald, “it’s life for me —” (272)

The words “wrestle” and “strive” and “be physically close” all convey liveliness of blood. It is without doubt that Birkin juxtaposes this “blood” with mental and spiritual aspects. Birkin resumes his speech again after the long span of silence ensuing from the dialogue

above like:

“We are mentally, spiritually intimate, therefore we should be more or less physically intimate too—it is more whole.” (272)

Birkin believes whether or not we can be “sane” and “more whole” relies on whether or not we, besides being mentally, spiritually intimate, can be “physically intimate.” This is the very reason why he puts great stress on the “blood.” Profound is his thought contained in the words — “One should enjoy what is given” and “We should enjoy everything.” (273) To be sure, he is meshed with self-consciousness all the time, but it is the fact that Gerald is freed from the tense of self-consciousness, even though it is temporary. Surely enough, he is aware what Birkin intends in the Blutbrüderschaft.— “I can say this much, I feel better. It has certainly helped me.—Is this the Blutbrüderschaft you wanted?”

The Blutbrüderschaft is a pledge to become “blood brothers,” which premises on the discontinuity between individuals. The blood goes beyond individuality, exalt and strengthen life, which is life itself. “Blood-liveliness” points to the perfection of life. In that sense, that has quite affinity with the impulse of Eros. This blood-pledge flares up a sacred fire between those who sworn each other, which frees them from the chaotic state of purposelessness by being put in order with the obligation of bonds. The fight between Birkin and Gerald gave them a chance to find a kind of non-existence, which is, at the same time, the disappearance of their usual selves. The body-consciousness took the place of that intellectual, mental, and visual consciousness.

### III Blood and Truth

Wilde’s adherence to the “blood” does not come from “decadent” tendency. Attention is paid to the fact that “The Nightingale and the Rose” takes a shape of a story for children. This type of story is designed to move, please, give a dream to children, and foster morality in their heart; its purpose is to refine their sense, broaden, and enrich their mind. How is this story described? The student, who is in love with a girl, is crying, for he cannot get a red rose to give to her. The Nightingale believes that he is the “true lover,” decides to do anything that she can for him, and actually fulfills his wish by creating the red rose.

Apparently, this is a plot for children. But when it comes to the ways to bring it into being, the story makes an unexpected turn. The Nightingale flies to rose trees, but one time she finds it a white rose or another yellow, and she cannot procure the red rose easily. At last she is told where she can gain the red rose. However, he knows that it cannot produce red roses due to the severe cold and frost this year. She earnestly asks the tree to tell the way to obtain it:

“One red rose is all I wanted, said the Nightingale, “only one red rose! Is there no way by which I can get it?” (293)

And the tree refuses to mention it to her, saying “it is so terrible that I dare not tell it to you.” But she, who puts “a true lover” before anything, keeps imploring the tree to tell the “terrible” means— “I am not afraid.” (293) The tree finally gives in to the earnest appeal of the Nightingale and explains the way to acquire it:

“If you want a red rose, said the Tree, “you must build it out of music by moonlight, and stain it with your own heart’s blood. You must sing to me with your breast against a thorn. All night long you must sing to me and the thorn must pierce your heart, and your life-blood must flow into my veins, and become mine.” (293)

Even the Nightingale hesitates when she sees that she must pay his life for a red rose. Life is precious for anyone. We can enjoy any kind of pleasures if only we are alive. However, the Nightingale, who lives on behalf of love and sings songs of love all the time, makes up her mind to discard his life, comparing her life with love— “Love is better than Life.” (294) Here is shown the author’s belief that the abstract idea of love is better than the reality of life. But the noticeable is that love is not mere one. The Nightingale asks for return— “All that ask of you in return is that you will be a true lover.” (294) The author takes being “true” very seriously. But it is a pity that the Nightingale’s mind does not travel to the student. He cannot understand the words that Lizard, Butterfly, and Oak-tree can do. On the other hand, the Nightingale figures out what the student says. He only comprehends what is written in the book. He can only put knowledge into his head, only accepting the known world. In effect, he can do nothing but trace the road trodden by forerunners, just like he goes back to Philosophy in the end of the story while he at one time seemed to have found something to live for in this world. If Philosophy represents the world of quietude, then Love

does the world of passion and affection. If Philosophy implies order, then Love does disorder. If Philosophy points to fixedness and stillness, then Love to movement and flow. The songs the Nightingale sings responding to the request by the Oak-tree do not sound in the young man's heart. He regards the songs as just "form," admitting that there is some beautiful tune:

"She has form, he said to himself, as he walked away through the grove— "that cannot be denied to her; but has he got feeling? I am afraid not. In fact, she is like most artists; she is all style without any sincerity." (294)

Clearly, his statement above contains the critical mind against the then times. To be sure, it is the fact that the student can only think of the songs as just "form," but there is another thing. The student's narrow mindedness reflects the hardened social system and the consciousness of those ruled by it. His problem in consciousness is enlarged into the problem in the society. Therefore, he considers the Nightingale to be identical to most artists, and degrades her to the mere "style." The world evaluation is that artists are "selfish." (294) It is the general belief that artists are absorbed in their own interest, showing no interest in their surroundings. The beauty in her songs surely exists as beauty, but is practically nothing in the world. This is the way he evaluates the artistic beauty in the Nightingale's voice, which intimates the lack of understanding the world has of the worth of the art:

"Still, it must be admitted that she has some beautiful notes in her voice. What a pity it is that they do not mean anything, or do any practical good! (294)

The student's statement "they do not mean anything, or do any practical good!" proves that he himself is "all style without any sincerity" without any feeling. Notice should be taken of is the process of a red rose being created by the Nightingale. Following the advice from the Tree, she first "sets her breast against the thorn" (294) when the moon is in the heavens. Gradually, "the thorn went deeper and deeper into her breast and her life-blood ebbed away from her." (294) As her song develops from "the birth of love in the heart of a boy and a girl" to "the birth of passion in the soul of a man and a maid," the Nightingale presses her heart more strongly to the thorn, and at the same time, her voice becomes "louder and louder." Petals of the flower opens one after another, and colors varies from "pale" and "silver" to "pink," though its core stays "white" since "the thorn had not yet reached her



heart.” She further thrusts her breast against the thorn as if driven by the words of the Tree — “Press closer, little Nightingale, or the Day will come before the rose is finished.” The voice gets “wilder and wilder” with “bitter pains” when “the thorn touched her heart.” The content of her love song also gets more serious, for she is singing a song of “the Love that is perfected by Death.” (295) And at last “the girdle of petals” and “the heart of the rose” become “crimson.” But her voice becomes “fainter,” and “a film came over her eyes,” and then “she felt something choking her in her throat.” (295) Listening to the music, “The white Moon forgot the dawn.” Finally “the red rose trembled all over with ecstasy, and opened its petals to the cold morning air.” (295) As the song progresses from the love of children to the love of young adult, the color changes its hue into “crimson.” The red rose is finished. In contrast, the Nightingale’s voice gets wilder with more pains, and concurrently her life fire gets weaker. The process of the red rose being completed deeply impresses the reader with the vivid description of change of color.

The student goes to see the girl with the red rose, delighted to find a red rose under the window of his room. He only results in disappointment at her attitude. Just like he took the beautiful note of the Nightingale’s song as “all style,” she says at the sight of the rose like:

“I am afraid it will not go with my dress,” she answered; and, besides, the Chamberlain’s nephew has sent me some real jewels, and everybody knows that jewels cost far more than flowers.” (296)

It is clear that the sense of value of the then world is contained in the word “jewels.” The point is that just a young girl makes no bones about saying this. Things are judged by whether or not they are practical. Furthermore, the girl not only compares “jewels” with “flowers,” but also laughs at his not having even “silver buckles.” Once the student believes in love, he regrets approving of things invisible, being repulsed by the reality. This failure teaches him a lesson:

“What a silly thing Love is! said the student as he walked away. “It is not half as useful as Logic for it does not prove anything, and it is always telling one of things that are not going to happen, and makes one believe things that are not true. In fact, it is quite unpractical and, as in this age to be practical is everything, I shall go back to Philosophy and study Metaphysics.” (296)

The student's utterance above indicate the stream prevailing in the society. The words "useful" or "practical" imply what they attach importance to. More serious is the fact that general people, not just the boy and the girl, who should have liberal and flexible mind, are ruled by the practical sense of values. It is very difficult for us to expect them to have the same heart, still less far more difficult to expect them to have rich heart and think that love is better than things practical. The author has a very harsh critical mind of the tide. The student throws away the red rose in anger when he is told that "jewels cost far more than flowers." Then the rose falls in the gutter made by the wheels and is trodden by the cart which happens to come, which intimates that the fragile, vulnerable life of the Nightingale, her humane heart was disgraced by the merciless iron. This is the moment when heart is destroyed by a thing. It is the wheel that treads the rose, not the horse. This is, without doubt, the author's intent.

It is apparent that the author makes use of this children's story as a means to advocate his cause. If it is just a children's story, that bloodstained rose is unnecessary. Children would not be delighted to read the story in which the red rose is created in the dreadful and cruel way. We cannot help asking why the author needed bloodshed for a red rose. There is another intention different from the criticism of the current of the times. It is the author's adherence to the "truth," which is seen in the repetition of "a true lover" in the scene where she first saw the student or in the occasion when she asked him to be "a true lover" in return for her life. The Nightingale would never have tried to stake her life on the red rose if he had not been "a true lover." The reason for her decision lies in that she believed that he is "a true lover," not just "a lover"; she saw the "truth" in his love for the girl. She responded to the true heart of the student by bloodshed. The author has a firm belief that blood is the evidence of the truth. This story evinces the belief that the truth exists in loving someone at the risk of life. Love and death and truth are closely connected in the mind of Wilde.

Just as the words "useful" and "practical" function as keywords, so the same adjectives sound the key note in "The Happy Prince, too." This story also takes the shape of children's tale, but its content is not so simple. Careful consideration is given to the characters as if it is a playwright: the main characters of the Happy Prince and the little Swallow, the Town Councilors, Charity children, the Mathematical Master, the Mayor, town's people, the Art Professor. Each character reflects the author's purpose. The content is divided into three parts: the first is until The Happy Prince and the little Swallow meet, the second after they met, and the third after they finished their roles. First consideration is centered on how the Happy Prince is described. He is the statue erected high on the column after his death. The

fact that he is dead young is apparent from the conversation between “a sensible mother” and “her little boy”:

“Why can’t you be like the Happy Prince” asked a sensible mother of her little boy who was crying for the moon. “The happy Prince never dreams of crying for anything.” (285)

The reason why he is the young Prince is that the author attempted to have children take to this story. Also the statement “He looks just like an angel” (285) charity children say when they come out of the cathedral suggests that the Prince is young just like a boy. The description of the Prince has an important meaning when we consider the intention contained in the tale:

High above the city, on a tall column, stood the statue of the Happy Prince. He was gilded all over with thin leaves of fine gold, for eyes he had two bright sapphires, and a large red ruby glowed on his sword-hilt. (285)

The beautiful Prince is covered all over with jewels, who is admired by all the town’s people. Everybody is fascinated by the statue. One of the Town Councilors blurts out:

“He is as beautiful as a weathercock,” remarked one of the Town Councilors who wished to gain a reputation for having artistic tastes; “only not quite so useful” he added, fearing lest people should think him unpractical, which he was not. (285)

He is the very incarnation of beauty for the people. But there is a meaning in the beauty which he is wearing, which we cannot look over. It is not a simple beauty. The remark “only not quite so useful” added to “as beautiful as a weathercock” does not allow us to interpret it in a simple way. His phrase intimates that just being “beautiful” is not “useful.” He represents all the people and being practical is his qualification as Town Councilor and also the reason of existence. He should like to behave lest people should think him to be “unpractical.” The added words very well bespeak how people are obsessed with practicability.

The Mathematical Master also has a very important role. The author’s idea is reflected in characterization of the Master. The following is the Master’s response against the children’s

statement “He looks just like an angel”:

“How do you know? said the Mathematical Master, “you have never seen one,” “Ah! But we have, in our dreams,” answered the children; and the Mathematical Master frowned and looked very severe, for he did not approve of children dreaming. (285)

There is the same psychology in the Master’s mind that drives him to say in such a way just as the Town Councilor added the next moment he said, “only not so useful.” The Master does not believe in something unreal such as a dream. The Master’s attitude to put the highest value on things visible reflects the then people imbued with practicality. More interesting is the fact that the author makes the Mathematical Master say this. The Master represents the “practical” learning. In the age of Victoria, the standard of values lied in whether or not it was practically useful, or whether or not it was real, or whether or not it was visible. The fact is that both society and people’s mind had been totally biased toward practicality. Children are denied even having dreams. The role of the story as children’s tale is already renounced in the beginning of the story. The most interesting is that materialism has been penetrated into the Swallows as well as people. The following is the scene in which the Swallow’s colleagues are ridiculing the attachment of the Swallow who is in love with the reed:

“It is a ridiculous attachment,”—“she has no money, and far too many relations;” (285)

The reason they tease the Little Swallow is that she has too many siblings besides having no money. People who are poor are not qualified as an object of love, which accounts for the reality that the world of the Swallows is also infected with materialism. The beginning of the story before the Prince appears attests that this tale has already stopped the pose as a children’s story. Obviously, this is used as a means to denounce the society. The Prince adorned with jewels, the Mathematical Master, and the Swallow are all actors created in order to criticize Victorian materialism; they are all the author’s spokesmen.

Another attention should be paid to the role of the Prince. His is different from the Nightingale’s role in “The Nightingale and the Rose.” Just as the Nightingale sacrifices her life for a red rose, the Prince gives all his jewels to the poor people, and becomes as miserable as “beggar.” But what we have to keep in mind is that he is not a simple self-sacrifice. The author’s uncompromising attitude is seen in the dead Nightingale and the miserable,

forsaken Prince.

Now again discussion should be held on the Prince. He has no knowledge about “what tears were.” While alive, he exhibited no interest in the outside world, playing happily in the garden surrounded by the high walls:

“My courtiers called me the Happy Prince, and happy indeed I was, if pleasure be happiness. So I lived, and so I did. And now that I am dead they set me up here so high that I can see all the ugliness and all the misery of my city, and though my heart is made of lead yet I cannot choose but weep.” (286)

It is true the prince did not fathom whether “pleasure” is happiness or not, but he enjoyed his life in his own right. From the standpoint of the courtiers, he was happy — no, he did look happy. Just as he himself says, if “pleasure be happiness,” he was happy. But his wording indicates that he is dubious about people’s view of happiness now that he has become a statue. However, “all the ugliness and all the misery of my city” is unbearable for him. Now he comprehends the feelings he never knew before. His thought that “I cannot choose but weep” is quite similar to the Nightingale’s when he made up his mind to pay her life for a red rose. He decides to give the ruby to a child crying for an orange for lack of water. And then he asks the Swallow to take a sapphire to a young man, or would-be playwright, suffering from poverty and lack of a warmer in spite of the cold night. The Swallow has “a good heart” as well as the prince who gives jewels to the poor. Furthermore, the Prince tells the Swallow to carry the other “sapphire” to the “little match-girl” crying because she dropped and fatally damaged her matches for sale. The Prince who has lost his eyes requests the Swallow to tell what he sees in the city. When he acquaints the Prince with “the rich,” “the beggar,” “starving children,” the Prince orders the Swallow to take all thin gold to the poor, saying “the living always think gold can make them happy.” (290)

It is, of course, the statement made by one who does not know what being poor is like, but he represents the author’s real intention. The Prince of gold reflects the Victorian people’s way of thinking.

The Swallow, who was attending him all the time, passes away due to the severe cold. At the very moment, the Prince’s leaden heart breaks right into two. Both devoted their lives to “a good action.” (287) However, the Swallow’s dead body is thrown away onto “a dust-heap”; the broken heart of the Prince is also done in the same way since it is not melted in the furnace. The Prince, who is now as good as “a beggar” because its glory is already lost,

does not deserve the town's people's admiration. Their attitude is just the reverse compared with it when he was beautiful covered all over with jewels. As "the Art Professor" looks at the shabby statue, he says, "as he is no longer beautiful, he is no longer useful." (291) The Professor's way of thinking is quite identical to the Councilor's appearing in the beginning of the story. The particularity of the then society is indicated just where the worth of beauty is judged in terms of its usefulness, and yet the author has "the Art Professor" state this. His satire is in its extreme there. However, unlike "The Nightingale and the Rose," there is salvation prepared here. The "good action" by the Prince and the Swallow is not neglected. We know this when God says to "one of His angels," "Bring me the two most precious things in the city." (291) Then, he brings "the leaden heart" and "the dead bird" back to him. A hope for the future is revealed in the ending of their being blessed. The author requires death as the evidence of true beauty. Here is unveiled the idea that the genuine beauty is manifested at the risk of death. Wilde attempted to make their eyes turn to the worth of things invisible by describing the stories where lives are risked for others as seen in the acts of the Nightingale and the Swallow in the times when the world had become visible, materialistic, and paid no attention to something unseen. A new society is expected in these stories designed for children.

#### IV Conclusion

Lawrence's "blood" operates as energy to encourage one to break the individual frame, exalt and strengthen life. Through the "Blutbrüderschaft" proposed to Gerald by Birkin in *Women in Love*, they experience the loss of their daily self and finding of a new one in the animated "blood" by the desperate grappling. The "blood" is a clue to promote them to unite themselves and acquire "a greater life" as "the third being." It is this sacred fire of life that incorporates Ramón and Cipriano in *The Plumed Serpent*, Mellors and Connie in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, and the dead man and the priestess of Isis in *The Man Who Died*. In Wilde's works, "blood" is the sacrificial shed by the Nightingale in order to create "a red rose," whose idea underlies "The Happy Prince." That is beyond individuality in that it is for the sake of others.

Their ideas are common in this impersonality. However, Wilde's "blood" never develops into the communion with others, though it proves the truthfulness of the conduct.

Works Cited

1. D.H. Lawrence, *Women in Love* Ed. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
2. D.H. Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1971)
3. D.H. Lawrence, *Love Among the Haystacks and Other Stories* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979)
4. Oscar Wilde, *The Works of Oscar Wilde* (Leicester: Blitz Edition, 1990)

Bibliography

1. Matthew Leone, *Shapes of Openness* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010)
2. Earl G. Ingersoll, *D.H. Lawrence, Desire, and Narrative* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001)
3. Barry J. Scherr, *D.H. Lawrence Today* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2004)
4. Mark Spilka, *Renewing The Normative D.H.Lawrence* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press,1992)
5. Mary Freeman, *D.H. Lawrence: A Basic Study of His Ideas* (Tallahassee: University of Florida Press, 1955)
6. Jack Stewart, *The Vital Art of D.H. Lawrence: Vision and Expression* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press,1999)
7. Philip K. Cohen, *The Moral Vision of Oscar Wilde* (Cranbury::; Associated University Presses,1978)

