D H LAWRENCE'S THE RAINBOW AND WOMEN IN LOVE

A STUDY OF GENDER ROLES AND VALUES

by

JAMES RICHARD OLCHOWY
B A , University of Alberta, 1985

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

English

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

[redacted]
Dr Anthony W Jenkins

[redacted]
Dr Trevor L Williams

[redacted]
Dr Anthony B England

[redacted]
Dr Mary J Gallant

[redacted]
Dr Alan Hughes

University of Victoria

August 1986

Supervisors Dr Anthony W Jenkins
Dr Trevor L Williams

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines D H Lawrence's complex treatment of gender roles and values in The Rainbow and Women in Love Its method of approach involves a mixture of historical and feminist criticism, as well as a close analysis of the two novels in question As products of the historical period spanning from 1913 to 1917, these novels illustrate how greatly Lawrence's view of gender was influenced by both the Women's Movement and World War I

The Rainbow is discussed in relation to Lawrence's idiosyncratic response to the Women's Movement Although he was antagonistic toward the political aspect of Women's Liberation, he was strongly in support of feminine values His attitudes are evident in an examination of gender roles and values in The Rainbow These roles and values are pertinent not only to individual characters and their relationships, but also to educational, religious, and industrial institutions within society Ultimately, this novel shows--through its emphasis on birth and through Ursula's entrance into the man's world--how D H Lawrence hoped that the feminine principle might be revived

Women in Love is analyzed in terms of Lawrence's response to both the Women's Movement and World War I. The War provided many women with the opportunity to work away from the home and family, but Lawrence increasingly saw the achievements of the Women's Movement--achievements that did not result in the feminization of human experience--as failures. Women in Love reflects both his disillusionment with women and the mounting dominance of masculine over feminine values in his characters' lives. In this novel, birth is de-emphasized and such masculine values as power, control, and death are stressed. An analysis of key chapters--including "The Industrial Magnate," "Coal-Dust," and "Class-room"--illustrates how masculine values are equally prevalent in both individuals' lives and society's structures. Women in Love thus shows how Lawrence came to see that the masculine principle had triumphed over the feminine.

Finally, three unresolved dilemmas that become evident in reading The Rainbow and Women in Love are addressed. The first dilemma involves Ursula's transformation of character from one novel to the next, the second involves the vision of inescapable violence and destruction with which Women in Love ends, and the third involves the trap of human knowledge and language which so preoccupies Women in Love as a whole. All three dilemmas point to Lawrence's changing view of gender roles and values, a glance at The Plumed Serpent bears that fact out by showing the future course his fiction took.

Examiners

[redacted]

Dr Anthony W Jenkins

[redacted]

Dr Trevor L. Williams

[redacted]

Dr Anthony B England

[redacted]

Dr Mary J. Gallant

[redacted]

Dr Alan Hughes

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Anthony Jenkins and Dr. Trevor Williams for their help and guidance in the completion of this work.

DEDICATION

To my friend, Gerald M. Wandio, for all of his support and encouragement

CHAPTER I

PROLOGUE

A good portion of the existing criticism on D. H. Lawrence treats him as a "genius"--with a coherent and consistent view of human experience--and reproduces his own terminology in its analysis. Such criticism often fails to concede that Lawrence's writing was a product of the ever-changing world in which he lived. Indeed, an historical approach to Lawrence's fiction--in considering such things as the prolonged ramifications of the Industrial Revolution, the sexual emancipation of the Feminist Movement, and the social effects of World War I--assumes that Lawrence is not a self-reliant "genius" but a product of his world. Historical criticism shows further that Lawrence is not always coherent or consistent in his writing and that this is due to the way various "ideologies" function in his works.

> . . . if we accept . . . that ideologies--structures of social practice, thought, belief, value and unconscious assumption--are always and invariably the frames in which pictures of the world appear, are perceived or created, then no literary work, however "great," can by-pass ideology and give direct access to history.[1]

Lawrence does not have "direct access" to his own history. Although his works are influenced by historical events and ideologies, one should not therefore expect to find, in his writing, a perfect account of his time. His fiction will inevitably emphasize and ignore certain

aspects of experience and history, thus producing its own textual ideology, hence, the need to analyze Lawrence in the context of other viewpoints on his world.

I propose to examine two of Lawrence's major works, The Rainbow and Women in Love, from an historical perspective; in so doing, I hope to move beyond the "attacks on Lawrence's misogyny and praise for his sensitive portrayals of femininity [which] have co-existed since the inception of the critical debate."[2] Despite the publication of such books as Holderness' D. H. Lawrence: History, Ideology and Fiction, Simpson's D. H. Lawrence and Feminism, de Beauvoir's The Second Sex, Millet's Sexual Politics, and numerous other articles on Lawrence's treatment of women, there is still no detailed study on Lawrence which combines adequately the methods of historical and feminist criticism. It would therefore be profitable to undertake the preliminaries of such a study.

In specific, an analysis of Lawrence's fiction which comments on the masculine and feminine principles of human experience--principles that are social constructs--is my concern. To believe that masculinity and femininity are historical constructions is to believe that there is a distinction between a person's "biological sex" and "gender": the former is a physical reality, whereas the latter is a cultural product. My concern is not with sex or sexual orientation, but with gender. At the outset, it is necessary to indicate my bias toward "psychological androgyny"[3] and to stress that "all people manifest qualities associated with all aspects of the gender principles."[4]

This examination of gender principles in two of Lawrence's works will interweave historical and feminist critical approaches. Marilyn French's feminist theory offers useful definitions of the masculine and feminine gender principles.

> [The masculine principle is] predicated on the ability to kill, is the pole of power-in-the-world. It is associated with prowess and ownership, with physical courage, assertiveness, authority, independence, and the right, rights, and legitimacy. It claims to be able to define and administer justice, and it supports law and order as an arrangement imposed and maintained by force.
>
> Its energies are directed at making permanent, fixing the flux of experience. It exalts the individual (who wants to transcend nature and natural oblivion). It values action over feeling, thought over sensation. Its ultimate goal is transcendence of nature, its immediate goal is the attainment and maintenance of power-in-the-world, whether as force or authority. In principle, it is conceived of as a means of protecting and ensuring the continuation of the human race and its felicity.[5]

> The feminine principle is associated with nature, and is not considered a fully human principle. It is associated with everything fluid, transient, and flexible, qualities sometimes denoted weak, with nature, the flesh, and procreation. It is thus the pole of sexuality and bodily pleasure, of nutritiveness, compassion, sensitivity to others, mercy, supportiveness, and all giving qualities. It is also the pole of emotion, and includes fury, raging grief, sorrow. It is associated with lack of control in every area--sensuous, sensual, emotive, and bodily. . . . Love is "feminine," especially the nonegoistic love associated with mothering. . . . All flexible and fluid experience is "feminine"--spontaneity, playfulness, creativity.[6]

These definitions almost reproduce Lawrence's own understanding of masculinity and femininity when he was at work on his Study of Thomas Hardy (written before World War I). There he considers the polarity between the masculine and the feminine to be a fundamental aspect of life. However, he is careful to note that both men and women can possess characteristics from either pole.

> an infant is of no very determinate sex that is it is of both Only at adolescence is there a real differentiation, the one is singled out to predominate In what we call happy natures, in the lazy, contented, people, there is a fairly equable balance of sex [7]

At this point in his writing career--a point that coincides with his composition of The Rainbow--Lawrence thus tends toward a belief in psychological androgyny, although he does not explain how one sex "is singled out to predominate" in a given person

In his later writing, however, Lawrence expresses a belief in "essential" masculinity and femininity

> boys and girls should be kept apart as much as possible, that they may have some sort of respect and fear for the gulf that lies between them in nature, and for the great strangeness which each has to offer the other, finally We are all wrong when we say there is no vital difference between the sexes There is every difference Every bit, every cell in a boy is male, every cell is female in a woman, and must remain so Women can never feel or know as men do And in the reverse, men can never feel and know, dynamically, as women do Man, acting in the passive or feminine polarity, is still man, and he doesn't have one single unmanly feeling And women, when they speak and write, utter not one single word that men have not taught them Men learn their feelings from women, women their mental consciousness from men [8]

This passage, from Fantasia of the Unconscious (published shortly after Women in Love), is fanatically traditional in its treatment of the sexes It reflects a change in Lawrence's viewpoint on gender and thus shows his development as a writer This change points to the fact that gender and history--both of which focused largely on the Feminist Movement and World War I in Lawrence's time--are related to one another in his works

French's definitions of gender become more complex as she shows how the feminine principle has historically been divided into two aspects:

> The Eve who was responsible both for the fall from unity with nature and for the continuation of the race becomes a subversive figure "redeemed" by the Mary who accepts that she is ancilla, ancillary, a handmaiden, only a vessel in the transmission of a male line. This split in the principle of nature, the feminine principle, still exists in our perception of actual women; there is the mother madonna, and the whore, the nourisher and the castrator.[9]

French calls the two halves of the feminine principle the inlaw (the mother madonna) and the outlaw (the whore) aspects. Such a split in the feminine principle indicates a male supremacist and patriarchal society:

> The split in the feminine principle was designed to guarantee the subordination of the benevolent aspects of nature [the inlaw feminine principle--which embodies the relinquishment of power in the world] to the human need to transcend nature [which is a need embodied by the masculine principle], and cast into a no-man's land the outlaw feminine principle. Each quality of the inlaw feminine principle was seen as connected to, and supportive of, a quality in the masculine principle, but always as subordinate. Mercy may only temper justice, compassion may only temper authority, feeling is essential, but must defer to thought, nutritiveness must bow to power.[10]

This split in the feminine principle is crucial to any study of gender because it signals a world that values power over love. The presence of the inlaw and the absence of the outlaw feminine principle indicates a culture deeply entrenched in masculine ideology.

In bringing French's feminist theory and an historical awareness to The Rainbow and Women in Love, I hope to show that conceptions of both gender and historical events are strongly

related in Lawrence's fiction. In contrast with The Rainbow's emphasis on the unified feminine principle and liberating possibilities of the Feminist Movement, Women in Love comments directly and indirectly on World War I's influence on individual people and society. Whereas The Rainbow shows how Ursula circumvents a split between private and public spheres (between female and male worlds) and upholds the feminine principle, Women in Love documents how the dominant masculine values associated with wartime activities penetrate both the public world and the private relationships of the novel. The Rainbow places faith in human love and regeneration, but Women in Love describes a destructive and fragmented world which has annihilated all human tenderness. To examine the masculine and feminine gender principles in each of these novels is to transcend the characters' biological sex and to see how the masculine principle eventually attains a position of incontestable dominance--in both the lives of men and women, and in the structures of society. An eminent Lawrencian scholar, Daleski, says this:

> There is no need of outside testimony in regard to Lawrence's fundamental identification with the female principle . . . for there is little doubt that Lawrence's sympathies are with the qualities ranged under the female [Daleski here refers to Lawrence's own definitions of male and female principles]. Although his effort is to reconcile the two principles, his stress is on the value of the female, on "being," not "doing."[11]

While Daleski is generally correct about Lawrence's stress on the female principle, "outside testimony" is still needed for a full evaluation of Lawrence's works. Because such testimony does not play an important role in The Forked Flame, Daleski fails to

acknowledge fully the subtle shift in Lawrence's treatment of gender difference and the relevance of historical events to that shift. Although The Rainbow and Women in Love do not represent a complete picture of Lawrence's vision of gender (a vision that continues to develop in his many later works), they do represent a picture, first, of how he hoped that the feminine principle might be revived and, second, of how he came to see that the masculine principle had triumphed over the feminine.

This triumph signals a crux in Lawrence's thinking, as his female and male characters become equal accomplices to masculine ideology by the close of Women in Love.[12] His vision of a world balanced by feminine and masculine values is obliterated in the face of a predominantly masculine value system. Gender difference thus becomes an issue that affects not only the individual male or female, but society as a whole. Indeed, it is actually the complex machinery of society that produces the individual and the individual's value system.

ENDNOTES

[1]Graham Holderness, D H Lawrence History, Ideology and Fiction (London Gill and Macmillan, 1982), p 10

[2]Hilary Simpson, D H Lawrence and Feminism (London Croom Helm, 1982), p 13

[3]Ellien Piel Cook, Psychological Androgyny (Toronto Pergamon Press, 1985 Piel Cook provides a definition of "psychological androgyny" it "refers to the blending of positive masculine and feminine characteristics within a person This concept is rooted in previous conceptualizations about the nature of sexual differences between the sexes, but reframes the conceptualizations to acknowledge a much broader range of sex-role options for men and women alike " (5)

[4]Marilyn French, Shakespeare's Division of Experience (New York Summit books, 1981), p 26

[5]French, Shakespeare's, pp 21-22

[6]Marilyn French, Beyond Power On Women, Men and Morals (New York Summit books, 1985), p 93

[7]D H Lawrence, Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays, ed Bruce Steele (Cambridge Cambridge University Press, 1985), p 70

[8]D H Lawrence, Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious (Markham, Ont Penguin, 1971, reprint ed 1981), p 102

[9]French, Shakespeare's, p 24

[10]French, Shakespeare's, p 24

[11]H M Daleski, The Forked Flame (London Faber and Faber, 1965), p 35

[12]Because women and men become equal accomplices to masculine ideology, it would therefore be fruitless for a feminist critic to defend Lawrence's female characters--at all costs--in unmasking male dominance

CHAPTER II

THE RAINBOW: REVIVING THE FEMININE PRINCIPLE

> In spite of his limited qualities of scholarship and his fitful interest in all non-musical subjects, the idea of refusing Edward a university education never so much as crossed my father's mind. I loved him too dearly even while he was still at school to be jealous of him personally, particularly as he was always my gallant supporter, but I should have been far more patient and docile than I ever showed any symptom of becoming if I had not resented his privileged position as a boy. The most flattering of my school reports had never, I knew, been regarded more seriously than my inconvenient thirst for knowledge and opportunity; in our family, to adapt a famous present-day phrase, what mattered was not the quality of work, but the sex of the worker.[1]

This passage, from Vera Brittain's Testament of Youth, shows how large a factor gender was in English society when D. H. Lawrence wrote The Rainbow. As Brittain lucidly indicates, before World War I the division of experience along lines of gender was an accepted circumstance of life. In this context, it is clear that The Rainbow, a novel that attempts to break down the gender division, was heavily influenced by the Feminist resurgence of the early twentieth century. "The driving force behind Ursula's efforts is . . . the feminist movement, at its height during the years of The Rainbow, and a great force in Lawrence's time, one which he was compelled to deal with."[2] Lawrence desired to write a novel which would promote the Woman's Movement--though in a better way than the movement was able to do for itself--for,

as one might expect from such a contentious writer, his approach was coloured by his own bias against the politics of the Feminist Movement

> . . . the suffrage movement was careful to keep its campaign to public issues. We should not expect, then, to find in [Lawrence's] writing much sympathy with suffragism per se, and the presentation of suffragists in his work follows a conventional pattern in its rejection of reform in favour of individual liberation and development. Lawrence differed from other novelists of the period not in his treatment of his theme, but in the language which he created for the portrayal of such development.[3]

This passage, from Simpson's D. H. Lawrence and Feminism, suggests that, rather than concerning himself with ostensibly political questions, Lawrence concentrated on one female human being's development and emancipation in his novel. His belief in the transcendence of the individual, however, lends credence to the illusion of bourgeois individualism.[4] Lawrence's unwillingness to envision a firmer connection between the individual and the community, or to clarify his stance on the private and public spheres, is crucial to his attitude toward the politics that surrounded the Women's Movement of his time.

Although Lawrence rejects overt political reform as a means to women's liberation, The Rainbow nonetheless shows the feminists' struggles--political or otherwise--in an intractably patriarchal world. Indeed, the novel dissolves the artificial division of private and public spheres because it shows how both spheres interact on the level of masculine and feminine values. The private individual cannot be separated from the social animal, and Lawrence cannot

isolate personal relations from politics in The Rainbow, but this does not stop him from reacting against the political activism of the Women's Movement.

> . . . he had urged the "feminization" of experience, the necessity for men to take women, and the feminine side of their own natures, seriously. He had never argued that women should enter the masculine world of industry and technology which he hated.[5]

Simpson here correctly indicates that Lawrence's early support for Feminism emphasizes a need for the feminization of human experience, rather than a need for women's enfranchisement within the existing political structures of the man's world. In the pre-war years, Lawrence favours feminine over masculine values, but his belief in the need to transform society through non-political channels explains why feminists are often so outraged with even The Rainbow--the most feminist of his works.

> . . . it is not merely the intellectual recognition that Lawrence is not sympathetic to the cause which explains the outrage, but rather the emotional recognition on the part of the modern woman of the accuracy of Lawrence's insights into the frustrated needs that motivate liberationist tendencies. If Lawrence were simply a male chauvinist he could be dismissed along with the others, because he is the emotional enemy within the ranks, he must be destroyed.[6]

Lawrence's treatment of the Women's Movement is not always supportive, even so, in The Rainbow at least, he shows a deep understanding and support for feminine values.

However, Lawrence was not totally oblivious to political reform.

> While writing The Rainbow, the politics of which are primarily negative or anarchic, Lawrence wrote letters arguing for a form of democratic socialism implicitly based on, among other principles, equality of the sexes.[7]

That he wanted to keep politics distinct from Ursula's liberation is not a sign of Lawrence's political ignorance, his strategy "suggests that the feminist revolution has to be fought on more than one front--for rights in the man's world and for a transformation of that world."[8] Lawrence's approach to Feminism may thus be seen as idealistic. But he undoubtedly associated the political world with masculine values, therefore, he thought it was dangerous for the Women's Movement to seek only political reform, because political rights would not necessarily ensure the protection and enhancement of feminine values. To look at The Rainbow with this understanding of Lawrence's reaction to the Women's Movement is to see it as a Feminist novel.

> In the beginning was the Mother, the Word began a new era, one we have come to call patriarchy. The word, a symbol, an arbitrary and abstract entity, can give reality to something nonexistent, invented, imagined. That women have babies is a reality . . . , they also generally take care of them. We may choose to see birth and mother love as great powers--as do people in simple cultures--or as vulnerabilities, sources of weakness and dependency--as do people in complex cultures like our own. However we see them, the facts remain.[9]

The idea of birth--both physical and metaphorical--is The Rainbow's central feature. Woman's ability to give birth ranks above all other human functions, as is evident in descriptions of how a wife and husband cope with the strain of a woman's pregnancy, and in the pervasive birth imagery of the novel. Kate Millett's comment is fitting. "[The Rainbow] celebrates the pastoral life in terms of fertility--never the phallic fertility of the later period, but the power of the womb. Every event, whether it

be falling in love or attaining maturity is described in terms of fertility, gestation, parturition, and birth."[10] In this novel actual pregnancies are treated as important events--from both female and male perspectives. For instance, soon after marrying Tom Brangwen, Lydia is pregnant, on the day her labour starts, Lawrence draws a delicate portrait of Tom comforting the young Anna, whom he takes to feed the cows. Because Lydia's energy is consumed in the hard work of giving birth, Tom must accept a larger share of domestic responsibility. The activities of both Lydia and Tom are thus shaped by the importance of birth.

Lawrence also delineates Anna's first pregnancy as a celebration of birth. Anna rejoices in the miraculous power of her womanhood, for she dances, naked and pregnant, in complete self-fulfillment. In her ecstasy over this new-found ability to bring forth life, however, Anna ostracizes Will from the experience of birth. He feels insecure because he knows how much he depends on Anna. Although Tom was slightly envious of Lydia's ability to create and nurse life, Will has a weaker personality and, consequently, must learn how to be alone--to be a strong individual rather than a defective fragment. Through Tom and Will, Lawrence thus gives a detailed description of the male perspective on birth.

What one learns from Lydia's and Anna's pregnancies, and from Lawrence's mystical description of woman's biological nature, is that birth is the common denominator of human existence in The Rainbow. If there is no birth, then there is no life. In

the first two Brangwen generations, both women and men build their lives around the central event of birth. Moreover, The Rainbow also emphasizes the values represented by human reproduction. Lydia and Anna are women who represent powers not only of motherhood but also of free sexual expression. Both women take the initiative in sexual relationships with their husbands, they are not passive lambs. And birth's centrality to existence signifies that Brangwen life harmonizes with Nature. Nature's presence is evident in Lydia's painful, inhuman cries, which Tom associates with owls' cries from his youth. During Anna's pregnancy, Nature is like the company of sisters. "She lifted her throat to the breeze that came across the fields, and felt it handling her like sisters fondling her, she drank it in perfume of cowslips and of appleblossoms."[11] The power of birth is synonymous with the energy of Nature. In The Rainbow, then, birth and mother love are great powers which are not seen as "sources of weakness and dependency" but associated with the vitality of Nature. "women and fertility are close to the divine in The Rainbow."[12]

But birth represents more than its literal meaning suggests. In addition to ensuring human continuity through the creation of new physical life, birth is an all-important metaphor for the growth of an individual's consciousness. One encounters all sorts of metaphorical births in The Rainbow.

> He submitted to that which was happening to him, letting go his will, suffering the loss of himself, dormant always on the brink of ecstasy, like a creature evolving to a new birth (R, 74).

> He returned gradually, but newly created, as after a gestation, a new birth, in the womb of darkness (R, 81).

> She could not bear to come to, to realize. The first pangs of this new parturition were so acute, she knew she could not bear it. She would rather remain out of life, than be torn, mutilated into this birth, which she could not survive. She had not the strength to come to life now, in England, so foreign, skies so hostile (R, 90).

> The veils had ripped and issued him naked into the endless space, and he shuddered (R, 157).

> So suddenly, everything that had been before was shed away and gone. One day, he was a bachelor, living with the world. The next day, he was with her, as remote from the world as if the two of them were buried like a seed in darkness. Suddenly, like a chestnut falling out of a burr, he was shed naked and glistening on to a soft, fecund earth, leaving behind him the hard rind of worldly knowledge and experience (R, 185).

> His soul leapt, soared up into the great church . . . it swooned with a great escape, it quivered in the womb, in the hush and the gloom of fecundity, like seed of procreation in ecstasy (R, 243).

The first two passages indicate how Tom gives birth to a new self when he and Lydia agree to marry. The third passage refers to Lydia's struggle for new life in England after Paul Lensky's death. Her experience shows how difficult metaphorical birth can be. The fourth passage shows how Tom gives birth to a different self--as a father--in the light of Anna and Will's imminent marriage. He must relinquish the possessiveness of fatherhood. The fifth passage describes the dramatic change which Will's marriage to Anna causes--his rebirth into a new world, as a soul to be reborn through the womblike church. As these passages demonstrate, "In The Rainbow, metaphoric birth is clearly more important to Lawrence than actual childbirth . . . ."[13]

This birth imagery illuminates the literal miscarriage and the figurative birth that occur in the last chapter of The Rainbow. One cannot be absolutely sure that Ursula actually experiences a miscarriage, although the evidence for such an interpretation of the novel's closing chapter certainly exists. In any case, the final chapter juxtaposes the idea of miscarriage with the idea of Ursula's metaphorical birth into a new life and the community's birth into a healthier form of existence.

> She was the naked, clear kernel thrusting forth the clear, powerful shoot, and the world was a bygone winter, discarded, her mother and father and Anton, and college and all her friends, all cast off like a year that has gone by, whilst the kernel was free and naked and striving to take new root, to create a new knowledge of Eternity in the flux of Time (R, 545).

> She knew that the sordid people who crept hard-scaled and separate on the face of the world's corruption were living still . . . that they would cast off their horny covering of disintegration, that new, clean, naked bodies would issue to a new germination, to a new growth, rising to the light and the wind and the clean rain of heaven (R, 548).

Intriguingly, the first passage describes Ursula's birth of a new self in terms of an analogy with Nature, that is, Ursula is a seed which begins to thrust itself above the ground simultaneously with the departure of winter. Although Ursula has presumably had a miscarriage, her own transformation of consciousness is looked upon as something which is harmonious with Nature--not as something negative and shameful. "The imagery of germination here characterizes Ursula's spiritual rebirth and mediates both the destructive violence of the horses and the antiprocreative nature of the realistic event."[14] The second passage, from the

closing page of the novel, shows further why Ursula's individual rebirth figures as such a positive event, even though it does not represent the arrival of a new child which is so characteristic of the traditional ending of a Victorian novel. That Ursula does not bring a new child into the world, but instead a resurgent and transformed womanhood--which is capable of so much more than one biological function--relates explicitly to the transformation of consciousness which is needed in the larger world if humankind is to survive, the "sordid people" will soon be reborn as well. Thus, the novel ends by affirming the identity of an isolated individual and emphasizes the link between individual and community.

Ursula's personal liberation in The Rainbow is a most consistent and praiseworthy account of the feminine principle because it joins the values associated with birth to Ursula's liberation and spiritual enlightenment in the public sphere. The novel comes down solidly in favour of the Feminist Movement's values, even though it aims at something different politically. Lawrence uses The Rainbow to show that what is really needed is a new way of thinking about life. That he does not acknowledge the implicit connection between political reform and the transformation of human awareness is perhaps his only major disagreement with the Feminist Movement. However, the novel itself bears out the fact that Lawrence is mistaken in his belief that there can be any separation between political change and individual awareness.

With this knowledge of The Rainbow's abundant birth imagery, one can proceed to a deeper analysis of gender difference by

considering the following aspects of the novel: the portrayal of female and male characters and their relationships, the function of education and political ideology, the function of the church and religious ideology, and the function of industrialism and capitalist ideology. To study these various aspects of The Rainbow as they relate to gender difference is to discover that the novel articulates the need for a resurgence of the feminine principle in interpersonal relationships and in society's larger institutional structures. This analysis will show, most importantly, how persons adopt their society's values and, consequently, how gender difference affects a much larger social context than that of the so-called private sphere. Indeed, Ursula's liberation in the end coincides with her discovery that the private/public dichotomy is an illusion of masculine ideology.

A useful starting off point is Lawrence's version of the Garden of Eden myth--which centers on the idea of a fortunate fall[15]--in the novel's opening chapter. The early Brangwen women have a desire for self-improvement and knowledge (they have eaten of the forbidden fruit), and they want to transform human existence into something greater than it already is.

> The women were different . . . the women looked out from the heated, blind intercourse of farm-life, to the spoken world beyond. They were aware of the lips and the mind of the world speaking and giving utterance, they heard the sound in the distance, and they strained to listen (R, 42).

In beginning with this picture of woman's eagerness to develop human potential, Lawrence indicates woman's positive role in human

evolution. Yet, some human development has already occurred, under the guidance of knowledgeable men, therefore, woman's initial desire to reach "the beyond" largely results from her dissociation from the active, public sphere of life.

> She stood to see the far-off world of cities and governments and the active scope of man, the magic land to her, where secrets were made known and desires fulfilled. She faced outwards to where men moved dominant and creative, having turned their back on the pulsing heat of creation, and with this behind them, were set out to discover what was beyond, to enlarge their own scope and freedom, whereas the Brangwen men faced inwards to the teeming life of creation, which poured unresolved into their veins (R, 43).

The above passage indicates that there is a discrepancy between the Brangwen way of life, which is close to Nature, and life in the city, the emblem of man's desire "to enlarge . . . [his] own scope and freedom." Whereas the Brangwens' world deeply reveres the power of women and Nature, the urbanized world shows no sign of such reverence. The Brangwens' world, then, is a microcosmic matriarchy within a macrocosmic patriarchy, it is a world within a world, and therefore it is not immune to the subtle and pervasive influence of that larger world--as the gradual encroachment of the canal, the collieries, and the Midland Railway indicates. However, the illusion of a separation between the Brangwens' world and the urban world still exists. In the first part of chapter one, there is a summary of what is to be the woman's project in the rest of the novel. "she strained her eyes to see what man had done in fighting outwards to knowledge . . . . She also wanted to know, and to be of the fighting host" (R, 43). Women must break down the separation between the private and public spheres.

The early Brangwens lived according to matriarchal values, in their secluded pastoral world

> In the close intimacy of the farm kitchen, the woman occupied the supreme position. The men deferred to her in the house, on all household points, on all points of morality and behaviour. The woman was the symbol for that further life which comprised religion and love and morality (R, 53).

The woman is the "conscience-keeper," the foundation, and the security of Brangwen life. "she was the anchor and the security, she was the restraining hand of God . . . " (R, 54). The Brangwen men live and work in harmony with their women and Nature. The woman is the source of life in their simple culture. Still, though women possess great power in the Brangwen world, it is knowledgeable men who have authority in the larger world, and there thus appears to be a split between Marsh Farm and the urbanized world. The Brangwens certainly believe in the reality of such a split. However, this split is not absolute because it is bridged by various ideologies of male supremacy.

Lydia and Tom, the first Brangwen couple in The Rainbow, both subscribe to the idea of male supremacy. Perhaps the most interesting thing about Lawrence's portrayal of Lydia's character is his use of retrospection to convey a sense of her earlier life in Poland, as the wife of Paul Lensky. By looking at Lydia's and Paul's relationship, one gains a context not only for Lydia's later marraige to Tom but also for her relationship with Ursula, her granddaughter. Lydia has struggled, in her own way, for liberation as a woman while married to a very "masculine" doctor.

> Lydia still resented Lensky. When she thought of him, she was always younger than he, she was always twenty, or twenty-five, and under his domination. He incorporated her in his ideas as if she were not a person herself, as if she were just his aide-de-camp, or part of his baggage, or one among his surgical appliances (R, 299-300).

> At twenty-three, twenty-four, she began to realise that she too might consider these ideas . . . . She adventured into the minds of other men. His, then, was not the only male mind! She did not exist, then, just as his attribute (R, 301).

As the first passage shows, sexual discrimination is obvious in Lydia and Paul's relationship. Paul's maleness and his medical career take priority over Lydia's femaleness and desire for self-fulfillment. The second passage points to Lydia's need to discover that she is not Paul's possession. Until she has the opportunity to discover other minds--including her own--she adopts masculine ideology and believes in the inferiority of the feminine sex. She had been culturally programmed to believe in a limited conception of womanhood--a conception which she partially overcomes through her training. "She learned nursing as a mark of her emancipation" (R, 86). However, even after that she was still enchained by Paul, the obsessively self-important and arrogant doctor.

In the light of her first marriage, then, one can fully appreciate Lydia's strength and courage in dealing with her second husband. With Tom, Lydia takes the initiative. When he proposes marriage, she also proposes to him, as if to establish the reciprocity necessary to a healthy relationship. That Lydia overcomes, in part, the conventional limitations of womanhood is evident most obviously in her willingness to marry Tom, who is six years her

junior. After their wedding, her needs as a woman are given a natural prerogative. "She was with child, it was his turn to submit" (R, 100). She is no longer an underling as she was with Paul Lensky, her womanhood is powerful within the matriarchal framework of the Brangwen family tradition. Yet she does not take undue advantage of her womanly powers, she realizes that a successful relationship with Tom depends on equality between the sexes. She will not tolerate being treated as an object nor treating Tom as an object. "I want you to know there is somebody there besides yourself" (R, 131), "She waited for him to meet her, not to bow before her and serve her. She wanted his active participation, not his submission" (R, 132). As a woman, then, Lydia learns to assert herself and to love at the same time. What is essential to note about Lydia is that--despite her struggles against Paul and her successfully negotiated marriage with Tom--she is still caught in a larger world which bars woman from the public sphere of life. "Mrs. Brangwen went on her own way, following her own devices. She had her husband, her two sons and Anna. They staked out and marked her horizon. The other people were outsiders" (R, 139). She succeeds in mitigating her encounter with sexism in her private life, but the public world remains to be challenged by the women of the future.

Tom Brangwen, having been raised in the matriarchal world of the Brangwens' pastoral life, possesses a delicacy of feeling uncommon to the average man. As a boy, his sensitivity is obvious.

> . . . his feelings were more discriminating than those of most of the boys, and he was confused. He was more sensuously developed, more refined in instinct than they. For their mechanical stupidity he hated them, and suffered cruel contempt for them. But when it came to mental things, then he was at a disadvantage (R, 50).

Once he reaches adulthood, however, he has a great deal of difficulty in understanding women, indeed, his male experience reflects not only on himself but on the society in which he lives.

> Now when Tom Brangwen, at nineteen, a youth fresh like a plant, rooted in his mother and his sister, found that he had lain with a prostitute woman in a common public house, he was very much startled. For him there was until that time only one kind of woman--his mother and sister (R, 54).

This passage points both to Tom's discovery of his own sexual identity and to the way Tom's world classifies women. Either a woman is like a mother or sister (a nice woman) or she is like a prostitute (an evil woman). The former type is restricted to the private sphere, while the latter type is restricted to the public sphere. That Tom should be so startled to discover female sexuality is a comment on the way that woman's experience is strictly controlled and prescribed. A sensitive young man, he reacts confusedly to his sexual initiation with the prostitute.

> . . . there was a slight sense of shame before the prostitute, fear that she would despise him for his inefficiency, there was a cold distaste for her, and a fear of her, there was a moment of paralyzed horror when he felt he might have taken a disease from her, and upon all this startled tumult of emotion, was laid the steadying hand of common sense, which said it did not matter very much, so long as he had no disease (R, 54).

Here Tom feels insecure about his manhood--not an unnatural feeling for a young man. With the prostitute, he feels "fear," "distaste," "horror," and "shame." Yet, how does he rationalize his affair

with this woman? By looking to "common sense," which here is masculine in its logic, he reduces his complex emotional reaction to a concern about whether he might have contracted some sort of sexual disease. The "common sense" Tom refers to is a mere cover for the ideology of male supremacy which is promoted by Tom's society. Later, when Tom has another sexual encounter, this time with a foreign woman, he reevaluates his understanding of women. "He saw how the foreigner treated the women with courteous contempt, as if they were pleasing animals. Brangwen's girl had put on a ladylike manner, but her voice betrayed her. She wanted to win back her man" (R, 58). In this instance, the woman's sexuality and ladylike manner are juxtaposed in Tom's mind, he begins to see that women are infinitely more complicated than he had originally imagined. But Tom remains terribly confused when he tries to understand the contradictory vision of women which his society supports. "when he had a nice girl, he found that he was incapable of pushing the desired development. The very presence of the girl beside him made it impossible. He could not think of her like that, he could not think of her actual nakedness" (R, 55). At this point in his life, he searches for a means of sexual expression. In his aloneness and in his restricted life on Marsh Farm he wonders if perhaps he is missing out on the larger world. He questions his own manliness and normality. "was he a dunderheaded baby, not man enough to be like the other fellows who drank a good deal and wenched a little without any

question, and were satisfied" (R, 62), "He fought with himself furiously, to remain normal" (R, 62-3). Just as Lydia struggles to define the nature of her womanhood, so Tom feels uncertain about the status of his manhood. What is most obvious is that he has been raised in a family that respects the power of women and Nature, as he encounters the larger world, in his experiences with the prostitute and the foreign woman, he becomes aware of a new kind of sexual politics not evident on Marsh Farm.

Tom does finally marry a foreigner in Lydia Lensky, and develops a healthy sexual relationship with her. In analyzing what marriage means to him, though, Tom is rather uncertain about his status as husband.

> Did he own her? Was she here forever? Or might she go away? She was not really his, it was not a real marriage, this marriage between them. She might go away. He did not feel like a master, a husband, father of her children. She belonged elsewhere (R, 96).

This passage centers on the issue of ownership: does a husband own or possess his wife? Tom concludes that he does not own Lydia, and that she is an independent person. This conclusion parallels Lydia's eagerness to see Tom as an independent participant in their relationship. Again, however, Tom feels a sense of masculine insecurity which deepens when Lydia gives birth to their first child.

> His heart leapt, fearing she was dead. Yet he knew perfectly well she was not. He saw the way her hair went loose over her temples, her mouth was shut with suffering in a sort of grin. She was beautiful to him--but it was not human. He had a dread of her as she lay there. What had she to do with him? She was other than himself (R, 117).

This passage poignantly expresses the uncertainty which results from the alienation of the male seed from the male in copulation [16] Tom faces his feeling of uncertain paternity by bringing a religious interpretation to his relationship with Lydia and Anna (Paul's child) "What did it matter, that Anna Lensky was born of Lydia and Paul? God was her father and her mother, He had passed through the married pair without fully making Himself known to them" (R, 133) He sees no need to worry about earthly paternity when, in actuality, God is Anna's true parent Of course, even though God can be both father and mother, he is always a He The traditional notion of a male God is important to the question of gender difference and to masculine ideology

Tom does manage to deal with his paternal uncertainty, although he occasionally reverts to his initial anxiety--which is obviously due to the total absorption of his energies into his marriage with Lydia

> Was his life nothing? Had he nothing to show, no work He did not count his work, anybody could have done it What had he known, but the long, marital embrace with his wife! Curious, that this was what his life amounted to! (R, 167)

Tom certainly is the least "masculine" male in The Rainbow He maintains a respect for women throughout the novel, especially after discovering that one woman can possess both inlaw (maternal) and outlaw (sexual) capabilities

However, what Tom rarely realizes is how the larger world causes him to conform to certain patriarchal values When he transfers Anna's wealth to Will, this conformity is evident

> ... it was to Will Brangwen that the uncle, one evening, handed over the shares which he had transferred to Anna Lensky. They were for two thousand five hundred pounds. Will Brangwen looked at his uncle. It was a great deal of the Marsh capital here given away. The youth, however, was only colder and more fixed. He was abstract, purely a fixed will. He gave the shares to Anna (R, 165).

That Will gives the shares to Anna is an overt indication of the changing norms of the larger world, and of the changing position of man in relation to woman in that world. However, Tom retains the uncritical mind of the early Brangwen men, thus, he is unconscious of the patriarchal values which he accepts as natural.

Anna is the second major woman figure in The Rainbow and her experience demonstrates her intensified sense of sexual politics in the private sphere, as well as her flickering awareness of the restrictions placed on women by men and institutions in the larger world. As a young girl, she is acutely conscious of the disadvantages that accrue to her sex.

> But Anna was not to be won over. She had a curious shrinking from commonplace people, and particularly from the young lady of her day (R, 137).

> From constant telling, she came almost to believe in her own badness, her own intrinsic inferiority. She felt that she ought always to be in a state of slinking disgrace, if she fulfilled what was expected of her. But she rebelled. She never really believed in her own badness (R, 138-9).

She resents having to live in an environment that places no value on women's abilities. Her feistiness is no doubt partly the result of her childhood trips to the cattle market with Tom. Yet there remains--despite Anna's obvious potential for rising above the traditional biological determinism of her sex--no real and viable

alternative through which she might escape a life of conventional domesticity. She wants to escape from the "crampedness" of her lot, yet she can only do so by falling victim to the romantic illusion which is perpetuated by her lot. She must, in the end, be rescued by Will, who makes a rather odd prince. "Anna was wanting him to come. In him she had escaped. In him the bounds of her experience were transgressed. he was the hole in the wall, beyond which the sunshine blazed on an outside world" (R, 151). Anna thus has no choice but to be the princess locked in the tower, and can only escape in the conventional way--that is, by giving herself to a man.

In her marriage with Will, Anna continues to struggle against the restriction of her sex. When Will is angered by her self-contained enjoyment of sewing, she establishes her prerogative immediately. "I like sewing, and you're not going to stop me doing it" (R, 204). Because she is ever suspicious of Will's ideas and practices, she comes to place a great deal of faith in human knowledge. "She . . . clung to the worship of human knowledge . . . . She believed in the omnipotence of the human mind" (R, 214). In so doing, however, she unconsciously pledges her allegiance to male systems of thought, for human knowledge is largely determined by masculine ideology.

As a potentially subversive female figure who senses the injustice of the male vision of reality, Anna nonetheless is channeled into the woman's conventional domain--that of motherhood and the

family. She rightly acknowledges the importance of her biological capability as a woman, after all, bearing children is something of which men are incapable. She revels in the exclusive prerogatives of motherhood. "when the milk came, and the infant sucked her breast, she seemed to be leaping with extravagant bliss" (R, 234). But, in becoming so obsessed with her biological function, Anna neglects other sides of her potential as a human being. Occasionally, she becomes aware of her exclusion from other sorts of experience. "she faced the blazing close of the affair, in which she had not played her fullest part . . . ." (R, 237). Nevertheless, she succumbs to the role dictated to her by the pervasive male ideology of her world. "With satisfaction she relinquished the adventure to the unknown. She was bearing her children" (R, 238), "She was a door and a threshold, she herself. Through her another soul was coming, to stand upon her as upon the threshold, looking out, shading its eyes for the direction to take" (R, 238). She sacrifices her own personal development to her task of producing new members of society. And she becomes an observer rather than a participant in life:

> Anna was absorbed in the child now, she left her husband to take his own way. She was willing now to postpone all adventure into unknown realities. She had the child, her palpable and immediate future was the child. If her soul had found no utterance, her womb had (R, 249).

That Anna partakes in a close relationship with Nature--a relationship based on the continuity of life through birth--is highly evident in her self-conscious role as Magna Mater:

> All the future was in her hands, in the hands of a woman. And before this baby was ten months old, she was again with child. She seemed to be in the fecund storm of life, every moment was full and busy with productiveness to her. She felt like the earth, the mother of everything (R, 250).

But, though Anna feels the tremendous power of her capacity to give birth and suck, though she sees how important it is to be the vehicle through which the human race ensures its continuity, she ultimately fails to realize that her little matriarchy is enclosed in a world ruled by men. That she labours for men is evident in that her life remains restricted to the private sphere. "Anna continued in her violent trance of motherhood, always busy, often harassed . . . . The outside, public life was less than nothing to her, really" (R, 262). Moreover, she is not paid for her work in the domestic sphere, this is a clear hint that she serves a masculine ideology (just as many other women of her time do). As a woman, she is limited to achieving utterance through her womb, this limitation excludes her from mental development and public utterance. Anna, formerly a rambunctious and at times hostile young woman, is tamed by the constraints her society places on women, although periodically she rises to challenge male ideology. For instance, when Will seeks sexual freedom outside marriage, Anna immediately notes the injustice of the sexual double standard. "Her old defiant hostility came up. Very good, she too was out on her own adventure . . . . Something was liberated in her . . . . He expected her to keep the moral fortress. Not she! It was much too dull a part" (R, 277). But she is never able to enter

the public domain, which is the world wherein she might establish a greater equality between the sexes, therefore, she does "keep the moral fortress" through her permanent restriction to the role of mother. And, by excluding Will from her life during pregnancy, she sustains the very trap of her existence--motherhood. Instead of being excluded from the man's world, Anna learns to exclude the public realm from herself, as Engleberg points out: "Her main defense against the encircling world and the roofed-in arch of the church is multiplication of self: by producing scores of children she erects a kind of shield around herself."[17] She therefore adopts a role in accordance with the male ideology of the world in which she is enclosed.

Anna's husband, Will, is a complex male figure both similar to and different from his precursor, Tom. What distinguishes Will from the start is not only his apparent aura of self-containment but also his religious fervor and artistic sensibility. He shows none of Tom's youthful frustration because he dedicates his energies to the art of wood-carving. As a young man, Will carves his vision of Eve--the ideal woman: this is a way of defining masculine and feminine principles in his own life.

> Will Brangwen worked at his wood-carving. It was a passion, a passion for him to have the chisel under his grip. Verily the passion of his heart lifted the fine bite of steel. He was carving, as he had always wanted, the creation of Eve. It was a panel in low relief, for a church. Adam lay asleep as if suffering, and God, a dim, large figure, stooped towards him, stretching forward His unveiled hand; an Eve, a small vivid, naked female shape, was issuing like a flame towards the hand of God, from the torn side of Adam (R, 158).

Nevertheless, his art reproduces the values that his society normalizes. It is one of the central myths of male supremacy, for instance, that woman was created from man--especially when it is so obviously woman, and not man, who gives birth. It is a telling point when, on his honeymoon, Will realizes he has the ability to complete the carving of Eve.

> He sat thinking of his carving of Eve. He loved to go over his carving in his mind, dwelling on every stroke, every line. How he loved it now! When he went back to his Creation--panel again, he would finish his Eve, tender and sparkling (R, 189).

That carving, however, does not meet Anna's approval because she perceives its male bias.

> She jeered at the Eve, saying "She is like a little marionette. Why is she so small? You've made Adam as big as God, and Eve like a doll."
>
> "It is impudence to say that woman was made out of man's body," she continued, "when every man is born of woman. What impudence men have, what arrogance!" (R, 215).

In this passage, Anna confronts the myth of male supremacy that finds expression--consciously or unconsciously--in Will's carving. Her critical adeptness never has a higher moment as she unravels the mistaken belief that man can physically give birth. That woman gives birth is for Anna the basic, incontrovertible fact of human existence. Will's masculine identity, as it finds expression in his art, shows evidence of his absorption in religious ideas that have been created from a male perspective. In the end, Will destroys his wood-carving because he understands the falsity of its masculine bias: "he chopped up the whole panel and put it on the fire" (R, 215). However, religion continues to serve his needs

apart from Anna--even though "She had broken a little of something in him. And at length he was glad to forfeit from his soul all his symbols, to have her making love to him" (R, 203). Eventually, Will's love for Anna obliterates all his other concerns. The woman's power is supreme.

It is crucial that, like Tom before him, Will finds fulfillment in the so-called private sphere of life, rather than the public domain.

> He did not attach any vital importance to his life in the drafting office, or his life among men. That was just merely the margin to the text. The verity was his connection with Anna and his connection with the church, his real being lay in his dark emotional experience of the Infinite, of the Absolute (R, 199).

Of course, Will's existence centers on his family, even though he is exposed to the ideological fabric of the larger world--to a lesser extent, perhaps, through his job and to a greater extent through the church. He needs to be in constant union with his wife and Nature.

> . . . for his private being, Brangwen felt that the whole of the man's world was exterior and extraneous to his own real life with Anna. Sweep away the monstrous superstructure of the world of to-day, cities and industries and civilisation, leave only the bare earth with plants growing and waters running, and he would not mind, so long as he were whole, had Anna and child and the new, strange certainty in his soul (R, 235).

Will's belief in the separation of his family life and the man's world here is an illusion which is soon undermined. For although he often feels the urge to submit to Anna, whom he refers to as his ark and rock, he struggles for manly independence.

> Yet he must be able to be alone. He must be able to lie down alongside the empty space, and let be. He must be able to

> leave himself to the flood, to sink or live as might be. For he recognized at length his limitation, and the limitation of his power. He had to give in (R, 231).

Will's ultimate need to define himself always in terms of what he is not (the woman) leads him to seek a new form of security in the completeness of religious symbols. After Anna criticizes his religious passion, he retreats into himself. "He was purely a world to himself, he had nothing to do with any general consciousness" (R, 272). This represents his desire to transcend the material conditions of human existence--which embody male insufficiency and female supremacy. Anna's criticism of Will's religion is thus not a wholly positive development, because the motive for her condemnation is not only her feeling of exclusion from the church, but also her need to dominate Will's life. That Will is first alienated from Anna's communion with the cosmic force inherent in birth, and then cut off from his own attempt to commune with this cosmic force through religion, means that he must either retreat into himself or escape to the public world in order to find security. Will thus begins to long for new adventures with women. At a football match, he spots a girl who is the perfect object for his needs.

> She would be small, he would be able almost to hold her in his two hands. She would be small, almost like a child, and pretty. Her childishness whetted him keenly. She would be helpless between his hands (R, 270).

> About the girl herself, who or what she was, he cared nothing, he was quite unaware that she was anybody. She was just the sensual object of his attention (R, 272).

> Probably she was a warehouse-lass. He was glad she was a common girl (R, 270).

> He was perfectly self-contained. He was himself, the absolute, the rest of the world was the object that should contribute to his being (R, 270).

He is sadistic in his desire to have power over the girl, he cares about the girl only as a sex object, not as a subject with an identity, a life-history, and emotions of her own, and his desire is whetted by the lower-class status of the girl. His attempt to seduce the girl shows how the sexual oppression of women is related to class oppression which results in the objectification of human beings. His attempt to rape the girl is his retaliation for a feeling of manly inadequacy in his relationship with Anna. His belief in a separation between family life and the public world is what had initially led him to serve "the little matriarchy" and to ignore the public domain. However, now Will is conscious that he has brought his dissatisfaction with the private world to the public realm. He sees that the division between spheres is only an illusion, but that it is an illusion which nonetheless serves his male needs for freedom from Anna's overpowering domination. He therefore institutes his own form of male supremacy in the public domain, while continuing to serve Anna in the private sphere.

The pivotal female character in The Rainbow, Ursula, manages to break through to the so-called public realm, unlike her two female precursors. From an early age, Ursula notices the limitations placed on females. When she helps her father with planting potatoes, she feels powerless beside his masculine efficiency. "She dreaded work, because she could not do it as he did it. She

was conscious of the great breach between them. She knew she had no power" (R, 265). Nevertheless, as she matures, she develops her own idea of what women are capable of accomplishing. She brings a critical mind to all that she encounters, early developing an instinctive dislike for the romanticized picture of human fecundity. "When she saw, later, a Rubens picture with storms of naked babies, and found this was called 'Fecundity,' she shuddered, and the word became abhorrent to her" (R, 309). Ursula has a persistent desire for knowledge which leads her to devalue traditional domesticity and to emphasize the religious and the mystical in life. "But Ursula was all for the ultimate. she was always in revolt against babies and muddled domesticity" (R, 320). The outlaw feminine principle is explicit in her feelings and actions. After deciding that conventional domesticity is not for her, she discovers--most specifically in her analysis of the Bible and in her inclination towards controlling her lover, Skrebensky--that she has abilities which cannot be given full expression through traditional gender roles. Rather than being the vehicle for human continuity through birth, Ursula finds that "Her hands [feel] destructive like metal blades of destruction" (R, 366). As a strong and assertive individual, she is emblematized by the lion, not the lamb, as demonstrated in the way she sexually devours Anton. "So she held him there, the victim, consumed, annihilated. She had triumphed. he was not any more" (R, 368). Ursula's affair with Skrebensky results in a role reversal, but it maintains the idea that one partner must dominate over the other--an idea

which is central to the masculine principle of life. There is an implicit danger that Ursula's strength embodies too many of the masculine values which she had initially wanted to overcome.

In the public world, Ursula interacts with progressive women who have aspirations similar to her own. Through Winifred Inger, whose "ideas . . . are close to Lawrence's own views,"[18] Ursula learns about the material conditions of life faced by women. "Miss Inger was telling Ursula of a friend, how she had died in childbirth, and what she had suffered, then she told of a prostitute, and of some of her experiences with men" (R, 386). In her revolt against the conventional female role, Ursula even experiments in a lesbian relationship with Winifred. This relationship, which Lawrence delineates with a great deal of delicacy and ambivalence, constitutes a major period of transition for Ursula. Although it remains a secret memory in her later life, Ursula's new-found awareness of love between women allows her to question more fully the bias and limitation of so-called normal, heterosexual relationships.

Ursula's antagonism toward traditional feminine domesticity--as embodied by her mother--intensifies when she returns from college.

> Even this fact of her mother's pregnancy enraged the eldest girl. Mrs. Brangwen was so complacent, so utterly fulfilled in her breeding. She would not have the existence at all of anything but the immediate, physical, common things (R, 401).

And Ursula articulates her radical opinions. she "would try to insist, in her own home, on the right of women to take equal place with men in the field of action and work" (R, 402). She decides to

apply for a teaching post to prove that a woman can succeed in a man's world. Her efforts represent the struggles of an isolated woman against a system, for, as she tries to establish herself in school, she discovers that--more than ever--she is enchained within the bounds of her sex. One passage, which describes her metaphorically as a filly and thus establishes her link with Nature and the animal world (a link that causes one to associate her with the horses in the last chapter), shows that Ursula intends to function within the channels of power in the man's world, but only so that she may eventually conquer that world.

> She was like a young filly that has been broken in to the shafts, and has lost its freedom . . . To shafts like these she would never submit for long. But she would know them. She would serve them that she might destroy them (R, 457).

This passage indicates the constraints that men have placed on the outlaw feminine principle of life. Nature and women are thus inferior to men because of their earthly vulnerability.

Ursula is a subversive female in The Rainbow. One might question, however, the extent to which she absorbs and acts according to masculine values in her struggle for liberation. Obviously, the most problematic aspect of her nature is her strident individualism. Until the end of the novel, she refuses to acknowledge the value of collective action among women. Her condemnation of the Suffragette Movement indicates that she remains under the influence of masculine ideology, which often separates the individual from the community. Hence, Ursula chooses to detach herself from the political agenda of the Women's Movement.

> Maggie was a great suffragette, trusting to the vote To Ursula the vote was never a reality She had within her the strange, passionate knowledge of religion and living for transcending the limits of the automatic system that contained the vote (R, 456)

In addition to ridiculing the political faith of other types of feminists, Ursula sees collective female action as a form of slavery for Dorothy Russell Dorothy "spent her spare moments slaving for the women's Social and Political Union Ursula always felt her to be a creature of fate, like Cassandra" (R, 482) On one level, the two passages above point to Ursula's belief in her self-sufficiency as an individual, moreover, they show how--in her opposition to collective action--she tentatively maintains the illusion of a division between the private and public aspects of life On another level, however, her deprecation of collective action illustrates her belief in the need for more than token changes to the male political system Instead of assimilating the concerns of women to the "automatic system" which already exists, she wants to bypass the system itself because it is not a neutral social construct--but an embodiment of all that is masculine She envisions the need for a transformation of consciousness among individual members of society, a need which--though it will be assisted by the enfranchisement of women--will require a more all-encompassing change "The only way to avoid the structures, to replace them, is to perceive in different ways--in Ursula's case at this point, by intuition "[19] That Ursula is perhaps more a visionary than a practical politician is a point that cannot be stressed enough She does, after all, dream of a new

form of social organization in which--it appears--the masculine principle will lose its dominance.

> She made dreams of the new place she would live in, where stately cultured people of high feeling would be friends with her, and she would live with the noble in the land, moving to a large freedom of feeling. She dreamed of a rich, proud, simple girlfriend, who had never known Mr. Harby and his life, nor ever had a note in her voice of bondaged contempt and fear, as Maggie had (R, 470).

There is somewhat of an aristocratic air to Ursula's visionary world, and perhaps some nostalgia for the pastoral world of her ancestors. Even though she speaks of "a large freedom of feeling," one cannot help but think that she is slightly elitist in her dream. On the more positive side, however, she does hope for a girlfriend who has never been belittled as the result of her womanhood by a man such as Mr. Harby, she wishes for the warmth of sisterhood. This wish appears to contradict Ursula's rejection of female companionship. But what she actually rejects in the Women's Movement is not women but women's use of masculine values and political structures to promote their concerns. She wants to develop a community which values the feminine principle, and she is thus unwilling to espouse a political system based wholly on masculine values.

During her first experiences as a teacher, Ursula discovers how difficult it is to achieve her personal expectations. Nonetheless, she does achieve some personal development through her struggles, and is certainly more successful in advancing the cause of women (or of the feminine principle) than are Lydia and Anna. After all, she is at least paid for her labour in the man's world. Her continuing courage is tested when Anthony Schofield tempts her to return to a

modern Garden of Eden. Although Ursula almost accepts this offer, she is ultimately unable to settle for anything less than her vision of a better life for women and all humankind. Her inner response to Anthony's marriage proposal is thus one that is suited to a visionary:

> All this so beautiful, all this so lovely! He did not see it. He was one with it. But she saw it, and was one with it. Her seeing separated them infinitely (R, 467).

> She liked Anthony, though. All her life, at intervals, she returned to the thought of him and of that which he offered. But she was a traveller, she was a traveller on the face of the earth, and he was an isolated creature living in the fulfillment of his own senses (R, 467).

> She saw herself travelling round a circle, only an arc of which remained to complete. Then, she was in the open, like a bird tossed into mid-air, a bird that had learned in some measure to fly (R, 467).

She realizes she cannot turn back to the life represented by Tom and Lydia, since she is making progress toward achieving a new sort of freedom and lifestyle for women. She dreams of mastering the man's world by returning to college for a higher degree, a dream which obliterates her physical attraction to Schofield. "Then poetry and books and learning took the place of Anthony, with his goats' movements and his cold, gleaming humour" (R, 464). After returning to college, however, she comes to identify the capitalist motive behind higher learning. Disillusionment sets in and she falls back, once again, on the possibility of a loving relationship with Skrebensky. "The one thing she believed in was in the love she had held for him" (R, 489). But, as it turns out, she and Skrebensky almost destroy one another because of their antithetical beliefs and values. In condemning Skrebensky for wanting to go to war, and for believing

in the colonization of the Indian people, Ursula comes close to comparing Indians and women. This parallel certainly exists in what she says about Skrebensky's thirst for war and domination. "'You think the Indians are simpler than us, and so you'll enjoy being near them and being a lord over them,' she said. 'And you'll feel so righteous, governing them for their own good'" (R, 513). Ursula feels compassion for the Indians because she is a woman--she has known what it means to be oppressed. In the end, she not only refuses to make love to Skrebensky in a bed or a house, but also refuses to marry him, for to do either of these things would be to accept a life of social convention and limitation. He represents all that she must avoid in the man's world, and thus implicitly demonstrates the connection between personal relationships and the public world.

Ursula's greatest moment of struggle comes when she is pregnant (or dreams she is). Facing the fact of biological womanhood, she reconsiders the position of her mother. "Her mother was simple and radically true. She had taken the life that was given. She had not, in her arrogant conceit, insisted on creating life to fit herself" (R, 537). This passage brings together much of what it is that Ursula has fought against in the novel. She has fought against "the life that was given," although she has perhaps been too egoistic in her belief that she could always create life to fit her own personal needs. Nonetheless, as a feminist, it is essential that she believe in humankind's ability to construct a world that emphasizes

feminine values. She must believe that the present world is only one world and not "the best of all possible worlds"--that the so-called facts and common sense of life are only fiction. And the greatest fiction created by male domination is the myth that women must accept the limits of the private sphere, marriage, and biological determinism. "For what had a woman but to submit? What was her flesh but for childbearing, her strength for her children and her husband, the giver of life? At last she was a woman" (R, 538). But Ursula survives this last moment of uncertainty and realizes, after her apparent miscarriage, that she could have raised her child without marrying Skrebensky. "There would be no child. she was glad. If there had been a child, it would have made little difference, however. She would have kept the child and herself, she would not have gone to Skrebensky" (R, 546). She surmounts the fate handed down to previous Brangwen women and is now capable of assisting in the ultimate feminist objective: a transformation of society. At the novel's end, she envisions a transformed world and reaches a new plateau: that of the free-thinking and creative participant in life. She represents a reunified feminine principle of life, for she will not be tied down to the single, childbearing function.[20] Despite her strident individualism, Ursula eventually demystifies the illusion of private and public spheres, opening up a whole new realm of possibilities for women.

In contrast, Anton Skrebensky epitomizes the man whose first priority is his public duty. He is "beyond any change or

question," "fatally established," "irrevocable," "a gentleman," and "made up of a set of habitual actions and decisions" (R, 336-7, 493). In short, he has no individuality and is rather like a corpse or a machine. He puts on an air, however, of complete self-containment. When asked about his home, he promptly remarks "but my real home, I suppose, is the army" (R, 338). And "other people were mere objects of indifference to him" (R, 341), a rather useful situation since he belongs to a profession that has the habit of killing people. Actually, Skrebensky is a profoundly weak man because he adheres so strictly to the masculine principle. There is no ebb and flow to his existence, he is a permanent entity--a fixity.

For Skrebensky, fighting is the most serious business there is in humankind's "toy-life" (R, 356), consequently, his duty to the state is of the highest priority. He is not concerned with the means of war, but only with the results. In serving the state and its militaristic agenda with such diligence, Skrebensky obeys a man-made system of rules and regulations--an artificial principle of human continuity. He thus represents the patriarchal man's world and its devaluation of the feminine principle of human continuity--which is birth--in favour of the masculine principle of human continuity, which involves the permanence of death through killing.

Skrebensky's relationship with Ursula is conducted in terms of his strict sense of public duty and war. His personal life is thus permeated with violent ideas, as is clear from the way he makes Ursula his prey.

> But he must weave himself round her, enclose her, enclose her in a net of shadow, of darkness, so she would be like a bright creature gleaming in a net of shadows, caught How he would enjoy her, when she was caught (R, 366-7)

His desire to control her is never fulfilled, however, because she is not a traditional, passive woman, and his inflexible male ego is bruised by her resistance. "But the male in him was scotched by the knowledge that she was not under his spell nor his influence" (R, 377). Beneath Skrebensky's armor is a fatally weak man. That his weakness brings him to almost total emotional dependence on Ursula leads him to become a mere instrument for her pleasure. "After each contact his mad dependence on her was deepened, his hope of standing strong and taking her in his own strength was weakened. He felt himself a mere attribute of her" (R, 514). Skrebensky is an emotional cripple and Ursula destroys him through her dominating influence. "She owned his body and enjoyed it with all the delight and carelessness of a possessor" (R, 511). Their relationship portrays a gender role reversal in that it shows how a woman can dominate a man. But, even though she loves his body, Ursula outgrows Skrebensky, he no longer provides her with a door to the unknown. When he proposes marriage, as a means of possessing her, she therefore refuses his offer. His flood of tears momentarily obliterates his usually mechanical self. He is, for once, vulnerable. But Ursula, rather than soothe his injured feelings, belittles them. "He heard, and his manhood was cruelly, coldly defaced" (R, 519). Kate Millett thinks that "Anton must be sacrificed as an object lesson in how monstrous the new woman

can be "[21] But Millet is only partly right here. The issue is not solely Ursula's womanhood, it is also Skrebensky's manhood. Through his total neglect of the inlaw feminine principle in his life, Skrebensky suffers poignantly. Rather than trying to prove how bad the modern woman is, then, Lawrence here seems to be showing how desperately both sexes need to develop both the masculine and feminine sides of their characters. In the end, Skrebensky's manhood reverts to its automatic functioning: he "would marry his colonel's daughter" (R, 535).

Skrebensky's almost total identification with his public image illustrates the private/public dichotomy:

> He went about at his duties, giving himself up to them. At the bottom of his heart his self, the soul that aspired and had true hope of self-effectuation lay as dead, still-born, a dead weight in his womb. Who was he, to hold important his personal connection? What did a man matter personally? He was just a brick in the whole great social fabric, the nation, the modern humanity. His personal movements were small, and entirely subsidiary. The whole form must be ensured, not ruptured, for any personal reason whatsoever, since no personal reason could justify such a breaking (R, 374).

This passage is remarkable for its insight into the parallelism between the private/public and the feminine/masculine division. What it shows, at bottom, is an opposition between two very distinct principles of human continuity: that of continuity through human reproduction and that of continuity through the creation of a permanent political state. The first principle of continuity is feminine (dynamic) and is rooted in humankind's symbiotic relationship with Nature; the second is masculine (static) and is based on

humankind's need for stability and control. The first principle acknowledges humankind's vulnerability in Nature, the second proclaims humankind's invincibility. The passage above is also interesting because of its imagery. Skrebensky's soul is "stillborn, a dead weight in his womb." This imagery is fascinating because it equips a man with the capacity to give birth--metaphorically speaking. Instead of giving birth to a new self and feeling a sense of continuity through the birth process, however, Skrebensky cannot be reborn to life and must contribute to the preservation of the fixed political structures of the state for security. He thus is only able to live as a fixity--as a corpse--since the masculine values of the state glorify death and degrade life. Whereas Ursula gives birth to a new self, even through the physical reality of a miscarriage, Skrebensky's life gives way to an impersonal, deathly way of existence.

The private/public dichotomy--in which Skrebensky believes and which is such an influence on his life--is a product of gender difference within the structures and institutions of society. And such a dichotomy hides a male supremacist ideology, as Mary O'Brien indicates:

> Operating at the theoretical level, it is relatively easy to see the separation of private and public as an abstract dialectical opposition of particular and universal, of individual and social, of the domestic and the biological, standing opposed to political and historical development . . . .[22]

It is therefore in the apparent separation of so-called private and public aspects of human experience that one sees how The Rainbow's

language appears to espouse certain terminological divisions that are opposed to the values of its feminist objective. For instance, the first generation of Brangwens is seen as being segregated from the larger world. "They were a curious family, a law to themselves, separate from the world, isolated, a small republic set in invisible bounds" (R, 140). As the account of an imagined but not actual isolation, this passage is acceptable. However, if this split between the Brangwen family and the larger world is seriously intended, then one must question Lawrence's ideological presumptions in proposing such a dualism. Does he think the Brangwen life is "natural" and, consequently, reject an evolution in human consciousness based on a dialectical relationship with the material conditions of existence? To accept the Brangwen life as "natural" (and, hence, not to be changed) would be to arrest human development and to value permanence. On the contrary, The Rainbow's emphasis on birth and change points to the inevitability of impermanence.

The second Brangwen generation is also described as being curtained off from the larger world. Will and Anna's feeling of separateness during their honeymoon is a case in point. "But when he unbolted the door, and, half-dressed, looked out, he felt furtive and guilty. The world was there, after all. And he had felt so secure, as though this house were the Ark in the flood, and all the rest was drowned" (R, 187). Clearly, the honeymoon isolation is a pleasant illusion that must be rudely shattered--

especially for Will, who believes at first in a rigid separation of private and public life. Being mentally free of Will's categorical division of life, Anna shatters his illusions:

> And down went his qualms, his maxims, his rules, his smaller beliefs, she scattered them like an expert skittle-player (R, 190).

> He stood and gazed and grinned with wonder whilst his Tablets of Stone went grinding and bumping and splintering down the hill, dislodged forever (R, 190).

These two passages seem to indicate not only the artificial separation between private and public life, but also the falsity of the public world's air of objectivity and permanence. In other words, there is the implication that the values of the private sphere are much more "real" than those of the public sphere, and that the division of spheres is at most an arbitrary distinction.

Whereas the first and second generations of Brangwens largely preserve the private/public dichotomy, even while indirectly questioning it,[23] Ursula consciously tries to destroy the private/public dualism in life. "There was the mysterious man's world of daily work and duty, and existence as a working member of the community . . . She wanted to make her conquest also of this man's world" (R, 381). She finds that the public world, in its absolute adherence to masculine values and to a political principle of continuity which transcends Nature, is highly antagonistic towards feminine values. For instance, she feels a poignant sense of exclusion when she teaches in school. "In school, she was nothing but Standard Five teacher. Ursula Brangwen must be excluded" (R, 443). This sort of exclusion contradicts Ursula's

belief in the inseparability of emotion and thought, thus, she is suspicious of the man's world and of modern intellectuals with whom she interacts, because they separate feelings from ideas in their lives.

> Ursula was introduced by her friend to various women and men, educated, unsatisfied people, who still moved within the smug provincial society as if they were nearly as tame as their outward behaviour showed, but who were inwardly raging and mad (R, 390).

Such an incongruity between the inward and the outward shows Ursula that the people she meets have absorbed the male ideology of their world. They find their world and its structures inhumane, yet, they dissociate feeling from thought and perpetuate the division between private and public spheres.

The private/public dichotomy essentially represents the female/male split in human experience, and is at the root of the ideological assumptions embodied by social institutions in The Rainbow. This point can be supported by an analysis of the function of education in the novel. Although education pervades all aspects of human experience to some extent, it will suffice for the moment to examine more closely Ursula's two major encounters with the recognized education system: her experiences as teacher and as college student. First, however, it will be useful to develop a proper context for those experiences by glancing at how knowledge and learning are seen before Ursula emerges as the main character in the novel.

At first, the question of knowledge is addressed by the early Brangwen women, who conclude that knowledge is what

separates people into various classes and creates a "natural" aristocracy

> It was not money nor power nor position. What power had the vicar over Tom Brangwen--none. Yet strip them and set them on a desert island, and the vicar was the master. His soul was master of the other man's. And why--why? She decided it was a question of knowledge.
>
> Why were her own children marked below those others? Why should the curate's children inevitably take precedence over her children, why should dominance be given them from the start? It was not money, nor even class. It was education and experience, she decided (R, 44).

What is most interesting about these passages is the way in which the Brangwen woman decides that money, power, and position are, somehow, separate from education and experience.[24] Interwoven with the woman's idea of knowledge is the vicar's ability to be "master" and his children's inevitable "dominance" over the Brangwen children, yet, alongside the woman's acceptance of a natural aristocracy of the knowledgeable is the idea that her own children might benefit from higher education. Over the course of the novel, her view that knowledge is untainted by money, power, or position is proven false.

The ideal of education as a great religious experience that leads to a knowledge of Divine and Objective Truth collapses when juxtaposed with the sort of educational experiences delineated in the novel. Ursula's youth, for instance, illustrates how children are educated to be either male or female. "The Brangwen girls were well-grown and stronger than many boys. But for pinafores and long hair, they would have carried easy victories" (R, 306).

Obviously, the need for long hair and skirts undermines the strength of the Brangwen girls. Ursula's consumption of fairy tales and romance shows, in addition, how literature has an important function in normalizing certain types of gender roles. Her picture of herself as a princess locked in a tower indicates that masculine ideology is easily absorbed through a young girl's reading. But Ursula's ideas are subject to continual revision, as she reaches for new forms of knowledge.

> . . . she must move out of the intricately woven illusion of her life. the illusion of a father whose life was an Odyssey in an outer world, the illusion of her grandmother, of realities so shadowy and far-off that they became as mystic symbols --pleasant-girls with wreaths of blue flowers in their hair, the sledges and the depth of winter, the dark-bearded young grandfather, marriage and war and death, then the multitude of illusions concerning herself, how she was truly a princess of Poland, how in England she was under a spell, she was not really this Ursula Brangwen, then the mirage of her reading. out of the multicoloured illusion of this her life, she must move on, to the Grammar School in Nottingham (R, 312).

Although she may never fully escape the influence of illusions, even as she grows older, Ursula's desire to alter the male ideology of her culture demands that she be adept at circumventing the illusions of her world. That Ursula is a product of her world--a product of a world that clothes women in long hair and pinafores--is a fact that contributes to the frustration inherent in her feminist enterprise.

That becomes fairly evident when Ursula enters the classroom as a teacher. Her initial vision of a successful teacher includes both her past knowledge of teachers and her present view of how she would like to enhance the teaching profession.

> She dreamed how she would make the little ugly children love her. She would be so personal. Teachers were always so hard and impersonal. There was no vivid relationship. She would make everything personal and vivid, she would give herself, she would give, give, give all her great stores of wealth to her children, she would make them so happy, and they would prefer her to any teacher on the face of the earth (R, 416).

Alongside Ursula's obvious idealism in this passage is her desire to bring her whole personality to teaching. She wishes to erase any division that might exist between her private and public selves. In other words, she sees teaching in terms of the feminine principle--which is usually restricted to the private sphere. But Ursula soon discovers that the school environment, with its painful and imprisoning architecture, includes the masculine principle and excludes the feminine. "She had brought her feelings and her generosity to where neither generosity nor emotion were wanted" (R, 422). The logical conclusion one can draw from this is that the feminine principle is not wanted in the public sphere.

It is therefore interesting to see how Ursula performs within the patriarchal school system. She sees how the school's physical structure is unsuitable to learning. "The whole place seemed to have a threatening expression, imitating the church's architecture, for the purpose of domineering, like a gesture of vulgar authority" (R, 418). The school's architecture emits a sense of domination and authority and shows how deep the masculine ideology of education runs, and how impossible it is for the feminine principle to survive in such a place. The number of students makes it impossible for Ursula to teach as she would

like "She could not speak as she would to a child, because they were not individual children, they were a collective, inhuman thing" (R, 426). This defeats her plan to treat students as human beings. Then there is Mr. Harby's idea of education: "to crystallise the children into hard, mute fragments, fixed under his will, his brute will, which fixed them by sheer force" (R, 426). This reminds one of Anton Skrebensky, who is so fixed in his nature. One thus sees how early the public world begins to make its many Skrebenskys.[25] Ursula soon discovers Mr Harby's male chauvinism, which is an extension of his philosophy of education. He criticizes Ursula not only for her lack of discipline and control in the classroom, but also because she is a woman. Her apparent weaknesses are described in justaposition with descriptions of supposedly successful teachers: "[Mr. Brunt] was become a mechanism working on and on and on. But the personal man was in subdued friction all the time" (R, 433); "Miss Harby was a splendid teacher. She could keep order and inflict knowledge on a class with remarkable efficiency" (R, 434). Evidently, both Mr. Brunt and Miss Harby have accepted the following philosophy of education:

> . . . the first great effort of every teacher of a large class must be to bring the will of the children into accordance with his own will. And this he can only do by an abnegation of his personal self, and an application of a system of laws, for the purpose of achieving a certain calculable result, imparting of certain knowledge (R, 432).

Both Mr. Brunt and Miss Harby have abnegated their personal selves by accepting a philosophy of power, coercion, and absolute knowledge.[26] Indeed, Miss Harby is a rather pointed example of

how a woman can be accepted in the man's world through her adoption of masculine values [27] The education system thus involves both women and men in its oppressive function, which entails the use of ideology (on vulnerable children) to ensure the maintenance of a hierarchical, class-based society Education is here a machine that shapes young people to suit the needs of industrial capitalism, it makes people into submissive servants of the ruling class [28]

What is especially interesting is that Ursula, after briefly succumbing to the brutality of the system and beating Williams, attempts to employ some new strategies

> She made her children happy too, with a little tingling delight But to her, the children were not a school class this afternoon They were flowers, birds, little bright animals, children, anything . . . . It was for once a game, this teaching And if they got their sums wrong, what matter? And she would take a pleasant bit of reading And instead of history with dates, she would tell a lovely tale (R, 459)

This passage shows her inclination toward creating a playful learning environment based on imaginative rather than scientific thinking She makes learning into "a game" and interests the students in "a lovely tale" rather than in history (which is viewed in this instance as being a hardened body of factual knowledge) Lawrence's description of Ursula's new teaching tactics is ironic (because the children run wild and take advantage of her "soft" approach), but the irony is undercut by the deathly state of the male-run education system It is a slight embarrassment for Ursula when her students do poorly on their examinations, however, to excel on their examinations would be to bind themselves to the masculine rigidity of the education system

Ursula does not at first fully realize the complex relationship between the education system, knowledge, masculine values, the private/public dichotomy, and gender difference. Until she goes back to college, she remains unenlightened about the hypocrisy of an education system that merely serves the masculine values of the status quo. Having returned to college, she initially feels like one of "the elect" pupils of higher learning. After all, her expenses are paid in full by the government (a hint that education and politics do mix quite nicely!). Her idealism is visible once again in her belief that she is on the threshold of total independence. She will be completely self-sufficient once she learns all she can from the priestly professors.

> . . . there was in it a reminiscence of the wondrous, cloistral origin of education. Her soul flew straight back to the mediaeval times, when the monks of God held the learning of men and imparted it within the shadow of religion. In this spirit she entered college (R, 480).

> Here, within the great, whispering sea-shell, that whispered all the while with reminiscence of all the centuries, time faded away, and the echo of knowledge filled the timeless silence . . . . At first, she preserved herself from criticism. She would not consider the professors as men, ordinary men who ate bacon, and pulled on their boots before coming to college (R, 481).

The college's harsh architecture, however, signals that even in this place, where knowledge and religion are closely wedded, learning is steeped in masculine values. After all, the college does belong to the public sphere, which men have traditionally held as their realm (illusory as it is) apart from women. Ursula eventually realizes the ideological implications of her college education.

> The life went out of her studies, why, she did not know. But the whole thing seemed sham, spurious, spurious Gothic arches, spurious peace, spurious Latinity, spurious dignity of France, spurious naiveté of Chaucer. It was a second-hand dealer's shop, and one bought an equipment for an examination. This was only a little side-show to the factories of the town. Gradually the perception stole into her. This was no religious retreat, no seclusion of pure learning. It was a little apprentice-shop where one was further equipped for making money. The college itself was a little, slovenly laboratory for the factory (R, 485).

That Ursula does not pass her final examination for the higher degree is often viewed as an illustration of Lawrence's male supremacist beliefs. Kate Millett, for instance, makes this comment:

> Ursula earns her freedom and goes to the university, but Lawrence ridicules her ambitions . . . . Big women are dangerous items unless they be the maternal figures of the past, and so the fate reserved for Ursula is a very different one--Lawrence causes her to fail her examinations, go down in defeat with her coveted B. A. and end her life a contented housewife.[29]

This shows how easy it is to misread The Rainbow's adherence to feminine values by judging the society in which Ursula lives--including the school and the college--to be free of male ideological biases. Ursula's "failure" not only reflects her disgust with the idea of buying "equipment" for such a test, but also shows her determination to preserve the feminine values that she so cherishes. After all, what would it prove if Ursula had passed the examination by regurgitating the "right" answers? It would only prove that Ursula had done a good job in absorbing and accepting the dominance of masculine values.[30]

The larger world thus plays an important and often hidden role in promoting gender difference. Like the educational system,

religious ideology also purveys a masculine bias, it is one of the most pervasive forces in The Rainbow, affecting both the simple society of the earlier Brangwens and the later urbanized, industrial state. For the early Brangwens, the Church represents a transcendental realm that gives purpose and meaning to earthly existence through a divine ordering of experience. This is evident as early as the first page of the novel. "Whenever one of the Brangwens in the fields lifted his head from his work, he saw the church-tower at Ilkeston in the empty sky. So that as he turned again to the horizontal land, he was aware of something standing above him and beyond him in the distance" (R, 41). Religion is something to which man must submit. Tom "sat small and submissive to the greater ordering" (R, 75). Religion is a source of authority and mystery, and Tom believes that it plays a direct role in his relationship with Lydia. "And then it came upon him that he would marry her and she would be his life" (R, 75). Insofar as religion represents an unknown force which guides human conduct, it does not interfere with Tom's sense of the sanctity of his fleshly existence. However, in that it creates an opposition between the spirit and the body, it thwarts his physical needs and desires. "And when he [Tom] looked at her [Lydia], an over-much reverence and fear of the unknown changed the nature of his desire into a sort of worship, holding her aloof from his physical desire, self-thwarting" (R, 93). The spirit/body opposition that this passage highlights serves a religion of transcendence,

which relates to masculine ideology's characteristic separation of man from Nature. However, Tom soon posits greater faith in a religion of immanence, when Lydia and he find comfort in their long marital embrace.

Anna and Will have a much more intellectual understanding of religion than do Tom and Lydia. Will in particular finds stability through his absorption in religious iconography. In the Cathedral chapter, he envisions the church as a "She" and as "the perfect womb" (R, 243), and in church he experiences a religious consummation synonymous with sexual climax. His religious passion fulfills his need for independence from Anna. The Church acts as a surrogate womb over which he has complete control, and this feeling parallels man's need for a public sphere in life--a sphere apart from women in which man can construct a world that transcends the female's power to give birth.

Anna feels uncomfortable within the artificial, womblike church. She cannot empathize with Will's enraptured state while in the cathedral because she senses that, in some way, the church opposes women. She does not feel personally touched by the church's function. "Everything seemed to be a matter of social duty, and never of her self. They talked about her soul, but somehow never managed to rouse or to implicate her soul" (R, 198). For Anna, who has felt so strongly the feminine power of giving birth, transcendental philosophy and elaborate religious symbolism pale before the actual conditions of human existence. While Will attaches

a profound meaning to the statue of the lamb, Anna interprets it literally "Whatever it may pretend to mean, what it is is a silly absurd toy-lamb with a Christmas-tree flag ledged on its paw--and if it wants to mean anything else, it must look different from that" (R, 202) She questions the validity of religious miracles as well "Did [Will] believe the water turned to wine at Cana? She would drive him to the thing as a historical fact . . . " (R, 212) Through her critical powers, she destroys Will's religious illusions, she must do so because the Church imposes limitations on her

> The cathedral roused her too But she would never consent to the knitting of all the leaping stone in a great roof that closed her in, and beyond which was nothing, nothing, it was the ultimate confine . . . . She claimed the right to freedom above her, higher than the roof She had always a sense of being roofed in (R, 245)

Indeed, Anna's feeling of alienation within the church parallels Will's mounting sense of alienation within the family (when Anna succumbs to her trance of motherhood) Both feel alienated because they have constructed mutually exclusive gender roles for themselves Anna seeks the divine through her childbearing function, Will seeks the divine through his surrogate womb--the Church Their mutual religious alienation duplicates to some degree the private/ public dichotomy of male ideology

The masculine bias of institutionalized religion becomes most obvious in Will's response to Anna's attack on his religious beliefs For him, Anna "was the voice of the serpent in his Eden" (R, 246) Earlier, Will had envisioned his religion as a manifestation of human continuity--since religion transcends Nature and man's

dependency on the physical earth for survival (or man's dependency on woman). In responding to Anna's scepticism, he begins to lose that sense of purpose.

> he felt that his cathedrals would never again be to him as they had been. Before, he had thought them absolute. But now he saw them crouching under the sky. With still the dark, mysterious world or reality inside, but as a world within a world, a sort of side show, whereas before they had been as a world to him within a chaos, a reality, an order, an absolute, within a meaningless confusion (R, 247-8).

This is a crucial passage because it points not only to Will's religious disillusionment but also to his new awareness that institutionalized religion is a mere earthly creation--a human phenomenon. Moreover, he sees that religion is a social construction which attempts to overcome man's insecurity in a material and historical world.

Anna's mockery is therefore quite devastating to Will's sense of security as a man.

> His own being gave him the lie. He knew it was so: wine was wine, water was water, for ever: the water had not become wine. The miracle was not a real fact. She seemed to be destroying him. He went out, dark and destroyed, his soul running its blood. And he tasted of death. Because his life was formed in these unquestioned concepts (R, 213).

He is forced to confront religion with a critical mind and so comes to realize that the cathedral's illusory completeness does not include the natural world in its symbolism.

> He listened to the thrushes in the gardens and heard a note which the cathedrals did not include: something free and careless and joyous . . . . There was life outside the church. There was much that the church did not include. He thought of God, and of the whole blue rotunda of the day. There was something great and free. He thought of the ruins of the Grecian worship, and it seemed, a temple was never perfectly a temple, till it was ruined and mixed up with the winds and the sky and the herbs (R, 248).

Implicit in the church's exclusion of Nature is its exclusion of women. Will does not perhaps realize, in debating with Anna about whether the gargoyles in the cathedral are women, that he has made his religion into a celebration of life without women. Through religion, then, he reaches out for a permanent reality, but because of Anna the Church crumbles and exposes Will to the flux of life. Nevertheless, his desire for completeness and stability leads him to dedicate his spare time to restoring the church and the self-sufficient manhood it represents. "To keep the church fabric and the church-ritual intact was his business, to have the intimate sacred building utterly in his own hands, and to make the form of service complete" (R, 251).

Ursula's involvement with institutionalized religion is an important factor in her development as a woman, for the masculine bias of religion is something she must confront directly. Perhaps most central to Ursula's conception of traditional religious doctrine is her belief that Biblical stories are fictional and that fiction (or literature) articulates complex human feelings. This association of religion with literature is the focus of Ursula's special relationship with her grandmother, Lydia.

> Almost every day, Ursula saw her grandmother, and every time, they talked together. Till the grandmother's sayings and stories, told in the complete hush of the Marsh bedroom, accumulated with mystic significance, and became a sort of Bible to the child (R, 304).

What Lydia relays to Ursula in the form of sayings and stories represents a sort of woman's Bible or female tradition for the young girl. And the fact that Ursula reacts to the actual Bible as she does

to her grandmother's stories reveals the way she interweaves elements of conventional religious doctrine and common everyday fact. To her, religion "was a vision not a reality" (R, 318). The young Ursula's imaginative response to religious vision gives way to a critical response as she matures.

> The religion which had been another world for her, a glorious sort of play-world, where she lived, climbing the tree with the short-statured man, walking shakily on the sea like the disciple, breaking the bread into five thousand portions, like the lord, giving a great picnic to five thousand people, now fell away from reality, and became a tale, a myth, an illusion, which, however much one might assert it to be true an historical fact, one knew was not true--at least, for this present-day life of ours (R, 328).

As a young woman, Ursula translates the meaning of religion into weekday terms because the notion of a transcendental religion puzzles her.

Her religious notions focus mainly on the Book of Genesis, her favourite book of the Bible. Following the tradition of her grandfather, Tom, she investigates the question "which of us is Noah?" (R, 287). She demystifies the story by saying that it is wrong for Noah to believe that he and his men are the only survivors of the flood, in so doing, she ridicules the arrogance of men who believe that they are the rightful masters of the earth.

> It pleased Ursula to think of the naiads in Asia Minor meeting the nereids at the mouth of the streams, where the sea washed against the fresh, sweet tide, and calling to their sisters the news of Noah's Flood. They would tell amusing accounts of Noah in his ark. Some nymphs would relate how they had hung on the side of the ark, peeped in, and heard Noah and Shem and Ham and Japeth, sitting in their place under the rain, saying, how they four were the only men on the earth now, because the Lord had drowned all the rest, so that they four would have everything to themselves, and be masters of everything, sub-tenants under the great Proprietor (R, 372).

Ursula here condemns many of the features that lie at the heart of the masculine principle: power, control, and the ownership of property. The nymphs, who are female and who exhibit the narrowness of Noah's vision, voice other perspectives on the nature of the flood, showing the masculine bias of the standard version. Ursula further criticizes the "stock-raising" reproduction of human beings and man's belief in the righteousness of his "lordship" over the animal world:

> Multiplying and replenishing the earth bored her. Altogether it seemed merely a vulgar and stock-raising sort of business. She was left quite cold by man's stock-breeding lordship over beast and fishes (R, 371).

She thus subjects the Book of Genesis to a fairly rigorous feminist critique.[31]

About her early belief in the Sons of God--men who had managed to escape the fall to which Adam was victim--the mature Ursula maintains a certain ambivalence. Before her first love affair with Skrebensky, she considers the possibility that God might have had more than two sons: "Had God many offspring, besides Adam and besides Jesus, children whose origin the children of Adam cannot recognise? And perhaps these children, these sons of god, had known no expulsion, no ignominy in the fall" (R, 321). She doubts humankind's fallen nature, but neglects to explain how a male God can give birth to sons. Because Ursula does not question God's ability to give birth, she persists in believing that she will eventually marry the Son of a male God: "These came on free feet to the daughters of men, and saw they were fair, and

took them to wife, so that the women conceived and brought forth men of renown. This was a genuine fate" (R, 321). And to maintain her belief in the Sons of God, she must superimpose a realm of transcendence on the physical world--an action that implicitly devalues life in the flesh and feminine values, while establishing a religious and masculine principle of human continuity.

Nevertheless, Ursula's later failure with Skrebensky results from her desire to create a man for herself--a desire that reveals how Ursula's belief in the Sons of God alters during the course of the novel. Through her educational and teaching experience, Ursula does come to believe in an extreme form of individualism, passing through an irreligious phase in which the Sons of God mean nothing to her. At the end of The Rainbow, however, she condemns her behaviour with Skrebensky and reconsiders her former beliefs:

> Who was she to have a man according to her own desire? It was not for her to create, but to recognise a man created by God. The man should come from the Infinite and she should hail him. She was glad she could not create her man. She was glad she had nothing to do with his creation. She was glad that this lay within the scope of that vaster power in which she rested at last. The man would come out of Eternity to which she herself belonged (R, 547).

The difference is that here both sons and daughters come from Eternity--an Eternity described as more of a creative force than a male deity. Although Ursula continues to believe in an ambiguous "vaster power," she comes to see woman and man as equal products of that power. This duality (which indicates that women are not naturally subordinate to men) shows her support for a resurgent feminine principle of life.

Ursula's religious feelings in the end move beyond her search for a man and connect her with the human community. She therefore ends with a vision of change on earth, as Cornelia Nixon indicates, for "The rainbow symbol presides over this novel because it rounds back to stand on the ground."[32] Hers is a vision of immanence and not, in the end, of transcendence. "The Resurrection is to life, not to death" (R, 326).

The Rainbow also reflects the masculine bias of the Wiggiston mining industry. The capitalist system, as it permeates the relationship between labour and management in the mines, touches on two major concerns already mentioned in terms of interpersonal relationships, education, and religion: the private/public dichotomy and the objectification of human experience in the public realm.

> It is the office, or the shop, or the business that gets the man, the woman gets the bit the shop can't digest. What is he at home, a man? He is a meaningless lump--a standing machine, a machine out of work (R, 396).

This passage emphasizes the almost complete split which exists between the private and public spheres. The male worker's responsibility to his job is greater than his responsibility to his wife. The working world takes precedence over family life, resulting in the atrophy of the feminine principle in the lives of men. A man is thus only "a machine" in the home, he is not a sensitive and compassionate human being. The inlaw feminine side of his nature is almost totally absent from his personality and, in the dominance of the masculine principle, the man becomes a perfect

instrument or tool of the industrial machine, which has become a substitute principle of human continuity--displacing human reproduction. The world of the machine takes on an objectified life of its own--a life that necessitates humankind's conformity to its system. "They [the miners] believe they must alter themselves to fit the pits and the place, rather than alter the pits and the place to fit themselves" (R, 395). Man, the creator of the machine, becomes man the servant of the machine. Just as religion can cause people (such as Will) to lose sight of its human and subjective nature, so the machine becomes an object apart from man. This inversion of man's role in relation to the machine raises questions about culture (and technology). Is culture something that constantly changes and that man must continually re-create, or is it something permanently established--like a bureaucratic system of rules and logic to which all people must naturally conform? Is the machine subject to the changing needs and values of human beings and their environment or is the machine--as the symbol of technological advancement--a new configuration of a transcendental and dominating religion? The former alternative is feminine, in that it preserves a sense of relativity and subjectivity in human life, whereas the latter posits a new religion of science that operates under the pretense of objectivity. In Wiggiston, the machine has become a new religion, whereas Ursula champions the relativity and subjectivity of life, Nature's flux and humankind's continuous reconstruction of social reality.

Industry's masculine bias is made clear in Lawrence's use of the mistress-metaphor to describe Wiggiston:

> The pit was the great mistress. Ursula looked out of the window and saw the proud demon-like colliery with her wheels twinkling in the heavens, the formless, squalid mass of the town lying aside. It was the squalid heap of side-shows. The pit was the main show, the raison d'être of all (R, 397).

This passage brings together many different aspects of gender difference in The Rainbow. First, it shows how capitalist ideology, which is based on man's desire to exert power and control over Nature, and on the goal of producing an endless stream of products, is represented as a motive for all human activity. Although capitalist ideology creates the illusion of a private/public dichotomy, this illusion merely shifts attention away from the patriarchal values that pervade all social intercourse. In the passage referred to above, the comparison of the colliery with a mistress is an indication not only of how the experience of sex is objectified into a purchasable commodity in the "public" world, but also of how the outlaw feminine principle is subservient to male control in a capitalist society. Man controls woman's sexuality by allocating to her two roles: either that of a good woman who does nothing but produce babies (in the "side-show" of family life), or that of a bad woman who is paid to objectify her sexuality into a marketable commodity ("the main show"). Lawrence's comparison of the "pit" to a "mistress," as a "demon-like colliery with her wheels twinkling in the heavens," shows the masculine bias that lies behind the machine's role as the new principle of human continuity. Just as human babies are produced

through the labour of women in the so-called private sphere, so products are created endlessly by the god-like machine in the public world. In public, man appropriates the woman's body for his physical lust and then replaces woman with the new and improved male womb--the machine--which is fully obedient to man's request that it manufacture products endlessly.

The mining industry in The Rainbow illustrates the predominance of masculine over feminine values--or rather man's appropriation of the outlaw feminine principle and disregard of the inlaw feminine principle. That leads Ursula to reject the working world. "No more would she subscribe to the great colliery, to the great machine which has taken us all captives. In her soul, she was against it, she disowned even its power" (R, 397). Yet, following this passage in "Shame," Ursula struggles in "The Man's World." And through this struggle, as a teacher and college student, she finds how pervasive the masculine principle actually is. She despises such people as Skrebensky, Uncle Tom, and Winifred because they--the intellectuals of this world--all succumb to the male ideology of the society in which they live.[33] If society's intellectuals subscribe to the system's illusion of permanence, then, Ursula thinks, "They [are] all in prison, they [are] all going mad" (R, 547). If intellectuals are not willing to work for change, then who will? Ursula's answer is given at the end of the novel. "In the still, silenced forms of the colliers she saw a sort of suspense, a waiting in pain for the new liberation, she saw the same in the false hard confidence of the

women" (R, 547). In this crucial passage, Ursula acknowledges the inevitability of both a workers' revolution and women's liberation, seeing change as metaphorical birth rather than deathly destruction.[34] She consciously associates the oppression of male workers with the oppression of women. She renounces the negative values associated with the masculine principle of life and prophesies a resurgence of the unifying feminine principle, which is ultimately based on the values attached to the positive aspects of human reproduction.

The Rainbow, therefore, fulfills its promise and reinstitutes the process of human reproduction as the principle of human continuity through the novel's numerous references to actual and metaphorical births. The continuity of the Church has crumbled, the continuity of the machine must be interrupted, too, if human growth, reproduction, and life--in harmony with Nature--are to be valued. Although he does not prescribe an explicit political program for the Feminist Movement of his time, Lawrence--through Ursula--provides a vision of the transformation of human consciousness that the birth of a Feminist world would require.[35] And it is a vision that undermines the private/public dichotomy of masculine ideology, for it shows a cross-fertilization of values between personal relationships and public life.

ENDNOTES

[1]Vera Brittain, Testament of Youth (London Victor Gollancz, 1933, reissued 1978), p 58

[2]Kate Millet, Sexual Politics (New York Ballantine Books, c1969, reprint ed 1978), p 58

[3]Hilary Simpson, D H Lawrence and Feminism (London Croom Helm, 1982), p 42

[4]Lawrence's tendency to separate the individual from the community is a major concern of such critics as Christopher Caudwell, Raymond Williams, and Terry Eagleton However, Michael Wilding, in "The Rainbow Smashing the Machine," Political Fictions (Boston Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), shows rather convincingly that Lawrence's faith in the "individual" must be seen "in the context of a socialist critique of industrial capitalism" (p 141) Wilding suggests, therefore, that Lawrence's new "individual" is defined in terms of his/her active participation in making culture "Less sympathetic commentators, like Christopher Caudwell, have stressed the 'bourgeois individualist' interpretation but this is a distortion of [Lawrence's] position What gets continually missed is Lawrence's emphasis that the only worthwhile social revolution will be one that is built on the primacy of the individual not the individual of the old society, either, he emphasizes, but a new individual 'the [new] individuals participate as individuals'" (p 141) Wilding's point is central to an analysis of the confusing question of Ursula's strident individualism

[5]Simpson, p 66

[6]Evelyn J Hinz, "The Rainbow Ursula's Liberation," Contemporary Literature, 17 (1976) 24-43

[7]Cornelia Nixon, Lawrence's Leadership Politics and the Turn Against Women (Berkeley University of California Press, 1986), pp 3-4

[8]John Hoyles, "D H Lawrence and the Counter Revolution An Essay in Socialist Aesthetics," DHLR, 6 (1973) 173-200

[9]Marilyn French, Beyond Power (New York Summit Books, 1985), p 65

[10]Millett, p. 362.

[11]D. H. Lawrence, The Rainbow, ed. John Worthen (Markham, Ont.: Penguin, 1981), p. 22. (All subsequent references to this novel will be made in the text of the paper next to the abbreviation "R").

[12]Nixon, p. 84.

[13]Nixon, p. 100.

[14]Nixon, p. 100.

[15]I am in agreement with George Ford's Double Measure (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965) on this point: "The urge of the Brangwen women to thrust themselves and their men out of the happy valley of the past up the hillsides of the future, evident in the opening pages of The Rainbow and fully illustrated in the development of Ursula, is to be regarded . . . as a fact of the human condition not as a wicked falling away from perfection" (125).

[16]Mary O'Brien, The Politics of Reproduction (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), p. 29.

[17]Edward Engelberg, "Escape From the Circles of Experience: D. H. Lawrence's The Rainbow as a Modern Bildungsroman," PMLA, 78 (1963): 103-13.

[18]Simpson, p. 39.

[19]Wilding, p. 145.

[20]John Hoyles sees Ursula's accomplishments as a feminist to be the following: "to register in her consciousness the experiences available to a new generation of women . . . and to reveal areas where a feminist ideology can expose the impoverishment of bourgeois social relations--namely, in the world of work . . . and in the world of sex . . . " (192).

[21]Millett, p. 368.

[22]O'Brien, p. 93.

[23]I agree with Wilding on this point: "It is important to stress that the worlds of Tom and Lydia and of Will and Anna are extremely circumscribed, limited worlds. The usual version of the myth of the ideal organic country life was that though it might be limited, it contained all that man required" (129-130). This is an important point to keep in mind when judging Ursula's vision at the end of the novel, for I believe she does not revert to the myth of rural England.

[24]In believing that education and experience are not tainted by politics or wealth, the Brangwen woman shows how she accepts a class-based society as "natural."

[25]In Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays (London: NLB, 1971), translated from French into English by Ben Brewster, Louis Althusser suggests that the education system is the State's primary ideological apparatus; hence, it is education that shapes individuals into workers who will fit into the existing relations of production. Education is a means by which the dominant class (consisting of landholders or people with wealth and status) secures its advantages: "besides . . . technique and knowledges . . . children at school also learn the 'rules' of good behaviour, i.e. the attitude that should be observed by every agent in the division of labour, according to the job he is 'destined' for: rules of morality, civic and professional conscience, which actually means rules of respect for the socio-technical division of labour and ultimately the rules of the order established by class domination" (127). Education therefore works to ensure that the existing relations of production (and, consequently, of dominance) are reproduced.

[26]Kate Millett tries her best to show that Lawrence here sympathizes with Mr. Harby's brand of education. This attempt to link Harby with Lawrence is highly incompatible with the text, for Lawrence obviously favours Ursula's feminine values over Harby's authoritarianism. Certainly, Ursula's idealism is open to some mockery (and perhaps some Lawrencian irony), but this does not mean that Lawrence is not sympathetic with her cause. True, there is an indirect sympathy for Mr. Harby--but it is a sympathy that focuses on how his human potential is thwarted beneath the garment of male ideology and the rigid containment of traditional masculinity. If there is an enemy here, for Lawrence, it is the education system and the values it represents.

[27]Perhaps a radically different view of education needs to be placed alongside the school system as it exists in The Rainbow before the masculine values inherent in Mr. Harby's sytem are borne out. Jerome Bruner's Actual Minds, Possible Worlds (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986) provides this different view. I think it can be shown that the sort of educational system which Bruner proposes is very "feminine," and that Ursula shows signs of wanting to employ such an educational philosophy. Bruner begins by explaining "that the medium of exchange in which education is conducted--language--can never be neutral, that it imposes a point of view not only about the world to which it refers but toward the use of mind in respect of this world" (121). This statement directly contradicts the pretense to objectivity of the educational system in The Rainbow; it leads one to state that the view of education in the man's world in Lawrence's novel is an extremely masculine one.

Bruner then develops a new conception of culture as the result of a dialectical process between people "a culture is constantly in process of being recreated as it is interpreted and renegotiated by its members In this view, a culture is as much a forum for negotiating and renegotiating meaning and for explicating action as it is a set of rules or specifications for action" (123) Bruner's view of culture here radically opposes that which is expressed in The Rainbow's education system Mr Harby's system looks at culture as an unchanging construct--as a fixity Thus, all knowledge is objective and factual and must be transmitted from those who know to those who do not know Bruner finally clinches his and my point by showing how a view of culture and education as dialectical process differs from the traditional notion of culture and education "It follows from this view of culture as a forum that induction into the culture through education, if it is to prepare the young for life as lived, should also partake of the spirit of a forum, of negotiation, of the recreating of meaning But this conclusion runs counter to traditions of pedagogy that derive from another time, another interpretation of culture, another conception of authority--one that looked at the process of education as a transmission of knowledge and values by those who knew more to those who knew less and knew it less expertly" (123) Surely, Bruner here distinguishes between feminine and masculine views of education, for French's definition of the feminine principle is centered on "everything fluid, transient, and flexible," as well as on "spontaneity, playfulness, and creativity " The masculine principle supports just the opposite "Its energies are directed at making permament, fixing the flux of experience " Bruner's "forum" of culture then supports the idea that education involves participation and the free play of ideas--imaginative thinking, whereas at the school where Ursula teaches, the system demands that "the teacher close down the process of wondering by flat declarations of fixed factuality " (127) The distinction between Bruner's idea of education and that of Mr Harby is that Bruner looks at education as a developmental dialogue between people, whereas Harby looks at education as a monologue of absolute authority and knowledge

[28]As Althusser says "The State is a 'machine' of repression, which enables the ruling classes to ensure their domination over the working class, thus enabling the former to subject the latter to the process of surplus-value extortion (i e to capitalist exploitation)" (131)

[29]Millett, pp 267-8

[30]As Wilding says "The intellect that formal education cultivates is the intellect that created and that maintains the system--intellectual inquiry turns out to have the same arid, rational, mechanical nature as the structures of the commercial, technological world of industrial capitalism" (144) Ursula's intellect is evidently unsuited to maintaining the existing system

[31]The following passage from French's Beyond Power reflects on much of what Ursula says about the Book of Genesis and its masculine bias "The essential question about the origin of patriarchy is why people should have altered an ancient and revered way of life Either the new values held by the men's cults themselves changed behaviour or some change in the human situation seemed to require a new adaptation, which was available in a moral change that had to have occurred earlier the positing of control as a value superior to the old values of fertility, continuation, and sharing The fundamental nature of this new morality is explicit in the Old Testament, in the opening of Genesis, which propounds the principles of patriarchy The gift of the male god to man is dominion over nature The old values are still present--humans are still to replenish as well as subdue the earth But man is to have dominion also over woman The key word is dominion power-over, control (75)

[32]Nixon, p 58

[33]In commenting on such characters as Winifred and Uncle Tom, Hoyles makes an insightful point concerning the illusory private/public dichotomy "the juxtaposition between the sexual and the economic carries the reader into two areas of great concern In the first place a connection is made between the quality of personal relationships and the quality of communal life (including town planning) And in the second place the subordination of workers' individual and collective interests to the needs of industry and the pressures of naked economic forces is powerfully evoked" (196-197) The private and public worlds thus interpenetrate one another

[34]Wilding describes the novel's final vision as destructive "Ursula moves through the novel to an ever-widening conspectus of capitalist society, that leads to the book's culminating vision of the destruction of 'all the inhuman conditions' so that a new humanity can emerge And that destruction begins in the miners' cottages of Wiggiston, begins among the proletariat" (135-136) On the contrary, I feel the ending of The Rainbow refers to the positive aspects of birth Ursula's vision is one of new life, not of deathly destruction

[35]I believe Ursula's vision is not a reversion to the "myth of rural England" or to a purely metaphysical resolution of humankind's problems As Wilding says, "It is certainly a retreat from conventional political programmes and solutions, but is not a retreat that in any conceivable way implies a hostility to social change" (149) Ursula's vision is of a new kind of society If, as Mary O'Brien indicates, the Feminist project is "to move from the war against nature and against life to policies of integration with nature and with life," then Ursula's vision surely embodies a Feminist world (201)

CHAPTER III

WOMEN IN LOVE

THE MASCULINE PRINCIPLE TRIUMPHS

> If the feminist movement in the most general sense of the term is an important influence for The Rainbow, the war is clearly crucial to Women in Love [1]

> The war is not only the historical context of Women in Love, but its unspoken subject [2]

During the early stages of World War I, Lawrence "continued to envisage a crucial role for women in the reconstruction of the state "[3] But as the war progressed, those hopes faded as he realized that women had come merely to replace their absent men in the public domain They assumed masculine values and proved they were fully proficient at numerous so-called "masculine" tasks Women's adoption of male roles, however, did not eliminate the need for the feminization of human experience--a need that Lawrence felt strongly On the contrary, what it did satisfy was women's desire to demonstrate their talents at jobs that were non-domestic

> There is no doubt that the war was an emancipating experience for most women It changed their image of themselves, and the public's image of them, from decorative but largely useless creatures with their own sphere of trivial interests and duties, to people of resourcefulness, strength and capability who differed from men much less than had been imagined [4]

For their work at non-domestic tasks, women were paid salaries, whereas they had never before possessed independent incomes as a result of their labour at domestic tasks (unless they were paid

house servants) This showed the way to a new feminine identity both inside and away from the home and family

Lawrence's displeasure with the course of the Women's Movement gradually increased, then, as he saw that women were becoming more like men rather than asserting feminine values through their newly gained access to the public world His growing uncertainty about gender roles became a major subject of Women in Love, which presents a variety of viewpoints on this matter

> In Women in Love the notion of male supremacy is only one of a whole range of controversial subjects discussed, often in a spirit of intellectual play, by the central characters Ultimately, the reader of Women in Love feels that Lawrence has no one axe to grind, in a complex presentation of possibilities and potentialities we are not forced to take sides [5]

The many-sided nature of the novel is particularly relevant to gender difference because the book not only voices ideas of male supremacy and female supremacy, but presents various problems common to both sexes However, whereas Lawrence had previously encouraged his female characters in The Rainbow to strive for self-fulfillment alongside their male counterparts, in Women in Love he reveals his mounting disgust with idealistic and aggressive women who concern themselves excessively with public issues Related to this resistance to the modern woman is the novel's negative stance toward maternity--evidenced through Birkin's antagonism toward the concept of the "Magna Mater "

These largely negative responses to both modern women and maternity converge on a new issue dominance

> Women in Love presents active heterosexuality as a battle, as regression into primitive or diabolic cruelty, and it treats female sexuality and procreative power as weapons in the battle for dominance between the sexes.[6]

For Lawrence, modern women are frequently guilty of treating their men as sons, this situation places females in the dominant role. Throughout the novel, he therefore tends to diminish the importance of human sexual relations and, in his dismay, to focus on a relationship in which the female acts as a mother or the male as a father. The parent-child bond, when transferred from a familial context to an adult sexual relationship, is a sure sign of unhealthy heterosexuality.

While Women in Love shows Lawrence's increasing discontent with the changing roles of women induced by war-time activity and a new power structure between the sexes, it also shows an additional grievance against the capitalistic forces at work in English society--forces that played a central role in creating the war.

> Women in Love circumvents and undermines ideology by focusing on the social system which produced the war and which the war ideology existed to conceal, industrial capitalism, symbolized as always in Lawrence by the mining industry.[7]

The mining industry of Women in Love, even more than that of The Rainbow, disseminates masculine values throughout the novel's entire social world, ultimately affecting the characters' personal relationships. The masculine values espoused by capitalism contribute not only to an escalation of war and to the mechanization of the mining industry, but also to sexual destructiveness. In Women in Love, the traditional

bourgeois family is gradually being displaced as society's basic political unit by the economically independent individual the private/public dichotomy, which was so prominent (as an illusion) in The Rainbow, ceases to be a central concern[8] "The worlds of 'war' and 'industrialism' are indistinguishable . . . "[9] Because war marks the triumph of masculine over feminine values, it follows that--through the mining industry's pervasive, hidden ideology of war--Women in Love represents a masculinization of English life.

Lawrence's growing frustration with English society was therefore a product of both his dissatisfaction with the path of Women's Liberation and his disgruntlement with the masculine values kindled by industrialization and the War. His inability to offer a firm solution to the destabilizing effect of the simultaneous occurrence of both a sexual revolution and the war is shown not only in the novel's intellectual debate but also in the dejection and uncertainty of its ending.

> There have been . . . huge numbers of women and men who were willing to cede power-in-the-world to others in return for the right to run their private worlds in their own way. Many religious men and women have renounced worldly values, preferring to nourish and care for others. Mothers have accepted subordination to their husbands in order to raise their children with love and nutritiveness. The right to cultivate one's own garden--to create a felicitous living arrangement, to offer and receive love, to provide compassion and care to others, to feel connected to the human race--offers pleasures and graces difficult or impossible for those who exercise wordly power. There are and always have been legions of people who valued the feminine principle more than the masculine, for whom power-in-the-world was not a great good.[10]

In contrast with The Rainbow's celebration of human continuity through birth, Women in Love focuses on discontinuity

through death. The novel is consequently episodic and pervaded by sterility, decay, and disintegration. Whereas actual and metaphorical birth are described in divine terms in The Rainbow, Women in Love does not glorify human reproduction. There are no actual births in the novel and only the prostitute Pussum, a minor character with no maternal inclinations, becomes pregnant. Pussum's reaction toward her pregnancy reflects the general attitude toward reproduction in the novel: "Isn't it beastly?"[11] That negative feeling also surrounds the negro statue in Halliday's apartment:

> One was a woman sitting naked in a strange posture, and looking tortured, her abdomen stuck out . . . she was sitting in childbirth, clutching the ends of a band that hung from her neck, one in each hand, so that she could bear down, and help labour . . . it was also rather wonderful, conveying the suggestion of the extreme of physical sensation, beyond the limits of mental consciousness (W, 127).

This statue emphasizes the physical strain that the "tortured" woman experiences rather than the miraculous aspect of birth.[12] In discussing the possibility of bearing children, Gudrun and Ursula are also unenthusiastic, as they are "sisters of Artemis rather than of Hebe" (W, 54). Gudrun "get[s] no feeling whatever from the thought of bearing children", Ursula "feels it is still beyond one . . . " (W, 55). Their modern attitudes conflict with that of the elderly Mrs. Crich--a woman who has given her life to the sole purpose of raising Mr. Crich's numerous children:

> And she bore many children. For . . . she never opposed her husband in word or deed . . . . She submitted to him, let him take what he wanted and do as he wanted with her . . . . The relation between her and her husband was wordless and unknown, but it was deep, awful, a relation of utter interdestruction (W, 289).

Mrs. Crich's life story, which is obviously one of abject submission to her husband, is reflected upon by Birkin, who has an uncanny insight into her character. "I think she only wanted something more, or other than the common run of life. And not getting it, she has gone wrong, perhaps" (W, 279). Her predicament as wife and mother provides a realistic picture of the restricted role that the modern women in the novel fear and avoid.

Birkin, whose comment on Mrs. Crich suggests that he understands the restrictions placed on women in the past and present, is also the major proponent of the novel's pessimism toward mother love.

> But it seemed to him, woman was always so horrible and clutching, she had such a lust for possession, a greed of self-importance in love. She wanted to have, to own, to control, to be dominant. Everything must be referred back to her, to Woman, the Great Mother of everything, out of whom proceeded everything and to whom everything must finally be rendered up.
>
> It filled him with almost insane fury, this calm assumption of the Magna Mater, that all was hers, because she had born it. Man was hers because she had born him. A Mater Dolorosa, she had born him, a Magna Mater, she now claimed him again, soul and body, sex, meaning, and all. He had a horror of the Magna Mater, she was detestable (W, 270).

It is true that this protest against the Magna Mater comes when Birkin is ill and miserable, but the attitude of the passage is nonetheless a major element in Women in Love's treatment of women. What is important to note is that Birkin does not attack motherhood itself, but such values as possessiveness, arrogance, control, and domination--masculine values which he associates with motherhood and women in the modern world.

The only other references to fertility are metaphorical, focusing on Ursula, Birkin, and Gerald. Throughout the novel, Ursula searches for fulfillment and a new sort of life. "If only she could break through the last integuments! She seemed to try and put her hands out, like an infant in the womb, and she could not, not yet" (W, 56). The birth image of this passage comments on Ursula's struggle to bring to life a new self--a struggle that shows signs of persisting interminably. Later in the novel, Birkin discards his wordy intellectualism for love with Ursula and is born into a new world. "he was as if born out of the cramp of a womb" (W, 393), it was "as if he had just come awake, like a thing that is born, like a bird when it comes out of an egg, into a new universe" (W, 394). Birkin's rebirth through loving Ursula erases his earlier pledge of communion with Nature--in isolation from women--which was described in terms of fertility. "He knew where to plant himself, his seed,--along with the trees, in the folds of the delicious fresh-growing leaves. This was his place, his marriage place. The world was extraneous" (W, 166). His regeneration through love also refers to the Biblical fertility image of the mustard seed.[13]

> she was so new, so wonder-clear, so undimmed. And he was so old, so steeped in heavy memories. Her soul was new, undefined and glimmering with the unseen. And his soul was dark and gloomy, it had only one grain of living hope, like a grain of mustard seed. But this one living grain in him matched the perfect youth in her (W, 458).

Ultimately, Ursula and Birkin become one seed of life, searching for a new world in which they can grow and prosper. "There was no

sky, no earth, only one unbroken darkness, into which, with a soft, sleepy motion, they seemed to fall like one closed seed of life falling through dark, fathomless space" (W, 479) They are journeying toward "a paradise unknown and unrealised" (W, 479) The last crucial fertility image in Women in Love involves Gerald Crich, whose achievement of personal growth through his destructive relationship with Gudrun is a significant event in the novel "Why should he close up and become impervious, immune, like a partial thing in a sheath, when he had broken forth, like a seed that has germinated, to issue forth in being, embracing the unrealised heavens" (W, 543) Gerald's growth toward self-awareness marks his realization of the impossibility of perfect, individual self-sufficiency on earth

Birth imagery is vital to a thorough interpretation of Women in Love because it emblematizes positive change and growth rather than stagnation and disintegration An analysis of the novel, however, reveals its preoccupation with death

> better die than live mechanically a life that is a repetition of repetitions To die is to move on with the invisible To die is also a joy, a joy of submitting to that which is greater than the known, namely, the pure unknown . . . There is no ignominy in death There is complete ignominy in an unreplenished, mechanised life . . . Death itself, like the illimitable space, is beyond our sullying . . . The only window was death One could look out on to the great dark sky of death with elation, as one had looked out of the classroom window as a child, and seen perfect freedom in the outside Now one was not a child, and one knew that the soul was a prisoner within this sordid vast edifice of life, and there was no escape, save in death . . . whatever humanity did, it could not seize hold of the kingdom of death, to nullify that . . . Whatever life might be, it could not take away death, the inhuman transcendent death

> Oh, let us ask no question of it, what is is or is not. To know is human, and in death we do not know, we are not human. And the joy of this compensates for all the bitterness of knowledge and the sordidness of humanity.

This passage describes death as humankind's only means of escaping a mechanized life. Whereas "Humanity is a dead letter" (W, 111), "Inhuman transcendent death" is the one aspect of life which humankind has not been able to contaminate with knowledge--it is the last frontier, the incomprehensible. Death cannot be appropriated by people, it is free of human constraints. Death becomes associated with freedom.

Lawrence here romanticizes death because it is something that every individual faces alone, outside the human community. What is most problematic about this romantic view of death, however, is its similarity to war-propaganda that sells the idea that death is noble and heroic. On the one hand, Lawrence is supportive of a surrender to mortality (a surrender antagonistic to the fighting spirit), on the other, he makes death into something more than it actually is (into some sort of "victory" over human constraints). Indeed, there are generally two types of death in the novel: actual death, which reveals the lies of the past and acts as an epiphany of the future, and metaphorical death, which signals the need for escape from the past and society--to be followed by some sort of transcendental fulfillment. Like birth in The Rainbow, death in Women in Love demonstrates that life is process. However, this promotion of metaphorical death as a solution to the problems of life does not involve the continuity of gestation and parturition,

but the discontinuity of a radical break with the past. In accepting human mortality as part of life, Lawrence acknowledges the flux in life, but, in believing that beyond death lies a better life, he rejects the physical world and humanity. In so doing he indirectly conforms to a masculine ideology that devalues life and looks to some future triumph--ignoring the actual price of death.

The three death scenes in Women in Love are thus crucial in providing insight into the novel's hidden relationship to the War. The first death-scene occurs at the Crich's public water-party. "One of the young mistresses, persisting in dancing on the cabin roof of the launch, wilful young madam, drowned in the midst of the festival, with the young doctor!" (W, 258). This is the public account of that death. Gerald, however, concludes that Diana "killed" the doctor. when the bodies were recovered from the water, "Diana had her arms tight round the neck of the young man, choking him" (W, 258). This image foreshadows Gerald's own destructive relationship with Gudrun (he nearly strangles her) and the persistent war between the sexes which takes center stage in the novel as a whole. The second death-scene, Thomas Crich's, is so prolonged that death, for him, is a way of life. "He would have no raison d'être if there were no lugubrious miseries in the world, as an undertaker would have no meaning if there were no funerals" (W, 289). At his daughter's wedding, Mr. Crich is described as a dead person, as "a shadow," "self-obliterated" (W, 65), and as "suspended on the path, watching with expressionless face" (W, 67). His life literally is death.

What is most significant about Thomas Crich's slow death, however, is the way he associates pain and death with his wife "She indeed was like the darkness, like the pain within him By some strange association, the darkness that contained the pain and the darkness that contained his wife were identical" (W, 285) Just as Diana literally strangles the young doctor, so Mrs Crich figuratively strangles Mr Crich (from Mr Crich's viewpoint) When he actually dies, he lies "in repose, as if gently asleep, so gently, so peacefully, like a young man sleeping in purity" (W, 419) Since his marriage, he has not really lived He has never advanced beyond young manhood But his suffering is only half the story, for, as already noted, Mrs Crich had been treated as a prisoner in her marriage and home

> like a hawk in a cage, she had sunk into silence By force of circumstance, because all the world combined to make the cage unbreakable, he had been too strong for her, he had kept her prisoner And because she was his prisoner, his passion for her had always remained keen as death (W, 287)

Mrs Crich knows that her side of the story will not be told beneath the eulogistic clamor at her husband's funeral (in death he is praised and remembered as the best father in the world), therefore, her frustrated exclamations at her husband's death-bed are packed with years of suppressed grief and torment

> None of you look like this, when you are dead! Don't let it happen again Blame me, blame me if you like, that he lies there like a lad in his teens, with his first beard on his face Blame me if you like But you none of you know (W, 419)

She and Mr. Crich have had a destructive relationship. It failed largely because of the restrictions placed on both of them by conventional gender roles. Mrs. Crich was imprisoned within the confines of the domestic sphere with the sole function of bearing children. Mr. Crich, on the other hand, led a public life full of unnoticed contradictions. For instance, his Christianity and idolization of labour conflicted with his role as a wealthy capitalist-entrepreneur. And he brought his combination of saintly philanthropy and ruthless capitalism to his relationship with Mrs. Crich, for he juggled a poignant sense of pity for her violent and impatient nature against an intense fear and hatred of her.

> With unbroken will, he had stood by his position with regard to her, he had substituted pity for all his hostility, pity had been his shield and his safeguard, and his infallible weapon. And still . . . he was sorry for her, her nature was so violent and so impatient (W, 286).

Mr. Crich was adept at self-delusion and at psychological warfare. His tragedy, however, represents that of a man totally incapable of expressing his feelings. "all his never-revealed fears and secrets were accumulated" (W, 285). He thus was at war not only with Mrs. Crich, but with parts of himself. The tragedy of Mr. and Mrs. Crich is thus both personal and social, for they are victims of themselves and of the highly masculine values of their world. Mr. Crich's slow death and Mrs. Crich's habitual imprisonment show that their marriage had functioned as an oppressive institution--for both master and slave.

The last actual death in Women in Love is partially a repetition of Mr. Crich's. It represents an interesting variation,

however, because Gudrun and Gerald's relationship almost ends with Gudrun's death rather than Gerald's. What distinguishes Gerald's death from his father's is the fact that he seems to choose death as a way of ending his miserable life. Vulnerable and unable to exist as a fully independent individual, he sees death as an escape from his unfulfilled life. He does not fight death like his father, he seeks it as a means of self-completion. This is why Birkin finds his dead body so repugnant. "And Gerald! The denier! He left the heart cold, frozen, hardly able to beat. Gerald's father had looked wistful, to break the heart. but not this last terrible look of cold, mute Matter" (W, 582). Gerald's death symbolizes the death that must follow from a highly masculine way of life; it foreshadows the destruction that will result if humankind continues to value power, domination, and individuality over love, equality, and community. All three death-scenes emphasize the battle between the sexes, but Gerald's specifically points to an individual's war with himself.

The hidden ideology of war, which is evident behind the novel's actual deaths, becomes even more obvious in "The Industrial Magnate," a chapter that focuses on Gerald's upbringing and on the creation and dissemination of masculine ideology in the world of the novel. Gerald's hatred of his father and his father's philanthropy, as well as his revolt against authority and convention as a young man, is fundamental to an understanding of the forces that shape him into what he becomes as ruler of the mines. As a boy, he

had sensed the opposition between his family's interests and those of the miners, this became obvious when the miners went on strike--even in the face of Thomas Crich's generous handouts. Gerald thus came to oppose the colliers' viewpoint and his father's ambiguous way of conducting business. "The whole Christian attitude of love and self-sacrifice was old hat. He knew that position and authority were the right thing in the world, and it was useless to cant about it" (W, 300). What Gerald cannot understand is the contradiction between his father's paternal benevolence and unflinching capitalism. When his father hands over control of the mines, then, Gerald's goal is to reorganize the industry into a highly efficient business. He would rebuild the mining industry, stressing the principles of authority and power, and rejecting certain feminine values that are inefficient and wasteful. He would tap into the

> instrumentality of mankind. There had been so much humanitarianism, so much talk of sufferings and feelings. It was ridiculous. The sufferings and feelings of individuals did not matter in the least. What mattered was the pure instrumentality of the individual. As a man as of a knife: does it cut well? Nothing else mattered (W, 295-6).

Gerald takes a strictly functionalist approach to the mining industry, valuing only the efficient production of coal. His mines would be much more than the "abortions of a half-trained mind" (W, 296) which his father had left him. The association here of "abortions" with the mining industry shows how industrial production is a metaphor for human reproduction. The endless production of such goods as coal, however, establishes a masculine principle of human

continuity which far transcends the continuity of human reproduction--which is viewed as a specifically feminine task and is devalued in economic terms (i e mothers are not compensated economically for having or raising children) Gerald's reorganization of the mines is therefore centered on such masculine values as power, control, domination, and the profit motive His goal is to ensure human security and continuity by subjecting "matter" (what he himself is described as on his deathbed at the end of the novel) to the unflinching will of man

> There it lay, inert matter, as it had always lain, since the beginning of time, subject to the will of man The will of man was the determining factor Man was the arch-god of earth His mind was obedient to serve his will Man's will was the absolute, the only absolute (W, 296)

This desire to dominate "inert matter" translates into an attempt to dominate Nature Gerald's work satisfies "his own will in the struggle with natural conditions" (W, 296) That Gerald's attitude toward the mines demonstrates the urgency of his craving for power and control indicates the similarity between industrialism and war[14] Gerald is described as "a general" who "grasps the plan of his campaign" (W, 297) He is actually at war with Nature

To understand the mining industry's ideological function in the novel, one need only compare it to a conventional religious institution Gerald approaches the task of rejuvenating the mines not only with a militaristic strategy but also with a religious passion

> He had a fight to fight with Matter, with the earth and the coal it enclosed This was the sole idea, to turn upon the inanimate matter of the underground, and reduce it to his

> will. And for this fight with matter, one must have perfect instruments in perfect organization, a mechanism so subtle and harmonious in its workings that it represents the single mind of man, and by its relentless repetition of given movement, will accomplish a purpose irresistibly, inhumanly. It was this inhuman principle in the mechanism he wanted to construct that inspired Gerald with an almost religious exaltation. He, the man, could interpose a perfect, changeless, godlike medium between himself and the Matter he had to subjugate. There were two opposites, his will and the resistant Matter of the earth. And between these he could establish the very expression of his will, the incarnation of his power, a great and perfect machine, a system, an activity of pure order, pure mechanical repetition, repetition ad infinitum, hence eternal and infinite . . . . And this is the God-motion, this productive repetition ad infinitum. And Gerald was the God of the machine, Deus ex Machina [my emphasis] (W, 301)

His scheme is to force all the parts and people of the mining industry into mystic harmony. Furthermore, his scheme embodies humankind's desire for certainty, unity, and order--a desire that is traditionally satisfied through faith in God and religion. Gerald therefore creates a masculine ideology that finds its stability and security in the mechanical flawlessness of the machine, and which is as attractive to the miners as traditional religion once was. Although the miners are "mere mechanical instruments" under Gerald's system, they find religious satisfaction in their submission to it:

> The men were satisfied to belong to the great and wonderful machine, even whilst it destroyed them. It was what they wanted. It was the highest that man had produced, the most wonderful and superhuman. They were exalted by belonging to this great and superhuman system which was beyond feeling or reason, something really godlike (W, 304)

The mining industry, "wonderful and superhuman" and "beyond feeling or reason," functions effectively as an ideological mechanism because it brings the colliers into complicity with its general aim that of living to work, to make countless products, and to create

profit. There is no mention of such a thing as leisure. Gerald's reorganization of the mines clearly follows the model of a religious institution. "Gerald was their high priest, he represented the religion they really felt" (W, 304); "What he was doing seemed supreme, he was almost like a divinity. He was a pure and exalted activity" (W, 305). Gerald is eminently "successful" in his bid to rejuvenate the mining industry, even though he creates a system based on illusions of permanence and perfection.

While the colliers are converted into happy servants of Gerald's new industrial machine, it is crucial to note that they pay a high price for their membership in this pseudo-religious institution: the old workers are "removed . . . as so much lumber (W, 302), "all the control [is] taken out of the hands of the miners" (W, 304), widows must now pay for their coals, and "as men, personalities, they [are] just accidents, sporadic little unimportant phenomena . . . " (W, 305).[15] The mining industry values the masculine principle and devalues the feminine principle of life through its construction of a rational, objective, and scientific social mechanism. "When the machine is the Godhead, and production or work is worship, then the most mechanical mind is purest and highest, the representative of God on earth.--And the rest are subordinate, each according to his degree" (W, 298). The mining industry, as it is described in "The Industrial Magnate," is an example of how customs, conventions and values are absorbed with unquestioning faith and given the appearance of permanence and

objectivity, when they are actually only human constructs that are historical, impermanent, and changeable.

Gerald associates himself so fully with his role as the priest of industrialization that he does not fully develop other sides of his potential.[16] He acknowledges this weakness in his life, even though he has created an ideological mechanism that places no value on eliminating those weaknesses. "He was afraid that one day he would break down and be a purely meaningless bubble lapping round a darkness . . . . It was as if his centres of feeling were drying up" (W, 306). Gerald epitomizes the indomitable male whose life erects a rigid border between masculinity and femininity, finding masculine values useful and feminine values unimportant. His "success" as a working male is thus connected to his emotional fragility and his inability to love. The masculine ideology of the workplace therefore affects his approach to all aspects of human experience.

The war-time ideology generated by the industrial machine works so effectively in Women in Love that Loerke's art reflects both his passive absorption and active complicity in that masculine ideology. "since industry is our business, now, then let us make our places of industry our art . . . . Art should interpret industry, as art once interpreted religion" (W, 518). Loerke suggests that artists must give industry an appealing appearance. He fears that ugliness will deter people from submitting to the God-like, functionally perfect machine.

> Men will not go on submitting to such intolerable ugliness. In the end it will hurt too much, and they will wither because of it. And this will wither the work as well. They will think the work itself is ugly: the machines, the very act of labour. Whereas the machinery and the acts of labour are extremely, maddeningly beautiful. But this will be the end of our civilization, when people will not work because work has become so intolerable to their senses, it nauseates them too much, they would rather starve (W, 518).

His view of art is staunchly conservative in that its aim is to preserve the status quo. He sees work as the ultimate purpose of life and therefore his art must make the idea of work more palatable: "nothing but this, serving a machine, or enjoying the motion of a machine--motion, that is all" (W, 519). Humankind must be either working or moving. Loerke's granite frieze for a factory in Cologne indicates how fully he believes in a mechanical form of human continuity. Only work and movement are highly valued in this frieze, it contains no rest, self-reflection, and human tenderness:

> It was a representation of a fair, with peasants and artizans in an orgy of enjoyment, drunk and absurd in their modern dress, whirling ridiculously in roundabouts, gaping at shows, kissing and staggering and rolling in knots, swinging in swing-boats, and firing down shooting galleries, a frenzy of chaotic motion (W, 517).

Loerke uses art to make work and movement attractive to the masses, this is his way of serving the masculine values that he so adores, and of idealizing the violence and destructiveness inherent in an impersonal and mechanical style of life. By making a destructive kind of life superficially beautiful, he encourages support for the mechanization of life. His art serves as an analogue for war propaganda that depicts fighting as highly noble and virtuous. The final purpose of his art is to illustrate the perfect

interchangeability of people and machines. "What is a man doing, when he is at a fair like this? He is fulfilling the counterpart of labour--the machine works him, instead of he the machine" (W, 519). This equation between people and machines resembles an army's attitude to human life, because in battle men are parts of a military mechanism, not sensitive and unique persons.

The war-ideology of the mining industry and of Loerke's art filters down through the workplace to other aspects of life. For instance, "Coal-Dust" shows how humankind asserts this power and domination in its treatment of Nature and women. Moreover, such women as Gudrun and Hermione comply with those values. This chapter opens with the evocative picture of Gerald on a Red Arab mare at a railway crossing. Although a locomotive is on the tracks, Gerald forces the horse to stay close to the gate.

> The locomotive chuffed slowly between the banks, hidden. The mare did not like it. She began to wince away, as if hurt by the unknown noise. But Gerald pulled her back and held her head to the gate. The sharp blasts of the chuffing engine broke with more and more force on her. The repeated sharp blows of unknown, terrifying noise struck through her till she was rocking with terror. She recoiled like a spring let go. But a glistening, half-smiling look came into Gerald's face (W, 168).

The scene is rich with meaning, for the locomotive represents the mechanical principle of life (or industrialization) and the mare represents both Nature and female sexuality. Gerald is a "masculine" man whose ruthless domination over the mare symbolizes his attitude toward both Nature and women (he now exerts control over much more than "inert matter"). His use of power is explicitly a sexual assault:

> She roared as she breathed, her nostrils were two wide, hot holes, her mouth was apart, her eyes frenzied. It was a repulsive sight. But he held on her unrelaxed, with an almost mechanical relentlessness, keen as a sword pressing in to her. Both man and horse were sweating with violence . . . her paws were blind and pathetic as she beat the air, the man closed round her, and brought her down, almost as if she were part of his own physique (W, 169-170).

Gerald demonstrates male domination at its worst here. He is associated with the locomotive through his "mechanical relentlessness" and with war through words like the "sword pressing in to her" and "violence." He finds sadistic glee in using another living creature for his own ends. The masculine and mechanical principle of life is here victorious over the feminine principle, which values such things as mercy and compassion. The other man in this scene, the one-legged gatekeeper, condones Gerald's tyranny over the horse. "I expect he's got to train the mare to stand to anything" (W, 171). The episode shows male dominance and the way it is rationalized by men.

Gudrun and Ursula observe this scene with conflicting reactions. Initially, both retreat from the violence. "Ursula and Gudrun pressed back into the hedge, in fear" (W, 168). After her initial fear, Gudrun continues to watch, but now she masochistically projects herself into the mare's position and derives a sexual thrill from the imagined physical sensation. She feels neither sympathy for the mare nor anger toward Gerald. "she . . . was cold and separate, she had no more feeling for them . . . . Gudrun could see the whole scene spectacularly, isolated and momentary, like a vision isolated in eternity" (W, 170). She

treats what she sees just as she would treat a work of art, and so becomes an accomplice to the mare's torture. Her masochism represents a destructive connection between knowledge and physical sensation and complements Gerald's sadistic ecstasy.

Ursula's initial fear, however, evaporates and is replaced by an instinctive hatred for Gerald. She cries out for the mare, and so alienates Gudrun.

> "No--! No--! let her go! Let her go, you fool, you fool--!" cried Ursula at the top of her voice, completely outside herself. And Gudrun hated her bitterly for being outside herself. It was unendurable that Ursula's voice was so powerful and naked (W, 169).

> "and she's bleeding!--She's bleeding!" cried Ursula, frantic with opposition and hatred of Gerald. She alone understood him perfectly, in pure opposition (W, 170).

Ursula thus directly opposes Gerald and the mechanical principle of life which he represents, and indirectly opposes Gudrun. She sees male pride in Gerald's cruelty. "Why couldn't he take the horse away, till the trucks had gone by? He's a fool, and a bully. Does he think it's manly, to torture a horse? It's a living thing, why should he bully it and torture it?" (W, 171). But whereas Ursula responds with compassion and tenderness, Gudrun, as modern woman and artist, has adopted masculine values. This contrast between the sisters indicates how gender difference transcends biological sexuality and roots itself in social conditioning, for Gudrun is more like Gerald than like Ursula. Gudrun has lived amongst London's bohemian society, with a freedom equivalent to that of any man, whereas Ursula's role as teacher involves the

more traditional feminine task of working with children. Gudrun lives a life of intellect, Ursula a life of feeling (though she also imparts knowledge to her students). While Gudrun is trapped within the prison-house of knowledge, language, and masculine values, Ursula is in a state of grace, using intuition to inform her response to Gerald's violence.

Later, in "Carpeting," a further discussion of Gerald's treatment of the mare includes Hermione and Birkin. Hermione and Ursula initiate the new debate, asking Gerald to justify his cruelty, and he defends himself in exactly the terms of the one-legged gatekeeper. "She must learn to stand--what use is she to me in this country, if she shies and goes off every time an engine whistles?" (W, 200). When Ursula responds, saying that he inflicted "unnecessary torture" and that the mare had a "right to her own being" (W, 200), Gerald vehemently disagrees:

> I consider that mare is there for my use. Not because I bought her, but because that is the natural order. It is more natural for a man to take a horse and use it as he likes, than for him to go down on his knees to it, begging it to do as it wishes, and to fulfill its own marvellous nature (W, 200).

He maintains the rigid patriarchal attitude that leaves unquestioned man's dominion over Nature and, by implication, over woman. His justification is simplistic: either man rules over Nature and woman, or Nature and woman rule over man. There is no possibility of a compromise between these alternatives. Interestingly, Hermione agrees with Gerald's reasoning:

> I do think--I do really think we must have the courage to use the lower animal life for our needs I do think there is something wrong, when we look on every living creature as if it were ourselves I do feel, that it is false to project our own feelings on every animate creature It is a lack of discrimination, a lack of criticism . . . Either we are going to use the animals, or they will use us (W, 200)

Gerald raises the pitch of the discussion by adding that horses have wills but not minds That means he "can't help being master of the horse" (W, 200) Birkin advances Gerald's thesis one step further

> Every horse, strictly, has two wills With one will, it wants to put itself in the human power completely--and with the other, it wants to be free, wild . . . It's the last, perhaps highest, love-impulse, resign your will to the higher being . . . And woman is the same as horses two wills act in opposition inside her With one will, she wants to subject herself utterly With the other she wants to bolt, and pitch her rider to perdition (W, 202)

This ridiculous comparison is perhaps the most outrageous statement of male chauvinism in the novel He denies women any mental capacity and, further, suggests they are naturally masochistic and submissive Not even his tendency to taunt Hermione can justify his stupidity here! In fact, his interpretation of the mare's behaviour in terms of human knowledge signifies his own entrapment in the novel's fallen, destructive world

In the face of this unpalatable male chauvinism, Ursula and Hermione join forces "Hermione and Ursula strayed on together, united in a sudden bond of deep affection and closeness" (W, 203) It is ironic that Hermione here befriends Ursula after supporting the masculine values that Gerald and Birkin uphold as natural Ursula does not recognize Hermione's hypocrisy in condemning

Birkin "And Rupert . . . He can only tear things to pieces. He really is like a boy who must pull everything to pieces to see how it is made. And I can't think it is right . . . " (W, 204). If she and Ursula are "like two conspirators who have withdrawn to come to an agreement," then Hermione is surely a double agent and Ursula seems to capitulate when she admits that there is such a thing as inferiority and, by implication, superiority.

> I must say that, however man is Lord of the beast and the fowl, I still don't think he has any right to violate the feelings of the inferior creation. I still think it would have been much more sensible and nice of you if you'd trotted back up the road while the train went by, and been considerate (W, 205).

Ursula would certainly not make such a weak statement in The Rainbow, wherein she provides a thorough critique of the Book of Genesis.

What is particularly disturbing about the end of "Carpeting," however, is not Ursula's feeble response, which might be interpreted as an attempt at compromise, but the narrator's attitude toward the debate on Gerald's treatment of the mare. The narrator links one of Birkin's comments with Ursula's instinctive aversion to Hermione. Birkin's comment is this: "It's a dangerous thing to domesticate horses, let alone women . . . The dominant principle has some rare antagonists" [my emphasis] (W, 202). And those words correspond with the narrator's description of Ursula: "And she tried to feel at one with Hermione, and to shut off from Birkin. She was strictly hostile to him. But she was held to him by some bond, some deep principle. This at once irritated her and saved

her" [my emphasis] (W, 205). What does one make of the use of "principle" in both passages? From one perspective, the narrator implies that it is "natural" for women to accept men, and to alienate themselves from women, no matter what the situation is. The fact that this implication reflects an aspect of masculine ideology--the discouragement of female friendship--aligns the narrator with Gerald and Birkin's side of the argument. Yet, aside from Ursula's mystical link with Birkin, one must note the contradiction between Hermione's words and actions: her words support the men, whereas her actions embody an attempt to join forces with Ursula against the men. Ursula's rejection of Hermione thus represents more of an instinctive aversion to masculine values--in a woman--than the "natural repugnance of women toward one another."[17] The ending of "Carpeting" therefore emphasizes how man's subjugation of Nature requires woman's cooperation. The battle between the sexes therefore frequently becomes a struggle for dominance and power rather than for equality, hence, the warlike destructiveness of personal relations in the novel.

That struggle between the sexes is nowhere more evident than in "Class-Room," a chapter that relates the war-ideology of the novel's social environment to education and the Biblical myth of the Fall. This chapter convincingly connects the battle of wills between man and woman to human knowledge itself, which is seen to inhibit life-as-process. Moreover, this chapter draws a parallel between human knowledge and death--both of which are central to a world infested with conflict.

The sequence begins with Ursula, in her public role as teacher, in front of her classroom of students. The setting is one of "soft dim magic" (W, 85) because Ursula wishes to imbue education with intensity and mystery--an extension of her teaching philosophy from The Rainbow. She encourages her students to participate in the learning process by asking them questions. "Ursula stood in front of the class, leading the children by questions to understand the structure and the meaning of the catkins" (W, 84). Significantly, her lesson centers on botany and on the asexual reproduction of catkins. When Birkin enters the room, her lesson becomes an indirect comment on human sexuality. His entrance destroys the atmosphere that she had been attempting to create. "he switched on the strong electric lights. The class-room was distinct and hard, a strange place after the soft dim magic that filled it before he came" (W, 85). Birkin is described as an almost supernatural being, Ursula "seemed to be standing aside in arrested silence, watching him move in another, concentrated world. His presence was so quiet, almost like a vacancy in the corporate air" (W, 85). Birkin is here more a spirit than a body, that he has the "unearthly" air of a prophet is plain, for Ursula becomes entranced by his wisdom. "Yet Ursula was concerned not only with solving her own problems, in the light of his words" (W, 92). However, she is affected not only by his apparent wisdom but by his physical presence. "Also the magic of his thighs had fascinated her. the inner slopes of his thighs" (W, 94). The scene thus establishes

a relationship between Ursula and Birkin which might be described in both religious and physical terms. Ursula's classroom magic is overwhelmed by Birkin's substitution of a different sort of magic--a magic that throws Ursula into a state of awe and subordination. He is like a Son of God who possesses divine knowledge, whereas she is the daughter of a mere earthly man. Birkin's stature as a figure of religious authority corresponds with his stature as school inspector. Ursula, a mere teacher, feels inferior, shameful, and incompetent in his presence. Her sense of inferiority is apparently a result of his higher religious and educational understanding, and of his physical manhood.

In the classroom, Birkin recommends her to discount subjective impressions. "It's the fact you want to emphasize, not the subjective impression to record. What's the fact?--red, little spiny stigmas of the female flower, dangling yellow male catkin, yellow pollen flying from one to the other" (W, 85). The fact Birkin is at pains to point out is the separation of female and male principles in plant life. He here defines masculinity and femininity in mutually exclusive terms. Ursula only gives a very inadequate response to his suggestion. "'It will make the books untidy,' she said to Birkin, flushing deeply" (W, 85). This is obviously not the strong, resilient Ursula of The Rainbow, here she loses her confidence in the presence of a man. For the remainder of the chapter, she plays the role of passive observer.

The classroom is soon invaded by another visitor, Hermione, dressed in the colours of a snake.

> she was a strange figure in the class-room, wearing a large, old cloak of greenish cloth, on which was raised a pattern of dull gold. The high collar, and the inside of the cloak, was lined with dark fur. Beneath she had a dress of fine lavender-coloured cloth, trimmed with fur, and her hat was close-fitting, made of fur and of the dull, green-and-gold figured stuff (W, 86-7).

Later, she is referred to as "hard and poisonous," as "a stricken pythoness of the Greek oracle" (W, 91), and as "the real devil who won't let life exist" (W, 93). It is clear that she is the serpent in this re-enactment of the Fall. Hermione immediately attempts to lure Ursula into her influence and confidence, as Satan lured Eve in the Biblical account. "Hermione seemed to be compelling her, coming very close to her, as if intimate with her, and yet, how could she be intimate?" (W, 86). And Hermione's irony mirrors that of Satan in Eden. "She spoke all the while in a mocking, half-teasing fashion, as if making game of the whole business" (W, 86). Although Hermione clearly represents a demon, she more obviously embodies Lawrence's idea of the modern woman. Whereas Ursula is here depicted as a passive woman, subordinate to man and innocent of worldly happenings beyond her classroom, Hermione is a woman who possesses knowledge equivalent to that of any man.

The scene is therefore set for Hermione and Birkin's debate on the value of knowledge. In the Genesis account of the Fall, Satan debates the question of knowledge with Eve, ultimately convincing her of its usefulness. "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be gods, knowing good and evil."[18] The attractiveness of

knowledge lies in its role in transforming humans--including both women and men--into gods. In "Class-Room," the debate on knowledge takes a slightly divergent path. Hermione questions not Ursula but Birkin as to the purpose of knowledge.

> "Do you really think, Rupert," she asked, as if Ursula were not present, "do you really think it is worth while? Do you really think the children are better for being roused to consciousness?" . . . "Isn't it better that they should remain unconscious of the hazel, isn't it better that they should see as a whole, without all this pulling to pieces, all this knowledge?" (W, 89)

Hermione's question implies that knowledge somehow perverts human innocence--an implication compatible with the standard interpretation of the Fall. But when Birkin asks whether she prefers to know or not know, and she responds with vagueness and uncertainty, he makes clear his view that Hermione parallels Satan in her prying desire to know. "'To know, that is your all, that is your life--you have only this, this knowledge,' he cried. 'There is only one tree, there is only one fruit, in your mouth'" (W, 89). Birkin's attack is somewhat unfair, since Hermione has really not demonstrated her unequivocal support for knowledge. Obviously, Birkin's attack springs from his deeper suspicion of Hermione's character, suspicion that he has acquired through his romantic involvement with her. Hermione repeats her question. In responding a second time, Birkin defends knowledge to a certain degree. He says that "spontaneity" and "instincts" are not destroyed by knowledge itself, rather, they are destroyed "Not because [children] have too much mind, but too little" (W, 90). He makes a distinction between knowledge and kinds

of knowledge which essentially points to the fact that human knowledge is an incomplete construction that imprisons the individual. Hermione persists in her interrogation. "If I know about the flower, don't I lose the flower and have only the knowledge? Aren't we exchanging the substance for the shadow, aren't we forfeiting life for this dead quantity of knowledge?" (W, 91). This question relates knowledge to deadness, an important equation in view of the novel's preoccupation with death. It is clear that Birkin agrees with the gist of Hermione's question because her words echo his own from other occasions, however, he again ignores her point and insults her personally.

> . . . you are merely making words . . . . Knowledge means everything to you. Even your animalism, you want it in your head. You don't want to be an animal, you want to observe your own animal functions, to get a mental thrill out of them (W, 91).

But "merely making words" applies not only to Hermione's apparent insincerity, but to Birkin's own use of words to refute her, and to the nature of human discourse in general.[19] Birkin condemns Hermione for not really meaning what she says. But how does he know what her real feelings are? Moreover, in rejecting Hermione's statements, Birkin postulates the existence of a realm of truth beyond her "making [of] words"--a realm of knowledge to which he apparently has special access. He intensifies his attack. "But now you have come to all your conclusions, you want to go back and be like a savage, without knowledge. You want a life of pure sensation and 'passion'" (W, 91). Birkin then states clearly what he has been hinting at all along, although the personal attack on Hermione is still the focus of his irritation.

> But your passion is a lie . . . It isn't passion at all, it is your will. It's your bullying will, you want to clutch things and have them in your power . . . Because you haven't got any real body, any dark sensual body of life. You have no sensuality. You have only your will and your conceit of consciousness, and your lust for power, to know . . . If one cracked your skull perhaps one might get a spontaneous, passionate woman out of you, with real sensuality. As it is, what you want is pornography--looking at yourself in mirrors, watching your naked animal actions in mirrors, so that you can have it all in your consciousness, make it all mental (W, 92).

His remarks link together such words as "passion," "bullying will," "power," "lust," "pornography," and "consciousness"--all of which relate to the perversion of human feelings in individuals who are preoccupied with knowledge. He expresses a belief in instinctive knowledge: "the great dark knowledge you can't have in your head-- the dark involuntary being. It is death to the self--but it is the coming into being of another" (W, 92). Although this is indubitably supposed to be a telling point in Birkin's argument, one is inclined to feel that he implicates himself in refuting Hermione. Indeed, he and she both use words for their own purposes. If "blood knowledge" exists, how can Birkin do it justice by talking about it? His stance is riddled with hypocrisy. The scene shows the inherent difficulty and imprisonment of human communication, even though Birkin does refer to a non-verbal realm of knowledge which presumably points to humankind's original state of plenitude and truthful communication with God before the Fall.

As far as gender difference is concerned, "Class-Room" can be seen as the pivotal chapter in Women in Love because its re-enactment of the Fall provides, through its juxtapositioning of

Ursula and Hermione, a modern perspective on women. Here, Ursula is a passive observer--almost an allegorical figure of feminine innocence. "She was pale and abstracted" (W, 92). It is as if Ursula epitomizes the inlaw and Hermione the outlaw feminine principle. The chapter ends with Hermione assuming a false intimacy with Ursula. Although she "[knows] Ursula as an immediate rival" (W, 93), she still invites her (and the absent Gudrun) to Breadalby for a visit. Birkin is alienated. "The two women were jeering at him, jeering him into nothingness. The laughter of the sneering shrill, triumphant female sounded from Hermione, jeering at him as if he were a neuter" (W, 92). Yet when both Hermione and Birkin have departed, Ursula is left to shut off the lights, not knowing whether she feels miserable or joyful about the performance she has witnessed.

Women in Love continually associates the Fall with knowledge and the modern woman--who is represented not only by Hermione but by Gudrun. Indeed, "Class-Room" implicitly connects the two through the novel's main symbol for female power: clasping hands and fingers. Hermione's "long, white fingers" (W, 87) and her "clenched . . . fist" (W, 90) have an insidious presence. These fingers are frequently referred to in the novel as when she crushes her fingers while hitting Birkin over the head with the lapis lazuli. The one major reference to Gudrun in "Class-Room" involves a discussion of her fondness for little things that she can hold between her hands. "Isn't it queer that she always likes little things? She

must always work small things, that one can put between one's hands, birds and tiny animals" (W, 88). This linking of female power with hands is emphasized again later, when Gudrun thinks about Gerald:

> And this knowledge was a death from which [Gudrun] must recover. How much more of him was there to know? Ah much, much, many days harvesting for her large, yet perfectly subtle and intelligent hands upon the field of his living, radio-active body. Ah, her hands were eager, greedy for knowledge. . . . Her fingers had him under their power. The fathomless, fathomless desire they could evoke in him was deeper than death, where he had no choice (W, 416).

For Gudrun, Gerald is living matter from which she can extract knowledge; but he is also a being in whom she can "evoke" a "desire" "deeper than death." This passage associates "knowledge," "death," and "power" with the modern woman, thus establishing a firm connection between women and masculine values. This is a damning association which reflects Lawrence's dissatisfaction with the Women's Movement of his time. This emphasis on woman's desire for knowledge (a desire which resulted in the mythic Fall), however, encourages the misleading argument that they are more responsible than men are for the world's problems. It would be more accurate to say that men have controlled the production and dissemination of human knowledge throughout history, but that modern women have come to participate in and accept that masculine ideology. The Biblical Fall is thus at loggerheads with historical fact. In Women in Love, the main point seems to be that both women and men have access to human knowledge and that both adhere to destructive values. In "Class-Room," neither Hermione

nor Birkin wins the debate because both are caught within the web of human knowledge. They cannot escape their knowledge and their world.

Apart from these key episodes, all of which show how masculine values permeate the social environment of Women in Love, there is the more specific question of how such values affect personal relationships. The woman initially involved with Birkin, Hermione, "was a woman of the new school, full of intellectuality, and heavy, nerve-worn with consciousness. She was passionately interested in reform, her soul was given up to the public cause. But she was a man's woman, it was the manly world that held her" (W, 62-3). Through her excessive self-consciousness and intelligence, as well as her desire for "reform" and "the public cause," she represents all the aspects of the Women's Movement which Lawrence found so repugnant. Hermione's greatest flaw is that she "[betrays] the woman in herself" (W, 375). Intriguingly, this shows that gender is largely a cultural product. Hermione's female body is of little relevance to her masculine role. In fact, she devalues her own biological femininity, as is evident in the description of her sexual longing for Birkin.

> She craved for Rupert Birkin. When he was there, she felt complete, she was sufficient, whole. For the rest of time she was established on the sand, built over a chasm, and, in spite of all her vanity and securities, any common maid-servant of positive, robust temper could fling her down this bottomless pit of insufficiency . . . . (W, 64)

She resents her female sexuality because it signals her incomplete self-sufficiency. "She always felt vulnerable . . . there was always

a secret chink in her armour" (W, 63-4). When she treats Ursula as a sentimental woman who lacks a tempering intellect, Hermione's aversion to feminine values of any kind is clear:

> [Hermione] was apt, in the presence of other women, whom she thought simply female, to wear the conclusions of her bitter assurance like jewels which conferred on her an unquestionable distinction, established her in a higher order of life. She was apt, mentally, to condescend to women such as Ursula, whom she regarded as purely emotional (W, 372-3).

She becomes so much like a man that she is assimilated into the male establishment and, unwilling to support other women, absorbs destructive values and becomes "a leaf of the old great tree of knowledge that [is] withering now" (W, 373).

In her relationship with Birkin, Hermione is manipulative and dominant, she treats him as her possession. Yet, although Birkin is the passive partner, he does have "the wilfulness of an obstinate child" and wants "to break the holy conjunction that [is] between them" (W, 64). Being both vulnerable and antagonistic toward Birkin's resistance, Hermione feels both envy and malice: "her soul writhed in the black subjugation to him, because of his power to escape, to exist, other than she did, because he was not consistent, not a man, less than a man" (W, 149), "[Hermione] realised that [Birkin's] presence was the wall, his presence was destroying her" (W, 162). This mixed attitude toward him stimulates her sexually when she knocks him over the head with a "ball of jewel stone":

> . . . swiftly, in a flame that drenched down her body like fluid lightening and gave her a perfect, unutterable consummation,

> unutterable satisfaction, she brought down the ball of jewel stone with all her force, crash on his head . . . it was one convulsion of pure bliss for her, lit up by the crushed pain of her fingers (W, 163).

She associates violence, power, and sexuality in much the same way as Gerald does in "Coal-Dust." She is at war with Birkin.

Birkin's ultimate submission to Hermione, when he writes her a letter saying he deserved that knock on the head, is a perplexing problem. Whenever they are together, there is conflict and a power struggle--with Hermione almost always winning.

> It was a great joy to her to do things, and to have the ordering of the job, with Birkin. He obeyed her subduedly (W, 198).

> Birkin came with Hermione. She had a rapt, triumphant look, like the fallen angels restored, yet still subtly demoniacal, now she held Birkin by the arm. And he was expressionless, neutralized, possessed by her as if it were his fate . . . (W, 70).

When Birkin moves into the Mill, Hermione triumphs yet once more by forcing a rug upon him. It is a triumph because the rug represents her unending influence on his life, at a time when he wishes to end their affair, rather than her unconditional, friendly regard.

What is most significant about the Hermione-Birkin affair is her tendency to treat him as a child. "She was stimulated above all things by this conflict with him, when he was like a sulky boy, helpless, and she had him safe at Breadalby" (W, 144). Birkin's misogyny is the direct result of her dominating, maternal influence on his life.

> She was on a very high horse again, was woman, the Great Mother. Did he not know it in Hermione. Hermione, the humble, the subservient, what was she all the while but

> the Mater Dolorosa, in her subservience, claiming back man she had borne in suffering. By her very suffering and humility she bound her son with chains, she held him her everlasting prisoner (W, 270).

He finds her female arrogance and tyranny as imprisoning as any woman (for example, Mrs. Crich) might find a man's assumption of superiority. The passage above makes the additional point that the modern woman's childbearing capabilities are perverted into a false sense of power and superiority. Mother love is looked upon as destructive, then, when it infiltrates adult, heterosexual relationships, because it creates a fundamental inequality between two mature people.

The Hermione-Birkin affair provides a necessary context for examining the Ursula-Birkin relationship, which is less violent but equally conflict-ridden. As has been said, Ursula is not the same person as she was in The Rainbow, moreover, she is, in many ways, the opposite of Hermione. Nonetheless, Ursula retains many of her earlier concerns--that is, her concern with equality between the sexes and satisfaction in love. In this novel, she realizes she is unhappy with life and must "leap like Sappho into the unknown" (W, 260). She feels like a ripened fruit that must "fall from the tree into death" (W, 260). She grows unsatisfied with her teaching position--her most obvious connection with the public domain. "Tomorrow was Monday. Monday, the beginning of another school-week! Another shameful, barren school-week, mere routine and mechanical activity. Was not the adventure of death infinitely preferable?" (W, 262). She senses that her life is too mechanical

and too detached from the joyful world of Nature. "She had had enough. For where was life to be found? No flowers grow upon busy machinery, there is no sky to a routine, there is no space to a rotary motion. And all life was a rotary motion, mechanised, cut off from reality" (W, 262). Finally, she wants to love and be loved, thus, her mounting attraction to Birkin. Yet she fears a dominating man who would treat her like an object.

> Would he be able to acknowledge her through everything, or would he use her just as his instrument, use her for his own private satisfaction, not admitting her? That was what the other men had done. They had wanted their own show, and they would not admit her, they turned all she was into nothingness (W, 375).

But, even so, she does have an inner fantasy about the sort of love she wants. "Man must render himself up to her. He must be quaffed to the dregs by her. Let him be her man utterly, and she in return would be his humble slave--whether he wanted it or not" (W, 343). Lawrence here indicates that Ursula's ideal love is interdependent rather than independent--a mutual sacrifice. Moreover, her idea of love, because it is described with such phrases as "render himself up to her" and "she would in turn be his humble slave," implies dominance of a sort.

Whereas Ursula is seriously concerned with finding a suitable man to love, Birkin--a man who hates conventions and standards--yearns for an inhuman kind of love and a woman willing to join him in his quest for the unknown. He preaches continuously like "some instrument of divination" W, 487) and, because he is so frequently ill, is almost like a disembodied spirt. "He was motionless

and ageless, like some crouching idol, some image of a deathly religion . . . and his face, very pale and unreal, seemed to gleam with a whiteness almost phosphorescent" (W, 265). He feels that the conventional relationship between the sexes destroys a person's independence, and his personal experience with Hermione has led him to fear dominating women.

> It was intolerable, this possession at the hands of woman. Always a man must be considered as the broken-off fragment of a woman, and the sex was the still aching scar of the laceration. Man must be added on to a woman, before he had any real place or wholeness (W, 271).

His fear of powerful women is similar to Ursula's fear of dominating men. Yet it leads him to evaluate Ursula with unfair harshness.

> And Ursula, Ursula was the same--or the inverse. She too, was the awful, arrogant queen of life, as if she were a queen bee on whom all the rest depended. He saw the yellow flare in her eyes, he knew the unthinkable overweening assumption of primacy in her. She was unconscious of it herself. She was only too ready to knock her head on the ground before a man. But this was only when she was so certain of her man, that she could worship him as a woman worships her own infant, with a worship of perfect possession (W, 270-1).

Significantly, he fears the tyranny of mother love.

The "Mino" chapter brings the struggle between Ursula and Birkin into focus. That it comes after "Carpeting," in which Ursula expresses her disapproval of Gerald's treatment of the mare and her disgust at Birkin's male arrogance, is significant. Ursula feels that she has clearly stated "her challenge" to Birkin, so "Mino" opens with her waiting for a "sign" indicative of his desire to continue their relationship. When Birkin finally does invite Ursula and Gudrun to tea, Ursula does not inform Gudrun

of the invitation and goes alone--on her own terms. She feels as though she has passed through death into a new and unknown realm. This is important because death is a metaphor for transcendence and escape, and is used to describe Ursula and Birkin's eventual "transit out of life." At Birkin's lodging, the air is tense, he gives a long, wordy explanation of his philosophy of love, stating that he wants an irrevocable commitment between himself and Ursula and "something much more impersonal and harder--and rarer" (W, 207) than "love." He wants their relationship to involve "no speech and no terms of agreement," "no obligation," "no standard for action," "no understanding," something "inhuman," "no calling to book," "nothing known," and "primal desire" (W, 208-9). What Birkin appears to want is a relationship that transcends human limits--a relationship that involves complete trust "without reserves or defenses" (W, 209). In short, he wants to revoke the conventions and structures of the fallen world. Birkin's philosophy, however, also mirrors his insecurity. His emphasis on the impersonal and on "a pure balance of two single beings" (W, 210) clearly connects indirectly with the disastrous interdependence that made his affair with Hermione so destructive.[20] Insofar as he means to avert another mutually destructive relationship, one can empathize with his concerns, but, for one who wants "no terms of agreement," he does have an awfully long list of stipulations. His extreme intellectualism, and his dependence on language to articulate his philosophy, banishes him from any so-called prelapsarian world and hurls him forward

into his earthly prison. Ursula and Birkin thus reach a stalemate because of their conflicting notions of love. "She believed that love far surpassed the individual. He said the individual was more than love, or than any relationship (W, 343).

What brings their discussion to a crisis is the entrance of a male and a female cat. The male is described as possessing "manly nonchalance" and he cuffs the female cat a few times. The female is described as "crouched before him," "in humility," an "outcast," "self-obliterating," "a shadow," "a blown leaf," "submissive," and "unquestioning" (W, 211-212). The cats thus appear to mirror the conventional active male and passive female. Ursula is offended by the male cat's arrogance and aggressiveness, and uses this particular incident to generalize about the male sex. "Mino . . . I don't like you. You are a bully like all males" (W, 212). Birkin, however, defends the male cat, whose sole aim is to achieve "superfine stability with the female" and to preserve his "male dignity" and "higher understanding" (W, 212-213). Ursula's anger reaches the boiling point. "It is just like Gerald Crich with his horse--a lust for bullying--a real Wille zur Macht--so base, so petty . . . . It's the old Adam" (W, 213). Birkin persists in defending the Mino.

> I agree that the Wille zur Macht is a base and petty thing. But with the Mino, it is the desire to bring this female cat into a pure stable equilibrium, a transcendent and abiding rapport with the single male (W, 213).

What is most evident about this Lawrencian "play within a play" is that it is founded on a very silly comparison of human beings

with cats, Ursula and Birkin insist on attaching human significance to the cats' behaviour--an insistence that reflects on their inability to comprehend the cats in other than human terms.

This anthropomorphism--representing the ineluctable nature of human knowledge--occurs again in "Moony" when Gudrun accuses a robin of arrogance and of being a "Little Lloyd George of the air" (W, 342). After first seeing the robins as "stout, short politicians" and "little men who must make themselves heard at any cost" (W, 342), Ursula later realizes how foolish "anthropomorphism" is:

> . . . it is impudence to call them little Lloyd Georges. They are really unknown to us, they are the unknown forces. It is impudence to look at them as if they were human beings. They are of another world . . . . Gudrun is really impudent, insolent, making herself the measure of everything, making everything come down to human standards . . . . It was such a lie towards the robins, and such a defamation (W, 343).

Her enlightenment here reflects back on the earlier "Mino" episode in which she and Birkin are equally guilty of translating the cats' experience into human terms. In so doing they reduce sex to mere biology and neglect to consider the influence of cultural conditioning not only on their own lives but also on their perception of the cats' behaviour.

The Mino makes a second appearance, in "Woman to Woman," when Hermione pours him out some milk but then proceeds to torment him:

> She lifted the cat's head with her long, slow, white fingers, not letting him drink, holding him in her power. It was always the same, this joy in power she manifested, peculiarly in power over any male being (W, 381).

Since she has recently terminated a relationship with Birkin, one can see how he is identified with the Mino through their common subjection to Hermione's will. Birkin's defense of the male cat in "Mino" is an indirect comment on his relationship with Hermione and on the theme of female domination.

His vulnerability to female power and control is clear toward the end of "Mino" when he thinks about Ursula: "he mistrusted her, he was afraid of a woman capable of such abandon, such dangerous thoroughness of destructivity" (W, 217). On the other hand, Ursula is particularly concerned with man's assumption of superiority and dominance over woman: "Oh it makes me so cross, this assumption of male superiority! And it is such a lie!" (W, 213). They both fear being dominated by each other. What happens in "Mino" is therefore an example of how this mutual fear leads to misunderstanding. It is plain that Ursula and Birkin have no greater chance of understanding the cats than Birkin's landlady has of understanding what transpires between Ursula and Birkin; this is clearly indicated in the parallel drawn between the cats and the human couple, when the landlady intrudes upon the scene: "They both looked at her, very much as the cats had looked at them, a little while before" (W, 214). After arguing for a while longer, Ursula and Birkin reach a temporary compromise: "Let love be enough then . . . ." (W, 218). Ultimately, the chapter does not illustrate sexual differences but a common male and female fear: the fear of domination and power. Moreover, the chapter

articulates both the fallibility and the necessity of human communication.

The problem of being trapped within the prison-house of human language and knowledge is central to Women in Love and its depiction of masculine ideology, because knowledge is inextricably linked with the Fall and with the values espoused by the novel's characters. "Speech" and "talking" are at the heart of Ursula and Birkin's attempt to re-establish the prelapsarian, paradisal union of man and woman.

> There was always confusion in speech. Yet it must be spoken. Whichever way one moved, if one were to move forwards, one must break a way through. And to know, to give utterance, was to break a way through the walls of the prison as the infant in labour strives through the walls of the womb. There is no new movement now, without the breaking through of the old body, deliberately, in knowledge, in the struggle to get out (W, 254-5).

> What was the good of talking, any way? It must happen beyond the sound of words. It was merely ruinous to try to work her by conviction. This was a paradisal bird that could never be netted, it must fly by itself to the heart (W, 327).

> Even when he said, whispering with truth, "I love you, I love you," it was not the real truth. It was something beyond love, such a gladness of having surpassed oneself, of having transcended the old existence. How could he say "I" when he was something new and unknown, not himself at all? This I, this old formula of the age, was a dead letter (W, 459).

The inefficiency of language only creates more uncertainty and more fuel for conflict, ultimately, therefore, Ursula and Birkin must circumvent the pitfalls of human language and knowledge in expressing their love for one another. They must transcend the hate culture of their world. Yet one questions the validity of their transcendence of "the old existence" and language. It

seems impossible to believe that their relationship could have developed to its final state of wavering bliss without language and without the often silly arguments that they have. They are products of their world. Moreover, their transcendence of the world, described in terms of death and escape, appears to superimpose an illusory and impenetrable private world or "heaven" on the actual world. The "Mino" chapter in particular seems to show the unavoidable need for human knowledge and the inescapability of conflict between the sexes, yet Ursula and Birkin still attempt to escape the "fallen" world to which they belong. Ursula comes to recognize Birkin as "one of the sons of God such as were in the beginning of the world, not a man, something other, something more" (W, 395), "It was the daughters of men coming back to the sons of God, the strange inhuman sons of God who are in the beginning" (W, 395). She and Birkin also quit their jobs and dissociate themselves from the working world--a dissociation that is only made possible by Birkin's financial independence (obtained through that world). "They decided, when they awoke again from the pure swoon, to write their resignations from the world of work there and then" (W, 399). In "A Chair," they truly feel that through marriage they must reject rather than accept the world.[21] They therefore refuse to burden themselves with material possessions which signal the acquisitiveness of industrial capitalism, giving the recently purchased chair to a meek and poor young couple.

Their search for transcendence begins when they leave for the Continent. "This was the first time that an utter and absolute peace had entered his heart, now, in this final transit out of life . . . like disembarking from the Styx into the desolated underworld, was this landing at night" (W, 480). Their "marriage resembles a plunge into another sleep, even a death."[22] They journey to an "unknown paradise" where they can dispose of human knowledge, conventions, and worries. Indeed, their experience at the Tyrol intensifies Ursula's desire to sever her earthly connections and to enter a new, paradisal union with Birkin:

> She wanted to have no past. She wanted to have come down from the slopes of heaven to this place, with Birkin, not to have toiled out of the murk of her childhood and her upbringing, slowly, all soiled . . . . Why not a bath of pure oblivion, a new birth, without any recollections or blemish of a past life. She was with Birkin, she had just come into life, here in the high snow, against the stars. What had she to do with parents and antecedents? She knew herself new and unbegotten, she had no father, no mother, no anterior connections, she was herself, pure and silvery, she belonged only to the oneness that struck deeper notes, sounding into the heart of the universe, the heart of reality, where she had never existed before (W, 502).

She renounces human history and wishes to bypass the "fallen" human world. She surmounts her fear that earthly existence is inescapable, as she had said earlier to Birkin in "Excurse," "I'm so afraid that while we are only people, we've got to take the world that's given--because there isn't any other" (W, 398). However, in surmounting this fear Ursula rejects the possibility of working toward meaningful change in the human community, for her, change is now possible only in the transcendent world

that she and Birkin have created. Gudrun at one point questions Ursula's motive for escape. "But I think that a new world is a development from this world, and that to isolate oneself with one other person, isn't to find a new world at all, but only to secure oneself in one's illusions" (W, 533). Ursula's response shows her fear of human knowledge and language--both of which contain the values she wishes to reject. "She was always frightened of words, because she knew that mere word-force could always make her believe what she did not believe" (W, 533). Ursula therefore dismisses Gudrun's argument. "I do think that one can't have anything new whilst one cares for the old . . . even fighting the old is belonging to it. I know, one is tempted to stop with the world, just to fight it. But then it isn't worth it" (W, 534). Her position here reflects her conversion to Birkin's transcendent individualism; moreover, it reflects the essential dilemma faced by individuals in wartime England: whether to fight for a cause that--in the fight--comes to represent that which one opposes. What good is a "better" life if it must be paid for with wasted life or death? In the end, Ursula places her faith in Birkin rather than the world: "How dark, like a night, his eyes were, like another world beyond! . . . If only he would call a world into being, that should be their own world!" (W, 482). Power-in-the-world is not Ursula and Birkin's objective, they wish to cultivate their own garden and to uphold feminine values in their life together (at least, they want to enjoy life as process and adventure, rather than life as the

deadening acquisition of material possessions). For them, human needs are not solely economic. However, their belief in transcendence essentially becomes a vote for the masculine ideology of the world that they have tried to escape--an ideology that upholds self-sufficient individualism.

The Gudrun-Gerald relationship dominates the close of Women in Love, providing a realistic and ironic foil to the transcendent and other-wordly quality of the Ursula-Birkin affair. In assessing Gudrun, one sees that her character is detached and highly intellectual. "Her one motive was to avoid actual contact with people" (W, 576). When she observes people, she thinks of them as objects that she can manipulate.

> Gudrun watched them closely, with objective curiosity. She saw each one as a complete figure, like a character in a book, or a subject in a picture, or a marionette in a theatre, a finished creation. . . . She knew them, they were finished, sealed and stamped and finished with, for her (W, 60-61).

In addition to this intellectual detachment, Gudrun's personality is destructive. "Once inside the house of her soul, and there was a pungent atmosphere of corrosion, an inflamed darkness of sensation, and a vivid, subtle, critical consciousness, that saw the world distorted, horrific" (W, 549). Yet she apparently combines her intense inner scepticism about life with a lingering nostalgia for traditional modes of living, as evidenced by her mixture of repulsion and attraction toward the colliers throughout the novel. In "Death and Love," for instance, she imagines that Gerald is a worker and she a worker's wife. "It is like a workman getting up

to go to work . . . And I am like a workman's wife" (W, 434). Her tragedy is that she only observes and never participates in life. "She never really lived, she only watched" (W, 565). And at the novel's end, Gudrun fears that through her own restlessness, she is being transformed into a machine--a clock. "Didn't her face really look like a clock dial . . . " (W, 565).

The Gudrun-Gerald relationship is obviously a new configuration of Mr. and Mrs. Crich's relationship but, unlike Mrs. Crich, Gudrun sets out to prove she is Gerald's equal in every respect. Indeed, Gerald and Gudrun are seen to be "of the same kind" (W, 181), possessed of a "mutual hellish recognition" (W, 316-317), and partners in a "a league . . . abhorrent to them both" (W, 317). In short, "he was initiate as she was initiate" (W, 318). They are equally destructive characters in the novel. Unlike Mr. and Mrs. Crich's hierarchical union, Gudrun and Gerald's relationship is like a game of see-saw in that the balance of power continually shifts. Gerald's exertion of masculine power in "Coal-Dust" is thus connected to his relationship with Gudrun.

> Gudrun reached out the sketch-book, Gerald stretched from the boat to take it. As he did so, he remembered Gudrun's last words to him, and her face lifted up to him as he sat on the swerving horse. An intensification of pride went over his nerves, because he felt, in some way she was compelled by him (W, 179).

Gudrun establishes her power in "Water-Party" when she drives the castrated bullocks to "helpless fear and fascination" (W, 233), and when she hits Gerald on the face. Her ability to compete with Gerald for control is vividly shown in "Rabbit" when she rejects

Gerald's opinion that humans are similar to rabbits

> "Ah, Gerald," she said, in a strong, slow, almost man-like way. "All that, and more." Her eyes looked up at him with shocking nonchalance. He felt again as if she had hit him across the face--or rather, as if she had torn him across the breast, dully, finally (W, 318).

This subtle power struggle continues until Gerald's death.

The Gudrun-Gerald relationship is also assimilated into the story of the Fall that is expounded in "Class-Room." Gudrun is clearly related to an Eve, hungry for knowledge.

> [Gudrun] reached up, like Eve reaching to the apples on the tree of knowledge, and she kissed him, though her passion was a transcendent fear of the thing he was, touching his face with her infinitely delicate, encroaching, wondering fingers . . . . This was the glistening, forbidden apple, this face of a man (W, 416).

That the "apple" becomes a metaphor for the "face of a man" is an indirect way of attributing cannibalistic tendencies to the modern woman. What is more important about the passage, however, is Gudrun's unending desire for knowledge.

> She wanted to touch him and touch him and touch him, till she had him all in her hands, till she had strained him into her knowledge. Ah, if she could have the precious knowledge of him, she would be filled . . . . (W, 416).

These passages draw an incontrovertible connection not only between Gudrun and Eve, but also between Gudrun and Hermione. They also stress the unavoidable connection between human knowledge and such values as power and control.

After Thomas Crich's death, Gudrun and Gerald's relationship becomes like a mother and child's, and is thus similar to Hermione and Birkin's affair. When Gerald goes to Beldover to make love to Gudrun, he enacts a return to the womb.

> he was a child, so soothed and restored and full of gratitude . . . And she, she was the great bath of life, he worshipped her. Mother and substance of all life she was. And he, child and man, received of her and was made whole . . . as if he were bathed in the womb again . . . Like a child at the breast, he cleaved intensely to her, and she could not put him away . . . He was infinitely grateful, as to God, or as an infant is at its mother's breast (W, 430-431).

This mixing of a woman's maternal capacity with sexual love, although it momentarily satisfies Gerald's need for human tenderness, heralds the eventual demise of their relationship; Gudrun later tells him that she had never loved but only pitied him on the night of his father's death. "When you first came to me, I had to take pity on you. But it was never love" (W, 539). Yet it is clear that she enjoys the maternal aspect of their relationship, as is shown at the end of "Water-Party" when she "[has] wild ideas of rushing to comfort Gerald" (W, 258) after Diana drowns. Still, in "Snowed Up," Gudrun is jealous that Gerald can sleep while she cannot:

> What then! Was she his mother? Had she asked for a child, whom she must nurse through the nights, for her lover. She despised him, she despised him . . . An infant crying in the night, this Don Juan.
>
> Ooh, but how she hated the infant crying in the night. She would murder it gladly. She would stifle it and bury it, as Hetty Sorrell did (W, 566).

Gudrun no doubt has some cause for frustration; Gerald is rarely tender, and his feminine nature has atrophied so much that he is--to her--little more than a perfectly functioning sexual instrument. "Oh God, when I think of Gerald, and his work--those offices at

Beldover, and the mines--it makes my heart sick. What have I to do with it--and him thinking he can be a lover to a woman! One might as well ask it of a self-satisfied lamp-post" (W, 563). Here, Gudrun loathes his machine-like precision, but earlier she clearly thought differently: "His instrumentality appealed so strongly to her, she wished she were God, to use him as a tool" (W, 511). What Gudrun finds both repulsive and attractive in Gerald, a god-like control and efficiency, is exactly what she desires for herself. The peculiar repulsion and attraction she feels toward him and other mechanical men occasionally deteriorates into an intense hatred:

> [Gerald's] maleness bores me. Nothing is so boring as the phallus, so inherently stupid and stupidly conceited. Really, the fathomless conceit of men, it is ridiculous--the little strutters (W, 563).

> . . . let them be taken up entirely in their work, let them be perfect parts of a great machine, having a slumber of constant repetition. Let Gerald manage his firm. There he would be satisfied, as satisfied as a wheel-barrow that goes backwards and forwards along a plank all day . . . . (W, 566).

These passages surely add weight to Birkin's misogynistic statements, showing that the world of Women in Love is a thoroughly developed hate culture. Gudrun thinks of men not as human beings but as enemies. Yet her larger ambivalence toward love and men takes on new meaning at the novel's end, because there she is "favoured over Ursula and Birkin, and even over Gerald," in terms of the space given to the presentation of her "inside views."[23] This indicates that Lawrence empathizes with Gudrun more strongly than previous critics have shown.

The Gudrun-Gerald relationship reaches a climax in the mountains--a realm apart from "reality" and close to heaven. For both of them, the attempt to escape industrial England--with its masculine ideology and destructiveness--is a failure. In their time at the Tyrol, it is obvious that they have not escaped the power and domination cherished by their world. Their relationship is a battle to the finish, it ends with Gerald's futile "victory" over his own human vulnerability--his final eradication of the feminine impurity in his nature. Most importantly, Gerald's death brings Ursula and Birkin back down to earth. Their own metaphorical death, their "transit out of life," is ultimately a failure too, for the reality of Gerald's death is inescapable--even in their imagined "paradise." It teaches them that paradise _is_ lost.

The treatment of gender difference in Women in Love, highly controversial as it is, is essentially a study of the pervasiveness of masculine ideology. Central to this study is the idea that such modern women as Hermione and Gudrun have become accomplices to a "war-ideology" constructed by men like Gerald--accomplices both in their personal relationships and in the larger sphere of knowledge and industrial capitalism. This results in the increasing mechanization of human experience, rather than in the feminization of life which Lawrence had hoped for.

Although Women in Love periodically reflects the masculine bias of its narrator, it does voice a desperate protest against a war-stricken world and destructive individuals. It _is_ an anti-war

novel. However, its final vision is uncertain and pessimistic, for Ursula and Birkin fail to cultivate their own garden amid or above their fallen world. "Now one was not a child, and one knew that the soul was a prisoner within this sordid vast edifice of life, and there was no escape, save in death" (W, 262). Ursula and Birkin's marriage shows that it is impossible to escape the world's masculine values, they can refuse to purchase a chair but they cannot refuse humanity itself, except through actual death--which is Gerald's solution, and the solution proffered by a masculine value system, in order to erase love, tenderness, and compassion.

At the novel's end, the reality of actual death supersedes Lawrence's conception of metaphorical death, and yet that solution comes perilously close to imitating war propaganda in its romanticization of an end to human life. Birkin's tears over Gerald's dead body show that death is not a sign of heroic nobility, rather, they indicate that war--in the mining industry, between the sexes, or within the individual--results from a world that values power, domination, and death over feminine values. And that world, like language and knowledge, is inadequate and inescapable.

ENDNOTES

[1]Hilary Simpson, D H Lawrence and Feminism (London Croom Helm, 1982), p 42

[2]Graham Holderness, D H Lawrence History, Ideology and Fiction (London Gill and MacMillan Humanities Press, 1982), p 199

[3]Simpson, p 66

[4]Simpson, p 64

[5]Simpson, p 65

[6]Cornelia Nixon, Lawrence's Leadership Politics and the Turn Against Women (Berkeley University of California Press, 1986), p 114

[7]Holderness, p 203

[8]Linda J Nicholson, Gender and History The Limits of Social Theory in the Age of the Family (New York Columbia University Press, 1986), p 202 Nicholson's comment about women becoming individuals is pertinent to Women in Love "Industrialization brought new jobs for women either directly, for example, as mill hands, or indirectly, as teachers or social workers of those who were being called to work in the new factories Such jobs in turn affected women's sense of self and their position within the family A wage-earning job raised the possibility that a woman could exist outside a family or within a family as an individual contributor" (202) Gudrun, Ursula, and Hermione are very much identified as individuals when the novel opens

[9]Holderness, p 208

[10]Marilyn French, Beyond Power (New York Summit Books, 1985), p 65

[11]D H Lawrence, Women in Love, ed Charles Ross (Markham, Ont Penguin Books, 1982, reprint ed 1983), 121 [All subsequent references to this novel will be made in the text of the paper, following "W"]

[12]In Sexual Politics (New York: Ballantine Books, 1969), Kate Millett says that Lawrence presents this African statue as "the perfection of female function" (377). There is really no basis for this subjective interpretation. True, the statue does portray the female reproductive capacity, however, it in no way limits woman's potential in areas beyond human reproduction.

[13]Matthew 13: 31-32.

[14]Holderness, pp. 190-219.

[15]Holderness makes an important point when he says that, historically speaking, the colliers offered greater resistance to the sorts of changes that Gerald implements. "The miners did not submit to these changes with anything like this degree of acquiescence" (210), "But historical criticism must recognise that Lawrence's powerful image of the perfectly industrialised, completely dehumanised social machine may adequately describe the historical role of the bourgeoisie, but can only exist in the form it does by excluding the active intervention of the working class" (211).

[16]Millett says "Gerald is really just a better-looking version of Anton, the mechanical man of the system, that embodiment of industrial mentality who is executed in The Rainbow" (376). The comparison is apt except for the crucial fact that Gerald grows in self-awareness throughout the novel.

[17]Millett, p. 375.

[18]Genesis 3: 5.

[19]Millett is correct to point out "the obvious contradictions between [Birkin's] preachment and practice" (370), however, she draws the false conclusion that Birkin is Lawrence and thus wrongly condemns the book by reading it solely from Birkin's warped perspective. I believe that Lawrence does not identify himself consistently with any one character in the novel.

[20]Millett says "The 'new' relationship, while posing as an an affirmation of the primal unconscious sexual being . . . is in effect a denial of personality in the woman" (370-1). This is clearly a poor interpretation of Birkin's philosophy because he wants to transcend not only Ursula's but his own personality.

[21]In "Hierogamy versus Wedlock: Types of Marriage Plots and Their Relationship to Genres of Prose Fiction" (PMLA, 91 (1976), 900-13), Evelyn Hinz makes the interesting point that Lawrence sees marriage as hierogamy: "the hierogamous union . . . is not for the sake of the human couple but for the sake of the

cosmos, what is for the sake of the partners is the feeling of consonance with the cosmos that hierogamy effects On the one hand, this sense of connection expresses itself negatively, that is, in the sense of the loss of all personality, all identity, time and place, the loss of what Lawrence calls ego consciousness This is the way Birkin explains why his love for Ursula cannot be expressed by way of the conventional 'I love you' . . . . " (910) The hierogamous marriage contrasts with the conventional "wedlock plot" which "symbolizes the entrance into society of the individual, the acquisition or restoration of a realistic attitude toward life, the movement from romantic illusion to a novelistic sense of reality" (904)

[22]Millett, P 372

[23]F K Stanzel, A Theory of Narrative (Cambridge Cambridge University Press, 1979), p 108

CHAPTER IV

EPILOGUE

It is not insignificant that The Rainbow and Women in Love were originally conceived as one work but eventually shaped into two novels. Clearly, the Feminist Movement and World War I influenced the course of Lawrence's literary development between 1913 and 1917, making two novels the inevitable result of his altered conception of gender difference. As I have shown, The Rainbow describes Lawrence's vision of how the feminine principle might be revived to save the world, while Women in Love demonstrates how he came to see that the masculine principle had triumphed over the feminine. To see the novels as two offshoots of what was originally one creative endeavour is to reveal that both Lawrence and his reader are left with certain unresolved dilemmas at the close of Women in Love.

The first of these involves Ursula. Why does she change from one novel to the next? The most likely answer to that question points to Lawrence's shifting attitude toward women. When writing The Rainbow, he believed that women needed to play a greater role in society, by bringing new values to the public domain, hence Ursula actively and aggressively challenges the obstacles of "the man's world" in that novel. Her energy and outspoken nature are seen positively, as she continually struggles

to keep to her purpose. Lawrence is, however, careful to distinguish Ursula--his conception of the "true" feminist--from such women as Winifred Inger and Maggie Schofield, who are excessively political. Ursula is described as a sensitive but occasionally volatile woman; even so, she ultimately does not sacrifice her feminine values to her liberating tendencies. She is the embodiment of the unified feminine principle.

When placed alongside such modern women as Hermione and Gudrun in Women in Love, Ursula retains her sensitivity and instinctive awareness but loses most of her unpredictable pugnacity. Because Hermione and Gudrun wield power with a destructiveness equivalent to any man's, Lawrence is pressed to create--in Ursula--their antithesis. However, in making Ursula the "ideal" woman, and the antithesis of these destructive characters, Lawrence describes her as more traditional than she previously was in The Rainbow. She is thus intensely concerned with the Crich wedding at the start of Women in Love and with her own "good looks" in her later relationship with Birkin. As well, her teaching skills in Women in Love only faintly reflect her hard-earned experience under the tutelage of Mr. Harby and his rigidly masculine education system in The Rainbow. In the classroom, she is much too easily intimidated by Birkin. Even in the light of these various examples of Ursula's altered nature, however, it seems that much of the dissatisfaction with her later development--on the part of the reader--stems not solely from her often passive demeanour, but more fundamentally from Lawrence's

mounting animosity toward the "modern woman" or "feminist" of his time. This animosity leads him to polarize his female characters in Women in Love, rather than to portray them more realistically as figures with a blend of positive and negative traits. The effect on Ursula is to transform her from The Rainbow's fairly radical heroine to Women in Love's more conservative representative of womanhood. What the "new" Ursula lacks is the ability to challenge conditions in the public world. This is not to say that in Women in Love Ursula has no strength and conviction. On the contrary, as one critic has said, criticism of the novel fails "to consider not only the important strengths of Ursula's character, but also how she is used skillfully by Lawrence to fashion a sustained and effective critique of Birkin's most cherished theories . . . ."[1] After all, Lawrence does show his support for feminine values through Ursula, even if he seriously damages her stature as representative of the unified feminine principle. That point is often forgotten when critics too hastily align Lawrence with Birkin. But it cannot be denied that Lawrence eliminates from Ursula's character many of those qualities that he finds repulsive in the modern woman.

The second dilemma posed by the two novels involves Lawrence's closing vision of inescapable violence and destruction. In The Rainbow, the masculine principle of power, control, domination, and death (or killing) is represented most specifically by the young soldier, Anton Skrebensky. But in that novel Ursula surmounts Anton's destructive influence and envisions a

brave new future. In Women in Love, however, it is Anton's world that comes to the fore in the portrait of Gerald Crich. What is marginal in The Rainbow thus becomes central in Women in Love. Moreover, in Women in Love masculine values contaminate both human knowledge and language and Lawrence leaves his characters no escape from those values.

The way Lawrence ultimately tried to move beyond the uncertainty and pessimism of Women in Love can be understood only by glancing at the future course his fiction took. Crucial to his later work is his attitude toward the outcome of World War I, an attitude that embodied a shift in emphasis from love to power and from women to men.

> [Lawrence] believed that the dominant ideology of the post-war world was feminine--not, however, a true femininity of instinct and feeling, but a perverted femininity of will and idealism--and that a masculine renaissance was necessary to restore the balance.[2]

This passage, in addition to reiterating the distinction between Ursula's and Hermione's types of femininity, indicates the need for men to reassert themselves. Lawrence's strategy for escaping the muddle in Women in Love, or the battle between the sexes, thus involves a new development in the role played by men in society. Whereas he had previously placed his hope for a better future in women, he now places the onus for change on men.

A good example of this change in emphasis is The Plumed Serpent, a novel in which Lawrence describes two men who consciously seek to alter their destructive, non-productive society.

These two men, Ramon and Cipriano, perceive the need to transform Mexico and their own manhood simultaneously, by bringing back the old gods of the Quetzalcoatl religion. This attempt at transforming a world--from destructive to creative values--reinstates a traditional view of masculinity and femininity as mutually exclusive opposites. Hence, the idea that Ramon and Cipriano must serve a larger cosmic purpose, while Carlota (who dies), Kate, and Teresa must learn to serve their men, is brought to the forefront of the religious movement depicted in the novel. Essentially, the new religion is a male-run organization and, consequently, it advocates female submission and servitude to men. Kate Leslie, the central female character, is faced with the choice of either retaining her will and independence as a woman (elements of her "modern" womanhood) or relinquishing her individual control to the new religion. Whereas Carlota, faced with a similar choice, refuses to submit to Ramon, Kate harbours mixed feelings about the Quetzalcoatl religion even at the novel's close. She wants to experience a new form of life, yet she resists the submission required by the men behind the religious revival.

Whereas Women in Love ends with a vision of unavoidable death and hopelessness, The Plumed Serpent epitomizes a good number of Lawrence's later works in suggesting that the way out of destructive personal relationships and a war-like world is for the individual to submit voluntarily to a higher religious purpose. The Quetzalcoatl religion is the ideology--the religious purpose--with which Ramon attempts to unify a fragmented world. Intriguingly,

he is fully aware of the fact that all religions are human constructions, that awareness informs his effort to create harmony among Mexicans by re-introducing a set of religious symbols that will mean something to them. Yet the new religion, in imposing justice on criminals through violence (all but one of the individuals who attempt to murder Ramon are executed), is repressive and destructively masculine. Since Cipriano commands a large squadron of troops, the new religion comes to resemble the oppressiveness of a state government. The Plumed Serpent is thus, on the whole, rather unconvincing in its message. Just as Gerald Crich's religious vision of a perfectly functioning mining industry imposes violence on workers, so Ramon's religion imposes violence on people by quelling dissention under the guise of creating harmony. There is really little difference between the struggle of individuals against mechanical domination in Women in Love and the struggle of individuals against ideological domination (or religious indoctrination) in The Plumed Serpent. The greatest difference between Women in Love and The Plumed Serpent is that women and men are equally affected by destructive values in the former novel, whereas women sacrifice more individuality to the religious cause than do the men in the latter novel.

The third dilemma posed by The Rainbow and especially Women in Love--the trap of human knowledge and language--is partly addressed by the Quetzalcoatl religion. Throughout The Plumed Serpent, Ramon and Cipriano generate interest in their religious mission by using progaganda. By distributing

advertisements and enacting old rituals (involving music that makes use of drums and dancing), they consciously attempt to replace the Catholic faith with the Quetzalcoatl religion. They see their task as educational: they must gradually reacquaint Mexicans with the story of Quetzalcoatl--with their own traditional religious symbols. As propagandists and educators, Ramon and Cipriano control the production and dissemination of knowledge about their religion, and partly circumvent the usually unavoidable entrapment of words by emphasizing feeling and mystery rather than verbal understanding. "Of all things human, and humanly invented, we have had enough, [the people] seemed to say. And though they took not much active notice of the hymns, they craved for them, as men crave for alcohol, as a relief from the weariness and ennui of mankind's man-made world."[3] The liberating effect of their religious message does not reach out to intellect but to emotion. However, even though individuals find a sense of freedom through submitting to the new religion, the Quetzalcoatl faith fails to engender real harmony because of its hidden domination and coercion. Dissenters are not tolerated. Kate senses the religion's fundamental association with the masculine principle and, consequently, is unable to relinquish her will to it. The new religion, in the end, is little more than a new form of domination--a new trap for the individual.

In the context of The Plumed Serpent, it is clear that The Rainbow and Women in Love constitute a crucial stage in Lawrence's developing vision of gender principles--a stage at which

the masculine principle takes precedence over the feminine. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that Lawrence's vision is always shifting and that these novels represent only a part of his much larger and diverse body of thought. After The Plumed Serpent, his fiction continues to experiment with possible solutions to conflict-ridden personal relationships and destructive societies.

ENDNOTES

[1]Peter Balbert, "Ursula Brangwen and 'The Essential Criticism': The Female Corrective in Women in Love," Studies in the Novel, 17 (Fall 1985) 272.

[2]Hilary Simpson, D. H. Lawrence and Feminism (London: Croom Helm, 1982), p. 17.

[3]D. H. Lawrence, The Plumed Serpent (1950; reprint ed., Markham, Ont.: Penguin, 1981), p. 272.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Althusser, Louis. Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays. Translated by Ben Brewster. London: NLB, 1971.

Balbert, Peter. "Ursula Brangwen and 'The Essential Criticism': The Female Corrective in Women in Love." Studies in the Novel 17.3, (Fall 1985): 267-283.

Beauvoir, Simone de. The Second Sex. Translated and edited by H. M. Parshley. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.

Bilan, R. P. The Literary Criticism of F. R. Leavis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Blanchard, Lydia. "Love and Power: A Reconsideration of Sexual Politics in D. H. Lawrence." Modern Fiction Studies 21 (1975): 431-43.

Boulton, James T., and Andrew Robertson, ed. The Letters of D. H. Lawrence, Vol. III 1916-1921. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Brittain, Vera. Testament of Youth: An Autobiographical Study of the Years 1900-1925. London: Victor Gollancz, 1933, reprint ed., 1978.

Brookesmith, Peter. "The Future of the Individual: Ursula Brangwen and Kate Millett's Sexual Politics." Human World 10 (1973): 42-65.

Bruner, Jerome. Actual Minds, Possible Worlds. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Caudwell, Christopher. Studies in a Dying Culture. London: Monthly Review Press, 1971.

Cook, Ellen Piel. Psychological Androgyny. Toronto: Pergamon Press, 1985.

Core, Deborah. "'The Closed Door': Love Between Women in the Works of D. H. Lawrence." D. H. Lawrence Review 11 (1978): 114-31.

Culler, Jonathan. On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Daleski, H M. The Forked Flame: A Study of D H Lawrence. London: Faber and Faber, 1965.

D'Heurle, Adma and Joel N. Feimer. "The Tender Connection." Antioch Review 37 (1979): 293-310.

Engelberg, Edward. "Escape From the Circles of Experience: D H Lawrence's The Rainbow as a Modern Bildungsroman." PMLA 78 (1963): 103-13.

Ford, George. Double Measure: A Study of the Novels and Stories of D H Lawrence. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

French, Marilyn. Beyond Power: On Women, Men and Morals. New York: Summit Books, 1985.

_____. Shakespeare's Division of Experience. New York: Summit Books, 1981.

Garvin, Harry R., ed. Literature and Ideology. Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1982.

Glazer, Myrna. "Why the Sons of God Want the Daughters of Men: On William Blake and D H Lawrence." William Blake and the Moderns. Edited by Robert J. Bertholf and Annette S. Levitt. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1982.

Green, Eleanor H. "Schopenhauer and D H Lawrence on Sex and Love." D H Lawrence Review 8 (1975): 329-45.

Haste, Cate. Keep the Home Fires Burning: Propaganda on the First World War. London: Allen Lane, 1977.

Heldt, Lucia Henning. "Lawrence on Love: The Courtship and Marriage of Tom Brangwen and Lydia Lensky." D H Lawrence Review 8 (1975): 358-70.

Hibberd, Dominic and John Onions, ed. Poetry of the Great War: An Anthology. London: Macmillan, 1986.

Hinz, Evelyn J. "Hierogamy versus Wedlock: Types of Marriage Plots and Their Relationship to Genres of Prose Fiction." PMLA 91 (1976): 900-13.

_____. "The Rainbow: Ursula's Liberation." Contemporary Literature 17 (1976): 24-43.

_____ "The Paradoxical Fall Eternal Recurrence in D H Lawrence's The Rainbow " English Studies in Canada 3 (1977) 466-81

Holderness, Graham D H Lawrence History, Ideology and Fiction London Gill and Macmillan, 1982

Hoyles, John "D H Lawrence and the Counter Revolution An Essay in Socialist Aesthetics " D H Lawrence Review 6 (1973) 173-200

Humma, John "D H Lawrence as Frederich Nietzsche " Philological Quarterly 53 (1974) 110-20

Hyde, Virginia "Will Brangwen and Paradisal Vision in The Rainbow and Women in Love " D H Lawrence Review 8 (1975) 346-57

Kennedy, Andrew "After Not So Strange Gods in The Rainbow " English Studies 63 (1982) 220-30

Lawrence, D H Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious Markham, Ont Penguin, 1971, reprint ed , 1981

_____ The Plumed Serpent Markham, Ont Penguin, 1950, reprint ed , 1981

_____ The Rainbow Edited by John Worthen Markham Ont Penguin, 1981

_____ Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays Edited by Bruce Steele Cambridge Cambridge University Press, 1985

_____ Women in Love Edited by Charles Ross Markham, Ont Penguin, 1982, reprint ed , 1985

Leavis, F R D H Lawrence Novelist London Chatto & Windus, 1962

_____ Thought, Words and Creativity Art and Thought in Lawrence London Chatto & Windus, 1976

Lerner, Laurence Love and Marriage Literature and its Social Context London Edward Arnold, 1979

Manicom, David "An Approach to the Imagery A Study of Selected Biblical Analogues in D H Lawrence's The Rainbow " English Studies in Canada 11 4 (December 1985), 474-483

Marwick, Arthur. Women at War 1914-1918. London: Croom Helm, 1977.

Millett, Kate. Sexual Politics. New York: Ballantine Books, 1969.

Moore, Harry T. The Priest of Love: A Life of D. H. Lawrence. Rev. ed. Markham, Ont.: Penguin, 1974.

Nicholson, Linda J. Gender and History: The Limits of Social Theory in the Age of the Family. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Nixon, Cornelia. "To Procreate Oneself: Ursula's Horses in The Rainbow." Journal of English Literary History 49 (1982): 123-42.

_____. Lawrence's Leadership Politics and the Turn Against Women. Berkeley: University of California, 1986.

O'Brien, Mary. The Politics of Reproduction. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Quennell, Peter. "The Later Period of D. H. Lawrence." Scrutinies. Comp. Edgell Rickword. London: Wishart, 1931. II, 124-37.

Rossman, Charles. "'You are the Call and I am the Answer': D. H. Lawrence and Women." D. H. Lawrence Review 8 (1975): 255-328.

_____. "D. H. Lawrence, Women, and Women in Love." Cahiers Victoriens & Edouardiens 8 (1979): 93-115.

Ruderman, Judith. D. H. Lawrence and the Devouring Mother: The Search for a Patriarchal Ideal of Leadership. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1984.

Ruthven, K. K. Feminist Literary Studies: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Salgado, Gamini. "Taking a Nail for a Walk: On Reading Women in Love." The Modern English Novel: The Reader, The Writer, and the Work. Edited by Gabriel Josipovici. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1976.

Showalter, Elaine. "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness." Critical Inquiry 8.2 (Winter 1981): 179-205.

Simpson, Hilary. D. H. Lawrence and Feminism. London: Croom Helm, 1982.

Smith, Anne, ed. Lawrence and Women. London: Vision, 1978.

Spilka, Mark. "Post-Leavis Lawrence Critics." Modern Language Quarterly 25 (1964), 212-17.

_____. "Lessing and Lawrence: The Battle of the Sexes." Contemporary Literature 16 (1975): 218-40.

Stanzel, F. K. A Theory of Narrative. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Stewart, Garrett. Death Sentences: Styles of Dying in British Fiction. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Wells, Susan. The Dialectics of Representation. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Wilding, Michael. Political Fictions. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.

Worthen, John. D. H. Lawrence and the Idea of the Novel. London: Macmillan, 1979.

Zoll, Allan R. "Vitalism and the Metaphysics of Love: D. H. Lawrence and Schopenhauer." D. H. Lawrence Review 11 (1978): 1-20.

Zytaruk, George J., and James T. Boulton, ed. The Letters of D. H. Lawrence, Vol. II: 1913-1916. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

VITA

Surname OLCHOWY Given Names JAMES RICHARD

Place of Birth Edmonton, Alberta Date of Birth April 26, 1963

Educational Institutions Attended, with Dates of Entering and Leaving

University of Alberta, Edmonton 1981 to 1985

University of Victoria, B C 1985 to 1986

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded, with Dates and Names of Institutions

B A (Honors) University of Alberta

Honors and Awards

- Maimie S Simpson Scholarship 1983-84
- Priscilla Hammond Scholarship in Honors English 1983-84
- University of Victoria Graduate Fellowship 1985-86

Publications

N/A

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Dissertation

D. H. Lawrence's The Rainbow and Women in Love:
A Study of Gender Roles and Values

Author [redacted]

(Signature)

JAMES R. OLCHOWY

August 19, 1986