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Critics continue to debate Lawrence's attitude toward women: Some say Lawrence is a misogynist, some say he is an egalitarian, and others say he is ambivalent toward women. If Lawrence's works are divided into two chronological periods, before and after 1918, these differences of opinions begin to dissolve. Lawrence is fair in his treatment of women in the earlier works; however, in his later works Lawrence restricts women to what he calls the sensual realm, the realm of feelings and emotions. In addition, Lawrence denounces all women who assert individuality and self-responsibility. In the later works, Lawrence's ideology restricts the role of women and presents male supremacy as the natural and necessary order for human existence.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: LAWRENCE AND CRITICAL DEBATE

Contemporary critics disagree concerning Lawrence's treatment of women in his works of fiction and nonfiction. Some critics argue that Lawrence is a misogynist, some say that he is ambivalent toward women, and still others say that he is an egalitarian. For instance, Kingsley Widmer, in The Art of Perversity, writes that Lawrence's work reflects a "mystical misogyny" which becomes more than a biographical problem (77):

Starting perhaps from the Victorian sentiment that a bad man is bad indeed, but a bad woman is worse, Lawrence repeatedly uses the female to dramatize the sicker forms of destruction. . . . The destructive women of Lawrence's fictions have invariably failed to submit to masculine destiny and order. . . . This male bigotry against women who are not submissive . . . should not be 'explained away.' (76-77)

Kate Millett in Sexual Politics also says that Lawrence is a misogynist:

Lawrence never uses the word female in the novel without prefacing it with the adjectives 'weird' or 'queer:' this is presumably done to persuade
the reader that woman is a dim prehistoric creature operating out of primeval impulse. (341)

While critics like Millet and Widmer say that Lawrence is a misogynist, Sheila MacLeod and Janice Harris say that Lawrence demonstrates an ambivalent attitude toward women. MacLeod, in *Lawrence's Men and Women*, writes that Lawrence communicates a paradoxical attitude toward women: "So often he shows uncannily intuitive insight into his female characters: as often his understanding comes to an abrupt halt, wiped out by a wave of apparent misogyny. . ." (5).

Harris, in an article titled "D. H. Lawrence and Kate Millett," also writes about Lawrence's ambivalence: "For every instance Millett finds of a Lawrentian heroine submitting, one can uncover ten of that same heroine struggling, doubting, fighting, winning--and with the blessing of the novelist" (524).

In disagreement with these first two groups of critics, a third group says that Lawrence is an egalitarian, that his works actually promote the liberation of women. Carol Dix, in *D. H. Lawrence and Women*, writes that Lawrence was working on the concept of woman as individual and self-responsible: "Far from degrading women, far from treating them as inferior objects, as Lawrence is accused of by Kate Millett, he saw more in women, and the feminine principle, than did most of his contemporaries" (x-xi). Harry T. Moore, in an article titled "Bert Lawrence and Lady Jane,"
says Kate Millett misses the point:

A married couple should be 'two single equal stars balanced in conjunction.' This condition is a difficult one to bring about, and since Lawrence is not a stickily popular author with contrived happy endings, he does not give us what is called a pat ending. (181)

In an attempt to resolve this ongoing debate, some critics divide Lawrence's works into two time periods: before and after 1920. In an article titled "The Fox and the 'Devouring Mother,'" Judith Ruderman writes: "In D. H. Lawrence's works after 1920 or so, a central concern is with the means of combating what Lawrence in Sea and Sardinia . . . calls 'the old, ghastly woman-spirit'" (262-63). In D. H. Lawrence and Feminism, Hilary Simpson agrees that Lawrence's attitude changed around 1920:

The change which the war brought about in Lawrence's ideas can be most dramatically illustrated by comparing his pre- and post-war theoretical writing on sexuality. In 1914 he still has strong affinities with the progressive, liberal, pro-feminist sex-psychologists such as Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis. . . . By the 1920s, Lawrence had become convinced that a feminist revolution had actually occurred, and had gone badly wrong. (17)
This thesis will also divide Lawrence's work into two time periods, but rather than using 1920 as the point of division, this thesis will use 1918. Lawrence, in his works before 1918, writes favorably of women and even takes a stand for suffrage. For example, in a letter to Sallie Hopkins dated 23 December 1912, Lawrence writes: "I shall do my work for women, better than the Suffrage" (Collected Letters 171). In another letter dated 7 July 1914, addressed to Mr. D--, Lawrence writes as one who holds women in high esteem:

You mustn't think that your desire or your fundamental need is to make a good career... It isn't. Your most vital necessity in this life is that you shall love your wife completely and implicitly and in entire nakedness of body and spirit. Then you will have peace and inner security... (Selected Letters 77)

By 1918, however, Lawrence's attitude toward women began to change, as did his views about relationships between men and women. In a letter to Katherine Mansfield dated 21 November 1918, Lawrence writes:

I do think a woman must yield some sort of precedence to a man, and he must take this precedence. I do think men must go ahead absolutely in front of their women, without turning round to ask permission or approval from
their women. Consequently, the women must follow as it were unquestioningly. I can't help it, I believe this. *(Selected Letters* 156)

Several years later, in his nonfiction book *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (1922), Lawrence not only asserts a belief in male precedence but becomes much more radical, even malevolent toward women. Here, Lawrence no longer writes as one who plans to work for suffrage. Nor does he sound like the same person who advised his friend to place love above all else. Instead, in *Fantasia* he says that love is a vice which leads to self-consciousness in our behavior, and he advises men and women to avoid it at all costs:

> We have a vice of love, of softness and sweetness and smarminess and intimacy and promiscuous kindness and all that sort of thing. . . . And it is on this promiscuous love and intimacy and kindness and sweetness, all a vice, that our self-consciousness really rests. If we are battered out of this, we shall be battered out of self-consciousness. *(217)*

As he continues this discussion on love, Lawrence manifests a malignant attitude toward women:

> And so, men, drive your wives, beat them out of their self-consciousness and their soft smarminess and good, lovely idea of themselves. Absolutely tear their lovely opinion of themselves
to tatters, and make them look a holy ridiculous sight in their own eyes. Wives, do the same to your husbands.

But fight for you life, men. Fight your wife out of her own self-conscious preoccupation with herself. Batter her out of it till she's stunned. Drive her back into her own true mode. Rip all her nice superimposed modern-woman and wonderful-creature garb off her. Reduce her once more to a naked Eve, and send the apple flying. (217-18)

It is true that Lawrence briefly addresses women in this passage, but this scant interruption is fenced in by Lawrence's advice to the man. He continues: "Make her yield to her own real unconscious self, and absolutely stamp on the self that she's got in her head" (218).

When passages such as these last ones are juxtaposed with some of Lawrence's earlier work, it appears that Lawrence contradicts himself, that he is ambivalent toward women. But when Lawrence's work is divided into two time periods, the ambivalence and the apparent contradictions dissolve. Lawrence is consistent in his treatment of women in each of the two time periods. Based on his treatment of women in a work such as The Rainbow, published in 1915, it is possible to say that Lawrence is an egalitarian. In Lawrence's later fiction, however, in a work such as Aaron's Rod, published in 1922, or in The Plumed Serpent, published
in 1926, the focus is clearly on male dominance and female subordination. Simpson, in the introduction to *D. H. Lawrence and Feminism*, speculates on the reason for the change in Lawrence's attitude toward women:

He (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. (17)

Lawrence, to restore the balance between men and women, openly declares that men must control their women and that women must willingly and completely yield to male dominance. This, to Lawrence, is the natural order because women are, by their very nature, exclusively passive and dependent. Toward the end of *The Plumed Serpent*, Lawrence demonstrates this through Kate Leslie. As Kate silently watches Cipriano, her future husband, she describes him as assertive and all-powerful and herself as passive and dependent:

As he sat in silence, casting the old . . . Pan-power over her, she felt herself submitting, succumbing. He was once more the old dominant male, shadowy, intangible, looking suddenly tall, and covering the sky, making a darkness that was himself and nothing but himself, the Pan male.
And she was swooned prone beneath, perfect in her proneness. . . . She could conceive now her marriage with Cipriano; the supreme passivity, like the earth below the twilight, consummate in living lifelessness, the sheer solid mystery of passivity. (341-42)

In the last chapter of Aaron's Rod Lawrence also writes about male dominance and female subordination: "The woman must now submit--but deeply, deeply, and richly! . . . And men must submit to the greater soul in man, for their guidance: and women must submit to the positive power-soul in man, for their being" (288-89). In Fantasia, published in the same year with Aaron's Rod, Lawrence writes about the harmony that results when men and women understand and yield to their respective roles:

Ah, how good it is to come home to your wife when she believes in you and submits to your purpose that is beyond her. . . . And you feel an unfathomable gratitude to the woman who loves you and believes in your purpose and receives you into the magnificent dark gratification of her embrace. (219)

While Lawrence, in the later works, depicts the passive woman as desirable, he depicts the assertive or modern woman as willful and perverted. In Fantasia (1922) he writes:
The great flow of female consciousness is downwards, down to the weight of the loins and round the circuit of the feet. Pervert this, and make a false flow upwards, to the breast and head, and you get a race of 'intelligent' women, delightful companions, tricky courtesans, clever prostitutes. . . . But then, after a while, pop it all goes. The moment woman has got man's ideals and tricks drilled into her, the moment she is competent in the manly world--there's an end of it. She's had enough. . . . She becomes absolutely perverse, and her one end is to prostitute herself and her ideals to sex.

(215-16)

Quotations such as these make it difficult to defend the later works. Lawrence's fiction and non-fiction after 1918 indicate that he dislikes and distrusts modern women, depicting them as shrewish, destructive, and out of control. In addition, Lawrence in the later works does not allow for a medium between the extremely passive woman and the aggressive, modern woman. All heroines in Lawrence's later fiction yield completely to male leadership. The female protagonists are those who do not yield--those who attempt to develop a sense of individuality and independence.

One might wonder how critics continue to defend these later works when Lawrence directs so many abusive, offensive
statements toward women. Some critics, in order to dismiss the chauvinistic statements from Lawrence's nonfiction, insist that the nonfiction is unrelated to the fiction. In the introduction to Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious, Philip Rieff explains why some readers ignore Lawrence's nonfiction: "Friendly readers generally assume still that the artist in Lawrence can be distinguished from the prophet, that his fiction can be properly enjoyed without the pathos of learning from it. . ." (viii).

This approach is certainly valid if the artist does in fact stand apart from the prophet, if the fiction can be explicated without an understanding of the writer's philosophy or ideology. However, in Lawrence's case the ideology is central to many of his stories, and this ideology is clearly outlined in the nonfiction. Consequently, these nonfiction works should not be dismissed as unrelated. Even Lawrence would agree that the fiction and nonfiction are interrelated. In the forward to Fantasia Lawrence writes:

This pseudo-philosophy of mine--'pollyanalytics,' as one of my respected critics might say--is deduced from the novels and poems, not the reverse. The novels and poems come unwatched out of one's pen. And then the absolute need which one has for some sort of satisfactory mental attitude towards oneself and things in general
makes one try to abstract some definite conclusions from one's experiences as a writer and as a man. The novels and poems are pure passionate experience. These 'pollyanalytics' are inferences made afterwards, from the experience. (57)

In other words, in **Fantasia** Lawrence made a study of his own ideology, a study similar to the ones he made of Hardy, Poe, Hawthorne, Melville, and others. So when questions surface concerning Lawrence's fiction, and these questions cannot be easily answered, turning to the nonfiction is the next logical step in order to better understand Lawrence's ideology.

While some of Lawrence's defenders try to separate the artist from the prophet, another group of defenders ignore only Lawrence's later nonfiction. Carol Dix, for example, interprets and praises Lawrence's later novels such as *The Plumed Serpent*, *Aaron's Rod*, and *Lady Chatterly's Lover*, basing the interpretations on Lawrence's earlier study of Thomas Hardy, written in 1914. Dix writes that Lawrence, in his "Study of Thomas Hardy," explores his ideas, "as theory, most fully and most comprehensibly" (54), but Dix discredits *Fantasia*, published eight years later, as "too bitty and rambling" (54).

It is true that some of Lawrence's later works digress at times; however, they are intelligible, and they do
unravel some of the subconscious messages in Lawrence's fiction. In an article titled "Sexual and Psychological Symbolism," Robert H. MacDonald writes about the parallels between Lawrence's fiction and nonfiction:

It is extremely difficult to argue with any confidence either that the fiction led to the theory, or that the theory led to the fiction, when it is clear that the same ideas, and even the same metaphors, appear and evolve in each kind of writing over the years. To Lawrence, both fiction and the essay were creative forms, and there is no evidence to suggest that he cleared his mind of one before going on to the other. The essays are a working out, in theoretical terms, of a sexual and psychological system that is 'felt' in the fiction. In the essays Lawrence's ideas and his symbolism is [sic] often clearer than in the novels and the poems, and thus the essays can be used to explain and clarify meaning. (141-42)

This idea that Lawrence's fiction and nonfiction overlap can be demonstrated by juxtaposing passages from Lawrence's later fiction and nonfiction. The parallels then become self-evident.

In the following chapters, I will analyze some of Lawrence's work published after 1918. In these later works, Lawrence focuses closely on the male-female relationship,
insisting that men and women need one another. Although he reveals dissonance in all male-female relationships, he does not recommend autonomy. In an essay titled "We Need One Another," published in May 1930, Lawrence writes about the importance of male-female relationships:

There is hardly a man living who can exist at all cheerfully without a relationship to some particular woman. . . . There is hardly a woman on earth who can live cheerfully without some intimate relationship to a man. . . .

(188)

In addition to maintaining that men and women need one another, Lawrence also says that all male-female relationships are, by nature, dual. Toward the end of the same essay, "We Need One Another," he writes: "And the relation of man to woman is wide as all life. It consists in infinite different flows between the two beings, different, even apparently contrary" (193). Lawrence repeatedly insists in his later works that all men are exclusively rational, active beings, while all women are exclusively emotional, passive beings. Men and women can occasionally reverse their roles, he says, but this is both unnatural and perverse: "You don't find the sun and moon playing at pals in the sky. Their beams cross the great gulf which is between them. So with man and woman" (Fantasia 216).
Throughout his later works, Lawrence proclaims that men and women are in absolute opposition to one another. He also maintains that if men and women are to coexist in harmony, a balance must be established. To accomplish this balance, Lawrence says that men and women must understand and completely adhere to their preordained, opposing poles. In chapter two of this thesis, to demonstrate Lawrence's concern with duality and balance and to define it further, I will explicate "The Horse Dealer's Daughter" (1922), The Fox (1921), and "You Touched Me" (1920), juxtaposing these stories with some of Lawrence's nonfiction works written after 1918. I will show how these three stories are held together by a common subtext: Men and women need one another, but in order to have a balanced, working relationship, men and women must adhere completely to their respective dominant and subordinate roles.

In chapter three I will explicate "Tickets, Please" (1919), "Monkey Nuts" (1922), and "Wintry Peacock" (1921). These three stories also demonstrate Lawrence's concern with duality; however, these stories end with imbalance rather than balance. In each story both the males and females are operating outside of what Lawrence defines as their natural realms, and the results, according to Lawrence, are predictable: Only chaos and unhappiness can result when men and women step outside of their opposing realms.
After explicating stories that demonstrate the male-female duality, I will next consider the source of this duality. In chapter four, I will examine Aaron's Rod and The Plumed Serpent, juxtaposing passages with Fantasia and other nonfiction works. In these works, Lawrence presents love and power as the two principal human urges, the motivating forces behind all male-female duality. In Aaron's Rod, The Plumed Serpent, and Fantasia, Lawrence associates the female with the love-urge and the male with the power-urge and expresses a need to subordinate the love-urge to the power-urge. When these works are studied simultaneously, Lawrence's ideology becomes clear. It also becomes evident that even though Fantasia seems to ramble at times, this work is vital to an understanding of Lawrence.

After examining the fiction and nonfiction from this later period, I find it impossible to categorize Lawrence either as an egalitarian or as one who is ambivalent toward women. In his works before 1918, he may promote egalitarianism, but after 1918 he negates this position. In the later works, Lawrence carries male supremacy to its farthest extreme: Woman must not only capitulate to male authority, but each woman must surrender her individuality, her very being to the man. In addition, the man decides to whom she will surrender. Women are capable of initiating in love, but men make all final decisions.
Because critics today still defend Lawrence's treatment of women in the later works, this thesis will concentrate on these later works and point to some of the problems with the defenses; because critics are in agreement concerning Lawrence's treatment of women in the earlier period, this thesis will make only occasional references to the earlier writings. By dividing Lawrence's works into two periods and by focusing on his later fiction and non-fiction, this thesis will reveal Lawrence's harsh, sadistic treatment of women in his works after 1918.
In some of Lawrence's later works, he writes about the individuality and separateness of man and woman. For example, in an essay titled "Love," first published in 1918, he writes: "I will gather myself complete and free from the beloved, she shall single herself out in utter contradiction to me. . . . They must be two complete in opposition, neither one partaking of the other, but each single in its own stead" (153). One could argue that when Lawrence writes a passage such as this one, he is advocating egalitarianism. However, a close examination of this and other works reveals that the stress is on the word duality rather than equality. Later in the same essay Lawrence writes: "But the love between a man and a woman, when it is whole, is dual" (154).

In Fantasia Lawrence also focuses on duality, defining the differences between men and women. He says that a woman's talent, her true potential, is in the sympathetic or emotional realm while a man's potential exists in the intellectual or rational realm:

If the man, as thinker and doer, is active, or positive, and the woman is negative, then, on the other hand, as the initiator of emotion, of
feeling, and of sympathetic understanding the woman is positive, the man negative. The man may be the initiator in action, but the woman is the initiator in emotion. The man has the initiative as far as voluntary activity goes, and the woman the initiative as far as sympathetic activity goes. (Fantasia 132-33)

In addition to defining male-female polarity, Lawrence also adds that men and women must not stray from their respective poles. "The great thing is to keep the sexes pure. And by pure . . . we mean pure maleness in man, pure femaleness in a woman" (Fantasia 215).

According to Lawrence, the two realms, the emotional realm of the female and the rational realm of the male, are mutually exclusive. The two may be equal in their importance, but this should never be confused with equality between the sexes. Each sex belongs to a single, opposite pole. In an essay titled "Give Her A Pattern," published in 1930, Lawrence expands on this idea of polarity:

Women are not fools. They have their own logic, even if it's not the masculine sort. Women have the logic of emotion, men have the logic of reason. The two are complementary and mostly in opposition. But the woman's logic of emotion is no less real and inexorable than the man's logic of reason. It only works differently. (22)
In *Fantasia* Lawrence writes something similar: "Woman will never understand the depth of the spirit of purpose in man, his deeper spirit. And man will never understand the sacredness of feeling to woman. Each will play at the other’s game, but they will remain apart" (138).

Lawrence illustrates in his fiction and states in his nonfiction that men and women will occasionally cross over into the opposite realm. However, he says this is both unnatural and destructive. If males become sympathetic or if females become intellectual, then each must realize that the change is incongruous and return to their natural realm in order to achieve balance. In his essay titled "Morality and the Novel" Lawrence writes: "The only morality is to have man true to his manhood, woman to her womanhood. . . " (531).

In addition to understanding Lawrence's duality, one must also understand the implications of this duality. If it were true that women are exclusively emotional and men are exclusively rational, then it would also follow that male dominance is the natural and necessary order. The rational being must have control over the emotional being. In a world, in a community, or even in a household, if the emotional person dominates, the result will be chaos and imbalance. So anyone who accepts the premises that men are exclusively rational and women are exclusively emotional must also accept male supremacy.
In D. H. Lawrence and Feminism, Hilary Simpson writes: "In his later work . . . Lawrence adopts completely new definitions of 'masculinity' and 'femininity' and proposes a rigid and deterministic sexual hierarchy" (17). Lawrence demonstrates this hierarchy in the following stories: "The Horse Dealer's Daughter," The Fox, and "You Touched Me." Each of the main characters in these three stories is operating in some way outside of his or her prescribed realm, and Lawrence guides each of these lost souls back into their correct or natural realm. Lawrence first presents the imbalance; then he corrects it, bringing the couple back into balance, the Lawrentian balance, for better or for worse.

"The Horse Dealer's Daughter"

"The Horse Dealer's Daughter" provides a clear example of the sexual hierarchy that Lawrence outlines in his later nonfiction, especially in Fantasia; however, critics such as F. R. Leavis and Clyde Ryals interpret this story differently. Leavis calls "The Horse Dealer's Daughter" a love story, "... a story of the triumph of love and of life" (313). Ryals says this story is a clear presentation of Jung's rebirth archetype. "The reader," Ryals writes, "... becomes aware of the symbolic nature of the story, and ultimately, it is to the symbolism--of psychic death and rebirth through love--that he responds" (39).
Although these two interpretations are plausible and clearly supported, each one leaves unanswered questions. For example, why does Doctor Ferguson vacillate between love and fear if this is a story about the triumph of love? Why is the change in Mabel a negative change; why is she so strained and doubtful in the end, if this is a story of rebirth? Juxtaposing scenes from "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter" and passages from Lawrence’s nonfiction book Fantasia will provide answers to these questions. Both works are filled with parallel imagery of light, darkness, death, and rebirth. Both works address power, seduction, dominance, and dependence. Both works were published in the same year, 1922. Juxtaposing "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter" with Fantasia makes it clear that "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter" is a story of rebirth; however, rather than a rebirth to love or life, it looks as though the rebirth represents an awakening to sensual love, and most importantly, an awakening to the male-female duality as outlined by Lawrence in Fantasia.

On the surface, one can see why Leavis considers this story to be about the triumph of love and life. In the beginning Mabel is totally isolated. The only contact she has is with her three self-centered, abusive brothers, who have been talking at her and around her for so long that she doesn’t even listen to them anymore (844). Doctor Ferguson, like Mabel, is also quite isolated. His only friends are
Mabel's brothers, and they are leaving town for good within a few days (849). By the time Ferguson rescues Mabel from the murky waters and brings her back to life, it is clear that these two friendless people need one another. Because the last third of the story focuses on their mutual need, one can see how Leavis supports his interpretation. However, when the subtext is brought into clear view, one can also see the sexual hierarchy that Lawrence is prescribing in this story, the hierarchy placing the male in the active, dominant role and the female in the passive, emotional role.

In *Fantasia* Lawrence defines the role of the male and the female in love and life, and he says these roles are instinctual. "Every single cell in every male child is male, and every cell in every female child is female. . . . Now in what we call the 'natural' mode, man has his positivity in the volitional centres, and women in the sympathetic" (*Fantasia* 131-32). Men are the doers and thinkers, Lawrence writes, while women are passive and emotional. Love is the only area where women act as initiators. Lawrence says that in love the woman is the one who initiates and the man the one who answers. "In love, it is the woman naturally who loves, the man who is loved. In love, woman is the positive, man is the negative. It is woman who asks, in love, and man who answers" (*Fantasia* 133). In this sense, the story parallels *Fantasia*. As soon
as Mabel learns that the doctor had undressed her, she asks him if he loves her. She initiates, and he answers.

Apart from love, Lawrence says that the male initiates and the woman lives up to what he initiates. "In knowing and in doing, man is positive and woman negative: man initiates, and woman lives up to it" (Fantasia 133). It is the doctor who saves Mabel's life. Mabel does not choose to save her own life. In fact, the reader knows that her choice was to commit suicide. So, in life, the doctor initiates by rescuing Mabel, and Mabel must live up to it. Again, this story parallels Fantasia as the doctor operates in the active, dominant realm as the initiator of life.

Leavis briefly mentions that Mabel functions independently of her brothers; he also says that she lacks the pathos of feminine charm or helplessness. He says this lack of pathos increases the story's remoteness and intensity. "She is sullen, impassive, and, one would judge, well able to take care of herself" (Leavis 312). Mabel may lack pathos before her attempted suicide, but Levis does not explain why Mabel becomes both emotional and dependent after the rescue and what this change might suggest.

In the beginning Mabel holds the key to her own situation; however, after the doctor saves her life, both feminine charm and helplessness become apparent in Mabel as she begins to center all of her hope and energy around being loved by the doctor. As Ferguson hesitates to declare his
love, her eyes become wide with fear and doubt. In the last paragraph when the doctor tells Mabel he wants her, he uses "that terrible intonation which frightened her almost more than her horror lest he should not want her" (856). Mabel's hope of survival is now contingent upon the doctor's love for her, placing her in a passive, emotional role.

While Mabel is awakened to her feminine role, both Mabel and the doctor are awakened to sensual love; however, this must not be confused with ideal love. At no point in the story does Mabel say that she loves the doctor. It is true that she is concerned about the doctor's love for her, but the scene after the rescue is anything but a sweet and tender love story. Instead, this scene evokes images of passion and seduction. Mabel shuffles forward on her knees, pressing her breasts against his thighs, drawing him to her face. (At this point it is important to consider where Mabel is pressing her face.) Next, Mabel looks up at him "triumphant in first possession . . . triumphant and confident" (853). The words "triumphant" and "possession" are more appropriately used in conjunction with sensual love rather than ideal or spiritual love. In other words, this scene describes the kind of feminine charm associated with seduction, or sensual love, and the detail in the story will not support Leavis's romantic interpretation.

In agreement with Leavis, Ryals also says this story represents an awakening to love: "Realizing that she
[Mabel] has been saved by Ferguson, an act which she recognizes as love, she looks at him 'with flaring, humble eyes of transfiguration, triumphant in first possession. . .'." (41). If this is an awakening to love, why does Mabel never say she loves the doctor? And why does the doctor's love seem more like a sincere case of lust? Until he undresses her and touches her "bare, animal shoulders," he has no single personal thought of her (853).

Lawrence explains in Fantasia that sensual love is the only valid form of love. He says it is time to drop the word love and the ideal of love: "Every frenzied individual is told to find fulfilment in love. So he tries. Whereas, there is no fulfilment in love. Half of our fulfilment comes through love, through strong, sensual love" (155-56). If Lawrence believes that sensual love is the only valid form of love, then it would follow that the story awakens Mabel and the doctor to sensual love.

Although both characters are awakened to sensual love, the doctor is uncomfortable with his new awareness. Doctor Ferguson is ambivalent toward Mabel from the moment of his awakening through the end of the story. When Mabel begins kissing his "knees," the narrator says Ferguson revolted violently, but at the same time he did not have the power to break away. "He had a horror of yielding to her. Yet something in him ached also" (853). In Fantasia Lawrence writes about the initial stage of physical attraction, which
explains why Ferguson does not have the power to break away: "From the powerful dynamic centre the female sends out her dark summons, the intense dark vibration of sex. . . . The male enters the magnetic field of the female. He vibrates helplessly in response" (Fantasia 213). Throughout the story, Lawrence describes the "heavy power" (849) in Mabel's eyes and equates this to a powerful drug. The doctor is described as powerless in response to her, yet at the same time he does try to resist her. "It was horrible to have her there embracing his knees. It was horrible. He revolted from it violently. And yet--and yet--he had not the power to break away" (853).

Ryals says that the doctor vacillates because he did not voluntarily enter the pond. Mabel, on the other hand, accepts the rebirth, Ryals says, because she views the doctor's rescue as an act of love (41). However, this explanation is problematic because the doctor did in fact enter the pond voluntarily, just as Mabel did. No one forced him to rescue Mabel.

One way to explain the doctor's ambivalence is to look at Lawrence's references to love in Fantasia. Lawrence says that ideal love is something to be feared. He warns husbands not to love their wives. Instead, say quietly, "My soul is my own. It shall not be violated" (Fantasia 177). If the wife insists on love, Lawrence says, tell her she cannot have yours. "If your wife should torture you
every day with her love—will . . . never give in, but be alone . . . in the stillness and sweet possession of your own soul" (Fantasia 178). Each time Mabel insists on love, Ferguson is uncomfortable. Finally, in the end, he begins using the word "want" instead of "love." He says, "No, I want you, I want you," using that "terrible intonation" (856). The word "want" is much more compatible with the concept of sensual love, which Lawrence advocates.

In Fantasia Lawrence equates women with darkness, the moon, the lower plane, the sensual realm, and he equates men with the sun, the upper plane, the spiritual realm (Fantasia 218-19). He also warns the reader that there must be a balance between the sexes. Only at dusk can man allow himself to be pulled downward into the sensual realm. "Woman for him exists only in the twilight, by the campfire, when the day has departed" (Fantasia 143-44). This scene of passion between the doctor and Mabel takes place at twilight, by the fire, and she draws him down to her. "Her hands were drawing him, drawing him down to her. He was afraid, even a little horrified" (853).

In opposition to darkness, Lawrence says light is symbolic of the rational, creative realm of the male (Fantasia 215). Lawrence also says that the light, masculine realm will be in conflict with the dark, feminine realm, and the male must never make woman the center of his life or he falls into despair: "You have got to keep your
sexual fulfilment even then subordinate, just subordinate to the great passion of purpose" (Fantasia 145). At the end of this story, after the doctor adds coal to the fire and lights the gas, he thinks of his work. The light seems to distract him from the sensual realm and remind him that he must go back to the surgery.

Because Lawrence believed that men belong to the light, rational realm and women belong to the dark, sensual realm, it follows that the awakening in this story should result in something other than the ideal of love. After the rebirth scene, Mabel is less active and becomes dependent and emotional. This change does not reflect feelings of love but rather her new feelings of dependence. The rebirth incident in this story also draws attention to the male-female duality and the resulting power struggle between the male and female. The narrator demonstrates that Mabel is so powerless in the male world surrounding her that she cannot even take her own life. Instead, she spends the last third of the story groveling on her knees. Her last words: "I feel awful. I feel I'm horrible to you" (856). Clearly, these are not the words one would expect to hear from a rejuvenated soul, a woman who is supposed to live happily ever after.

In a patriarchal society, which Lawrence clearly advocates, a woman's goal is to marry and serve the male. Mabel, after her rebirth, has a sense of purpose, and
because of the doctor’s proposal, she now has an acceptable vocation. But this change in Mabel should not be confused with love. In fact, the title itself suggests something other than love. First written in 1916, this story was originally titled "The Miracle." Lawrence made substantial changes to the text itself, and he changed the title before publishing it in *England, My England* in 1922. The new title, "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter," suggests a lack of identity in the female. Lawrence uses the possessive case which strongly associates Mabel with chattel. If Lawrence had intended for this to be an awakening to ideal love, then the original title would have been much more appropriate.

If "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter" is viewed as an awakening to sensual love and to the male-female duality, then it becomes clear that rebirth means something different to the female than to the male. This view also explains the change in Mabel from "brutally proud" (848) in the beginning to frightened and doubtful in the end. Mabel’s awakening to her passive, emotional role is a negative experience while the doctor’s awakening is a positive one.

Although the doctor’s awakening is positive, he does have one struggle to contend with. He must, according to Lawrence, keep his sensual desire "subordinate to the great passion of purpose" (*Fantasia* 145). Before the rebirth experience, the doctor is unawakened to sex. He focuses almost entirely on his work. After the doctor is awakened
to sex, he becomes aware of the struggle between sex and his creative motive. He desires Mabel but at the same time understands that the surgery must come first. He understands that he must balance the two motives.

Because "The Horse Dealer's Daughter" was published in the same year with Fantasia, and because much of the symbolism in this story so clearly parallels the symbolism in Fantasia, it looks as though this story is an allegory representing an awakening to the Lawrentian balance as it is outlined in Fantasia. The female in this story is awakened to the dark, passive, sensual realm while the male becomes aware of the light, active, creative realm. In addition, the doctor is awakened to the struggle between the creative and the sensual realms.

Although readers should be able to enjoy literature independently of the author's intentions, this story raises questions which can be answered best by examining the ideology in Fantasia. Why does the doctor vacillate between love and fear? Why is Mabel so strained and doubtful in the end? Why does Mabel never say she loves the doctor? In the beginning of the story both the doctor and Mabel are functioning outside of their natural or prescribed realms. And Lawrence awakens both characters to the sexual hierarchy, the Lawrentian balance. This balance that Lawrence prescribes can also be viewed as a most extreme case of male supremacy. In both Fantasia and "The Horse
Dealer’s Daughter," Lawrence restricts the woman to the realm of darkness and passivity, while allowing the man exclusive rights to the realm of light and activity. In these two works, Lawrence presents male dominion as the natural and necessary order for human existence.
The Fox

Like "The Horse Dealer's Daughter," The Fox, a short novel published in 1921, also demonstrates an awakening to sensual love and to the Lawrentian balance. Character and setting may be different in these two stories, but the underlying message is the same: Men and women need one another, but in order to have a balanced, workable relationship, neither person in the relationship can step outside of his or her prescribed realm. In addition to demonstrating this message, Lawrence also demonstrates--through March and Banford--why he believes women cannot function effectively in the active, dominant realm.

As Lawrence states over and over in his nonfiction, women are by nature passive, emotional beings. March and Banford are prime examples of this as they rely exclusively on what Lawrence calls the logic of emotion. In the beginning of The Fox, March and Banford are living together and running their own farm without any outside help. However, they are unsuccessful, and the farm will likely fail because of their incompetence. The reason for March's and Banford's incompetence is not that they lack skills or training but that they cannot function effectively in the active, masculine realm.

In his nonfiction, Lawrence says that women belong exclusively to the sensual realm of feeling and emotion,
while men belong to the spiritual realm. Man alone is the "thinker and doer" (Fantasia 132).

Women can never feel or know as men do. . . . And women, when they speak and write, utter not one single word that men have not taught them. . . . The whole mode, the whole everything is really different in man and woman. (Fantasia 137-38)

Because March and Banford are female, they can only imitate on a superficial level the dominant role of the male. To prove this point, Lawrence shows the women making one irrational decision after another, managing the farm in a clumsy, ineffectual manner. For example, they have two heifers, one of which is free-spirited and will not stay in the fence. "No matter how March made up the fences, the heifer was out, wild in the woods . . . and March and Banford were away, flying after her, with more haste than success" (113). Exasperated, the two women decide to sell this heifer, along with the other heifer that was expecting a calf. Not only does the sale of these heifers reveal the women's incompetence, but the sale of the second heifer draws attention to the irrational, emotional behavior of the two women. They are both terrified of the upcoming birth of the calf. They are terrified of reproduction, the very thing that a successful farm is dependent upon. "The girls, afraid of the coming event, sold her (the heifer) in a
panic, and limited their attentions to fowls and ducks" (113).

The sale of the two heifers does not improve the overall situation, however. The women are just as unsuccessful with the fowls as with the heifers. "The girls were disgusted at their (the fowls) tendency to strange illnesses, at their exacting way of life, and at their refusal, obstinate refusal to lay eggs" (114). This peculiar behavior of the fowls draws attention to the inability of March and Banford to manage the fowls, the animals with the lowest intelligence of all those on the farm, the animals which cannot present any serious physical challenge to them. In fact, it might even be fair to say that the fowls turn out to be more assertive than the two women. "The fowls obstinately refused to go to bed. . . . Now they cheerfully walked around, without so much as glancing at the barn, until ten o'clock or later" (114-15).

These eccentric, uncooperative fowls, and the women's incompetence at farming, are of course not the only problems here. The underlying and most serious problem is that March and Banford are women. They cannot function in the active, rational realm, according to Lawrence; hence, they lack the reason and motivation necessary for success. For example, the farm is nearing collapse. March and Banford understand this but refuse to allow farming to interfere with their free time. "Both Banford and March disbelieved in living
for work alone. They wanted to read or take a cycle-ride in the evening, or perhaps March wished to paint curvilinear swans on porcelain, with green background. . ." (115). These women want the farm to succeed, and they do understand that a farm requires hard work, that it will fail without their dedication, yet they lack motivation, the necessary ingredient for success. "If you're going to do farming" March said, "you must be at it from morning till night, and you might as well be a beast yourself" (124). Banford agrees with this comment and adds: "We want some of our time for ourselves" (124). The youth who is listening to this farcical conversation reacts as one would expect: "The youth threw himself back on the sofa, his face tight with laughter, and laughed silently but thoroughly" (124).

In addition to exemplifying the passive, emotional natures of the women, Lawrence also brings the issue of procreation into the foreground to demonstrate that a woman's place is in the male-dominated home. Lawrence shows this through the fowls and their refusal to reproduce. This idea that the fowls might choose or "obstinately refuse" to lay eggs suggests that the fowls have a will, an absurd idea which hints at something more than the professional failure of the two women. It seems as though Lawrence is suggesting that it is ludicrous to choose not to procreate, as March and Banford have done. Lawrence states this idea clearly in an essay titled "Making Love to Music" (1936):
What is the lame and smothered dream of the lady? Whatever it is, she will never know: not till somebody has told it her, and then gradually, and after a great deal of spiteful repudiation, she will recognize it, and it will pass into her womb. (164)

In an essay titled "Cocksure Women and Hensure Men," which was published in 1929, Lawrence uses fowl imagery to make his point that a woman's place is in the nest, or home. In this essay Lawrence says that once a hen lays her egg, she "steps forth again with prancing confidence and gives that most assured of all sounds, the hensure cackle of a bird who has laid her egg" (50). But, Lawrence says, if a woman tries to be "cocksure" instead of "hensure," she will ultimately be unhappy:

It is the tragedy of the modern woman. She becomes cocksure, she puts all her passion and energy and years of her life into some effort or assertion without ever listening for the denial which she ought to take into account. She is cocksure, but she is a hen all the time. . . . Suddenly, because she is a hen and not a cock, all she has done will turn into pure nothingness to her. . . . The hensureness which is the real bliss of every female, has been denied her; she has never had it. Having lived her life with
such utmost strenuousness and cocksureness, she has missed her life altogether. Nothingness! (50)

In this essay Lawrence describes women who attempt to function outside of the nest as aggressive and shrewish, and also as unfulfilled and unhappy. Through March, Lawrence echoes this description of the modern, unfulfilled woman. March, who is by nature an emotional, passive female, tries to operate almost completely outside of the female realm. In the beginning of The Fox March is described as "the man about the place" (113). She is also described as odd and absent. "Her eyes were . . . strange, startled, shy and sardonic at once. Her mouth, too, was almost pinched as if in pain and irony. There was something odd and unexplained about her" (114). Later she is described as partly "shy and virgin," and partly "grim, matter-of-fact, shrewish" (149).

Toward the end of The Fox Lawrence writes that March had been seeking some vague, unrealistic goal that was beyond her. "And she was left with nothingness at last" (176). This quotation closely parrots Lawrence's essay "Cocks sure Women," as does the following quotation from The Fox in which Lawrence writes:

Poor March, she had set off so wonderfully towards the blue goal. And the farther and farther she had gone, the more fearful had become the realisation of emptiness. An agony, an insanity at last. (178)
March, who is cocksure in the beginning, becomes unsure by the end of the story. Grenfel enters the story and his presence exposes March to her own incompetence. In an article titled "The New Adam and Eve," Judith Ruderman writes that Henry Grenfel enters the story to assert male power and reveal the inadequacy of the women:

The Fox, with its struggling farm girls, shows clearly how World War I caused profound changes in the male-female relationship as men went off to battle and left women no choice but to take on new responsibilities at the home front. But Grenfel and the men he represents have returned now from war, ready to resume their manly duties. (229)

When Grenfel appears on the scene, a new battle begins, the battle for dominance. After several days on the farm, Grenfel decides he will marry March. "Why not?" he thought to himself. "What if she was older than he? It didn't matter. When he thought of her dark, startled, vulnerable eyes he smiled subtly to himself. He was older than she, really. He was master of her" (130). Although Grenfel is confident, he understands that he must be cautious in approaching March.

It's no good walking out into the forest and saying to the deer: 'Please fall to my gun.' No, it is a slow, subtle battle. . . . It is a subtle, profound battle of wills which takes place
in the invisible. . . . It is your own will which carries the bullet into the heart of your quarry. . . . (130-31)

Lawrence also writes about this battle of the wills in *Fantasia* as he warns men against the modern woman:

> Combat her in her sexual pertinacity, and in her secret glory or arrogance in the sexual goal. Combat her in her cock-sure belief that she 'knows' and that she is 'right.' Take it all out of her. Make her yield once more to the male leadership. (218)

In an article published in *Studies in Classic American Literature*, first published in 1923, Lawrence echoes this idea in the chapter on Nathaniel Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter*. In this essay, Lawrence regularly departs from his explication and addresses the reader directly, usually the male reader:

> You've got to believe in yourself and your gods, your Holy Ghost, Sir Man; and then you've got to fight her, and never give in. She's a devil. But in the long run she is conquerable. And just a tiny bit of her wants to be conquered. You've got to fight three-quarters of her, in absolute hell, to get at the final quarter of her that wants a release. . . . (100-1)
After examining *The Fox*, along with some of Lawrence's later non-fiction, one can see that Grenfel's role is to bring these two women into subjection. And this Grenfel accomplishes by willing the death of Banford in order to overcome March. "In his heart he had decided her (Banford's) death... And his heart held perfectly still, in the terrible pure will that she should not move" (173). Banford does not move, and the tree that Grenfel chops down falls on Banford, killing her. March then looks at Grenfel with tears in her eyes, and with a "senseless look of helplessness and submission... She would never leave him again. He had won her" (175).

March and Grenfel marry only months later, but when Grenfel sees that March is unhappy, he ponders a solution:

He would never have it till she (March) yielded and slept in him. Then he would have all his own life as a young man and a male, and she would have all her own life as a woman and a female. There would be no more of this awful straining. She would not be a man any more, an independent woman with a man's responsibility. Nay, even the responsibility for her own soul she would have to commit to him. He knew it was so, and obstinately held out against her, waiting for the surrender. (179)
In this passage, maleness is equated with independence and responsibility, while femaleness is equated with passive behavior, with sleeping. Toward the end, March puts up one last, but futile, fight against submission:

And she was so tired, so tired, like a child that wants to go to sleep, but which fights against sleep as if sleep were death. . . . She would keep awake. She would know. . . . She would be an independent woman to the last. But she was so tired, so tired of everything. And sleep seemed near. (178)

F.R. Leavis, in his book titled *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist*, interprets *The Fox* as a study of youthful love. Although this is not an ordinary love story, Leavis says, it should nevertheless be considered a study of love. "It is a study of human mating; of the attraction between a man and a woman that expresses the profound needs of each and has its meaning in a permanent union" (326). The first problem with Leavis’s interpretation concerns the story’s focus. Lawrence directs very little attention to courtship and to the subject of love. What little attention is directed to courtship and love is focused on sensuality; however, most of the attention concentrates on the battle of the wills, on the aggressive, willful intentions of Grenfel, and on the defeat of the independent spirit in March. Leavis, however,
does not see this as a battle of the wills, and to explain Grenfel' s intentions, he writes:

The form in which the idea of marriage comes to him reveals, not any mercenary bent, but the profound seriousness with which, implicitly, he thinks of March as a mate. The naive natural wisdom that, for all his youth, he represents in comparison with the girls, has come out in his first evening' s talk with them. (327)

This "natural wisdom," according to Leavis, is what March lacks, and her submission is the natural and correct response: "All Henry' s conviction and grasp of his purpose are needed to rescue March--for that is what it amounts to: she is incapable of decision. She assents under his compulsion when she is with him and relapses when she is with Banford. . . ." (Leavis 330). Leavis is in agreement here with Lawrence concerning March' s helpless nature and her need to submit. In The Fox Lawrence writes: "She looked up at him with tears running from her eyes, a senseless look of helplessness and submission. So she gazed on him as if sightless, yet looking up to him" (175). In addition to sanctioning March' s need to submit, Leavis also says that the death of Banford was necessary, and the strain that March suffers in the end is to be expected:

The difficulty of adjustment is what the tale ends on: 'she still felt she ought to do something, to
strain herself in some direction.' But Henry insists that all the responsibility must be relinquished to him: 'she had to be passive, to acquiesce, and to be submerged under the surface of life.' (Leavis 332)

After a ten-page explication, Leavis ends by saying that the conclusion of The Fox is a "normative" one, and the "psychological truth" is both concrete and compelling (332).

In an article titled "Lawrence's 'Male and Female Principles' and the Symbolism of 'The Fox,'" Peg Brayfield is in accordance with Leavis, writing that it is a mistake to read this story as an anti-feminist work. Lawrence, Brayfield says, is demonstrating the need for duality within the individual, the need for each individual to incorporate both male and female elements into their being:

'The Fox' is the story of a human being struggling to retain individuality against the demands of a passive, helpless woman on the one hand, and on the other, a willful, domineering boy. . . . The story's indeterminate ending poignantly suggests the unhappiness caused to the individual by too rigid a conception of what it means to feel and act as a man or a woman. (42)

Brayfield supports her argument based on a quotation from Lawrence's "Study of Thomas Hardy," published in 1914 during Lawrence's early period. In this study Lawrence
writes: "For every man comprises male and female in his being, the male always struggling for predominance. A woman likewise consists in male and female, with female predominant" (481).

One of the problems with Brayfield's defense concerns her references to the "Female Principle" and the "Male Principle." Brayfield says that in the study of Hardy, Lawrence associates the "Female Principle" with "the Body, the Feelings, the Senses, the Soul, the Natural Law, Instinct, Passion" (43). She says the "Male Principle" is associated with "the Spirit, the Mind, the consciousness, non-physical Love, Action" (43). After defining these dual principles, Brayfield then says that some Lawrentian characters allow either the male or the female qualities exclusive control over their personalities. These characters, she writes, are "less than whole human beings" (43). She says that Lawrence was demonstrating in The Fox the importance of maintaining an inner duality. Each character, to be well-adjusted or whole, can allow either one of the two qualities precedence, but not to the total exclusion of the other quality. If this is what Lawrence is saying in The Fox, then why is March a failure in the beginning of the story when she does accept both her female and male qualities? Why is she odd and absent, shrewish and grim? Why does March lack reasoning skills, and why does she need Grenfel to save the farm?
Jan Good is yet another Lawrence defender who quotes the study of Hardy, but her position is opposite Brayfield's. While Brayfield says that each individual must possess both male and female qualities, Good uses the same study to argue that men and women must avoid duality:

Lawrence persistently theorizes and fictionally demonstrates his notion of the basic distinction between masculinity (activity) and femininity (passivity). In his view, these natural poles must be maintained in strong opposition in order for harmony to abide in the relation between man and woman. . . . Woman must express neither a will of her own nor desire for control. Harmony in the male-female relation is impossible if woman unnaturally asserts will. . . . (218)

Good says that The Fox addresses and expands on Lawrence's male and female principles. Henry is a little bit soft and feminine in the beginning, Good says, and he is attracted to the masculine attributes of March. However, according to Good, this inclination is abnormal and must be corrected:

The two are, thus, initially fragmented personalities, without sufficient polarity between them. If they are to attain and sustain a balanced relationship, March must (as must all Lawrence's women) ultimately yield her self to the male. (219)
Good also says that March is unproductive and unfulfilled as a result of this imbalance:

March has creative urges (‘unsatisfied tendencies’), but her creative potential is blocked by the symbolic ‘stupid fowls’ which are uncontrolled, wild, and which stubbornly refuse to sleep or to produce eggs. Instead of performing their natural functions, the women’s fowls are perversely active. Creativity is impossible because of a lack of female (i.e., passive) integrity and integration. (220)

Good says that Henry understands he must defeat the masculine element in March and the feminine element in himself. "It is only the masculine part of woman which must die," Good says. "The principle of activity and domination in woman must be tamed and extinguished, not the whole woman. . . . Mastering March and destroying her active principle will demand that Henry’s masculinity come to the fore in his psyche" (221-22). In conclusion Good writes:

It may be granted that Lawrence is, indeed, prescribing doctrines—but not necessarily ones that are pernicious. Disillusioning as the reality may be, life seems not to present evidence which would make nonsense of Lawrence’s conception of the male and female principles and the attendant logical necessity for duality,
separation, and polarity between the sexes. Gender confusion is present in all social men and women. The greater one's gender conflict, the greater will be one's psychic fragmentation and incapacity for [a] stable, creative relationship with a person of the opposite sex. This being so, Henry's demand that March acquiesce to him . . . ought, most realistically, if unhappily, to be given consideration as a necessary and productive coercion. (225-26)

Lawrence Jones, in an essay titled, "Physiognomy and The Sensual Will" does not defend Lawrence as other critics do but writes that Lawrence's work must be studied on its own terms. Jones also says that an understanding of Fantasia and Lawrence's system of sexual psychology allows for a more precise reading of a story such as The Fox (24):

Many of the misinterpretations of The Fox probably come from the critic's feeling that a story so powerful and fully realized cannot really imply such narrow, even hateful views of male dominance, the primacy of the unconscious will, and leadership; thus the critic searches for a way to interpret the story so as to see meanings in it that are more personally acceptable to him (or her). However, Lawrence must be faced in all of
his perversity, absurdity, and idiosyncrasy if we are to understand him fully. As with Blake, Shelly, Yeats, and other prophetic writers, we should do him the honour of interpreting him first in his own terms before subjecting him to ours.

(25)

All of the women in Lawrence's later fiction who attempt to function outside of their restrictive, feminine realm soon learn they cannot function successfully. Ultimately, if unhappily, these women must close their eyes, submit their will, and accept the passive, emotional role. Like Mabel in "The Horse Dealer's Daughter," March submits in the end. While "The Horse Dealer's Daughter" ends with Mabel grovelling on her knees, saying she feels awful and horrible, The Fox ends with March struggling against sleep and meditating on death. "It must be sweet to be dead," March says (178). As in "The Horse Dealer's Daughter," the awakening in this story is a negative experience for both March and Banford. The awakening results in the death of Banford and in surrender or "sleep" for March.

The Fox and "The Horse Dealer's Daughter" seem to imply that it is time to restore the balance between the sexes. The war is over and it is time for women to submit, to return to their naturally passive, emotional roles, and for the men to return to their naturally dominant, assertive
roles. It is time for a restoration of the Lawrentian balance.
"You Touched Me"

If *The Fox* and "The Horse Dealer's Daughter" were the only two stories that Lawrence concludes with male dominance and female suppression, or if Lawrence's later nonfiction did not so explicitly address and define the male-supremacist ideal of balance, then the parallels between the two stories and the parallels between the fiction and nonfiction would not be significant. However, in this next story, "You Touched Me" (1920), Lawrence again ends with the Lawrentian balance, and the subtext in this story is closely related to the subtext in the previous two stories: Men and women need one another, but men will always play the dominant role in male-female relationships, and women have no choice but to accept the wishes and demands of the males.

Lawrence wrote "You Touched Me" in 1919, and it was first published in 1920, within two years of *Fantasia*, "The Horse Dealer's Daughter," and *The Fox*. Although the plot and character are related in all three of these stories, "You Touched Me" and *The Fox* are the most closely connected. In fact, "You Touched Me" turns out to be a direct parallel to *The Fox*. In both stories there are two single women and only one available man, who is approximately ten years younger than the females. Also, the man in each story is attracted to the dominant female: Hadrian is attracted to Matilda just as Grenfel is attracted to March. Hadrian has a desire to conquer and control Matilda just as Grenfel
desires to dominate March. The narrator of "You Touched Me" writes that Hadrian wants to possess Matilda and her "high-bred sensitiveness" (403). "He wanted to make himself master of it. As he went about through the old pottery-yard, his secretive mind schemed and worked. To be master of that strange soft delicacy . . . . He was secretly plotting" (403).

Not only is there a likeness between the character and situations of the men in the two stories, but the women can be compared as well. In "You Touched Me" Matilda and Emmie, like March and Banford, are approximately thirty years old; they are eccentric, independent women; they are unproductive inside and outside of the home. Matilda and Emmie are "old maids" with no prospects for marriage (394), and they let their business turn to dust, so they will have free time for their art, as well as more peace and quiet. "We like it much better--oh, much better--quieter," said Matilda, and Emmie agreed (394).

In addition to being unproductive like March and Banford, Matilda and Emmie show other similarities to the two women as well. In The Fox, March is the artistic, dominant female, the man about the place who does four-fifths of the work (115). In "You Touched Me," Matilda is the dominant, artistic one. "Matilda loved painting and music, and read a good many novels, whilst Emmie looked after the housekeeping. Emmie . . . . had no accomplishments."
after the housekeeping. Emmie . . . had no accomplishments. She looked up to Matilda, whose mind was naturally refined and sensible" (395). Not only is Matilda the dominant one, but like March she is also quiet and melancholy. "Matilda’s dark blue eyes had a strange, full look in them, the lids, with the faint blue veins showing, dropped rather low. She carried her head light and high, but she had a look of pain" (400).

Several critics have commented on the correlation between these two stories, but each critic reads something different into these correlations. For example, F. R. Leavis says the stories in England, My England are linked by Lawrence’s concern for relationships between men and women, "the relations in all their delicate complexity" (315). "You Touched Me," like "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter" and The Fox, Leavis says, are all stories about love and life (319). Leavis acknowledges that Matilda could be seen as a victim of a cruel alliance between her father and Hadrian, but her touch, he writes, signifies this is a love story. Leavis also says the reader automatically empathizes with Hadrian:

We are made to feel at one and the same time the profound attraction (which is certainly not crudely and simply sexual) . . . . It is the attraction that, felt by a man towards a woman, inspires him with the specific and deliberate
conviction that he must marry her—-that the
fulfilment of his life depends upon his marrying
her. (316)

After discussing Hadrian’s feelings, Leavis then
explains that although Matilda’s situation is unpleasant,
the reader should not suppose that she was forced into
marrying Hadrian. "There is something more subtle about the
surrender," he says (317). Where Hadrian is concerned, this
is a love story, but where Matilda is concerned, Leavis says
this is a story about the triumph of life:

Hadrian stands for life, and the marriage is the
assurance of a living future; we know, without
needing to be told in so many words, that
essentially the dying man sees the dead end of
old-maidhood in the Pottery House as a defeat of
life. And we have been given too strong a sense
of the symbolic value of the ‘square, ugly brick
house girt in by the wall that enclosed the whole
grounds of the pottery itself’ to feel that old
Rockley’s interposition, his brutal assertion of
will, is just the caprice of rugged masculine
‘character.’ (Leavis 319)

Leavis, in his interpretation, takes only the male
perspective into account, however. If the female point of
view is considered, it will become clear that the women do
not need or want to be rescued. In the beginning of the
story, the narrator says, "In their quiet, melancholy way, the two girls were happy" (395). Throughout the story, the narrator also makes it clear that both of the women despise Hadrian, and if Matilda is forced to marry Hadrian, she and Emmie will most assuredly be unhappy. Matilda thought the idea of marrying Hadrian was disgraceful and disgusting (405). "He seemed a strange monster to her" (407). She says Hadrian "had no proper respect for anybody or anything, that he was sly and common" (399). The narrator even describes Hadrian as someone with the "neatness, the reserve, the underground quality of the rat" (407).

Even though Hadrian knows Matilda despises him, he still seeks the union. Hadrian says to Matilda:

'You've come round to it, then?' he said, giving her a pleasant look from his twinkling, almost kindly eyes. She looked down at him and turned aside. She looked down on him both literally and figuratively. Still he persisted, and triumphed. (409)

The father, who the narrator says has a nature similar to Hadrian's, is also pleased with the match (396). After Hadrian successfully traps Matilda, and after the marriage ceremony, her father's "face lit up with a clear twinkling smile" (410). Mr. Rockley may believe that Hadrian, a boy who is ten years younger than Matilda and who is compared to
an underground rat, is better than no man at all, but the two women clearly oppose him.

Leavis’s interpretation seems to suggest that "old-maidhood" is so undesirable that even a sly, "unscrupulous" boy looks desirable in comparison (403). However, when the female perspective is considered, Leavis’s "love and life" interpretation will not hold up. If we consider the coercion of Matilda by Mr. Rockley and Hadrian, and if we consider Matilda’s revulsion against Hadrian, it is difficult to read this as a story about love and life. Mr. Rockley gets "malevolent satisfaction" in telling Hadrian that he has drawn up a new will which requires Matilda to marry Hadrian (407). "He [Mr. Rockley] seemed to have a strange desire, quite unreasonable, for revenge upon the women who had surrounded him for so long, and served him so carefully" (407).

Mr. Rockley, by revising his will, is forcing Matilda into something closely resembling prostitution. Mr. Rockley’s new will states that if Matilda refuses to marry Hadrian, all of the Rockley inheritance will transfer to Hadrian leaving both her and her sister penniless. For financial reasons, to save the inheritance for her sister, Matilda is coerced into giving herself away, for life, to a man she despises. Matilda loses no matter what she does, but by choosing to marry Hadrian, at least her sister will be provided for in the material sense. Matilda is
protective of her sister, and if she marries Hadrian, at least not all will be lost. Clearly, from the female perspective, Matilda is trapped and has no real choice, making this anything but a story of love and life.

James C. Cowan, like Leavis, says this story is intended as a romance. In an article titled "Lawrence and Touch" Cowan says this story "is a fable about the power of a single touch to be irrevocably binding" (123). This touch, he says, is so potent that it functions as an oedipal awakening:

Touch opens a kind of two-way oedipal street whereby Hadrian attains sexual conquest of his quondam "mother," and whereby Matilda, by her father's collusion in what she recognizes as a socially inappropriate match, gains sexual access to her father though Hadrian . . . whom the father has chosen as his successor. (Cowan 124)

To suggest that Matilda gains sexual access to Hadrian is to suggest that Matilda desires to do so. But Matilda has no control here, and without control there can be no volition. If she did have control, if she did desire to "gain access" to her father, it certainly would not be through this "rat." Instead of explaining the story's meaning, an interpretation like Cowan's actually raises questions: How can Matilda, who is trapped, be in a kind of "two-way" situation? How can there be a "two-way oedipal street" with only one
participant? If there is a hint in this story that Matilda has a desire for her father, it is a slight one, and it is inconceivable that she would choose Hadrian for the fulfillment of this desire. "She was at his [Hadrian’s] mercy, for he was unscrupulous, his standard was not her standard" (403).

It seems more likely that this is yet another one of Lawrence’s stories about an awakening to sensual love and to the Lawrentian balance. Like Doctor Ferguson in "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter," Hadrian is unawakened to sensual love until Matilda goes into his room and touches him, by mistake, on the forehead. "The soft, straying tenderness of her hand on his face startled something out of his soul... The fragile exquisiteness of her caress startled him most, revealed unknown things to him" (402). After Matilda awakens Hadrian, both literally and figuratively, Hadrian is changed. "If you wake a man up," he says, "he can’t go to sleep again..." (409).

Ironically, Hadrian and Matilda are both awakened by an accidental or unconscious touch—but it turns out to be a "rude awakening" for Matilda. As Hadrian is stimulated, Matilda is repulsed. As Hadrian’s corporeal nature is aroused, Matilda’s psychic nature is subdued. In Fantasia, Lawrence’s writings on male-female duality explain the reason for these opposite reactions: "The man has the initiative as far as voluntary activity goes, and the woman
the initiative as far as sympathetic activity goes. . . . It is woman who asks, in love, and man who answers" (133). Matilda initiates in love through her physical touch, and although she did not voluntarily or consciously stimulate Hadrian, the fact remains that her touch did awaken him. Once aroused, Hadrian is determined to make Matilda yield her will to his. In Fantasia Lawrence says the male must make the woman yield: "Drive her forcibly back, back into her own true unconscious. . . . And you'll have to fight very hard to make a woman yield her goals to yours. . . ." (218-19). And fight is just what Hadrian does. In collaboration with Mr. Rockley, Hadrian succeeds in forcing Matilda into marrying him against her will.

Although Matilda and Emmie sulk and argue, they learn that they are ultimately powerless in the male-dominated world that surrounds them. Like Mabel in "The Horse Dealer's Daughter," and like March in The Fox, Matilda's awakening is a dark and negative experience. "She was awakened from her late-at-night trance. . . . She stood in the darkness as if stung" (402). In Fantasia Lawrence equates women with darkness and the moon:

The moon, the planet of woman, sways us back from our day-self. . . . That is woman's inevitable mode, let her words be what they will. Her goal is the deep, sensual individualism of secrecy and
night-exclusiveness, hostile, with guarded doors.

(218-19)

Matilda's experience in this story is dark and negative, as Lawrence suggests that it should be. Also, Matilda is both hostile and guarded.

Romantic interpretations of "You Touched Me" do not hold up well, especially if this story is juxtaposed with other stories during the same time frame and with some of Lawrence's later nonfiction. Harris, in The Short Fiction of D. H. Lawrence, writes:

In 'The Fox,' 'You Touched Me,' and in many of the tales to follow, one sees Lawrence dramatizing the notion encoded through centuries of law and custom that there is a real gain for man and woman alike in the woman's giving up self-responsibility. The gain derives of course from the fact that each is following his or her 'natural' bent, his to lead, hers to follow. (Harris 153)

Throughout his work during this later period, Lawrence consistently places the male in the dominant realm and the female in the subordinate realm. Any character who operates outside of his or her natural, prescribed realm, to Lawrence, is by definition perverted, and must be brought back into balance. "The great thing is to keep the sexes pure. And by pure we don't mean an ideal sterile innocence and similarity between boy and girl. We mean pure maleness
in a man, pure femaleness in a woman" (Fantasia 215). Like the previous two stories, this story suggests that the war is over and it is time for men and women to return to their exclusive, preordained roles. It is time to restore the balance between the sexes.
CHAPTER III

ROLE REVERSALS AND IMBALANCE

To expand on the idea of duality and balance, in 

*Fantasia* Lawrence explains the two great motives for 
humankind: the sex motive and the creative motive. Of 
these two, Lawrence says the creative motive is dominant:

In one direction, all life works up to the one 
supreme moment of coition. Let us all admit 
it, sincerely. But we are not confined to 
one direction only, or to one exclusive 
consummation. . . . There was something else, of 
even higher importance, and greater dynamic power. 
And what is this other, greater impulse? It is 
the desire of the human male to build a world: 
not 'to build a world for you, dear'; but to build 
up out of his own self and his own belief and his 
own effort something wonderful. . . . This is the 
prime motivity. And the motivity of sex is sub-
sidiary to this: often directly antagonistic. (60)

In addition to explaining the two motives, Lawrence 
emphasizes that the primary motive, this "greater dynamic 
power," belongs to the male: "For in the male the dominant 
centres are naturally the volitional centres, centres of 
responsibility, authority, and care" (*Fantasia* 87). The
male alone, Lawrence says, is the "thinker and doer"; the male belongs to the spiritual, upper plane (132). Conversely, the female belongs to the sensual, lower plane; she is the initiator of emotion. "The man has the initiative as far as voluntary activity goes, and the woman the initiative as far as sympathetic activity goes" (Fantasia 133). Lawrence says that men and women will occasionally cross over into opposite realms, but this is unacceptable:

Naturally this nicely arranged order of things may be reversed. . . . But it is all a fallacy. Man, in the midst of all his effeminacy, is still male and nothing but male. And woman . . . is still completely female. They are only playing each other's roles, because the poles have swung into reversion. The compass is reversed. But that doesn't mean the north pole has become the south pole, or that each is a bit of both. (Fantasia 133-35)

Although men and women belong to opposite poles and are not to reverse roles, Lawrence says that men can enjoy and participate in the sensual realm, as long as the creative motive remains dominant: "It behooves every man in his hour to take off his shoes and relax and give himself up to his woman and her world. Not to give up his purpose. But to give up himself for a time to her who is his mate" (Fantasia
Lawrence warns over and over in Fantasia that although the male is privileged in both realms, the sensual drive must remain subordinate: "But you have got to keep your sexual fulfilment even then subordinate, just subordinate to the great passion of purpose..." (145).

While the male enjoys both realms, Lawrence says the female should not involve herself in anything but the emotional, sensual realm. Feelings are, for women, an end in themselves, Lawrence says, and women should not ask for anything beyond this: "A woman reaches her fulfilment through love, deep sensual love, and exquisite sensitive communion. But once she reaches the point of fulfilment, she should not break off to ask for more excitements" (Fantasia 156). The woman exists for the man "only in the twilight, by the camp fire, when the day has departed. Evening and the night are hers" (Fantasia 143-44).

Lawrence wrote and published each of the following stories after 1918. "Tickets, Please" was written in 1918 and first published in 1919. "Monkey Nuts" was written in 1919 and first published in 1922. "Wintry Peacock" was written in 1919 and first published in 1921. In each of these three stories, the women cross over into the active, dominant realm, and the men fail to assert themselves in the dynamic, creative realm. When everything is out of balance, as it is in these stories, Lawrence shows that all relationships will naturally fail, and the results will be
chaos and unhappiness for all who remain out of balance. Hence, the underlying message in these stories complements the message in the earlier stories: Men and women need one another, but if either the male or the female in a relationship steps outside of his or her prescribed realm, the results will be chaos and imbalance.

"Tickets, Please"

On the surface, "Tickets, Please" is a comical story about female retaliation against John Thomas, a flagrant womanizer. Below the surface, this turns out to be another story about a male-female imbalance and the dissonance that results from this type of imbalance. Annie and the other women in this story are functioning in the masculine, or creative realm. John Thomas, on the other hand, places the sex motive above the creative motive to the point that he fails to operate at all in the masculine realm. Because the men and women have reversed what Lawrence believes to be their natural poles, their lives are surrounded by chaos and imbalance.

In "Tickets, Please," John Thomas turns out to be the antithesis of the males in chapter two of this thesis. In "The Horse Dealer's Daughter," for example, Doctor Ferguson is unaware of his own sexuality before his awakening, and he focuses entirely on his work. John Thomas, whose very name
is a British slang for the phallus, focuses on his sexuality almost completely, placing no apparent emphasis on the creative motive. In Fantasia Lawrence writes about the results of an imbalance such as this one: "With sex as the one accepted prime motive, the world drifts into despair and anarchy. . . . Assert sex as the predominant fulfilment, and you get the collapse of living purpose in man. You get anarchy" (144-45). And anarchy is exactly what Lawrence presents in "Tickets, Please."

This story, which is appropriately set during war-time, is about a group of ex-girlfriends who gang up on John Thomas, a notorious philanderer:

There is considerable scandal about John Thomas in half a dozen villages. He flirts with the girl conductors in the morning, and walks out with them in the dark night, when they leave their tram-car at the depot. Of course, the girls quit the service frequently. Then he flirts and walks out with the newcomer . . . . (336)

Although John Thomas has had many affairs, the story focuses on one particular affair with Miss Annie Stone who wants "to take an intelligent interest in him, and to have an intelligent response" (339). According to the narrator, this is where Annie makes her mistake:

John Thomas intended to remain a nocturnal presence; he had no idea of becoming an all-
round individual to her. When she started to take an intelligent interest in him and his life and character, he sheered off. He hated intelligent interest. So he left her. (339)

At first, Annie is furious with John Thomas, then miserable. Finally, after she sees that he is "enjoying pastures new," the possessive female in her is aroused. "Then she determined to have her own back" (339). And this is when the anarchy begins.

Annie meets with six other ex-lovers of John Thomas who agree to join forces and pounce on John Thomas, to take him down a peg or two (340). And these women do succeed in erasing his impudent smile, in changing him into a "ragged, dazed creature" (345). Together, after locking him in a small room, these "strange, wild creatures" continue to push and slap John Thomas, insisting that he choose one of them for marriage (343). After a long struggle and with a bleeding face and torn wrists, he chooses Annie; however, Annie is unhappy with his choice. Even though Annie is the one who initiates this whole scene, even though she is the one who insists the most vehemently that he choose one of them for marriage, Annie is disconcerted when John Thomas chooses her. "She seemed as if she would fall" (345), the narrator writes.

It is not clear why Annie is unhappy until some of Lawrence's non-fiction is juxtaposed with "Tickets, Please."
Lawrence, in his later non-fiction, writes that women who vacate the sympathetic, emotional camp are an anomaly, and these independent, active women will never be happy. Also, Lawrence writes that the battle for control between men and women will be an ongoing battle with no satisfactory resolution until the men get back in touch with the creative motive. In an essay titled "The Real Thing," first published in 1930, Lawrence writes:

A woman does not fight a man for his love--though she may say so a thousand times over. She fights him because she knows, instinctively, he cannot love. He has lost his peculiar belief in himself, his instinctive faith in his own life-flow. . . .

(198)

John Thomas places no apparent focus on the creative motive; he has lost contact with his own "life-flow." When this happens, Lawrence says in "The Real Thing," the woman becomes emotionally destructive:

It is when men lose their contact with this eternal life flame . . . that the fight between man and woman begins. It cannot be avoided. . . . Once she feels the loss of the greater control and the greater sustenance, she becomes emotionally destructive, she can no more help it than she can help being a woman. . . . (202)

And the outcome of this fighting, Lawrence continues, is
always the same: No woman will ever get a man's love by fighting him. But she will not stop fighting until he submits: "Sometimes she can join with other women, and keep up the fight in a group" (199), but when the man submits to a woman, Lawrence says, she usually fights even harder.

"Why doesn't she leave him?" Lawrence asks. "Often she does" (199). These passages from "The Real Thing" closely parallel the action in "Tickets, Please." After John Thomas chooses Annie, she rejects him. "Then she got up, drawing away from him with strange disgust and bitterness. 'I wouldn't touch him,' she said" (345).

In addition to focusing on the chaos and unhappiness that surrounds these characters, Lawrence also places a great deal of emphasis on choice. Twelve or thirteen times the girls insist that John Thomas choose one of them, and each time that John Thomas avoids making a decision the girls beat him more severely until finally he succumbs by picking Annie, who is only left frustrated by his decision. "Her face quivered with a kind of agony. . . . 'I don't want him—he can choose again,' said Annie, with the same rather bitter hopelessness" (345).

In D.H. Lawrence: Body of Darkness, R. E. Pritchard offers an explanation for Annie's frustration over the choice that John Thomas makes. Pritchard says this story is concerned with female sexual aggression, with the effect of the war, and the war between the sexes (108). He says Annie
cannot accept John Thomas because she has overcome him. "He 'chooses' Annie, who cannot now accept him, having overcome him, and she is left in a tortured frustration of hatred and desire" (Pritchard 109).

In an article published in *Women's Studies*, Judith Breen adds to Pritchard's explanation. Breen says the women are left frustrated because they understand that the choosing must always be left to the male. She writes:

John Thomas's victory rests on her (Annie's) realization that while she can force him to the ground, only he can 'exact more,' and his choice of Annie vindictively reminds her of the realities of sexual politics. At the end of the story, then, Annie is not horrified because (as sentimental readers might feel) she has lost invaluable love through her possessive ways; rather 'something' (her assumed masculine power, we can guess) 'is broken in her' (345), and she is tormented by her realization that she is too weak to wreak vengeance on her enemy. Male genital power, says Lawrence, is the final power. (71-72)

Breen says that "Tickets, Please" not only suggests misogyny, but it also suggests an even more disturbing point:
No matter how strengthened by the freedoms brought by World War I, women can never be the equals of men. The source of their power remains in the underlining of the word please. Annie's essential failure in her own eyes--the most cruel element in her humiliation--as well as in those of John Thomas, is her failure to be a man. (72)

Breen concludes this analysis by saying that John Thomas was beaten but undefeated. "Annie herself produces the key to unlock the door of the escape, and he returns alone to his mist-filled darkness to await a better day" (Breen 72).

In *The Short Fiction of D. H. Lawrence*, Janice Harris takes an opposite stance, writing that "Tickets, Please" is not derogatory towards women. "If Lawrence intended 'Tickets, Please' simply to illustrate a war-torn society in which the women have taken the upper hand to the detriment of themselves and the men, the characterizations and myth work against the intention" (139). Harris says that the girls represent commitment, responsibility, and ultimately, marriage, while John Thomas is a rebel against any system of belief. In addition, Harris says that John Thomas and the tram girls are presented as neither good nor bad in this story. The tram girls "are not wearisome hags to be avoided or tricked, nor are they female devourers, emblems of a culture gone mad" (139).
In another essay defending Lawrence’s sexual politics, Paul Wood writes that Lawrence’s sympathy in "Tickets, Please" is with the women. This story, he says, shows how women might earn Lawrence’s admiration and respect (76-77). Wood says the "tone and point of view affirm the women’s new-found strength and freedom" (75).

These comments by Wood and Harris are brief and leave some unanswered questions. If "Tickets, Please" does not treat women in a unfavorable manner, then why does Lawrence paint such a grim picture of these "fearless young hussies" (335)? If this is merely a presentation of the clash between freedom and responsibility, then why do both sides appear to lose? If Lawrence’s sympathies are with the women, as Wood says they are, then why doesn’t this story allow the women any satisfaction in the end? They succeed with their goal, so why are they left "mute" and "stupefied" (346)?

One of Wood’s main arguments relies on the either/or fallacy. Wood concludes that Lawrence’s sympathy is clearly not with John Thomas; therefore, it must be with the tram-girls. Also Wood concludes that John Thomas is not triumphant, so the women must be:

Surely, ‘Tickets, Please’ can be taken as Lawrence’s portrait of man triumphant only if we ignore what so many have—the truth spoken in his posture, clear in his face: ‘But without a word
or sign he had opened the door and gone, his face closed, his head dropped' (345). He goes considerably less a man than he had come, taking with him little of our sympathy. It is by continued attention to detail that many students begin to see how much of Lawrence’s sympathy has remained with these women. (76)

Even though it is true that John Thomas does not have reader sympathy, it is not correct to assume that the women have it. Neither is it correct to assume that the women triumph just because John Thomas lowers his head in the end. What about the faces of the tram girls? Wood does not address the problem posed by the equally despondent faces of the females. In the last two lines Lawrence writes: "The girls were all anxious to be off. They were tidying themselves hurriedly, with mute, stupefied faces" (346).

One way to address the questions raised by the interpretations of Wood and Harris is to consider the possibility that both sides lose. If "Tickets, Please" is viewed not just as a story about commitment versus irresponsibility, or winners versus losers, but instead as a story depicting the failure on both sides, these questions can be answered. At the end of the story the girls’ faces reflect frustration and failure. Annie’s face "quivered with a kind of agony, she seemed as if she would fall"
Likewise, the battered John Thomas left with "his face closed, his head dropped" (345).

"Tickets, Please" is a clear example of a male-female imbalance and the resulting chaos. This can be demonstrated by juxtaposing passages from Fantasia along with additional passages from Lawrence’s essay, "The Real Thing." For example, in "The Real Thing," Lawrence writes about modern, assertive women who vacate their female camp:

Today, woman is always tense and strung-up, alert, and bare-armed, not for love but for battle. In her shred of a dress and her little helmet of a hat, her cropped hair and her stark bearing she is a sort of soldier, and look at her as one may, one can see nothing else. (197)

This description is similar to the one of the tram-girls in "Tickets, Please": "In their ugly blue uniform, skirts up to their knees, shapeless old peaked caps on their heads, they have all the sang-froid of an old non-commissioned officer" (335). These tram girls "pounce on the youths who try to evade their ticket-machine. They push off the men at the end of their distance. . . . They fear nobody--and everybody fears them" (335). These characterizations of the females in "Tickets, Please" closely parallel Lawrence’s description of the "strung-up," militant, modern women in the above passage from "The Real Thing."
In an article titled "'Cunning in His Overthrow': Give and Take in 'Tickets, Please,'" Richard P. Wheeler writes about the role reversals of the females in this story:

The girls of 'Tickets, Please,' however, have already demonstrated an inclination to appropriate masculine properties to themselves. As conductors, the girls are carefully stripped of feminine qualities and likened to experienced soldiers. . . . The adventurous route of the tram is presented in the phallic imagery of plunging, tilting, rushing penetration. With the able-bodied men at war, the girls have taken over this phallic power. (245)

Because the women have taken over this phallic power that Wheeler describes, and because John Thomas fails to assert himself in the masculine, creative realm, "Tickets, Please" ends in a stalemate. John Thomas has his deepest consciousness in the "loins," where Lawrence says the woman's true consciousness is located (Fantasia 215). The male conductors are crippled, unfit for military service, or they are "delicate young men, who creep forward in terror" (335). None of the men, according to these descriptions, operates in the creative, dominant realm. The trams girls, on the other hand, have their consciousness located in the volitional centers, the centers of responsibility and
authority, and these "fearless young hussies" are left tortured and frustrated at the end of the story (335).

This reversal of the male-female roles is unacceptable to Lawrence. The males, Lawrence writes in Fantasia, must stick to their own "positivity of being, of action, disinterested, non-domestic, male action, which is not devoted to the increase of the female" (135). If a man vacates the male camp, "then in comes woman, (she) picks up the sceptre, and begins to conduct a rag-time band" (Fantasia 135). Toward the end of Fantasia Lawrence writes:

You'll have to fight very hard to make a woman yield her goal to yours. . . . She'll never believe until you have your soul filled with a profound and absolutely inalterable purpose, that will yield to nothing, least of all to her.

(219)

John Thomas is a failure in this sense because he places little interest in the creative motive; however, he does in one way stay in accord with Lawrence's ideology. John Thomas understands that women belong exclusively to the night, and he does not yield to Annie's desire for companionship: "John Thomas intended to remain a nocturnal presence. . . . He hated intelligent interest" (339). In Fantasia Lawrence explains that companionship between a man and a woman is nothing but an illusion:
Women and men are dynamically different, in everything. Even in the mind. . . . Whatever a man says, his meaning is something quite different and changed when it passes through a woman's ears. . . . The apparent mutual understanding, in companionship between a man and a woman, is always an illusion, and always breaks down in the end.

(215)

Lawrence also goes into great detail in Fantasia to explain that a woman's happiness is dependent on the man. If in any relationship the man does not place his creative motive above all else, then neither the male nor the female will have a moment of peace. "If man will never accept his own ultimate being, his final aloneness, and his last responsibility for life, then he must expect woman to dash from disaster to disaster, rootless and uncontrolled" (Fantasia 157). And this is exactly what the tram girls do in this story. These tram-girls work for the most dangerous tram-service in England:

To ride on these cars is always an adventure. Since we are in war-time, the drivers are men unfit for active service: cripples and hunchbacks. So they have the spirit of the devil in them. The ride becomes a steeple-chase. . . . It is quite common for a car, packed with one solid mass of living people, to come to a dead
halt in the midst of unbroken blackness, the heart of nowhere on a dark night. . . . (334)

Not only do these women work in the midst of disaster, but one by one they go into a relationship with John Thomas, most of them aware of his reputation as a womanizer, knowing that he is only interested in the sexual aspect of the relationship, and knowing that a relationship with John Thomas will certainly fail.

Because John Thomas does not initiate in the masculine realm, because he places sex above his creative motive, he is out of balance and fails as a male leader. Lawrence insists that men must force women to yield to male leadership: "Make her yield once more to the male leadership: if you've got anywhere to lead to" (Fantasia 218). John Thomas, of course, has nowhere to lead. Because John Thomas fails as a male leader, and because Lawrence says women must have one, all the characters are out of balance at the beginning and through the end of the story. Hence, there are no winners in "Tickets, Please."

In fact, the abrupt, unresolved ending even suggests a comedown on both sides. Lawrence creates a fair amount of tension toward the end, he builds on that tension, then ends the story abruptly with no resolution. This abrupt, discordant ending is just one more indicator of the imbalance.
In a world where the women are assertive, acting outside of their emotional realm, there can be no Lawrentian balance. Neither can there be balance in a world filled with lust-driven men like John Thomas or ineffectual, "delicate" men like the drivers. The ending suggests that all the characters, males and females alike, will continue to "dash from disaster to disaster, rootless and uncontrolled" (Fantasia 157). There can be no peace until all people recognize and accept their natural polarity and return to the Lawrentian balance.
"Monkey Nuts"

"Monkey Nuts," like "Tickets, Please," also deals with a deadlock, an impossible relationship. Add to this the story's concern with choice and with aggressive women, and the parallels between these two stories become evident. However, this story is not a rehash or an imitation of "Tickets, Please." Dominance, aggression, and balance may be the central concerns here, but Lawrence addresses these concerns from a slightly different angle.

In story after story during this later period, Lawrence explores many combinations of the male-female relationship. In "Tickets, Please," for example, the females are out of balance as they attempt to dominate the males, and John Thomas is out of balance as he places sex above the creative motive. In this story the land-girl, Miss Stokes, crosses over into the active, masculine realm as did Annie and the tram-girls. Joe, on the other hand, turns out to be very different from John Thomas. Although Joe does not confuse his sexual motive with his creative motive, he does cross over into what Lawrence refers to as the passive, feminine realm.

Joe is sensitive and wavering, completely unable to assert himself with Miss Stokes: "Joe remained silent, averted, neutral, a little on his dignity. Miss Stokes was off-hand and masterful" (370). Apparently, Miss Stokes
recognizes Joe's passive nature from the moment she sees him, and this is the very thing that attracts her to Joe. "But there was something in the turn of Joe's head, and something in his quiet, tender-looking form, young and fresh—which attracted her eye" (367). Toward the end of "Monkey Nuts," Joe's friend Albert puzzles over Joe's passive behavior and concludes that Joe has a sensitive nature. "You're too soft-hearted, that's where it is, boy. You want your mettle dipping in cold water, to temper it. You're too soft-hearted—" (376).

Lawrence warns against this type of attraction in his discussion of Nathaniel Hawthorne in *Studies in Classic American Literature* (1923): "The greatest triumph a woman can have, especially an American woman, is the triumph of seducing a man: especially if he is pure" (94). Lawrence, in *Fantasia*, also warns the reader against this type of attraction and against role reversals:

Man has assumed the gentle, all-sympathetic role, and woman has become the energetic party, with the authority in her hands. The male is the sensitive, sympathetic nature, the woman the active, effective, authoritative. So that the male acts as the passive, or recipient pole of attraction, the female as the active, positive, exertive pole, in human relations. Which is the reversal of the old flow. . . . But man is purely
male, playing the woman's part, and woman is purely female, however manly. . . . The dynamic polarity has swung around. (132)

Even though Joe is operating in the passive, emotional realm, he is by no means comfortable with this role, nor is he comfortable with the assertive Miss Stokes. When Miss Stokes sends him the telegram telling him to meet her, he received it as "a bolt from the blue. . . . His heart melted, he felt weak as if he had a blow" (368). Joe seems to fear female domination, although he does not have the power to resist it.

The reason for Joe's fear remains a little vague until this story is juxtaposed with some of Lawrence's nonfiction. In Fantasia Lawrence explains that dominant, independent women are inwardly destructive, something to be feared:

Woman meanwhile becomes fearless, inwardly relentless, determined positive party. She grips the responsibility. . . . She is now a queen of the earth, and inwardly a fearsome tyrant. . . . But God help the man whom she pities. Ultimately she tears him to bits. (134)

Lawrence gives a similar warning in an essay titled "The Real Thing:"

It always seems to start, in man, an overwhelming worship of woman, and a glorification of queens. It always seems to bring a brief spell of glory,
and a long spell of misery after. Man yields in
glorifying the woman. . . . (197)

To Lawrence, there is no medium. Women are either passive
and sympathetic, or they become fearsome tyrants. In his
study of Nathaniel Hawthorne, Lawrence writes: "Unless a
woman is held, by man, safe within the bounds of belief [in
himself], she becomes inevitably a destructive force. . . .
She becomes subtly diabolic" (98-99).

One might argue here that if Lawrence's nonfiction is
ignored, the description of Miss Stokes borders on
complementary rather than derogatory. She is described as a
pretty, buxom young girl, perhaps a little on the cold side,
but she is certainly not described as a tyrant. However,
two things must be considered. First of all, the story
focuses on Miss Stokes' beauty and her aggressive behavior
only. There is no character development beyond this.
Second, the attitudes of Joe and Albert toward Miss Stokes
are undoubtedly derogatory. Both men treat her rudely.
Albert calls her "Monkey Nuts" behind her back and talks as
if Miss Stokes' worth is in her looks. "She's a smart-
looking girl. What's wrong with her, my boy? I should have
thought you were a lucky chap, myself" (375). Joe, unlike
Albert, hardly notices her looks. Instead, he sees her as a
threat, something to be feared. When she reaches out to
hold Joe's hand, he quails. "To say he was staggered is to
put it mildly. Yet he allowed her softly to clasp his
fingers for a few moments. But he was a mortified youth" (372).

Miss Stokes is aggressive in pursuing the relationship with Joe, but as Janice Harris writes, in *The Short Fiction of D. H. Lawrence*, a woman's power lies in the word "please" (72). In *Fantasia* Lawrence says that it is the "woman who asks, in love, and man who answers" (133). In other words, the woman asks and the man makes the final choice. Because Miss Stokes is out of balance, she not only initiates in love but also insists on it, and she seems oblivious to Joe's answer or choice. Because Joe is out of balance, he can only resist this aggressive woman by joining forces with another man, Albert, who must intercede twice on Joe's behalf. In the last scene, when Miss Stokes makes a "half-inviting, half-commanding gesture," Joe automatically crouches to jump off the truck and go to her (378). Then Albert puts out his hand to stop Joe and says: "Where are you off? Work's work, and nuts is nuts. You stop here" (378).

The outcome of this final scene closely parallels a section out of *Fantasia* where Lawrence turns this battle for dominance into a national cause:

Well, then, Americans must make a choice. It is a choice between belief in man's creative, spontaneous soul, and man's automatic power of production and reproduction. It is a choice
between serving man, or woman. It is a choice between yielding the soul to a leader, leaders, or yielding only to the woman, wife, mistress, or mother (145).

In the end, Joe submits to his leader, Albert, who saves him from this woman whose "'Whoa!' rang out like a war-whoop" (378). At the end of "Monkey Nuts," Lawrence writes: "They were reassured, however, when they found that Miss Stokes came no more. . . . And Joe felt more relieved even than he had felt when he heard the firing cease, after the news had come that the armistice was signed" (378).

Hilary Simpson in D. H. Lawrence and Feminism explains Joe's relief in terms of the male-female struggle for dominance: "The implication is clear--a sexual revolution is more threatening to men than conventional war can ever be" (70). R. E. Pritchard, in his book D. H. Lawrence: Body of Darkness, says "the situation and language indicate dangerous female domination. . ." (109). Janice Harris in her book, says that "Monkey Nuts" addresses the issue of who shall dominate:

Men say to women, 'Try as you might, you cannot make me follow. And one of the ways I will withstand you is by joining forces with another man. . . .' In 'Monkey Nuts,' the tale's title is also the heroine's nickname. 'Monkey Nuts,' is slang for coconuts, but 'monkey' can mean woman;
it can also mean mock. . . . The implication here is that the woman has woman nuts, which is to say no real nuts at all, aggressive and demanding though she may be. (153)

In both "Monkey Nuts" and "Tickets, Please," a serious Lawrentian imbalance exists, and in both stories everyone loses, all relationships fail. However, at the end of "Monkey Nuts" Joe does express relief and a small degree of triumph as he escapes female domination. Apparently, the underlying issue in this story concerns the battle of the wills, and Lawrence seems to say that women can try to dominate, but female domination is unacceptable.

Man, in the midst of all his effeminacy, is still male and nothing but male. . . . Of course there should be a great balance between the sexes. Man, in the daytime, must follow his own soul's greatest impulse, and give himself to [his] life-work. . . . It is not woman who claims the highest in man. It is a man's own religious soul that drives him on beyond woman, to his supreme activity. . . . Hence Jesus, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' (Fantasia 135).

By the end of the story, Joe finally learns that the woman, Miss Stokes, cannot claim the highest in him: "Joe turned and looked at her, and a slow, jeering smile gathered on his face. "'Monkey-Nuts!' he replied, in a tone mocking her
call" (378). It is also worth noting that this scene takes place in the daytime, when Joe is working. The daytime to Lawrence is symbolic of the masculine, spiritual realm. With Albert's help, Joe finally chooses the masculine over the feminine realm—a major step for Joe.

This story, like "Tickets, Please," places a fair amount of focus on choice. Joe says, "She bain't my choice." (372) "I don't want her. . ." (375). Also like "Tickets, Please" this story focuses on role reversals, which Lawrence clearly denounces. In his nonfiction, Lawrence presents the rational, intellectual woman as perverted:

For the true polarity of consciousness in woman is downwards. . . . Pervert this, and make a false flow upwards to the breast and head, and you get a race of 'intelligent' women, delightful companions, tricky courtesans, clever prostitutes, noble idealists, devoted friends, interesting mistresses, efficient workers. . . .

(Fantasia 215)

But Lawrence says this will not last. In his non-fiction, Lawrence bluntly denounces role reversals as well as any consideration in favor of equality between the sexes. In his fiction, Lawrence demonstrates the ideology of his nonfiction. Stories like "Monkey Nuts" and "Tickets, Please" show that when a woman steps outside of her
naturally passive realm, she will become devious, treacherous, and false. In an essay titled "Women are so Cocksure," Lawrence writes: "As sure as a woman has the whip-hand over her destiny and the destinies of those near her, so sure will she make a mess of her own destiny, and a muddle of others'" (168). So, "pervert" a woman into consciousness, allow her the "whip-hand over her destiny," and what will be the result? Lawrence suggests in this story that the result will be "Monkey Nuts" or "Mock Nuts."
"Wintry Peacock"

In "Wintry Peacock," as in "Tickets, Please" and "Monkey Nuts," Lawrence also presents an imbalance between men and women. Again, the plot is different, but the underlying battle for dominance is similar. Mrs. Goyte, the principal female character, fails to remain in her passive, submissive realm, and like the women in the previous two stories, she is described as a destructive, shrewish woman, a dark, witch-like demon. Likewise, her husband has his role confused. Like John Thomas in "Tickets, Please," Mr. Goyte places the sex motive above the creative motive, and he fails as a male leader, leaving both Mrs. Goyte and his mistress frustrated and unfulfilled. Even though Mr. Goyte fails as a male leader, the women in this story learn that ultimately they have no control. Lawrence suggests in this story, as he does in the previous stories, that women can try to step outside of their passive, emotional roles but will always learn that men are the controllers.

"Wintry Peacock" opens when Mrs. Goyte asks her neighbor, the narrator, to interpret a letter which is addressed to her husband who has not returned home from the war. The letter is signed by a girl named Elise, and Mrs. Goyte is suspicious of the contents. The reader soon learns that Mrs. Goyte's suspicions are justified. Elise, the
Belgian girl who wrote the letter, has given birth to a baby boy, fathered by Mr. Goyte.

The narrator reads the letter silently first so the contents are revealed only to the reader, but not to Mrs. Goyte. Then he pretends to read the letter to Mrs. Goyte, leaving out information and misrepresenting the contents. He says the baby is Elise's little brother, and he makes the letter sound more like a thank-you note than a love letter; however, Mrs. Goyte remains suspicious that the baby is the offspring of Elise and Mr. Goyte. She says: "It's a blind. You mark, it's her own right enough--and his" (383).

In this opening scene it becomes apparent, through the narrator's attitude, that Mrs. Goyte and Elise live in a male-dominated world. The narrator provides the first clue to this interpretation as he defends Mr. Goyte. He says that if Mr. Goyte did have an affair with Elise, he is not to blame but rather Elise is the one to blame. The narrator says to Mrs. Goyte: "You know how anxious women are to fall in love, wife or no wife. How could he help it, if she [Elise] was determined to fall in love with him" (384)?

Not only does the narrator blame Elise for her own predicament, but he describes and treats Mrs. Goyte unfavorably. First of all, the narrator patronizes her by trying to shelter her from the truth. Next, he describes Mrs. Goyte, whom he has only briefly met, as "witch-like and impossible" (380). He says she has a witch-like laugh with
a "sinister witch-like graciousness" (389). When he thinks of her, he describes her as the "black witch-like little Mrs. Goyte" (386). Likewise, when Mr. Goyte returns home, he also refers to Mrs. Goyte as "Maggie wench" (388) and a "little devil" (392).

Lawrence depicts all willful women in his fiction as shrewish and witch-like. His attitude toward willful women also shows up in the nonfiction. In a letter to Baronin Von Richthofen, dated 5 December 1922, Lawrence writes that Mabel Dodge (a woman who provided him a place to live in New Mexico for several years) is intelligent but too volitional. He says that she is "very intelligent as a woman" but likes to play the patroness:

She . . . wants to be 'good' and is very wicked, has a terrible will-to-power, you know--she wants to be a witch and at the same time a Mary of Bethany at Jesus' feet--a big, white crow, a cooing raven of ill-omen, a little buffalo. . . . Basta, we are still 'friends' with Mabel. But do not take this snake to our bosom. (Selected Letters 206-07)

The men in "Wintry Peacock" clearly represent Lawrence's attitude toward the women. Not only do the two men show no respect for Mrs. Goyte, but they are equally condescending where Elise is concerned. Mr. Goyte's father refers to Elise and her illegitimate baby as a "Lot o' tom-
foolery" (389). Then he says, "What's good o'makkin' a peck o' trouble over what's far enough off, an' ned niver come no higher" (389). When Mr. Goyte learns that Elise named the baby boy after him, both the narrator and Mr. Goyte grin. "Good luck to her," Mr. Goyte said (391). Later the narrator asks Mr. Goyte what he plans to do about Elise, and he responds, "Who?" (392). The narrator repeats her name; Mr. Goyte replies "she was all right--" (392). Finally, for the third time, the narrator asks if Mr. Goyte plans to make contact with Elise. Mr. Goyte replies that he does not. "'Not me,' he said. 'Back your life it's a plant'" (392). Subsequently, he admits that he might be the father but says there is no proof of this, and he reminds the narrator that he never got the letter anyway. His wife burned it.

Even though the conflict centers around Elise and her baby, the narrator provides only a small amount of information about them. They are not the main issue in the narrator's mind; instead, the real issue involves the battle of the wills between Mr. and Mrs. Goyte. When Mr. Goyte learns that the narrator withheld the truth from Mrs. Goyte, he "broke into a short laugh" (392). Then he laughed aloud again, "evidently feeling he had won a big move in his contest with his wife" (392).

One might argue that Lawrence presents this story to expose and criticize abusive males. For example, Keith
Cushman, in "The Achievement of England, My England and Other Short Stories," writes: "The 'misogyny' . . . is present, but Lawrence is critical of the men in the story as well" (37). It is true that Lawrence is critical of the two men, but he is always critical of men who fail as male leaders. What is important here is that he is even more critical of the women. Also, Lawrence does not give the reader any information that will allow for reader sympathy with Mrs. Goyte, a woman presented as a shrill, overbearing witch. It is equally difficult to sympathize with Elise, whom the men discount as just one of the many Belgian lasses. Mr. Goyte talks as if all Belgian women are in the habit of having babies and trying to blame any male they can. At the end of the story, Mr. Goyte hints that Belgian girls are experienced in writing letters like the one he received from Elise. He says, "They know how to pitch you out a letter, those Belgian lasses" (392). In another attempt to discredit Elise, the narrator describes her love letter as "trite and vulgar" (380). He says, "Therefore I read with a callous heart the effusions of the Belgian damsel" (381).

Janice Harris says that Lawrence keeps Elise in the background through her flatly translated letter in order to prevent the reader from sympathizing with Elise: "Clearly, sympathizing with her would conflict with the focus on masculine independence" (149). To add to the effacement of
Elise, the two men refer to her as one of those Belgian girls, or as a lass, as if she is just one of many. To Mr. Goyte especially, there is nothing individual or special about Elise. Hence, the lesson seems to be that Elise is not important as an individual; she is also to blame for her own fate. The two men speak as if they believe that Elise would be in this same situation by some other man if Mr. Goyte had not happened along.

Kingsley Widmer, in The Art of Perversity, writes that misogyny is clearly apparent in "Wintry Peacock": "The harsh and defining natural scene echoes approval of the tamer of the female soul, and so does the narrator as he concludes the story" (111). It is clear that the narrator approves of Mr. Goyte, this tamer of the shrew. The narrator elevates Mr. Goyte as well as himself, while he describes the women in a disparaging manner. The narrator presents himself as an intelligent, educated, and polite man. Where Mr. Goyte is concerned, most of the focus is on the fact that he thinks he is the winner in this battle of the wills. The women are background material at best, incidental characters by the end of the story. The fate of the women seems to be of no consequence, and the story ends by focusing on the two men. At the end of the story Mr. Goyte, thoroughly amused by everything, says, "God, it’s a knock-out!" The narrator ends by saying that Mr. Goyte was
at ease, and "a handsome figure of a man" (393). Then the narrator runs down the hill, "shouting with laughter" (393).

Clearly, the narrator believes that Mr. Goyte has won this small battle, but it is evident that the larger battle for dominance has not yet been won. As in "Tickets, Please" and "Monkey Nuts," there are no clear winners here. Mrs. Goyte remains far too outspoken, and it seems that Mr. Goyte, like John Thomas in "Tickets, Please," places too much emphasis on the sex motive. For example, Mr. Goyte talks like one who has had other indiscretions, which in turn suggests that he places too much importance on the sex motive. He makes several generalizations about the Belgian women, as if he knows all about them. He says these Belgian women often write love letters like the one he received (392).

It is possible that Mr. Goyte is rationalizing here, so this evidence alone is not enough to prove he is a philanderer. However, if Mrs. Goyte's reaction to Elise's letter is considered, it seems likely that Mr. Goyte has been unfaithful more than once. A letter like Elise's--that Mrs. Goyte cannot even read--would not raise such strong suspicions in a trusting, unsuspecting wife. An individual like Mrs. Goyte would not likely draw such a radical and accurate conclusion without experience in this area. Her reaction suggests that she has been through this before with her husband, that she has good reason to be suspicious.
Keith Cushman, in his discussion of "Wintry Peacock," writes that the story should not be taken too seriously. He says "Wintry Peacock" can be read as comical: "The little-known 'Wintry Peacock' is decidedly in a comic vein, and the joke is at the expense of the incompatibility of men and women" (37). Cushman says that in the *England, My England* stories, Lawrence's use of comedy has never been adequately explored. "In so many of these stories the attempt to bridge the gap between man and woman only produces a wider chasm. This failure of the relationship is presented comically" (37). Finally, Cushman says many of these stories in *England, My England* are comedies and "can't be entirely serious" (37).

It is certainly possible that Lawrence intended to present this story in a comical vein; however, the humor relies on the exploitation of the females by the males. Readers who manage to sympathize with Elise and Mrs. Goyte, in spite of the negative characterizations of these two women, will likely fail to see the humor which is at the expense of these women. If readers do see humor, they must first overlook the abusive attitudes of the men as well as the emotional pain of the two women. Elise's predicament is hardly humorous. Mrs. Goyte's disappointment is likewise unamusing.

Because Lawrence is considerably more critical of the women than the men in "Wintry Peacock," it seems fair to say
that something else is going on in this story. In *Fantasia* Lawrence writes: "But then man must stick to his own positivity of being, of action, disinterested, non-domestic, male action, which is not devoted to the increase of the female" (135). The ideal balance that Lawrence describes in *Fantasia* can exist only when men and women understand and accept their Lawrentian-ordained roles: "To come at last to a nice place under the trees, with your 'amiable spouse' who has at last learned to hold her tongue and not to bother about rights and wrongs: her own particularly. . . . That is the best I know" (169).

Mrs. Goyte clearly does not know her "place," and this is partially exemplified through the peacock, Joey. Harris says the peacock is an emblem of defeated masculinity:

As Joey, the main bird, crouches at the feet of the cajoling wife, one sees him as the foil to the independent, undefeated husband. Joey is a wintry peacock, lacking the grandeur of his full, proud tail. The husband, by contrast, is going to allow no clinging Belgian girl, no devious wife, to clip his feathers. (149)

Mrs. Goyte has trained the peacock, this emblem of defeated masculinity, to show both loyalty and affection toward her. "Yes," she says, "He's an affectionate bird" (382). This bird, which pecks Mrs. Goyte on the cheek, which is her only source of tenderness and affection, is
laughed at and run off of the farm by Mr. Goyte, symbolically dispelling this threat to his masculinity. At the end, the narrator brings the bird back, and when Mr. Goyte sees Joey again, he says to the narrator, "I hate the brute. . . . I had a shot at him--" (393). Finally, at the very end, Mr. Goyte says he will "do that blasted Joey in--" (393). In other words, the battle may not be over yet, but Mr. Goyte will soon end the battle by overcoming this wintry peacock, Joey.

In addition to signifying a threat to masculinity, the peacock also calls attention to the subject of love, which Lawrence often condemns in his later works, and the narrator likewise condemns in this story. In Fantasia Lawrence writes: "It is time to drop the word love, and more than time to drop the ideal of love" (155). In a letter to Earl Brewster, written in 1921, Lawrence writes:

I here and now, finally and forever, give up knowing anything about love, or wanting to know. I believe it doesn’t exist, save as a word: a sort of wailing phoenix that is really the wind in the trees. In fact I here and now, finally and forever, leave off loving anything or everything or anybody. (Selected Letters 174-75)

The men in "Wintry Peacock" seem to share Lawrence’s attitude toward love. When the narrator first realizes that he is reading another man’s private correspondence, he
thinks to himself: "How could one consider these trivial, facile French phrases private! Nothing more trite and vulgar in the world, than such a love letter..." (380). Mr. Goyte, like the narrator, is untouched by the emotional words of Elise. After the narrator recites as much of the letter as he can remember, Mr. Goyte replies: "Oh, well . . . . I've never got that letter, anyhow" (392). The two men never once consider the possibility that Elise could be sincere.

Janice Harris, in The Short Fiction of D. H. Lawrence, writes that the story upholds the view that "the female and the love she represents are to be avoided" (149). Mr. Goyte's hatred of the peacock, Harris says, expresses the husband's will to avoid domestication altogether. "His last scene, with the narrator, is a brief image of the masculine understanding, fellowship, and wildness that Lawrence had begun to pit against heterosexual ties" (Harris 149). This story, to expand on this idea of masculine independence, amplifies the impotence of the female. "The Wintry Peacock" suggests that women like Mrs. Goyte can attempt to understand and control circumstances, and women like Elise can plead for love, understanding, and provisions, but ultimately these women are completely powerless. Men and women need one another; but like it or not, men will dominate, and women must submit.
CHAPTER IV

LOVE AND THE POWER STRUGGLE IN

AARON'S ROD AND THE PLUMED SERPENT

In each of the previous stories, Lawrence defines the characters in terms of duality: All balanced male and female characters are respectively dominant and submissive, active and passive, spiritual and emotional. In Fantasia, Lawrence explains the reasons for these dualities in terms of the sex motive and the creative motive (60). In Aaron's Rod, which was published in 1922, the same year with Fantasia, Lawrence also addresses male-female duality but uses a slightly different terminology. Here, Lawrence explains through Rawdon Lilly that humanity is driven by two great urges: love and power.

I told you there were two urges--two great life-urges. . . . There may be more. But it comes on me so strongly, now, that there are two: love and power. And we've been trying to work ourselves, at least as individuals, from the love-urge exclusively, hating the power-urge, and repressing it. And now I find we've got to accept the very thing we've hated. (288)

In addition to identifying the love and power urges, Lawrence says that these two urges cannot co-exist within
any one person. In *Aaron's Rod* Lilly says: "We must either love, or rule" (289). Lilly also asks which of the two urges Aaron follows: "Is it that you want to love, or to be obeyed?" (284). In other words, Aaron must choose because he cannot answer to both urges.

Even though it may appear that Aaron is free to choose between the two urges, Lilly makes it clear that only one of the choices is correct. The power-urge belongs to the masculine realm, while the love-urge belongs to the feminine realm. In the closing scene of *Aaron's Rod* Lilly says:

> We've got to accept the power motive, accept it in deep responsibility. . . . It is a great life motive. . . . And, of course, there must be one who urges and one who is impelled. Just as in love there is a beloved and a lover: the man is supposed to be the lover, the woman the beloved. Now, in the urge of power, it is the reverse. The woman must submit, but deeply, deeply submit. (288)

In *Fantasia* Lawrence also says that men must make a choice. They must choose between believing in the male creative soul, "a man's automatic power of production and reproduction," and serving the woman: "It is a choice between serving man, or woman," he says (145).

In *Aaron's Rod* and *The Plumed Serpent*, Lawrence shows that men and women will always be in opposition because the
female-male, love-power urges are in opposition. Lawrence also demonstrates in these two novels that men and women need one another, so if they are to coexist they must establish what he calls a "balance" or an "equilibrium." To create this "balance" or "equilibrium," Lawrence shows that men must assert their "great dynamic power" over the women.

In *Aaron's Rod* and *The Plumed Serpent*, as in short stories like "The Horse Dealer's Daughter" and "You Touched Me" Lawrence opens with imbalance, and the main characters are unaware of this imbalance on a conscious level. Aaron Sisson, the hero of *Aaron's Rod*, understands that he is seriously discontented and leaves home, but he does not understand the source of his unhappiness. Kate Leslie, the heroine in *The Plumed Serpent*, is discontented and travels as well. Like Aaron, she has much to learn.

Because Kate and Aaron are unconscious of what they are searching for, the process of enlightenment is slow and explicit. As Lawrence speaks directly through the characters in each novel, he sheds additional light on many of the ideas in his nonfiction. Through the private thoughts of the characters in these novels and through their dialogue with other characters, Lawrence writes candidly about his belief in male-supremacy. At times, he even addresses the reader directly. As a result, these two novels fill in some of the gaps in Lawrence's nonfiction.
Lawrence began writing *Aaron's Rod* in the fall of 1917, but the novel developed slowly and was not completed until May 1921. Lawrence began working on *The Plumed Serpent* in 1923 and completed it in 1925. During the eight years that passed between the time he began *Aaron's Rod* and completed *The Plumed Serpent*, Lawrence also wrote and published *Fantasia* (1922), *Studies in Classic American Literature* (1923), and many other essays and short stories, some published as late as 1936. All of these later works show that Lawrence is unwavering in his belief in male-supremacy.

To begin this study of love and power in *Aaron's Rod*, Lawrence reveals an imbalance between Aaron and the females in his life. Aaron's wife and his young daughters are persistent and controlling, functioning in the masculine realm. In contrast, Aaron is submissive, giving in to their every wish. The story begins as Aaron is walking home from work. He is preoccupied with concerns about the meeting of the Miner's Union that he just left. As he goes home in the twilight, he walks under a "large, brilliant evening star" (1), which to Lawrence signifies the light, spiritual realm of the male. As Aaron approaches home and begins to interact with his family, which is entirely female, the light fades into darkness. Aaron's two young daughters meet him in the yard and ask him to set up the Christmas tree right away. Although Aaron is tired, cold, hungry, and still concerned with his work, his wife asks, with a
"plangent" voice, that he go ahead and set the tree before dinner. "You might as well. You’ve left your dinner so long, you might as well do it now before you have it," she said. (1). Aaron acquiesces.

When Aaron begins to work on this "lop-sided" (2), unbalanced Christmas tree to placate the insistent females, the description of the scene focuses on the surrounding darkness, which to Lawrence signifies the realm of the female. "There was still a crystalline, non-luminous light in the under air. . . . The air breathed dark, frosty, electric" (2). Next, as Aaron brings the tree into the house, the inside light is described as artificial and harsh: "A stark white incandescent light filled the room and made everything sharp and hard" (3).

In Fantasia Lawrence teaches that women belong to the dark, sympathetic realm. Men belong to the light, spiritual realm. However, like Mrs. Goyte in "Wintry Peacock," Aaron’s wife does not know her "place." For instance, she complains about Aaron making a mess with the tree. "Mind where you make a lot of dirt," she said (3). Next she complains that he pays too little attention to his family: "If you cared for your wife and children half what you care about your Union, you’d be a lot better pleased in the end. . . . What I should like to see is a man that has thought for others, and isn’t all self and politics" (4). Apparently, Aaron attempts to focus on his creative motive,
but his wife interferes as she asserts her "love-will" over him. Because this relationship is out of balance, because the wife has vacated her sympathetic, emotional camp, she is surrounded by a harsh, artificial light. A woman cannot truly belong to the light, spiritual realm, according to Lawrence, so the wife is presented in a false and negative light.

Aaron's daughters, Marjory and Millicent, turn out to be younger versions of their persistent, complaining mother. As the two girls unwrap the tree ornaments, they fight over who is going to hang each ornament on the tree, and they try to force their father to pay attention to them (5-6). The girls fight and nag at one another, tugging at each of the decorations, until finally Millicent finds the most important of all the decorations, the big, blue ball which had belonged to Aaron since he was a child. Millicent, the more active and aggressive of the two girls, asks Aaron if he thinks it will break if she drops it. "I sh'd think not" (6), he replied. "But Millicent must go further," Lawrence writes. "She became excited. . . . She tossed it wildly: it fell with a little splashing explosion: it had smashed" (7). Millicent stood, looking half miserable yet half satisfied that she had broken her father's blue ball.

This smashing of Aaron's ball signifies the lack of masculine power in the Sisson family. Even the names of the girls suggest that the females are combative and aggressive.
The names Millicent and Marjory sound a lot like "militant majority," which is appropriate terminology for these females who outnumber and work in opposition to Aaron. The Sisson females are dominating, and the household is noisy, chaotic, uncontrolled. Clearly, Aaron does not successfully assert the power-urge. At home, he gives in to every female demand, and each time that he submits to the demands of his wife, she only complains that he does not give enough.

Lawrence writes in his essay titled "The Real Thing" (1930): "When a man has submitted to a woman, she usually fights him worse than ever, more ruthlessly... The need to fight with a man is upon her, inexorable" (199). The reason for this need, Lawrence says in the same essay, is that the man fails to assert himself in the leadership role—he has "lost his peculiar belief in himself, his instinctive faith in his own life-flow..." (198).

Aaron senses that things are out of balance and thinks to himself: "The war over, nothing was changed... The war was over, and everything just the same. The acute familiarity of this house... the changeless pleasantness of it all seemed unthinkable. It prevented his thinking" (7-8). Aaron cannot think about his problems because he does not have a conscious understanding of them, so he retreats to his flute for comfort. "A stream of music, soft and rich and fluid, came out of the flute" (9). The music was delicate, "very limpid and delicate" (9), but Aaron was
dissatisfied with his music also: "The more exquisite the music, the more perfectly he produced it, in sheer bliss; and at the same time, the more intense was the maddened exasperation within him" (9). Like Joe in "Monkey Nuts" who was sensitive and wavering, Aaron is sensitive and wavering as well. Also, like Joe, Aaron is not comfortable with his sensitive, passive nature. Nor is he comfortable with female domination.

To escape these persistent females, Aaron leaves for the town tavern where he often drinks and talks with his friends in the evenings. At the tavern, however, Aaron finds he cannot get away from the dangerous, female domination. The landlady of the tavern, who loves intellectual discussion, who carries her head with "dauntless self-sufficiency" (14), was feeling very warm toward him. But a terrible obstinacy overcame Aaron:

He saw the fine, rich-coloured, secretive face of the Hebrew woman, so loudly self-righteous, and so dangerous, so destructive, so lustful. . . . The very danger and lustfulness of her, which so pricked his senses, now left him colder. He disliked her tricks. He had come to her once too often. To her and to every woman. Bah, the love game! (18)

In the past, Aaron had enjoyed the landlady's attention, but on this night he realizes he is not happy:
A woman and whisky, these were usually a remedy—and music. But lately these had begun to fail him. No, there was something in him that would not give in. . . . Nothing would have pleased him better than to have felt his senses swimming and flowing into darkness. But impossible! (18-19)

These passages clearly echo the descriptions from Fantasia as well as scenes from stories like "Monkey Nuts" and "Wintry Peacock." For example, this scene and the earlier one with Aaron's family produce the imagery of light and darkness. Also, the descriptions of the volitional, cerebral landlady are accompanied by destructive, dangerous words. Like Miss Stokes in "Monkey Nuts" and Mrs. Goyte in "Wintry Peacock," the women surrounding Aaron are dark, ominous individuals. As Aaron glances at the landlady's profile, he sees "that fine throwback of her hostile head, wicked in the midst of her philanthropy. . . ." (18).

Aaron, who was in the habit of giving in to his wife, his mistress, and the young girls, is now going through some mysterious change. "There was a hard, opposing core in him. . . . It remained hard, nay become harder and more deeply antagonistic to his surroundings, every moment" (18). Aaron does not understand these feelings, but on this night they become so overpowering that he leaves the tavern and does not return home. He strikes out on a journey in search
of answers, deserting his family, leaving his job and his friends.

In *The Plumed Serpent*, Kate Leslie also searches for answers. Kate is forty years old, her children are grown, and she is widowed. Kate, an independent, self-sufficient woman, is uncomfortable and discontented like Aaron, but her dissatisfaction is the opposite of Aaron's. While Aaron is surrounded by imbalance, Kate is uncomfortable because she is a "modern woman" surrounded by balance. All of the men in *The Plumed Serpent* are extremely dominant, and all of the women are completely passive. At the end of *The Plumed Serpent*, Kate will learn the lesson that Aaron's wife cannot learn. She will submit "deeply and richly" as Lawrence requires of women in *Fantasia* and *Aaron's Rod*.

As Kate travels through Mexico she can "feel" the presence of the men: "Here were men face to face not with death and self-sacrifice, but with the life-issue. She felt for the first time in her life a pang almost like fear, of men who were passing beyond what she knew, beyond her depth" (70). In *Fantasia* Lawrence explains that a woman like Kate fears men for the same reason she fears the bull:

The woman's fear of the bull is a great terror of the dynamic upper centres in man. The bull's horns, instead of being phallic, represent the enormous potency of the upper centres. . . . Her wakeful fear is terror of the great breast-and-
shoulder, upper rage and power of man, which may pierce her defenseless lower self. The terror and the desire are near together—and go with an admiration of the slender, abstracted bull loins. (200).

Not only does Kate fear the men, but she fears the women of Mexico even more. The women were "images of wild, submissiveness, the primitive womanliness of the world..." (82). She feared "They would pull her down, pull her down, to the dark depths of nothingness" (82).

At the beginning of The Plumed Serpent, Kate is operating in the light, spiritual realm and must learn to abandon this masculine realm and submit to male power. However, Kate fears surrendering to the male. As a result, she has a more difficult time learning her lesson than Aaron does. Even though the lessons are essentially the same, Aaron seems to understand on an instinctive level that men are supposed to lead and women follow. Kate also has a vague understanding of Lawrence's natural order, but her understanding is incomplete. She does understand that the man must go ahead of the woman. In the beginning of The Plumed Serpent she says: "A woman who isn't quite ordinary herself can only love a man who is fighting for something beyond the ordinary life" (75). Even though Kate believes that a man's creative purpose must take him beyond the realm of the female, she does not understand the necessity for
total submission. Consequently, it takes 487 pages for Lawrence to awaken this unbalanced, misguided woman.

In both The Plumed Serpent and Aaron's Rod, the characters must be awakened to the hierarchy of love and power; and to understand this hierarchy, Kate and Aaron must first learn about love: what it is and what it is not. In Fantasia Lawrence divides love into sensual and ideal love. Sensual love between a man and a woman is sexual and desirable, he says, while ideal love is a form of bullying and must be avoided. In Fantasia Lawrence explains: "We have to break the love-ideal, once and for all" (162). Likewise, in a letter to Achsah Brewster (1921), Lawrence writes: "The word love has for me gone pop: there isn't anything any more" (Selected Letters 177). In Aaron's Rod Lawrence explains that the love ideal leads to the total abandonment of the individual self:

In his (Aaron's) now silent, maskless state of wordless comprehension, he knew that he had never wanted to surrender himself utterly to Lottie: nor to his mother: nor to anybody. The last extreme of self-abandon in love was for him an act of false behavior. His own nature inside him fated him not to take this last false step, over the edge of the abyss of selflessness. (161)

Clearly, in Aaron's Rod Lawrence does not recommend ideal love. When Aaron is alone in his room and begins to miss
his wife, he soon remembers her female will. He remembers that the love between them developed into combat almost immediately after their marriage:

But the moment he actually realised himself at home, and felt the tension of barrenness which it meant, felt the curious and deadly opposition of his wife's will against his own nature . . . he pulled himself together and rejoiced again in his new surroundings. Her will, her will, her terrible, implacable, cunning will! What was there in the female will so diabolical . . .

The female will! He realised now that he had a horror of it. (154)

Through a conversation between Aaron and several of his friends, Lawrence continues to explain that the love-ideal leads to destruction:

This [love] is the sacrament we live by; the holy communion we live for. That man give himself to woman in an utter and sacred abandon, all, all, all himself given, and taken. Woman, eternal woman, she is the communicant. She receives the sacramental body and spirit of the man. And when she's got it, according to her passionate and all-too-sacred desire, completely, when she possesses her man at last finally and ultimately, . . . she is driven mad by the endless meal of the
marriage sacrament, poisoned by the sacred communion which was her goal and her soul's ambition. (162)

Once a man gives himself to the woman, she is driven mad, Lawrence writes, and she drives the man insane as well. During a conversation with several friends, one of Aaron's acquaintances, Argyle, explains that if a man surrenders to the love-ideal, he becomes a slave to the women—if a woman says "gee-up" the man must canter, he says (237):

I went through it all. But I broke the shafts and smashed the matrimonial cart, I can tell you, and I didn't care whether I smashed her up along with it or not. . . . And here I am. And she is dead and buried these dozen years. (237)

In Fantasia Lawrence says that men would rather die or kill somebody than go on with this game of love:

And there she is, functioning away from her own head . . . and her own automatic self-will, till the whole man-and-woman game has become just a hell, and men with any backbone would rather kill themselves than go on with it—or kill somebody else. (121)

Not only in Aaron's Rod and Fantasia does Lawrence suggest that men prefer death to the female love-will, but he says the same in The Plumed Serpent. Carlota tries to assert her love-urge over Ramon's power-urge (377); and
Carlota continues to persist even though she understands that if she does not submit, either she or Ramon must die. She says to Kate: "If you think you can help me with Ramon, do help me do! For it means the death either of me or him" (182-83). In other words, Carlota cannot give up; therefore, she believes Ramon must succumb. "God is love," she says, "and if Ramon would only submit to love, he would know that he had found God. But he is perverse" (183).

Both Kate and Carlota are surrounded by strong males who are beginning to understand and assert the Lawrentian balance. "But all the while, gradually, his [Ramon's] nature was changing inside him... He had to cast that emotional self, which she [Carlota] loved, into the furnace, to be smelted down to another self" (227). The world, the narrator says, has gone too far in the loving direction, "and anything further in that line meant perversity. So the time had come for the slow, great change to something else" (228). The two male characters in *The Plumed Serpent*, Ramon and Cipriano, were beginning to assert the power urge, and the women must either submit or die.

Because Carlota refuses to submit, she finally dies a preternatural death. Kate tries to explain Carlota's death by suggesting that it resulted from sunstroke (379); and apparently the sun, being symbolic of the spiritual realm of the male, did in fact kill her. Just before her death, Carlota enters the church which Ramon had taken over and
stripped of all Christian symbolism. On her knees, Carlota begs for divine intervention. In essence she begs God to take Ramon’s life: "Oh, take his life from him now, now, that his soul may not die" (376). But Ramon, who was watching her, replies: "The Omnipotent . . . is with me, and I serve Omnipotence!" (377). As he said this, a strong convulsion seized her, and she fell in a heap on the altar steps. Ramon watched without any change of expression: "Not a muscle of his face moved. And Kate could see that his heart had died in its connection with Carlota, his heart was quite, quite dead in him. . ." (377). Kate heard Ramon say: "There is no star between me and Carlota" (377). The implication in this scene is that the male-female balance, or the Lawrentian "star equilibrium," is non-existent between Ramon and Carlota. This scene also implies that the power-urge is supreme over the love-urge.

In The Plumed Serpent, in Aaron’s Rod, and in much of the later nonfiction, Lawrence says that the ideal of love is illusory and must be replaced. At the end of Aaron’s Rod Lilly tells Aaron that love is not real: "It’s one of your lost illusions, my boy" (284). Lilly says this illusion of love must be replaced by a belief in the individual soul in the individual man. In Fantasia Lawrence says the same thing: "For there is only one law: I am I. . . . There are other stars buzzing in the centre of their own isolation. And there is no straight path between them" (66). In
Aaron's Rod Lawrence writes more about this isolation:

In so far as he [man] is a single individual soul, he is alone—ipso facto. In so far as I am I, and only I am I, and I am only I, in so far, I am inevitably and eternally alone, and it is my last blessedness to know it, and to accept it, and to live with this as the core of my self-knowledge.

(239)

In Fantasia Lawrence continues this discussion on isolation and duality:

There is only one clue to the universe. And that is the individual soul within the individual being. That outer universe of suns and moons and atoms is a secondary affair. It is the death-result of living individuals. There is a great polarity in life itself. Life itself is dual. And the duality is life and death. And death is not just shadow or mystery. It is the negative reality of life.

(181)

Lawrence also says: "In life . . . Man is positive and woman negative" (Fantasia 133). So it follows that Carlota must be sacrificed to this "negative reality of life" because she does not subordinate her negative love-urge to Ramon's positive power-urge.

Because Lawrence believes men and women are in direct opposition, it follows that the male-female equilibrium can
be achieved only through a positive-negative polarity. Just as light negates darkness and active negates passive, man must negate woman through his power-urge. In other words, Lawrence's male-female equation requires one dominant and one submissive partner. And at the end of Aaron's Rod, Lilly tells Aaron that the submissive partner must always be the woman: "The woman must submit, but deeply, deeply submit" (Aaron 288). And when the woman does submit, Lilly says: "There will be profound, profound obedience in place of this love-crying, obedience to the incalculable power-urge" (Aaron 289). If women fail to submit, according to Lawrence, they will be either miserable or they will die. In The Plumed Serpent, Ramon's new wife, Teresa, explains:

But you [Kate] can no more keep your own soul inside you for yourself, without its dying, than you can keep the seed of your womb. . . . And until you give your soul to a man, and he takes it, your soul is nothing to you. (448-49)

Although Lawrence believes that women must submit, that the love-urge must be subordinated, he never denies love altogether. Love will be a nest of scorpions "unless" it is overshadowed by the power-urge in the male (Fantasia 219). Love, sensual love, is acceptable to Lawrence as long as it is subordinated to the dominant, power-urge in the male. To assert the dominant urge, Lawrence suggests in Aaron's Rod and The Plumed Serpent that the male must rely on
phallic power. In *The Plumed Serpent* Lawrence writes: "Man is a column of blood: Woman is a valley of blood" (457). Because of this, Lawrence writes, woman must submit to the man: "It meant a strange, marginless death of her individual self" (457).

In *Aaron's Rod*, Lawrence also writes about male sexual desire and phallic power. After dining with friends, the Marchesa and Manfredi, Aaron finds he is physically attracted to the Marchesa. For many months, Aaron had repressed all sexual desire, but he now finds this desire has returned:

And now came his desire back. But strong, fierce as iron. Like the strength of an eagle with the lightning in its talons. Something to glory in, something overweening, the powerful male passion, arrogant, royal, Jove's thunderbolt. Aaron's black rod of power . . . . (250)

Aaron visits the Marchesa the next day, and as he satisfies his "fierce" male desire, the Marchesa enjoys the magic feeling of Aaron's "phallic immortality" (264). The narrator says this experience both frightens and fascinates the Marchesa: "And she clung to him closer. Strange, she was afraid of him! Of his actual male physique she was afraid as of a fetish. Fetish afraid, and fetish-fascinated" (264). This fear and fascination also parallels the passage in *Fantasia* where Lawrence describes the woman's
fear of the bull: "The [woman’s] terror and desire are near
together--and go with an admiration of the slender,
abstracted bull loins" (200).

One might wonder why Lawrence insists on using this
phallic imagery, but a closer look at his ideology will show
that male supremacy and phallic supremacy are, to Lawrence,
one and the same. In Fantasia, and in works like Aaron’s
Rod and The Plumed Serpent, Lawrence says the power-urge
must dominate the love-urge, and the love-urge must remain
sensual. Therefore, it follows that if the male wants to
assert his power-urge over the female’s love-urge, this
assertion must be communicated through the sensual realm.
In other words, the male’s supremacy is enforced through
phallic-power.

Even the titles of these two books allude to the male
phallus. Aaron’s rod may be a flute in the literal sense,
but this flute symbolizes the emotional, sensational realm
that Aaron must learn to control. The way in which Aaron
learns to control women, as well as the emotional side of
himself, is by withholding at all times a part of himself.
Lilly says that in love, a man must remain alone, "most
intensely of all, alone" (239). In other words, the man can
enjoy the sensual realm but must not submit to this realm,
even for one moment, because if he does, the love-urge will
dominate him: "Cost what it may, he [Aaron] must come to
her [the Marchesa]. And yet he knew at the same time that,
cost what may, he must keep the power to recover himself from her. He must have his cake and eat it" (244).

The struggle for control is not easy for Aaron because his understanding is weak. As he dines with the Marchesa and her husband, he realizes that he is losing his control:

Something deep, deep at the bottom of him hovered upon her [the Marchesa], cleaved to her. Yet he was as if sightless, in a stupor. Who was she, what was she? He had lost all his grasp . . . . If someone had taken his mind away altogether, and left him with nothing but a body and a spinal consciousness, it would have been the same. (244)

After dinner, however, Aaron recovers control over his sensual nature and over the Marchesa--through his flute or rod. When he plays his flute for the Marchesa, he sits where she cannot see him. The music from his concealed "rod" has an immediate effect on her:

She seemed to go still, and yielding. . . . A certain womanly naturalness seemed to soften her. And the music of the flute came quick, rather brilliant like a call-note, or like a long quick message, half command. To her it was like a pure male voice . . . telling her something, and soothing her soul to sleep. (246)

While the Marchesa is in this trance-like state, Aaron is aloof. After his recital, Aaron returns to the room, and
the Marchesa sees his face: "Between the brows was something of a doubt, and in his bearing an aloofness that made her dread he might go away and not come back. She could see it in him, that he might go away and not come back" (246). Like Mabel at the end of "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter" the Marchesa now feels dependent, afraid that he will leave her. "There was something wistful, almost pathetic now, in her elegance. . ." (247).

When the Marchesa’s husband, Manfredi, sees that Aaron has transfixed his wife, "His face looked strange and withered and gnome-like. . . . But Manfredi knew that Aaron had done what he himself never could do, for this woman" (249). Aaron sat with them both feeling as though he had triumphed:

He had performed a little miracle, and felt himself a little wonder-worker, to whom reverence was due. . . . His manhood, or rather his maleness, rose powerfully in him, in a sort of mastery. He felt his own power, he felt suddenly his own virile title to strength and reward. Suddenly, and newly flushed with his own male super-power, he was going to have his reward. The woman was his reward. (249-50)

Clearly, Aaron’s rod is symbolic of the phallus. When he returns home he places his flute on the table and smiles, remembering that Lilly had called it "Aaron’s rod" (250).
"So you blossom, do you?" Aaron asks as he looks at the flute (250). "For such a long time it had been hard and unyielding, so hard and unyielding. . . . For such a long time his desire for women had withheld itself, hard and resistant" (250). But now Aaron had his desire back: "Aaron's black rod of power, blossoming again with red Florentine lilies and fierce thorns. . . . He had got it back, the male godliness, the male godhead" (250).

To further this association of the phallus with power, Lawrence also refers to the phallus as a phoenix: "He [Aaron] felt his turn had come. The phoenix had risen in fire again, out of the ashes" (251). Like the phoenix, the phallus is to Lawrence a sign of immortality. To further this image of the rod as phallus and phoenix, Lawrence titles the penultimate chapter "The Broken Rod," and the focus is on the destruction and the renewal of this rod: "And the loss was for him [Aaron] symbolistic. It chimed with something in his soul: the bomb, the smashed flute, the end" (276). This smashed rod symbolizes a change in Aaron. With all the women in Aaron's past, Aaron had rotated between being wavering and commanding. With his wife, he at times acquiesced and at times withheld himself from her. He was the same with his mistress (the landlady) and the Marchesa. This smashed flute, symbolizes for Aaron a true break with his past, a type of rebirth. Lilly says to Aaron: "It'll grow again. It's a reed, a water-plant.
You can’t kill it" (276). Aaron’s rod, like the phoenix, is immortal and will rise from the ashes anew. And this new rod will represent the new phallus, which is non-domestic, not dedicated to the increase of the female (Fantasia 135). This new, modern phallus will oppose and conquer the new or modern woman that Lawrence so detests in the later nonfiction.

Like Aaron's Rod, The Plumed Serpent also relies on phallic imagery. While Aaron has his "rod," Ramon and Cipriano have their "plumed serpent." However, in this book Lawrence becomes more assertive, and even sadistic, concerning phallic power.

This "plumed serpent," or bird-snake, symbolizes male dominion over the earth and sky, over the day and night, light and darkness. The plumed serpent turns out to be a god named Quetzalcoatl, who has returned to earth, and who preaches that man is lord over the upper and lower realms, the emotional and spiritual realms. "For me the serpent of middle-earth sleeps in my loins and my belly," Ramon says, "the bird of the outer air perches on my brow and sweeps her bill across my breast" (250). In Fantasia Lawrence says the loins (where the serpent sleeps) are symbolic of the lower, emotional plane while the chest and head (where the bird perches) are symbolic of the upper, spiritual plane. "I am master of up and down...," says Quetzalcoatl. "I am I! The lord of both ways" (250).
In *The Plumed Serpent* the men dominate both realms, the realm of the power-urge and the love-urge, and they do this through their phallic power, through the plumed serpent. Ramon preaches a sermon to the people, symbolically describing the serpent-god of the earth using phallic imagery:

```
Serpent . . . snake that lies in the fire at the heart of the world, come! come! Snake of the fire at the heart of the world, coil like gold round my ankles, and rise like life around my knee, and lay your head against my thigh. . . . From the heart of the earth man feels his manhood rise up in him, like the maize that is proud, turning its green leaves outwards. Be proud like the maize, and let your roots go deep, deep, for the rains are here, and it is time for us to be growing in Mexico.  (215, 217)
```

In addition to associating the phallus with the serpent, Ramon also equates the male to the morning star: "But on your brow, Men! the undimmed Morning Star, that neither day nor night, nor earth nor sky can swallow and put out" (219). One of the men listening to Ramon asks how shall men become "Men of the Morning Star?" (219). Ramon answers: "Lower your fingers to the caress of the Snake of the earth" (219). Apparently, the serpent or phallus is the place where the
men will find the powers of the Morning Star, or as the narrator also calls it, the "manhood of man" (219).

In The Plumed Serpent the narrator says that Kate, without a doubt, understands the phallic mystery, the "supreme phallic mystery" (340). And she can also understand marrying Cipriano:

Ah! and what a mystery of prone submission, on her part, this huge erection would imply! Submission absolute, like the earth under the sky. Beneath an over-arching absolute. . . . She could conceive now her marriage with Cipriano; the supreme passivity, like the earth below the twilight, consummate in living lifelessness, the sheer solid mystery of passivity. Ah, what an abandon, what an abandon, what an abandon! --of so many things she wanted to abandon. . . . She looked back at him, wordless. . . . Her self had abandoned her, and all her day was gone. (342)

Kate does not, however, remain in this submissive state. She continues to waver between submission and independence. So to continue to overcome this struggle in Kate, Cipriano asserts his power-urge through the act of coition. But rather than withholding a part of himself, as Aaron did, Cipriano withholds something from Kate. He does not allow her to have an orgasm, or as she calls it, her "Aphrodite of
the foam": "When in their love, it came back on her, the
seething electric female ecstasy, which knows such spasms of
delirium, he recoiled from her" (463).

Cipriano does not withhold satisfaction from Kate just
once but on a habitual basis:

By a dark and powerful instinct he drew away
from her as soon as this desire rose again in
her, for the white ecstasy of frictional
satisfaction, the throes of Aphrodite of the
foam. She could see that to him, it was
repulsive. He just removed himself, dark and
unchangeable, away from her. (463)

Why does Cipriano deny Kate this pleasure, this "Aphrodite
of the foam"? Here again, if Lawrence's ideology is
considered, it becomes evident that this is part of
Cipriano's attempt to dominate Kate's will or love-urge.
The "deep, unfathomable" submission that Lawrence writes
about in Aaron's Rod (289) means that woman must give beyond
what is measurable. When a woman does this, Lawrence
suggests in The Plumed Serpent, her satisfaction will be
much deeper than the conscious satisfaction of coition:

And succeeding the first moment of disappointment,
when this sort of 'satisfaction' was denied
her [Kate], came the knowledge that she did not
really want it, that it was really nauseous to
her. . . . And there was no such thing as conscious
'satisfaction.' What happened was dark and untellable. So different from the beak-like friction of the Aphrodite of the foam. . . . (463)

Carol Dix, in a book titled *D. H. Lawrence and Women*, says *The Plumed Serpent* conveys some of Lawrence's most complicated ideas concerning men, women, and duality. Dix says that Cipriano withholds Kate's orgasm as a means of educating her:

Another way of looking at Cipriano's act is to see it as a means of educating Kate in traditionally eastern values to be slower, to accept the flow of natural sex, not to be struggling and striving for the self-motivated orgasm that Lawrence knew was the drive of modern western women—the masturbatory orgasm. (87)

Dix also adds that Lawrence does not find the female orgasm to be repulsive, as some feminist critics claim. "Far from it. He [Lawrence] describes in detail the extremely active movements of the woman in ecstacy" (87). Dix, to support the above conclusion, next quotes Lawrence's passage about the "repulsive" orgasm, the death of the "Aphrodite of the foam." Dix says that his passage, because it mentions the woman's "ecstacy" (87), proves that Lawrence does not find the female orgasm to be repulsive.
One might wonder, at this juncture, why Lawrence attempts to "educate" women only. Also, if the female orgasm is not repulsive to Lawrence, if Lawrence is not a misogynist, one might wonder why Cipriano recoils from Kate, and why Kate herself sees her own satisfaction as something dreadful. "She did not really want it," Kate thinks to herself. "It was really nauseous to her" (463).

Through Kate, Lawrence not only creates a female who accepts this denial of satisfaction but actually prefers denial on a permanent basis:

And there was no such thing as conscious 'satisfaction.' What happened was dark and untellable. . . . What she had with Cipriano was curiously beyond her knowing: so deep and hot and flowing, as it were subterranean. She had to yield before it. (463)

This sadomasochistic relationship between Kate and Cipriano apparently symbolizes the self-denial or surrender of the woman. In addition to this sexual denial, Cipriano does not allow Kate to share any other connection with him:

And as it was in the love-act, so it was with him. She could not know him. When she tried to know him, something went slack in her, and she had to leave off. She had to let be. She had to leave him, dark and hot and potent, along with the things that are, but are not known. The presence.
And the stranger. This he was always to her. . . . And there was no personal intimacy. . . . She had so craved for intimacy, insisted on intimacy. Now she found herself accepting him finally and forever as the stranger in whose presence she lived. (464)

In an introduction to Aaron's Rod, Mara Kalnins says that Lawrence's idea of power transcends any notion of mere authoritarianism: "Lawrence's vision of man is not political but spiritual, not a denial of man's freedom and individuality but a confirmation of it. . . ." (xxvi). If Kalnins, when writing about "man's" freedom, refers only to the male, she accurately describes Lawrence's ideology. Lawrence most definitely confirms "man's" individuality and freedom, but in order for man to achieve this, woman must sacrifice her freedom and individuality altogether.

Near the end of Aaron's Rod, Lilly speaks of female submission: "And there will be profound, profound obedience in place of this love-crying, obedience to the incalculable power-urge" (289). Aaron argues that women will never submit, but Lilly disagrees. He says women will submit when men want them to. In addition, Lilly also explains that men want leaders, just as women do. But their leaders will always be other, higher males. Aaron asks Lilly who he should submit to, and Lilly tells him that he will discover the answer in his own soul. Hence, the Lawrentian
hierarchy: Each woman must choose a man and submit, while each man must choose some higher male soul and submit. Although Aaron does not find a submissive woman, he does understand that he wants to submit to Lilly. "If he [Aaron] had to give in to something: if he really had to give in, and it seemed he had: then he would rather give in to the devilish little Lilly than to the beastly people of the world" (280). In The Plumed Serpent, this hierarchy is also evident: Kate submits to Cipriano, who in turn submits to Ramon, who finally submits to Quetzalcoatl, the plumed serpent, the supreme male phallus. "I am Quetzalcoatl," says the phallic-god, "lord of both ways, star between day and the dark" (251).

In both Aaron's Rod and The Plumed Serpent, the men learn that the male power-urge must dominate the female love-urge. Lawrence never says this ideology will be easy to implement, but through the narrators and the characters Lawrence says it must be so. "The change has to be made," Ramon says. "And some man has to make it" (445). After a silence, Ramon adds: "Man is a column of blood, with a voice in it . . . . And when the voice is still, and he is only a column of blood, he is better" (446). More supreme than even the male intellect is the phallus, Quetzalcoatl, the god symbolic of the "phallic mystery," the "supreme phallic mystery" (340).
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION: MISOGYNY AS IDEOLOGY

Although no one knows for sure what brought about the change in Lawrence's attitude toward women, critics like Judith Ruderman and Janice Harris have made some speculations. In D. H. Lawrence and the Devouring Mother, Ruderman says that the first World War had a profound effect on Lawrence's attitude: "As the men went off to war, leaving the women at home to take on traditionally male occupations and responsibilities, profound changes occurred in the male-female relationship. These changes were deeply threatening to Lawrence, with his need to assert male dominance over (strong) females" (15-16). Harris, in The Short Fiction of D. H. Lawrence, says that Lawrence may have been affected by the war, and also by the long, painful fights with Frieda. He and Frieda lived in severe poverty and often quarrelled with each other and with their friends, Harris says (105-06).

Whatever the reasons might be, the change is apparent. Lawrence, in his later works, consistently places all balanced women in passive, submissive roles, and all balanced males in active, dominant roles. In addition, Lawrence depicts all women, balanced and unbalanced alike, as destructive. While the "modern" woman is destructive of
others, the balanced woman becomes self-destructive, destroying her own individuality. For example, Lawrence presents balanced women, such as Mabel in "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter" and Kate in The Plumed Serpent, as submissive, and their submission is accompanied by a sense of unworthiness and self-degradation. In the closing scene of "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter" as Mabel grovels on her knees, she says: "'And I’m so awful, I’m so awful! Oh no, I’m too awful.’ And she broke into bitter, heart-broken sobbing. ‘You can’t want to love me, I’m horrible’" (856). At the end of The Plumed Serpent, published four years after "The Horse Dealer’s Daughter," Kate says: "'You don’t really want me... I knew you didn’t really want me,’ she wept. ‘You don’t want me to go, do you?’ she pleaded" (486-87).

In the later works, the key to each submission is the female will. While someone like Hadrian in "You Touched Me" has the power to force himself upon Matilda, the woman still has the power to despise this intrusion. A woman may outwardly submit, but nobody can force a complete and absolute submission. The complete submission must be done freely, willingly. In Aaron’s Rod Lawrence writes: "The woman must now submit--but deeply, deeply, and richly! No subservience. None of that. No slavery. A deep, unfathomable free submission" (288-89). Part of this free submission requires that the woman place the man above
herself. Lawrence insists that the man must be everything to woman—her ultimate goal. In *Fantasia* he writes:

How wonderful it is to come back to her, at evening, as she sits half in fear and waits. . . . And then, for her, at last, all that she has lost during the day, to have it again between her arms, all that she has missed, to have it poured out for her, and a richness and a wonder she had never expected. It is her hour, her goal. (219)

According to Lawrence's fiction and nonfiction writings, female submission is the natural and necessary order because women are "nothing" without a male leader. In the beginning of *The Plumed Serpent* Kate has no male leader, and she finds her life empty. After she meets Ramon and Cipriano, who make a strong impression on her, she thinks to herself:

She had seen Ramon Carrasco, and Cipriano. And they were men. They wanted something beyond. She would believe in them. Anything, anything rather than this sterility of nothingness which was the world, and into which her life was drifting.

(113)

Later, as Kate sits alone in her room, she thinks about her loneliness as a "modern" woman: "Never had she passed her
days so blindly, so unknowingly, in stretches of nothingness. . . " (337).

These passages from *The Plumed Serpent* echo a passage from *The Fox* where March also recognizes her "nothingness." As she looks back on her efforts at independence, she thinks to herself:

She knew that, even in her small way, she had failed. She had failed to satisfy her own feeling of responsibility. It was so difficult. It seemed so easy at first. . . . She had been all her life reaching, reaching, and what she reached for seemed so near, until she had stretched to her utmost limit. And then it was always beyond her. Always beyond her, vaguely, unrealisably beyond her, and she was left with nothingness at last.

(176)

*Matilda* and *Emmie* in "You Touched Me," like the women in *The Fox*, are also surrounded by barrenness, or nothingness. These two "quiet, melancholy" girls live in an "ugly, brick house girt in by the wall" that encloses the grounds (394). The yard is desolate, everything closed: "No more great crates. . . . No more the drays drawn by great horses. . . . No more pottery-lasses. . . . All that was over" (394).

Lawrence explains what he believes to be the reason for this female "nothingness" in his essay "Cocksure Women and
Hensure Men," published in Forum magazine in January 1929:

The tragedy about cocksure women is that they are more cocky, in their assurance, than the cock himself. . . . And it is this that makes the cocksureness of women so dangerous, so devastating. . . . It is all an attitude, and one day the attitude will become a weird cramp, a pain, and then it will collapse. . . . Having lived her life with such utmost strenuousness and cocksureness, she has missed her life altogether. Nothingness! (50)

In The Plumed Serpent, Lawrence further explains the fallacy of the modern woman. At the end of the book, Kate thinks about the "modern" women she has known in her past: "But look, only look at the modern woman of fifty and fifty-five, those who have cultivated their ego to the top of their bent! Usually, they are grimalkins to fill one with pity or with repulsion" (481). Kate concludes that her ego and individuality are not worth that: "I'd better abandon some of my ego, and sink some of my individuality, rather than go like that" (481).

Of course not all of Lawrence's female characters submit, but those who fail to submit will find no relief from this "nothingness." Annie and the women in "Tickets, Please" do not submit and are left "mute" and "stupefied" (346). Also like the women in "Ticket, Please," Miss
Stokes, the cold, aggressive protagonist in "Monkey Nuts," is rejected by her lover because of her independent nature. The last thing the narrator says suggests that she is left both mortified and empty: "She turned white—dead white. The men thought she would fall" (378). In Aaron's Rod, Lottie is yet another example of a woman who fails to submit: "And in one black, unconscious movement he [Aaron] was gone... She, realising, sank upon the hearth-rug and lay there curled upon herself. She was defeated" (122). All of Lawrence's women who do not submit are either left defeated or they must die, as did Carlota in The Plumed Serpent.

Repeatedly, Lawrence suggests that each woman needs a man, but if she continues to assert her will, she will be rejected. The woman's one and only job is to glorify the male. In The Plumed Serpent, Kate thinks to herself:

She herself had known men who made her feel a queen, who made her feel as if the sky rested on her bosom and her head was among the stars... Now she saw the opposite taking place. This little bit of a black-eyed woman [Teresa] had an almost uncanny power, to make Ramon great and gorgeous in the flesh, whilst she herself became inconspicuous, almost invisible... This hidden, secretive power of the dark female!
The ancient mystery of the female power, which consists in glorifying the blood-male. (435-36) Kate at first resists and questions this glorification of the male, yet she never totally rejects it:

Wasn't it degrading for a woman? And didn't it make the man either soft and sensuous, or else hatefully autocratic? Yet Kate herself had convinced herself of one thing finally: that the clue to all living and to all moving-on into new living lay in the vivid blood-relation between man and woman. A man and a woman in this togetherness were the clue to all present living and future possibility. . . . And the togetherness needed a balance. Surely it needed a balance! (436)

Through Kate, Lawrence demonstrates his idea of balance, the need for a final and complete submission of the "modern" woman. In the end of The Plumed Serpent, Kate goes to Cipriano intending to make only "a sort of submission" (486). She thinks to herself: "I will make my submission; as far as I need, and no further" (482). Although Kate does not want to submit totally, she understands that submission is the only way: "Without Cipriano to touch me and limit me and submerge my will, I shall become a horrible, elderly female. I ought to want to be limited. I ought to be glad if a man will limit me with a strong will and a warm touch"
(482). In the last scene, as soon as Kate is in Cipriano’s presence and hears the "hot, phallic passion in Cipriano’s voice," she begins to cry. In the very last line of the book she says to Cipriano: "You won’t let me go!" The narrator ends the story showing that although Kate does not want to yield a complete and absolute submission, she will do anything to avoid "nothingness," anything to avoid becoming a grimalkin. The narrator also makes it clear that a complete submission will be necessary in order for Kate to avoid the fate she so fears.

In *Fantasia* Lawrence explains why he believes female submission and male dominance are necessary. He says women are by nature passive, emotional beings: "Women can never feel and know as men do" (137). If women are allowed to function in the active, volitional realm, Lawrence says they become perverse. "The moment she [woman] is competent in the manly world--there’s an end of it. She’s had enough. . . . She becomes absolutely perverse, and her one end is to prostitute herself and her ideals to sex" (216). Earlier in *Fantasia* Lawrence also explains that if women do become active, their "womanhood" will be permanently destroyed: "Teach a woman to act from an idea, and you destroy her womanhood forever. Make a woman self-conscious, and her soul is barren as a sandbag" (121).

Carol Dix in *D. H. Lawrence and Women* says that Lawrence does not degrade women or treat them as inferior
objects: "He saw more in women, and the feminine principle, than did most of his contemporaries" (x). Dix also says Kate Millett misinterprets Lawrence: "I wanted to know what her [Millett's] deep feelings were, but all I came away with was a feeling of anger and hostility . . . that someone could so misread Lawrence's works, so misrepresent him as a man of ideas" (81). Dix says Lawrence treats female sexuality "with originality and a sense of excitement" (81), and through *The Plumed Serpent*, Lawrence addresses some of his most complicated ideas concerning men, women, and duality. Dix writes: "Kate Leslie is an independent, educated, self-motivated woman" (87). Although Kate is independent and self-motivated in the beginning of the novel, she does not remain so. Dix does not address the passages which explain that Kate must abandon her individuality, that all women must achieve their being through a man.

Lawrence never produces in his later works a woman who maintains her sense of individuality. In the pre-1918 works, through characters like Ursula in *The Rainbow* (1915), Lawrence shows that he had the genius with which to imagine the independent, self-actualized heroine. If he truly believed in the possibility of a self-actualized woman, where is she to be found in the post-1918 fiction? If Lawrence is an egalitarian, as Dix says he is, where is the evidence of this? Why does Lawrence never address the
woman's "creative motive" in these later works? Why does Lawrence repeatedly depict all female characters as destructive?

Throughout his later works, Lawrence asserts that men and women need one another, but in order to have a balanced, workable relationship, men must rule and women must obey. And Lawrence does not simply require obedience, but he requires a woman to submit her soul, her very being to the man. In *The Fox* Lawrence explains, through Grenfel, that a woman must yield herself completely to a man in order to achieve her womanhood: "He [Grenfel] would never have it till she [March] yielded and slept in him. Then he would have all his own life as a young man and a male, and she would have all her own life as a woman and a female" (179).

In Lawrence's post-1918 writings, he describes self-confidence and individuality in a woman as superficial garb, nothing more than pretense that must be effaced. In addition, he instructs men to subdue their women, to destroy the women's confidence and sense of individuality:

Fight for your life, men. Fight your wife out of her own self-conscious preoccupation with herself. Batter her out of it till she's stunned. . . . Rip all her nice superimposed modern-woman and wonderful-creature garb off her. . . . Make her yield to her own real unconscious self, and absolutely stamp on
the self that she’s got in her head. Drive her forcibly back, back into her own true unconscious. . . . Combat her in her cock-sure belief that she ‘knows’ and that she is ‘right.’ Take it all out of her. Make her yield once more to the male leadership. . . .

(Fantasia 217-18)

Lawrence acknowledges that the battle will be troublesome for both men and women, but he insists that women must remain unconscious, sensual creatures. He says women must be brought into subjection, regardless of the difficulty:

You’ve got to know that you’re a man, and being a man means you must go on alone, ahead of the woman. . . . You’ll have to fight to make a woman believe in you as a real man. . . . You’ll have to fight still harder to make her yield her goal to yours: her night goal to your day goal. . . . That is woman’s inevitable mode, let her words be what they will. Her goal is the deep, sensual individualism of secrecy, and night-exclusiveness, hostile, with guarded doors. And you’ll have to fight very hard to make a woman yield her goal to yours, to make her, in her own soul,
believe in your goal as the goal beyond. . . .

(Fantasia 218-19)

After Lawrence explains why he believes women must be subdued, he then explains the rewards to the man. Once a man conquers his woman, she will become awe-stricken and obedient:

But when once a woman does believe in her man . . . who goes on ahead beyond her . . . ah, then, how wonderful it is! How wonderful it is to come back to her, at evening, as she sits half in fear and waits! . . . How good it is to come home to your wife when she believes in you and submits to your purpose that is beyond her. . . . That's what it is to have a wife.

(Fantasia 219)

And this, to Lawrence, is also what it is to be a woman. Lawrence says that the woman is completely dependent on the man for her being. The woman can only function in the emotional, sympathetic realm, the realm of the love-urge, which Lawrence says must remain subordinate to the volitional, rational realm of the male. Lawrence also says that the only valid form of love is sensual love. In summary, women cannot exercise their intellect or their volition, so they can communicate with the male through the sensual realm only. Men are the "doers and thinkers," the rulers, while women exist for the men only in the twilight,
in the sensual realm (Fantasia 132). Also, a woman must learn to hold her tongue, to live silently within the aura of the male, and to avoid seeking any fulfillment outside of the sensual realm. Within the sensual realm, the woman must not enjoy herself on a conscious level. Furthermore, in this one area where the woman is allowed to function, she is to deny herself conscious pleasure.

Could Lawrence have possibly restricted the female realm any further? Women must deny self-responsibility, individuality, and pleasure while directing their focus permanently and entirely on the male. What Lawrence presents in these works is an extreme example of the egocentric male who uses the woman for pleasure with no responsibility at all toward her. By restricting the woman to the sensual realm and by not allowing the woman any conscious satisfaction in coition, Lawrence relieves the male of all responsibility toward the female. The only purpose for the women is that she glorify the male and allow herself to be used by the male.

So the "balance" that Lawrence writes about, the Lawrentian balance, turns out to be anything but a balance or equilibrium. All of the volition, all of the pleasure, and all of the control in life belong to the masculine realm--and women must not even attempt to participate in this realm. In addition, the woman must deny her own individuality, and she must also despise it as Lawrence
despises it. Lawrence demonstrates in his later works that he fears and abhors the individual soul in the individual woman, and through the self-destructive heroines in his works, he communicates the idea that women should fear and abhor this in themselves as well.

Hence, in Lawrence's later works, he presents readers with a most extreme case of misogyny as ideology.
WORKS CITED


Jones, Lawrence. "Physiognomy And The Sensual Will In The


