CHAPTER III

EQUINE ANIMALS: SUPERANNUATED MEN
AND MASTERLESS HORSES

The horse, as an image and a symbol, occupies one of the most important positions in Lawrence. It appears more concentratedly in three particular works of his than it does in his others. The animal is pivotal and crucial in "The Rocking-horse Winner", a short story, St Mawr, a short novel and The Rainbow, a novel. The horse is so central here that a considerable part of the understanding of these stories depends on a certain explication of the symbolism involved in the image of the horse.

C.G. Jung observes that legend has long attributed clairvoyance and foresight to the horse.¹ However, these associations of the horse are only of occasional use and of secondary relevance in Lawrence. This is so perhaps because Lawrence, being a writer who did not believe in the delineation of the

conventional character with "a stable ego", found the clairvoyant and foreseeing horse almost useless. These two qualities, he felt, help merely to control and manipulate the events and externalities. Whereas, Lawrence's intention was to present the unpredictability and strangeness of life that resemble the lines drawn by a fiddle-bow on sand.

The Jungian proposition that the horse, by tradition, has been symbolizing things which "psychologically belong to the unconscious of man" and that, as such, the horse is a symbol for the unconscious, undergoes a slight modification and an extension in the Lawrentian metaphysic. Yet it does not affect the conclusion that Lawrence's horse is also a symbol for sex.

Though a significant part of Lawrence's non-fictional prose holds the horse as a symbol for male sensual power or potency, the three narratives mentioned above seem to employ the horse with a contrary import. In these writings of Lawrence the equine beast appears to connote, as a symbol, the sexual passions of a woman.

---


3 idem .

4 See footnote 1 of this chapter.
While Lawrence writes that "In sex we have our basic, most elemental being"," his belief that sex is the closest approximation that one is capable of to the unconscious of man becomes evident.

Sex is our deepest form of consciousness. It is utterly non-ideal, non-mental. It is pure blood-consciousness.\(^6\)

And again he continues to write a few lines later in his *Fantasia of the Unconscious* the following:

The blood-consciousness is the first and last knowledge of the living soul: the depths.\(^7\)

It becomes needless to say here that Lawrence did not consider it healthy, the sex that was mental and non-physical.

The Lawrentian horse represents, as a symbol, an unmixed physicality and a state of oblivion achieved through sex. Thus, the link between the horse and the palpably concrete physicality or flesh surfaces unmistakably, when Lawrence writes the following in his *Apocalypse*:

---

5D.H. Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, p. 185.

6*Idem*.

Far back, far back in our dark soul the horse prances. He is a dominant symbol: he gives us lordship: he links us, the first palpable and throbbing link with the ruddy-glowing Almighty of potence: he is the beginning even of our godhead in the flesh.  

The balance between the two states of being, the sensual and the spiritual, of man has been jeopardized by the setting in of the Christian era. And the effect is the gradual rendering of the spiritual as superior to the sensual. And Lawrence's lifelong effort was to restore the balance by upholding the sensual and physical above the spiritual.  

Lawrence subtly suggests this state of unhealthiness—the shying away from the sensual—through Clifford Chatterley in The First Lady Chatterley. Clifford's paralysis is symbolic of his unsensual nature.

---

8D.H. Lawrence, Apocalypse, p. 61.

Clifford who was terribly wounded in the war has got his lower half of the body paralysed. Propped up on a wheelchair, he allots it to himself to attend to his coal mines. And he loses himself to the world of machines and gradually becomes a part of the `system'. His physical disability only expediting his disintegration, he ends up as the embodiment of that which is mental or cerebral. His physical calamity aggravates his inclination for immortality into a madness.

Unconsciously and insensitively, Clifford compels his wife into his sterile and inhuman life. He tends to deny her her womanhood. By sheer negation he ill-treats Constance, his young wife, who hardly enjoyed a year's marital happiness. Through a dialogue between Clifford and Constance, Lawrence suggests the voluptuousness and physicality for which the horse becomes a symbol. The subject of the discussion becomes the allegorical chariot of Plato.

According to the Platonic view, the human soul is the chariot and it is drawn by two horses, one black and the other white. The symbolism embedded here is obvious: the black horse represents

the instincts, the senses or, more crudely, sexual desire, and the white horse stands for the spirit, the ideal and the cerebral.

Constance perceives herself to be the black horse which Clifford, like a charioteer "anxious for immortality", pulls violently and inhumanly at the reins and cruelly breaks her. Lawrence's adaptation of Plato's chariot to suit his need can be seen in the following passage:

Clifford bullied her, not by obvious compulsion, but by insidious negation. Some part of her soul he just absolutely ignored.... As one might kill a person by withdrawing all the air from her....

He would have done just the same if he had never been wounded in the war. Only then she would not have seen so clearly. The terrible catastrophe had made her clairvoyant.

The poor black horse of her body! He had been lying now for months as if he were dead, with his neck twisted sideways as if it had been broken by some specially vicious twist of the reins. She had felt him dead, a corpse inside her.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11}D.H. Lawrence, \textit{The First Lady Chatterley}, p. 36.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 39.
While Lawrence attributes the power of clairvoyance to the horse in the above reference, his awareness of the legendary belief that horses possess foresight is revealed in *The Virgin and the Gipsy*: the fortune-telling gipsy woman is said to be empowered like a horse with it. Lawrence renders this through Yvette's admiration for the woman: "...that gipsy woman who told my fortune, like a great horse...."\(^{13}\) The likening of the gipsy woman to a horse here is unprecedented and distinct. And it may not have been intended to suggest only an aspect of physical similarity between her and the horse since Lawrence has used the image of the wolf for that purpose.\(^{14}\)

As in *The First Lady Chatterley*, in *Women in Love* Gerald Crich is seen to force his red Arab mare to stay and wait while a locomotive passes by. Unlike the figurative or metaphoric use of the image of the subjugation of the horse in the former instance, here in *Women in Love* the atrocity done to the horse is actual: the rearing horse against a rattling and clanking train on the move is a tableau-like picture suggestive of the tension between the living and the non-living, the machine. Gerald Crich, like Clifford Chatterley, fixes his will on love and/or sex.

In the works of Lawrence where the horse appears, of course, with the exception of the three titles mentioned earlier, it can

\(^{13}\)D.H. Lawrence, *The Complete Short Novels*, p. 526.

\(^{14}\)See the section entitled "The Wolf" in Chapter II, pp. 133-136.
be perceived that the horse is used in the background or as a casual instrument. Only in *St Mawr* and *The Rainbow* does the horse loom omnipotently to presage the destiny of the central character: in the former, the heroine Lou Carrington and in the latter, Ursula Brangwen.

The horse or horses, as the case might be, in these two narratives is the initiator and the intensifier of the respective heroine's destiny. The animal is indispensable. However, since the short story "The Rocking-horse Winner" is of a different quality and is a slight deviation, as far as the horse-symbol is concerned, from the other two works of fiction, it will be taken first for discussion in this chapter.

The short story, "The Rocking-horse Winner" is about a household that is devoid of love or affection and the bizarre atmosphere that amounts ultimately to a death in the family.

Hester, mother of two girls and a boy, unfortunately finds in her heart of hearts, "a hard little place that could not feel love....not for anybody."  

It is evident that Hester is only a different version of the Gertrude Morel of *Sons and Lovers*: like Gertrude, Hester is also dissatisfied in her marital life and affects thereby her son. And it is perhaps not a coincidence that both these women have a son named Paul. Hester's son Paul is the misguided boy - the rocking-horse winner.

The lack of love seeks a bogus fulfillment through luxury. Hester does not get satisfied with the husband's income. And there is an unquenchable craving for more money in the house. Hence, the mother herself tries to earn by doing embroidery and drawing, and frets herself more and more to earn.

Significantly, there is little said about Hester's husband. His appearance in the story is carefully avoided as if to enhance the Oedipal matrix that is embedded in the plot.

Paul shows an infantile wish to usurp his father's place by being lucky. He believes that his being lucky will win his mother's affection for him. And to be lucky, for master Paul, is to be capable of earning a lot of money. He divines that that alone will please his mother. The bitter-irony in the tone of his mother while she speaks of her husband is misunderstood by Paul to be the result of material discontent. And he determines to earn money somehow or other, since he is misled to believe that money will cause his mother to love.

Master Paul's Oedipal love almost naturally ushers him into a vicious realm of masturbatory and fetishist activity. His rocking-horse, ironically, becomes his fetish and he clings to the wooden horse even after he has physically overgrown that phase of his life. His mother, Hester, asks him once:
Aren't you growing too big for a rocking-horse? You're not a very little boy any longer, you know.16

But instead of quitting the hobby-horse, Paul takes it, his 'secret of secrets', to "his own bedroom at the top of the house."17 And innocently apologetic, he answers his mother for persisting with the wooden horse:

Well, you see, mother, till I can have a real horse, I like to have some sort of animal about....18

W.D. Snodgrass in his essay on the short story has traced its implications with the help of Lawrence's essay "Pornography and Obscenity". Lawrence's views on sex and his resentment over the prevailing attitude of contempt which ultimately reduces sex to the status of an excremental function, are vehemently expressed in "Pornography and Obscenity". Tabooing sex as a sin or as something to be ashamed of, is sure to pave

17ibid., p. 745.
18idem.
the way for the emaciating and deadening activity of masturbation, according to Lawrence. Master Paul strays into that unhealthy habit and Snodgrass explains the short story to underlie this theme. Moreover, Snodgrass points out the sexual connotations implied in the act of Paul's horse-riding:

Just as the riding of a horse is an obvious symbol for the sex act, and "riding" was once the common sexual verb, so the rocking-horse stands for the child's imitation of the sex act, for the riding which goes nowhere.20

Thus the rocking-horse, being a poor substitute for the living horse, become a suitable symbol for the deviation or perversion which Paul's secrecy implies.

Moreover, Lawrence's frequent references to the rocking-horse winner as "Master Paul" is not wholly devoid of irony. The word "master" has an exclusive relation to the horse, as it will be seen in the case of Lawrence's The Boy in the Bush, which is focused upon in the following few pages. Paul here, hence, is portrayed with grim irony to be the master and conqueror of a wooden horse.

The parallels between the 'sex act' and horse-riding were not perhaps unfamiliar for Lawrence. He is seen to superimpose orgasmic and violent sex very covertly when he describes, in *The Boy in the Bush*, Jack riding a horse called Stampede. The novel seems to belong to the period of "The Rocking-horse Winner" and *St Mawr*.21

In the novel *The Boy in the Bush*, when Jack rides Stampede for the first time it turns out to be an exhausting and strenuous ride, since Stampede is a wild and an untamed horse. Lawrence describes the whole event as follows:

By being very quick and light, Jack got into the saddle, and gripped. The boys stood back, the horse stood up, and then whirled around on his hind legs, and round and down. Then up and away like a squib round the yard. ...but Jack, because it was natural for his legs to grip and stick, stuck on. His bones rattled, his hat flew off, his heart beat high....

He did not believe in the innate viciousness of the horse. He never believed in the innate

---

21While *The Boy in the Bush* was written and revised finally by mid-January 1924, *St Mawr* was written and completed between June and August of the same year. And the short story "The Rocking-horse Winner" was written during February 1926. See Keith Sagar, *A D.H. Lawrence Handbook*, pp. 223 & 226.
viciousness of anything, except a man. And he did not want to fight the horse for simple mastery. He wanted just to hold it hard with his legs until it soothed down a little, and he and it could come to an understanding.

And Lawrence writes, just when the ride is about to end:

Jack was conscious of a body of live muscle and palpitating fire between his legs, of a furious head tossing hair like hot wire, and bits of white foam. Also he was aware of the trembling in his own thighs, and the sensual exertion of gripping that hot wild body in the power of his own legs. Gripping the hot horse in a grip of sensual mastery that made him tremble with a curious quivering.\textsuperscript{22}

In spite of the intermittent references to the quadruped, the sensuality and the meticulousness in the above passage certainly give rise to an ambivalence.

Rico in \textit{St Mawr} also has a similar experience like Jack. \textit{St Mawr} is also wild and untamed like Stampede. Moreover, Lawrence makes both Rico and Jack emerge victorious after a

distressing and exhausting ride on their respective horses. Jack feels brave and fearless in front of Red Easu, after his ride on Stampede, though Red Easu is "bigger, older and on his own ground." Jack is undaunted. Rico also, like Jack, becomes heroic after a tiresome ride on St Mawr which was undertaken primarily to reach Corrabach Hall. Lawrence describes Rico's appearance and elation:

... Rico arrived after all something of a conqueror at Corrabach. To be sure, he was perspiring, and so was his horse. But he was a hero from another, heroic world.

Curiously enough, the horse for Lawrence is inseparable from its master. Lawrence is seen to use the word 'mastery' in the quote from The Boy in the Bush, and the almost synonymous word 'conqueror' in that from St Mawr. The need to master the horse is an imperative for Lawrence. However, by mastery he does not mean 'bossiness' or a bullying sort of dominance. Significantly, the requirements for the Lawrentian, ideal sex or love seem to hold


good for this mastery as well. That is, the ideal mastery is to 
be distinguished from the "mind-perverted, will-perverted, ego-
perverted"\(^{25}\) mastery.

Lawrence's reiteration of the need to master the horse, once 
again, gets more clearly voiced in a passage, at a later stage in 
*The Boy in the Bush*.

... though Stampede was wild and wicked, he[Jack] 
ever exerted his last efforts. He bucked like 
the devil. But he never let himself altogether 
go. And Jack seemed to be listening with an 
inward ear to the animal, listening to its 
passion. After all, it was a live creature, to 
be mastered, but not to be overborne. ...he never 
for one moment doubted his own mastery over it. 
In his mastery there must be a living tolerance. 
This his instinct told him. And the stallion, 
bucking and sitting up, seemed somehow to accept 
it.\(^{26}\)

This ability to "harmonize"\(^{27}\) with the horse and to feel the 
"strange, powerful life beneath him and between his thighs,


\(^{27}\) *ibid.*, p. 381.
heaving and breaking like some enormous alive wave ... the exultance in the power of life"\(^{28}\) on the part of Jack suggests the nature of the symbolism of the Lawrentian horse to be unambiguously sexual. And Lawrence's revealing use of the word 'mastery' in relation to the horse here is significant. The implications that underlie this usage become clear if the 'herd of horses' that frighten Ursula towards the end of *The Rainbow* are analysed.

One of the most expansive of Lawrence's novels, *The Rainbow* is a complex narrative outlining the history and development of the Brangwen family through three generations and Lawrence chooses one character from each generation to portray. The third generation pair, Ursula Brangwen and Anton Skrebensky, and their unsuccessful affair become the points of discussion here because the horses that chase Ursula are inextricably woven into her love-affair with Skrebensky.

"The Sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair: and they took them wives of all which they chose....

"There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the Sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare

children unto them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown." 29

Over this passage in the Bible Ursula lingers in wonder and awe. Being a girl of impressionable age, she questions herself if she is sufficiently 'fair' to be taken as a wife by one of the Sons of God. It becomes a secret wish, her 'aspiration'.

When he writes of the apocalyptic horses in his Apocalypse, Lawrence quotes Enoch who states that the Sons of God who knew the daughters of men had 'the members of horses'. 30 The suggestion that Ursula not only aspires for one of the Sons of God for her husband but more importantly, yearns for a good horseman. It does not appear casual for Lawrence that the Sons of God are skilled horsemen too. His emphasis of this aspect of the Sons of God is unmistakable and deliberate. For, very frequently, Lawrence makes his heroes potential horsemen. Skrebensky of this novel is not alone in being a good horseman: Jack


30 D.H. Lawrence, Apocalypse, p. 61.
in *The Boy in the Bush*, as it has already been shown, Lewis in *St Mawr*, the groom of the stallion *St Mawr*, and the gipsy, Joe Boswell in *The Virgin and the Gipsy*, who is an "A1 man with horses" are all Skrebensky's companions.

Of Anton Skrebensky, Lawrence writes that he is a good horse-rider and so, he has a "down-to-earth" forcefulness. Lawrence observes:

He seemed so balanced and sure, he made such a confident presence. He was a great rider, so there was about him some of a horseman's sureness and habitual definiteness of decision, also some of the horseman's animal darkness.

And for the great rider in Skrebensky, Ursula becomes the horse-like woman wanting to be mastered. Hence, the writer likens her to a horse:

[Skrébënský] saw Ursula kindle and flare up to the romance of the situation. She raised her head like a young horse snuffing with wild delight.

---

31 D.H. Lawrence, *The Complete Short Novels*, p. 522. It is Major Eastwood, in *The Virgin and the Gipsy*, who voices this aspect of the gipsy.


33 *ibid.*, p. 350.
However, the aspirations of Ursula place her at the polar opposite of Skrebensky, who is gradually disclosed to be a finished being. Whereas Ursula "was a traveller, she was a traveller on the face of the earth", and "could not help it, that she was a traveller."\(^{34}\)

Ursula's essential nature is very much like that of Lou Carrington in *St Mawr*. The traveller in Ursula corresponds to that in Lou. For Lou also experiences an eternal restlessness; she feels "like a sort of gipsy, who is at home anywhere and nowhere".\(^{35}\) Thus, both Ursula and Lou are unable to contain themselves. Their inherent unrest makes them the onward moving, questing protagonists that they are.

That which takes Lou Carrington finally to the desert spaces and to the lonely ranch can be seen to be present in Ursula also. Lawrence writes of Ursula the following which is revealing:

\[
... \text{she lay face downwards on the downs, that were so strong, that cared only for their intercourse with the everlasting skies, and she wished she could become a strong mound smooth under the sky, bosom and limbs bared to all winds and clouds and bursts of sunshine.}^{36}
\]

\(^{34}\)D.H. Lawrence, *The Rainbow*, p. 467.


\(^{36}\)Lawrence, *op. cit.* , p. 515.
Lou, like Ursula, is also found to exhibit a tendency to commune with nature. Towards the end of *St Mawr*, she is seen to assert that "a wild spirit more than men"\(^{37}\) wants her there amidst the mountains, at the ranch, where there is only thunder and lightning and pack-rats.

Similarly, Birkin in *Women in Love* retreats to the hillside and 'saturates' himself with a communion with the cool primroses, after his climactic encounter with Hermione.\(^{38}\)

It is a common predicament of the Lawrentian protagonists to seek a recession from the world of mankind since there is no fulfillment possible for them from that world. The horses that appear towards the end of *The Rainbow* symbolize this helpless longing. Perhaps, Lawrence was not conscious of it when he wrote of Lady Daphne in *The Ladybird* to have an unvent wild energy which portends in the long run, the blood's revenge against the body.\(^{39}\) Lou Carrington's sado-masochist decision to stay in the savage desert-ranch is suggestive of such a blood-revenge: her own dammed up energy compels her to physically victimize herself.

---


Returning to Ursula of *The Rainbow*, it is evident that her unchanneled urge is what gives her the steel-like and destructive strength. Her inward yearning is to be conquered. But ironically, in spite of his physical gracefulness and movements, Skrebensky has no 'core' to himself. He is extremely vulnerable. Gradually and unconsciously, Skrebensky becomes dependent on Ursula. He fails to perceive the eternally unsettled yearning in her, which adds to her burden of herself. He does not give any hope of relieving her of her burden. Yet he becomes finally so dependent—almost parasitically—on her that he urges her to marry him. For,

When the time came that he should kiss her again, a prevention was an annihilation to him.\(^\text{40}\)

His practicality and down-to-earth aspect now turn him to be vulgarly calculative and manipulative. He becomes static. Hence it is only convincing that these qualities of Skrebensky repel Ursula who is instinctively romantic and adventurous. She finds that "To his own intrinsic life Skrebensky was dead" and that "His soul lay in the tomb."\(^\text{41}\) Furthermore, contrary to her own beliefs, Skrebensky "did not consider the soul of the individual sufficiently important."\(^\text{42}\) He was content to be average and unadventurous.


\(^{41}\) *ibid.*, p. 374.

\(^{42}\) *ibid.*, p. 375.
Skrebensky's assignment to go to India, though sounds to him pleasing, does not attract Ursula because his decision to go to India and pride himself on being part of the ruling class reflects, for her, his unchallenging spirit which seeks to be lordly over a vulnerable, if not lowly, race. Skrebensky's is not true Lawrentian aristocracy. Ursula, hence, assesses his decision to go to India to be a direct outcome of his insinuating and cowardly cunningness.

He was always side-tracking, always side-tracking his own soul. She could see him so well out there, in India - one of the governing class, superimposed upon an old civilisation, lord and master of a clumsier civilisation than his own. It was his choice. He would become again an aristocrat, invested with authority and responsibility, having a great helpless populace beneath him.... He would go to India⁴³

Later in the novel, when Ursula attacks democracy, it angers Skrebensky. The fear of being labelled as a rebel and an outcast is what prevents Skrebensky from defying democracy. His cowardice allows him only a secret nurturing of aristocratic leaning. His unmanly secrecy enrages Ursula and the dialogue that ensues reads as follows:

⁴⁴ ibid., p. 512.
"What do you mean?" he asked her, hostile. "Why do you hate democracy?"

"Only the greedy and ugly people come to the top in a democracy," she said, "because they're the only people who will push themselves there. Only degenerate races are democratic."

"What do you want then - an aristocracy?" he asked secretly moved. He always felt that by rights he belonged to the ruling aristocracy. Yet to hear her speak for his class pained him with a curious, painful pleasure. He felt he was acquiescing in something illegal, taking to himself some wrong, reprehensible advantage.44

Ursula's blatant rejection of democracy is, nevertheless, not to be taken as an approval of Skrebensky's secret sense of superiority. And the passionately voiced views of Ursula very naturally lead both Skrebensky and her into a direct verbal combat in which Ursula's coup de main is:

"You think the Indians are simpler than us, and so you'll enjoy being near them and being a lord over them,"... "And you'll feel so righteous, governing them for their own good. Who are you to feel righteous? What are you righteous about, in your governing? Your governing stinks. What do you govern for, but to make things there as dead and mean as they are here!"45


45 ibid., p. 513.
After exposing Skrebensky thus, Ursula seeing his suffering feels regretful. For, "Stronger than life or death was her craving to be able to love him." \(^{46}\)

Lawrence shows through Ursula what an unspontaneous and passionless love would be like. Ironically, because of her craving to be able to love Skrebensky, Ursula finishes him and her relationship with him in the terrible scene of their love-making amidst the sand dunes. Against the destructive and towering physical vitality of Ursula, Skrebensky who has become increasingly vulnerable, finds her more than his match.

Frank Kermode has pointed out the 'old Lawrentian lesson' which Kate in *The Plumed Serpent* learns: "that the ruin of Europe arises from the sexual demands of women, their ignorance of the truth that their fulfilment lies not in sexual satisfaction but in submission." \(^{47}\) Ursula is, in the light of Kermode's observation of Kate, the predecessor of Kate and Constance of *The Lady Chatterley's Lover* as well, who can be seen to insist on having their satisfaction before they meet their ideal, Lawrentian partners. While Constance Chatterley is seen to assert herself

---


with Michaelis, Kate Leslie, it is learnt, had been accustomed to have her orgasms with her husband Joachim before she meets Cipriano. R.E. Pritchard shows an awareness of this when he writes:

... Kate has to forgo any self-assertion. She has no 'personal intimacy' with Cipriano, who, in their love-making, denies her her orgasm, her 'satisfaction'.

Thus, like Kate and Constance, Ursula is also self-assertive and Lawrence's hinting of it becomes evident when he writes of the destructive love-making between her and Skrebensky in the chapter entitled "The Bitterness of Ecstasy":

... she fastened her arms round him and tightened him in her grip, whilst her mouth sought his in a hard, rending, ever-increasing kiss, till his body was powerless in her grip, his heart melted in fear from the fierce, beaked, harpy's kiss. The water washed again over their feet, but she took no notice. She seemed unaware, she seemed to be pressing in her beaked mouth...\(^49\)


\(^{49}\)D.H. Lawrence, The Rainbow, p. 532.
Apart from the violence suggested in the words 'hard', 'grip', 'rending' and 'fierce', the word 'beaked' is unique and significant. Lawrence uses it, apparently, with a special sense and the word finds its place almost exclusively in the context where the woman insists on her satisfaction during the sex-act. While Kate differentiates her sexual experience with Joschim from her experience with Cipriano, Lawrence writes that the experience she has with the latter is

So different from the beak-like friction of Aphrodite of the foam, the friction which flares out in circles of phosphorescent ecstasy, to the last wild spasm which utters the involuntary cry, the final love-cry. This she had known to the end, with Joachim. And now this too was removed from her. 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. She could not grip it into one final spasm of white ecstasy which was like sheer knowing.50

Lawrence's "Aphrodite of the foam", here is a clever usage of the myth. The Aphrodite whom Lawrence refers to is, more like-lily, Hesiod's. And it is given that, according to Hesiod, Aphrodite "sprang from the foam (aphros) of the sea

that gathered about the severed member of Uranus when Cronos mutilated him.\textsuperscript{51} That is, Aphrodite is born of severed phallus. The harpy-like or beaked woman is an Aphrodite of the foam, according to Lawrence, in that, very much like her mythical counterpart who is born of a severed phallus, she vaguely retains an association with castration because of her " rending" and tearing of the male genital.

Lawrence describes the 'beakiness' of the woman who is self-assertive in sex, in the case of the gamekeeper's wife, Bertha Coutts. Far more overtly than the previous two instances, the quotes from The Rainbow and from The Plumed Serpent above, Lawrence explains the kind of love-making where the woman is a destructive 'old whore', through Mellors. Speaking to Constance Chatterley of his unsuccessful married life with Bertha, Mellors unfolds the causes for the failure:

... when I had her, she'd never come off when I did. Never! She'd just wait. If I kept back for half an hour, she'd keep back longer. And when I'd come and really finished, then she'd start on her own account, and I had to stop inside her till she brought herself off, wriggling and shouting, she'd clutch clutch with herself down there, an' then

she'd come off, fair in ecstasy. And then she'd say: that was lovely! Gradually I got sick of it, and she got worse. She sort of got harder and harder to bring off, and she'd sort of tear at me down there, as if it was a beak tearing at me. By God, you think a woman's soft down there, like a fig. But I tell you the old rampers have beaks between their legs, and they tear at you with it till you're sick. Self! Self! Self! all self! tearing and shouting! They talk about man's selfishness, but I doubt if it can ever touch a woman's blind beakishness, once she's gone that way. Like an old trull!  

The repetition of the word 'beak' and the additional use of its other inflected forms are too frequent to go unnoticed in the above quotation. And again, the painfulness which was just hinted at in The Rainbow or The Plumed Serpent, involved in such a lovemaking is also made explicit, if not outrageously so.

Thus, it becomes clear that the yearning within Ursula is, though slightly perverse because of the beakishness, unfulfilled and Skrebensky, unlike Cipriano of The Plumed Serpent or

52D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 436. This and the subsequent references to Lady Chatterley's Lover are to the twin text "Sons and Lovers" and "Lady Chatterley's Lover" (London: Chancellor Press, 1960).
Mellors of Lady Chatterley's Lover, is unable to secure Ursula a sense of peace, which is no different perhaps from oblivion.\(^5^3\) Finding herself in a *cul de sac* in her affair with Skrebensky, Ursula finally snaps her engagement to him.

At this stage of the story, the sense of her unusedness and the deep unrest caused by the frustration, of Ursula, are evoked by Lawrence through the dream-vision of the "herd of horses". Fearing herself to be pregnant with Skrebensky's child, Ursula writes him a letter pleading with him to accept her. And while she awaits his response, she is frenzied and exhausted by the attack of the massive and powerful horses.

The group of horses that threaten to trample her down are, unmistakably, an externalization of the yearning within

---

\(^5^3\)Ursula's craving to be relieved of her own burden, i.e. self-knowledge, is similar to that of the persona's in Lawrence's poem "Resurrection of the Flesh", *The Complete Poems*, pp. 737-738.
herself, to be possessed physically. The horse is, in no uncertain terms ever, a symbol for the physicality of a woman. Crude it might sound, the horse seems to pose a one-to-one parallel with a woman, as far as these particular narratives of Lawrence are concerned. The woman is to be possessed as the horse is to be mastered. Paradoxically, being thus possessed, the woman is released from the burden of her own self.

Ursula was failed by Skrebensky in that, he could not control her. He had no power to hold her from her waywardness and hence, left her adrift in a directionlessness. Lawrence clues the reader of this, while he writes:

After each contact, her anguished desire for him or for that which she never had from him was stronger, her love was more hopeless. After each contact his mad dependence on her was deepened, his hope of standing strong and taking her in his own strength was weakened. He felt himself a mere attribute of her.54

The horse in Ursula is rendered masterless and, consequently, she becomes conscious of "a gathering restiveness, a tumult impending within her."55 And she attempts to dodge it. The house becomes suffocating. She, "feeling the seething rising to madness within her",56 ventures out of the house.

55 Ibid., p. 538.
56 Idem.
Lawrence, in a revealing passage in an essay, "The Novel and the Feelings", remarks:

Supposing all horses were suddenly rendered masterless, what would they do? They would run wild. But supposing they were left still shut up in their fields, paddocks, corrals, stables what would they do? They would go insane.\footnote{Lawrence, Phoenix, p. 758.}

It becomes explicit then what Lawrence is trying to do in the dream-vision of the group of horses that appear in The Rainbow. He is fictionalising the suppositions that are merely expressed in the above quotation. The horses that encircle and frighten Ursula in the novel are implied both to be 'master-less' and 'shut up'. Lawrence's pre-occupation with the complementariness between the horse and the master is evident here also.

As the symbolism has suggested, Ursula can be safely fitted in the place of the horses. Staying indoors becomes suffocating for her and she escapes only to wander aimlessly. Her unrest and the growing madness are pointed out already. Ann L. McLaughlin makes a note of the fact that the horses here are enclosed by the hedges and are not free.
The horses Ursula encounters symbolize vitality. But they also reveal the anguish that arises when that vitality is balked, for these horses are not free like the horse in *Apocalypse*. They are hedged into a meadow awaiting man's enslaving use, and Ursula is immediately aware of their tension and their drive toward madness.58

The physicality of the symbolic horses is described by Lawrence with an alarming vividness. These horses are "clenched" and "knotted". They are imposing and dangerously powerful.

These horses represent the developing tension within Ursula that needs to be eased out. Ursula, being at the mercy of her own tormenting passion, feels holdless. Her condition of wretchedness and despair will be pacified only when she knows herself through another being. Her tension (suggested by the words, describing the horses, like "gripped", "clenched", "narrow", "burst", "endurance", and the repetitions of "pressing" that occur in the quotation given below) will be eased only by the touch of a man (master) who will define her to herself. Lawrence describes the horses that oppress Ursula as follows:

She was aware of their breasts gripped, clenched narrow in a hold that never relaxed, she was

aware of their red nostrils flaming with long endurance, and of their haunches, so rounded, so massive, pressing, pressing, pressing to burst the grip upon their breasts, pressing forever till they went mad, running against the walls of time, and never bursting free ... rain could not put out the hard, urgent, massive fire that was locked within these flanks, never, never.59

Very much like the group of horses that annoy Ursula, in The First Lady Chatterley, Constance Chatterley is also pictured to undergo a similar trauma before she meets the gamekeeper, Parkin. Like Ursula, Constance also is tormented not merely by a sexual hunger, but something greater which is concommitant with sex. And the irony of their situation lies in their struggle to express that other which eludes expression.

Unlike the intensely and elaborately dramatized scene of the horses in The Rainbow, Lawrence is seen to condense and suggest the idea in a nutshell in The First Lady Chatterley. It would be appropriate to quote here the few paragraphs that Lawrence uses for the purpose.

The only thing that troubled her were strange violent disturbances within herself, with which

she could not reckon. She had recurrent violent
dreams, of horses, of a mare which had been
feeding quietly, and suddenly went mad. And she
would get up in the morning with a terrible anger
upon her, so that if she had not controlled her-
self, she could have bullied the servants cruelly
and have spoken to Clifford in savage derision.
On the tip of her tongue were the terrible, tor-
turing things she wanted to say to Clifford as he
sat propped up so bright and coldly alert in bed
or lay so apathetic.

She never said the things. But she came nearer
and nearer to saying them, and at last she was so
frightened, when she got up in the morning in one
of these demoniacal tempers, that she would hurry
out into the park to walk herself calm. At such
times her face was blank with ugly passion, and
her eyes wide with fear of herself. 'I am
possessed, I know I am possessed,' she would say
to herself pathetically, rushing forward impelled
by some savage power in her breast. She could
have killed something, someone. It was a great
cruelty surging in her.

And in the park, and on the edge of the wood, a
reminiscence would come back on her. It was here
that something, something had happened. She
looked around, into the secret of the place.
Ant it came upon her again, her dream of
horses. Surely there was a group of horses,
and a mare that would go mad and lash at the
others with her heels and tear them with her
teeth!60

60D.H. Lawrence, The First Lady Chatterley, pp. 24-25.
In *The Rainbow*, the horses are said to chase Ursula during the month of October, while Constance is haunted by the reminiscence, probably, by early winter. And Ursula is frightened by the horses in the woods, whereas Constance is "in the park, and on the edge of the wood".61 Constance's looking "into the secret of the place"62 uncovers the symbolism involved in the wood. The image of the wood reinforces the perspective that the whole episode of the horses is an externalization of the inward trauma. The wood implies the protagonist's 'heart of darkness', so to speak. While Lawrence replaces Benjamin Franklin's creed with his own, the imagery is of the forest--"That my soul is a dark forest" and "That my known self will never be more than a little clearing in the forest".63

Lawrence retains much of the symbolism of the scene of the horses of *The Rainbow* for *The First Lady Chatterley*, though he has altered it in several other ways. Lawrence has, in the latter instance, shortened it and, at the same time, he has distinguished a mare from the group of horses. And more importantly, Lawrence does not dramatize here, but presents it passively.

62 *Idem*.
The singling out of a mare from the group of horses in The First Lady Chatterley seems to imply a meticulous parallel between the animal and Constance. The 'cruelty surging' within Constance and her fear of its resulting in an unpleasant and indecent bullying of the servants or a savage derision towards Clifford are connoted by the mare "that would go mad and lash at the others with her heels and tear them with her teeth!" This explicitness and meticulousness, in spite of the skill involved, defeat the purpose of the symbolism. And the horses are non-existent here as far as the physical sphere of things is concerned. Finally, the passage lacks the subjective immediacy which is unmistakably present in The Rainbow.

Besides these connotative readings of the scene of the horses, Lawrence's own 'pollyanalytic's' can be referred to since much has been made about the passage in his Fantasia of the Unconscious in connection with this scene here. Lawrence in this particular passage discusses a dream like Ursula's--the fear-dream of horses:

... a man has a persistent passionate fear-dream about horses. He suddenly finds himself among

---

64 D.H. Lawrence, The First Lady Chatterley, pp. 24-25.

65 D.H. Lawrence, "Foreword" to Fantasia of the Unconscious, p. 15.
great, physical horses, which may suddenly
go wild. Their great bodies surge madly
round him, they rear above him, threatening
to destroy him. At any minute he may be
trampled down.66

Reading the above-given passage the reader's suspicion that
Lawrence is trying to refute and explain away the dream which he
has himself dreamt at one time or other perhaps, grows stronger.
R.E. Pritchard has touched this while writing about the particular
section of The Rainbow. Perceiving that Lawrence is defending
such a dream to be symbolic of 'male sensual power', he writes:

In so far as this is a male sexual power, it is
not surprising that Lawrence should fear a
quasi-homosexual submission to it.67

Nevertheless, Pritchard seems to agree with Lawrence that
the horse is suggestive, of course as a symbol, of 'male sexual
power'. But Lawrence, though feared an accusation of
homosexuality, still could have feared it because it was a dream
connoting the female sexual power. And his explanation of the
dream is too general to be unequivocal. That every dream is a
wish-fulfillment, and that it implies the presence of something to

66D.H. Lawrence, Fantasia of the Unconscious, p. 170.
be censored from the dream, is a theoretical fact which does not, at any event, help to establish the horse as a symbol of male sexuality in itself.

Lawrence's apprehension and his fear of guilt make him conclude that a man's dream of fearful horses does not necessarily imply incest, even though it is a dream suggestive of the "love of the dreamer for the sensual male who is his father." And such an interpretation as the above, by Lawrence, is belied by his own narratives. The horse's requiring a master and a woman's need to be possessed, undoubtedly, suggest the Lawrentian Will-to-Inertia, which is the female principle.

Lawrence's own feminine impulse to submit or to yield to a man could be seen to be present in his novels, The White Peacock and Women in Love, and, paradoxically, his 'leadership novels' are works of wish-fulfillment in the sense that they compensate, though fictionally, for the unsuccess of the Rananim.

The much-discussed bathing scene in The White Peacock where Cyril, the narrator and the Lawrence-figure, lends himself...

68D.H. Lawrence, Fantasis of the Unconscious, p. 171.
69D.H. Lawrence, "Study of Thomas Hardy", Phoenix, pp. 448-449.
in the hands of George Saxton to be rubbed dry after the bath, is relevant here:

He saw I had forgotten to continue my rubbing, and laughing he took hold of me and began to rub me briskly, as if I were a child, or rather a woman he loved and did not fear. I left myself quite limply in his hands.... It satisfied in some measure the vague, indecipherable yearning of my soul ... our love was perfect for a moment, more perfect than any love I have known since, either for man or woman.  

And in Women in Love the point need not be laboured since the conclusion of the novel is left open-ended with a dispute between Ursula and Birkin over the latter's insistence on having a male partner and the disapproval of Ursula for the same as perverse.  

Beyond doubt the horse stands as a feminine symbol of sex. The Lawrentian horse represents a woman's passion and sexual craving. 

What Julian Moynahan writes about the 'ritual scene' - the appearance of the herd of horses - does not explicate the

symbolism. He writes that the scene dramatizes the "voice of her [Ursula's] submerged 'essential' nature signaling her that she must continue her search after wholeness."72 The image of the horses in themselves does not seem to get the author's direct attention.

H.M. Daleski writes that his own view is close to that of E.L. Nichole who holds that the horses symbolize "the anarchy of elemental passion".73 Explaining further, Daleski imparts that "in presenting Ursula's encounter with the horses he [Lawrence] gives us a concentrated, symbolic retrospect of crucial stages along her soul's journey."74

While Philip Hobsbaum finds this particular section of The Rainbow to have a "narrative description [which] is orgiastic in its best, sexually suggestive in its imagery",75 he still does not pursue the horses any further.


74 idem.

And it is curious that even F.R. Leavis should evade the horses of *The Rainbow* in *toto*. 76

Keith Sagar, drawing a parallel between the encircling horses in *The Rainbow* and the imagery of the swooping eagle77 that Lawrence employs in a passage about mind and consciousness, does not point out the contextual significance of the horse-symbol.78

Ursula's effort to run away from the horses is suggestive of her inner struggle to escape her own yearning. Although she feels in her heart of hearts that the yearning deserves to be fulfilled, she fears it because of the condemnation from the society which would entail her indulgence of the instinctive and essentially physical. This fear of Ursula could possibly have resulted after her talk with Dorothy:

Dorothy could feel that Ursula was already hankering after something else, something that this man [Skrebensky] did not give her.


"The question is, what do you want," prepounded Dorothy, "Is it just other men?"

Ursula was silenced. This was her own dread. Was she just promiscuous?

Suspecting vaguely her 'indecipherable' yearning to be mere promiscuity, she attempts to escape, when the horses chase her, by bearing "the weight steadily". She does not dare to acknowledge her yearning by turning and looking at those horses. Yet after jumping over the hedge and escaping them, Ursula pities the equine beasts that stand as an antithetic to the life of the "ordered world of man".

What Lawrence writes for Constance Chatterley is noteworthy here. Clifford Chatterley, her husband, being paralysed after he was wounded in the war, Constance feels herself to be wasting away. She isanguished by the lack of physical warmth, until she meets Mellors, the gamekeeper.

... never had she felt so acutely the agony of her own female forlornness.

The 'female forlornness' of Constance is almost the same as that which makes Lou, in St Mawr, look slightly distracted and also "so much younger and so many thousands of years

---

80 Ibid., p. 540.
81 Ibid., p. 541.
82 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 377.
older than her mother", simultaneously. It is worth remembering that Lou and Constance are married women and their respective narratives begin with the account of their sexless marital lives. That is, Lou and Constance begin their lives apparently from that juncture where Ursula in *The Rainbow* is left off. The pre-marital frustration of Ursula with Skrebensky becomes a prolonged and seemingly endless agony for Constance and Lou after their marriage. Their discontent is so desperate that they are benumbed. They are, as a result, on the verge of madness as the symbolic horse suggests. And their impending insanity is that which makes an indelible mark on their external appearance.

That Lawrence's horse represents the physical pining of a woman and that it is inevitably a sexual symbol will become clear and reinforced with an analysis of the short novel *St Mawr*.

*St Mawr* is the name of the horse, a stallion, that awakens Lou Carrington from her mechanical and superficial way of living. On seeing *St Mawr*, "she felt that it forbade her to be her ordinary, commonplace self."  

Within the first few pages of the short novel itself, Lawrence discloses with irony the dry and sexless marital life of

---

84 *ibid.*, p. 287.
Lou. Her relationship with Rico, her Australian husband, is a "nervous attachment, rather than a sexual love." Rico, as shown in the chapter on canine animals in Lawrence is a social being and hence lives a superficial life of social prominence. He belongs to the "cardboard let's-be-happy world". And his is a terribly unreal world where everything appears bodiless, "wraith-like", for Lou.

The curious lack of physical existence or the total negation of the sense of touch undermines Lou, and she despairs. Consequently, she is condemned to look older than her age and a little distracted. The life devoid of the sense of touch does imply almost automatically a directionlessness. Burdened with a freedom which is unintercepted, Lou experiences an inward barrenness and loneliness.

The awareness of her own condition slowly surges within her and overpowers her after her acquaintance with and knowledge of St Mawr. The horse provides a Joycean epiphany, if not a more powerful apocalyptic vision, for Lou. She sees the horse at the mews in Westminster and falls, almost immediately, "half in love

---

85 D.H. Lawrence, The Complete Short Novels, p. 279.
86 See Chapter II above, pp. 105-112
87 Lawrence, op. cit., p. 299.
with St Mawr. “Lou is seen in the short novel to identify herself with the horse at several instances, though unconsciously perhaps.

Rico, Lou’s husband, is the exemplary modern youth; he belongs to the mechanical world. To a degree, Rico is portrayed as lacking the essential manly ‘dare’. He is effeminate. And his characterization is a subtle accomplishment for Lawrence.

Rico is an artist, or, more precisely, has pretensions to be an artist. The self-consciousness which makes Rico flinch under the steady stare of Lewis, the horse’s groom, is one evidence which supports the fact of his feminine quality. He feels ‘defenceless’ and exposed in that ‘man-to-man’ confrontation with Lewis.

And more importantly, Lawrence likens Rico to a horse. By alluding to Rico as a horse, which is a feminine sexual symbol, Lawrence seems to mock and satirize Rico. This again reinforces the horse to be a feminine sexual symbol in Lawrence and Rico to be effeminate.

You had only to see the uneasy backward glance at her [Lou], from his big blue eyes: just like

a horse that is edging away from its master: to know how completely he was mastered.  

The horse that glances backwards stealthily suggests an apprehension on the part of the animal which is appropriately, Lawrence mentions elsewhere, a symbol for the emotions. Unlike feelings, emotions are recognizable according to Lawrence. They are "noble like the horse, timid like the rabbit, but all completely at our service." 

Rico is like a horse in that he exhibits a tendency to go 'nasty' sometime or other, as a horse would if not mastered with an utmost competence. Lou is disgusted with the men of her day and Rico is the most outstanding representative of them. She feels there is no "single man who is a proud living animal". And, as a result, men have become merely women in her eyes. They are degraded and in a subtler sense have obliterated the dynamic and active life of Man. Lou feels that "Men are all women, knitting and crochetting words together."

---

91Lawrence, op. cit., p. 321.
92ibid., p. 322.
And it becomes clear thus that Lou's ennui is the outcome of her deadening life with Rico. The world of Rico is corrosive and decadent.

The atmosphere of "enjoying ourselves" was becoming cruel to her: it sapped all the life out of her. 'Oh, if only I needn't enjoy myself,' she moaned inwardly.  

What, according to Lydia Blanchard, makes Gudrun and Gerald, in Women in Love, a representative pair of the decadent modern world can be seen inescapably to permeate the lives of Rico and the Manby girls. While Rico places himself 'in the picture' unfailingly, the Manby girls--Flora and Elsie--are bent on having 'a good time' and 'lots of fun'. That is, they exhibit a "willingness to experience oneself [themselves] as an object in a setting ...".  

Moreover, painting which is Rico's career, is not very far from being a feminine activity like knitting or crocheting. Lawrence himself being an artist-painter, perhaps not unconsciously voices a self-deprecation and a fatigued distaste for painting which could have intermittently descended on him. Painting is not far from novel-writing in that both the activities confine the artist involved to a seclusion of self-
absorbedness. Lawrence who voices the disgust towards novel-writing in his Kangaroo, through Richard Lovat Somers,\textsuperscript{95} probably found the opportunity to articulate a similar contempt towards painting as a profession through Rico here.

It is not just Lou who feels that men are like women 'knitting and crochettting words together', but her mother Mrs. Rachel Witt, also feels the same about the young Englishmen. Talking about Dean Vyner, Mrs. Witt expresses the same idea retorting to Rico's words:

'... I can imagine there would be great satisfaction in having him [Dean Vyner] for a husband.'

'Why, mother?' asked Lou.

'Oh, such a presence! One of these old Englishmen, that nobody can put in their pocket. You can't imagine his wife asking him to thread her needle. Something after all so \textit{robust}! So different from \textit{young} Englishmen, who all seem to me like ladies, perfect ladies.'

'Somebody has to keep up the tradition of the perfect lady,' said Rico.

'I know it,' said Mrs. Witt. 'And if the women won't do it, the young gentlemen take on the burden. They bear it very well.'\textsuperscript{96}

\textsuperscript{95}See the Chapter IV, p. 203.

\textsuperscript{96}D.H. Lawrence, \textit{The Complete Short Novels}, pp. 303-304.
Thus all these characteristics of Rico constitute his failure as a man or husband. Even his flirting with the Manby girls is a pose—something that is done out of a necessity to 'fit in', since he recognizes it as a trend and a fashion of the day.

Lawrence presents St Mawr in the midst of such decadence and makes it an antithesis of all the morbidity. St Mawr, at least for Lou, serves as a corrective.

Lou's first meeting with the horse becomes a prelude to her ultimate liberation. Her contact with the horse, her touch of St Mawr, causes "in her weary young-woman's soul, an ancient understanding... to flood in." And this understanding, because of the force of its strangeness and authenticity, nonetheless generates a conflict within Lou against her present-day life-style. The intriguing eyes of St Mawr put "a ban on her heart: ... some uncanny authority over her, that she dared not, could not understand." The horse brings Lou, first and foremost, a realization. It awakens her essential and vital being.

Since she had really seen St Mawr looming fiery and terrible in an outer darkness, she could not believe the world she lived in. She could not believe it was actually happening, when she was dancing in the afternoon at Claridge's, or in the evening at the Carlton, sliding about with

97 D.H. Lawrence, The Complete Short Novels, p. 286.
98 ibid., p. 287.
some suave young man who wasn't like a man at all to her. Or down in Sussex for the weekend with the Enderleys: the talk, the eating and drinking, the flirtation, the endless dancing: it all seemed far more bodiless and, in a strange way, wraith-like, than any fairy story. She seemed to be eating Barmecide food, that had been conjured up out of thin air, by the power of words. She seemed to be talking to handsome young bare-faced unrealities, not men at all: as she slid about with them, in the perpetual dance, they too seemed to have been conjured up out of air, merely for this soaring, slithering dance-business. And she could not believe that, when the lights went out, they wouldn't melt back into thin air again, and complete nonentity. The strange nonentity of it all.99

The passage quoted above is a sample which gives a glimpse of the world of Rico. But it is still an adequate one to suggest why Leavis parallels St Mawr with Eliot's The Waste Land.100

The horse, St Mawr, intensifies Lou's yearning to divest herself of the shackle of decadence. The horse suggests the promise of another world, more potent and forceful than her own. "The wild, brilliant, alert head of St Mawr seemed to look at her out of another world."101 And "She [Lou] realized that St Mawr

99 D.H. Lawrence, The Complete Short Novels, pp. 299-300.
100 F.R. Leavis, "St Mawr" D.H. Lawrence: Novelist, p. 271.
drew his hot breaths in another world from Rico's, from our world. Perhaps the old Greek horses had lived in St Mawr's world. Again, Lawrence reiterates that "in his [St Mawr's] dark eye, that looked, with its cloudy brown pupil, a cloud within a dark fire, like a world beyond our world, there was a dark vitality glowing, and within the fire, another sort of wisdom." When Rico rides St Mawr to Corrabach Hall in spite of the stallion's wild and dispiriting temper, Lawrence writes that he emerged at his destination a "hero from another, heroic world." Thus, Lawrence repeats and thereby stresses the strangeness of the horse.

And Lou, the protagonist, is guided by the horse whose name, as Keith Brown holds, has its link with the disciple of St. Benedict of France, St. Maurus. Keith Brown adds that the Welsh meaning for Mawr being 'great', the name of the horse can also connote The Great Holy One: "the hidden God [Pan] who shines through him." This does not sound far-fetched, since the novel

103 *ibid.* , p. 299.
104 *ibid.* , p. 309.
certainly discusses the omnipresence of Pan; and, through Cartwright, Lawrence asserts that Pan can be seen in St Mawr the horse.\footnote{D.H. Lawrence, \textit{The Complete Short Novels}, p. 326.}

St Mawr, like its Benedictine disciple-counterpart, lives a life of retreat and celibacy. Pained by the growing decadence in Europe, St Mawr, though raised for "stud purposes", does not "fancy the mares".\footnote{\textit{ibid.}, p. 285.} In a subtle way, Lawrence invests Lou with these aspects that are detected in the horse.

Lou also lives a life of celibacy and isolation. After she escapes to the ranch, what Lou voices about taking a man almost echoes, by transference, the horse's own reason for abstaining from mating and for its vindictiveness. Lou says:

\begin{quote}
... sex, mere sex, is repellent to me. I will never prostitute myself again. Unless something touches my very spirit, the very quick of me, I will stay alone, just alone.\footnote{\textit{ibid.}, p. 408.}
\end{quote}

Lou's retreat to the ranch is suggestive of her choice of sex. As it has already been stated, the tendency here of Lou is...
similar to that of Birkin in *Women in Love*.\textsuperscript{109} It is a paradoxical condition for Lou who is sexually famished but still cannot stoop to fulfill herself when sex does not have a "meaning and a mystery that penetrates [her] very soul".\textsuperscript{110}

Like Lou, the horse St Mawr refrains from mating with a mare in Europe, because it finds "mere sex ... repellent". The horse lacks masters to handle it, except for Lewis, in the English setting whereas in Texas, St Mawr, for once, finds itself normal. A ranch-man takes St Mawr casually for a ride and handles it roughly, which makes even Lewis envious. Having landed on the soil where the horse is not yet superannuated for man, St Mawr finds itself at home. Hence St Mawr is seen to follow "at the heels of the boss' long-legged black Texan mare, almost slavishly."\textsuperscript{111}

At this stage, Lawrence very subtly transfers the implications of St Mawr onto the landscape around the ranch where Lou decides to remain like the vestal virgins. Early in the short novel Lawrence prepares the reader for the landscape into which the horse is transfigured now. Lou is aware of the horse in this aspect even before the crucial accident in the story, which forces Lou and her mother to quit Europe, takes place:

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{109}See above, p. 162.
\textsuperscript{110}D.H. Lawrence, *The Complete Short Novels*, p. 427.
\textsuperscript{111}ibid., p. 401.
\end{flushleft}
Why did he [St Mawr] seem to her like some living background into which she wanted to retreat? When he reared his head and neighed from his deep chest, like deep wind-bells resounding, she seemed to hear the echoes of another darker, more spacious, more dangerous, more splendid world than ours that was beyond her. And there she wanted to go.¹¹²

David Cavitch shows an awareness of this when he writes that the lightning described to strike at the New Mexican landscape, which Lou retreats to finally, is "reminiscent of St Mawr's explosive hoofs".¹¹³

After the accident in which St Mawr hurts severely Rico, Lawrence reiterates the horse as a promise of a new setting. Lou is described to feel a sudden release from the exasperation. And a vision of the Texan landscape descends on her. As already foreshadowed by Lawrence, St Mawr's eruption now suggests the possibility of escape.

Something suddenly carried her away to the great bare spaces of Texas, the blue sky, the flat,

¹¹²D.H. Lawrence, The Complete Short Novels, p.299.

burnt earth, the miles of sunflowers. Another sky, another silence towards the setting sun.\textsuperscript{114}

However, the horse is condemned as a wicked animal. It has proved once again that it is a killer. Identifying herself with the horse, Lou justifies St Mawr's atrocious behaviour as a natural outcome of its being masterless. According to Lou, the horse is grief-stricken because it is unruled and is rendered useless. And undoubtedly, Lou's own condition of being left manless for her life is reflected here.

Dimly in a woman's muse, Lou realized this, as she breathed the horse's sadness, his accumulated vague woe from the generations of latter-day ignobility. And a grief and a sympathy flooded her, for the horse. She realized now how his sadness recoiled into these frenzies of obstinacy and malevolence. Underneath it all was grief, an unconscious, vague, pervading animal grief, which perhaps only Lewis understood, because he felt the same. The grief of the generous creature which sees all ends turning to the morass of ignoble living.

She did not want to say any more to the horse: she did not want to look at him any more. The grief flooded her soul, that made her want to be alone. She knew now what it all amounted to. She knew that the horse, born to serve nobly, had waited in vain for some one [sic] noble to serve. His spirit knew that nobility had gone out of men. And this left him high and dry, in a sort of despair.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{114}D.H. Lawrence, \textit{The Complete Short Novels}, p. 345.

\textsuperscript{115}\textit{ibid.}, p. 347.
On the basis of Lawrence's description of the horse as it is lying on its back in the accident and kicking its hoofs, David Cavitch deduces St Mawr to be not merely phallic but a symbol "of dangerously overwrought sexual inhibition." Contrarily, the upturned "pale gold belly" of St Mawr when Rico "pulled the horse over backwards on top of him" is suggestive of the horse's masterlessness - the dearth of noble horsemanship. England (or even the whole of Europe) has become the "morass of ignoble living" because the horse is unused and has become a mere plaything, a source for 'lots of fun'. It is divested of its heroic world and it is diminished almost to an insignificance. "While horses thrashed the streets of London, London lived."

The ungrounded horse, lying backwards and kicking its hoofs in the air, also suggests the sordid and highly ironic picture of the modern man who has to lie on his back, grinning his teeth while the woman attains her orgasm by her own "exertions". Thus,


118 D.H. Lawrence, Apocalypse, p. 61.

119 The cruel and heavily sarcastic words of the sexually ineffectual Michaelis to Constance Chatterley form the basis of the point made here. See Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover, pp. 337-338.
the picture of the writhing and lizard-like St Mawr here is an indirect condemnation of both the sexes of the modern age. Neither is the woman justified in insisting on her satisfaction in sex, nor is the man who lacks the virility to secure his woman the sense of peace.

The cause of St Mawr's sudden unleashing of violence is its seeing a dead snake on the path. Here is the phallic symbol in its most perverse aspect. And is it not a deliberate stroke by Lawrence that the horse's "sun-arched" neck and its snake-like way of looking around should get distorted to picture here, in the moment of its malevolence, a curving fish and a panicked lizard? The horse here is seen in its most horrifying posture.

"The physical sense of injustice is a dangerous feeling, once it is awakened. It must have outlet, or it eats away the one in whom it is aroused."120 It was an injustice on the part of Constance Chatterley's husband who became parasitically dependent on her and denied her the fundamental physical warmth. And the injustice done to her by her husband is appeased by the gamekeeper. Whereas, in the case of Lou Carrington, the whole

120 D.H. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley's Lover, p. 348.
society is barren and it is not a personal grievance. As such, Lou retires to live in isolation appropriately.

Considering Lou's utterance that unless she succeeds in finding her 'mystic man' she will die,\textsuperscript{121} her decision to stay in the ranch towards the close of the novel can imply one of two things: either Lou chooses martyrdom so as to be faithful to her sexual ideals or that her prolonged frustration has driven her to the ultimate point of sado-masochism. It is ambiguous which of these two Lawrence intends.

\textsuperscript{121}D.H. Lawrence, \textit{The Complete Short Novels}, p. 322.