

The Influence of D.H. Lawrence on John Fowles's Early Fiction: Blood Consciousness, Women, and Heraclitus

Michelle Phillips Buchberger

Summary

This interdisciplinary analysis considers the influence of D.H. Lawrence on John Fowles's early novels (*The Magus* and *The Collector*), with particular emphasis on the parallels between the writers' early experiences and personal lives which, I suggest, may have created a natural point of affinity between Fowles and his pariah predecessor. The particular relevance of the times in which both authors were writing is also of particular interest in this article, since it focusses on the experience of male novelists writing during periods in English history following World Wars and overlapping with major social and economic convulsions, including the burgeoning Women's Movement. Ultimately, the article considers why an understanding of this influence is helpful to scholars of Fowles.

Opsomming

Hierdie interdissiplinêre analise beskou die invloed van D.H. Lawrence op John Fowles, met besondere klem op die parallelle tussen die skrywers se vroeë ervarings en persoonlike lewens, wat volgens my moontlik 'n natuurlike punt van affiniteit tussen Fowles en sy paria-voorganger geskep het. Die besondere relevansie van die tye waarin beide outeurs skryf, is ook van besondere belang in hierdie artikel, aangesien dit fokus op die ervaring van manlike romanskrywers wat geskryf het oor periodes in die Engelse geskiedenis wat beide wêreldoorloë gevolg het en ook oorvleuel het met groot sosiale en ekonomiese stuiptrekkings, insluitend die ontluikende Vrouebeweging. Uiteindelik oorweeg die artikel waarom 'n begrip van hierdie invloed nuttig is vir studente van Fowles om sy werk te verstaan.

Influence is a dangerous subject. For the influenced, it implies a lack of originality, and given the paradigm of modern literature – in the words of Ezra Pound to “Make it New” (1935) – it is an association few authors would willingly embrace. Moreover, declaring oneself “influenced” by an author who has been effectively excommunicated from the literary canon would surely be unwise. Nevertheless, on several occasions, English author John Fowles did just that; he openly acknowledged his debt of gratitude to that pariah of English literature, D.H. Lawrence.

JLS/TLW 35(2), June/Junie 2019
ISSN 0256-4718/Online 1753-5387
© *JLS/TLW*
doi.org/10.2519/1753-5387/11598



Exploring literary influence is also challenging because it requires treading fraught intellectual ground mined with arguments about authorial intention and whether evidence of influence might be dismissed as coincidence or simple affinity. However, such an exploration is still worthy of investigation for several reasons. First, thanks to the work of critics such as Mary Orr (2003), the investigation of "influence" has been somewhat rescued from the postmodern juggernaut, which had rejected such pursuits as elitist: over reliant on the male subject in hierarchical structures of knowledge and power; too closely tied to the preeminence of the white, male, European; and dependent upon the arbitrary relationship between the signifier and signified. Orr reminds us of the "rich legacies, rather than [the] obstructive father" (67) that studies of influence might evince, and that to avoid the negative ramifications of influence studies highlighted by the postmodern movement, we should instead approach studies of influence as "complex and plural" (83) rather than reductive and hierarchical. Most germane to this study is her observation that such studies of influence are particularly crucial in "moments of great national, political and cultural upheaval when "authorities" vie for supremacy and are most ready to eradicate any who refute their angle and vision" (92). This approach then, rather than a consideration of Bloomian "anxiety" or an examination of conscious intellectual reworking, or an analysis of intertextual allusion or play will be the focus of this article. It will concentrate on an examination of the influence of Lawrence's fiction on Fowles's novels. Orr suggests that periods of cultural and political upheaval render the study of influence during these times "particularly crucial." Surely then there can be few time periods for which a consideration of influence is more appropriate than the years following each of the World Wars: the exact times during which each of the two authors who constitute the focus of this study were writing.

Such an investigation is also overdue. There has been very little examination of the influence of Lawrence on Fowles. There has instead been a significant amount of scholarship dedicated to an exploration of the influence of existentialism and French writers on Fowles, a fact that is surprising given Fowles's own acknowledgement of Lawrence's influence. It is also intriguing to consider why both novelists have subsequently been exiled to the periphery of the literary academy despite having written some of the most important literature produced in the twentieth century.¹

1. This is not hyperbolic. As James Campbell notes in the *New York Times*, *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969) remained on the *New York Times* best-seller list for "more than a year" (October 29, 2006). Fowles was nominated for the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1999, being passed over for Gunter Grass's *Tin Drum*. Similarly, *The Rainbow* makes it to number "43" on *The Guardian's* "definitive list of the greatest novels written in English" (<<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/jul/14/100-best-novels-the-rainbow-dh-lawrence-robert-mccrum>>). Not surprisingly, both authors rank far

This article also draws attention to Fowles's own feelings of rejection and exile from his native country, a fact that I suggest may have contributed to the sense of kinship Fowles felt toward, and clearly articulated regarding his predecessor. Lawrence's reputation, like Fowles's, has suffered as a result of the vicissitudes of critical taste and, more understandably perhaps, from the demands for political correctness. For example, in his 2004 work, Lawrence scholar Barry Scherr examined the level of discomfort professed even among those for whom the author's work has been at the core of their research agendas. Scherr highlights Mark Spilka, (named Harry T. Moore Distinguished David Herbert Lawrence scholar by the Modern Language Association and David Herbert Lawrence Society in 1988) who lamented in 1996 that he had suffered "mounting pressures" from "left-wing politically correct academia" and that this has made it "extremely difficult for him to continue to be a Lawrence defender" (Scherr 2004: 39).

Fowles has suffered similar marginalisation and attack from the left, and with some validity. He was famously accused of being "the greatest block to intelligent feminism in the British novel" (Vipond 1999: 123), an attack which Fowles rebutted in a 1974 interview with the *New York Times*. In this interview, Fowles, barely concealing his bitterness, tried to explain the disparity between his reception in America versus Britain: "I get slammed in Britain" he complained, "It's for not being Anthony Trollope or C.P. Snow. I'm really persona non grata" (Gussow 1974: 24). As Sarah Lyall noted in her obituary of the author in 2005, "In America, his books became mainstays of college literature courses while managing to achieve that rare combination: admiring reviews from serious-minded critics and best-selling sales in the stores. [...] Not so in England" (25). Both Lawrence and Fowles were embraced by the U.S. while being simultaneously rejected by their native country. The considerable esteem in which these English authors are held in the U.S. compared to the relative indifference of their native England is striking, and can be seen starkly in the way in which each author has been honoured across the Atlantic. For example, Chapman University in California launched its "John Fowles Center for Creative Writing" (<<https://www.chapman.edu/research/institutes-and-centers/john-fowles-center/index.aspx>>) in 1996. By contrast, as Christopher Bigsby noted in his obituary to Fowles, "He [Fowles] tried to give his house to my university [University of East Anglia], for use as a students' writing centre, and was baffled when we declined, not having enough money to guarantee its upkeep" (<<https://www.theguardian.com/news/2005/nov/10/guardianobituaries.booksobituaries>>). In direct conflict with Fowles's own wishes, his home, "Belmont

higher on U.S. "lists." The "Modern Library" 100 best novels of all time produced by Random House/Penguin note *Sons and Lovers* at number 10, *The Rainbow* at number 48 followed by *Women in Love* at 49. No author appears more than three times on this list. Fowles's *The Magus* appears at number 98. (<http://www.modernlibrary.com/top-100/100-best-novels/>).

House” has effectively been turned into a hotel by the Landmark Trust. Ironically, on the very web page where one might book a night in Belmont House appears the statement, attributed to Fowles: “The usual destiny for large houses in Lyme these days is to be bought up as hotels. I am determined to avoid this; and hope that the house ... may have some kind of permanent educational function” John Fowles (1926-2005) (<<https://www.landmarktrust.org.uk/Properties-list/belmont/holiday/>>). Similarly, Lawrence’s family home in Nottingham is marked by a modest plaque and museum (discussed later in this article). In contrast, in New Mexico, U.S.A., the now-named “D.H. Lawrence Ranch” has emerged from a location where Frieda and Lawrence lived for only two years. The ranch was bequeathed by Frieda Lawrence to the University of New Mexico in 1956. The Ranch is now on the National Register of Historic Places and the New Mexico State Register of Cultural Properties. In his native England, the D.H. Lawrence center, “Durban House” was sold off by the local council in 2016 and turned into a beauty salon (<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/11/14/dh-lawrence-heritage-centre-could-become-beauty-salon/>). It is hardly surprising then that Fowles, who felt his slight by the English establishment keenly, would single out Lawrence as a similarly overlooked, kindred spirit.

This study will evince the shared literary themes and interests, born perhaps from a startling number of similar personal experiences despite being separated historically by fifty years, between two important novelists who inhabited unique periods of English history. It will suggest that it was the nature of these specific periods of history, post-World War I and World War II, that would dramatically affect the critical reception of these two writers, and perhaps doom them to their current peripheral status in the English literary canon.

Influences on Fowles

Very little has been written about literary influences on the novelist John Fowles, and hardly any scholarship has focused on the influence of Lawrence on Fowles. One possible exception is Lisa Colletta’s essay, “The Geography of Ruins: John Fowles’s *Daniel Martin* and the Travel Narratives of D.H. Lawrence”, but this work, as the title suggests, focusses on the influence of Lawrence’s non-fiction travel writing and considers only one of Fowles’s later novels. Those scholars who have focused on influences on Fowles’s work have instead considered the writer’s numerous allusions to existentialism.² Peter Wolfe’s *John Fowles: Magus and Moralist* does allude

2. For example Jeff Rackham’s “John Fowles: The Existential Labyrinth” in *Critique: Studies in Modern Fiction*, 13.3., pp. 89-103; William J. Palmer’s *The Fiction of John Fowles. Tradition, Art, and the Loneliness of Selfhood*

briefly to the influence of D.H. Lawrence, but this brief discussion is tangential to the primary aim of his work, which is to align Fowles more with Hardy than with Lawrence. Given the focus of Fowles scholars on existentialism and French writers on the author, it is perhaps surprising that Fowles himself draws attention to Lawrence as one of his major influences. In a 1974 interview, for example, James Campbell asked Fowles to identify the main influences on his writing. He responded: “Certainly the French writers, Camus and Sartre, impressed me very much, and Gide, although I’ve gone off him. Lawrence, among English writers, I admired” (Campbell 1999: 36). Fowles also stresses the importance of Lawrence on his writing to Vipond, as he explains that he:

[...] adored Lawrence when I was a student in the 1940s and have recently, although so many nowadays find him politically incorrect, discovered a deep recrudescence of sympathy for his almost metaphysical attitude to the now – the importance of conveying the immediacy and reality of the present. I am worried far less by his sometimes cockamamie views on society and man-woman relations. I feel closer to that obsessive, intensely self-absorbed line, in which I’d also put Golding, than to any other in Britain.

(Vipond 1999: 201)

However, the most explicit acknowledgement of Fowles’s indebtedness to Lawrence can be found in Fowles’s own preface to a 1994 edition of Lawrence’s *The Man Who Died*. Here he writes, “I have always counted him [Lawrence] as a very strong influence on my own writing, I now think a much greater one than that of the French existentialists, supposedly my favourites” (Lawrence 1994: 92).

Political and Historical Commonalities

Fowles was born in 1926, four years before Lawrence’s death. Given the dramatic transformations experienced by the country during Lawrence’s lifetime, it seems that a chasm separates the two men. However, significant similarities in their experiences remain. Both wrote in the shadow of the bloodiest human conflicts in modern history. Both experienced dramatic

(1974); Dwight Eddins’s “John Fowles: Existence as Authorship” in *Contemporary Literature*, (1976) 17.2., pp. 204-222; Richard Lynch’s “Freedoms in The French Lieutenant’s Woman,” (2002) *Twentieth Century Literature*, 48: 1., pp. 50-76; and Mike Marais’ in “I am infinitely strange to myself: Existentialism, the Bildungsroman, and John Fowles’s *The French Lieutenant’s Woman*” in *Journal of Narrative Theory*, (2014) 44: 2, pp. 244, in addition to my own book chapter “The 1960s Existential Fiction of John Fowles” in *The 1960s: A Decade of Modern British Fiction* (2018) among others.

changes in the social, political, and economic rights of women, effectively forcing a re-examination of masculinity and the relationship between men and women; and both witnessed various stages of the end of the British Empire. Both men grew up in households dominated by women. Lawrence's increasingly suffocating relationship with his mother, Lydia, is infamously traced with startling candour in the novel that would establish him as a writer, *Sons and Lovers* (1913). Similarly, Fowles's mother, who feared she would not be able to have children, considered John [...] the "apple of her eye" and, according to Warburton, Fowles's biographer, "mother and son were close companions" (Warburton 2004: 3). As Warburton reflects, this close relationship would, like Lawrence, infuse Fowles's work:

[John] an adored only child, attended by two young, pretty, affectionate women. In the novels he published decades later, the configuration is often similar: A young man is lost in wonder in a green, enclosed natural place, instructed by an authoritarian older male and teased, cherished, and tempted by a pair of lovely young women. (3).

Both Lawrence and Fowles were alienated and weakened by illness: Lawrence from childhood, by numerous bouts of pneumonia and, ultimately, the tuberculosis that would prematurely end his life; Fowles, by several attacks of amoebic dysentery, which often necessitated extended periods of hospitalization. These episodes of isolation and immobilization encouraged Fowles to be a prolific diarist; his bouts of self-reflection ultimately becoming the first outpourings of his narrative imagination. For Lawrence, his illness had the effect of alienating him from other children, contributing to his choice to turn away from people and towards reading as a source of companionship and entertainment.

Perhaps this alienation developed both writers self-professed misanthropy. Both lived lives of "exile", although Fowles's exile was self-imposed while Lawrence's forced by the outbreak of World War I. Married to a German wife, Lawrence was driven from England by would-be spy hunters in Cornwall, and he spent the remainder of his life after the war in almost unrelenting poverty, moving from one donated home to another. Fowles consciously modeled his own exiled existence on Lawrence. As he reflected in an interview with Richard Boston in 1969:

[...] if you're English and you want to go into exile then you live in England. There's nowhere you can feel more alienated from your fellow human beings. If you go to France or Greece you're not really an exile because you're living among people you might admire. If I'd been born in 1906 instead of 1926 I'd be living abroad, because I can't stand the English way of life. I'd be leading Lawrence Durrell's or D.H. Lawrence's kind of life.

(Boston 1969: n.p.)

As detached observers of others, both writers severely critiqued their respective social classes. Neither grew up among the literary or financially elite. Lawrence experienced genuine poverty; born in a mining town in the North of England in Eastwood, at 8a Victoria Street, in the city of Nottingham to a lace maker and a coal miner (see figure 1).



Fig. 1. 8A Victoria Street, Eastwood, Nottingham (Source: author's own photograph)

In 1887, the Lawrences moved to “The Breach House”: a step up from Victoria Street, since it had a garden and was the end terrace house. Lawrence was 2 years old when the family moved here (see fig 2).



Fig 2. “The Breach House” (Source: author's own photograph).



Fig 3. 63 Fillebrook Avenue. (Source: Google Earth)

In contrast to Lawrence, the financial success of Fowles's works facilitated his purchase of Belmont House in Lyme Regis. (see fig 4).



Fig 4. Belmont House, purchased by Fowles and his wife, Elizabeth in 1968 (Photograph: author's own).

Both harboured complex feelings about their respective social classes, which are apparent in their work. Lawrence vacillates between his hatred of the “mob” jingoism of the lower classes, which he felt contributed to the misplaced support for and consequent protraction of the First World War. However, Lawrence also acknowledges a deep affection for the uncomplicated “soft, non-intellectual, warm[th]” of the working classes that he associates with Walter Morel, modeled on his own father, Arthur, in *Sons and Lovers* (Lawrence 2010: 165). Fowles’s fiction demonstrates a complete rejection of middle-class social and behavioural norms, and his journals show an outright detestation of all things bourgeois. Interestingly, and I suggest, propelled by an early mistrust of the classes into which they were born, both writers reject democracy. Perhaps indicative of Lawrence’s influence on Fowles is the fact that both authors turned to the writing of Heraclitus, who advocated rule by an intellectual elite and divided humanity into the *hoi polloi* and the *aristoi*, as an alternative to democracy. Lawrence’s work, particularly the later “leadership novels” which I will discuss at greater length below, are particularly suffused with this philosophy. In Fowles, the early philosophical pensées, *The Aristos* (1964) as well as his early novels are also greatly influenced by Heraclitus.

Given the alienation and misanthropy attributed to both writers,³ it is also interesting to note that both began their professional lives as teachers. Perhaps less surprisingly, both hated teaching. In a letter to Blanch Jennings, Lawrence described his miserable teaching experience as akin to “a quivering greyhound set to mind a herd of pigs” (Sagar 2013: 40). Fowles, equally miserable as a teacher, was less poetic: “I teach small classes of foreign girls [...] Hate the job; *mais il faut vivre*” (Fowles 2003: 340-342).

The Wives

One of the most significant parallels that links these two writers, I suggest, is the relationship with their respective wives. Both Frieda Lawrence and Elizabeth Fowles were married to other men when they met their future husbands (Lawrence famously eloped with Frieda Weekly after he met her when seeking career guidance from his Nottingham University tutor, Professor Ernest Weekly). Frieda scandalously abandoned her three young children to be with Lawrence only weeks after this first meeting. The fact that the couple were never able to have children of their own, and that Frieda was

3. Fowles describes himself as being “too misanthropic to keep up a convincing persona of some other self” in his Journals, Volume 1, p. 528. The editors of Lawrence’s collected letters highlight the writer’s misanthropy in their introduction, characterizing his view of humanity as “rat-like; he prophesies that man’s self-destructiveness will continue for many generations” (D.H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence (October 1916-21)* p. 1).

forbidden from seeing her children for several years haunted her and strained their marriage. It is widely reported that the Lawrences fought constantly and violently over this and other issues. Brenda Maddox describes Lawrence's rages as "uncontrollable" and she was equally astounded by the ferocity and frequency of his wife's physical attacks (Maddox 1996: 158). Lawrence's determination not to be dominated by Weekly, despite her strong personality and demands to be perceived as an equal, appears in many of his novels as a thinly veiled misogyny.

Fowles's marriage, though less violent, began in a strikingly similar way. Elizabeth Fowles was married to Roy Christy when she met the would-be author while he was teaching English at Anargyrios College on the Greek island of Spetsai. Elizabeth left her husband, and it was he who was granted custody of their only child. Fowles had made it very clear to Elizabeth that he refused to accommodate the child in their relationship. He recorded his reaction to Elizabeth about her daughter, writing in his startlingly candid journals and to his biographer, "I could never love Anna" and "I don't want any other man's child, and least of all the child of someone I despise as much as R" (Warburton 2004: 149). Like Frieda, Elizabeth was tortured by this decision to leave her child and was subsequently also unable to have any more children. This huge emotional strain infuses the works of both novelists, and, not surprisingly, colours the ways in which both authors discuss both the feminine, the maternal, as well as the relationships between men and women in their works.

These details show a clear affinity of ideas and experiences between the two novelists, but they do not demonstrate influence. Influence is a difficult phenomenon to identify, so I will examine three main areas where, I suggest, key ideas in Lawrence's writing are either reworked or extended by Fowles. In each case, it is my contention that the shared experience of the writers, the fact that there are so many parallels in their lives, contributed to a deep affinity and interest on the part of Fowles for many of the themes and concepts explored previously by Lawrence, and a commitment to extending and developing them. I have therefore identified three key areas of shared interest and focus: first, the body/mind division and the struggle between the two for dominance (along with the ramifications of such dominance on the individual and on society); second, the depiction of the relationship between men and woman and the continual conflict between them; and finally, class conflict and the influence of Heraclitus.

Areas of Shared Interest: 1. The Mind/Body Division

Very early in his writing career, Lawrence became interested in examining the bifurcation in human consciousness between instinct and rationality. He became obsessed with modern Western civilisation's domination by the

rational and the intellectual over the instinctive and corporeal; what he characterized as “blood consciousness”. This domination by the rational at the expense and suppression of the corporeal instinct was, Lawrence firmly believed, a detriment to society, and his writing discusses at some length English society’s overreliance on intellectual constructs. In particular, the repression of thoughts and actions (especially the sexual), and a slavish adherence to behavioural expectations of particular social classes are, he believed, idiomatic of a society in decline.

We see this philosophy clearly articulated in a 1915 letter to Bertrand Russell, where Lawrence accused the mathematician of suffering from this civilized “disease”:

[...] there is a blood-consciousness which exists in us independently of the ordinary mental-consciousness, which depends on the eye as its source or connector. There is the blood-consciousness, with the sexual connection, holding the same relation as the eye, in seeing, holds to the mental consciousness. One lives, knows, and has one’s being in the blood, without any reference to nerves and brain. [...] And the tragedy of this our life, and of your life, is that the mental and nerve consciousness exerts a tyranny over the blood-consciousness, and that your will has gone completely over to the mental consciousness, and is engaged in the destruction of your blood-being or blood-consciousness.

(Lawrence 1962a: 393)

As early as 1914, this idea had already coalesced to Lawrence’s “great religion”, which he described as: “[...] a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds. But what our blood feels and believes and says, is always true. The intellect is only a bit and a bridle” (Lawrence 1962a: 180). As if in vindication of this declaration, World War One broke out, and Lawrence declared that it was dependence on the intellect that had brought Western civilisation to “the very brink of oblivion” (Lawrence 1962a: 375), and that this decline demanded, “a resurrection of the soul” (Lawrence 1962b: 454).

In *Women in Love* (1920) Lawrence investigates blood consciousness in some depth. The novel traces the relationships between Ursula and Rupert Birkin, a school inspector, and between Gudrun and coal mine heir, Gerald Crich. How each of the characters balances the other in terms of their dependence on either the body or the mind, and each character’s internal struggle to balance the cerebral with the instinctive, is central to the novel.

Throughout *Women in Love*, industry is represented as the manifestation of man’s heightened dependence on rational thought. Gerald Crich is such a man, part of “the great social productive machine” (Lawrence 1982: 300). Crich epitomizes the sublimation of instinct – of blood consciousness – to the intellect. This aspect of his character is made explicitly clear when Gudrun and Ursula see him riding an exquisite Arab horse along a railroad track. As

the train approaches, the horse instinctively attempts to escape from the terrifying experience, but by strength of will, Crich forces the animal to submit and remain still as the train passes, demonstrating that sheer animal instinct is no match for the power of mind and intellect. Lawrence writes: "the man encompassed her; her paws were blind and pathetic as she beat the air, the man closed round her, and brought her down, almost as if she were part of his own physique" (Lawrence 1982: 170).

Crich's physical presence, though sublimated here by his rational consciousness, constantly struggles for dominance, and the battle that has raged between instinct and intellect for control has resulted in a tortured existence. He is haunted by the death of his brother, whom we learn he accidentally shot as a child. He harbours great anger, especially against the miners who are on strike at his father's colliery and whom he wants to kill. He also recognises his yearning for "a sort of savagedom" (Lawrence 1982: 294), surely a rejection of rational domination in favour of a more corporeal or instinctive existence.

Hermione Roddice also sublimates her blood consciousness and as a result she is unsatisfied and incomplete. Birkin's occasional lover, described as being "nerve-worn with consciousness", Lawrence depicts her as a character who is over reliant on the intellect. This has negative ramifications for her physical and psychological health. Like Gerald she is described as having a "tortured" soul (Lawrence 1982: 63). Birkin criticises Hermione for her reliance on rationality:

You are merely making worlds, ... knowledge means everything to you. Even your animalism, you want it in your head. You don't want to be an animal, you want to observe your own animal functions, to get a mental thrill out of them. It is all purely secondary – and more decadent than the most hide-bound intellectualism.

(Lawrence 1982: 91)

He criticises her strong will, her ability to use her mind to impose her reality upon the world, declaring, "[i]t is fatal to use the will like that [...] disgusting. Such a will is an obscenity" (Lawrence 1982: 201).

Birkin also privileges the intellectual, which would also make him suspect in Lawrence's philosophy, but he is self-aware enough to recognise the negative effect this dependence has on his relationships with others. Birkin advocates the freedom of blood consciousness over the tyranny of the rational and cerebral. Only by stripping the individual of such oppressive layers might one truly be in the world and thus connect with others. As Maxim opines, being naked to the world – to experience the world corporeally, viscerally, through touch rather than sight, and thus unmediated by the intellect, is vital. He explains:

I should feel the air move against me, and feel the things I touched, instead of having only to look at them. I'm sure life is all wrong because it has become much too visual – we can neither hear nor feel nor understand, we can only see. I'm sure that is entirely wrong.

(Lawrence 1982: 132)

In a similar way, Fowles's damaged male characters come to recognize that the artificial behaviour demanded by quotidian social norms constructed by the dominant rational mind have weakened individuals; they have become insensitive to historical events as well as to the thoughts and feelings of others. I suggest Fowles's preoccupation with this core idea might be traced directly to the Lawrence project I have just described. *The Magus*, Fowles's *magnum opus*, describes a key episode in the life of Nicolas Urfe, who has privileged the rational yet comes to realise that this is not helpful in the quest to pursue an authentic life.

The Magus is set in the years immediately following World War Two. The protagonist is middle class lothario Nicolas Urfe, who states in the novel's opening pages that he "thought D.H. Lawrence the greatest human being of the century" (Fowles 1985: 16). Urfe extricates himself from the rationally dependent and highly contrived, constructed world of London society and enters the highly visceral domain of Phraxos, a (fictional) Greek island where he is hired to teach. He is so alienated from corporeal existence (or what Lawrence might identify as blood consciousness) that he barely recognises parts of his own body on his way to Greece; noting for example that "my pale London hands [...] seemed changed, nauseatingly alien, things I should long ago have disowned" (Fowles 1985: 49). Also, like Birkin, Urfe recognises his own psychological disquiet. He decides to go to Greece in part to break off a messy love affair, but also because he has begun to "discover I was not the person I wanted to be" (Fowles 1985: 15). On Phraxos, Urfe is brought to recognise the artificiality of his life and his overdependence on the ratiocinative which has conspired to distance him from the real, visceral lived life. As he reflects at the end of the novel "... all my life I had tried to turn life into fiction, to hold reality away" (Fowles 1985: 539). On the island, Urfe comes under the influence of Maurice Conchis, the magus, who engineers mysterious metatheatrical experiences to challenge Urfe's identity and his over-dependence on logic. The remarkable events force Urfe to engage with these experiences on a more immediate, visceral level rather than rationalising them because they are beyond the rational. I suggest one core event in *The Magus* illustrates the direct influence of Lawrence on Fowles's fiction in its vertiginous overturning of rationality and a reinvigoration of blood consciousness.

Maurice Conchis is widely believed by the villagers on Phraxos to be a collaborator. As the climax of many metatheatrical occurrences for Urfe, Conchis recreates an event from World War Two, where he had served as the mayor for the small town. Resistance fighters had inflicted casualties on the

German occupying forces, and the punitive action taken by the Germans results in a choice Conchis had to make – save himself and the town by killing a resistance fighter himself, or refuse to kill and thus sacrifice the lives of the villagers. Although Conchis *tells* Urfe about his experiences, and Urfe can connect with the events on an intellectual level, even empathise, it is not until he has engaged with the events physically and corporeally that he comes to a genuine understanding of Conchis's predicament on what Lawrence might describe as a “blood conscious” level. As the metatheatre unfolds, Urfe remains characteristically unimpressed and unaffected by its narrative. He reflects in typical intellectual, analytic mode:

I calculated: thirteen men, at least half of whom were German. Cost of getting them to Greece, from Athens to the island. Equipment. Training-rehearsing. Cost of getting them off the island, back to Germany. It couldn't be done for less than five hundred pounds. And for what? To frighten – or perhaps to impress – one unimportant person. At the same time, now that the first adrenaline panic had subsided, I felt my attitude changed. This scene was so well organized, so elaborate. I fell under the spell of Conchis the magician again. Frightened, but fascinated.

(Fowles 1985: 376)

But as the realism of the masque intensifies, Urfe is less rapt by the prospect of solving the puzzle and more willing to surrender to the direct experience of the events. Conchis describes being under the German control of the innocuous Lieutenant Anton Kluber followed by the vicious Colonel Wimmel, who personifies the ultimate terminus of the logical and the rational. He had “eyes like razors ... without a grain of sympathy. Nothing but assessment and calculation They were the eyes of a machine” (Fowles 1985: 419). Wimmel's characteristics are Urfe's *in extremis*. The description is also highly reminiscent of Gerald Crich. As the masque continues, Urfe experiences Conchis' memories of being taken to the Nazi torture room, where the Greek guerrillas have been horrifically mutilated and tortured, and he is coerced into encouraging one guerrilla to betray his contacts. The guerrilla's dramatic refusal is encapsulated in one word: “eleutheria” – freedom (Fowles 1985: 428). In the dénouement of the metatheatre, the Germans suggest Conchis (now replaced by Urfe reliving the events in the masque) might gain a reprieve for the villagers. Conchis/Urfe must kill the guerrillas in front of the villagers in the town square. He is handed a gun but discovers that it is not loaded – he is expected to club the guerrillas to death. This is direct exposure to life lived in the moment at its most extreme – no sanitised detached killing is possible. It is an action that neither Conchis nor Urfe, while reliving the events, is able to execute. Urfe understands not only Conchis's choice to spare the guerrilla, thus condemning himself to accusations of collaboration, but also the true meaning of the guerrilla's cry – and it is one that transcends reason and logic:

It was eleutheria: freedom. He was the immalleable, the essence, the beyond reason, beyond logic, beyond civilization, beyond history. He was not God, because there is no God we can know. But he was proof that there is a God that we can never know. He was the final right to deny. To be free to choose.
(Fowles 1985: 434)

Several things are significant about this event and this passage in particular. First, the word “freedom” is no longer dulled by its passive, cerebral (over)use. Urfe experiences freedom because of this physical encounter. Second, we can infer from this passage that Conchis (and we might presume, Fowles) is drawing a direct connection between reason and logic, and inhumanity. The Lawrencean rejection of the logical and the intellectual over blood consciousness and its contribution to reprehensible human behaviour is surely evident here.

Urfe comes to realise that his preoccupation with solving the mysteries on Phraxos has prevented him from understanding their meaning:

That was the meaning of the fable. By searching so fanatically I was making a detective story out of the summer’s events, and to view life as a detective story, as something that could be deduced, hunted, and arrested, was no more realistic (let alone poetic) than to view the detective story as the most important literary genre, instead of what it really was, one of the least.
(Fowles 1985: 552)

I suggest that there is significant evidence here of an infusion of Lawrence’s philosophy in Fowles’s work. Both authors were convinced that the way to a new, reinvigorated society must begin with a reengagement with blood consciousness; one that reunites the individual with a more primitive, instinctive, but, it is implied, a more human existence. I suggest Fowles is deeply indebted to Lawrence for this recurrent theme.

Areas of Shared Interest: 2. The “Woman” Question

Just as both authors appear to polarise the instinctive and the ratiocinative, a similar binary is evident in both novelists regarding gender. For Lawrence, dilution of male power was responsible for the decline of Western civilisation and this idea might be traced both to his horror at his father’s subjugation by his mother as well as to his own constant battles with Frieda. The impulse to clearly define gender differences and to fetishise male power is starkly drawn as early as 1913 in *Sons and Lovers*. Here, Paul Morel struggles to escape what he discerns as the cloying oppression of his mother. The pattern of conflict is established early between Paul’s mother and his father, Walter, who observes the world from a very different perspective from his wife, making coexistence between the two almost impossible:

There began a battle between the husband and wife – a fearful, bloody battle that ended only with the death of one. She fought to make him undertake his own responsibilities, to make him fulfill his obligations. But he was too different from her. His nature was purely sensuous, and she strove to make him moral, religious. She tried to force him to face things. He could not endure It – it drove him out of his mind.

(Lawrence 2010: 12)

As Morel attempts to escape the claustrophobic control of his mother, he develops a hatred of feeling contained by women. The claustrophobia is evident in his relationship with Miriam, who makes “him feel anxious and *imprisoned*” (Lawrence 2010: 234) (italics are mine). The same adjective is used to describe Clara Dawes, who “made him feel *imprisoned* when she was there, as if he could not get a free deep breath, as if there were something on top of him. She felt his desire to be free of her” (Lawrence 2010: 342) (italics are mine). A similar feeling of imprisonment is seen in Urfe’s desperate escape from Alison, the woman from whom he flees to Greece. His departure from her is accompanied by a sense of liberation from imprisonment that is reminiscent of Morel’s. As Urfe describes his departure, “I began to hum, and it was not a brave attempt to hide my grief, but a revoltingly unclouded desire to celebrate my release” (Fowles 1985: 48).

The revitalisation of the male character is a core theme in both novelists’ works. Interestingly, both novelists marginalise women or use them as catalysts for the improvement of the male. Lawrence advocated a “great adjustment” in heterosexual relationships. In a letter to Goodwin Baynes in 1919, he writes of his admiration of Walt Whitman who offers

[...] one of the clues to a real solution – the new adjustment. I believe in what he calls ‘manly love’, the real implicit reliance of one man on another; as sacred a union as marriage: only it must be deeper, more ultimate than emotion and personality, cool separateness and yet the ultimate reliance.

(Delavenay 1971: 277)

Lawrence looks to “Blutbruderschaft” to escape the torpor of heterosexual relationships, which, in his view, lacked the vitality to spur changes in society. In the works characterised as the “leadership novels,” Lawrence depicts the importance of male friendship, replete with explicit homoeroticism and increasingly diminishes the role of women. In *Aaron’s Rod* (1922), for example, Aaron seeks consolation and meaning in his life after leaving his own wife and children. He finds this consolation with the writer Rawdon Lilly. In *Kangaroo* (1923), Richard Lovat Somers increasingly distances himself from his German wife, Harriet, in favour of the company of Jack Calcott. His relationship with Calcott is bound up with a sense of change and social reengineering:

But Jack came to him and flung an arm round his [Somers'] shoulders and pressed him close, trembling slightly, and saying nothing. Then he let go, and caught Somers by the hand. "This is fate," he said, "and we'll follow it up." He seemed to cling to the other man's hand. And on his face was a strange light of purpose and of passion, a look at once exalted and dangerous. [...] They still sat for some time by the fire, silent; Jack was pondering. Then he looked up at Somers.

"You and me", he said in a quiet voice, "in a way we're mates and in a way we're not. In a way – it's different".

(Lawrence 1998: 453)

Similarly, in *The Plumed Serpent* (1926), Don Ramón Carrasco, the charismatic leader of a primitive Indian cult aims to revitalise Mexico with a patriarchal society into which Kate Leslie, the novel's central character (although she is eclipsed in significance by Carrasco), is gradually immersed. Her doubts and fears about the cult and her desire to return to the rationality of Western Europe are gradually eroded as she becomes increasingly ensnared by the seductive power of Don Ramón and his lieutenant, Don Cipriano, to whom she is eventually married. The core relationship in the novel, however, is between the two men, who enact a bizarre and explicitly homoerotic ritual:

Ramón knelt and pressed his arms close round Cipriano's waist, pressing his black head against his side. And Cipriano began to feel as if his mind, his head were melting away in the darkness; like a pearl in black wine, the other circle of sleep began to swing, vast. And he was a man without a head, moving like a dark wind over the face of the dark waters. [...] Ramón bound him fast round the middle, then, pressing his head against the hip, folded the arms round Cipriano's loins, closing with his hands the secret places.

(Lawrence 1995: 564)

Increasingly, as we see in this novel, women in Lawrence's works are peripheral to the major project which is to revitalise masculinity; a requirement for a reinvigorated society.

Fowles too is preoccupied with the revitalisation of his male characters, and extending Lawrence's approach, the women in his novels are increasingly adjunct to this revitalisation or act merely as catalysts in the process. As a result of this attitude, and the peripheral or subservient roles played by women in his work, Fowles has been described as a "chauvinist" (Palmer 1975: 75) and Fowles's own vehemently self-professed feminism⁴ dismissed by

4. Fowles describes his own feminism in his 2003 interview with Adam Lee-Potter, which was given following the publication of his *Journals*. Here he insists, rather unconvincingly given the content of his quote and his novels, that "I am a feminist. Men need to realise that a great deal of truth in life lies in the woman. A woman's main task is to educate us, to make us see we're not fully educated yet" (Lee-Potter).

Conradi as “oddly complacent” (Conradi 1982: 91). Similarly, Woodcock suggests Fowles recognises that men must change while nursing a “nostalgic desire that women should do the job for them” (Woodcock 1984: 15). The women in Fowles’s novels, just as in Lawrence, are increasingly passive like Kate Leslie in *The Plumed Serpent*. Like Kate, Sarah Woodruff acts as a catalyst in the rebirth of the male protagonist while having very little to say herself. Despite Sarah being the eponymous hero of the novel, compared to Smithson she is almost mute, and the dramatic arc of the novel is predicated on Smithson. Alison Kelly, in *The Magus*, while also sharing the double female moniker of Lawrence’s Kate Leslie, is similarly rejected. Kate is alternatively rejected by Carrasco (after which she marries Cipriano) but then vicariously becomes Carrasco’s “wife” in her role as Malintzi to Cipriano who is “her husband in Quetzalcoatl” (Lawrence 1995: 302). Kelly is rejected by Urfe, and then he spends the remainder of the novel trying to find her again, their doubtful reunion captured in the final pages of the novel. Kate Millett sums up Lawrence’s marginalised and unconvincing Kate Leslie as a “female impersonator” (Millett 2016: 284), but the criticism could easily be applied to Fowles’s Alison Kelly or Sarah Woodruff. The marginalisation of the female by Lawrence can clearly be seen in Fowles’s work, not only in the two novels mentioned above but also from his first published work, *The Collector* (1964) where Miranda Grey is literally imprisoned and ultimately dies as a result by Frederick Clegg. In one of his final works, *Mantissa* (1982), the Greek muse, Erato, is reduced to titillating an academic with writer’s block. Both writers similarly see the revitalisation of society as a male domain, with women at most peripheral to the project.

Areas of Shared Interest: 3. Social Class and Heraclitus

A final influence on Fowles, already developed in the writing of Lawrence, is the writing of Heraclitus. The Heraclitian division of humanity between the intellectual elite – the *aristoi* – and the rest, the “*hoi polloi*” who simply follow, was of great interest to both authors. Lawrence despised those who mindlessly embraced John Bull jingoism during the First World War. He specifically references Heraclitus in a letter to Bertrand Russell on 14th July, 1915, when he urged Russell to “drop all your democracy” and abandon faith in “the people” to govern (Lawrence 1962a: 352). He advocates instead for “an aristocracy of people who have wisdom, & there must be a Ruler: a Kaiser: no Presidents & democracies. I shall write out Herakleitos, on tablets of bronze” (352). This conviction did not waver, as we see the same sentiment expressed in a letter to Mabel Dodge Stern in April 1922, when he wrote “I don’t believe either in liberty or in democracy. I believe in actual, sacred, inspired authority: divine right of natural kings [...]” (Lawrence 1962b: 700). Only a male charismatic leader with unquestioning support could affect the

great changes in society Lawrence craved, and in the “leadership novels” – *Aaron’s Rod* (1922), *Kangaroo* (1923) and *The Plumed Serpent* (1926) – Lawrence articulates his desire for a reinvigorated society, the need for a strong leader to bring about such a seismic social shift. In *Aaron’s Rod*, Rawdon Lilly represents the type of leader Lawrence also discusses in *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (1922) published in the same year as this novel, and in the latter, he declares that “[m]en have got to choose their leaders, and obey them to the death. And it must be a system of culminating aristocracy, society tapering like a pyramid to the supreme leader” (Lawrence 1922: 270). Lawrence makes it quite clear that Lilly is identified as a member of the aristoi. He is quite literally a saviour, saving the life of the titular Aaron Sisson after a doctor ominously predicts that he (Sisson) “might go off quite suddenly – dead before you can turn round” (Lawrence 2000: 103). Lilly possesses many of the characteristics associated with a strong charismatic leader. He is a maverick: described in the Chapter “Words” no fewer than six times as “peculiar”; a “freak” and an “outsider” (Lawrence 2000: 300). Lily delivers a significant speech, where he might be clearly identified as a Lawrence surrogate, about what drives the individual: the “two great dynamic urges in LIFE: love and power” (304). Man’s dedication to the love urge (heterosexual relationships) according to Lilly, is responsible for the sickly nature of contemporary society. Individuals must choose freely between the two urges, and then completely embrace the chosen urge. In both *Kangaroo* and *The Plumed Serpent*, Lawrence exhorts the need for leaders who emerge, not by a democratic process, but instead, by virtue of their charismatic ability to inspire loyalty in the *hoi polloi*. The titular *Kangaroo* is one of these leaders, as is Don Carrasco in *The Plumed Serpent*. It is interesting to note that Fowles develops a similar attitude toward leaders and leadership in his novels.

Fowles also draws a clear line in his novels between the aristoi and the *hoi polloi*. In *The Collector*, for example, the Heraclitean division reflects social class. Frederick Clegg, firmly established as educationally and socially impoverished, enabled only by a “pools” win to stalk and imprison middle-class art student, Miranda Grey, in his cellar. Although Miranda’s flaws are also apparent, her shallow snobbishness is eclipsed by Clegg’s emotional and physical cruelty when the novel, at least implicitly, suggests that Clegg sexually assaults her.

Fowles creates a more nuanced reading of Heraclitus’ division of humanity in his philosophical pensées, *The Aristos* (1964), where he suggests that “[t]he dividing line between the Few and the Many must run through each individual, not between individuals” (Fowles 1981: 9). In Fowlesian terminology, the aristoi are the “elect”, who may be biologically determined but at least partly conditioned by access to education. The responsibility of those who are “elect” is especially evident in *The Magus*.

In perhaps the greatest homage to Lawrence’s conception of the aristoi, Fowles’s Maurice Conchis encapsulates the charisma and artistry of Rawdon

Lilly, the political astuteness of Kangaroo, and the mastery of mythmaking of Don Carrasco. These three elements are used by Conchis to manipulate Nicolas Urfe upon his arrival on the Greek island of "Phraxos". Conchis draws Urfe into his confidence by weaving a history in which he was both military deserter, and Nazi collaborator but possibly also a hero; a concert pianist and an art collector, one-time mayor of Phraxos; and finally, the conjurer of mythic masques that ultimately force Urfe to confront his inauthentic life.

This investigation of influence has, I hope, avoided the pitfalls of influence studies that make naïve assumptions about biographical details and authorial intentionality, providing instead a nuanced, and as Orr suggested, a more "complex and plural" (83) view of intertextual references between the Fowles and his infamous predecessor. In the absence of any serious study of the debt of influence owed to Lawrence by Fowles, I have attempted to make connections between the two authors, taking as a starting point Fowles's own gratitude and homage to the writer as expressed in interviews and in his own preface to Lawrence's *The Man Who Died*. As both writers have been exiled to the periphery of academia, I hope to have shown how their now unpopular stance on class, gender politics, and to a less extent, their concept of realism, still yields interesting analysis.

I hope to have illustrated how Fowles and Lawrence, though a common understanding of the world borne of their experiences of post-war tumult, developed attitudes toward their central themes which are now considered at best antiquated and at worst dangerous. The novelists inhabited years during which the feminist movement was first established and then pushed its agenda into its "Second Wave". As a result, many of their reactionary themes are no longer considered welcome in academic literary circles. Bruce Woodcock reflected that Fowles's "especially rigid" concepts of masculinity and male power, which, both Fowles and Woodcock agree, was partly a result of his exposure to "public school [...] and military service", can complicate attacks on the motives behind Fowles's self-professed but highly problematic feminism. Woodcock reminds readers that part of Fowles's artistic project was an often uncomfortable, frequently contradictory, consideration of 'the appalling crust of masculinity' in contemporary England from the 1950s onwards" (Woodcock 1984: 11). Such apologies, if they are needed, might also be made on behalf of D.H. Lawrence, whose extreme candour; a willingness to try new ideas in the face of those that he felt were failing him and generations to come, would doom the writer to exile, censorship, and periods of poverty.

Both authors have been accused, quite deservedly, of misogyny and of dubious political allegiances. As a result, neither is considered worthy of teaching, particularly Lawrence, who rarely if ever appears on "A" level or "G.C.S.E" syllabi in England. A recent "A" level and "AS" level Cambridge syllabus from 2016 alludes to several Lawrence poems and *Sons and Lovers*,

rather surprisingly in a module on “Discussing women writers” (see <https://gceguide.com/files/example-candidate-responses/cambridge-inter-national-as-a-levels/AS-AL_SOW_9695_v2_1.pdf>) – one would assume he was presented as antithetical rather than as paradigmatic in such a case. At the university level, my internet search located three examples of syllabi that include Lawrence novels: all were in the U.S.

Fowles is taught more frequently than Lawrence at the college level, according to a survey of U.K. syllabi, but again, far more often in U.S. universities than in the U.K. Their significance to literature is, however, occasionally still acknowledged, but it is in the U.S. that such reverence remains. In 1996, Chapman University in California launched its John Fowles Center for Creative Writing (<<https://www.chapman.edu/research/institutes-and-centers/john-fowles-center/index.aspx>>). Similarly, it is the University of New Mexico that reveres Lawrence with its “D.H. Lawrence Ranch Initiatives” (see <https://dhlawrenceranch.unm.edu/>) although Nottingham University, England acknowledges its famous son in its “D.H. Lawrence Research Centre”, founded in 1991.

Given the significance of both writers, their problematic content and personal views notwithstanding, it seems incongruous that they have been so marginalised by their native England and its literary and academic establishments. Examining their work through the lens of the very extreme and tumultuous periods of English history into which they were thrust, this study proposes and encourages a modest recuperation, but perhaps not exoneration, of their work. More specifically for scholars of Fowles, this examination of that author’s work – a consideration of the influence of Lawrence and Fowles’s own high regard for his literary predecessor – offers insight into Fowles’s work that might otherwise not be evident.

Lawrence offers an interesting precedent in the apprehension of the “real” in fiction. I suggest that Lawrence’s insistence on the elevation of the instinctive is an interesting antecedent of Fowles’s own consideration of literary realism, which placed him at odds with many of his contemporaries. For Fowles, it is the inchoate nature of the novel that allows it to evolve and remain a viable vehicle for apprehending contemporary experience. It can free language from reductively rational and descriptive tabulation or description. Fowles’s view, which sets him apart from much of the contemporaneous debate that raged around him at the time, is that language is as stable and reliable as anything can be in a world of constant change. Fowles’s use of language allows as far as can be achieved a categorisation of the perceptual flux, and it is instinctive. Blood consciousness, Lawrence’s attitude toward and apprehension of reality is also instinctive, which would suggest an innate basis in which reality, and therefore, language might inhere. By suggesting that one should navigate the vicissitudes of human experience instinctively rather than by adhering to artificially contrived norms, I suggest Lawrence’s approach is clearly identifiable in Fowles’s philosophy.

Similarly, Lawrence's attitude toward the relationship between men and women also reveals a common thread in Fowles's work. Lawrence strongly advocated the delineation of male and female: that the dilution of male power must be prevented at all costs and pointed to its demise as a significant contributor to the decline of Western civilisation. Fowles's work too might be read as a reaction against Second Wave feminism, and such a view is helpful when attempting to deconstruct Fowles's own puzzling pseudo-feminism. Fowles's approach to gender politics might thus be informed by feminist writers such as Mary Daly. In her work, *Gyn/Ecology, The Metaethics of Radical Feminism* (1978), Daly reclaims the matriarchal mythology from the suppressive force of Christianity and other male institutions and articulates the inherent power in the female as distinct from that of the male. This offers an alternative interpretation of feminism to those who sought to erase the distinction between the male and female natures. Fowles elevates the power and mystery of the female as distinct from the male. This is also an element of Fowles's focus on the power of the matriarchal myth whose influence has been eroded by a powerful and fearful patriarchal society, which has attempted to undermine the importance of the maternal and the feminine. Equally this context manifests itself in the power of the female Muse, and the superiority of mythic and intuitive thought (associated by Fowles with the feminine) over the scientific and the empirical (associated with the male).

Finally, and perhaps most controversially, Fowles's attitude toward social class might be firmly rooted in Lawrence's embrace of Heraclitus. By viewing Fowles's work as a natural descendent of Lawrence's problematic social categorisation of the Few and the Many, we might interpret Fowles's examination of this reductive labelling in a more nuanced way; as an interrogation and problematisation of this persisting phenomenon. Fowles himself sought to grapple with why people appear to fall into such categories. In an interview with Roy Newquist in 1963, Fowles explained that he thought of *The Collector* as a parable in which such labels are analysed.

You see, I have always wanted to illustrate the opposition of the Few and the Many (*hoi polloi*). I take these terms from the pre-Socratic Greek philosopher Heraclitus, who's been a major influence on my life. For him the Few were the good, the intelligent, the independent; The Many were the stupid, the ignorant, and the easily moulded. Of course he implied that one could choose to belong to the Few or to the Many. We know better. I mean these things are hazard, conditioning, according to one's genes, one's environment, and all the rest.

(Newquist 1999: 1)

He does not, however, reject the categories or deny their existence. Instead, he suggests in *The Collector* that people tend to demonstrate behaviours that identify them with the *hoi polloi* as a result of social conditioning rather than a natural, biological deficiency. By freeing Fowles from such unhelpful labels

as “crypto fascist” (St John Butler 1991), and taken together with the acknowledgement of an important literary predecessor with whom Fowles clearly identified, a more holistic and meaningful apprehension of his work might be evinced.

References

- Berlatsky, Noah
 2013 Why D.H. Lawrence, Misogynist Male Author, Has Lots of Female Fans. *The Atlantic*, May 2013. Online: <<https://www.theatlantic.com/sexes/archive/2013/05/why-dh-lawrence-misogynist-male-author-has-lots-of-female-fans/275680/>>. 2 June 2019.
- Boston, Richard
 1969 John Fowles, Alone But Not Lonely. *New York Times* 9 Nov. 1969: Books Section. Online: <<http://www.nytimes.com/books/98/05/31/specials/fowles-alone.html>>. 1 August 2017.
- Campbell, James
 1999 An Interview with John Fowles. In: *Conversations with John Fowles*. Ed. Dianne L Vipond. University Press of Mississippi, pp. 33-49.
- Colletta, Lisa
 1999 The Geography of Ruins: John Fowles’s Daniel Martin and the Travel Narratives of D.H Lawrence. In: *John Fowles and Nature. Fourteen Perspectives on Landscape*. Ed. James R. Aubrey. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, pp. 212-229.
- Conradi, Peter
 1982 *John Fowles*. London: Methuen.
- Delavenay, Emile
 1971 *D.H. Lawrence and Edward Carpenter: A Study in Edwardian Transition*. London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Fowles, John
 1981 *The Aristos*. London: Triad/Granada
 1982 *Mantissa*. London, Triad/Panther.
 1985 *The Magus: A Revised Version*. London; Triad Grafton
 2003 *The Journals, Volume 1*. Ed. Charles Drazin. New York: Jonathan Cape, 2 vols.
- Gussow, Mel
 1974 For Fowles, Novel Mostly Means New. *New York Times*, 27 Nov. 1974, p. 24.
- Harris, Janice H.
 1974 D.H. Lawrence and Kate Millet. *The Massachusetts Review* 15(3): 522-529.
- Jódar, Andrés Romero
 1922 *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Ed., T. Seltzer.
 1962a *The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence in Two Volumes – Volume 1*. Ed. Harry Moore. First Edition edition. Viking Books.

- 1962b *The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence in Two Volumes – Volume 2*. Ed. Harry Moore. The Viking Press
- 1982 *Women in Love*. Penguin.
- 1995 *The Plumed Serpent*. Wordsworth Classics.
- 1998 *Kangaroo*. Cambridge University Press.
- 2000 *Aaron's Rod*. Book Jungle Press.
- 2002 *The Man Who Died: A Story*. Ecco.
- 2002a *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence: Volume III, Part 2 (October 1916-June 1921)*. Ed. James T. Boulton and Andrew Robertson. Cambridge University Press, 6 vols.
- 2002b *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume II. 1913-16*. Ed. George Zytaruk & James T. Boulton. Vol. 2. Cambridge University Press.
- 2006 "A Stranger in a Strange Land": An Existentialist Reading of Fredrick Clegg in "The Collector" by John Fowles. *Atlantis* 28(1): 45-55.
- 2010 *Sons and Lovers*. Penguin Books.
- Lyall, Sarah
2005 John Fowles, British Author of Ambiguous Endings, Dies at 79, *New York Times* November 7, p. 25.
- Maddox, Brenda
1996 *D.H. Lawrence: The Story of a Marriage*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- McMorran, Will
2006 From Quixote to Caractacus: Influence, Intertextuality, and Chitty Chitty Bang Bang. *The Journal of Popular Culture* 39(5): 756-779.
- Millett, Kate
2016 *Sexual Politics*. Columbia University Press.
- Newquist, Roy
1999 John Fowles. In: *Conversations with John Fowles*. Ed. Dianne L. Vipond. University Press of Mississippi, p. 1.
- Orr, Mary
2003 *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Polity Press.
- Palmer, William
1975 *The Fiction of John Fowles. Tradition, Art, and the Loneliness of Selfhood*. University of Missouri Press.
- Peter Wolfe
1974 *John Fowles. Magus and Moralist*. Associated University Presses.
- Pound, Ezra
1935 *Make It New*. Yale University Press.
- Sagar, Keith M.
2003 *The Life of D.H. Lawrence: An Illustrated Biography*. Chaucer Press.
- Scherr, Barry Jeffrey
2004 *D.H. Lawrence Today: Literature, Culture, Politics*. Peter Lang Press.
- St John Butler, Lance
1991 Abstract for "John Fowles and the Fiction of Freedom. In: *The British and Irish Novel Since 1960*. Ed. J. Acheson. Palgrave Macmillan, pp 62-77. Online:
<https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-349-21522-5_5>. 2 June 2019.

Vipond, Dianne L.

- 1999 Interview with Jan Relf. *Conversations with John Fowles*, University Press of Mississippi.
- 1999 An Unholy Inquisition. In: *Conversations with John Fowles*. Ed. Dianne L. Vipond. University Press of Mississippi, pp. 198-213.
- 1999 Interview with Jan Relf. *Conversations with John Fowles*, University Press of Mississippi.

Warburton, Eileen

- 2004 *John Fowles: A Life in Two Worlds*. Viking Adult.

Woodcock, Bruce

- 1984 *Male Mythologies. John Fowles and Masculinity*. Harvester Press.

Michelle Phillips Buchberger

Miami University
buchbem@miamioh.edu