

Performing Gender: Female Masculinity in D. H. Lawrence's *The Rainbow*

Gol Man Gurung*

Abstract

This paper analyses Ursula, the female protagonist of D. H. Lawrence's the novel The Rainbow, who reflects her masculinity. Many feminist critics have perceived this novel as man-centered. In response to this analysis of the novel, the paper tries to look at the novel from the perspective of Judith Halberstam's theoretical concept of female masculinity, especially Ursula as a masculine woman who acts like a man. Female masculinity is not an identity but a site for identification where different identities can flourish, but masculine women possess confidence, assertiveness, and independence. Lawrence gives justice to women's role by presenting Ursula as a new woman who seeks her individual identity in the traditional world. Through the reading of the novel as its theoretical tool, the research concludes that females can be as males and males can be like females. She acts like a man and that means she has masculine qualities. The novelist portrays Ursula as a woman with masculinity because she can flourish different identities of her life. She plays the role of an independent woman, a liberated woman, a Lesbian woman, and a new woman, etc. She behaves like a tomboy who refuses to accept the Victorian conventions of society. So, she is a masculine woman rather than a feminine woman. This paper emphasizes how a woman can perform like a man; this suggests masculinity is not the private property of a male; it is a social position that can be practiced in an individual way.

Keywords: female masculinity, masculine, female, femininity, gender reversal

Introduction

This article explores female masculinity in D. H. Lawrence's *The Rainbow*, focusing on how the novelist announces the protagonist Ursula as a modern woman as she belongs to the third generation of Brangwen family. She is painted as masculine woman in a very conventional world, with an aim to present the changing role of women in the contemporary society of England. So, the aim of this paper is to discover

*Dr. Gurung is the Associate Professor of English and the campus Chief of Saraswati Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal.

female masculinity through characterization of Ursula's masculine traits. For Halberstam the nagging question is:

What is "masculinity"? This has been probably the most common question that I have faced over the past five years while writing on the topic of female masculinity. If masculinity is not the social and cultural and indeed political expression of maleness, then what is it? I do not claim to have any definitive answer to this question, but I do have a few proposals about why masculinity must not and cannot and should not reduce down to the male body and its effects. (Halberstam, 1998, p. 15)

Female masculinity is an alternative model of gender variation; it is not simply the opposite of female. Judith Halberstam's "*An Introduction to Female Masculinity: Masculinity without Men*" introduces the issue of femaleness or female masculinity. She claims that far from being an imitation of maleness, female masculinity actually affords us a glimpse of how masculinity is constructed as masculinity. In other words, female masculinities are framed, as the rejected scraps of dominant masculinity in order that male masculinity may appear to be the real thing. She introduces the term "heroic masculinity" which has been produced by and across both male and female bodies. According to Paul Smith "[...], masculinity or masculinities are in some real sense not the exclusive "property" of biologically male subject – it's true that many female subjects lay claim to masculinity as their property" (Smith, 1996, p. 8).

Therefore, masculinity is not the property of men. Masculinity in the 1990s has recognized as, at least in part, a construction by female as well as male born people. Halberstam states, "Female masculinity has been situated as the place where patriarchy goes to work female psyche and reproduces misogyny within femaleness" (Halberstam, 1998, p. 6).

Talking about alternative model of gender Halberstam claims, "[...] In alternative models of gender variation female masculinity is not simply the opposite of female femininity, nor is it a female version of male masculinity" (Halberstam, 1998, p. 29). Janet Wolff's *The Invisible Flaneuse Woman and Literature of Modernity: Culture and Society* to criticize the rational, hegemony and rejection of female access in the modern world. Richard Howson's *Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity* is an innovative and radical exploration of domination, gender and social justice. Howson contributes to contemporary understandings of men and masculinity, presenting a detailed examination of hegemonic masculinity. Lawrence has been considered as a modern writer since the early twentieth century. And this modernity is reflected in the way he treats his characters. Ursula's assertiveness serves to define her as modern character. We have to see her not as a variant of man because she is masculine in her own terms. She reflects the intentions which Halberstam has in defining masculinity.

I want to carefully produce a model of female masculinity that remarks on its multiple forms but also calls for new and self-conscious affirmations of different gender taxonomies. Such affirmations begin not by subverting masculine power or taking up a position against masculine power but by turning a blind eye to conventional masculinities and refusing to engage. (Halberstam, 1998, p. 9). This quote basically means that Halberstam wants to talk about a model of masculinity that concerns different classifications of gender and subvert conventional notion of masculinity. Or it does not care about conventional idea of masculinity and just takes up a position against what we have understood to be masculine.

The Story of a Masculine Woman

Ursula begins a lesbian relation with Winifred, one of her schoolmistresses, who later on marries Ursula's uncle. Anton returns after six years. They spend their time like husband and wife when Anton asks Ursula to marry him. She explains that she does not want to be married and Anton feels deeply hurt later on. He marries a girl and both of them go to India. Soon Ursula comes to know that she is pregnant and writes to Anton to return and marry her but she does not get any response. She comes to know that Anton has already married with another girl. One day, while she is away from her home, it starts raining and she gets wet. On the way, she sees horses advancing towards her. The horses reflect male masculinity, which is not real but her hallucination. She tries to escape from them and falls down leading her to miscarriage. Getting up she sees a rainbow that fills her with hope, happiness and an urge to begin a new life.

Lydia Lensky and Anna represent traditional type of women who are dependent on their husbands. They are only limited in their house and child caring. They are very conscious about their role and even they know that they are suppressed by patriarchal ideologies. They have compulsion to accept it. They cannot raise their voice against male domination. So, they are victimized by masculine figures. Tom Brangwen marries Lydia only to fulfill his desire. Will also marries Anna only to fulfill his desire. That means they are fully determined by masculine power. Anton also loves Ursula only for his desire as he is away from her without giving any reason. It shows that he is not devoted towards her. He is not responsible for his love to her. He thinks that nation is most important than his life. He is guided by patriotism as he only thinks about how to save his nation.

In the middle part of this novel, Ursula is seen as a new woman. As a new woman, she joins University College for higher education and works as a teacher in a male dominated society. She keeps homosexual relation with Winifred who is also a modern woman; later on, she marries with Ursula's uncle. When she becomes adult, she gains the sexual experience through her romantic life with Anton Skrebensky; at that

time, she recognizes her identity. She considers that she should have a good knowledge of herself as a woman. This development of her feminine self helps her to keep her relation with the next man. As a result, she turns like a man. Woman had no power to speak against patriarchal authority or self-emancipation until the late 19th century. Therefore, they had no chance to get the knowledge from the outside world. However, Ursula successfully gets knowledge and experience from conventional world. Therefore, she can revolt against male masculinity. The performance of such activities establishes her as a masculine woman. She challenges domination of men. Lawrence has not objectified the women's role but he does justice to the woman character through the portrayal of Ursula. Through the position of Ursula, the novelist gives a positive role to women in his novel. He presents the relationship between men and women as growing and changing in course of time. He also believes that women are not only limited in private sphere, but they are also moving to public arena.

Ursula is the only female protagonist who not only explores ways of self-discovery but also takes action to achieve the goal of her life. Here, Lawrence sets the story of three generations of Brangwen families of different ages. The first, Lydia and Tom, the second, Lydia's daughter Anna and Tom's nephew Will, and the third is Anna and Will's daughter Ursula and her lover Anton. Lydia represents an ideal woman who depends on her husband in the pre-industrial phase. At that time, men treated women as sexual object and weak. However, after the industrial revolution, the society underwent radical change because of women's awareness and consciousness about their rights and social status. Men run all the factories, institutions and financial institutions. Women have no chance to work as a superior, manager and supervisor in the same factories. While some women accepted traditional roles some others like Ursula accepted new challenges and acted strongly.

Lawrence clarifies the notion of femininity or female masculinity through this novel. In this novel, Tom and Will treat their wives as a counterpart of their body. They thought that they have masculine power to control over femininity. They believe that women are the sexual objects but Ursula boldly revolts against that attitude and behaviour. She is a revolutionary woman who demands for societal change. She wants to give the message for all women to exist as bold and show masculine action in the society. She seeks to gain her self-discovery. Her struggle does not represent her individual struggle but her struggle represents all women's struggle and suffering. Her experience and education lead her to become as a new woman. They were only limited within four walls of house. They are considered as weak, passive, and even inferior than men. Lawrence focuses on women's consciousness and awareness of their position rather than objectifying their role.

Textual Analysis

Ursula is essentially a risk taker and always rejecting the secured and ordinary world for more exciting experience of loving another woman and rejection Anton's proposal for marriage in the beginning. She is a determined woman and attacks everything with fervor, especially to be very free from the everyday aspects of this world. She is searching for her own identity and her own beliefs. Angelina Subrayan, in her article "Representation of Hegemonic Masculinity," argues "Not all men attempt to comply with this type of masculinity as there are some who oppose hegemonic masculinity by inculcating alternative masculinities which are subordinate in nature" (Subrayan, 2015, p. 18). She further emphasizes masculinity. Its successful application to a wide range of diverse cultures suggests that relevant social systems legitimize the dominance of men over women. However, most men position themselves accordingly in situations where their choices may be quite restricted. Ursula has a sensitive idealistic nature and is always searching for perfection in herself. Anna and Will subsequent Brangwen generation, develop a modern mentality. The narrator says, "And Anna had a new reserve, a new independence. Suddenly, she began to act independently of her parents, to live beyond them." (Lawrence, 1915, p. 110) This line states that Anna is determined by modern mentality. She also wants independence in her life but she did not take action like Ursula. Hans Ulrich Seeber's article "Utopian Mentality in George Eliot's *Middlemarch* and Lawrence" examines that "Ursula Brangwen, in *The Rainbow* totally rejects the role and possibilities offered to her by society's mechanisms" (Seeber, 1995, p. 38). Ursula refuses to follow the role, which was offered to her by her society's mechanisms. Therefore, she assumes that "She was the female ready to take hers; but in her own way. A man could turn into a freelance: so then could a woman" (Lawrence, 1915, p.232). She was a female who is ready to take action herself in England. Therefore, Lawrence's novel is the symbolic expression of Ursula's utopian dream for a better world that is more equitable toward gender differences in the future.

Female masculinity is an alternative model of gender variation; it is not simply the opposite of female. Judith Halberstam's "*An Introduction to Female Masculinity: Masculinity without Men*" introduces the issue of femaleness or female masculinity. She claims that far from being an imitation of maleness, female masculinity actually affords us a glimpse of how masculinity is constructed as masculinity. In other words, female masculinities are framed, as the rejected scraps of dominant masculinity in order that male masculinity may appear to be the real thing. She introduces the term "heroic masculinity" which has been produced by and across both male and female bodies. According to Paul Smith "[...] masculinity or masculinities are in some sense not the exclusive "property" of biologically male subject – it's true that many female subjects lay claim to masculinity as their property" (Smith, 1996, p. 8). Therefore, masculinity is

not the property of men. Masculinity in the 1990s has recognized as, at least in part, a construction by female as well as male born people. Halberstam states, “Female masculinity has been situated as the place where patriarchy goes to work female psyche and reproduces misogyny within femaleness” (Halberstam, 1998, p. 6).

Offering new possibilities for the experience of women Halberstam claims, “[...] In alternative models of gender variation female masculinity is not simply the opposite of female femininity, nor is it a female version of male masculinity” (Halberstam, 1998, p. 29). Janet Wolff’s *The Invisible Flaneuse Woman and Literature of Modernity: Culture and Society* to criticize the rational, hegemony and rejection of female access in the modern world. Richard Howson’s *Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity* is an innovative and radical exploration of domination, gender and social justice. Howson contributes to contemporary understandings of men and masculinity, presenting a detailed examination of hegemonic masculinity. Lawrence has been considered as a modern writer since the early twentieth century.

When Ursula fails her university graduation test, she is faced with two choices to be a teacher means more difficult and she has to explore in the man’s world. While it seems more attractive to be the wife of Anton, she can depend on a man to have a leisure life in her rest of life. At the very moment, clearly being aware of Anton’s hypocrisy and incapability to help her fulfill her natural self, she rejects him and decides to continue her exploration and pursuit of self-fulfillment as well as self-discovery by herself. She remains one of the finest creations of Lawrence. Her character has a great dramatic significance. Besides the history of a family over three generations, the main character is Ursula. In the late 19th century just before the World War I, she is a feminist before her time. We find that she rejects marriage, engage in premarital sex, conducts a homosexual affair and objectified men.

Lydia said, “Resistant, she knew she was beaten, and from fear of darkness turned to fear of light. She would have hidden herself indoors, if she could” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 49). It means that she knew she has been exploited by man and is in darkness but she could not express it. It stands for the weakness for her life. The narrator asserts, “As if he hypnotized her. She was passive, dark, always in shadow” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 46). Her husband hypnotized her as being passive dark and always in shadow. She cannot try to revolt against him’ even she knows everything about her position and situation. However, Yaorong claims, “Lydia has made great progress from an appendix to a relatively independent female self without being subjugated by Tom’s male self” (Yaorong, 2014, p. 138). Thus, Lydia said, “She would not want him enough, as much as he demanded that she should want him. It was that she could not. She could only want him in her own way, and to her own measure” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 78). Lydia did not feel she had married him because she has experience of married life and domination

of male. Yaorong also adds, “Lydia is even aware of her right to refuse Tom’s demand of sexuality. She refuses to serve as sexual object to satisfy man’s desire of sexuality” (Yaorong, 2014, p.138). These lines indicate that it is impossible to imagine for a woman in the Victorian time to pursue sexuality actively.

Therefore, Lydia lives for herself. Tom is just a part of her life and her self-fulfillment. Their relationship is based on marriage, which is natural. The death of Lensky is a turning point for her progress of growth. It is painful for her to escape from the male dominated society and to wake up for the suppressed female self. However, she survives and starts to be aware of her female self. It is impossible for a widowed woman at that time to achieve the goal of self-emancipation but it is a great attempt to start a journey of seeking her female self.

Lydia firstly married Lensky who is superior to her economically and typical result of patriarchal society. She is completely conquered by his authority. Therefore, during that time she has no her female self and acts as a surgical appliance for her husband. Then she chooses Tom for her second marriage, who is a farmer and seems to be inferior and less sophisticated than Lydia. She is a traditional female character in this novel. She also urges, “All women must have a husband” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 63). This means she determines by traditional assumptions and restricts of society. Therefore, she believes that all women must have a husband. That means she is living in a transition phase of British society. Therefore, she cannot totally refuse the traditional role and cannot be very modern. Therefore, Leavis claims, “*The Rainbow* shows us the transmission of the spiritual heritage in an actual society, and shows it in relation to the general development of civilization” (Leavis, 1995, p. 173). So, Lydia has not eventually achieved the goal of self-discovery. The characters Lydia and Anna serve as a pretext for Ursula, the protagonist. Their pursuit is the same; Ursula has achieved the final goal of self-discovery.

Emphasizing the constructed nature of gender R. W. Connell comments, “All forms of femininity in this society are constructed in the context of overall subordination of women to men. For this reason, there is no femininity that holds among women the position held by hegemonic masculinity among men (Connell, 1995, p.187). From this definition, we can understand that gender is constructed by society. All the forms of femininity held by masculinity in the society before 1960s, as a result, the feminist movement flourished in the British society. In case of Ursula and her character in *The Rainbow*, she is female by birth but she has not held any male masculinity because she knows the previous situation of women in her society. She fights bravely in the men’s world without taking support of parents as being masculine. Even she had no regrets for what she had done, she never forgave those who had made her guilty and she breaks relation with Anton. Connell also declares, “Masculinity is a

social position, a set of practices” (Connell, 1995, p. 81). I agree with his notion of masculinity that is a social position, a set of practices because the gender role is constructed by the society. Ursula was free; she declared that in her revolts there was no law for her. She existed for herself alone. Gudrun (sister of Ursula) was happy at home but Ursula was not. Gudrun was easy in her own house whereas Ursula was uneasy, unwilling to be herself or unable. So, Connell defines masculinity as “...simultaneously a place in gender, and the effects of these practices on bodily experience, personality and culture” (Connell, 2005, p. 71). From this definition, we can take masculinity as practices on bodily experience. My point is that a masculine position works as an individual way that is not only the property of male.

At first, when together with Anton, Ursula behaves like a traditional woman and when puts great emphasis on her appearance. She feels like behaving as traditional women do at the time and accepting the submissive role in the male dominated society later, she became unlike traditional women. So, the narrator assumes in the novel, “She [Ursula] would fight and hold her place in this state also, in the world of work and man’s convention”. (Lawrence, 1915, p. 406) This line means that she wants to hold her own place in the world of task and man’s world. She wants to create a separate identity in the British society. Ursula regards Anton as the Son of God and falls in love with him. During the romance with Anton, she is not satisfied with confining herself to romantic emotion. She gradually redefines her pursuit of spiritual fulfillment in the society and intends to develop herself into a self-responsible modern woman. Therefore, she begins to discuss social affairs with Anton including submissive role of female. As John Worthen points out, “Skrebensky [...] is at first the man limited by his abstention from self, submitted as he is to the power of established society ...” (Worthen, 1981, p. 22). During his discussion with Ursula, he argues, “I belong to the nation and must do my duty by the nation” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 309). Later on, Anton has gone to the war in South Africa. Nevertheless, Ursula has hatred for war because she gets to know the cruelty of the war. The narrator also articulates:

The good of the greatest number was all that mattered that which was the greatest good for them all, collectively, was the greatest good for the individual. And so, every man must give himself to support the state, and so labor for the greatest good of all. One might make improvement in the state, perhaps, but always with a view to preserving it intact”. (Lawrence, 1915, pp. 326-327)

As being a soldier of nation, Anton believes that a man is important to preserve the state and social welfare of all humanity. Therefore, Ursula refuses the marriage proposal of him. She could not want to stop her search for fulfillment. She has not hesitated to do anything. Similarly, said, “I believe there are many men in the world one might love – there is not only one man” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 411). After Anton goes to war, she

keeps a lesbian relationship with Winifred Inger who is independent and beautiful. They spend a period together very happily. Thus, the narrator says, “When they were in the room together [...] almost to the exclusion of everything else. Winifred Inger felt a hot delight in the lessons when Ursula was present; Ursula felt her whole life begin when Miss Inger came into the room” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 335). These lines prove that Inger is typical representative modern woman who supports female masculinity rather than femininity. The narrator himself also claims, “Winifred Inger was also interested in the Women’s Movement” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 341). That means she is conscious about women’s emancipation and right and she wants to develop the progressive status of female in a society. Inger encouraged Ursula to be free in her life. Similarly, she is also very conscious about women role and growth of their position.

Unlike traditional women, she does not confine herself to family and domestic affairs hence she is more exposed to the evils of British society. Ursula dismantles the so-called traditional role of femininity and her rebellion against traditions and conventions and her self-discovery makes her the exemplary. She is an independent self-responsible woman. The narrator utters:

Already it was history. In every phase, she was so different. Yet she was always Ursula Brangwen. But what did it mean, Ursula Brangwen? She did not know what she was. Only she was full of rejection, of refusal. Always, always she was spitting out of her mouth [...] and grit of disillusion she could only stiffen in rejection. She seemed always negative in her action that which she was, positively. (Lawrence, 1915, p. 437)

When we talk about the long history of women’s role, they are considered as passive, inferior, submissive, and object of men, etc. But Ursula wants to dismantle the so-called history of society, which has not given the space for female masculinity. It only emphasizes the femininity and submissive position of female. However, she creates new history in the British society by presenting herself as new woman. She always rejects the traditional history, which is constructed by society. Holderness argues that “The novel is a radical novel of criticism and protest against the value of Lawrence’s contemporary society” (Holderness, 1992, p. 52). Ursula wants to make her identity so different from other. She always thinks she should avoid her feminine qualities that make her weak in destination of her life.

In fact, femininity and masculinity are socially constructed that can perform both female and male. For instance, Ursula cannot take support of her parents in any difficult moment of her life. Even she does not feel any regret while she is breaking the relationship with Anton, her lover. It means that she is not passive woman. Later on, she knew, she is pregnant that time she also does not feel disappointed with her life. The narrator urges, “She [Ursula] made dreams of the new place she would live in where

stately cultured people of high feeling would be [...] with her, and she would live with the noble in the land moving to a large freedom of feeling” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 419-420). She has a dream to create a new place where she can live freely. So, she demands for change of her society. Since the beginning of human civilization, women are suppressed and oppressed by men and considered as the subordinate to men. However, Lawrence presents Ursula not like a traditional woman. She is a liberated woman because she can do whatever she likes. So, Evelyn J. Hinz expresses, “She [Ursula] really wants freedom from the compulsion [...] Liberation, freedom from pursuing the ideals of self-determination, individualism, and independence, the freedom that comes from the recognition” (Hinz, 1976, p. 25). These lines demonstrate that Ursula always wants freedom, self, determination, and independent. She is an independent woman who is not pathetic, submissive and inferior.

Lawrence projects Ursula as spokesperson of this novel. However, the narrator declares, “She [Ursula] was no mere Ursula Brangwen. She was Woman, she was the whole of woman in the human order. All-containing, universal, how should she be limited to individuality?” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 444). Thus, Ursula represents the whole of woman in the human order; she is an only one woman who is not limited only to her individuality. Her experience struggle, and revolution connect with other women that mean her demands for change is demand for all women. She is the spokesperson of all women. It can be claimed that one word can change the world likewise one-person can change the whole society of the world. For instance, Ursula is a single woman however she represents all women of British society. She wants to give the message for all women that they can revolt against the patriarchal ideologies and act like her. So, the narrator adds, “She [Ursula] wanted to go away, to be free to stand straight up to her own height” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 419). She is a woman who is determined for herself. She does not take any support for developing her life ahead. Without any support from the male counterparts, she can get success in her life and complete her mission. She can change the role of woman. She also gives the message for all women to live a free life like men. Therefore, she is a representative character of all women. Here, the narrator assumes:

She [Ursula] knew that soon she would want to become a self-responsible person, and her dread was that she would be prevented. An all-containing will in her for complete independence, complete social independence, complete independence from any personal authority, kept her dollishly at her studies. For, she knew that she had always her price of ransom – her femaleness. She was always a woman, and what she could not get because she was a human being, fellow to the rest of mankind, she would get because she was a female, other than

the man. In her femaleness, she felt a secret riches, a reserve, she had always the price of freedom. (Lawrence, 1915, p. 333)

As mentioned above, the statement illustrates what she wants in her life and what is the main goal of her life. She says, she wants to become self-responsible, completely independent. She needs to get price of freedom. She feels proud with her femininity and masculinity. Similarly, Evelyn J. Hinz claims, “She really wants is freedom from compulsion to strive after liberation, freedom from pursuing the ideals of self-determination, individualism, and independence, the freedom that comes from the recognition” (Hinz, 1976, p. 25). In this way, she is liberationist woman by nature. She really needs freedom and independence. Therefore, the narrator also insists that “Ursula passed from girlhood towards womanhood gradually the cloud of self-responsibility gathered upon her. She became aware of herself, that she was the separate entity [...] of an unseparated [...] that she must go somewhere, she must become something” (Lawrence, 1915, p.281). It requires that she must be gaining something in her life. She is very conscious of herself that denotes she identifies her goal, which she wants to achieve by dismantling the boundary of conventional world of society. She accomplishes the crossing the boundary of Victorian role of women as being a masculine woman. Her masculine role contributes for all the women to become masculine and strong.

In sum, Ursula thinks that she must have a place in the world as the narrator utters, “She [Ursula] must have her place in the working world, be a recognized member with full rights there” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 410). Here, we can understand that Ursula wants to make her own world and wants to recognize herself as an independent woman in the society. Later, she becomes more and more an inhabitant of the world of work. She works with intensity because she wants to exist. She is a woman who keeps her identity as an independent woman in the British society. When we talk about her relationship with Anton, the narrator expresses, “He [Anton] thought that, because the community represents millions of people, therefore it must be millions of times more important than any individual, forgetting that the community is an abstraction from the many, and is not the many themselves” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 327). Anton only gives priority for the community rather than the individual. He argues that the community represents millions of people. So, he does not care for his life and his love relation. He only thinks that the community and the nation. He does not give value for individual self and identity. In this case also, the narrator, “She [...] wanted to fight, to fight the whole world. And these two small hands were all she had to do [...] with” (Lawrence, 1915, p. 326). So, Ursula only fights for emancipation of women and equality of humans in the whole world. She thinks that she can do everything to live her own life

and get success. She does not hesitate to take action against men. She has her own vision of her life.

Conclusion

In Lawrence's *The Rainbow*, Ursula performs like a man that stands for masculinity. So, we can figure out that she is a masculine woman. The researcher agrees with the view of Judith Butler that Ursula believes that women can also perform like men. Even the novelist tries to balance the relationship between male and female. Ursula has feminine qualities but her action shows she is a masculine woman. In this novel, she represents a masculine woman who acts like a man in the British society. The novelist gives justice for the women's role by presenting Ursula as a new woman who seeks her individual identity in the conventional world. She wants to create a new history by presenting herself as a modern woman. She dismantles the conventional world of women. She can do what man can do. She is a masculine woman. Masculinity and femininity reflect the identification of gender, which are not a separate issue of gender. Both males and females can exhibit masculine traits and behaviors. Exhibiting both masculine and feminine characteristics are considered androgynous. The researcher employs the notion of Halberstam's female masculinity in order to interpret Lawrence's novel.

References

- Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*, translated by H. M. Parshley. Vintage Books, 1953.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. California: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W. (2000). *The men and the boys*. California: University of California Press.
- Butler, Judith. (1999). *Gender trouble feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.
- Halberstam, Judith (1998). *An introduction to female masculinity: Masculinity without men*. Durham. Duke University Press,
- Halberstam, Judith. (1998). *Female masculinity*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hinz, Evelyn J. (1976). The rainbow: Ursula's liberation. *Contemporary Literature*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 24-43.
- Holderness, G. (1992). *Transition (The rainbow)*. London: Longman Publishing.
- Lawrence, D. H. (1915). *The rainbow*, London: Random House.
- Leavis, F. R. D. H. *Lawrence e: Novelist*. Penguin Books. 1995.
- Paul Smith, ed. *Boys: Masculinity in Contemporary Culture* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1996.

- Seeber, H. (1995). Utopian Mentality in George Eliot's *Middlemarch* (1871/72) and in D.H. Lawrence's *The Rainbow* (1915). *Utopian Studies*, 6(1), 30-39. Retrieved December 12, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20719362>
- Subrayan, Angelina. (2015 Dec.). Representation of hegemonic masculinity. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)* vol. 3, pp. 18-21.
- Wolff, Janet (1986). The invisible Flaneuse. *Woman and Literature of Modernity: Culture and Society*, vol. 2. No. 3, pp. 40-60.
- Worthen, John. "Introduction to *The Rainbow*" In Lawrence. D. H. *The Rainbow*, Penguin, 1981.
- Yaorong, He (2014). *The Rainbow*, as a female bildungsroman. *Canadian Social Science*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 136-144.