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ABSTRACT

The primary goal of this paper is to question the situation of men’s place in D.H.Lawrence’s Sons and Lovers. Our question is what is the role of each man in the novel? And how a mother’s possessiveness had changed the life of all men in the family?

David Herbert Lawrence was an important and controversial English writer of the 20th century. He wrote a lot of great works, one of his most popular novel, Sons and Lovers, is an autobiographical account of his youth. This novel is about the life of the Morels. The author develops the story by portraying the relationships between a lot of characters, especially the male ones we focus on.

Sons And Lovers seems to be written especially to women, all what Lawrence wrote is about women but when we go deeper we see that Lawrence was also interested in men.

This work will approach the question in two ways.

The first chapter will deal with men’s place in D.H.Lawrence’s Sons and Lovers, more exactly with Paul and his father Walter Morel, and with Baxter Dawes. We will focus on each man’s behaviour with one another.

In The second chapter we will analyze possessiveness, that is to say, the desire of holding or having someone as one’s own or under one’s control. We will try to prove this view from the spiritual and symbolic possession of different relationships.

Our study will be through an intensive psychological analysis of a wife’s possessiveness to her husband, and a mother’s possessiveness to her sons: William and Paul.

The conclusion will review all the important aspects of this analysis. It is very important to know about men’s relationships in D.H.Lawrence’s Sons and Lovers this will give us another vision of the novel, and where we can situate Paul’s true relationships, that is to say, his relationships with his father and the other men in the novel.
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INTRODUCTION

David Herbert Lawrence is a very original as well as controversial writer in modern times. His novels are full of vividness and vitality and the researcher is very interested in his portrayal of the truth of life experience. His stronger attachment is given to the spiritual world and the exploration of sub and non-consciousness fields, which is often regarded as what made him a distinguished writer. His central theme is always personal and related to men and women. Lawrence’s concern for man-woman relationships has its family reasons. Lawrence was born in the midland mining village of East-wood, Nottinghamshire. His father was a miner and his mother, better educated than his father, was teaching in a school, and struggled all her marriage life to lift her children from the working class to an upper middle class. Lawrence was educated at a local high school and the college of Nottingham. He had a very close relationship with his mother; friction between his parents and strong connection with his mother are evident in his works, especially in Sons and lovers. In this novel, though Lawrence mainly deals with the relationships between men and women, he also informs us that the relationship between parents and children with the influence of the disharmonious relationship between the special man and woman—father and mother are very significant to children, family and even society. Sons and Lovers has always been Lawrence’s most popular novel, it is true that the novel reflects the life of the author, and in analyzing it we find that the novel shapes all Lawrence’s own experience, as his personal problems. This thesis is about men’s relationships in Sons and Lovers. The aim of the dissertation is to prove the role of each male character in the novel and especially how Paul faced these relationships.
This dissertation will approach the question in two ways. The first chapter will begin with a brief introduction to masculinity, and how Lawrence as Paul faced their masculinity in the novel as in real life.

Like his male characters, Lawrence desperately wanted friendship and explained belief in friendship and his longing in particular for male friends in a letter to Katherine Mansfield on December 5, 1918:

“ I do believe in friendship. I believe tremendously in friendship between man and man, pledging of men to each other inviolably. - but I have not ever met or formed such friendship. Also I believe the same way in friendship between men and women, between women women, sworn, pledged, eternal, as the marriage bond, and as deep. but I have not met or formed such friendship.”(The Letter of D.H. Lawrence 2:301-2).

Though Lawrence wanted friendship and community, especially with other men, it eluded him in his adult life. Compared to his own ideal of friendship, Lawrence thought that the late-Victorian model of friendship was “brittle” and “superficial” and that it ignored the deep, synergistic passion that he thought was essential to life and personal relationships.

In addition, as Lawrence was deeply interested in relationships with men, in a letter to Jennings (a friend of him) dated July 30[-August 3],1908, Lawrence explains that contrary to her assumption about him, he does have male friends:

“Do not suppose I have no men friends. I could show you two men who claim me as their heart’s best brother; there is another, home for vacation, who has been with me every available moment- till I am tired, I confess”(Letters1: 66-67).
Despite suggesting that he does have good male friendships, however, Lawrence also suggests that his male friendships lack intimacy. In the same letter, Lawrence iterates his definition of friendship. He suggests that friendship is measured by “breadth of understanding” and the “delicate response from the chores of feeling which is men to be friends with other men than men with women:

“Various folk vibrate to various frequencies, tones, whatever you like. Now a woman’s soul of emotion is not so organized, so distinctly divided and active in part as a man’s. Set a woman’s soul vibrating in response to your own, and it is her whole soul which trembles with a string, soft note of uncertain quality. But a man will respond, if he is a friend, to the very chord you strike, with clear and satisfying timber, responding with a part, not the whole of his soul. It makes a man much more satisfactory.”(Letters: 66-67).

In November 1912, Lawrence described the theme or “idea” of his novel in a letter to Edward Garnett. He explained that the main character was a young man whose adult development is thwarted by the undying love his mother had showered upon him when he was a child. He writes,

“It follows his idea: a woman of character and refinement goes into a lower class, and has no satisfaction in her own life. She has had a passion for her children, so the children are born of passion, and have heaps of vitality. But as her sons grow up she select them as lovers --- first the eldest, then the second. These sons are urged into life by their reciprocal love of their mother—loved on and on. But when they come to manhood, they can’t love, because their mother is the strongest power in their lives, and holds them.” (476-77).

According to Lawrence, the book represented the “tragedy of thousand of young men in England,” including his new-close friend, David Garnett. What is interesting about this statement, however, is that Lawrence says nothing about the autobiographical
implication of the novel, or about his own loving mother’s recent death. Even Frieda (Lawrence’s wife) commented, in a note to Edward Garnett, that “the mother is really the thread” and the “domineering note” of the novel. Without any measure of self-implication, Lawrence suggests that overwhelming mother produces homosexual sons, though Paul Morel, the main character of Sons and Lovers, is heterosexual, much like Lawrence advertised himself to be.

The second chapter will deal with an intensive psychoanalysis of Mother’s possessiveness towards the men of the family, and how she tried to own control on them. D. H. Lawrence’s perpetual search for the archetypal human relationship affects all his fiction and particularly Sons and Lovers. It is here that his preoccupation with the love ethic and the profound split caused by the imbalance or “power cast,” of most relationships are so nakedly revealed.

The conclusion reviews the major points of the analysis and where can we situate Paul’s true relationships in the novel.
Introduction sources cited


D.H. Lawrence was one of many crusaders who set out to save what was seen as a crippled manhood and reclaim what was believed to be the essential, buried, primitive man. In describing Sons and Lovers to Edward Garnett, Lawrence saw men as split down the middle between the demands of femininity and masculinity, represented by mothers and fathers, by the middle class and working class, “It is a great tragedy,” he writes, “It’s the tragedy of thousands of young men in England.”

Sons and Lovers conveys Lawrence’s ideas about masculinity, but it also tells the story of competing masculine norms and of the “role stress” that they produce. In the novel, Paul Morel one of the main characters, the semiautobiographical protagonist, grows up in a household split by antagonisms between his middle-class, educated mother Gertrude Morel and his working-class, coal-mining father Walter Morel. Paul tries both to fulfill his mother’s aspirations for respectability and to escape her suffocating attentions. In order to escape he attempts relationships with two women. Each fails; Miriam Leivers is a childhood friend, an introverted intellectual who wishes to share an artistic-spiritual companionship but whose repressed sexuality and resemblance to Paul’s mother leave him frigid and distrustful. Clara Dawes, a factory girl estranged from her husband, is both strongly sexual and strongly feminist. Yet when Paul’s mother dies, Paul helps reconcile Clara and her husband, Baxter Dawes. In the end, Paul, companionless, seems to be preparing to move beyond the small world that had contained him up to this point.
Because *Sons and Lovers* has been analyzed from the perspective of Lawrentian philosophy, it has often been viewed as an expression of Lawrence’s ideal of masculinity. Reader than viewing *Sons and Lovers* as an exposition of the problematic situation of masculinity and hence the stress and confusing experienced by men of his age, early appreciations of the novel, as well as many later readings, saw it as the solution to problems experienced by men. Such reading of the novel has led to a skewed notion of what actually happens in the book and what actually happens, according to Lawrence.

Dorothy Van Ghent’s essay is typical of the early critical appreciations in that it reaches out tentatively to accept Lawrence’s later themes and ideas as means of understanding the earlier book. For instance, Van Ghent speaks of Walter Morel, the rarely seen father, as the book’s sole representative of the “life force”. For Van Ghent:

“…integrity is… associated with the man [Walter] Morel and his own Integrity of warm and absolute maleness.” (p.19).

One could easily raise many objections to this view: that the notion of absolute maleness that Van Ghent invokes has little reverence to the views either of men or of masculinity expressed in the book; that warmth has rarely been associated with masculinity, and that in the book warmth occurs in those scenes:

“When Morel is made most vulnerable, discloses most, or acts in some way feminine, for instance in giving Paul his dinner” (P.90,92).

That Morel’s behavior is brutal much time, and that this activity of aggressive domination is much more in keeping with age’s emerging idea of masculinity, as well as those internally authorized by the book as constituting masculinity.
The deeper problem with Van Ghent’s description of the novel lies in making beloved, large characters, like the mother, become small and making small characters, like the father, become large:

“Morel, the father, the irrational life principle… is equally embattled against the death principle in the mother, the rational and idealizing principle working rhythmlessly, greedily, presumptuously, and possessively.”(p.22).

No matter how reductive his own views of the book may appear in his correspondence, Lawrence also admits in those letters that the book was not written like a spiritual autobiography, after the resolution of the problems of sons and mothers, masculinity and femininity, by writing about them. Therefore, instead of the mother’s being reduced to a figure of good or evil, ambivalence dominates; an ambivalence predominated by admiration and love. This would seem to be the experience of most readers and not far from even the author’s intent: “The son loves the mother—all the sons hate and are jealous of the father”*

And yet even this view is misleading. As he was writing Paul morel, the original drafts of which were to become Sons and Lovers, Lawrence repeatedly remarked that Paul chooses his mother’s view*. Although, some commentators felt that the narrator, like young Paul himself, sides with the mother against the father, neither the narrator’s nor Paul’s point of view appears self-evident.


2. I am leaving aside the transposition of the Oedipus theme onto earlier drafts, the impact of this relationship with Frieda, etc; as discussed by Sagar (D.H. Lawrence: life Art, 90-91). Lawrence
refers to the writing of the book as a process of working out his relationship; his various approaches to the book's original material simply illustrate that point.

For instance, one critic cites the following lines to support his contention that “the novel as a whole…assumes Mrs. Morel's purposes and standards”. “…The pity was, she [Mr. Morel's] opposite. She could not be content with the little he might be; she would have him the much that he ought to be. So, in seeking to make him nobler than he could be, she destroyed him. She injured and hurt and scarred herself, but lost none of her worth. She also had the children (S.L.p.21-22). This passage is not clearly on Mrs. Morel's side; in fact, a distaste and hatred of the mother lurks very close to its surface. She “would have him” such and such a way. She destroyed the father, but she was only slighter injured. This hardly seems like unambiguous praise.
1. Paul Morel

We know that *Sons and Lovers* is essentially an autobiographical novel, the words 'manly' and 'manliness' are rarely used today, and then probably with some sense of irony. The very idea of someone being manly in all seriousness has an old-fashioned air to it.

D.H. Lawrence uses both words often, and with the utmost seriousness. The idea, indeed ideal, of manliness is clearly important to Lawrence, for all his professed scorn of both ideas and ideals.

Why was manliness of such vital importance to Lawrence's? Norman Mailer, who understands Lawrence very well, provides us with a clue:

“He illumines the passion to be masculine as no other writer, he reminds us of the beauty of desiring to be a man, for he was not much of a man himself, a son despised by his father, beloved of his mother, a boy and young man and prematurely ageing writer with the soul of a beautiful woman.” (p.76).

and that Paul Morel has many of his author's characteristics in him. He is the pivot around which the whole action of the story moves. From birth is somehow different from his brothers and sister, and perhaps this is exemplified by the baby's action when his mother holds him up towards the 'crimson, throbbing sun,' for he lifts up his fist, and his mother is ashamed of 'her impulse to give him back again whence he came'. She decides to call him Paul, and although she does not know why at the time we can guess the reason: Mrs. Morel is reacting against the sensual, irresponsible nature of her husband, and subconsciously recurring to the influence of her father, George Coppard, 'who drew near in sympathy to the only one man, the Apostle
Paul... he was very different from the miner'. In fact Paul acquires the nickname "Apostle", an ironic reference to the origin of his own name and perhaps also to his character.

Gertrude Morel, the character based on Lawrence's mother, has married below her station; she is a religious woman who is serious and believes in hard work and adherence. She is unhappy and disillusioned with the lower-class mining-family lifestyle and is:

"sick of it, the struggle with poverty and ugliness and meanness" (S.L.p.5).

But she is resolved to stay in her unhappy marriage:

"and all the time ... thinking how to make the most of what she had, for the children's sake" (S.L.p.6).

She met Walter Morel at the age of twenty-three:

"his cheeks were ruddy, and his red, moist mouth was noticeable because he laughed so often and so heartily." Upon meeting him, she watches him with fascination, for he is "so full of colour and animation . . . Soft, non-intellectual, [and] warm" (S.L.p.9).

He is a simple miner with simple needs and no real ambition to better himself. Physical attraction leads her to marry him, but when the attraction fades, the marriage becomes bitter and stormy. Her frustration with him stems from the fact that he is completely unable to live up to her bourgeois expectations. Consequently, Mrs. Morel turns away from her husband and invests all her love and energy in her two eldest sons, William and Paul. William, the eldest, is ambitious and finds a lucrative job in London, but dies soon after marrying a frivolous woman. Mrs. Morel then turns all her attentions upon Paul, the character based on Lawrence himself, in an abnormally close relationship. As Walter Morel turns to drinking and spends his evenings at the pub, spending his family's much-needed money:
"his pride and moral strength" disappear (S.L.p.25).

As a result, Mrs. Morel directs all of her attentions to her children, especially Paul, and treats her husband as a failure. Paul is a pale and quiet child, old for his years. Even as a newborn child, Paul has:

"dark, brooding pupils, as if a burden were on his heart ...quite sorrowful" (S.L.p.34). Paul, always withdrawn, follows his mother around like a shadow, establishing himself a special place in her favor. Mrs. Morel is the center of Paul's life, and "his heart contracted with pain of love of her" (S.L.p.88). Paul sides with his mother against his father and views life from her point of view. He is completely dependent upon her, even as he ventures out to find his first job. Paul feels distraught, for he feels that "the business world, with its regulated system of values, and its impersonality ... is monstrous" (S.L.p.88). Paul feels "a prisoner of industrialism," and only wants a simple life. His only wish is to earn a small salary and when his father dies, to have a cottage with his mother, paint, and live happily ever after. But Paul appeases his mother and goes along with her plans for him. Paul's going to work in industry is the fulfillment of his mother's dreams. As her son goes into the world, Mrs. Morel sees him as a reflection of herself. And so the two travel together on the way to the interview, "feeling the excitement of lovers having an adventure together" (S.L.p.89). Mrs. Morel lives each moment through Paul, as though his life were her own.

Part Two of the novel begins with a new life for Paul, in his friendship and eventual relationship with Miriam. Paul, coming into manhood, is fascinated by the revelations he finds in Miriam. The awakening in Miriam of her sensuality draws her to Paul, and she hopes to be with him in a spiritual union. But Miriam shrinks from any thoughts of
physical passion between them. Meanwhile, Paul is waking up to his feelings of sexuality and feels uneasy:

"Paul hated [Miriam] because, somehow, she spoilt his ease and naturalness. And he writhed himself with a feeling of humiliation" (S.L.p.171).

Miriam is in many ways like Paul's mother--she is religious, pure and possessive. However, their relationship cannot work, for Paul's closeness to his mother inhibits him from forming any successful and lasting relationships with other women. Mrs. Morel is resentful of the closeness that Paul and Miriam share, and she treats Miriam with disdain. Mrs. Morel, with her strength and domination, feels as though she possesses Paul's soul and will now allow room for Miriam in Paul's life. Next, there is the older, sensual woman that arrives in Paul's life: Clara Dawes. She enters his life when Paul is becoming aware of his need for a physical relationship with a woman. Her sense of mystery intrigues Paul, and they begin a love affair. Clara fulfills a need for Paul, stemming from his unsatisfying relationship with Miriam. Clara possesses a sensuous and intuitive quality that Miriam lacks and makes Paul feel like a man. However, Paul's attachment to his mother ends this relationship as well. No other woman can compare to his mother, and though Paul resents her, he cannot separate himself from her. Mrs. Morel's intense possessiveness of Paul has made it impossible for him to feel a normal desire, sexually or emotionally, for any other woman. Even when near death, Mrs. Morel does not want to die, for she feels that she must finally leave Paul. Upon her death, Paul feels nothing but a longing for his own death. He must then learn to live a life of his own, independent of the influence (and support and encouragement) of his mother.

Paul Morel, like Lawrence himself, is a man alone. As an artist, searching for identity and meaning in his world, Paul must find his own answers from his background in the
mining community, from industrial England, and from the strong influence of his mother. Paul has lived a life of struggle and despair in the mining community, but he has also wondered at the beauty and miracle of the earth and all the growing things that surround him in the pastoral countryside. It is obvious that Lawrence preferred the agrarian England as opposed to the dehumanizing and mechanized modern world. Lawrence addresses "the human costs" of an industrialized society in Sons and Lovers.

To read *Sons and Lovers* is to live with Paul Morel, to share his experience, warm or bitter, sad or frustrating. Characterization which has its roots in autobiographical actuality often bears the impress of biding truth; it is so with Paul. He is far from perfect. Many of his actions, particularly with women, are undertaken in blind selfishness- but he is never less than human.
2. Walter and Paul Morel

“Always run away from the battle with himself” Graham Handley
(Brodie’s Note)

Still, the author later came to regret the way in which he had portrayed his father, Lawrence, in his later books,’ says Alastair Niven:

“came to admire the type of man which he believed his father to have been far more than would appear from his portrait of Walter Morel, who is presented initially as unreasonably ill-tempered, then as weak-willed, and finally as an empty husk from whom the kernel of life has been removed.”(p.55).

As the novel proceeds, not much is left of the charming Morel that captured Gertrude’s heart, and their first happy days together are not to return. Morel becomes a lazy, irresponsible drunk, a violent coward, keeping bad company with friends like Jerry Purdy and neglecting his duties as a father and husband. The atmosphere between husband and wife is downright aggressive:

“They were now at battle-pitch. Each forgot everything save the hatred of the other and the battle between them. She was fiery and furious as he. They went on till he called her a liar. ‘No,’ she cried, starting up, scarce able to breathe. ‘Don’t call me that - you, the most despicable liar that ever walked in shoe - leather.’ She forced the last words out of suffocated lungs. ‘You’re a liar!’ he yelled, banging the table with his fist. ‘You’re a liar, you’re a liar.’ She stiffened herself with clenched fists. ‘The house is filthy with you,’ she cried. ‘Then get out on it - it’s mine. Get out on it!’ he shouted. ‘It’s me as brings th’ money whoam, not thee. It’s my house, not thine. Then get out on’t - get out on’t!’

‘And I would,’ she cried, suddenly shaken into tears of impotence. ‘Ah, wouldn’t I, wouldn’t I have gone long ago, but for those children. Ay, haven’t I repented not going years ago, when I’d only the one’ -
suddenly drying into rage. 'Do you think it's for you I stop - do you think I'd stop one minute for you?'

'Go then,' he shouted, beside himself. 'Go!' (S.L.p.33).

However, Lawrence adds: 'He was afraid of her.' Morel, in his illiteracy, cannot compete with his verbal, articulate wife. Primitive as he is in his drunkenness, he uses brute force to maintain his authority, shutting his pregnant wife outdoors in the middle of the night, before falling into a drunken sleep himself: 'He dipped gradually into a stupor, from exhaustion and intoxication' (S.L.p.34). Yet the reader would find it hard to think of Morel as completely hateful. There are instances in which the author tries to be fair to Morel. He is also shown as a good father to the children, kind to his wife and content with the routine of his working days as a miner (p.82.SCAL). 'He was a good workman, dexterous, and one who, when he was in a good humor, always sang.' The children love his stories about the pit and his making fuses from wheat-straws for them. The portrait of his having breakfast in the kitchen during the early morning hours, taking boyish pleasure in toasting his bacon on a fork and pouring his tea into his saucer captures the reader's sympathy. When his wife is dying, like in the event when Paul is ill, his gentle nature is portrayed in his 'timid fashion'.

At the beginning of the book Walter Morel is a simple and superficial man, but also lively and positive; he is charming, has a sense of humor, is a good dancer, has gusto and alacrity. Gradually his role in the family develops from bad to worse. Morel becomes a hopeless drunk, bullying his family and making their life a misery. He is cruel to his children, who hate him (S&L.p.48): William hates him with 'a boy's hatred for false sentiment, and for the stupid treatment of his mother' and Annie never liked him; 'she merely avoided him.' Paul even prays to God to let his father die if he will
not give up drinking. Along with this, he is no longer up to his work (S.L.p.51): 'His work seemed to exhaust him. When he came home he did not speak civilly to anybody.' His wife has more respect for a dog than for him (S.L.p.53): 'I'd wait on a dog at the door first.' He is pictured to the reader as a thieving little fraud when he steals drinking money from Gertrude's purse and hotly denies it afterwards. His decision to put a stop to the degrading marital sham by running away is merely another degradation of himself; he returns that every evening, looking a fool who has sunk so low as to be even beyond his wife's anger. Gradually she is casting him off, and turning for love and life to the children: 'Henceforward he was more or less a husk' (S.L.p.62). He becomes as a helpless victim of the Magna Mater: 'And he half acquiesced, as so many men do, yielding their place to the children.' An outsider to his family, he is shut off from all family affairs, good enough to eat stale bread from the dust and dirt of the pit floor. He cannot safely be left alone with the mother of his children, who dare not go to sleep until reassured that in spite of his presence she is still alive and well (S.L.p.78). His downfall does not stop at that, he becomes a dud of unsound mind, one who can hardly be trusted to walk about freely (S.L.p.106): 'And what's he done this time?...Eh, dear, what a one he is! There's not five minutes of peace.' When he ends up in hospital after one of his stupid, careless accidents he seems to be in need of watch and ward as if he were a demented nonentity.

As father, Mr. Morel's exclusion in novel has been read as a necessary part of the oedipal drama which unfolds between mother and son. In all this, the father comes off rather badly, his prime role that of rival in love. Later in life, when physical, earthy masculinity had taken a more central place in his agenda, Lawrence claimed to regret the novel's bullying spirit of disruption. And in a notorious chapter("Parent Love") in *Fantasia of the unconscious*, Lawrence also engages in a lengthy critique of the
indulgent mother ‘with her boy of eighteen’, a passage which needs to be set alongside the more intimate moments of oedipal desire which pass between,’ diseased with self-consciousness:

“...beats about for her insatiable satisfaction, seeking whom she may devour. And usually, she turns to her child. Here she provokes what she wants...So she throws herself into a last great love for her son, a final and fatal devotion, that which would have been the richness and strength of her husband and is poison to the boy.”(FLI p.125).

Lawrence’s discourse on the ruptured modern family is thus inconsistent, and he is not afraid to open up its dangers and disturbances. Morel loves his children despite his estrangement; like Lawrence’s later silent but passionate heroes, Morel, in particular, loves but cannot articulate that love, and inhabits a world (fashioned by the educated woman) where the control of words is paramount. Mr. Morel is a classic alienated, pre-new-man father: with no obvious role in the central activity of the home, financially central to the family unit but emotionally excluded from it, the nominally controlling patriarch finds himself domestically important. The male subject is increasingly fractured, and this break begins with the family itself.

In the central discussion of the family in Fantasia of the unconscious, Lawrence actively advocates the absent-presence of the father, who might pass through the child’s life but takes no responsibility for it. Although ‘the child’s needs more than the mother. It needs as well the presence of men, the vibration from the present body of man’, nevertheless ‘the true male instinct is to avoid physical contact with a baby and the father that strange, intangible communication’, (FLI 32-3).

Lawrence’s family structures era at best disaffected, at worse dysfunctional, with the father as well as the mother as focus of dissent and change. For if the father cannot
control ‘his’ space, if his home is not castle (in 1929 Lawrence writes that the working man’s one desire is to get out of [his] “castle” and [his] “own little home” (P1.138), if his only real power is the power to leave (with his mistress or just down to the pub), then his position as seat of authority is fundamentally undermined.

Mr. Morel rants and ranges against his domestic impotence, he tries to resurrect his control through violence, but this only makes resistance stronger. Certainly the father has the power to absent himself more than the women have, but they are always assured the loyalty of their children, and this essential bodily connection is elsewhere figured by Lawrence as a more than ample compensation.

3. Baxter and Paul relationships

Baxter Dawes is an interesting male character in the novel, not in any sense fully developed by Lawrence, though he develops in a different way from what we should except after our two or three brushes in the novel. He is coarse-grained, imposing physically, and aggressive, the more so after Clara his wife has left him; even before Paul Knows Clara he has disliked Dawes’ manner, his uncouthness, and has started at him, to the latter’s fury. Although he has a mistress for a time, Dawes has not ceased to watch his wife, as is apparent when he sees Paul and Clara come out of the theatre. He is a shady character, and there is every indication that he is going to seed. Dawes has three major encounters with Paul before he is taken ill himself. The first is in the pub, where his innuendo about Clara and Paul at the theatre shows his own frustration, coarseness, and a certain ominous, vicious streak; the second is in Thomas Jordan’s factory, where he is bewildered by Paul’s tactics, and where he ends up by causing Thomas Jordan’s fall. The third one is when one night as Paul is coming home he is waylaid and attacked by Baxter. The latter is very powerful, but loses his head when Paul nearly strangles him, and kicks Paul, injuring
him quite severely as he is lying defenseless on the ground. Yet there is little doubt that hatred is mingled with a certain kindship despite their disparate physical and mental affiliations.

In the closing episodes Paul is trying to align himself with "man" more fully by coming into relationship with Baxter Dawes, who in his working-class identity, his brutality, his drinking, resembles Paul's father. Paul tests in his relationship whether he and Baxter are not alike and the process learns about masculinity from Dawes, even though ultimately Paul, as always, needs to prove that he is superior.

In the battle with Dawes, Paul feels himself rend the dainty clothing of society and claim as part of himself that which is "without reason of feeling", without the previous formulations of masculine and feminine, claim what he considers manly, pure brutal instinct that allows him to out-Dawes:

“Pure instinct brought his hands to the man's neck, and before Dawes, in frenzy and agony, could wrench him free, he had got his first twisted in the scarf and his knuckle dug in the throat of the other man .he was a pure instinct, without reason or feeling. His body, hard and wonderful in itself, cleaved against the struggling body of other man; not a muscle in him relaxed. He was quite unconscious, only his body hard taken upon itself to kill this other man. For himself he had neither feeling non reason. He lay pressed hard against his adversary, his body adjusting itself to its one pure purpose of choking the other man, resisting exactly at the right moments, with exactly the right amount of strength, the struggles of the other, silent, intent, unchanging, gradually pressing its knuckles deeper, feeling the struggle of the other body become wilder and move frenzied .tighter and tighter grew his body, gradually increasing in pressure, till something breaks". (SCAL.p.451).
The glow of the words in this passage awes: the repetition of “pure” and “right”, the words “wonderful” and “instinct”. Man to man, Paul and Dawes mirror each other as they “cleave” and lie upon each other feeling each other, the wildness, the frenzy.

Alternatively, one might say that personal discomfort with the situation intervenes. Had he really been Dawes, his situation would have the ambiguous. So too, had he been able to acknowledge the person he feels himself to be, his situation would have been less ambiguous. Because he is neither one person nor the other, his action are always impromptu, skewed to the situation at every step.

This is not to say Baxter Dawes is not of intense interest or importance to Paul. Paul feels, as he states, that Clara had screwed up Dawes as she was screwing up him: “I consider you treated Baxter rottenly” is the accusation Paul raises more than once---- an odd thing to say to a lover. But in his own discomfort with women and his own discomfort in his role, Paul finds it easy to see his situation and Baxter’s similarly------- women want something from men that men cannot give them. In Baxter Dawes he sees a man who, because he could not conform to the demands of workplace obeisance nor to the demands of “changed” women, felt role stress and rage . in Baxter’s relationship to Clara, Paul also sees a picture of his father’s relationship to his mother, a relationship he can fix. And yet for Baxter and Clara to have a strong relationship, Baxter must do what Walter Morel cannot do and what Paul cannot do--- -- change: he must renounce part of masculinity. Baxter Dawes must become a weakened man.

Paul, it seems to me, is the new man, the rugged, post-liberal, middle-class feminized individualist. He represents the difficult amalgam that modern man became, and that postmodern man struggles with, the bundle of unresolved
contradiction that makes him the center of distress, frustration, conflict, and potential violence. Paul is the modern man who knows a “real man” is brutal, instinctive, natural, inexpressive, and unsociable because he has invented him; and because he has invented him he knows, somewhere in himself, that he can never be a “real” man—that “real” man does not exist, never have, and never will.

Frank O'Connor sees the Paul/Dawes relationship as possibly one in which Paul Morel reencounters the father of his life, and thus his own masculinity through the presence of a virile, less spiritual person in whom the “dark consciousness” reigns. This analogy seems plausible considering Paul’s efforts at reconciling Dawes and his wife, a kind of substitution for reconciling his own mother and father.
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CHAPTER TWO

Possessiveness in D.H. Lawrence’s SONS and Lovers.

SONS and Lovers, is an autobiographical account of Lawrence’s early life. Lawrence gives an account of his mother which shows how strongly she influenced the conception of SONS and Lovers. In it he writes of her as being a clever and ironical woman of good old burgher descent who married beneath herself. During the course of their marriage Lawrence’s father revealed a lack of principles, deceived his wife, lied to her, and drunk. Lawrence describes the friction between them, and refers to his own hatred of his father; he even shivered with horror when his father touched him. There grew up between mother and son a bond.

In this novel, though Lawrence mainly deals with the relationship between men and women, he also informs us that the relationship between parents and children with the influence of the disharmonious relationship between the special man and woman—father and mother is very significant to children, family and even society. However, there are many different relationships in this novel, like Fiona Becket said:

“...D.H. Lawrence’s novel mainly talk about relationships... especially the relationship between man and woman...”(p.134).

There are two major relationships in this novel: the relationship which is, between Gertrude Morel and her husband Walter Morel, whereas the other is the relationships between Mrs. Morel her two sons.
As it is certainly beyond the capacity of a thesis to deal with all kinds of human relationships thoroughly, this chapter intends to focus its efforts on the relationship between the parents and children found in the novel *Sons and lovers*. In other words, we must guide our emotional responses to others in society and set the stages for what happens to us in the interpersonal lives with others. However, we will analyze the cause possessiveness, which is the desire of holding or having something as one’s own or under one’s control.

1. **Mrs. Gertrude Morel’s possessiveness to Walter Morel**

   In essence, love is “an attaching emotion, an inside emotion, a feeling of oneness”. It is common in the human world. For example, love is found between husband and wife, between parents and children between brothers or sisters, etc. Often, hostility is spoken of as an opposite to love. Since two opposite things usually do not co-exist with each other, there is normally a clear boundary between love and hostility, just like that between fire and water. However, there are always exceptions to every rule in the world. In some situations, the boundary between love and hostility can also be crossed and the two seemingly contrasting emotions go hand in hand. For example, in the novel *Sons and lovers*, Mr. and Mrs. Morel did love each other at the very beginning of their marriage, even later they may have some disputes, but they still stuck to each other. Besides, Gertrude Morel is a strong-willed, refined, puritanical, and middle-class lady who has been shocked and disappointed by her marriage to a miner. Her husband, Mr. Walter Morel comes from the lower class. In Mrs. Morel’s eyes, he is a brutish and sensual coal miner. Before they married, Mr. Morel is a healthy good-looking young guy of 27, with:

   “a vigorous black beard that had never been shaved.”(S.L.10).
“His cheeks and his red mouth are very attractive because he laughs so often and so heartily.” So Mrs. Morel thinks he is strong and full of color and animation. Besides, he is a man who is different from Mrs. Morel’s father. Though he is uneducated and a common man, Mr. Morel has a curious animal attraction for the proud, reserved, intellectual Mrs. Morel. Walter Morel loved to dance and flirt; and he is so ready and pleasant with everybody. Mrs. Morel, on the other hand, has a curious, receptive mind which finds much pleasure and amusement in listening to other people. Gertrude Morel was clever in leading people talk. She loves ideas, and is considered very intellectual. What she likes most of all is an argument on religion or philosophy or politics with some educated men. So she is very different from Mr. Morel. Because of this difference and attraction, within a year, they married:

“…For three months after marring, Walter Morel and Gertrude Morel are perfectly happy, for six months she was very happy.” (S.L.p.13).

Mrs. Morel hated her husband and at the same time she loved him. She wished Mr. Morel to be a good example for their children. Therefore, the two contrasting emotions can co-exist between husband and wife. Hurt is a fundamental but distinctively subjective emotion. We are all vulnerable to being hurt at one time or another and most of us are able to know when one is hurt:

“… And Morel sitting there, quite alone, and having nothing to think about, would be feeling vaguely uncomfortable. His soul would reach out in its blind way to her and find her gone. He felt a sort of emptiness, almost like a vacuum in his soul. He was unsettled and restless. Soon he could not live in that atmosphere, and he affected his wife. Both felt an oppression on their breathing when they were left together for some time. Then he went to bed and she settled down to enjoy herself alone working, thinking, living.”(S.L.p.47).
Furthermore, there is an intrinsic connection between hurt and love. Usually, people are not hurt by discourteous strangers. Most of us can easily forget the rudeness of an occasional acquaintance, but people tend to remember and remain affected by a rude remark by someone they love. Therefore, they are not only vulnerable to being hurt by those love, but also fallible in hurting our loved ones. No wonder love can also be defined as “granting that other person the power to hurt and to be hurt”. What’s more, hurt is not a feeling that is easily expressed. It is usually avoided and hidden from others:

“… Morel was penniless. He dreaded his wife. Having hurt her, he hated her. He did not know what to do with himself that evening, having not even two pence with which to go to the Palmerton… while his wife was down the garden with the child…” (S.L.p.42).

Yet ironically and paradoxically, people are needy of comfort and support from the very ones whom they may have hurt. In some extreme cases when the greatly desired comfort is not available, the emotion of hostility can be triggered even in the old intimate relationships within no time. Experience tells people that emotions can largely regulate people’s behaviors and the latter shall in turn exert deep effect upon the former. Presumably, when one wants a relationship to develop, one tends to engage in approach strategies; when one wants to restrain a relationship, one consciously increases avoidance tendencies toward others which shall in turn freeze or even ruin the relationship. In other words, the time dimension of our behavior mainly shows how and when one responds to the external stimuli. Love is an emotion like a magnet that can help bind people together. It shortens not only the physical distance among one another, but also the distance in the psychological perspective. To love someone truly means one’s willingness to disclose a proper proportion of the self to that person through the close daily contacts between the two. Therefore, the
approach tendency usually dominates an emotion like love, and the love emotion will in return further increase the likelihood of the approach tendency between the persons concerned. Nevertheless, emotions of attachment take time to develop, and that is why people often say love does not come cheaply. But actually, most human beings do expect love in return for the love they bestow on others. When their expectation is attained, love is considered to be enjoyable; when not, people shall feel hurt. Those individuals who lack sufficient rationality in their mind would use withdrawal, denial and other forms of avoidance to deal with their hurts. That is exactly what Mr. Morel did to his wife and his children. Naturally, the avoidance of hurts can lead to the avoidance of intimacy. If the intentional estrangement between the old intimate relationships is still not enough to relieve the emotional crisis, individuals may resort to the emotion of hostility for the release of their inner anguish. Meanwhile, they shall delay relation-improving actions and discharge whatever negative emotions they have in mind spontaneously regardless of the consequences.

In another hand, disillusionment set in. Gertrude discovers that reality isn’t happy. The poor condition makes her feel very tired. They have no house, and they should hand in money to his step mother, and she finds still unpaid bills of the household furniture. Especially, his step mother says something to laugh at her:

“It is lucky to be you,” said the elder woman, bitingly, “to have a husband as takes all the worry of the money, and leaves you a free hand.”(S.L.p.54).

And at the same time, because of different background, they have distance in each other’s mind. Sometimes, when she herself wearies of love-talk, she tries to open her heart seriously to him. She sees him listen deferentially, but without understanding. This kills her efforts at an intimacy. Because of hard life, Mr. Morel works very hard for family, but he ignores his young wife. Walter Morel doesn’t know
she begins to change her manner to him. When October comes in, she thinks only of Christmas:

“…When October came in, she thought only of Christmas…” (S.L.p.13).

two years ago, at Christmas, she had met him:

“…When she was twenty-three years old, she met, at a Christmas party, a young man from the Erewash Valley…” (S.L.p.9).

However, the next Christmas she had married him:

“…the next Christmas they were married, and for three months she was perfectly happy: for six months she was very happy…” (S.L.p.11).

Gertrude Morel is very ill when the baby is born. Mr. Morel is good to her, as good as gold. But she feels very lonely, miles away from her own people. She feels lonely with him now, and his presence only makes the relationship more intense.

At the beginning:

“She fought to make him undertake his own responsibilities, to make him fulfill his obligations.” (S.L.p.16).

She will reform the miner and bring him up to her level of manners. But he is too different from her. His nature is purely sensuous, and she strives to make him moral, religious. So even if she tries to force him to face things, he could not endure this—it drives him out of his mind.

Mrs. Morel uses the strong possession to control her husband Walter. Because of her strong possession, she has highly requirements on Walter. On the day when Paul was born, Mr. Morel is in an especially bad mood. His works in the pit has gone poorly, and he comes home cross and tired. When he goes reluctantly upstairs, from their conversation: “A lad, that says,” (S.L.p.61).
Mr. Walter Morel stammers, especially, after the conversation he wants to kiss her, but he dares not. One time when a neighbor complains to the Morels that William has torn her son’s shirt in a fight, Mrs. Morel only mildly reprimands her son, while accepting his explanation of the event. But later, when Mr. Morel comes home and wants to beat the boy, she rushes between father and son, in a fury. “Only dare!” she said in a loud, rising voice:

“…Only dare, milord, to lay a finger on that child! You will regret it forever.”
(S.L.p.134).

Mrs. Morel wants to escape from poverty but she has to struggle with poverty and ugliness and meanness in her every life:

“I wait, ”Mrs. Morel said to herself- “I wait, and what I wait for can never come”(S.L.p.135).

As Mrs. Morel was waiting from her husband to bring something new, to have a better life, the change will never come. However, she turns to her two sons, but which later became a possessive relationships between the mother and her sons.

The Morels’ union is based on a sexual fascination, with no understanding of each other. The Morels have different class ideologies. Gertrude (Mrs. Morel) comes from a middle-class family whose philosophy of life, hopes and aspirations are a great deal different from those of Walter (Mr. Morel), who is from the working class, and who refuses to have everything done to satisfy his wife’s petty bourgeois desires. Therefore, her effort to reform her husband is destined to be a failure. Taken as an example of the scene of Walter’s cutting William’s hair in the first chapter, the scene presents what can be considered to be one of the major conflicts in the Morels’ marriage. By cutting the hair of his one-year-old son William, Walter attempts to assert his authority, as he thinks his wife is pampering the child and making him
effeminate. It is also a battle between husband and wife, based on their different social values. They differ in their own needs and demands on their children. And another scene: William’s white coat and hat with its ostrich feather and his twining wisps of hair embody Gertrude’s middle-class fantasy, which is nurtured by her family origin and is ridiculously inappropriate to the rough domesticity of a miner’s cottage, with the great fire burning, the breakfast roughly laid, and tile newspaper on the hearthrug. These details awaken Mrs. Morel to the object realities of her situation. William’s cropped head is a brutal expression of her marital disillusionment and of the clash of values and expectations between Mr. and Mrs. Morel.

In terms of education, the Morels are quite different. Walter, who left school at the age of ten to work in the mine, is barely literate and can only spell out painfully the headlines and see no value whatsoever in the reading of books. He can merely speak in Derbyshire dialect. However, his wife is well-educated. Gertrude is a former teacher for pupils. She is also an ardent reader of novels and a speaker of Queen’s English. She also joins the Women Guilds, where the women are supposed to discuss the benefits to be derived from co-operation, and other social questions. Sometimes she reads a paper, sometimes she sits writing in her rapid fashion, thinking, referring to books, and writing again (S.L.p.68).

Furthermore, even Walter Morel is even less educated than his children. As a result, he cannot communicate with Gertrude and his children. The dialogue between father and son in Chapter IV shows that Walter Morel is excluded from the intellectual life of the family:

“He was shut out from all family affairs. No one told him anything. The children, alone with their mother, told her all about the day’s happenings, everything. Nothing had really taken place in them until it was told to their mother. But as soon as the father came in, everything stopped. He was like the scotch in the smooth, happy machinery of the home. And he was
always aware of this fall of silence on his entry, the shutting off of life, the unwelcome. But now it was gone too far to alter.

He would dearly have liked the children to talk to him, but they could not. Sometimes Mrs. Morel would say:

"You ought to tell your father."
Paul won a prize in a competition in a child's paper. Everybody was highly jubilant.
"Now you'd better tell your father when he comes in," said Mrs. Morel.
"You know how he carries on and says he's never told anything."
"All right," said Paul. But he would almost rather have forfeited the prize than have to tell his father.
"I've won a prize in a competition, dad," he said. Morel turned round to him.
"Have you, my boy? What sort of a competition?"
"Oh, nothing--about famous women."
"And how much is the prize, then, as you've got?"
"It's a book."
"Oh, indeed!"
"About birds."
"Hm--hm!"

And that was all. Conversation was impossible between the father and any other member of the family. He was an outsider. He had denied the God in him.”(S.L.p.63).

The home is dominated by the mother's values and the father has no place there. When we look at the details it is evident that the whole family is now against the father, for the every word of the second sentence obviously does not include Walter Morel. When the mother suggests her son that "you'd better tell", her tone indicates that the father is not much interested in his son's study and never asks about it initiatively and Paul's answers are brief and unhelpful. And all the questions Walter puts to Paul in the dialogue only indicates that Morel can only think of prizes and rewards in terms of money; culture and learning are alien to him.

Mrs. Morel is a Puritan, who perceives her father as a representative of all men devoutly religious to the point of abstaining from all forms of sensuous experience. She strictly believes in the Protestant ethos of self-denial, sexual repression,
impersonal work, disciplined aspiration, guilt, and yearning for conversion-escape. But her industrially victimized coal-miner husband lives a life antithetical to that of his moralistic, chapel-going Congregational wife. He has no use for his wife’s religion, preferring the pub to chapel, and fails to understand either Gertrude’s ambitious ideas or Paul’s arts.

Family unity was considered as the backbone of Victorian society. Every family strived toward this ideal and believed in it regardless of how poorly their own personal experience matched up. As a writer, Lawrence did much to dispel the myth of the sanctity of home and family so prevalent in Victorian literature.

Socially, as a contradiction of possibilities, Gertrude becomes alien to her husband. She can only relate to Morel subjectively, trying to change him into her own image. But, unlike his wife, Morel never dreams of clawing his way into middle-class, nor does he envision a different future for his children. Little beyond Bestwood attracts him, and little within Bestwood repels him. Different vision of life between husband and wife leads to their dissensions of emotion.

Economically, the Morels are in oppressive poverty. More often than not, Gertrude has to use their hard-earned funds with meticulous care in order to keep the wolf out of the door, because Walter is not able to earn enough money to support the whole family, even if he stops drinking and gives his wife all the money he has earned. However, he does not feel specially pinched with poverty as his wife does. Economic problems greatly add to Gertrude’s dissatisfaction with her husband, and later helps lead to greater emotional crisis. Eventually, Morel is reduced only to the bread-winner upon whom the family depends.

The inhuman modern industrial civilization is also a factor which results in the Morels’ tragic marriage. It is the heavy mining work that turns the smart Walter into a miner,
scarred, deformed, exhausted and inhuman. The dehumanizing mining work constitutes the main reason for his addiction to drinking and for his wife-beating.

In a word, Gertrude and Walter do not share with each other in ideology, aesthetics, economic motivations, manners, language, moral views or political interests. The marriage of the Morels is ruined by the great differences between them that are both social and personal. Under such circumstances, their marriage being a battle, a tragedy is unavoidable. Thus, Morel gradually falls a victim of the industrial civilization and of his proud, petty, bourgeois wife.

2. Mrs. Morel's Possessiveness to her sons

Mrs. Morel is an educated woman. However, in D.H. Lawrence's *Sons And Lovers*, she is a fascinating compound of faults and virtues. Her virtues are hardworking, thrifty, and, most importantly, possessing intelligence and strength of will, Gertrude Morel makes most of the difficult situation in which she finds herself. Most of all, Gertrude Morel devote herself passionately to her children.

Through this aspect, Mrs. Morel proved to be possessive, towards all men in the family. She succeeded in making her boys succeed, but the negative effects of strong possession also affect her sons.

In the “Foreword” of *Sons and Lovers*, Lawrence says:

"The woman must find another man and he another woman; if the law does not permit it, then he will destroy himself, perhaps with drinking, and she may turn to a son...and his wife in her despair shall hope for sons, that she may have her lover in her hour." (P.58).

She fails to establish them, as a mother should make her children self-sufficient and independent individuals, and enable them ability of living their own lives and loving
their own loves without constant reference to her judgments and feelings. At first, she chooses and begins with her eldest son.

2.1 Mrs. Morel’s Possessiveness to William

William Morel is Morel’s elder son, a handsome and intelligent young man who combines his father’s gregariousness and physical magnetism with his mother’s intelligence and will power. However Mrs. Morel puts her strong possession from her husband Walter Morel to William. Before William goes out to work, he is a mother’s lovely boy. His mother loves him very much. When William is only one year old, his mother is proud of him, he was so pretty. She was not well off now, but she makes her sons appear to be respectable. One time Mr. Morel wanted to cut William’s hair, but Mrs. Morel wanted to kill Mr. Morel. She holds her two fists tightly then lifts them. Mr. Morel shrinks back.

“I could kill you, I could!” she said. She choked with rage, her two fists uplifted.(S.L.P.15).

“Yet non want you makes a wench on’im,” Morel says(S.L.P15).

In a frightened tone, bending his head to shield his eyes from hers. His attempt at laughter has vanished, "Oh—my boy!"She falters. Her lip trembles, and her face turns green and she cries painfully. Mrs. Morel treats William as part of her. She wanted to control William.

Mrs. .Morel protects William from her husband after a neighbor’s complaint, and with a terrible and conscious fixity of purpose she shuts Mr. Morel out of the family life, not only by ignoring him, but by inflexibly pursuing the right course for her children.

On the other hand, William also loves her very much. One time, Mr. Morel quarrels with Mrs. Morel, William was very angry, and his fists are shocked. He
wanted to kick his son. William is bigger, but Mr. Morel is hard-muscled, and mad with fury. William put his fists ready. He watches his father, suddenly, the air is frozen. Luckily, Mrs. Morel stops this fight. From this quarrel, we find that mother and son look like partner, because William thinks that he is the only man who can protect his mother.

But when William grows up to go to work and begins to keep dating with young girls, he doesn’t go home often. At first he would send some money to Mrs. Morel, but when he begins having relationships with girls, he hardly sends money to her. Mrs. Morel begins to be jealous of his girlfriends. Although William planed to marry Lily Louisa Weston, or "Gyp" as he calls her, he is forced to give up her under his mother’s persuading:

“My boy, remember you’re taking your life in your hands,” (S.L.p.17). says Mrs. Morel

“And so often William manifested the same hatred towards his betrothed. On the last evening at home, he was railing against her.”(S.L.p.17).

So he suffers a split in his mind and his body, and at last he suffers to die of pneumonia.

Because of Mrs. Morel’s possession, she deprives her son’s rights of love. Her son William can’t love because their mother is the major part in their lives and controls their mind tightly.

Readers believe that William dies of Pneumonia, but really because he can’t resolve the conflict he feels between marrying his girlfriend “Gyp” and remaining devoted to his mother.
William is his mother’s unwitting sacrifice. William’s brief life, his blighted youth, has a wider significance: it emphasizes the danger, pain and cost of upward mobility and social emancipation, and of excessive mother-love. And William’s tragic life and fruitless love with his fiancée prefigure those of Paul’s. For instance, When William turns thirteen, Mrs. Morel, determined to keep him out of the coal mines, finds him a clerical job. Mr. Morel makes fun of William for taking such a sissy job. Besides, he could make much more money as a miner. But mining is a dead-end field, and Mrs. Morel wants her children to get as far away from the working-class life as possible. Clerking, though vastly underpaid, will offer William a chance at middle-class respectability in the future. William may be pragmatic and socially ambitious like Mrs. Morel, but he’s also very much like his high-spirited father. He’s a great athlete and, to his mother’s chagrin, an expert at dancing and romancing.

After William’s death, Mrs. Morel is paralyzed with grief. Nobody could take her back to her old bright interest in life. She is not finally roused from her despair until her second son, Paul, another major character, is dangerously ill with the same illness. From then on, her life begins to root itself to Paul.

2.2. Mrs. Morel’s Possessiveness to Paul

D.H. Lawrence’s Sons and Lovers is considered as one of the most innovative novels of the twentieth century. In the novel, the extreme emotions given by the protagonist Paul to his mother is a brilliant illustration of Freud’s psychological theory of the Oedipus complex.

The theory of the “Oedipus complex” is central to Freud’s explanation of how all of us develop an adult identity. The infant, he argues, is a mere mass of impulses with no
sense of its own separate self. The main source of pleasure for the male infant is normally his mother who naturally becomes also the object of his sexual desire. This causes him to see his father as a rival in his ruthless search for satisfaction.

Paul is the second son of the Morels, a light, quick, slender boy. From childhood on Paul is especially sensitive, artistic and imaginative, and he becomes extraordinarily dependent on his mother, a highly intelligent woman with an unusually strong and vivid personality. Paul is always sick, he never wants to be separated from his mother and only wishes to devote himself to his mother.

As he grows up, he starts to work, though he is reluctant to leave his beloved home. When the girl named Miriam appears in his life, Paul wants to love her and to be loved by her. But he couldn’t. Whenever Paul is out and late with Miriam, he knows his mother is furious and getting angry with him.

Miriam was a girl who dislikes Paul’s mother, because Mrs. Morel controlled Paul’s mind and his mother thinks that Paul was a part of her, that’s to say, no one can take Paul:

“She is one of those who will want to suck a man’s soul out till he has none of his own left.”(S.L.p.163).

And Mrs. Morel takes him away from her, so she shouts at her son:

“I can’t bear it. I could let another woman—but not her. She’d leave me no room, not a bit of room—” “And immediately he hated Miriam bitterly.”(S.L.p.166).
Paul’s feeling is entirely under the control of his mother. So Paul threw away normal boys’ behavior, to strike for himself to adventure, to emulate and surpass his father, even though he tries to go on living with his mother forever!

Meanwhile, the mother has used the full weight of her powerful influence to prevent her son from giving other women the love, which she guards for herself. Paul’s mind still belonged to his mother at any time so that he couldn’t live at his own. In a convert with his mother, Paul complains that:

“But why-why don’t I want to marry her or anybody? I feel sometimes as if I wronged my women, mother.” (S.L.p.215).

It’s obvious that his intense attachment to his mother keeps him from properly loving any other woman.

This part deals mainly with the relationship between Mrs. Morel and Paul to explain the relation between the mother and children. As to Mrs. Morel’s second eldest son Paul was a born soul-mate to her. When he was born, it was a great comfort for the mother that the baby was another boy because it meant a great man in the future. Not long after his birth, Mrs. Morel noticed that the baby seemed to be trying to understand something painful, so:

“a wave of hot love went over her to the infant” (S & L, p. 51).

Mrs. Morel decided to do everything in her power for the baby’s well-being. Despite of the disharmonious relationship with her husband, Mrs. Morel, as a respectable middle woman was still a mother at the early stage of her children.
When he was still a child Paul ever went out to look for things like the blackberries so as to help finance the family. He hunted far and wide because he could not bear to disappoint his mother by going back to her empty-handed. He would: “have died rather” (S & L, p. 88).

Because of Paul’s hyper-sensitiveness, Mrs. Morel treated Paul differently from her other children. The two got on well with each other until Paul fell in love with a girl named Miriam after entering his adolescence. Mrs. Morel’s love for Paul was a bit too passionate than it should have been. When the sons were dating with young girls, she vaguely desired to prevent them from falling in love with the girls. Yet she held no good reason for it and had to let the sons have the upper hand whenever they had disputes over it. Still she fought against the sons’ partial wish to be free from her tremendous efforts. Mrs. Morel did not like Miriam in the belief that the young girl might take Paul’s affection exclusively. When Paul came to the knowledge of his mother’s disapproval of Miriam, he fell in great agony and was at a loss what to do as he loved both of them. His mother often accused him of returning home too late at night after his dating with Miriam, and sometimes he could not help answering back, “it’s not late, I shall do as I like” (S & L, p. 239).

Then he would regret bitterly and hate his own rudeness toward his mother because he still considered her to be the most important person in his life. His mother wanted him to lessen the contact with Miriam, but Paul could not take her advice. Once when he overheard his mother and another woman Clara talk bad about Miriam, he became angry and held Miriam as the better one than the other two. Mrs. Morel was so tied up with her sons in life that she failed to know who she was and what she should really have tried to get out of life. So she clung to her sons obsessively, and got herself confused in the respective roles she should have played at the different
stages of the sons’ growth. Because of Mrs. Morel’s unclear role at the different stages of her sons’ growth, her sons, especially Paul, repaid her love with passion. Then Paul just lost his ability to have his own ideally independent adult life as a complete man.

Paul has had a special tie with his mother from his early childhood. He “toddled after his mother like her shadow”, and her “treatment of Paul was different from that of the other children” (SL64). Oddly enough, in the family the sons all hate and are jealous of the father. Paul hates his father to such an extent that he even prays to God for his father’s death. When he is taken ill, his father's presence seems to aggravate all his impatience. He “loved to sleep with his mother…. The warmth, the security and peace of soul, the utter comfort from the touch of the other knits the sleep. Whilst she, always a bad sleeper, lull later on into a profound sleep that seemed to give her faith.” (SL 87).

In Chapter V, when Mr. Morel is hospitalized after an accident, the 14-year-old Paul repeatedly says to his mother with joy that he is the man in the house; and when they learn that the father is discharged from hospital after recovery, the mother and the son cannot help regretting his coming back home. Paul’s ambition is to earn quietly thirty or thirty-five shillings a week somewhere near his home, and then, when his father dies, to have a cottage with his mother, paint and go out as he likes, and live happily ever after.” (SL113). His “Oedipal complex” for his mother fails to dwindle even after he grows up on account of his mother’s unbalanced possessive love. Throughout the novel, he shows his animosity towards his poor father and his tenderness to his mother; his relationship with his mother is the most important factor in his life.
In Chapter V, when the son is bidden to call upon Thomas Jordan, manufacturer of Surgical Appliances, Lawrence gives the reader a very particular and loving detail of Mrs. Morel’s old gloves and worn purse as she searches for the fare money. A whole life of sacrifice and self-denial is summed up in this image. Paul is deeply touched by it because he has witnessed his mother’s struggle with adversity, and this feeling of his has helped bond them together. Paul’s care for his mother’s feelings is shown in the way he hides his apprehensions from her while she, on her part, is all vivacity and enthusiasm, like a young girl. Appropriate for a young adolescent, he finds trouble exposing a close, private relationship with his mother in public. In her general uncomplicated excitement Mrs. Morel appears, if anything, younger than her son.

Here we are shown a mother’s love for her son at its triumphant best. We feel file relationship is rather too tense -- Lawrence here describes Mrs. Morel as “gay, like a sweetheart”. This is not merely a mother-son relationship; it seems to be a relationship between lovers. This intimate relationship may be a joy to the mother, but it is unwholesome to the son, as we can perceive in Paul’s subsequent development in his life. On the one side, the mother, passionately devoted to her sons, wanting to live for and through them; on the other, the sons, equally devoted to their mother, but anxious, too, like all healthy young growing men, to live for and through themselves. It’s this conflict between these diametrically opposed needs of mother and sons which leads to Paul’s split of his soul. The abnormal love from the mother deprives Paul from his independent personality and mental health. In a letter to Garnett, Lawrence says:

“A woman of character and refinement goes into the lower class, and has no satisfaction in her own life. She has had a passion for her husband, so the children are born of passion, and have heaps of vitality. But as her sons grow up, she selects
them as lovers-first the eldest, then the second. These sons are urged into life by their reciprocal love of their mother-urged on and on. But when they come to manhood, they can’t love, because their mother is the strongest power in their lives, and holds them. As soon as the young men come into contact with women there is a split. William gives his sex to a friable, and his mother holds his soul. The next son gets “a woman who fights for his soul—fights his mother”. (The letter of D.H. Lawrence).

However, she fails to establish to her son, as a mother should, as self-sufficient and independent individuals capable of living their own lives and loving their own lovers without constant reference to her judgments and feelings. In this sense we might say that Gertrude suffers as severely from a kind of “Jocasta Complex”* as Paul and William suffer from Oedipus complexes. We sense that she is somehow corrupting them with her love. Gertrude Morel is an intense young woman, capable, of true sexual passion, of “the real, real flame of feeling through another person.” But when her relationship with her husband — for whatever reasons — failed to ripen into a permanent bond of love, her passionate nature shifted and fixed on her sons as objects of a most intense passion. In this rather morbid fixation, Gertrude partially destroyed her sons talents and hopes.

1. “Jocasta Complex” in Psychiatry means the sexual desire, usually latent, that a mother has for a son. The domineering and intense, but non-incestuous love.
Chapter two sources cited


Conclusion

The first objective of our dissertation was to show men’s place, and the role of each man in Sons and Lovers.

The balance of power in relationships seems to be an essential concern of D. H. Lawrence. Lawrence’s men and women will not be controlled, possessed or lost in another individual’s reality. Relationships to them must not be a mere matter of perfect blending with the resultant loss of selfhood, they are telling us. Nor can strong relationships be wrought of outright possession of one by the other, but rather, through a delicate balance, achieved somehow in terms of recognition of otherness and of the primal selfness. Which itself can only be recognized, even shaped, in encountering the other, unencumbered, and free.

In any case, all the relationships in Sons and Lovers seem to involve powerful struggles: Mrs. Morel wrenches power from her husband by turning from his sexual presence and then dominating, even emasculating her sons; she controls Paul’s devotion through the imposition of her values and aspirations and thus weights down that relationship.

In Sons and Lovers Lawrence succeeds in capturing the character of Walter Morel. The reader is able to sympathize with the character once we have learned that he is trying to build a relationship with his children. However there are times when Walter, the father, takes on his paternal responsibilities. The book also reveals an understanding of the father, whom Paul seemingly hated, and a latent sense of guilt at his harsh treatment of him seems evident at the end of the novel.
Concerning the relationships between Paul and Baxter, we have different ways of interpreting it.

We could believe that it is a kind of homosexual love. This could be true, because Paul and Baxter have a physical fight in the middle part of the book, and fights between men are often seen as a metaphor for homosexual bonding. After recovering from that fight, Paul however doesn’t hate Baxter, instead he even starts to visit the man, who is by this time very ill. He brings him gifts, shows affection and even organizes a job for Baxter.

We could also believe that Paul Morel tries to find his masculinity through the virile Baxter Dawes. Perhaps Baxter replaces in some ways Paul’s father, to whom Paul actually never had a bond. This seems plausible, considering that Paul now even tries to reconcile Baxter and Clara, maybe as a kind of substitution for reconciling his own mother and father.

Through our dissertation, we have seen the mother’s possessive love, her obsession towards her two sons. The umbilical cord which had never been cut, had regrettably destroyed the blooming (self-fulfillment) of the children. Being authoritative, she destroyed both her family life and her own couple.

The incomplete and imperfect relationships between men/women in D.H.Lawrence’s works especially in *Sons and Lovers* are among the most discussed and analyzed in English Literature. Paul Morel’s imprisoning relationship with his mother cripples all his other relationships. Early on it is evident that Mrs. Morel substitutes attachment to her sons for the broken connection with her husband, and what results is her certain domination over her children and Paul in particular.
Finally through our analysis of *Sons and Lovers*, we reached an important truth. We realized that men’s relationships are failing relationships and that all the male characters cannot achieve and fulfill a satisfactory relationship either with men or with women.
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Résumé

L’objectif principal de cette thèse est de s’interroger sur le rôle des hommes dans le roman de D.H.Lawrence intitulé “Amants et Fils”. Notre question posée est : quel est la place de chaque homme dans ce roman ? comment le désir de possession d’une mère peut changer la vie et les comportements de membres masculins de la famille.

D.H.Lawrence est un auteur anglais controversé du 20ème siècle. Il a écrit plusieurs grandes œuvres donc la plus connue est “Amants et Fils”, c’est une œuvre autobiographique ; racontant la vie des ‘Morels’.

L’auteur semble s’adresser particulièrement aux femmes, mais une analyse plus approfondie révèle qu’il a été aussi intéressé par les hommes.

Notre question sera faite en deux chapitres.

Le premier portera sur le rôle joué par certains personnages tel que : Paul-Walter Morel, le père et Baxter Dawes.

Le second est une étude psychologique de Gertrude Morel envers son mari et ses enfants : William et Paul.

Cette analyse sera sur la possession, c'est-à-dire, le désir d’une personne de posséder une autre.

Notre conclusion revient sur les points essentiels de notre étude du roman et notre désir de situer réellement les relations de Paul.
ملخص

إن الهدف الرئيسي من هذه المذكرة هو على مكانته الرجل في روايته "د.ش.لورنس" "الأبناء والعشاق". الإشكالية المطروحة خلال هذا البحث عن دور كل رجل في الرواية، كما نبحث عن دور تملك الأم في تغيير حياة كل رجل في العائلة.

"د.ش.لورنس" يعتبر من بين أكثر الكتاب والروائيين الإنجليزيين إثارة للجدل خلال القرن 20 قام بكتابة العديد من النصوص الأدبية ومن بين أشهرها: "الأبناء والعشاق"، الذي يعتبر سيرتا ذاتية للكاتب، هذه الرواية تدور حول حياة "المورال" وقد حاول الكاتب أن يقوم بتصوير العلاقة بين الشخصيات الذكرية خاصة التي سجلها محور دراستنا.

إن زاوية "الأبناء والعشاق" موجهة أساسا للعنصر النسوي أو إلى النساء عامة اللواتي يعتبر من المحاور الرئيسية في عمل كتابنا "د.ش.لورنس".

لكن المتأمل في كتابات "د.ش.لورنس" نجد أنه مهتم كذلك بالرجال، ويعتبر العمل بين أدبنا كمقارنة لهذه الإشكالية.

في الفصل الأول سنترطق إلى مكانة الرجل والخصوص "بول" ووالده "واتير مورل" و كذلك "بكترس دور".

في الفصل الثاني سنقوم بتحليل التكملية أو حب الامتلاك الذي هو عبارة عن الرغبة في امتلاك شخص ما و السيطرة عليه.

في هذا الفصل سيثبت أن حب الامتلاك من الناحية الروحية النفسية له تأثير على العلاقات الإنسانية.

في النهاية و كخاتمة سنقوم بمراجعة و إعادة كافة المفاهيم الخاصة بظاهرة الامتلاك أو حب الامتلاك كما أن العلاقات بين الرجال في رواية "د.ش.لورنس" سيعطي بعدا أخر للرواية و نظرة أخرى، كما أننا سنترطق إلى العلاقة الحقيقية "بول" مع الرجال الآخرين في الرواية.
Sons and Lovers. The houses themselves were substantial and very decent. One could walk all round, seeing little front gardens with auriculas and saxifrage in the shadow of the bottom block, sweet williams and pinks in the sunny top block; seeing neat front windows, little porches, little privet hedges, and dormer windows for the attics. Sons and Lovers. The lad began hastily to lay the table, and directly the three sat down. They were eating batter-pudding and jam, when the boy jumped off his chair and stood perfectly stiff. Sons and Lovers. in front of the Moon and Stars she heard men shouting, and smelled the beer, and hurried a little, thinking her husband was probably in the bar. At about half-past six her son came home, tired now, rather pale, and somewhat wretched.