

# 琉球大学学術リポジトリ

## D.H.ロレンスにおける男と女

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 琉球大学教育学部 公開日: 2007-07-18 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Taira, Katsuaki, 平良, 勝明 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12000/1058">http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12000/1058</a>

## Men and Women in D.H. Lawrence

H.M. Daleski in *The Forked Flame* contends that a "central feature of Lawrence's thought is its dualism" (p.20). If we seek a concrete example of such dualism, we find one as a cosmological manifestation in which two Wills, what Lawrence called "the Will-to-Motion" and "the Will-to-Inertia," ruled

from the ebb and flow of a wave, to the stable equilibrium of the whole universe, from birth and being and knowledge to death and decay and forgetfulness.<sup>1</sup>

If we turn to Lawrence's novels proper, we come upon a similar dualism in the form of opposition between the sexes. The opposition, prolonged till the end of such tensional relationships, is characterized by a conflict in which the individuals concerned, while maintaining their separate, autonomous egos, engage in a "battle" till they either achieve equilibrium or become alienated from each other. Indeed, the diachronic nature of the conflict is so conspicuous that even the relationships of the former category do not lose their dialectical energy after the establishment of the equilibrium but maintain their dynamic status which I characterize by opposition/tension. The source of the energy which makes the oppositional relationships possible seems to be derived from two underlying principles. These are mental and blood consciousnesses which motivate and constitute the characters within the scheme of the Lawrentian dualism of opposition/tension. The purpose of this paper is to track the operations of these principles in the couples defined by opposition/tension in four of Lawrence's novels—*Sons and Lovers*, *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

In *Sons and Lovers* Paul and Miriam are an exemplification of the dualistic relationship. The categorization may seem contradictory if we look at the ordinary relationship they maintain especially at the inception of the story. For instance, their mutual attraction betrays nothing that is proleptic of the future confrontation they are destined to engage themselves in except that Miriam recognizes intellectual value in Paul and Paul sensual value in Miriam, thus reflecting their heterogeneous psychical tendency. However, the fundamental polarity in their consciousness eventually causes a rupture in their relationship. Tangible evidence of the outcome of the interplay between the two consciousnesses appears as a symptomatic case of Paul's increasing fear in proportion to his increasing intimacy with Miriam. The reaction evinces the nature of his consciousness which identifies Miriam as a presence posing an existential threat. Indeed, Miriam's adversarial stance is later substantiated when Paul equates Miriam with Magna Mater, a formidable force that is on its way to nullify his ego: "you love me so much, you want to put me in your pocket. And I should die there smothered" (*Sons and Lovers*, p. 489). In this context, her love is taken as a form of assault on his subjective integrity in order to undermine him on the conscious level. Since there is a constant phenomenological struggle for Paul to escape from what appears to him as the relentless pursuit of Miriam (in fact, the struggle lasts nearly to the end of the story), the diachronic nature of the conflict also draws attention to the thematic significance of the dialectical functioning of the opposition/tension, which, if I conflate thematics and architectonics, is tantamount to

the "balance" in Edward D. McDonald's *Phoenix*:

Life is so made that opposites sway about a trembling centre of balance.... And of all the art forms the novel most of all demands the trembling and oscillating of the balance. (p. 529)

Clara is the woman who supersedes Miriam in Paul's affections. Although she is meant to be Miriam's polar opposite in consciousness, Clara's sensuality does not ensure an equilibrium that is absent in his relationship with Miriam. On the contrary, Paul is destined to wage a battle that ends only with their separation. One of the reasons for the instability is derived from the fact that Paul is suspicious of Clara's deep-rooted attachment to Baxter even after her apparent desertion of him. Thematically, Paul's doubt of Clara's total loyalty to him works as a factor that prevents the achievement of a sensual relationship which he has similarly been unsuccessful in establishing with Miriam. The resulting frustration Paul experiences leads to his conviction that Clara is depriving him of his freedom.

... he [Paul] preferred to be alone. She [Clara] made him feel imprisoned when she was there, as if he could not get a free deep breath, as if there were something on top of him. She felt his desire to be free of her. (p. 426)

As for Clara, she selects Paul to fill in the psychological lacuna left by her separation from Baxter. However, she soon becomes aware that Paul is an egotistic sensualist who is in pursuit of only that which pleases his own needs, desiring merely the "woman" in her, or the part that satisfies his sensual consciousness, and continually disregarding her being as a totality. The process of alienation between them takes the form of another battle, which continues insidiously because of its incomprehensibility to both of them on the cognitive level. The phenomenological energies involved in the battle are once again the kind I have been describing as the opposition/tension.

There was a silence in which they hated each other, though they laughed.

"Love's a dog in the manger," he said.

"And which of us is the dog?" she asked.

"Oh well, you, of course."

So there went on a battle between them. She knew she never fully had him. Some part, big and vital in him, she had no hold over; nor did she ever try to get it, or even to realize what it was. (p. 428)

If we place the disharmony in the Paul-Clara relationship within the Lawrentian dualistic framework, furthermore, it is interesting to speculate that Laura is not a distinct, independent persona but simply Miriam's doppelganger exhibiting a slightly different aspect but possessing essentially an identical self. The speculation is based on the existence of the isomorphic pattern of alienation and frustration that inheres in both Paul-Miriam and Paul-Clara relationships. If we hypothesize an immanent pattern of which the two relationships are its manifestations, the essential identity of the two female characters can be established. On the other hand, if Clara is classified as belonging to the

same category as Paul in consciousness, it is more logical in view of the opposition/tension between them to judge that they are not exactly of an identical consciousness but rather varieties of a more comprehensive one. However, seen from the thematic point of view, the opposition/tension particularized in the Paul-Clara relationship emerges as an overriding need for the author to create a leitmotif that constitutes the backbone of the bildungsromantic story of Paul as a young man. The introduction of Baxter as a source of disequilibrium, for example, is a visible sign of the authorial intention in this regard.

In order to understand the tensional relationships between Paul and Miriam, and Paul and Clara, it is crucial to recognize Mrs. Morel as a dominant influence on the formation of Paul's psychological and emotional makeup. Mrs. Morel is a poorly-educated miner's wife who seeks her consolation in her children, initially William and later Paul, as a compensation for her marital misfortune brought about by incompatibility with her husband, which is not unlike Lawrence's own parents'. In the course of her frustrated conjugal life she develops an almost pathological attachment to Paul, inhibiting him from maintaining any close relationships with other women. Since she claims an absolute right to possess her son, regarding him as her psychical reflection and thus superimposing his life upon hers, any third party who threatens the status quo that exists between them is an intruder who must be expelled, especially when the person happens to be a woman. This extraordinary maternal love is not unreciprocated, however, inasmuch as Paul shows an equal amount of devotion as can be inferred from their mutual dependence in the following passage.

Mrs. Morel clung now to Paul. He was quiet and not brilliant. But still he stuck to his painting, and still he stuck to his mother. Everything he did was for her. She wanted for his coming home in the evening, and then she unburdened herself of all she had pondered, or of all that had occurred to her during the day. He sat and listened with his earnestness. The two shared lives. (p. 158)

If we place Mrs. Morel in the context of the Paul-Miriam relationship, therefore, the outcome is more or less predictable. Because of the exclusive nature of Mrs. Morel's maternal love for Paul, his connection with Miriam is considered a breach of faith, or even worse, a revolt against her authority. However, since Mrs. Morel is always jealously protective of Paul, it is Miriam who is regarded as her archenemy, a seductress of her innocent son. As soon as Mrs. Morel detects the importance Miriam holds in his life, she sets off a defense mechanism and tries to regain normalcy between herself and her son. In other words the presence of Miriam, signaling a threat to the status quo, necessitates for her a battle over Paul. The rivalry is so intense that its effect is inevitably felt by Paul:

"It seems to me [Mrs. Morel] you like nothing and nobody else. There's neither Annie, nor me, nor anyone now for you."

"What nonsense, mother—you know I don't love her—I—I tell you I don't love her—she doesn't even walk with my arm, because I don't want her to." (p. 266)

Or, to quote another example:

Why was he torn so, almost bewildered, and unable to move? Why did his mother sit at home and suffer? He knew she suffered badly. But why should he? And why did he hate Miriam, and feel so cruel towards her, at the thought of his mother? If Miriam caused his mother suffering, then he hated her—and he easily hated her. (p. 246)

Mrs. Morel is also an important factor in the Paul-Clara relationship. Although Paul's ultimate decision to part from Clara seems to be made purely voluntarily, here again the role Mrs. Morel plays is undeniable. As in the Paul-Miriam relationship, she reacts cautiously to Clara's presence and from the beginning does not hide her hostility: "Mrs. Morel measured herself against the younger woman, and found herself easily stronger" (p. 386). Recognizing Clara as an intruder, she prepares herself for a decisive battle to moor Paul within the sphere of her influence and assert her centripetal pull on her son. In order to establish her supremacy Mrs. Morel takes recourse to the defence mechanism she used to expel Miriam and starts applying psychological pressure on Paul intending to cause a rupture in his relationship with Clara. In this context her argument against Clara's suitability for Paul because of her marital status appears a part of her defensive tactics, especially if we consider the reflexive nature of Mrs. Morel's response to both Clara and Miriam. Ultimately she succeeds in preventing Clara from gripping what Lawrence calls "the something—she knew not what—which she was mad to have" (p. 422). It is also possible to detect the maternal influence from the timing of the end of their relationship. The fact that Paul and Clara become completely alienated only after Mrs. Morel's death suggests that the tension generated by her presence between Paul and Clara, however indirectly it may be felt, is paradoxically necessary to keep them together. Although their uneven relationship is enough to foreshadow a similar outcome, it is at least possible to interpret that the demise of Mrs. Morel helps transform the existing relationship and accelerate their alienation. The last scene in which Paul leaves the "darkness" of his mother's world and resolutely walks towards "the faintly humming, glowing town" (p.492) seems to support this reading considering that the act not only symbolizes his departure from all that which pertains to the past, (thus signaling the beginning of a new phase of his life), but also it foregrounds the maternal influence on his psychical constitution. If we place Mrs. Morel within the purview of the Lawrentian opposition/tension, therefore, she emerges as an agent who intensifies Paul's confrontational relationships and who at the same time helps delineate the thematic and structural significance of the dualism in *Sons and Lovers*.

In *The Rainbow* there is also a pattern of opposition/tension. In this novel the pattern appears in three couples who cover a period of three generations. One of the couples are Tom Brangwen and Lydia Lensky. Initially Tom is attracted to Lydia because of her foreignness and seeming vulnerability which arouse in him both romantic yearnings and commiserations. However, their marriage proves to be a difficult one. A major cause of their dissension arises when Tom discovers that despite his devotion Lydia constantly retreats to the past for consolation because instead of finding any spiritual and emotional fulfillment in the present, she derives it by reminiscing about the happy days of her

childhood in Poland. In fact she is obsessed with her juvenile memories to such a degree that her past completely eclipses her present. For instance, England becomes only a temporary refuge where she is forced to reside merely for her material needs while her true attachment is to the timeless past of her childhood which comprises her entire spiritual existence. Her obliviousness to her surroundings and her de facto absence from his life leave him frustrated and isolated. When all his attempts to awaken her to immediate reality fail he is convinced of the hopelessness of their relationship, which has never genuinely existed on her part. Eventually, his anxieties turn to hostility.

And gradually he grew into a raging fury against her. But because he was so much amazed, and there was as yet such a distance between them, and she was such an amazing thing to him, with all wonder opening out behind her, he made no retaliation on her. Only he lay still and wide-eyed with rage, inarticulate, not understanding, but solid with hostility.

And he remained wrathful and distinct from her, unchanged outwardly to her, but underneath a solid power of antagonism to her. (p. 62)

Tom ultimately realizes that his psychological enslavement caused by his unrealistic expectations of Lydia is depriving him of the kind of freedom he used to enjoy. While he deplores the bondage he unwittingly entered into, Lydia concentrates on guarding her autonomous existence, and whenever she perceives his threat to her independent self, she "turned on him like a tiger, and there was battle" (p. 63). After the birth of their child the distance between them increases and Lydia further recedes into her solipsistic world. Their essential separateness, which has often been covert, now emerges as a condition for their relationship. (Indeed, Lydia's consistently regarding English as a foreign language to the end of her life is indicative of this gulf between them.) If they achieve equilibrium in their marriage, it can be described as Tom's knowing Lydia "without understanding" her (p. 96).

Now let us turn to the second generation couple, Anna and Will Brangwen. Anna is attracted to Will because of her romantic, escapist tendency similar to Tom's in the first generation: "In him the bounds of her experience were transgressed: he was the hole in the wall, beyond which the sunshine blazed on an outside world" (p. 114). Since Will is not unresponsive to her approach, their initial linkage seems to promise an auspicious development. However, their mutual attraction paradoxically starts an "endless contest," which, although mostly taking place under the surface and is an unconscious battle, is accompanied by the typical opposition/tension of the Lawrentian dualism. When the submerged energy is reified we can glimpse the intensity of the battle, for instance, in Anna's suffering in the following excerpt.

Where she was most vulnerable, he hurt her. Oh, where she was delivered over to him, in her very soft femaleness, he seemed to lacerate her and desecrate her. She pressed her hands over her womb in anguish, whilst the tears ran down her face. And why, and why? Why was he like this ? (p. 153)

From Will's perspective, Anna's resistance to the perfect "connexion" between them,

which is one of the few "verities" he finds in life, is a cause of frustration and anger.

She turned on him blindly and destructively, he became a mad creature, black and electric with fury. The dark storms rose in him, his eyes glowed black and evil, he was fiendish in his thwarted soul. (p. 152)

A clue to understanding their oppositional relationship seems to lie in their views on the "self," which reveal their fundamentally irreconcilable values. While Anna places a concrete self in the center of the universe and measures everything else in relation to it, Will is constantly in search of an indefinite x, an abstract, infinite, and absolute entity that transcends the self. If their incompatibility characterizes their strife, therefore, it is not unlikely that Anna fights for "her conscious self and powerful will" and Will for "his dark subterranean self."<sup>2</sup> A similar oppositional relationship exists between the third generation couple, Ursula and Anton Skrebensky, except that they do not marry at the end. The most conspicuous ideological difference between Ursula and Skrebensky that generates the opposition/tension is that while the latter entrenches himself in the system and tries to obliterate his individual will for the sake of "the nation," the former acts on a principle of the primacy of the individual over the whole.<sup>3</sup> The divergence of their mentalities is clearly detected in their conversation in Chapter XI.

"I belong to the nation and must do my duty by the nation."

"But when it didn't need your services in particular—when there is no fighting? What would you do then?"

He was irritated.

"I would do what everybody else does."

"What?"

"Nothing. I would be in readiness for when I was needed."

The answer came in exasperation.

"It seems to me," she answered, "as if you weren't anybody—as if there weren't anybody there, where you are. Are you anybody, really? You seem like nothing to me." (p. 311)

Thus, judging from the preceding analysis of the three relationships, the conflict attributable to the opposition/tension in *The Rainbow* arises from the dichotomy of the value systems members of each couple uphold, which in their turn can be transposed to the subjective plane as the Lawrentian division of the blood and mental consciousnesses if we rely on such relational features as Lydia's unfathomability for Tom, disparity between the views of Anna and Will on the self, and discrepancy between Ursula and Skrebensky concerning the individual will.

The opposition/tension stemming from the dualistic consciousnesses is again visible in *Women in Love*. The locus of such tension exists between Birkin and Hermione. While Hermione's life principle is based on mental consciousness, or *Will*, a kind of Apollonian principle regulating spontaneous impulses, Birkin's is derived from blood consciousness, or sensuality, a Dionysian counterpart conducive to the unchecked development of human potential. From Birkin's perspective, it is essential to liberate man from the tyranny of

the Will because its dominance reduces man to the state of a barren automaton. In order to achieve that end, he stresses the need for a sensual realm that transcends the Apollonian constraints. The objective correlative of such a world is the African statues in Halliday's apartment, which according to George J. Becker are "referents throughout the novel for a dark blood consciousness" (p. 65). For Hermione, however, Birkin's project signifies a chaotic disorder that should be resisted by all means. In a way, she functions as his counterbalance who perpetuates the dialectical energy between them. Since they are constituted of such diametrically opposed principles, their confrontation manifests itself as a fierce battle. In answer to what he interprets as Hermione's spurious confession to passion, Birkin says:

"But your passion is a lie," he went on violently. "It isn't passion at all, it is your *will*. It's your bullying will, You want to clutch things and have them in your power. You want to have things in your power. And why? Because you haven't got any real body, any dark sensual body of life. You have no sensuality. You have only your will and your conceit of consciousness, and your lust for power, to *know*." (p. 92)

Their opposition is not only concretized verbally but also physically as an actual violence when Hermione assaults Birkin with a ball of lapis lazuli. This act per se can be merely ascribed to her pathological state of mind, or simply treated as caused by the impulse of the moment, but from the perspective of the Lawrentian dualism the actual violence is evidence of how the opposition/tension arising from their contrary principles is potentially explosive both in abstract and concrete senses.

Although Birkin's relationship with Hermione culminates in actual violence, what he pursues as the ideal man-woman relationship is the one in which the two parties attain a "conjunction, where man [has] being and woman [has] being, two pure beings, each constituting the freedom of the other, balancing each other like two poles of one force, like two angels, or two demons" (pp. 269-270). Since the autonomy of the ego is maintained in this state, what Birkin calls "conjunction" is not a subsumption of one under another but more like an equilibrium of two beings. This is exactly the kind of relationship Birkin is pursuing when he proceeds from Hermione to Ursula. However, its achievement is hindered partly because of their temperamental differences. For instance, while Ursula considers the treatment of a stray cat by Birkin's cat Mino arrogant, Birkin interprets the act as a manifestation of Mino's "desire to bring this female cat into a pure stable equilibrium, a transcendent and abiding rapport with the single male" (p. 213). In the same context, Birkin criticizes Ursula for limiting herself to the superficial observation of their interactions and missing the submerged significance in Mino's attitude to the female cat. Since Ursula on the other hand counters by accusing him of being an illogical sophist and sexist, the divergence in their views becomes a driving force behind their dynamic, oscillatory relationship. However, they are never irreparably estranged like Birkin and Hermione because while Birkin and Hermione live according to fundamentally irreconcilable principles Ursula essentially remains within the boundaries where the "polar-conjunction" with Birkin is still possible. The Mino chapter in fact contains a few



parallels in disguise that indicate the homogeneity of their consciousnesses. If Birkin's cat appears to Ursula overbearing and that is its essential attribute, then similarly Ursula's unyielding, uncompromising response to Birkin clearly betrays her spontaneous self which she cannot discard without compromising her ontological being; also in the same chapter, if she cannot comprehend what Birkin explains about the blood consciousness, it is attributable to the fact that the concept being pre-verbal must be intuited without the mediation of the ordinary signifying system of speech. The phenomenological homogeneity between them is ultimately corroborated by the consummation they achieve in the form of utter sensual fulfillment.

She had her desire of him, she touched, she received the maximum of unspeakable communication in touch, dark, subtle, positively silent, a magnificent gift and give again, a perfect acceptance and yielding, a mystery, the reality of that which can never be known, mystic, sensual reality that can never be transmuted into mind content, but remains outside, living body of darkness and silence and subtlety, the mystic body of reality. She had her desire fulfilled, he had his desire fulfilled. For she was to him what he was to her, the immemorial magnificence of mystic, palpable, real otherness. (p. 403)

One more relationship that conforms to the scheme of opposition/tension in *Women in Love* is that of Gudrun and Gerald. From the outset their oppositionality in temperament is conspicuous. An incident that brings this feature to the fore is found in the scene in which Gerald forces a frightened mare to stand still before a railway crossing despite the deafening noise of an approaching train. To Gudrun the act appears cruel and unreasonable for he seems to be needlessly exercising his dominant power over the mare. Indeed, her criticism is evidenced when as if to alleviate the horse's pain she hurriedly opens the gate to the crossing as soon as the train passes. However, here Gudrun's response is somewhat ambivalent because, despite the repulsion she feels for Gerald, she simultaneously experiences a "terrible" attraction to him, paradoxically enough, for his perfect subordination of the horse to his will.

Gudrun was as if numbed in her mind by the sense of indomitable soft weight of the man, bearing down into the living body of the horse; the strong, indomitable thighs of the blond man clenching the palpitating body of the mare into pure control; a sort of soft, white magnetic domination from the loins and thighs and calves, enclosing and encompassing the mare heavily into unutterable subordination, soft blood-subordination, terrible. (p. 172)

Although Gudrun temporarily accepts Gerald, they are after all too heterogeneous to continue a harmonious relationship. Gerald on the one hand is extremely pragmatic and materialistic (though he may have "a paternalistic social conscience" as Sheila Macleod points out), considering individuals as mere cogwheels of one gigantic machine.<sup>4</sup> For instance, as long as he can improve the productivity of his company he does not hesitate to sacrifice his employees by making them redundant with the introduction of new engineers and equipment. Gudrun on the other hand is both aesthetic and esoteric and

places Art over Gerald's mechanistic Productivity as the highest aim of life. If Gerald's fundamental life principle is characterized as mechanical institutionalization for the sake of efficiency, Gudrun's is characterized as nullification of the externals for the sake of internal sensuality. As can be expected from their militating principles they belong to opposite camps in the dichotomy of mental and blood consciousnesses. Gudrun like Birkin typifies the latter as the beginning of the "Sketch-Book" chapter (p. 178) sufficiently proves, whereas Gerald betrays the contrasting consciousness when he finds the African statues in Halliday's apartment "disturbing" and "obscene" for conveying "the extreme of physical sensation beyond the limits of mental consciousness." Judging from the vast gulf between them, it is not surprising that Gudrun is eventually drawn to Loerke, who can "penetrate into the inner darkness, find the spirit of the woman in its inner recess, and wrestle with it there, the central serpent that is coiled at the core of life" (p. 549). In a way the death of Gerald is an inevitable outcome of an "eternal see-saw" in which "one destroyed that the other might exist, one ratified because the other was nulled" (p. 542).

In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the contrasting characters in the scheme of mental and blood consciousnesses are Connie and Clifford. Clifford, paralyzed in the lower half of the body and bound to a wheelchair because of the injuries he suffered during the war, is almost an allegorical representation of the rejection of phallic consciousness. As his narcissistic tendency and his obsession with empty "words" indicate, he is also a vainglorious and ambitious man who is inexorably drawn to the "bitch-goddess Success." Furthermore, being inimical to the affective side of his own conjugal relationship, which is a characteristic of his frigid "mental and spiritual" consciousness, he reduces his marriage to a sterile conjunction of two individuals. Clifford's negativity as a character is instanced in the stalled wheelchair scene where being left at the mercy of Connie and Mellors he betrays his petulance in his helpless desperation. Since the authorial presence is so visible here, it seems possible to deduce that Kingsley Widmer's assessment of Clifford coincides with what Lawrence intended the reader to make:

Clifford cannot have positive passion because he is sexually and emotionally absent... with the nasty dedication to class, worldly success, power, and other false purposes.<sup>5</sup>

Connie on the other hand is a frustrated wife who belongs to the category of the phallic consciousness as can be inferred from her view on Proust and from her praise of the body when it is "really wakened to life." Although she is initially attracted to Clifford because of what seems to her his complementary attribute to hers, i.e. his intellect, she soon realizes that they are in fact in an adversarial relationship on the conscious level. Already in the early part of the novel Connie shows signs of her dissatisfaction with her desiccated, passionless life. Eventually, even his "words," which she used to regard as a manifestation of his intellect, become meaningless.

As the years drew on it was the fear of nothingness in her life that affected her. Clifford's mental life and hers gradually began to feel like nothingness. Their marriage, their integrated life based on a habit of intimacy, that he talked about: there were days when it all became utterly blank and nothing. It was words, just so

many words. The only reality was nothingness, and over it a hypocrisy of words.  
(p. 52)

Once their confrontational relationship is established, a fierce battle ensues in which Clifford tries to dominate Connie with his desexed "intellect" while she fends him off with her sensual energy. Considering that the essential irreconcilability of their consciousnesses is presented at such an early stage in the story, the conflict involving her spontaneous and intuitive self and his materialistic and political self can without much difficulty be interpreted as a harbinger of the impasse in their relationship. In a sense, Connie's abandonment of Clifford for Mellors, who understands "the passional and transcendent sexuality," is an inevitable result and even a logical consequence.<sup>6</sup> If we place them in the scheme of the Lawrentian dichotomy, Connie and Clifford represent a kind of Zoroastrian forces constantly at war with each other, the latter typifying a negative force that is subdued at the apocalyptic battlefield, and the former a positive one that ultimately becomes a prevailing cosmic principle. If I draw on Frank Kermode and quote him slightly out of context Connie, functioning as a counterbalance to Clifford, is a personification of the "phallic consciousness conceived as the only means to regeneration both personal and national."<sup>7</sup>

Now that I have summarily described the tense relationships of the couples who I consider exemplify the Lawrentian dualism, I come to the conclusion. In *Sons and Lovers*, *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* we find one of the three Lawrentian motifs George J. Becker mentions in his *D.H. Lawrence*—"an awareness of the conflict between the sexes, in marriage and out" (p. 27)—in such couples as Gudrun-Gerald, Ursula-Birkin, Miriam-Paul, Anna-Will, and Clifford-Connie. The conflict, manifesting itself in a variety of ways but each of them conforming to the scheme of opposition/tension I initially postulated in this paper, thematically plays an important role because its durational nature is closely related to the bildungsromantic strategy of the novels and the couples defined by such conflict do not easily attain conciliation but continue their battle either till their relationships collapse or stabilize after reaching some kind of equilibrium. The outcome of the conflict is a division of the couples into two groups: those whose cohesion is reinforced and those whose alienation is increased. The division is not arbitrary but rather based on the underlying principle of the dominant consciousness each character is constituted of. On the one hand there are characters who are motivated by blood/phallic consciousness and solar plexus like Connie and on the other hand there are those who are driven by mental consciousness and cerebral cortex like Clifford.<sup>8</sup> The combination of characters belonging to the former category generates integrative energy and results in harmony and the combination of the former and the latter categories generates disintegrative energy and results in disharmony. The consistent pattern in these four novels strongly suggests the plausibility of the positivistic interpretation of the authorial preference of the dominance of blood consciousness over mental consciousness as well, especially in the light of such an example as a letter Lawrence sent to Catherine Carswell.

Christianity is based on re-action, on negation really. It says "renounce all worldly desires, and live for heaven." Whereas I think people ought to fulfil sacredly their desires. And this means fulfilling the deepest desire, which is a desire to live unhampered by things which are extraneous, a desire for pure relationships and living truth.<sup>9</sup>

Whether or not the author approves of the fictional characters may be an irrelevant issue here, but with a view to further elucidate the pattern of opposition/tension the study of its kind may prove to be worthwhile.

Notes

<sup>1</sup>Quoted from *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence* edited by Edward D. McDonald (New York: Viking Press, 1936), pp. 447-48.

<sup>2</sup>See Martin Price's "Levels of Consciousness" in *D.H. Lawrence* edited by Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea House, 1986), p. 257.

<sup>3</sup>Concerning their ideological dichotomy, refer to George J. Becker, *D.H. Lawrence* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1980), p. 136.

<sup>4</sup>According to Sheila MacLeod, Gerald "has a paternalistic social conscience and aims to create a perfect system, a perfect machine, for the benefit of all concerned." Quoted from her *Lawrence's Men and Women* (London: Heinemann, 1985), p. 40.

<sup>5</sup>Quoted from Kingsley Widmer's "Desire and Negation: the Dialectics of Passion in D.H. Lawrence" in *The Spirit of D.H. Lawrence* edited by Gamini Salgado and G.K. Das (London: MacMillan Press, 1988), p. 128.

<sup>6</sup>The quotation is from MacLeod, p. 202.

<sup>7</sup>The original reads: "*Lady Chatterley's Lover* is about the need for a rebirth of phallic consciousness conceived, in a familiar Lawrentian way, as the only means to regeneration both personal and national." Kermode, *Lawrence* (London: Fontana Press, 1985), p. 124.

<sup>8</sup>Apropos of the terms "solar plexus" and "cerebral cortex," Anthony Burgess says, "If Lawrence was irrational, it was because he recognised how small a part reason plays in the business of living. The centre of his response to the external world was the solar plexus, not the cerebral cortex." See his *Flame into Being: The Life and Work of D.H. Lawrence* (London: Heinemann, 1985), p. 9.

<sup>9</sup>See Catherine Carswell, *The Savage Pilgrimage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 52.

Bibliography

- Becker, George J. *D.H. Lawrence*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1980.
- Bloom, Harold, ed. *D.H. Lawrence*. New York: Chelsea House, 1986.
- Burgess, Anthony. *Flame into Being: The Life and Work of D.H. Lawrence*. London: Heinemann, 1985.
- Carswell, Catherine. *The Savage Pilgrimage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Daleski, H.M. *The Forked Flame*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.
- Kermode, Frank. *Lawrence*. London: Fontana Press, 1985.
- Lawrence, D.H. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Penguin Books, 1978.
- . *Sons and Lovers*. London: Penguin Books, 1988.
- . *The Rainbow*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1971.
- . *Women in Love*. London: Penguin Books, 1988.
- MacLeod, Sheila. *Lawrence's Men and Women*. London: Heinemann, 1985.
- McDonald, Edward D., ed. *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*. New York: Viking Press, 1936.
- Salgato, Gamini and G.K. Das, eds. *The Spirit of D.H. Lawrence*. London: MacMillan Press, 1988.

Men and Women in D.H. Lawrence

D.H. Lawrence の *Sons and Lovers*, *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* に登場する男女間には二元的な opposition/tension で特徴づけられる葛藤要因の存在が認められる。この論文では、その opposition/tension が究極的には二つの主要因である blood consciousness と mental consciousness に起因するものと想定し、葛藤範疇にある各男女関係をこれら二主要因の衝突の具象化として分析してみた。