

Concept of Rivalry in D.H. Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers*

Yasir Mutlib Abdullah

Department of English, University of Anbar, Iraq

Received on: 22-8-2019

Accepted on: 19-2-2020

Abstract

Sons and Lovers (1913) is one of D.H. Lawrence's most prominent novels in terms of psychological complexities characteristic of most, if not all, of his other novels. Many studies have been conducted on the Oedipus complex theory and psychological relationship between men and women in Lawrence's novels reflecting the early twentieth century norms of life. This paper reexamines *Sons and Lovers* from the perspective of rivalry based on Alfred Adler's psychological studies. The discussion tackles the sibling rivalry between the members of the Morels and extends to reexamining the rivalry between other characters. This concept is discussed in terms of two levels of relationships. First, between Paul and William as brothers on the one hand, and Paul and father and mother, on the other. Second, the rivalry triangle of Louisa, Miriam and Mrs. Morel. The qualitative pattern of the paper focuses on the textual analysis of the novel to show that *Sons and Lovers* can be approached through the concept of rivalry and sibling Rivalry.

Keywords: Attachment theory, Competition, Concept of Rivalry, Favoritism, Sibling rivalry.

Sons and Lovers is a well-known masterpiece of the early twentieth century focusing on the sensitive relations between men and women at the backdrop of the situations just before the First World War. Besides being an autobiographical in nature, it depicts the middle and working class conditions of the time. D.H. Lawrence was a great admirer of as well as influenced by Sigmund Freud's theories, and it can be fairly said that he wrote psychological manuscripts of human psyche in a literary framework. Based on Freud's interpretations, the novel takes the three stages of the major character's life from childhood into adolescence and adulthood. Lawrence expounds Oedipus complex, other complications and the effect of early childhood on the person's later life.

Sons and Lovers is roughly divided into two parts: part one paves the way first to introducing the two major characters: Mr. and Mrs. Morel, how they meet at a Christmas dance and how they fall in an unexpected and unexplainable romance based on the different backgrounds of both of them. Part one also tackles William's early childhood. Part two follows Paul's attachment to his mother and his later indulgence into a relationship with Miriam, a girl from a farming family. The two develop deep intimacy motivated by shared love of nature and intellectual viewpoints towards almost everything. This intimacy does not last long because of his mother disapproval which by time influences and dominates his

decisions. Being hypersensitive and easily gets upset from the slightest occasions, he would cling to and be a shadow of his mother. He always suffers from fits of mysterious and unexplainable sadness. When it comes to his relationship with Miriam, “he alternates between an almost resentful attraction to Miriam and hatred to his mother for her disapproval. Every time Gertrude expresses her dissatisfaction with Miriam, Paul draws away from Miriam and feels as though he hates her”. (Constantakis 2014, 5)

At the same time Paul realizes that his mother’s life is void and, as Schapiro notes, his “crippling dependence on her is thus paradoxically due to his sense that she is vitally dependent on him – that he is responsible for filling her emptiness, providing her missing self-esteem, and relieving her suffering” (Schapiro 1999, 29)

It is worthwhile to shed some light on Mr. and Mrs. Morel’s marriage background. It is impractical here to go into unnecessary details because the discussion should better be limited to the key points to lead to the aim intended. Gertrude Coppard comes from a middle class family and Walter Morel belongs to the working mining class community. Soon after her marriage, Gertrude realizes the different as well as difficult living conditions in a different remote atmosphere. Things get worse gradually after Mrs. Morel tries, in addition to the difficult rural life she has to be accustomed to at the Bottoms, to cope with the fact that her husband lied to her. She is made to believe that the house they live in belongs to Mr. Morel, but she finds out by chance unpaid bills in his pocket which so infuriate her that her life starts to change drastically afterwards. Life worsens for Mrs. Morel when they start to fight at the slightest troubles they confront each other with and thus drift apart day by day; Mrs. Morel to her housework and children, and Mr. Morel to the public house and heavy drinking. As a result, Mrs. Morel’s love and affections shift from the husband to her male children starting with William and ending with Paul.

When William was a child, he is obviously more attached to his mother than his father. His attachment seems to make him unable to enjoy his experiences at the wakes without her. He is seen always “stuck close to her, bristling with a small boy’s pride of her.” (*Sons and Lovers*, 8-9).

At the adolescence stage, William becomes old enough to defend his mother against his father’s occasional abuse. This stage is of significant importance because it more shapes and crystalizes a character’s future life than any other phases. This is obviously presented in the novel when William leaves Nottinghamshire home for a job in London and he starts to rise up into the middle class his mother aspires. Soon after he is in London, he meets a life-changing woman he calls Gyp and whose superficiality he later detests. Torn between his disappointed expectations in Gyp and sense of failure to find a woman in his mother’s figure, William gets ill and dies alone. Mrs. Morel is heartbroken, but William’s death clears the way for development of another even deeper attachment, that is between the mother and the second son, Paul.

The influence of the mother on her sons is clear from the start. She dominates and steers their life unconsciously and overwhelmingly. Unconsciously also, the oedipal or Oedipus complex and conflict develop even more with Paul. According to Lois Tyson, if the child never grows out of childhood and adolescence normally, he will fail to be functional in adulthood as will be discussed later. The complex gets even worse especially when the abusive father regularly practices violence with the mother as they

grow up through the stages of life. Consequently, they become protective of the mother and aggressive against their father. (Tyson 2005, 17)

Another key concept of contributive significance within the current discussion is the psychological delineation of the attachment theory. This theory was coined by the British psychologist John Bowlby in the second half of the 1960s and 70s. Bowlby was interested in studying the development of children and family bonds. His attachment theory is based on the concept that a child's development greatly relies on his/her capability to establish a robust bond with one caregiving parent as well as with a partner. This attachment can affectively be a lifelong psychological bond. Grounded on Bowlby, Inge Bretherton interprets that, "A child is said to seek the attachment figure when under stress but to seek a playmate when in good spirits. Because the two roles are not incompatible, it is possible for one person (e.g., the caregiver) to fill both." (Bretherton 2015, 4).

This theory stresses that a child seeks protection from the caregiver especially when confronted by difficult situations. Developmental stages identify as well as intensify this attachment. At adolescence, the bond starts to be more complicated when the adolescent seeks autonomy. In this respect, it is investigated that "the early bond between infants and their primary caregivers is critical to the infants' survival" and influences their identity at adulthood. (Whiteman 2011, 2). This can readily be applicable to *Sons and Lovers* by tracing the connectedness between Mrs. Morel and her male sons. Because Attachment concept purports that the siblings' search for security from the caregiver through which they acknowledge the world around them, the 'caregiver' consequently becomes their center of life, and deprivation of this attachment leads the siblings to stressful situations. On the long run the reciprocal parent-sibling relationship becomes dependent attachment. In other words, the emotional security the parent and child receive from each other is so essential that losing it would lead to complications. Thus, it is a matter of responsiveness to each other's needs. From attachment point of view, Whiteman furthermore argues that "children can form attachments to a range of familiar others in their social worlds" (Whiteman 2011, 2). This means that as they grow up, the siblings start to look for their social counterpart beyond the familial boundary. William and Paul can accordingly be approached from their reciprocal attachment to their mother which accompanies them as they socially develop. By time and maturity attachment develops into another serious psychological issue, that is sibling rivalry.

By definition, sibling rivalry can be viewed as jealousy and competition and at times quarrel brothers and sisters practice during their childhood. According to this concept, it usually and commonly starts after the parents have a second child. Sibling rivalry likely takes place for different reasons. It is appropriate to start with its key concept which is of significance in this study. Sibling rivalry is defined as "competition with siblings for the attention and affection of parents) can occur, in an important sense, between a parent and child". (Tyson 2006, 14). Because it is a matter of competition, it is thus based on how siblings start to identify themselves within the family. It is therefore a question of developing individuality inside one's family. The second probable reason is that a child, and specially the first one, starts to feel he or she does not get equal attention by one parent or both of them.

The competition appears more ostensibly in the second child who, for Alfred Adler, holds a different significance. When the oldest child shows no rivaling reaction, the situation of the second child will not be affected. But the second child in some cases is innately and subconsciously in continuous looking up to his brother's position in the family as what Adler terms as a "pacemaker". Adler states that "A typical second child is very easy to recognize. He behaves as if he were in a race, is under full steam all the time, and trains continually to surpass his older brother and conquer him." (Ansbacher 1956, 379)

The point here is that the second child is prone to take his older brother, who, he is convinced, better than him just because of his position order in the family, which makes him favorable for the parents. Ansbacher states that the second child for Adler is:

...often more talented and successful than the first. If he goes ahead faster, it is because he trained more. Even when he is grown up and outside the family circle, he often still makes use of a pacemaker by comparing himself with someone whom he thinks more advantageously placed, and tries to go beyond him. He also argues that mostly the second child often shows ill-feelings which are usually wordless but appear in some behaviors and reactions especially when he is pampered. (377)

This in effect is shown on Paul in the first place. It is not clear throughout narrative that Paul hides wordless ill-feelings towards his eldest brother William, but under some psychological scrutiny he later inclines to find his position inside the family especially after William's death. His inclination intensifies his attachment to his mother and detachment from his father.

Sibling rivalry, initiated by the psychologist Alfred Adler stresses the role of birth order in the family. In addition to focusing on "internal source of motivation for behavior and development", Adler's concept highlights more "the important role of external social influences on personality development" (Whiteman 2011, 127). Paul is also exposed to external influences represented by his mother's extreme care and attention. This will also identify the relationship between the characters.

Accordingly, the first child will feel that his position is threatened and the attention is taken away from him. In *Sons and Lovers* William does not clearly show such feelings, but as Paul grows and begins to identify himself, he develops unpronounced feelings embodied in his hatred to the father whose absence upon his accident in the mines actuates Paul to voice his remarkable announcement that he is the man of the house. Sibling rivalry is also stage-sensitive; it changes as the individual develops. It starts as fights between the brothers and sisters at childhood stage, and becomes critical at adolescence stage when the individual develops physiologically, which means that the competition that starts as jealousy between two brothers for the attention and care of the parents turns into more complicated feelings at adolescence stage.

In Freud's interpretation, the adolescents' competition starts to take another form in which they try to compete in order to win the affections of the parent of the opposite sex. This is of course within an early concept Freud conducted to showcase the psychosexual development of an individual. Although this concept has been subject to many criticism and modifications, it proves to be effectively applicable on *Sons and Lovers*. The concept of sibling rivalry in this study theoretically stems just from this stage and is

induced by the Oedipus complex. To refer to Tyson once more, Oedipus complex is further defined as the "competition with the parent of the same gender for the attention and affection of the parent of the opposite gender". It is important to remind here that everything usually happens unconsciously in the character. Tyson also expounds that sibling rivalry and other psychological issues that we go through are regarded as normal "developmental stages", and the problem arises when "we fail to outgrow" such conflicts.

To bring this to more ostensible light, it is vital to start with young William who lives exclusively for his mother. Everything he wins is won for her and the happiness he feels is not felt until his mother shares it with him. This appears early in his life. At the Wakes he feels extremely happy in his mother's presence and does not enjoy much when she leaves with Annie. This is shown later when he comes back home dejected and disappointed. When the eggcups he won have no meaning for him until she feels enthralled as he gives them as a present to her. In fact, she implicitly knows that he won them for her. As William grows, he fails to "outgrow" such attachment to his mother. He evidently becomes even ready to physically confront his father to defend his mother. In a remarkable study of *Sons and Lovers*, it is argued that "The antagonism, the rivalry, shows itself most clearly in the scene when father and son nearly fight in the presence of the mother; there is a precise parallel in Part II where Paul nearly fights with Morel" (Worthen et al. 2005, 61)

In Paul's case, he also could not outgrow his attachment to his mother, and that causes him to be imprisoned within the boundary and orbit of his mother. In a sense, Mrs. Morel's steering of his life and distancing him away from his natural sexual maturity generates inside him an obvious acquired resentment to his father. Seeing and living the violence of the father towards the mother and drinking habit deepen the sense of competition inside Paul who obsesses and directs his mother attention and love towards him. Along with this, the sense of resentment becomes so strong that Paul even prays that his father dies: "make him stop drinking, he prayed every night. Lord, let my father die, he prayed very often. Let him not be killed at pit, he prayed when, after tea, the father did not come home from work." (*Sons and Lovers*, 72). Paul's prayer may not be read superficially because it is an unconscious cry that implies an ulterior motivation of a rival who attempts to win. Paul's outcry "let him not be killed at pit" is not a compassionate expression of a son for his father's sake as one may mistakenly comprehend, it could be only because he always fears and resents going to the mines.

While William stands against his father face to face and tries to physically defend his mother against his father's violence, Paul hates his father almost passively and gradually takes his position as an alternative lover and man of the house. But at some times Paul is also intolerant of his father's violence. In this respect, Draper states that: "There is, in fact, a kind of rivalry between Paul and his father, which, when Paul is a young man, brings them near to blows (as had happened previously with William and his father)." (Draper 1986, 42). This rivalry is also termed as "Oedipal rivalry" and drives Paul to possess his mother wholly. This stems from and ignited by his mother's rejection of her husband and his contempt of his father as a competitor. (Harrison 2005, 128)

According to the definition of rivalry, Paul as a child tries to usurp his mother's attention and compassion especially at critical moments. In one episode Paul asks Mrs. Morel about his father who is late for dinner one night.

Has my dad come? he asked. You can see he hasn't, said Mrs. Morel, cross with the futility of the question. Then the boy dawdled about near his mother. They shared the same anxiety. Presently Mrs. Morel went out and strained the potatoes. They're ruined and black, she said; but what do I care? Not many words were spoken. Paul almost hated his mother for suffering because his father did not come home from work. What do you bother yourself for? he said. If he wants to stop and get drunk, why don't you let him? (Sons and Lovers, 73-74)

Paul is annoyed to see his mother wait and suffer all the night for her husband. One may overlook such sensations as Paul silently watches his mother but a deep reading of the scene can reveal an unspoken jealousy. This jealousy is so intense that he wishes that his father never comes that night. And also reading the line when Paul "dawdles about near his mother" and how in such a situation they "shared the same anxiety" would reveal a lot. When he was a child he used to suffer a regular illness which is either naturally or psychologically stimulated in order to draw his mother from his father's contact to his. In another significant episode Paul suffers an attack of bronchitis and before retiring to bed with Mrs. Morel, Mr. Morel comes into Paul's room to see the sick boy. Although Mr. Morel is usually "gentle" on such occasions, Paul feels "disturbed" at his father's presence. Paul instead asks for his mother:

'Are ter asleep, my darlin'?' Morel asked softly. 'No; is my mother comin'?' 'She's just finishin' foldin' the clothes. Do you want anything?' Morel rarely 'thee'd' his son. 'I don't want nothing. But how long will she be?' 'Not long, my duckie.' The father waited undecidedly on the hearthrug for a moment or two. He felt his son did not want him. Then he went to the top of the stairs and said to his wife: 'This childt'saxin' for thee; how long art goin' to be?' 'Until I've finished, good gracious! Tell him to go to sleep.' 'She says you're to go to sleep,' the father repeated gently to Paul. 'Well, I want HER to come,' insisted the boy. (Sons and Lovers, 79)

Paul's feeling of rivalry is obvious in this episode. His resentment of his father's presence unconsciously aggravates his sense of unrest, and his insistence on calling his mother is a way not to leave her share his father's bed. D. H. Lawrence exposes this very vividly when he describes how Paul shares his bed with his mother, "sleep is still most perfect, in spite of hygienists, when it is shared with a beloved." (Sons and Lovers, 80)

Paul rejects his father from the very beginning and his rejection is intensified by his mother impulsive rejection of her husband. Although he later seems to have felt a father figure in Baxter Dawes as some critics argue, Paul clearly remains resentful of his father.

Parental favoritism plays an important role in the siblings' life. According to favoritism concept, Alfred Adler believes that children's birth order influences the development of the individual in the family, and leads to the sibling rivalry for the parents' attention and affection. But Adler's concept of

favoritism mostly focuses on the competition between the children for their position and significance for the parents. (Whiteman et al. 2012, 125). The concept is somehow reversed in *Sons and Lovers*; Paul's rivalry is not with his brother William and Annie or even Arthur who was born later but with his father for the possession of his mother and the mother for her sons. In another key episode Paul even dreams to live with his mother in a cottage after his father's death.

His ambition, as far as this world's gear went, was quietly to earn his thirty or thirty-five shillings a week somewhere near home, and then, when his father died, have a cottage with his mother, paint and go out as he liked, and live happy ever after. (Sons and Lovers, 104)

And his repeated expression to his mother "I'm the man of the house now" reveals more than if it is read at face value. When Mr. Morel determines to beat William for ripping the neighbor Alfie's shirt, Mrs. Morel threatens him and stands between him and William in an act as if two opponents fighting to win. Such scenes manifest one of the situations of hostility between the parents. Rivalry can also be exposed in Mrs. Morel's characterization. Her rivalry for her sons is crystal clear. We have many episodes in which most of the fights between the Morels start when Mrs. Morel sees her sons in presence of their father especially when the marital relationship between the two became critical. A normal and maybe an innocent behavior by her husband is enough to put the wife in distress. The scene when Mr. Morel cut William's hair can read and look normal and natural; a father mending his son's hair, but for infuriated Gertrude this is disastrous:

Mrs. Morel stood still. It was her first baby. She went very white, and was unable to speak. 'What dost think o' 'im?' Morel laughed uneasily. She gripped her two fists, lifted them, and came forward. Morel shrank back. 'I could kill you, I could!' she said. She choked with rage, her two fists uplifted. 'Yer non want ter make a wench on 'im,' Morel said, in a frightened tone, bending his head to shield his eyes from hers... 'Oh—my boy!' she faltered. Her lip trembled, her face broke, and, snatching up the child, she buried her face in his shoulder and cried painfully. (Sons and Lovers, 21)

Reading this excerpt for the first time and separate from the rest of the text indicates a mother trying to protect her son from a stranger's grip. Mrs. Morel's reaction is so intense that the reader may feel that she is overreacting to her husband's normal behavior. Cutting a son's hair looks natural in any family consideration. D. H. Lawrence presents situations like this to imply the contrast in action and reaction between the Morels and to stress that their relationship is incurable. It is just like the contrast between light and darkness, the light of Mrs. Morel's house and the darkness of Mr. Morel's pits. In this situation she is presented as a passionate beloved defending her lover against an enemy. Morel's reaction to Mrs. Morel's infuriation connotes that he has become an antagonist. In fact, without a psychoanalytic perusal *Sons and Lovers* would be lacking its luster.

In this sense, Mr. Morel's character can also lend itself to rivalry discussion if it is studied especially after losing his central position in the family. His explicit action with William may indicate an implicit

unconscious reaction that can be diagnosed as jealousy. Unconsciously, Mr. Morel tries to be recognized and his role in the family respected. He is aware that he is cast off by his family and he hates them for that. His estrangement from the family, especially from his wife, which gets worse especially after the accident in the mines, increases his feeling of contempt and thus competition. For Mrs. Morel he is longer a favorite figure; his place is lost for her sons. This fact generates in him contemptuous sensation. He threatens, "There's not a man tries harder for his family!" he would shout. "He does his best for them, and then gets treated like a dog. But I'm not going to stand it, I tell you!" (*Sons and Lovers*, 133). Thus, Mr. Morel's presence is entirely obliterated and he "exists merely as a rival" in the house.

Another kind of rivalry arises when William meets a lady called Louisa in London. William calls her Gypsy or Gyp and entirely fascinated by her. Her full name is Louisa Lily Denys Western. D. H. Lawrence portrays Louisa as an immature shallow girl who belongs to a wealthy family. Her style of life spoiled her character. Although she works as a low-paid secretary, she behaves in a superior manner especially with William's family. In spite of all of her personal flaws William falls desperately in love with her. The crisis arises when Mrs. Morel receives a letter from William containing her photograph. Although Mrs. Morel sometimes feels sorry for Louisa because William always degrades her in front of the family, she cannot help seeing as well as feeling her as a rival. Many situations show Mrs. Morel absorbed and lost in her unconscious unbridled sensations, "And, as she stood over the washing tub, the mother brooded over her son. She saw him saddled with an elegant and expensive wife, earning little money, dragging along and getting dragged in some small ugly house in a suburb" (*Sons and Lovers*, 107). Mrs. Morel's reaction is mainly instigated by how William describes his beloved to his mother, "tall and elegant...transparent olive complexions, hair as black as jet" (*Sons and Lovers*, 107).

Brooding like this is repeated many times as she thinks of William in London away from him enjoying himself with another woman. Although much of her jealousy remains unspoken, Mrs. Morel's sensations get worse when William brings Louisa home later on. Louisa has no idea about what goes on in Mrs. Morel's heart. Tracing Mrs. Morel's behavior upon Louisa's photo arrival is evident of the opponency in the novel. Lawrence is so ingenious that his narrative makes the reader look through the characters' eyes rather than his. Prior to sending the photo, William precisely describes Louisa to his mother. When Louisa's photograph arrives Mrs. Morel and filtered through her eyes, we are made to see Louisa through an opponent's lenses rather than the narrator's description, "The photo came — a handsome brunette, taken in profile, smirking slightly — and, it might be, quite naked, for on the photograph not a scrap of clothing was to be seen, only a naked bust." (*Sons and Lovers*, 116)

This is how Mrs. Morel's first impression looks like. What we are made to see not anything else but naked shoulders. The way Louisa looks in the photo could be normal especially in William's description of her dress "as any woman in London", but Mrs. Morel's reply and impression of Louisa is sent to William like this innuendo, "Certainly the shoulders are beautiful, as you say. But I hardly expected to see so much of them at the first view." (116). Some views consider Mrs. Morel's commentary on Louisa's photo is induced by her reserved upbringing. While in fact a close reading of this reply is evident of the amount of passivity in it. The other members of the Morel family find the photo charming. The

sensuous Morel calls the way Louisa looks in the photo as "a bright spark" and Paul, upon receiving Louisa's second photo, believes that "the first one with bare shoulders is lovely". The situation is exacerbated even more as William and Louisa express and practice love in house in full view of the mother. In one evening they sit together in the parlour in the dark and Mrs. Morel is still awake raking the fire. It follows like this:

'Can't you trust us, mother?' 'Whether I can or not, I won't do it. You can stay till eleven if you like, and I can read.' 'Go to bed, Gyp,' he said to his girl. 'We won't keep mater waiting.' ... William kissed his sweetheart at the foot of the stairs, and she went. He returned to the kitchen. 'Can't you trust us, mother?' he repeated, rather offended. 'My boy, I tell you I don't BELIEVE in leaving two young things like you alone downstairs when everyone else is in bed.' (*Sons and Lovers*, 139)

A more complexity starts with Paul shortly after William's death. All of Mrs. Morel's passion and emotions concentrate on Paul who is just opening from childhood into adolescence. This stage in an individual's life is so sensitive that if it is not outgrown, it will develop into a problem. In *Sons and Lovers* Paul remains so captivated to his mother's condensed emotions and love around puberty that he is unable to overcome or go beyond them. Consequently, he cannot even develop any real relationship with the opposite sex. When he gets into the Leivers, he is overwhelmed by their world, especially by the femininity of Miriam's world; he becomes so infatuated by this new world that he appears strained to Miriam's presence. Paul's pattern of life changes as he stands face to face between two contrasted worlds; the maternal love that is possessive on one hand and the spiritual love Miriam offers to him on the other, which is described as oedipal complex.

It seems that both types of love are possessive and strife for Paul's being. The tension becomes obvious when Paul reaches to a crossroad when he is left to decide. Competition to win him is so tense and the two powers are so demanding. What worth discussion here is Mrs. Morel in all of this. As Paul gets deeper with Miriam, she gets worse and worse. Although her pain is not expressed by her at least, we can sense it in every speech and every comment with Paul. She always fears that she would lose Paul and be defeated in the mother/ beloved rivalry. Paul is conscious of his mother's conflict and careful not to do something that would hurt her. This is evident in more than one scene in the novel. Thus, what has started as contempt of his father and developed into a kind of competition with him is now reversed. The same thing will happen when Paul meets Baxter later on. His Mother hates Miriam because she is destroying the son in whom she has put all her love. His emotions are indirectly manipulated by his mother. Yet the real motivation behind Mrs. Morel's agony is competition. What may fill Mrs. Morel's mind subconsciously is that she is the source of compassion through maternal connectedness; she holds the right to possess him. She would not let another woman take her son and lover.

Mrs. Morel's attachment to her male children and her assiduousness not to fall prey to their father mining career produces a character-changing experience impairing them from naturally developing when they confront society. Ronald Granofsky points out that treating her sons "derives in part from her

unacknowledged design to thwart their masculine prerogative and retain their identification with her, thus enhancing her own otherwise fragile sense of self.” (Granofsky 2009, 250).

Miriam does not appeal that much to Mrs. Morel from the start and is afraid that she will imbibe him and leave nothing to her. For Draper, “Mrs. Morel’s antipathy to Miriam would appear to be based on her objection to such soulful possessiveness” (Draper 1986, 46). Hence, Mrs. Morel’s “objection” is a competitive urge against any existence beyond hers that, she thinks, would magnetize her son off her. What is important here and contributes to the present discussion is the concept of possessiveness. This type of rivalry, here, can rightly be argued to be based on possession, because it is just like two counter forces trying to attract certain body from the opposite force. For Mrs. Morel, Miriam is desperately after Paul’s soul, and she always feels this inside her and thus dreads it.

Mrs. Morel has polished Paul’s intellectuality so early that the relationship between them has been set as a sort of compensation for her. She does not get the mutual and equal sense of companionship from Mr. Morel. So Paul for her is her world and Miriam has come to threaten this world. (Draper 1986, 46-47). This novel can also be read as search for belonging that is never satisfactorily achieved. Having lost her interest in her husband, Mrs. Morel looks for a another pivot to belong to. She immediately takes on William who slips away very soon leaving her imbalanced. She shunts to Paul whom she also in some phase in his life starts to loosen her grip from him. At the end, feeling of loss and despair wins the battle she always tries hard to overcome.

Thus, *Sons and lovers* can commonly if not exclusively be read and filtered through psychological terms. All studies and discussions agree that this novel is one of D. H. Lawrence's masterpieces for the richness of content and implication. It can be approached psychologically, thematically, symbolically as well as technically. Rivalry, sibling rivalry, attachment, and favoritism concepts are psychological perspectives that lend themselves to the world of this novel.

مفهوم التنافس في رواية د.هـ. لورانس (*أبناء وعشاق*)

ياسر مطلب عبدالله

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، جامعة الأنبار، العراق

الملخص

تعد رواية (*أبناء وعشاق*) عام (1913) واحدة من أبرز روايات د. هـ. لورانس من حيث العقد النفسية التي تميز معظم رواياته الأخرى، إن لم تكن كلها، فقد جرت دراسات عدة حول نظرية عقدة أوديب والعلاقة بين الرجال والنساء في الروايات التي تعكس توجهات الحياة في بداية القرن العشرين. تعيد هذه الدراسة النظر في رواية (*أبناء وعشاق*) من منظور التنافس القائم على مفهوم دراسات ألفريد أدلر النفسية. تتناول الدراسة مفهوم تنافس الأشقاء بين شخصيات عائلة موريل، ثم تتوسع لتشمل التنافس بين الشخصيات الأخرى. تتم مناقشة هذا المفهوم على مستويين من العلاقات، الأول بين بول وليام كونهم أشقاء من ناحية ويول والأب والأم من ناحية أخرى. والثاني مثلث التنافس بين لويزا ومريم والسيدة موريل. يرتكز النمط البحثي النوعي للدراسة على تحليل نص الرواية لإظهار أنه يمكن تناول رواية (*أبناء وعشاق*) عبر المنظور النفسي للتنافس بشكله.

الكلمات المفتاحية: نظرية التعلق، التنافس، مفهوم التنافس، المحاباة، تنافس الأشقاء.

References

- Ansbacher, Heinz L. and Rowena R. Ansbacher, eds. 1956. *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler: A Systematic Presentation in Selections From His Writing*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Bretherton, Inge. 1985. *Attachment Concept: Retrospect and Prospect*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Vol. 50, No. 1/2, *Growing Points of Attachment Concept and Research*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3333824>
- Constantakis, Sara. 2014. *A Study Guide for D.H. Lawrence's Sons and Lovers*. Gale: Cengage Learning.
- Draper, R. P. 1986. *MacMillan Master Guides: Sons and Lovers by D.H. Lawrence*. London: MacMillan Education.
- Granofsky, Ronald. 2009. "His Father's Dirty Digging": Recuperating the Masculine in D. H. Lawrence's Sons and Lovers." *MFS Modern Fiction Studies* 55 (2): 242-264. <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/mfs/summary/v055/55.2.granofsky.html> (accessed August 21, 2019).
- Worthen, John and Andrew Harrison. 2005. *D. H. Lawrence's Sons and Lovers: A Casebook*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lawrence, David. Herbert. 1995. *Sons and Lovers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schapiro, Barbara A.. 1999. *D.H. Lawrence and the Paradoxes of Psychic Life*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tyson, Lois. 2006. *Critical Concept Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Whiteman, Shawn D., Susan M. McHale and Anna Soli. 2011. *Theoretical Perspectives on Sibling Relationships*, Journal of Family Concept and Review (June1) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3127252/>