

Natasha Saje

Hamlet, D. H. Lawrence, and Sons and Lovers

The reader of D. H. Lawrence is rewarded by close attention to his biography. Lawrence changed his mind, radically, about a host of subjects—notably politics and gender roles.¹ For Lawrence, more so than for most writers, recurring emblems in the work may represent very different things. Here I want to trace Lawrence's changing attitude toward a quintessential text, *Hamlet*, during and shortly after the writing of *Sons and Lovers*.

The idea that a writer has to grapple with his or her predecessors has been cemented into literary criticism by Harold Bloom. M. M. Bakhtin has taught us to see the novel as the genre able to subsume other genres; thus, *Sons and Lovers* can be said not only to grapple with *Hamlet*, but to encompass it. Tracing Lawrence's attitude toward *Hamlet*, or rather, defining the play for Lawrence over a three-year period, shows Lawrence using one genre to situate himself as a master of another. Though he also wrote plays, poems, literary criticism, and travel essays, Lawrence left his greatest mark on the novel, which, because of its use of dialogue in combination with narrative, is a genre well suited to conveying the difficulty of personal relationships, Lawrence's major theme.

Lawrence's relationship with *Hamlet* goes back to his first visit to the theatre:

When I was a child, I went to the two penny travelling theatre to see *Hamlet*. The ghost had on a helmet and a breastplate. I sat in pale transport. 'Amblet, Amblet, I am thy father's ghost.' Then came a voice from the dark, silent audience, like a cynical knife to my fond soul: 'Why tha arena, I can tell thy voice.' (*Twilight* 135)

Jessie Chambers relates another of Lawrence's experiences of the play, sometime in his teens:

I saw *Hamlet* for the first time with Lawrence and my brother. Lawrence was intensely excited. He went through Hamlet's soliloquy afterwards in our kitchen—"To be, or not to be . . ." . . . It was his characteristic blending of the serious with the comic . . . Going to the theatre was the same as reading, Lawrence identified himself with the play, and for the time being lived in its atmosphere. (108-109)

Lawrence began *Sons and Lovers* a few months before his mother's death in December 1910. The next year and a half, before Lawrence and Frieda's departure for Europe, was not only a gestation period for the novel, but a period of crisis for Lawrence. His letters during this period, as well as the novel itself, show that he identifies with Hamlet. Conversely, after the completion of the novel, Lawrence's letters and *Twilight in Italy* reveal a rejection of that highly self-conscious, melancholy former self.

On 19 December 1910 he wrote to his fiancée Louie Burrows, that his illnesses were self-induced, that

I shall never die unless I fling wide my arms and say, Hamletian—"Come death etc.": or unless some stilettoed sickness steal behind me and stick me unaware: which is very unlikely, being well trained as I am in the habits of these bravados. (*Letters I*: 207)

Six months later, on 16 May 1911 he told her,

I am so Hamletty—I am so confoundedly and absurdly Hamletty, it's enough to make you sick. When I begin to rant in the "To be or not to be" style, you should say "Hello, he's off again," and wait for the rhyme which rings conclusion if not reason. (*Letters I*: 269)

To others who knew him during this period Lawrence seemed to be imagining himself as a tragic genius. He had a sense of his genius that bordered on conceit, according to William Hopkin, who also remarks that "his conversation . . . sounded like someone reciting free verse." He was "very charming and also abominably rude—tender and savage," writes Hopkin (Nehls 71). An incident described by Dr. J. D. Chambers reveals that Lawrence "felt he could not be bound by the conventional standards

which were recognized if not respected by others." Lawrence saw himself as a rival to May Chambers's fiancé, a stonemason, and was often rude to him. Once Lawrence took a coal pick and smashed one of the stonemason's works. When reprimanded, Lawrence said, "With should and ought I have nothing to do" (Nehls 50).

His letters from 1908-1911 contain many references to his melancholy state and to his tragedy, and show that he saw himself as elevated above "ordinary" men. To Mabel Limb he quotes Exodus, "I am a stranger in a strange land" (*Letters I*: 82). To Blanche Jennings he writes, "I ought to be an elegiac poet: forever singing my own elegy . . . My cry is—My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (86). To Louie Burrows, "I am wild and sudden by nature . . . I wish I were just like ordinary men. I *am* a bit different—and God knows, I regret it" (208). Also in 1910 he writes to Louie that "sometimes I feel as if I shout—crever [French for burst or die]. My temper is damnably serious and melancholic. If I had not a few grains of reason I should be a maudlin idiot" (211). A few days later: ". . . things have rubbed a lot of the elastic capacity for pure happiness out of me: and it is my nature. I am rather 'cured' with the salt and salt-petre of bitterness and sorrow" (214).

Once Lawrence left England with Frieda, however, he changed his attitude toward himself, and toward *Hamlet*. The next references to the play, in letters to Ernest Collings, Arthur McLeod, May Holbrook, and Edward Gamett, are from 1913, when *Sons and Lovers* had been completed. To Collings, he complains that the English are too conscious, that they "know too much . . . We cannot be. 'To be or not to be'—it is the question with us now, by Jove. And nearly every Englishman says 'Not to be.'" Lawrence continues, "the real way of living is to answer one's wants" (*Letters I*: 504). While he still counts himself English, he has distanced himself from the intellectual self-consciousness so evident in *Sons and Lovers*, in part by choosing to live in Italy with Frieda.

In *Twilight in Italy* Lawrence describes the Italian actor who plays Hamlet as "a caricature of Hamlet's melancholy self absorption" (120). Lawrence uses the word "melancholy" five times in two short paragraphs to describe Hamlet. Such an emphasis echoes turn of the century Shakespeare criticism, most notably that of A. C. Bradley who, drawing on Goethe and Coleridge, saw action as issuing from character. Bradley explained Hamlet's delay as resulting from his melancholy, rather than from the difficulty of revenge or his moral scruples.

Psychoanalytic criticism developed when readers combined Bradley's methods with Freud's theories. In his *Interpretation of Dreams*, first published in 1899, Freud writes that Hamlet's Oedipal conflict is the reason for his delay. Hamlet is incapable of exacting revenge against the stepfather who is realizing his repressed childhood wishes (265). Ernest Jones took Freud's suggestion and developed it in "The Oedipus-Complex as an Explanation of Hamlet's Mystery: A Study in Motive," published in *The American Journal of Psychology* in 1910. A year later the essay was translated into German and published in Leipzig and Vienna. Such an Oedipal reading of *Hamlet*, whether from Freud or from Jones, might well have been discussed by Frieda and D. H. Lawrence (*Not I* 4). As Keith Sagar points out, during October 1912 Lawrence changed the name of the novel from *Paul Morel* to *Sons and Lovers*, acknowledging Frieda's—and Freud's—influence (91).

Lawrence critiques the Italian *Hamlet* for being "absorbed by his own self important consciousness . . . as he twists in his own soul, overwhelmed by a sort of inverted perversity" (125). Lawrence now rejects that self:

I had always felt an aversion from Hamlet: a creeping, unclean thing he seems, on the stage, whether he is Forbes Robertson² or anybody else. His nasty poking and sniffing at his mother, his setting traps for the King, his conceited perversion with Ophelia make him always intolerable. The character is repulsive in its conception, based on self-dislike and a spirit of disintegration. (*Twilight* 122)

An ordinary instinctive man, in Hamlet's position, would either have set about murdering his uncle, by reflex action, or else would have gone right away. There would have been no need for Hamlet to murder his mother. It would have been sufficient blood vengeance if he had killed his uncle. (124)

When Lawrence criticizes Hamlet, he criticizes his own former self-consciousness, though of course one can argue that it never dissipated, merely that his attitude toward it changed. In these passages one can see Lawrence veering away from the intellectual and toward the physical. Like Hamlet, Paul Morel is a singular intellectual and Paul Morel, of course, is Lawrence thinly veiled.³ Most critics agree that writing *Sons and Lovers* was Lawrence's way of separating himself from his mother and women friends and apologizing (albeit confusedly) to his father, an

"ordinary instinctive man." Many years later, according to Frieda, Lawrence said that he would write a different novel; "my mother was wrong, and I thought she was absolutely right" (*Not I* 56). Keith Sagar points out that Lawrence wrote the novel at precisely the point in his life where it would necessarily be ambivalent (93).

While many readers⁴ have outlined Oedipal patterns in *Sons and Lovers*, Daniel Weiss and Sydney Mendel have also noted similarities between *Sons and Lovers* and *Hamlet*. Daniel Weiss in *Oedipus in Nottingham* shows Lawrence's use of the Oedipal story and highlights the importance of the father figure in *Sons and Lovers*. Weiss points to earlier drafts of the novel,⁵ where Walter Morel dies upon release from the prison to which he is committed for having killed Paul's brother. In the final version, "Lawrence unconsciously rejected Walter Morel as Paul Morel's proper father and Hamlet-like, accepted him only as a despised stepfather" (18). Sydney Mendel argues that Lawrence's development from *Sons and Lovers* to *Lady Chatterly's Lover* is similar to Shakespeare's development from *Hamlet* to *Antony and Cleopatra*. The first works are studies of the "son in revolt against the father" (49) while the later works are more sympathetic "to an older man in conflict with a younger man . . . The equations 'moralistic youth=good: sensual father=bad' are inverted" (53).

Because *Sons and Lovers* is a *bildungsroman*, Paul Morel's relationships with his parents form the basis for most criticism. Lawrence's two-sided portrait of Walter Morel combines the attributes of the ghost of Hamlet and those of Claudius. For example, Paul sees his father as a having a "fine full presence" (29) and having, even in middle age, "a wonderfully young body, muscular, without any fat" (207). This vitality is like that of Claudius, with whom Walter also shares an earthy sensuality and pleasure in eating and drinking. The two men's sex appeal helps explain how they win their wives, though both additionally practice deception in order to do so. Walter Morel wins Gertrude in part because he pretends that his work is grander than it is.

Walter also shares some ghost-like qualities with Hamlet senior. He is often seen slinking away (48) or covered in pit dirt or alone. The family waits for him to appear: "All the room was full of the sense of waiting, waiting for the man who was sitting in his pit dirt, dinnerless, some miles away from home, across the darkness, drinking himself drunk" (65). Walter Morel's isolation and otherness is created by his wife

and fostered by children who treat him as if he were not one of them. This isolation leads to him being seen as powerless, haunted and pathetic, though Lawrence tempers this portrait with glimpses of his vitality and occasional scenes (for instance when he eats breakfast alone) where the reader sympathizes with him. While the whole family is separated from Walter, from Paul that separation is most acute due to their differences in character and upbringing. Walter is physical, lower class, brutish, blunt and strong. Paul is mental, aspiring toward middle-class values, refined, sensitive, and weak. Interestingly, Lawrence's father was perceived by others, for example by William Hopkin, as a "natural gentleman" (Nehls 22). Ford Madox Ford even sees Lawrence's creativity as coming from his handy father rather than his convention-bound mother (Nehls 114). By making Walter Morel more brutish than his own father was, Lawrence seems to be justifying his mother's treatment of him.

Like Hamlet, Paul hates his father for his relationship with his mother, for what he does and does not do to and for his mother. While Paul is unborn, a drunken Morel locks pregnant Gertrude out in the cold. From an early age, Paul is "conscious of what other people felt, particularly his mother. When she fretted he understood, and could have no peace" (61). She does not hide her resentment toward her husband from her children; rather, she seems to lessen her burden by sharing it with them. Consequently, Paul prays that his father will die (64).

A climactic scene in Paul's relationship with his father is that in which they almost come to blows. The episode ends with Paul entreating his mother, "sleep with Annie, mother, not with him" (225), a plea reminiscent of Hamlet, who, after having confronted his mother with her incest, tells her, "go not to my uncle's bed . . . / Refrain tonight / And that shall lend a kind of easiness / To the next abstinence" (III: iv, 183). We never learn whether Queen Gertrude obeys her son's injunctions. We do, however, learn that Paul's mother resists his plea and sleeps in her own bed.

Just as Paul is ambivalent toward his father, Paul is ambivalent toward Baxter Dawes, who is both father figure and alter ego. "Paul and [Baxter] were confirmed enemies, and yet there was between them that peculiar feeling of intimacy, as if they were secretly near to each other, which sometimes exists between two people" (355). With Baxter, the conflict comes to actual blows. Baxter, like Walter, has a "sensual mouth" (196), works with his hands, and is often dirty and unkempt. Baxter senses

Paul's disdain and hates his staring. When their conflict attains a focus in the form of Clara, Baxter suffers. When Paul throws beer at him, Baxter is expelled from the tavern, and he loses his job when he confronts Paul at work. When Clara asks, "and if he kills you?" Paul answers smugly, "I should be sorry for his sake and mine" and quotes, "a man in his righteousness arrayed . . . needs no weapons" (360). Similarly, Hamlet wrongs Laertes, treats him lightly, apologizes to him, and perishes at his hand. Laertes also functions as a mirror for Hamlet: a son bent on revenge (IV: v, 134).

Both Hamlet and Paul, despite their insight and intellect, misjudge their enemies because of their egoism. And Laertes and Baxter, with their hot tempers and furtiveness, get the better of *their* enemies. In *Sons and Lovers* Paul wrongs Baxter by taking up with Clara, but Baxter vows revenge, and waits until he can catch Paul off guard to inflict it. During their fight Paul first wants to strangle Baxter and then relents and allows himself to be kicked, as if he finally accepts his punishment. Later he atones for his deeds—his taking of Clara, his part in Baxter's downfall—by visiting Baxter in the hospital in Sheffield. He plays a part in restoring his health and his will to live and reuniting him with Clara. Dawes "depends" on Paul (417). But Paul's actions are another sort of patronage⁶ and the happy outcome of the struggle with Baxter seems like the wish fulfilment of Paul's (or Lawrence's) relationship with his father. Baxter and Clara become replacement parents for Paul, as Daniel Weiss points out (57), parents whom, unlike his own, Paul is able to reunite.

Both Paul and Hamlet are verbal as well as melancholic. From childhood Paul Morel has fits of depression (51), yet he is a great talker: he enjoys talking to Miriam about his work (213), and he says of himself: "I suppose I did all the jawing—I usually do" (304). Like Hamlet, Paul is witty and laughs a lot, which is interesting in light of their often apparently humorless situations. It is Paul's laughter that gets him into trouble with Baxter Dawes when he sees Paul and Clara on the street. Paul explains, "I never laughed, except as I'm always laughing" (405). Hamlet and Paul are intelligent and sensitive readers and thinkers, but their focus is always on themselves.

Another similarity in their introspection is the wish for dissolution as a way out of difficulty. When Paul is ill, he "tosses into consciousness in the ghastly sickly feeling of dissolution, when all the cells in his body seem in intense irritability, to be breaking down, and consciousness

makes a last flare of a struggle, like madness" (147). Even when he is not ill, when he and Miriam have just become lovers, he yearns for dissolution in passages that echo Hamlet's "to be or not to be" and "that this too too solid flesh would melt" soliloquies.

To him now, life seemed a shadow, day a white shadow; night, and death, and stillness, and inaction, this seemed like *being*. To be alive, to be urgent and insistent—that was not-to-be. The highest of all was to melt out into the darkness and sway there, identified with the great Being. (299)

To be rid of our individuality, which is our will, which is our effort—to live effortless, a kind of curious sleep—that is very beautiful, I think; that is our after life—our immortality. (300)

The suicidal longings of Hamlet and Paul are a result not only of their overly intellectual personalities but also of their conflicts—they are caught and do not know what to do. Hamlet, of course, must break up the incestuous marriage of his mother and uncle—without tainting his mind. Paul has a longer list of conflicting duties: he is the son of a miner, yet he wants to become a painter. He is attached to Miriam, yet must break with her. His mother depends on him, yet can give him neither the literary discourse nor the sex he craves. He thinks he cannot live without his mother, yet she dies, and he lives. Hamlet and Paul accept more responsibility than is usual for young men and therefore become isolated in carrying their burdens. Their incapable parents depend on them: Hamlet senior cannot intervene because he is dead, Queen Gertrude because she is weak. Paul becomes a husband to his mother. For example, he is responsible for entertaining her, taking her on outings, and paying for her luxuries and her medical care. He even accepts responsibility for her death, an act that is related to Lawrence's understanding of *Hamlet*: "There would have been no need for Hamlet to murder his mother" (*Twilight* 124). Lawrence blames Hamlet for Gertrude's drinking the poison that was meant for him. In the novel Gertrude (note that both mothers are named Gertrude) dies after drinking the poison her son has given her. In both cases the mother is probably unaware of the poison. Paul takes responsibility for his mother to the ultimate extent because his father does not meet her standards; Lawrence seems to imply that Walter would be incapable of administering poison to his wife. Because of their

conflicts and responsibilities, both Hamlet and Paul feel that happiness is beyond their reach; Paul says to Clara, "What is happiness! It is nothing to me! How am I to be happy" (269).

Paul takes the lover's place in his mother's life from an early age; Gertrude's intimacy with her second son is "subtle and fine" (73). They share aesthetic pleasures such as flowers and china (80). When he is older, Paul shares holidays with Gertrude, saying to her, "You are a fine little woman to go jaunting out with" (127). He is dismayed when he sees her growing older: "what do I want with a white haired mother" (128). He tells Clara that if he had money he would buy a house outside London and live there with his mother. In *Hamlet* also the relationship between mother and son is particularly close, though we see this largely from the Queen's point of view. Claudius says, "The Queen his mother lives almost by his looks" (IV: vi, 12). Interestingly however, Lawrence, in *Twilight in Italy*, places the responsibility for the Oedipal connection on Hamlet whom he chastises for his "nasty poking and sniffing at his mother" (122).

As has been often pointed out, Paul's ties to his mother complicate his development of relationships with women his own age.⁷ His superior attitude toward Miriam parallels that of Hamlet toward Ophelia. Both women are gentle, religious, intense, and often identified with flowers; furthermore, they take a subordinate role in the presence of their lovers. Paul says of Miriam that she

seemed to need things kindling in her imagination or in her soul before she felt she had them. And she was cut off from ordinary life by her religious intensity which made the world for her either a nunnery garden or a paradise, where sin and knowledge were not, or else an ugly and cruel thing." (158)

As Hamlet abuses Ophelia, Paul takes out his anger on Miriam: anger at her purity and humility. When Miriam has trouble with algebra, she "seems so utterly humble before the lesson it made his blood rouse" (156); he ends up throwing a pencil at her.⁸ He criticizes her for making him "too spiritual," for "absorbing him" because "she's got a shortage somewhere" (229). In a letter signalling his first break with her, he tells her she is "a nun" (263). Later she sings "like a nun singing to heaven" (291). When Paul and Miriam do become lovers, she "relinquishes" herself, "sacrifices" herself. Paul "hates her violently, and [is] more cruel

to her"—finally breaking off altogether. He finally understands her frigidity as her way to resist domination and remain free (309). His understanding, however, is distorted by his egoism and immaturity; for obvious reasons Lawrence is unable to present Miriam's consciousness as clearly as he does that of Paul. Interestingly, Lawrence's portrait of Miriam differs significantly from her model, Jessie Chambers.⁹ Helen Corke recalls that Lawrence was not accurate about Jessie, whom Helen saw as having "a warmth and strength of personality he had not suggested" (20). By making Miriam weak, Lawrence allows Paul superiority over her. Lawrence acknowledges this pattern in *Hamlet* when he berates Hamlet for his "conceited perversion with Ophelia" (*Twilight* 122). Ophelia represents both nuns and whores for Hamlet, though Lawrence splits the two between Miriam and Clara. Miriam bears the burden of being Paul's "nun" while Clara becomes his "whore."

Like Miriam, Clara sees that Paul will never be hers. In addition, she realizes that there is "something in him she hated, a sort of detached criticism of herself, a coldness which made her woman's soul harden against him" (359). When he has grown tired of Clara, Paul relegates their lovemaking to his spare time. Clara understands that Paul "can't come out of himself" (377); even Baxter could do that better than Paul. "You've never given me yourself," she says (378).

In another echo of Hamlet ("I say we will have no mo[re] marriages" III: i, 149), Paul Morel rejects marriage: Paul tells his mother, "I shan't marry . . . I shall live with you and we'll have a servant" (256). When he breaks off with Miriam, he tells her, "I don't want to marry. I don't want ever to marry" (308). His rejection of marriage is a way of remaining close to his mother, but it is also a way of rejecting the conflict he sees marriage bring. Paul's mother's marriage troubles him so deeply he cannot conceive of his own. Not marrying would prevent children, though a more drastic preventive to continuing the line is suicide, a notion both Paul and Hamlet contemplate and discard.

Parallels in character, language and incident show that Lawrence drew extensively on *Hamlet* in composing his novel. Yet the differences between the Renaissance play and the modernist novel reveal an older genre subsumed by a newer one. *Sons and Lovers* contains not only *Hamlet*, but also the scenes of Lawrence's own plays, *A Collier's Friday Night* (1909) and *The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd* (1914). What the novel can do better than drama is to probe the psychology of its characters, for

instance by indicating how they change without realizing it or by disclosing information from the past. The narrative voice furnishes more information in a more complex fashion than dialogue can. *Sons and Lovers* is narrated in what Gerard Genette calls "subsequent narrating," in which time separates the "moment of the narrating from the moment of the story" (220). While drama can imitate the story it tells, a novel, by using, subsequent narrating subtly emphasizes that the action described has taken place in the past, and that the narrator is distanced from it. So, while we often conflate the author, narrator, and character, and are especially tempted to do so in the case of *Sons and Lovers*, we should acknowledge that though D. H. Lawrence takes responsibility for the story, for instance by not using a pseudonym he nevertheless, through the act of telling it, removes himself thrice over: by forming it as a novel (rather than autobiography), by using subsequent narration, and by using a third person narrator. Moreover, by drawing from *Hamlet* to structure Paul Morel and then repudiating Hamlet, Lawrence distances himself even more.

Hamlet ends, Renaissance fashion, with order restored. *Sons and Lovers* has an ending that is much debated. Does Paul drift into death or does he move toward life?¹⁰ Lawrence's own words about the ending complicate the issue. In a 1912 letter to Edward Garnett, he states that "Paul is left in the end naked of everything, with the drift towards death" (*Letters* I: 162). Justification for seeing the ending as bleak is also in the novel: "Gertrude is the one place in the world that stood solid and did not melt into unreality" (222). However, the novel's last paragraph supports a more positive reading:

But no, he would not give in. Turning sharply, he walked towards the city's gold phosphorescence. His fists were shut, his mouth set fast. He would not take that direction, to the darkness, to follow her. He walked towards the faintly humming, glowing town, quickly. (436)

Paul has grown from his difficulties; certainly, Lawrence's own movement after *Sons and Lovers* was positive. Understanding Lawrence's reversal about *Hamlet* suggests that at the end of the novel, Paul is no longer dominated by melancholy. The "self dislike" and "spirit of disintegration"—terms Lawrence used to describe Hamlet after completing his novel—have been replaced by a more positive sense of self.

During the course of the play Hamlet matures (in a few months) from age 19 to age 30. By identifying with Hamlet, Lawrence implies that he too sees himself as in process of maturation. Maturation means accepting life, rather than following one's mother into death.

On the other hand, Hamlet dies because of his own errors in judgment; the very nature of the tragedy depends on this. Perhaps Lawrence, in his letter to Garnett, was thinking of death as an inevitable end for a tragic figure. He calls *Sons and Lovers* a "great tragedy" (*Letters* I: 447). However, his will to live, and more specifically his acts of writing, contradict such a conclusion. Self-consciousness is Paul's tragedy, but it is also an impetus for Lawrence to write the novel. Another impetus is his desire to outshine the text that represents his literary heritage. The last lines of *Sons and Lovers* contrast the lights of the city with the darkness of death and the past. The image recalls a bright stage and an audience in darkness: Lawrence chose the novel for his stage, exploiting the genre's capacity for intimacy, not only between characters, but between novelist and readers. He understood the novel's power to make ordinary lives the stuff of tragedy.

NOTES

1. See for example Judith Ruderman's study of "the devouring mother" in Lawrence, Comelia Nixon's *Lawrence's Leadership Politics and the Turn Against Women*, or Hilary Simpson's *D. H. Lawrence and Feminism*.
2. According to the reviews in John Mills's *Hamlet on Stage*, Johnston Forbes Robertson was a particularly amiable and philosophic Hamlet. His Hamlet was also consistently sane, a much debated point at the turn of the century.
3. For a brief review of the parallels and differences between the Morels and the Lawrences, see Pittock 124. See also Sagar.
4. For example, Evelyn Hinz, "Sons and Lovers: The Archetypal Dimension of Lawrence's Oedipal Tragedy," and Giles Mitchell, "Sons and Lovers and the Oedipal Project."
5. The novel was thrice rewritten by Lawrence, and then heavily edited by his editor Edward Garnett and publisher Gerald Duckworth. See Mark Schorer's edition of the manuscript facsimile.
6. John Haegert in "Brothers and Lovers: D. H. Lawrence and the Theme of Friendship" calls Paul's "gift" of Clara to Baxter "his most generous act" (41). I

- disagree; besides the patronage implied in "giving a woman back to her husband," it is clear that at this point Paul is sick of Clara and glad to be rid of her.
7. See, among others, Faith Pullin in *Lawrence and Women*, ed. Anne Smith.
 8. In her discussion of this scene in *Sexual Politics* Kate Millet points to the analogy between pencil and penis (254).
 9. Malcolm Pittock argues that Lawrence betrays Jessie Chambers via his portrait of Miriam, a kind of "moral evasion."
 10. For a review of criticism on the ending, see Donald E. Mortland, "The Conclusion of *Sons and Lovers*: A Reconsideration." Mortland argues that Paul's "commitment to darkness" is strongly developed in the novel and supports a reading in which Paul "loses in this life, [though] his loss implies a merger with powerful cosmic forces" (314).

WORKS CITED

- Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Bradley, A. C. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London and New York: Macmillan and St. Martin's, 1969.
- Chambers, Jessie. *D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- Corke, Helen. *D. H. Lawrence: The Croydon Years*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1965.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works*. Ed. James Strachey. Vol. 4. London: Hogarth, 1953.
- Genette, Gerard. *Narrative Discourse*. Trans. Jane Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980.
- Haegert, John W. "Brothers and Lovers: D. H. Lawrence and the Theme of Friendship." *Southern Review* VIII (March 1975): 39-50.
- Hinz, Evelyn. "Sons and Lovers: The Archetypal Dimension of Lawrence's Oedipal Tragedy." *D. H. Lawrence Review* V (Spring 1972): 26-53.
- Jones, Ernest. "The Oedipus-Complex as an Explanation of Hamlet's Mystery: a Study in Motive." *American Journal of Psychology* XXI (1910): 72-113.
- Lawrence, D. H. *Sons and Lovers*. New York: Viking, 1913.
- _____. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. 5 vols. Ed. James Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.
- _____. *Twilight in Italy*. London: Heineman, 1950.
- Lawrence, Frieda. *Not I But the Wind*. New York: Viking, 1934.
- Mendel, Sydney. "Shakespeare and D. H. Lawrence: Two Portraits of the Hero." *Wascana Review* III.2 (1968): 49-60.
- Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. New York: Avon, 1971.
- Mills, John A. *Hamlet on Stage: The Great Tradition*. London: Greenwood, 1985.
- Mitchell, Giles. "Sons and Lovers and the Oedipal Project." *D. H. Lawrence Review* 13.3 (Fall 1980): 209-219.

- Mortland, Donald E. "The Conclusion of *Sons and Lovers*: A Reconsideration." *Studies in the Novel* III (Fall 1971): 305-315.
- Nehls, Edward. *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*. Vol. 1. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1957.
- Nixon, Cornelia. *Lawrence's Leadership Politics and the Turn Against Women*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.
- Pittock, Malcolm. "Sons and Lovers: The Price of Betrayal." *Rethinking Lawrence*. Ed. Keith Brown. Milton Keynes: Open UP, 1990.
- Ruderman, Judith. *D. H. Lawrence and the Devouring Mother*. Durham: Duke UP, 1984.
- Sagar, Keith. *D. H. Lawrence: Life Into Art*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1985.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Ed. Harold Jenkins. London: Methuen, 1982.
- Schorer, Mark, ed. *D. H. Lawrence, Sons and Lovers: A Facsimile of the Manuscript*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1977.
- Simpson, Hilary. *D. H. Lawrence and Feminism*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 1982.
- Smith, Anne, ed. *Lawrence and Women*. London: Vision, 1978.
- Weiss, Daniel. *Oedipus in Nottingham: D. H. Lawrence*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1962.