

Original paper UDC 141.142:17.025.2Lawrence, D. H.  
165.745:316.462Nietzsche, F.

Received October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014

### **Vesna Stanković Pejnović**

Institute for Political Studies, Svetozara Markovića 36, RS–11000 Belgrade  
vesna.stankovic.pejnovic@gmail.com

## **Nietzsche's Shadow in *Sons and Lovers* by D. H. Lawrence**

### **Abstract**

*This paper analyses Friedrich Nietzsche's understanding of power as the will to power, of autonomy as self-becoming, and of dominance as self-overcoming. Wandering through the main thoughts of D. H. Lawrence's novel Sons and Lovers, this paper draws upon the main pillars of Nietzsche's philosophy and tries to ponder Nietzsche's understanding of power and his comprehension of any will to power. Nietzsche's understanding of the will to power is closely related to the process of the affirmation of life, the struggle for the achievement of nobility of spirit, struggle for the achievement of becoming "poets of our lives" and for creating law for ourselves, and to a constant struggle with life for life itself. Lawrence portrays the same perspective through the eyes of an artist, abounding with philosophical and psychological connotations. Lawrence provides his readers with a Nietzschean perspective of free spirits who try to overcome themselves and to create their own law for self-dominance and dominance over the world.*

### **Key words**

Friedrich Nietzsche, D. H. Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers*, will to power, autonomy, dominance

## **Introduction**

This paper aims to highlight three Nietzschean concepts that appear in D. H. Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers*, i.e. (a) the will to power as a force of life, (b) autonomy as self-becoming, and (c) dominance as self-overcoming. The paper considers various other sources which led Lawrence to Nietzsche's philosophy. The above concepts of the will to power, autonomy and dominance are interrelated. The will to power is the basis for achieving autonomy and a force that generates dominance. If one has no will to power, one is unable and unfree to create oneself. Increasing one's inner sense of power experienced by an individual is part of the process of self-overcoming. In philosophy, this concept of power was advanced by Friedrich Nietzsche in the form of *Übermensch* as the self-overcoming man. Probably no literary mind living in England during the first two decades of the twentieth century was left unaffected by Nietzsche's thought. It is not surprising that Lawrence was profoundly moved by him. Nietzsche, if properly interpreted, represents an intensely affirmative view of life. Lawrence, who criticised Europe for its "anti-life philosophy", would naturally have considered Nietzsche a guiding light.

Lawrence read German well, and it is not unlikely that his avid interest in Nietzsche led him to his original works.<sup>1</sup> The force that drives his self-crea-

1

Jessie Chambers, a close friend of Lawrence's, relates in her memoirs that he began

discussing Nietzsche in 1909. The Croydon Library had nine of Nietzsche's works at the



tion is his will to power. The fundamental principle, which Nietzsche called “Dionysian”, is actually a union of Dionysus and Apollo; a creative striving that gives force to itself. It seems appropriate to speak of a strong resemblance between his and Nietzsche’s ethics. From amongst early 20th century British writers, it is really only Lawrence who takes Dionysus as seriously as Nietzsche might have wished. Both Nietzsche and Lawrence offer elaborate worldviews, including political blueprints, based on thoroughgoing both metaphysical and personal irrationalism. Both were overwhelmed with the urgency of their “transvaluation” (in their later works, occasionally causing a shrill tone, a loss of moral balance, the most universal sign of the modern age). In their original, different yet basically similar way, both try to show that the relationship between life, philosophy and art is more profound and congenial. Friedrich Nietzsche expressed philosophic truths that artists such as Lawrence were capable of responding to. Although the way in which the philosopher expressed these truths was poetic, applying them to the dynamics of human relationships in a powerful work of fiction was the novelist’s task. Lawrence’s novel *Sons and Lovers* has accomplished this precisely. Lawrence gives flesh to the ideas voiced by Nietzsche and, in the process, creates characters of amazing psychological complexity.

As an artist, Lawrence’s main character, Paul Morel is potentially a Nietzschean creator. However, he allows his artistic sensibility to become misguided. He is a sensitive man and an artist, a person for whom one can feel compassion because of his inability to find himself, to cut ties with his mother and create himself as an autonomous person. Paul is not a common person, he is exceptional and powerful, but he manifests his will to power destructively. In a Nietzschean understanding, Lawrence is trying to show that the most spiritual men, as the strongest, find happiness where others would find destruction, namely in labyrinths, in rigorousness towards themselves and others. Lawrence’s art does emphasise the development of creation out of a solution and, therefore, what is at work is the creative self-emerging from the dissolution of an old condition. The dissolution of the condition signifies the death of the ego, and for this to happen, the will must be smashed if the creative self is to break free. Paul is in constant danger of becoming the modern egoist.

In his autobiographical novel *Sons and Lovers*, Lawrence places his young alter ego in the character of Paul Morel, who is caught in the crossfire between irreconcilable parents, the mother, an aspiring champion of culture, and the father, a “purely sensuous”, hard drinking miner. Paul is an artist, seeking to achieve fulfilled personality, united by Dionysian and Apollonian forces. Philosophical types feel that, behind everyday reality, there is another reality and that everyday reality is a mere semblance. Artistic types try to reach “beyond sun and stars”. The artist and the philosopher use semblance-images in interpreting life and in building an autonomous person capable of dominating over both the conscious and the unconscious, and over the world. Lawrence focuses the need for dominance in the novel, following Nietzsche, on the relationship and endless war between the two sexes.

### **Will to power as a force of the artistic life**

For Nietzsche, the will to power is the most fundamental feeling from which all emotions are derived. The will to power, as the “most primitive form of affect”,<sup>2</sup> is the feeling of our encounters with other forces, the experience of

quantity as quality. The concept of the will to power is neither that of being nor that of becoming, but that of *pathos* – the most elemental fact from which both becoming and effecting first emerge.<sup>3</sup>

The will is not only a complex of sensation and thought, but above all an effect, and in fact the effect of command.<sup>4</sup> The will to power is the will to ability, the spontaneous will necessary for the development of Dionysian consciousness, the transcendence of nihilism resulting from a break between the senses and the outspoken mind. The will to ability brings this condition into existence: a dynamic dualistic condition of self and other, freedom and imprisonment, self-centeredness and love. This form of freedom develops out of the destruction of the “will to nothingness”, given that the other form is possible only when the “will to nothingness” is no longer the impulse guiding life. Only a minority possesses this “will to ability”, which is opposite to the destroyed “will to nothingness”. The will to nothingness is commanded by the problematic emotion of fear. Fearful affects are a reaction to an actual or potential hurt or destruction of an organism; a reaction to the possibility of a loss of the thriving and persistence of an organism.<sup>5</sup> Lawrence describes some kind of “will to nothingness” in Paul’s case when his indecision seems to bleed off his energy.

“He had that poignant carelessness about himself, his own suffering, his own life, which is a form of slow suicide.”<sup>6</sup>

Lawrence explains the duality of energy by observation that Miriam believes that Paul had “desires for higher things”, but also for lower things, and that “desire for the higher would conquer”. However, she forgets that her “higher” and “lower” are arbitrary.<sup>7</sup>

For Nietzsche, the will to power is a system of “dynamic quanta”, in which the “quanta” are in a relationship struggling to overpower one another. This power must be commanded or balanced to promote a healthy individual. If it is not, and one force has excess power in deficient areas, then the individual is insufficient, sick or weak.<sup>8</sup> Nietzsche describes this substance as a “dynamic quantum” of energy and a “force” that is directed outwards to overcome, master or encapsulate other wills.

“This world is the will to power – and nothing besides! And you yourselves are also this will to power – and nothing besides!”<sup>9</sup>

time. They were as follows: *Beyond Good and Evil, Thus Spoke Zarathustra, Twilight of the Idols, The Antichrist, The Birth of Tragedy, The Future of Our Educational Institutions, Human, All Too Human, The Will to Power, and The Gay Science*. (Rose Marie Burwell, “Catalogue of D. H. Lawrence’s Reading from Early Childhood”, *D. H. Lawrence Review*, 3/1970, p. 207.)

2  
Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power* (hereinafter referred to as *WP*), 366, 688.

3  
*Ibid.*, 339, 635.

4  
Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil* (hereinafter referred to as *BGE*), 48.

5  
Erika KERRUISH, “Interpreting Feeling: Nietzsche on the Emotions and the Self”, *Minerva: An Internet Journal of Philosophy*, 13/2009, pp. 15–16.

6  
D. H. Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers* (hereinafter referred to as *SL*), p. 258.

7  
*Ibid.*, p. 229.

8  
John Richardson, *Nietzsche’s System*, Oxford University Press, New York 1996, pp. 39–43.

9  
F. Nietzsche, *WP*, 1067.

Thus, following this interpretation, we are a force of power. Mrs Morel hated Miriam because of the passion of her strong nature.<sup>10</sup> Regardless of whether power is described as an “effortful pursuit” or a drive to “overcome obstacles”, Nietzsche perceives people in an emotional state of one kind or another – there is no emotionally neutral state. The will to overcome an affect is itself only the will of either another or several other affects.<sup>11</sup> The will or the experience of willing (in self-mastery) is itself the product of various unconscious drives of affects.<sup>12</sup>

Mrs Morel understood freedom as a positive power, as a will to power, because she is a warrior.

“She could not be content with the little he [her husband] might be; she would have him the much that he ought to be. So, in seeking to make him nobler than he could be, she destroyed him.”<sup>13</sup>

In this process, she injured, hurt and scarred herself, but she lost none of her worth.

In his work, Lawrence interprets psychologically the will to power, emphasising the will to power as a second-order drive which influences first-order drives. This drive is “responsible” for overcoming or improving our desires, activities, and passions. For instance, if we desperately want to become something or have the desire to be an artist, depending on the will to power, we can be psychologically motivated to use our power to fulfil our desire, to overcome obstacles in the way and in the struggle within ourselves and the world, and become an artist. Nietzsche suggests this point in his *On the Genealogy of Morals* when he describes the will to power as “the strongest, most life-affirming drive”, and when he states that we are “obedient (...) to the same basic instinct”. From this perspective, the will to power is a drive in humanity and an instinct inherent in us. Paul Morel drew from his mother the warmth of life, the strength to produce; Miriam urged this warmth into intensity of a white light, but she is also very dangerous because

“She is one of those who will want to suck a man’s soul out till he has none of his own left (...). She will never let him become a man; she never will.”<sup>14</sup>

Her will to power is stronger than his.

The will to power is a positive motive which makes us strive for something. What is important for Nietzsche is that the will to power is a drive to overcome oneself or that it can be some kind of impulse. Lawrence shows how Paul Morel got the “force” from his mother, so

“... he (...) could feel her warmth inside him like strength. They were both very happy so, and both unconscious of it. (...) He was conscious only when stimulated. (...) he was stimulated into knowledge of the work he had produced unconsciously. In contact with Miriam he gained insight; his vision went deeper.”<sup>15</sup>

The will to power enables us to overcome ourselves by changing or growing, which reconstructs our entire being so that we have not only achieved a goal, but also changed something fundamental in ourselves. Lawrence’s view in Mrs Morel case is her thought:

“I don’t care who you are nor what you are, *I shall* have my own way.”<sup>16</sup>

She was stronger because her husband would always run away from battle, and the passion between them was deadlocked.

Lawrence declares that the “*Wille zur Macht* is a spurious feeling”.<sup>17</sup> It creates the man’s desire to venture within the unknown of the female, or in the case

of the woman the venture toward the sunrise and the brilliant active embrace of her husband. Lawrence describes the “shine” of the will to power in Paul’s eyes as a

“... peculiar heaviness of its [baby’s] eyes, as if it were trying to understand something that was pain. (...) Its deep blue eyes (...) seemed to draw her [mother’s] innermost thoughts out of her.”<sup>18</sup>

Lawrence holds that human existence is based on irreconcilable dualisms: between body and mind, between self and other, between instinct and morality, between Platonic body and soul. Both Nietzsche and Lawrence oppose this reductive dualism with a dynamic dualism, a shifting balance which repairs this condition of irreconcilability.

According to Nietzsche, there is no “being” behind doing – the deed is everything.<sup>19</sup> Lawrence shows this perspective through Miriam because she “want[s] to do something”, she “want[s] a chance like anybody else”, and everything the man has. She wants to learn.<sup>20</sup> According to Nietzsche, “knowing” is created as legislation, and the will to truth is the will to power.

The image of a healthy man, a truly powerful man, as presented by Lawrence, is the image of a Dionysian man who knows when to invoke reason and when to allow his intuitive faculty and his senses to predominate. Lawrence is eager to know the feelings of man and to become aware of new feelings. The energy one has and cannot use could destroy him. Feelings represent this kind of vital energy.

Both Lawrence and Nietzsche believed that the body–mind dualism is central to describing the human condition, since the relationship between the two polarities is crucial in determining what they consider to be life-giving and what life-denying. In *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche delineates the central polarity in terms of Greek deities. Namely, the opposing forces are Apollo, who contains “the glorious divine image of the principium individuationis”, the principle of individuation, and Dionysus, who is “brought home to us most intimately by the analogy of intoxication”, in which “the entire symbolism of the body is called into play”. Dionysus is a “mysterious primordial unity”, eternally suffering and contradictory, out of which Apollo, the cognitive mode of existence, arises as a necessity. Dionysus urges man to dissolve the distinction between man and man, and man and nature in an ecstatic participation in the irrational swirl of energy which lies beneath phenomena. Dionysian wisdom is the recognition of “the essence of nature”, which is a primordial

10  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 258.

11  
Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals* (hereinafter referred to as *GM*), III, 17.

12  
In slightly different terms, the theory of the will was developed by empirical psychologists an entire century after Nietzsche.

13  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 16.

14  
*Ibid.*, p. 160.

15  
*Ibid.*, p. 158.

16  
*Ibid.*, p. 26.

17  
Jessie Chambers indicates that Lawrence began discussing the will to power as if he had come upon “something new and engrossing” (Jessie Chambers, *D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record*, Barnes & Noble, New York 1965, p. 120.)

18  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 36.

19  
F. Nietzsche, *GM*, I, 13.

20  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 155.

flux of creation and destruction indifferent to its individual creatures. Apollo, as the *principium individuationis*, distances himself from the horror of the vision of the individual's annihilation by interposing a protective veil of self-contained art, ethical self-knowledge and self-moderation. Nevertheless, a balance between the two drives is necessary to sustain human life akin to Dionysian energy: an insatiable desire to manifest power by aggressively conquering and absorbing. Nietzsche unites Apollonian and Dionysian forces in his theory of the will to power.<sup>21</sup> In fact, he sees the entire world as an enormous force field made up of intersecting desires for power. The Dionysian indifference to the welfare of the individual is also apparent in this theory of the will to power. Nietzsche rejects the Darwinian belief that self-preservation is the basic instinct of life. Rather, self-preservation is a by-product of the will to power. The will to power is the urge to live through self-overcoming and self-creation.

The evolution of art is tied up with the duality between the Apollonian and the Dionysian, similarly to reproduction, where two sexes in perpetual conflict are brought together periodically in reconciliation. These are different natural drives "stimulating and provoking each other to give birth to ever-new, more vigorous offspring". For Nietzsche, the Apollonian and Dionysian are artistic powers, which erupt from nature itself without the mediation of any human artist.

According to Lawrence, the will to power is seen in a woman as a strange soft vibration in the air, going forth unknown and unconscious, and seeking a vibration of response. She is a discordant, jarring, painful vibration, going forth and hurting everyone within range. A man is a fountain of the vibration of life, quivering and flowing towards someone, something that will receive his outflow and send back an inflow, so that a circle is completed, and there is a sort of peace. Otherwise, he is a source of irritation, discord, and pain, harming everyone near him.<sup>22</sup> In his novel *Sons and Lovers*, Lawrence describes how Miriam was impressed with Paul, "discovered in him rare potentiality, discovered his loneliness". Her soul expanded into prayer beside him.<sup>23</sup> She is his worshipper and he caused her sorrow. Half the time he grieved her, and half the time he hated her. She was his conscience and this was too much for him.<sup>24</sup>

### Autonomy as self-creation

In *Sons and Lovers*, Lawrence starts to show a process of self-understanding, the consciousness of this rare freedom, this power over oneself and over fate, which in his case penetrated into the profoundest depths and became an instinct.

"Be yourself is the last motto."<sup>25</sup>

Nietzsche understands self-creation as the coming into being through the giving of rules or laws to oneself, which one holds onto by a "protracted will".<sup>26</sup> These laws are not explicit, symbolically represented rules, because Nietzsche stresses the uniqueness of the very active. Lawrence writes about "a new self or a new centre of consciousness".<sup>27</sup>

The highest type of free man should be sought where the greatest resistance is constantly being overcome: "five steps from tyranny, near the threshold of the danger of servitude".<sup>28</sup> Describing the self-creation as self-overcoming, Lawrence writes about Paul's irresoluteness regarding Miriam; he could not

leave her, because she did hold the best of him. He could not stay with her because she did not take the rest of him. Because of this, “he chafed himself into rawness over her”.<sup>29</sup>

Nietzsche proposes a programme of de-deification of nature, together with a naturalisation of humanity “in terms of a pure, newly discovered, newly redeemed nature”,<sup>30</sup> remaining faithful to the earth with the power of its virtue.<sup>31</sup> The same thought is expressed by Miriam who “could very rarely get into human relations with anyone: so her friend, her companion, her lover, was Nature”.<sup>32</sup>

A vitally important expression of a person is giving “style” to one’s character or “attain[ing] satisfaction to oneself”.<sup>33</sup> Giving style to oneself is a great and rare art, because we must be able to achieve a self-conception that is thoroughly satisfying, not merely our strengths, but also our weaknesses appear to us, necessary for a complete self that we can affirm in unity.

Nietzsche calls on us to be “poets of our lives” and emphasises that this is, first of all, about giving artistry to “the smallest, most everyday matters”.<sup>34</sup> Lawrence imagined the artist as someone who can reach “beyond stars and sun”, and has something evanescent. His main character in *Sons and Lovers* is Paul Morel, an artist. This understanding is very close to the Nietzschean Dionysian world-artist, the primordial unity itself as it creates the feeling in man of being a god who feels ultimate blissful pleasure in this creation. Art is joyous hope that the “spell of individuation can be broken” and that unity can be restored.

Every artist knows that, far from any feeling of letting himself go, his most “natural” state is – the free ordering, placing, disposing, and giving form at the moment of “inspiration”.<sup>35</sup> Lawrence sees some kind of inspiration in love relations because “together they received the baptism of life, each through the other”.<sup>36</sup>

As an aesthetic phenomenon, existence is still bearable to us, and art furnishes us with eyes and hands, and above all, a good conscience to be able to make

21  
Kenneth Asher, “Nietzsche, D. H. Lawrence and Irrationalism”, *Neophilologus*, 1/1985, pp. 15–16.

22  
D. H. Lawrence, *Late Essays and Articles* (hereinafter referred to as *LEA*), p. 299.

23  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 166, 167.

24  
*Ibid.*, p. 251.

25  
D. H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious; Fantasia of the Unconscious* (hereinafter referred to as *PU*), p. 105.

26  
F. Nietzsche, *GM*, II, 2.

27  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 252.

28  
F. Nietzsche, *Twilight of the Idols*, 38.

29  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 251.

30  
F. Nietzsche, *The Gay Science* (hereinafter referred to as *GS*), 161.

31  
F. Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, p. 188.

32  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 165.

33  
F. Nietzsche, *GS*, 290.

34  
*Ibid.*, 299.

35  
F. Nietzsche, *BGE*, 188.

36  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 361.

such a phenomenon of ourselves.<sup>37</sup> Art helped Paul to distinguish himself, but he was unaware in his own powers.<sup>38</sup> He had an internal struggle. Nietzsche valued artistry as the good will to appearance, as something necessary for supporting one's active immersion in life and for maintaining the will to self-responsibility. Successful artistry is also a form of self-discovery – it is the discovery within the lawfulness of one's actions. It is the will to overcome oneself, as a characteristic will to power or will to life.

As Nietzsche and Lawrence argue for a balance between the different modes of consciousness, they also advocate an art which entices a fusion between instinct and the conscious. Nietzsche conceives art as “the task of incorporating knowledge and making it instinctive”. The art of speech, Lawrence writes, is the use of symbols. The everyday world is an illusion. The world as such can never be experienced or expressed linguistically. Consciousness has been developed under pressure from the need for communication, so conscious thinking takes the form of words.

Nietzsche asserts that “we possess art lest we perish of the truth”.<sup>39</sup> It does not mean that we possess art instead of the truth, but we possess art so that we can possess the truth and not perish of it. Nietzsche is best understood as a conditional cognitivist – as someone who thinks of truth as valuable, but not as valuable no matter what. The criterion of the truth resides in the enhancement of the feeling of power. Because of this, the artist takes it upon himself to act as a legislator of values in society, for the total cultural pattern.<sup>40</sup> Art will tell him something horrible yet truthful about his existence, if only he would listen. Both Nietzsche and Lawrence agree that the task of art is to provide us with a new kind of knowledge: a synthesis of the conscious and unconscious. For Nietzsche, art makes life bearable; for Lawrence, art puts us in a new relationship with the universe.

In Lawrence's sense, all things, both human and inhuman, seek self-fulfilment beyond mere survival. In the same way as Nietzsche, Lawrence also advances the joyous affirmation of earthly existence, our own nature and that which is around us. The autonomous person is a free spirit who actualises drives towards self-overcoming and lives his life authentically. Man must be suppressed. Nietzsche pleads with us to be at least warriors. As each person struggles towards a sense of his own identity, it is uniformity that must be fought. According to Nietzsche, men who uncover the hypocrisy and excessive comfort of their age are the most admirable types because their reevaluation involves the courage to become conscious. The strength he possesses is an inner power.

The autonomous person strives successfully for mastery over his own passions, aiming for the highest possible state of self-perfection, because he develops a finer sense of his own humanity. The autonomous person constantly strives for self-overcoming, never compromising himself by accepting what others have defined as human. Nietzsche attacked the modern world because of its emasculated feature and blamed effeminacy on humanitarian ideals. Thus, we need a war of change that would replace morals with an artistic conception of life.

Asking himself what art is, Lawrence felt compelled to first say what man is. Art is a form of supremely delicate awareness. Art is the outcome of a true equilibrium between the Dionysian and Apollonian form of art. Man is anything from a forked radish to an immortal spirit. He is pretty much everything that ever has been or will be, absolutely human and absolutely inhuman.<sup>41</sup>



In terms of the ability of people to overcome mutual discord, we must look up to the highest man as the one who combines within himself the greatest versatility. The autonomous person has the capability to master his own passions. This self-awareness may make us noble. When a man's body has reached one of its periods of loneliness, and with a sure voice cries that it wants to be alone and intact, it is inevitably then that the accursed perversity of the spirit, the self-aware of itself, is bound to whip the unhappy senses into excitement and to force them into fornication.<sup>42</sup>

When Zarathustra returned to the mountains and to the solitude of his cave withdrawing from men, Nietzsche conceived of this withdrawal-return as a dynamic process of energy-gathering and energy-dispersing, as two polar forces in the recurring cycle of creative growth.<sup>43</sup> In Lawrence's view, Paul was in forced solitude after his mother's death. He lost someone with whom he faced the world.

"Now she was gone, and for ever behind him was the gap in life, the tear in the veil, through which his life seemed to drift slowly, as if he were drawn towards death."<sup>44</sup>

He was at a turning point in his life because he hesitated in the agony of which side to choose: the side of life or the side of death. In solitude, he decides not to take the side of darkness and follow his mother, but walked quickly through the faintly humming, glowing town.<sup>45</sup>

Zarathustra speaks of rebirth, not forgetting an awareness of childish naiveté. When a person is reborn, his old life dies, he forgets it. It is new wisdom that one discovers after one goes through a rite of passage. Nietzsche holds that man can develop a finer sense of humanity out of his inhuman qualities. By inhuman he means all that is awe-inspiring, that is, godlike. A visionary, a passionately driven artist, even a saint – they all manifest man's inhuman qualities. It is in this sense that Lawrence probably means "inhuman" activity.

We are unknown to ourselves, so we must seek knowledge of ourselves. First of all, a person must be a self-creator. We have no desire to say what men ought to be.<sup>46</sup> In other words, one must be capable of believing in the self that lies beyond the image that one has been conditioned to accept.

"Thou shalt – you ought to – you should – become the one you are."<sup>47</sup>

Even where he writes "be yourself" (*sei du selbst*) in *Schopenhauer as Educator*, he immediately outlines a tension with the present moment: "you are not really all that which you do, think and desire now".

37  
F. Nietzsche, *GS*, 107.

38  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 183.

39  
F. Nietzsche, *WP*, 822.

40  
David Thatcher, *Nietzsche in England 1890–1914*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1970, p. 228.

41  
D. H. Lawrence, *LEA*, p. 230.

42  
*Ibid.*, p. 169.

43  
James W. Hillesheim, "Action and Solitude: A Nietzschean View", *Educational Theory*, 4/1969, pp. 361–362.

44  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 407.

45  
*Ibid.*, p. 420.

46  
D. H. Lawrence, *PU*, p. 85.

47  
F. Nietzsche, *GS*, 270.

“Become the one that you are: that is a cry which is *always* only to be permitted among rare human beings, yet utterly superfluous for the rarest of those rare beings.”<sup>48</sup>

“Be yourself” seems to offer only encouragement and affirmation, only consent. It would thus seem, on this reading, that Nietzsche’s will to power is exactly a will to self-assertion or acceptance, lending credence to the historical legacy of being yourself, what you are, or of following your bliss. To become the one you are requires turning your own will upon itself. If the will cannot be a will against its own nature, if willing cannot become no willing, the will is powerless against time and is an “it was”.

To become what one is, one must take one’s own life over as an invention; even more importantly and at the same time, one must learn to love. To learn to love is to learn to bless and this love has an extraordinary meaning: it is as much human as it is divine.<sup>49</sup>

Nietzsche advocates a struggle for the improvement of ourselves beyond what we have ever achieved. He urges us to advance beyond this master morality<sup>50</sup> and become overman, without associating violence with the overman. Self-efficacy requires “resistance” or “obstruction”.<sup>51</sup> The autonomous individual wants to become a human being who is new, unique, incomparable, who gives himself laws, who creates himself.<sup>52</sup> Lawrence’s Paul is determined to “make a man whom nothing should shift off his feet; he was going to alter the face of the earth in some way which mattered”.<sup>53</sup> In some way, he is determined to become free. However, freedom is a very great reality. What is needed, above all, is achieving freedom from lies, freedom from oneself, from the lie of oneself, from the lie of one’s all-importance, even to oneself; it is freedom from the self-conscious and the self-enclosed. From the other side, freedom means moving away from the vast lie of the social world, the lie of purity and dirty little secrets.<sup>54</sup>

These Lawrence’s opinions are correlated with Nietzsche’s perspective that the gift of such benediction is the affirmation of the great and the small, “a yes-saying without reserve: to suffering itself, to guilt itself, to the most questionable and strangest in existence itself”, because “nothing that is can be subtracted, nothing is dispensable”.<sup>55</sup> An affirmation of pain and violence is not only inevitable, but also necessary, an affirmation of aging, death and change is also necessary, as a reconstitution of the process that brings such a change, absolved in itself as innocent, without fault.

According to Lawrence, “man is a changeable beast, and words change their meanings with him, and things are not what they seemed, and what’s what becomes what isn’t”.<sup>56</sup> When the great fight with man has almost come to an end, “is it because man has found a new strength, has died the death in his old body and been born with a new strength and a new sureness”?<sup>57</sup> At the end of the “fight” for love, Paul feels that he cannot bare Miriam’s love because her love smothered him.<sup>58</sup>

Lawrence holds that modern morality has its roots in hatred, a deep evil hate of the “instinctive, intuitional, procreative body”.<sup>59</sup> Because of that, people are no longer eager for life and man has been dodged, side-tracked. Tortured, cynical and unbelieving, he has allowed all his feelings to leave him, and what remains is a shell of a man, very nice, very pleasant and, in fact, the best of modern man. Nothing really moves him, except for one thing: threats against his own safety. He is terrified of not feeling “safe”. In this so framed and virtual world of reality, he keeps his woman there, namely between himself and the world of dangerous feelings and demands. Yet, he feels nothing. He

is only a creature, an empty shell, so far from being an autonomous human being.

### Dominance as self-overcoming

The true realisation of the will to power, genuine freedom, has been connected to self-overcoming. This drive towards self-overcoming inspires us to go beyond what we are today, what we are at this very moment. And for Nietzsche, this is life-affirming.

The goal of life is to overcome obstacles, and not merely to extend life as long as possible. Moreover, the will to power frequently causes us to take risks, overextend ourselves, and even sacrifice self-preservation. Nietzsche argues that consciousness, understood to be the ability to step back and observe ourselves in a particular situation, is a very late development in man.

Dominance over the weaker is an example of the will to power. Nietzsche explains that even the weakest of beings possess the will to power, but it is also expressed as tyranny, dominance, and oppression of others. Following Nietzsche, Lawrence points out that modern morality has its roots in hatred, a deep evil hate of the instinctive, intuitional, procreative body.<sup>60</sup> Nietzsche endorses mastery over others as a primary means of power, because the drive for power is something fundamentally real in everything.

“Life itself is an affair of aristocrats. In my soul, I’d be proud as he. As far as I am myself, Fierté, Inégalité, Hostilité.”<sup>61</sup>

Lawrence, much like Nietzsche, advocates “aristocracy of soul” as a product of an internal pathos of distance, a “mysterious” craving for multiplicity and stratification within the soul.

Nietzsche proposes a “going up” (*Hinaufkommen*) to nature that would also involve overcoming humanity. For this difficult task – demanding virtue without ethics and reverence without wings – Nietzsche thinks a new man is required, one who surpasses the present man: the free spirit, the Overman. The

48  
Friedrich Nietzsche, *Nachlass* 1876; *Sämtliche Werke. Kritische Studienausgabe*, ed. by G. Colli and M. Montinari, De Gruyter – DTV, Berlin 1999, 8, 19(40), p. 340.

49  
Friedrich Nietzsche, *Nachlass* 1884/1885; *Sämtliche Werke. Kritische Studienausgabe*, ed. by G. Colli and M. Montinari, De Gruyter – DTV, Berlin 1999, 11, 29(19), p. 341.

50  
F. Nietzsche, *BGE*, 260.

51  
F. Nietzsche, *WP*, 689, 693, 702.

52  
F. Nietzsche, *GS*, 335.

53  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 222.

54  
D. H. Lawrence, *LEA*, p. 251.

55  
Friedrich Nietzsche, *Ecce Homo (Birth of Tragedy)*, 2.

56  
D. H. Lawrence, *LEA*, p. 236.

57  
*Ibid.*, p. 362.

58  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 417.

59  
D. H. Lawrence, *LEA*, p. 192.

60  
*Ibid.*, p. 193.

61  
D. H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D. H. Lawrence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002, p. 213.

“will to life”, to self-overcoming, is akin to Lawrence’s favoured formulation of “singling out”. As Kaufmann explains,

“... the assumption is that the powerful and the impotent are both imbued with the will to power, and that extreme or prolonged oppression and frustration may easily pervert this drive and make the oppressed look for petty occasions to assert their will to power by being cruel to others.”<sup>62</sup>

Nietzsche accepts violence and dominance as one of the primary struggles for gaining the highest degree of power, claiming that growth is emphatically identified as “increased mastery” over others.

Lawrence’s concern with such a transformation was a major preoccupation of his for quite a number of years. It is significant that whenever he spoke of a new order in society, it was always in terms similar to those used by Nietzsche. We have created a great, almost overwhelming incubus of falsity and ugliness on top of us, so that we are almost crushed to death. Let us submit to the knowledge that there are aristocrats and plebeian born, not made.<sup>63</sup>

Nietzsche insists on great courage, because it is only the greatest act of courage that can bring one successfully to the final stage or “courage to be”. In a section of *The Will to Power*, “Nietzsche insists throughout that we must ‘employ’ (*in Dienst nehmen*) our impulses and not weaken or destroy them”.<sup>64</sup>

In the novel *Sons and Lovers*, Lawrence presents fight for dominance primarily through the man–woman relationship. For him, this relationship has a positive meaning in so far as it assists the couple in their mutual goal of achieving self-perfection.

According to Nietzsche, romantic love is absurd and lies. Love, just like any other feeling, is not within the individual’s power because feelings are involuntary and promises cannot be made based on something beyond our control. We softly grow tired of the old, of the one that we safely possess.<sup>65</sup> In correlation with this attitude, it is easy to see when Lawrence writes that Paul is tired of her and he was searching for “new sensation”, and “she remained alone with herself, waiting”.<sup>66</sup>

Lawrence holds that the woman felt that she is a higher moral being. Because of this, all the time she would be imagining something where there was nothing.

“She had known so much, and had told him so little.”<sup>67</sup>

For Nietzsche,

“The pleasure we take in ourselves tries to preserve itself by time and again changing something new *into ourselves* – that is simply what possession means.”<sup>68</sup>

Lawrence is aware of the notion that the woman should be submitted to this position, almost as a sacrifice.

“... her whole body clenched itself involuntarily, hard, as if against something; but Life forced her through this gate of suffering, too, and she would submit (...).”<sup>69</sup>

Lawrence observes that the man is not aware of the woman as a person, she is only a woman. Lawrence explains the act of voluntary sacrifice with the woman’s great love which she gives man. Because of this, he won and acquired dominance over her. In this possession, “her dark eyes, full of love, earnest and searching, made him turn away”; “he could not meet her gaze”; “his eyes, full of the dark, impersonal fire of desire, did not belong to her”; “she wanted to escape”; “she wanted him to look at her eyes full of love”.<sup>70</sup>

Nietzsche explains that sexual love most clearly reveals itself as a craving for new property: the lover wants the unconditional and sole possession of

the person he longs for; he wants to be the only beloved one, to live and to rule in the soul of the other as that which is supreme and most desirable.<sup>71</sup> In Lawrence's words, Paul was only like any other man, seeking satisfaction. For man's possession was "a great moment in life".<sup>72</sup> Miriam, as a woman, is arguing for something beyond, something more in him, something deeper.

Nietzsche holds that women naturally like peace and comfort, while men want the opposite; they welcome challenges and obstacles. Women hate to see men suffer and try to help ease life by removing obstacles; but this is very frustrating for men. As Lawrence rightly notes,

"... woman only works with a part of herself. The real and vital part is covered up."<sup>73</sup>

According to Nietzsche, "it is indeed amazing that wild greed and injustice of sexual love has furnished the concept of love as the opposite of egoism when it may in fact be the most candid expression of egoism".<sup>74</sup> In the novel, Lawrence describes that because of his wild greed Paul was not capable of being real with her, "he had to put aside himself and his desires".<sup>75</sup> Lawrence describes the ambivalence of love, domination, the conscious and the unconscious, with the following words:

"She hated her love for him from the moment it grew too strong for her. And, deep down, she had hated him because she loved him and he dominated her. She had resisted his domination."<sup>76</sup>

Love is only a part of creation and dominance. The ultimate goal is the creation of two individuals – two "single ones". Lawrence sees the energy of self-creation at times when a woman absorbs within herself, via uniting channels, one man's strength and energy.

"She did not want to meet him (...). She wanted to draw all of him into her."

This is the cause of "intensity like madness, which fascinated him, as drug-taking might".<sup>77</sup>

62  
Walter Kaufman, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1974, p. 194.

63  
D. H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, p. 248.

64  
W. Kaufman, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*, p. 225.

65  
F. Nietzsche, *GS*, I, 14.

66  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, pp. 299–300.

67  
Ibid., p. 298.

68  
F. Nietzsche, *GS*, I, 14.

69  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 284.

70  
Ibid., p. 284.

71  
F. Nietzsche, *GS*, I, 14.

72  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 284.

73  
Ibid., p. 416.

74  
F. Nietzsche, *GS*, I, 14.

75  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 290.

76  
Ibid., p. 296.

77  
Ibid., p. 194.

“Only the one who loves can be so attuned, as the lover catches a sensuality opening his/her senses into a sensibility veritably alive to everything in life.”<sup>78</sup>

Love begets love. If this were not so, love would be a very terrible thing.

Lawrence points out that “love is a great emotion”, and that power is quite another thing. However,

“... both love and power are based on wonder. Love without wonder is a sensational affair, and power without wonder is mere force and compulsion. The one universal element in consciousness which is fundamental to life is the element of wonder.”<sup>79</sup>

During the time of his wandering Paul was not dominated by Miriam. Because of this, he was “irritable, priggish and melancholic”.

“She spoilt his ease and naturalness. And he writhed himself with a feeling of humiliation.”<sup>80</sup>

During the Miriam's time of wandering, she did not realize him. He might be objected to because she never realized the male he was.<sup>81</sup>

According to Lawrence,

“What we want is life, first and foremost: to live, and to know that we are living. And you can't have life without adventure of some sort.”<sup>82</sup>

This perspective is very close to Nietzsche because, in tragic Dionysian ecstasy, we are happily alive, “not as individuals, but as the one living being, with whose procreative lust we have become one”.<sup>83</sup>

In *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche writes that moralities too are only a sign-language of emotions. In Lawrence's view, it was “purity” that prevented even their first lovers' kiss; “she could scarcely stand the shock of physical love, even a passionate kiss”.<sup>84</sup>

The real trouble with women is that they must always go on trying to adapt themselves to men's theories of women, which is what they have always done.

“When a woman is thoroughly herself, she is being what her type of man wants her to be.”<sup>85</sup>

In the love relationship between Paul and Miriam, Mrs Morel is petrified with fear because Miriam is not like an ordinary woman and she is not interested in adapting herself to men's theories of women. “She wants to draw him out and absorb him till there is nothing left of him, even for himself”; because of her domination, “he was uncertain of himself, insecure, an indefinite thing”.<sup>86</sup>

His mother hated her because he would never become a man standing on his own two feet – she would suck him up. She makes him so spiritual, and he does not want to be spiritual.<sup>87</sup> He felt that she wanted his soul out of his body, and not him.

Lawrence notes that the one thing he would not accept her as is a human being, a real human being of the feminine sex.

“A woman does not fight a man for his love – though she may say so a thousand times over.”<sup>88</sup>

Women have the logic of emotion; men have the logic of reason. She fights him because she knows instinctively that he is unable to love. He has lost his peculiar belief in himself, his instinctive faith in his own flow of life. Thus, he cannot love. Paul was afraid of her love for him. He does not have the courage to love. This love was too good for him; he was inadequate. “His own love was at fault, not hers”,<sup>89</sup> because the deepest of his love belonged to his mother. On the other hand, Paul realised that she dominated because she absorbs, she must fill herself up with love. This makes her negative.<sup>90</sup> By weaving the

character of Clara, Lawrence shows an ambiguity of attitude towards one's lover. Clara treated Paul as a hero, but thought of him as an infant, a foolish child. She was full of bitterness because he was away from her all the time, she had summed him up, had seen his littleness, his meanness, his lewd, false, inconsistent, despicable character. In spite of his weakness, Paul had exerted peculiar dominance over her. Her love was always a conflict.

## Conclusion

The language that both Nietzsche and Lawrence use is different from the language used by modern critics, but such "reverence" and humility seem to be another perspective of "materialist spirituality". In other words, they reject the duality of matter and spirit, whilst recognising that "materiality is already full of form, spirit, story, agency, and glory".<sup>91</sup> In an attempt to conceive a new way of life, to establish new values, we need a struggle to liberate human beings from the fixed, arbitrary control of ideals and into free spontaneity.<sup>92</sup> Therefore, the main aim of this paper was to shed light on Lawrence's work, and at the same time, to clarify certain misconceptions about Nietzsche's work.

His artistic sensibility allowed him to become misguided. Lawrence identified the male principle with culture-creating qualities and the female one with "natural" qualities. Thus, readers find themselves associated with the male principle through the following: the will to motion, change, activity, multiplicity and diversity, knowledge, mind, spirit, and light; and with the female principle through these: the will to inertia, stability, permanence, oneness, feeling, body, and darkness.<sup>93</sup>

Lawrence emphasises that creation inspires humanity to say "yes" to life. Nietzsche tells us to "create ourselves" by "inventing new values", but always in accordance with our inborn abilities and limitations. Nietzsche proclaims that, for the game of creation, a "scared 'yes' is needed". In his novel *Sons*

78  
Babette Babich, "Nietzsche's Imperative as a Friend's Encomium: On Becoming the One You Are, Ethics, and Blessing", *Nietzsche-Studien*, 33/2003, p. 56.

79  
D. H. Lawrence, *LEA*, p. 131.

80  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 179.

81  
Ibid., p. 189.

82  
D. H. Lawrence, *LEA*, p. 132.

83  
Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, 4.

84  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 179.

85  
D. H. Lawrence, *LEA*, p. 162.

86  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 193.

87  
Ibid., p. 188.

88  
D. H. Lawrence, *LEA*, p. 306.

89  
D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 208.

90  
Ibid., p. 218.

91  
Val Plumwood, *Environmental Culture*, Routledge, London 2002, p. 226.

92  
Émile Delavenay, *D. H. Lawrence and Edward Carpenter*, Taplinger, New York 1971, p. 231.

93  
D. H. Lawrence, *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence*, Viking Press, New York 1974, p. 446–448.

*and Lovers*, Lawrence underlines that “the game of creation” is a fiction that establishes value in life, allowing us to embrace life and derive strength from it. Nietzsche created the fiction of the will to power because he values humanity’s strength in life. Following perspectivism, the will to power is one perspective that Nietzsche offers as a means of envisioning the world.

According to Nietzsche, through the process of overcoming oneself, “you shall become the person you are”.<sup>94</sup> Nietzsche explains that each human being has a will to power and hence “belongs to the essence of what lives, as a basic organic function; it is a consequence of the will to power, which is after all the will of life”.<sup>95</sup> Lawrence allies himself with Nietzsche’s belief that our actions are determined in secret sessions of the dominances of wills to power, the decision of which the mind must await attentively so as to receive and react. Both Nietzsche and Lawrence try to influence people to learn to express their full potential.

Nietzsche sees that

“Love – in its means, war; at bottom, the deadly hatred of the sexes.”<sup>96</sup>

In Lawrence’s words, “something in him she hated, a sort of detached criticism of herself, a coldness which made her woman’s soul harden against him”.<sup>97</sup>

In the war for dominance, there is always a danger that he who fights with monsters should look to it that he himself does not become a monster. And when you gaze long into an abyss, the abyss also gazes into you.<sup>98</sup>

Nietzsche encourages us to be stronger and inspires us to become autonomous, individuals who possess such attributes as strength, bravery, and manners, and who aspire to live in a society in which there may be mercy for others. Self-mastery is not an achievement of a conscious “self” who contributes anything to the process, but merely an effect of interplay of certain unconscious drives, drives over which the conscious self exercises no control. What we suffer from today is a lack of a sense of our own wholeness or completeness, which is peace. What we lack, what the young lack, is a sense of being whole in ourselves. Lawrence fights against modernity in which we are taught to achieve a state of false peace, false strength and false power, and to become egoists in a negative sense. Egoists no longer have spontaneous feelings and can no longer be made to suffer humanly. This is herd or slave morality.

Nietzsche refers to master morality as a morality which endorses nobility, strength, honour, and the dominance of the weak. He contrasts this kind of morality with slave morality, a morality that espouses weak virtues, such as vengeance, pity and herd mentality. The three main characters, Paul, Paul’s mother and Miriam, are “free spirits”, each of who is on a different path, because every person is a unique human being with a noble spirit.

At the end of the novel, Paul is at a crossroads, because he can choose between the ability to nothingness and being “answerable for oneself, and proudly, and therefore to have the right to say yes to oneself”.<sup>99</sup> He is at a turning point in his life: to become a creature, an empty shell, or a creator, a free, autonomous human being capable of overcoming himself. Paul becomes free in the end, accepting and affirming himself as a whole, rather than seeing the necessity of character as an inhibition or obstacle to action.

Lawrence emphasises the thought that “to know means to lose”.<sup>100</sup> It is viewed as an irresistible formula of failures in our modern times, but also as a thought so much in contradiction with the Western culture, with the longing and believing that knowledge is the path to revealing new perspectives. He believes in one’s own forces as possibilities for the affirmation of life.



After mother's death, Paul recognises the condition and opportunity for true self-expression and for the expression of his inexhaustible energy. Constantly overcoming obstacles and challenges in life, people prove their strength of character which brings the greatest rewards and creativity.

People must become strong enough in themselves, powerful enough, to be creators, because "every strengthening and increase of power opens up new perspectives".<sup>101</sup> Lawrence shows on Paul's example that "the noble soul has reverence for itself"<sup>102</sup> and emphasises the value which both Nietzsche and Lawrence share – intense affirmation of life.

## References

Asher, Kenneth. "Nietzsche, D. H. Lawrence and Irrationalism", *Neophilologus*, 1/1985, pp. 1–16.

Babich, Babette. "Nietzsche's Imperative as a Friend's Encomium: On Becoming the One You Are, Ethics, and Blessing", *Nietzsche-Studien*, 33/2003, pp. 29–58.

Burwell, Rose Marie. "Catalogue of D. H. Lawrence's Reading from Early Childhood", *D. H. Lawrence Review*, 3/1970, pp. 193–330.

Chambers, Jessie. *D. H. Lawrence: A Personal Record*, Barnes & Noble, New York 1965.

Delavenay, Émile. *D. H. Lawrence and Edward Carpenter*, Taplinger, New York 1971.

Hillesheim, James W. "Action and Solitude: A Nietzschean View", *Educational Theory*, 4/1969, pp. 357–362.

Kaufman, Walter. *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1974.

Kerruish, Erika. "Interpreting Feeling: Nietzsche on the Emotions and the Self", *Minerva: An Internet Journal of Philosophy*, 13/2009.

Lawrence, D. H. *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious; Fantasia of the Unconscious*, Viking Press, New York 1974.

Lawrence, D. H. *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence*, Viking Press, New York 1974.

Lawrence, D. H. *Sons and Lovers*, Penguin Popular Classics, London 1995.

Lawrence, D. H. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D. H. Lawrence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002.

Lawrence, D. H. *Late Essays and Articles, The Cambridge Edition of the Letters and Works of D. H. Lawrence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2004.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil*, Vintage Books, New York 1966.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Vintage Books, New York 1966.

94

F. Nietzsche, *GS*, III, 270.

95

F. Nietzsche, *BGE*, 259.

96

F. Nietzsche, *Ecce Homo (Why I write such good books)*, 5.

97

D. H. Lawrence, *SL*, p. 345.

98

F. Nietzsche, *BGE*, 102.

99

F. Nietzsche, *GM*, II, 3.

100

D. H. Lawrence, *PU*, p. 66.

101

F. Nietzsche, *WP*, 616.

102

F. Nietzsche, *BGE*, 287.

- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy*, Random House, New York 1967.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Will to Power*, Random House, New York 1967.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Gay Science*, Vintage Books, New York 1974.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals; Ecce homo*, Vintage Books, New York 1989.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Twilight of the Idols and The Anti-Christ*, The Penguin Group, London 2003.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Sämtliche Werke. Kritische Studienausgabe*, ed. by G. Colli and M. Montinari, De Gruyter – DTV, Berlin 1999.
- Plumwood, Val. *Environmental Culture*, Routledge, London 2002.
- Richardson, John. *Nietzsche's System*, Oxford University Press, New York 1996.
- Thatcher, David. *Nietzsche in England 1890–1914*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1970.

### Vesna Stanković Pejnović

#### Nietzscheova sjena u *Sinovima* i *Ijubavnicima* D. H. Lawrencea

##### **Sažetak**

*Rad analizira Nietzscheovo razumijevanje moći kao volje za moć i autonomije kao samopostajanja, s jedne strane, te dominacije, kao samonadilaženja, s druge strane. Naglašavajući glavne misli Lawrenceova romana Sinovi i Ijubavnici, rad se oslanja na glavne stupove Nietzscheove filozofije, pokušavajući proniknuti u njegovo razumijevanje moći i svake volje za moć. Nietzscheovo razumijevanje volje za moć usko je povezano s procesom samoafirmacije, borbe za ostvarenje plemstva duha, te njegovim vlastitim riječima, pothvatom postajanja »pjesnikom vlastitog života« i stvaranjem vlastitih zakona te konstantnom borbom sa životom za sam život. Lawrence prikazuje istu perspektivu očima umjetnika s mnogo filozofskih i psiholoških konotacija. Lawrence dijeli sa čitaocima Nietzscheovu perspektivu shvaćanja slobodnog duha koji pokušava nadići sebe te stvoriti vlastite zakone samodominacije te dominacije nad svijetom koji ga okružuje.*

##### **Ključne riječi**

Friedrich Nietzsche, D. H. Lawrence, *Sinovi* i *Ijubavnici*, volja za moć, autonomija, dominacija

### Vesna Stanković Pejnović

#### Nietzsches Schatten in D. H. Lawrences *Söhne und Liebhaber*

##### **Zusammenfassung**

*Der Aufsatz analysiert Nietzsches Verständnis der Macht als Wille zur Macht und der Autonomie als Selbstwerdung einerseits, und der Domination als Selbstüberwindung andererseits. Indem er die Hauptgedanken von Lawrences Roman Söhne und Liebhaber akzentuiert, lehnt sich dieser Aufsatz an die Hauptsäulen der Philosophie Nietzsches an, wobei er seinen Standpunkt zur Macht und jeglichem Willen zur Macht zu ergründen sucht. Nietzsches Erfassung des Willens zur Macht ist eng verknüpft mit dem Prozess der Selbstaffirmation, des Kampfes um die Verwirklichung des Geistesadels. Sie ist, um es mit seinen eigenen Worten auszudrücken, ebenso verknüpft mit der Unternehmung, „Dichter des eigenen Lebens“ zu werden, sowie mit der Schaffung eigener Gesetze und dem Dauerkampf mit dem Leben um das Leben selbst. Lawrence stellt dieselbe Betrachtungsweise mit dem künstlerischen Auge dar, mit zahlreichen philosophischen und psychologischen Konnotationen. Lawrence teilt mit den Lesern Nietzsches Anschauung vom Verständnis des freien Geistes, der sich selbst zu überwinden und eigene Gesetze zu schaffen versucht, Gesetze der Selbstdomination und der Domination über die Welt, die ihn umgibt.*

##### **Schlüsselwörter**

Friedrich Nietzsche, D. H. Lawrence, *Söhne und Liebhaber*, Wille zur Macht, Autonomie, Domination

**Vesna Stanković Pejnović**

**L'ombre nietzschéenne dans *Amants et Fils* de D. H. Lawrence**

**Résumé**

*D'une part, ce travail analyse la compréhension nietzschéenne de la puissance comme volonté de puissance et l'autonomie comme auto-devenir, et d'autre part, il analyse la domination comme auto-dépassement. En accentuant les pensées principales du roman Amants et Fils de Lawrence, ce travail s'appuie sur les piliers principaux de la philosophie nietzschéenne et tente de pénétrer sa compréhension de la puissance et de chaque volonté de puissance. La compréhension de la volonté de puissance de Nietzsche est étroitement liée au processus d'auto-affirmation – lutte pour réaliser la noblesse de l'âme –, à une entreprise pour devenir « poète de notre vie » et à une création de nos propres lois, comme il l'affirmait lui-même, mais encore, à une lutte constante avec la vie pour la vie elle-même. Lawrence présente la même perspective à travers un regard d'artiste rempli de connotations philosophiques et psychologiques. Il partage avec Nietzsche sa perspective d'une conception de l'esprit libre qui tente de se dépasser soi-même et de créer ses propres lois d'auto-domination et de domination sur le monde qui l'entoure.*

**Mots-clés**

Friedrich Nietzsche, D. H. Lawrence, *Amants et Fils*, volonté de puissance, autonomie, domination