

The “Mesmerised States” of Becoming-Woman in D. H. Lawrence’s *The Virgin and The Gipsy*

Rahime Cokay Nebioglu *

Department of Western Languages and Literatures, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Turkey

Received on: 9-11-2020

Accepted on: 4-1-2021

Abstract

D. H. Lawrence introduces a new ontological dimension into his writing, emphasising the primacy of unbounded desire over oedipal structures situated in the social, political and sexual spheres. His writing often seeks to formulate unstructured, non-oedipalised, and non- binary relations to liberate life from its congealments and established boundaries, and to articulate it in its immanence. These new relations suggest a shift from “being” to “Deleuzian” becomings. *The Virgin and the Gipsy* (1930) is one of Lawrence’s novels in which characters are transposed into such becomings primarily in the form of becoming-woman. Becoming- woman in the novel calls for new modes of relationality going beyond the molar paradigms of sexual and religious identity imposed within the striated space of the Rectory house, and promises “mesmerised states” of transgression. This paper aims to investigate this affective trajectory of becoming-woman in Lawrence’ *The Virgin and the Gipsy* in the light of Deleuze and Guattari’s theories.

Keywords: Oedipalisation, Becoming-Woman, Lawrence, Deleuze and Guattari, Affect.

Introduction

Lawrence occupies a controversial position in feminism, being seen as one of “the most phallocratic” writers of all time. And yet, despite his salient virility, he is simultaneously one of those writers who, as Deleuze and Guattari point out, “become-women” in their *Thousand Plateaus*. (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 276). His writing produces various forms of becoming-woman capable of formulating unstructured, non-oedipalised, and non-binary relations. *The Virgin and the Gipsy* (1930) is one of such brief yet mighty writings in which Lawrence rehearses becoming-woman through his characters, particularly through the main character Yvette. In this novella, he proposes new modes of relationality that go beyond the molar paradigms of sexual and religious identity, and promises “mesmerised states” of transgression. This paper aims to trace these mesmerised states of becoming-woman in *the Virgin and the Gipsy* in the light of Deleuze and Guattari’s theories.

© 2023 JJMLL Publishers/Yarmouk University. All Rights Reserved,

* Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.15.3.7>

* Corresponding Author: rhmcky@gmail.com

Much ink has been spilt on Lawrence's oeuvre so far in feminist studies. Lawrence has always been a figure who is both admired and harshly condemned due to the complexities of his views. These readings of Lawrence remain important in drawing attention to the nuances of his attitude towards life, writing, women, sexuality, and race. But this paper departs from the earlier approaches by bringing Lawrence alongside Gilles Deleuze whose concepts are as controversial as those of Lawrence in feminist scholarship.

It is primarily Lawrence's critique of Freud that makes him interesting to Deleuze and that motivates this paper to read his work from a Deleuzian perspective. In his essays "Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious" (1921) and "Fantasia of the Unconscious" (1922), Lawrence displays a critical engagement with Freud, treating Freudian psychoanalysis as "a public danger" (2004a, 7). Lawrence sees psychoanalysis as a danger, for he believes that it is the new legitimized authority of the new century, producing its own problematic doctrines on the understanding of self and sexuality. Psychoanalysis is, for Lawrence, a fiction fabulating "[g]agged, bound, maniacal repressions, sexual complexes, fecal inhibitions, dream monsters", and these are "the horrid things that [eat] our souls and [cause] our helpless neurosis" (2004a, 9). Psychoanalysis is not a way of treatment but the primary source of our sicknesses. In his entire artistic enterprises, therefore, Lawrence strives to repudiate the taken-for-granted doctrines of Freudian psychoanalysis.

Among these doctrines, the Oedipus complex is perhaps the one Lawrence disavows most. For Lawrence, Freudian psychoanalysis functions just like religion, having its "priests", namely analysts, exert inhibitions on how people must perceive themselves, assume their identities, and perform their sexualities. All inhibitions begin with the Oedipus complex that is designed to repress desire. Desire is repressed because, as both Lawrence and Deleuze recognize, "every position of desire, no matter how small, is capable of calling into question the established order of a society; [...] desire is revolutionary in its essence [...] and no society can tolerate a position of real desire without its structures of exploitation, servitude, and hierarchy being compromised" (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 116). The Oedipus complex is one such structure to trap desire in the mommy-daddy-child triangle, reducing it to what Lawrence calls "dirty little secret" of the nuclear family (Lawrence 2004b, 243). It is not a state of unhealthy desire, but a tool in the service of the dominant power. As Lawrence contends, psychoanalysis, thanks to its Oedipuses, flattens desire and congeals its flows into rigid forms of gender and sexuality which rest upon a set of dichotomous oppositions. The maintenance of these forms is typically achieved through threats of being labeled "abnormal" or "unhealthy" that needs to be cured, and the practice of cure is simply another process of Oedipalisation where the analyst, or the priest in Lawrence's terms, performs as the new phallic father.

Against the insidious operation of psychoanalysis, Lawrence assumes a schizoanalytic task to destroy all the representatives of Oedipus, liberate the flows of desire from their entrapment in the familial domain, and overturn all the normative categories concerning gender and sexuality. To this end, Lawrence writes about and writes against the family in his novels and novellas because Oedipalisation begins first in the nuclear family and then expands to the social and political sphere. This is indeed the point where Lawrence becomes woman in his writing in Deleuzian terms.

Becoming-Woman of Lawrence

The question to pose at this point should perhaps be what is meant by becoming-woman in Deleuzian sense and why Deleuze thinks Lawrence becomes woman in his writing. As Rosi Braidotti demonstrates, the Deleuzian notion of becoming is "the affirmation of the positivity of difference, meant as a multiple and constant process of transformation" (1993, 44). Transformation hereby does not suggest a transition from one state to another or a teleological move towards a particular model. It rather stands for what "deviates from the model" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 106), calling for incessant mobility, fluidity, and multiplicity. It implies the pure movement which passes through the supposedly binary poles and fixed terms only to replace them with the continual production of affirmative difference. Becoming designates a desire and capability to resist the majoritarian in favor of the minoritarian, the molar in favor of the molecular, the oedipalisation in favor of the orphanage, the sedentarism in favor of nomadism, binaries in favor of multiplicities as Deleuze and Guattari suggest in their entire philosophical heritage.

For Deleuze and Guattari, "all becomings begin with and pass through becoming-woman" (1987, 277). Becoming-woman is the "first quantum" of all the other becomings. This is precisely because man has always taken himself as the presence, the standard and the logos while woman has been positioned as the first and earliest other, falling into the other leg of the binary and representing the absence and the deviant. In Elizabeth Grosz's words, woman has been "the projection of [men's] fantasies" (1994, 176), and becoming-woman represents the dismantling of all these fantasies along with "molar sexualities, molar identities, definite sexual positions as the prevailing social order defines them" (1994, 177). Becoming-woman is not an "imitation" of womanhood, a "resemblance" to woman or an "identification" with woman (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 237). It rather is a transgression of all the existing categories of identity, subjectivity, gender and sexuality, which, for Deleuze and Guattari, manifests in the "atoms of womanhood" (1987, 276). This, however, does not mean that becoming-woman is peculiar to women only, or all women necessarily go through becoming. Becoming-woman can be experienced by any, be it a man, woman or transgender, who recognises and actualises its potentialities to resist and to create. Becoming-woman is the primary stage of resistance and creation of the new. Accordingly, it is typically followed by other becomings until one truly achieves to overcome oneself and reach the point of what Deleuze and Guattari call "imperceptibility" (1987, 280).

In this regard, Lawrence's becoming-woman indicates his capacity as a writer to go beyond the molar impositions that rest upon the oedipalisation of desire and the reduction of difference into dualistic forms, and to propose new adjustments of life and being. Through his becoming-woman as a writer, his writings offer an affective politics that would increase the power in his reader to act against oppressive power structures of any kind. The affective politics of becoming-woman in Lawrence's writings can often be traced in the affective agency of his characters who establish contact zones wherein they are affected by and affect one another for a transformative action.

Affective States of Becoming-woman in *The Virgin and The Gipsy*

The Virgin and the Gipsy is one of Lawrence's works in which he comes closest to the becoming-woman of writing by transmitting affective intensities that would de-oedipalise imposed identities and hierarchised relations between men and women. The novella, which was written in 1926 and posthumously published in 1930, tells the story of Yvette, the youngest member of the Saywell family: Yvette's mother, Cynthia, elopes with another man, and the Saywell family (Yvette, her elder sister Lucille, and her vicar father Arthur/the Rector), moves to the Midlands where they begin to live with Yvette's grandmother Mater, and malevolent aunt, Cissie. Feeling herself extremely suffocated by the new atmosphere of the Saywell family in the Midlands, Yvette admires the life of a gipsy family whom she meets on one of her outings. While her desire for a more liberated and more vivid life turns the Rector and Mater against Yvette, a flood sweeps the Rectory house and kills Mater who is the centre of the Saywell family.

Lawrence portrays the Saywell family as a typical nuclear family where the Rector and Mater appear as the Oedipal figures administering the repression of desire and the full control of desiring-production within the family. Lawrence meticulously links the idea of repression to religion through the presence of the Rector in the Saywell family. The link Lawrence establishes between religion and the repression of desire can be interpreted in the light of those words uttered by Deleuze and Guattari: "every time desire is betrayed, cursed, uprooted from its field of immanence, a priest is behind it. The priest cast the triple curse on desire: the negative law, the extrinsic rule, and the transcendent ideal" (1987, 154). That is, the priest negates desire by suffusing it with lack, shame, and guilt. It is, therefore, no accident that Arthur both as the father and the Rector literally and symbolically acts as the bearer of the Law (of the father), the Logos. He takes on the mission of molding her daughters into submissive and loyal subjects. This mission is shared by the Mater in the family. The Mater is not only an acting figure of Oedipus but also an oedipalised woman who has incarnated the molar identities, roles and relations. Despite her female gender, ironically, her power even surpasses that of the Rector in regulating and controlling the family. As stated in the novel, "The Mater, of course, [is] the pivot of the family. The family [is] her own extended ego. Naturally, she cover[s] it with her power. And her sons and daughters, being weak and disintegrated, naturally [are] loyal" (Lawrence 2005, 6-7).

The Rectory house where the Saywell family lives is a highly striated space which, as Deleuze and Guattari define, is "both limited and limiting": "it is limited in its parts, which are assigned constant directions, are oriented in relation to one another, divisible by boundaries" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 383). The Rectory house is structured around strict boundaries that literally and metaphorically suffocate the main character, Yvette. This is implied in the novella through the constant references to "airlessness" and "closed windows." The following lines perhaps best summarize the limiting nature of the striated space of the Rectory house:

...in a nervous exasperation Yvette would open the window. The room was never fresh, she imagined it smelt of Granny. And Granny, who was hard of hearing, heard like a weasel when she wasn't wanted to. 'Did you open the window, Yvette? I think you might remember there are older people than yourself in the room,' she said. [...]

The "Mesmerised States" of Becoming-Woman in D. H. Lawrence's *The Virgin and The Gipsy*

The rector, in silence, marched to the window and firmly closed it. He did not look at his daughter meanwhile. [...] But she must know what's what! (Lawrence 2005, 10-11)

There are several moments in the novella in which the images of "breathlessness", "suffocation", "closedness", "imprisonment", and "airlessness" recur. All these images help to mark the egoistical, familial and religious boundaries surrounding and ensuring the power of Granny and the Rector, that is, Oedipuses incarnate. And "what is limiting" about this striated space is, as Deleuze and Guattari put it, "this aggregate in relation to the smooth spaces it 'contains,' whose growth it slows or prevents, and which it restricts or places outside" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 383). The Rectory house is a sedentary place defined constantly by its stability, rigidity and immutability, and yet the maintenance of this stability and the Oedipal power relies not only upon the physical and metaphorical walls and boundaries but also upon a discourse that formulates a couple of oppositions beginning with the one between inside and outside and continuing with others such as normal/abnormal, insider/outsider, clean/unclean, pious/impious, and chaste/unchaste. The following brief line in the novella is worth pausing upon to understand this situation: "Outside the family, what was there for them but danger and insult and ignominy? Had not the rector experiences it, in his marriage? So now, caution! Caution and loyalty, fronting the world!" (Lawrence 2005, 7). The insiders of the Rectory house are expected to yield to the tradition of loyalty whereas the outsiders are harshly categorized and denounced as abnormal, dangerous, unclean, unchaste and impious. But what about Yvette? Is she an insider? Or a trespasser? Or a complete outsider?

From the very first pages of the novella, Yvette is portrayed as a vector of deterritorialization, enacting several states of becoming-woman in and through her affective encounters with the "outsiders". These affective encounters, despite immediately turning her into "an outsider" in the eyes of the Rector and Mater, are indeed "visceral points" and "hunches" that trigger her capacities to act and change (Hickey-Moody 2013, 81). Yvette's affective encounters with the outsiders and the idea of outside-ness make her think differently about herself, and prompt her to transform herself and her relation with her environment. Her transformation becomes possible only when she gradually begins to move from negative affects such as anger and frustration towards positive affects that empower her. It is this move that makes her realize new possibilities of being and living. It is this move that opens up her becoming-woman.

To comprehend Yvette's becoming-woman better, it is indeed essential to understand the figure of the girl she embodies in Deleuzian terms. For Deleuze and Guattari, the figure of the girl is "the first victim" of Oedipalisation because the "body is stolen first from the girl: Stop behaving like that, you're not a little girl anymore, you're not a tomboy, etc." (1987, 276). This is primarily because girls pose the biggest threat to authority as they are pre-Oedipal. Thus, their bodies should be stolen and turned into organisms that would willingly assume the molar identities, relations and roles imposed on them. This immediately applies to the position of Yvette. Yvette is the youngest girl of the Saywell family aged only nineteen, and hence a flow of desire, a vast potentiality that needs to be restrained, repressed and regulated. What is more, she resembles her mother, Cynthia, the first resistant dissenter of the Saywell

family, “a great glow, a flow of life” (Lawrence 2005, 5) that chooses not to be imprisoned within the striated space of the vicarage any more. Yvette’s threatening potentiality against authority is indicated in the following lines in the novella: “[The Mater’s] great rival was the younger girl, Yvette” (Lawrence 2005, 5). Within the familial milieu, she is pushed to assume her molar identity as a submissive girl who must yield to the egoistical, religious and sexual inhibitions exerted by her Oedipal Father and Granny. Within the social milieu, she is pushed to assume her molar identity as “a vehicle for (pederastic) fantasy” as “pure innocence,” and as “a romantic or representative figure” (Grosz 1994, 174) whose presence is reduced to her virginity only. In either case, as Grosz rightly notes, the young girl is “the site of a culture’s most intensified disinvestments and re-castings of the body” (1994, 175). That is, she is forced to become a molar, Oedipal woman just like the Mater who is now the Oedipus incarnate, and Aunt Cissie, who has “ceased to be Cissie, [losing] her life and her sex” (Lawrence 2005, 6).

“But conversely,” as Deleuze and Guattari underline it, “becoming-woman or the molecular woman is the girl herself” (1987, 276). The girl is “an abstract line, or a line of flight”: “[the girl does] not belong to an age group, sex, order, or kingdom: [she] slip[s] in everywhere, between orders, acts, ages, sexes; [she] produce[s] n molecular sexes on the line of flight in relation to the dualism machines [she] cross[es] right through” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 277). Due to her multiplicity, vagueness and inbetweenness, the girl does not become; it is “the becoming itself that is [...] a girl” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 276). Thus, the affects of of becoming-woman already manifest in Yvette herself as the figure of girl. And yet the unleashing of these affects passes through some states, and is fully achieved through the forces of her encounter with other outsiders.

The first state of Yvette’s becoming-woman is projected through the affects of temper, exasperation and repulsion. Yvette has a quick-tempered spirit and perpetual exasperation against the pseudo-morality of the Rectory house and the patriarchal society. Her temper and exasperation display her genuine search for a “pathway to a deeper, non-binary level of being, and concept of human behaviour” (Monaco 2008, 56). This, of course, becomes possible primarily by dismantling the binary formation of identity and sexuality. The position of the young girl as the object of male desire and male gaze repulses her. She frequently uses the image of “beast” to describe her repulsion. She knows that men do not see her, i.e., her true self, but they see her only through her virginity. She finds it beastly to be desired by me, to become the sexual object of male desire. That’s why, she often says “I hate fellows who adore me!” (Lawrence 2005, 7). She rejects Leo’s marriage proposal. She never dreams of “such an impossible thing” (Lawrence 2005, 38) for she does not want to move from one anchorage to another, seeing both the Rectory and the institution of marriage simply as a prison. Yvette’s rejection is, however, not a rejection of sexuality for the sake of being asexual. On the contrary, she “should like to fall violently in love” (Lawrence 2005, 7), but she wants to have the full agency of her female desire and her sexuality. She does not want to be transformed into one single identity, that is, molar woman, whose sexuality is defined by her male counterpart. She rather believes that “[m]an or woman is made up of many selves” (Lawrence 2005, 63), man or woman is a flux rather than a fixed entity, and sexuality is as multiple as these multiple selves and fluxes.

The "Mesmerised States" of Becoming-Woman in D. H. Lawrence's *The Virgin and The Gipsy*

Here indeed we hear the voice of Lawrence, emphasizing the molecular nature of desire and sexuality. Lawrence denounces "the reduction of sexuality to the pitiful little familialist secret" (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 292). Thus, he "shows in a profound way that sexuality, including chastity, is a matter of flows, an infinity of different and even contrary flows" (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 351) As Deleuze and Guattari continue, "Lawrence attacks the poverty of the immutable identical images, the figurative roles that are so many tourniquets cutting off the flows of sexuality: 'fiancee, mistress, wife, mother' [...] all these roles are distributed by the Oedipal triangle, father-mother-me, a representative ego thought to be defined in terms of the father-mother representations, by fixation, regression, assumption, sublimation" (Deleuze and Guattari 1983, 351).

In *The Virgin and The Gipsy*, the affective chain that characterizes Yvette's early state of becoming-woman inholds predominantly negative affects. The affective assemblage she builds among these negative affects such as temper, exasperation and repulsion, despite signalling Yvette's resilience and determination, still drags her down, and drains her energy to take action and achieve a complete sense of becoming. Becoming is, as Deleuze defines, "an encounter between two reigns, a short-circuit, the picking-up of a code where each is deterritorialized" (Deleuze and Parnet 2007, 44). Becoming requires an encounter with positive affects that would increase one's power to act. As such, Yvette's becoming-woman is fully actualised only after she encounters other multiplicities represented by the Jewess and the Gipsy family and only after her fluxes combine with those of the Jewess and the Gipsies. Yvette as the figure of the pre-oedipal girl has always had the inherent capacities to become-woman and has always been impressed by the idea of transgression, as observed in her affective trajectory symbolized in her temper, exasperation and continual attempt to open the windows of the Rectory house. It is, however, not until Yvette's encounter with other outcasts and outsiders that she could turn negative affects into positive affects and increase the power in herself to take action and transform at the cost being an outcast herself.

Here Lawrence's choice of the Jewess and the Gipsies as the stimulus of Yvette's becoming-woman is quite telling. The Jews and the Gipsies are considered as the racial and religious other in Lawrence's conventionally Christian society, both being frequently attributed with the stereotypical tropes of dirt, immorality, lawlessness and animalism. Even if Lawrence cannot entirely escape some problematic implications in the portrayal of the Jews and the Gipsies, he still subverts these pejorative tropes and affirms these communities as the inspiration for Yvette's becoming-woman. What connects the Jews and the Gipsies in the novella is their minoritarian position. Throughout history, they have been bereft of their histories and their homes and pushed to pursue a nomadic life. The nomadic and minoritarian position of the Jews and the Gipsies, however, does not necessarily suggest negativity. The minorities and the nomads are indeed "multiplicities which are capable of following lines of flight and of forming war machines" (Watson 2010, 174). They operate in opposition to the state apparatus and refuse to participate in its hierarchical structures in and through which life's essential energy and flows are halted or misoriented. They, in this sense, represent an affective politics that embraces endurance and nomadism not as a means of survival but as a means of resistance and as a call for transformation. It is exactly this affective trajectory of the Jewess and the Gipsies that mesmerises Yvette to enter her own becoming by

transforming negative affects of temper, exasperation and repulsion into positive affects of admiration and empowerment.

To begin with the Jewess, Mrs. Eastwood, she is an independent woman who, despite the societal pressure and prejudices, chooses to pursue her life and enact her sexuality as she desires. Although she is still officially married, she lives with another man, looking forward to her divorce and having custody of her children. As stated in the novel, Yvette is rather mesmerised by the Jewess not simply because she pursues an unusual life and becomes the agency of her female desire but also because she is the opposite of the false morality, that is, everything the Rectory house represents. That is why Yvette's intimacy with the Jewess terrorizes the Rector who is "fanatically afraid of the unconventional", and makes him threaten Yvette with asylum.

Yvette's interaction with the Gypsies creates a much more mesmerising effect on her becoming-woman. Many scholars tend to read Yvette's becoming-woman as a physical attraction towards the Gipsy man and as a possible sexual intercourse. It is largely Lawrence's own making that this text falls prey to such two-dimensional readings. Despite his opposition to Freudianism which feeds on symbolism, Lawrence is a writer very much fond of symbolism. In *The Virgin and The Gipsy*, as such, he builds up Yvette's becoming-woman through a symbolic metamorphosis from virginity to womanhood. It is true that Yvette's becoming-woman is structured around some symbols that imply the unleashing of her female desire and the loss of her virginity. But it is still problematic to reduce her connection with the Gypsies to sexuality only. This is firstly because the implied sexual intercourse does not take place at all. Secondly, Yvette's admiration for the Gipsy man is not simply a sexual desire. As Irving Singer rightly recognizes, through the intimacy between Yvette and the Gipsy man, "Lawrence means more than merely sexual impulse. He also means the desire to exist, to assert one's self, to live in accordance with one's nature, to sense one's instinctual being and to gratify it" (1984, 228). That is, it is a desire to endure and grasp life in its immanence. Here is a lengthy passage from the novella that clearly displays Yvette's motives for admiring the Gipsy man:

She saw the gipsy twice. [...] Being of a race that exists only to be harrying the outskirts of our society, forever hostile and living only by spoil, he was too much master of himself, and too wary, to expose himself openly to the vast and gruesome clutch of our law. He had been through the war. He had been enslaved against his will, that time. So now, he showed himself at the rectory, and slowly, quietly busied himself at his cart outside the white gate, with that air of silent and forever-unyielding outsideness which gave him his lonely, predatory grace. [...] Such as herself ? [...] She liked him. She liked the quiet, noiseless clean-cut presence of him. She liked that mysterious endurance in him, which endures in opposition, without any idea of victory. And she liked that peculiar added relentlessness, the disillusion in hostility, which belongs to after the war. Yes, if she belonged to any side, and to any clan, it was to his. (Lawrence 2005, 61)

What she likes about the Gipsy man is the nomadism he represents, his endurance in opposition, his relentlessness, his being a war machine against the State, his refusal to be structured

The "Mesmerised States" of Becoming-Woman in D. H. Lawrence's *The Virgin and The Gipsy*

within the system, and finally his will to power for life. Hers is "a fascination for the outside" as an escape from the inside of the Rectory. As such, what she observes about the gipsy family during her first encounter stands in stark opposition to the Saywell family. Against the strictly striated space of the Rectory house, the Gipsy caravan represents the smooth space Yvette has been longing for. She hates "those houses with their indoor sanitation and their bathrooms, and their extraordinary repulsiveness. She hate[s] the rectory, and everything it implie[s]. The whole stagnant, sewerage sort of life, where sewerage is never mentioned" (Lawrence 2005, 27). The structuredness, stability, and order of the Rectory, for Yvette, are what exactly stops the flows of life and makes life intolerable, and the facilities such as sewerage and sanitation are nothing but the symbols of the sedentariness of the life in the Rectory. Sedentary life is a life where movement is restricted between the points determined by the Oedipal figures, that is, in Yvette's case, by the Rector and the Mater. The Gipsy caravan, however, occupies a smooth space, and promises a liberation, a line of flight from order, stability and structuredness. The life of the gipsies is a nomadic one, "the reverse of what happens with the sedentary" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 380). Not surprisingly, nomadic life is often described with the images of fresh air unlike the airlessness representing the inside of the Rectory for it is a life that is liberated from its capture, a life that glows in its flows. And Yvette's desire for the gipsy life is what triggers her to liberate her own flows of desire and intensities.

Yvette's gradual move from the imprisoning anchors of being (in the Rectory) towards her becoming-woman after her encounter with the Gipsies can be traced particularly in three textual marks: First, she no longer undergoes fits of temper and exasperation even within the Rectory. Second, she begins to experience time differently because, as Grosz underlines it, becoming has its own duration. Becoming occurs not on the level of *chronos* (that is, linear time progressing from the past towards the future) but on the level of *aion* (that is, a molecular time inclusive of multiple time zones or what Bergson calls duration). Yvette's claiming of her own duration against the linear time becomes most clear in the scene where she sees her friends waiting outside for hours for her to come out of the caravan, and asks "Did it seem long?" Third, she begins to feel her "soul in its flows", feel herself more potent, and make frequent references to her virginity. Her virginity here does not suggest a patriarchal implication but rather becoming-woman in the figure of the girl that is, as Deleuze and Guattari put it, "certainly not defined by virginity; [but] defined by a relation of movement and rest, speed and slowness, by a combination of atoms, an emission of particles: haecceity" (1987, 276). She becomes much more courageous in resist her continuing enculturation and oedipalisation, which is best epitomized in the scene where the Rector threatens her with to send her to the asylum.

These states of Yvette's becoming-woman help us to understand the nuances of her intimacy with the Gipsy family. It is the Gipsy man that she is fascinated with; she bears a fascination for the entire Gipsy family, "for the pack, for multiplicity" because "the multiplicity that fascinates [Yvette]" is "already related to a multiplicity dwelling within [her]" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 239-240). This affective encounter with other multiplicities enables her to embrace her own multiplicity and actualize her becoming-woman. The actualization of Yvette's becoming-woman does not take place through a sexual

intercourse with the Gipsy man, as many wrongly assume, but through the flood that sweeps away the Rectory and kills the Mater, the Oedipus incarnate. The flood in the novella becomes a powerful image of the victory of nature over culture, flows of life over false morality, instability over stability, becoming over being.

As many scholars agree, the novella certainly suggests an awakening, but it is not simply sexual awakening of a young girl to become woman in molar terms, but an awakening that contains a revolutionary tenor to dismantle the Oedipal theatre of repression in the form of the family, destroy the rigid hierarchies of socially constructed binaries, break away from the boundaries and affirm life in its immanence.

"الحالات المفتونة" للتحوّل إلى امرأة في رواية دي إتش لورانس (*العذراء والعجبر*)

رحيمة تشوكاي نيبويغلو

قسم اللغات والآداب الغربية، جامعة أنقرة حجي بيرم ولي، تركيا

الملخص

يقدم دي إتش لورانس في كتاباته بعداً وجودياً جديداً، حيث يؤكد فيها على أولوية طغيان الرغبة غير المقيدة على الهياكل "الأوديبيّة" (oedipal structures) السائدة في المجالات الاجتماعية والسياسية والجنسية. وتعتمد كتاباته في كثير من الأحيان إلى صياغة علاقات غير منظمة وغير أوديبيّة وغير ثنائية لتحرير الحياة من جمودها وحدودها الراسخة، والتعبير عنها في حيثياتها حتمية الحدوث في المستقبل القريب. وتشير هذه العلاقات الجديدة إلى تحول من "الوجود" القائم (being) إلى "الصيورة" الديلوزية (Deleuzian "becomings"). فرواية (*العذراء والعجبر*) (1930) هي إحدى روايات لورانس التي تُنقل فيها الشخصيات إلى مثل هذه الصيرورة في المقام الأول في شكل صيرورة امرأة. حيث تتطلب الدعوة إلى "التحول إلى امرأة" في الرواية إلى وجود أنماط جديدة من العلاقة تتجاوز النماذج القاطعة تماماً للهوية الجنسية والدينية المفروضة داخل المساحة المخطط لها في بيت القسيس، وتعد - بالمقابل - بـ "حالات مفتونة" من الانتهاكات للوضع القائم. لذا، تهدف هذه الورقة البحثية إلى التحقيق في هذا المسار العاطفي للتحوّل إلى امرأة في رواية لورانس (*العذراء والعجبر*) من منظور نظريتي دولوز وجواتاري.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المرأة الكاتبة، التحوّل إلى امرأة، لورانس، دولوز وجواتاري، التأثير

References

- Braidotti, Rosi. 1993. Discontinuous Becomings. Deleuze on the Becoming- Woman of Philosophy. *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 24 (1): 44-55.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 1994. *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1983. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (1972)*. trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis and London: U of Minnesota P.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (1980)*. trans. Brian Massumi, . Minneapolis and London: U of Minnesota P.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Claire Parnet. 2007. *Dialogues II*. trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Columbia UP.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. 1994. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP.
- Hickey-Moody, Anna. 2013. Affect as Method: Feelings, Aesthetics and Affective Pedagogy. In *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*, ed. R. Coleman and J. Ringrose, 79–95. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
- Lawrence, David H. 2004a. *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and the Fantasia of the Unconscious*. ed. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. .
- Lawrence, David H. 2004b. "Pornography and Obscenity". In *D. H. Lawrence: Late Essays and Articles*, ed. James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawrence, David H. 2005. *The Virgin and The Gipsy and Other Stories*. ed. Michael Herbert, Bethan Jones and Lindeth Vasey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Monaco, Beatrice. 2008. *Machinic Modernism: The Deleuzian Literary Machines of Woolf, Lawrence and Joyce*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Singer, Irving. 1984. *The Nature of Love*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- Watson, Janell. 2010. Minoritarian + Revolution. In *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition*, ed. Adrian Parr, 173-175. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.