

## **The Dualistic Doctrines of D.H. Lawrence and Tawfiq Al-Hakim: A Comparative Study**

**Tawfiq Yousef**

*Assistant Professor, Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Jordan,  
Amman, Jordan*

(Received 15/11/1409; accepted 17/10/1410)

**Abstract.** This paper makes a comparative study between D.H. Lawrence and Tawfiq Al-Hakim with a view to identifying the similarities and the differences between their dualistic doctrines. After discussing the affinities and the differences between the two writers' conceptions of dualism in general, it moves on to outline and explain the various pairs of polarity common to both doctrines as well as those which distinguish the one from the other. The paper ends with some conclusions indicating the possible sources which had an influence on the two doctrines and asserts the original contribution of both writers to the theory of dualism at large.

A dualistic view of life and art is perhaps the most striking feature that the Arab dramatist Tawfiq Al-Hakim and the English novelist D.H. Lawrence have in common despite the apparent differences between their cultural backgrounds. The objective of this study is to discuss each of these two writers' theory of duality by comparing and contrasting their views about this subject.

Though the dualistic philosophy of each of these two writers is embodied both explicitly and implicitly in his imaginative works, each of them has expressed his view of duality in his expository writings — essays, introductions, and treatises, etc. Interestingly enough, each of the two writers has affirmed that his dualistic doctrine has been deduced from the imaginative works, not the reverse.<sup>(1)</sup> Whatever the case may be, it is with the doctrinal writings rather than the imaginative works that I shall

---

(1) D.H. Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* (London: Heinemann, 1961), p. 9. See also: Tawfiq Al-Hakim, *Al-Taaduliyah: Mathhabi fi Alhayaht Walfan (Duality : My Doctrine in Life and Art)* (Cairo: Maktabat Alaadab, 1955), p. 7. All Quotations from Al-Hakim's works are my translation.

be primarily concerned in this article, for they contain virtually all the material needed for this study.

Before we come to a detailed discussion of the various pairs of polarity or duality which the two writers deal with, it is worth explaining the way in which each of them conceives of duality. A quick look at the way each of them conceives of duality is sufficient to show us that there are obvious similarities between their views despite the presence of some differences.

Quite-frequently Al-Hakim affirms that in his view duality means the existence of two forces polarized to each other without allowing either side to dominate the other:

والتعادل يعني المحافظة على بقاء القوتين، دون أن تتلاشى إحداهما في الأخرى.

Duality means preserving the two forces, without allowing the one to be overwhelmed by the other.<sup>(2)</sup>

وهذا التعادل بين القوتين يبطل إذا ابتلع أحدهما الآخر.

The duality between the two forces will vanish if one of them engulfed the other.<sup>(3)</sup>

التعادلية هي مقاومة الابتلاعية

Duality means resisting encroachment.<sup>(4)</sup>

Similarly, Lawrence repeatedly affirms that to him duality means an equilibrium, an equipoise between two opposing forces, without allowing any of them to dominate or deny the other:

There is no peace of reconciliation. Let that be accepted for ever. Darkness will never be light, neither will the one triumph over the other. Whilst there is darkness, there is light; and when there is an end of darkness, there is an end of light.<sup>(5)</sup>

The two [i.e. the tiger and the doe] exist by virtue of juxtaposition in pure polarity. To destroy the one would be to destroy the other; they would vanish together. And to try to reconcile them is only to bring about their nullification.<sup>(6)</sup>

---

(2) Al-Hakim, p. 12.

(3) Ibid., p. 64.

(4) Ibid., p. 123.

(5) Lawrence, *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*, ed. Edward D. McDonald (London: Heinemann, 1967), p. 691.

(6) Lawrence, p. 692.

And the marriage in the body must not deny the marriage in the spirit ... and the marriage in the spirit shall not deny the marriage in the body ...<sup>(7)</sup>

Apparently drawing upon the dualistic philosophies of early Greek philosophers, especially Heraclitus and Empedocles, who viewed the world as a series of warring opposites separated by strife and brought together by love or peace, both Lawrence and Al-Hakim see life as being composed of polarized or conflicting pairs which should be evenly balanced. Moreover, both believe that since each side of a polarized relationship is invariably trying to acquire predominance, it is incumbent on the other side to strive to redress the balance. Hence the two writers view any polarized relationship as an ever-trembling balance and a continuous oscillation and consider conflict as the *raison d'être* of the two opposing sides:

Life is so made that opposites sway about a trembling centre of balance .... If the fathers drag down the balance on the side of love, peace, and production, then in the third or fourth generation the balance will swing back violently to hate, rage, and destruction. We must balance as we go.<sup>(8)</sup>

There is no rest, no cessation of conflict .... Remove the opposition and there is a collapse, a sudden crumbling into universal darkness.<sup>(9)</sup>

Since there is never to be found a perfect balance or record of the two wills, but always one triumphs over the other, in life, according to our knowledge, so must the human effort be always to recover balance ....<sup>(10)</sup>

إذا توقف التعادل نموت . الحركة بين كفتي الميزان هي الحياة، هي جوهر التعادلية، هي إراقة منع طغيان كفة على كفة .

If the equilibrium ceases, we die. The oscillation of the two scales of the balance is life itself, the essence of duality, the prevention of one side from encroaching on the other.<sup>(11)</sup>

إن التعادلية . . . هي الحركة المقابلة والمناهضة لحركة أخرى .

Duality means one movement in opposition to and in conflict with another one.<sup>(12)</sup>

(7) Ibid., p. 475.

(8) Ibid., p. 529.

(9) Lawrence, *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*. Cited by Graham Hough, *The Dark Sun* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1968), p. 225. First published, 1956.

(10) Lawrence, *Phoenix*, p. 447.

(11) See Salah Taher, ed. *Ahadith Mu' Tawfiq Al-Hakim (Talks With Tawfiq Al-Hakim)* (Beirut: Al-shar-qiyyah Lelnashr Waltawzi', n.d.), p. 96.

(12) Al-Hakim, p. 121.

والتعادلية هي حركة المقاومة نفسها وليست هي حالة التوازن الحتمية التي تنتج عن المقاومة . فالتوازن موت وجهود .

Duality is the resistance movement itself rather than the equipoise resulting from the resistance, for equipoise is tantamount to actual death and utter inactivity.<sup>(13)</sup>

Thus, duality is seen by both writers not as a mere dichotomy nor as a golden mean or a compromise solution as it is the case in some dualistic theories. On the contrary, both authors conceive of it as an active conflict between contending forces. Indeed, what distinguishes Lawrence's and Al-Hakim's doctrines from most dualist philosophies is their insistence that the conflicting forces should retain their separate entities. Hence, the final outcome of the opposition or conflict is not a submission of one force to another nor a fusing of the two into one but a complementing of the one by the other:

The two Infinities, negative and positive, they are always related, but they are never identical.<sup>(14)</sup>

For his part, Ak-Hakim argues that his philosophy is entirely different from Aristotle's principle of moderation:

ليس بين عقيدتي وعقيدة «خير الأمور الوسط» من صلة . فعقيدة أرسطو أخلاقية وسلوكية ولا شأن لها بها في التعادلية من قضايا ترمي لتفسير موقف الإنسان من قوى الطبيعة والصراع بينهما .

My doctrine has nothing to do with Aristotle's Golden Mean. Aristotle's doctrine is moralistic and behavioral and is not concerned with the endeavors of duality to explore the relationship and the conflict between man and the forces of nature.<sup>(15)</sup>

لا ينبغي أن تؤخذ كلمة «التعادل» هنا بالمعنى اللغوي الذي يفيد «التساوي» . ولا بالمعنى الذي يعني «الاعتدال» أو التوسط في الأمور .

The term "duality" should not be equated with "equality" nor with "moderation" or "compromise."<sup>(16)</sup>

It is not surprising, therefore, to learn that each of the two writers tries to find a more appropriate alternative for the term "duality." Actually, the duality that

(13) Taher, p. 100.

(14) Lawrence, *Twilight in Italy* (London: Penguin, 1969), p. 53. First published 1916.

(15) Taher, p. 97.

(16) Al-Hakim, p. 121.

Lawrence uses in “Study of Thomas Hardy” is intermittently replaced by “polarity” for the most part of the *Fantasia* and in some degree in the other essays. Correspondingly, in Al-Hakim the proper relation between the contending forces is later described as “muqawamiyah” Which, roughly translated, would mean “counter-balancing.”<sup>(17)</sup>

With an apparent attempt to overcome this problem of language inadequacy for expressing the intended meaning, both writers seem to have resorted to metaphorical or symbolic language, hoping that this would make the meaning clearer and more definitive. Though Al-Hakim generally expresses his ideas in plain, concrete terms, preferring to call a spade a spade, he sometimes uses metaphor or symbol to explain his dualistic thought. On many occasions he equates the duality of intellect and feeling, doubt and faith with that between the mind and the heart.

فالتركيب الروحي للإنسان له هو أيضا شقيقه وزفيره فيما يمكن أن نسميه الفكر والشعور. أو عبارة أخرى: العقل والقلب.

The spiritual constitution of man also has its inhalation and exhalation in what may be called intellect and feeling or, in other words, the mind and the heart.<sup>(18)</sup>

أنت تعادلي إذا كنت تعتقد أن العقل بمنطقه وشكّه يجب أن يعادل ويوازن القلب بشعوره وإيمانه : أي أن الشك يمكن أن يعيش مستقلا موازنا للإيمان .

You are a dualist if you believe that the mind with its logic and doubts can equate and counter-balance the heart with its feeling and faith: doubt can be independent from and parallel to faith.<sup>(19)</sup>

And on another occasion Al-Hakim describes the conflict between passion and knowledge in *Shehrazad* as one between earth and heaven.

فهو يبحث عن المعرفة من أي طريق وينكر العاطفة إنكاراً تاماً . . . كان يريد أن يترك الأرض . . . ويخلق في السماء، وصار معلقاً - كما قالت له شهرزاد - بين الأرض والسماء ينخر فيه القلق .

He seeks knowledge by all means and denies passion completely. He wanted to leave earth and to soar to heaven, but the result was that he left earth and did not reach heaven

(17) Taher, p. 100.

(18) Al-Hakim, p. 11.

(19) Ibid., p. 113.

and become, as Shehrazad told him, hanging between earth and heaven, corrupted by cankering uncertainty.<sup>(20)</sup>

With Lawrence's doctrine the situation is even more complicated. Here we encounter diversity and obscurity of symbolism, and an apparent inconsistency which is often more apparent than real. There is also a lot of intuition and repetition instead of conscious reasoning and first-shot precision. Even more, Lawrence's symbolism is sometimes obscured by a scriptural-prophetic style and a religious exaltation of tone. In addition to the polarized pairs of the tiger and the lamb, the lion and the unicorn, the eagle and the dove, we find symbols of the Father and the Son, the dark and the light etc.

The Infinite is two-fold, the Father and the Son, the Dark and the Light, the Senses and the Mind, the Soul and the Spirit, the self and the not-self, the Eagle and the Dove, the Tiger and the Lamb.<sup>(21)</sup>

To illustrate the significance of these polarities it is necessary to mention that Lawrence postulates three major principles of polarized pairs namely, "Male" and "Female,," "Love" and "Law," "Will-to-Motion" and "Will-to-Inertia." Under these all-inclusive principles he subsumes several polarities such as "sun" and "moon," "intellect" and "blood," "spirit" and "soul," "brain" and "body," "knowledge" and "feeling," "male" and "female," "movement" and "stability," "consciousness" and "instinct," "mind" and "senses," etc.<sup>(22)</sup> Used symbolically, the tiger, the lion, the eagle, the light and the Son would correspond to the principles of "Male," "Motion," and "Love," whereas the lamb, the doe, the dove, the dark, and the Father would be associated with the principles of "Female," "Inertia," and "Law," with all the attributes characteristic of each group of principles as outlined above. Moreover, this cluster of symbols is in itself indicative of Lawrence's own conception of duality in that it shows a discrepancy between the two accounts or descriptions of duality. While the first group of polarized symbols would point to duality as a continuous strife, a real combat or a bloody hostility, the second group would establish it as reconciliation and harmony. In the first case, reconciliation is death; in the second, genuine unison,

The lion shall never lie down with the lamb. The lion eternally shall devour the lamb, the lamb eternally shall be devoured.<sup>(23)</sup>

---

(20) Taher, p. 66.

(21) Lawrence, *Twilight*, p. 53.

(22) For a more comprehensive list of these pairs see H. H.M. Daleski, *The Forged Flame: A Study of H. Lawrence* (London: Faber and Faber, 1965), p. 30; see also Hough, pp. 224-25.

(23) Lawrence, *Twilight*, p. 53.

He was the Father, the All-Containing; He was the Son, the Word, the Changer, the Separator; and He was the Spirit, the Comforter, the Reconciliator between the Two.<sup>(24)</sup>

All the symbols we have seen are actually manipulated to embody Lawrence's view of the man-woman relationship which is the core of his whole dualistic system. Man and woman, the symbolism seems to suggest, are perennially opposed but have their moments of reconciliation. Moreover, the relationship is sanctified by making it analogous to the union of the Father and the Son with the Holy Ghost as their reconciler.

Furthermore, the outcome of the relationship is a state of pure integrated being when opposition is transcended in the equipoise attained between opposites. Again, the new state is often symbolized by sweet-sounding words such as "peace," "rose," "rainbow," "crown," etc. Apparently, such symbols represent the outcome of the conflict and the reconciliation consequent upon it. In other words, it is a new state when conflict is transcended into a moment of complementary balance, thus allowing the two poles to merge and integrate within separateness — Two-in-One. The sexual union, therefore, becomes not only a consummation and a fulfilment both in the flesh and in the spirit but also an index to a continual movement from one pole to another and back again and a recognition of unity in duality:

Nevertheless, this is the greatest truth: we are neither lions of pride and strength, nor lambs of love and submission. We are roses of perfect being.<sup>(25)</sup>

Undoubtedly, Lawrence's unique symbolism and his interest in the relationship that transcends the opposition between the two conflicting parties are two main features which distinguish Lawrence's dualistic vision from that of Al-Hakim. The symbols that Al-Hakim uses are basically conventional but those of Lawrence are largely intuitive.

Another point of contrast between the two doctrines lies in the fact that whereas Lawrence accepts the duality of the lion and the lamb, the eagle and the dove as a *de facto* situation, Al-Hakim conceives of it, among other things, as being a kind of compensation and a strong urge for resistance. Thus he repeatedly notes that weakness in one point or aspect is invariably made up for by strength in another one and he frequently maintains that the law of duality promotes indefatigable resistance. But

---

(24) *Ibid.*, p. 453.

(25) *Ibid.*, p. 690.

(26) See Mandour, *Masrah Tawfiq Al-Hakim (Tawfik Al-Hakim's Drama)* (Cairo: Nahdhat Masr Lilitiba'a Walnashr, 1969), p. 44.

although Al-Hakim manipulates duality for a utilitarian purpose, the final outcome of this attempt is not that Lawrence's outlook is pessimistic and Al-Hakim's view is optimistic. Indeed, the opposite is true. Since Al-Hakim envisages an eternal conflict between man and some invisible superior forces, the outcome of the conflict is often determined beforehand and the result is, consequently, always tragic, as most of Al-Hakim's critics have recognized.<sup>(26)</sup> On the other hand, since Lawrence views death, destruction or defeat as the negative pole of dynamic polarity without which there is no life or "Peace," he seems to see no reason for putting up a definitely futile resistance and hence accepts the duality of life and death or strength and weakness as a basic fact of life. The following excerpts may well illustrate that contrast:

While the lion is lion, he must fall on the lamb, to devour her. This is his lionhood and his peace, insofar as he has any peace. And the peace of the lamb is to be devourable.<sup>(27)</sup>

There is great polarity in life itself. Life itself is dual. And the duality is life and death. And death is not just shadow or mystery. It is the negative reality of life.<sup>(28)</sup>

في حين أن فكرة الشعور بالقوى الأخرى التي تواجه الإنسان وتؤثر في إرادته وحرية تدفع به في نهاية الأمر إلى أن يحشد غرائز حربه ونشاطه وكفاحه، لا ضد نفسه، بل ضد هذه العوائق المستترة، وهذه القوى الخفية... فالشعور بعجز الإنسان أمام مصيره هو عندي حافز إلى الكفاح لا إلى التخاذل.

Whereas man's awareness of other forces facing him and limiting his will and freedom coerces him, in the long run, to direct his war, activity and struggle, not against himself but against these invisible impediments and hidden forces. For me, man's feeling of weakness in front of destiny is an incentive for struggle rather than for capitulation.<sup>(29)</sup>

Having outlined the main features of the dualistic doctrines of both writers as well as the points of similarity and contrast, we now turn to the pairs of polarity or duality dealt with by the two writers. A basic duality which the two doctrines have in common is the duality within the individual. Al-Hakim refers to man's biological duality based on a balance between inspiration and expiration and to man's spiritual duality built upon a polarity between intellect and feeling.

فالإنسان إذاً كائن متعادل مادياً وروحياً

Man is therefore a creature polarized biologically and spiritually.<sup>(30)</sup>

(27) Lawrence, *Phoenix*, p. 691.

(28) Lawrence, *Fantasia*, p. 147.

(29) Al-Hakim, p. 34.

(30) *Ibid.*, p. 11.



For Lawrence, there is a fourfold biological duality within a human being:

Now the equilibrium to be established is fourfold. There must be a true equilibrium between what we eat and what we reject again by excretion: likewise between the systole and diastole of the heart, the inspiration and expiration of our breathing.<sup>(31)</sup>

Lawrence also speaks of a polarity between intellect and blood or mind and senses but he does not see it as a traditional spiritual polarity as Al-Hakim does. Whereas Al-Hakim wants to revive the value of the heart and religious faith to cope with that of the mind and doubt, Lawrence is keen on awakening the value of the body and the blood to counterbalance that of the mind. Al-Hakim is trying to give the heart and religious faith full value but Lawrence wants to give this importance to the body and the senses. Both writers see the ill-matched conflict between the mind and the heart or knowledge and feeling as the main cause of the problems facing modern man. In their two different ways both writers stress the necessity of preserving a balance between the mental and the-intuitive, the spirit and the flesh. Apparently basing his views on orthodox religious faith, Al-Hakim asserts that the uncertainty of modern man is a consequence of the imbalance between the spiritual and the intellectual:

فالقلق السائد في النفوس اليوم مبعثه هذا الاضطراب في ميزان التعادل بين العقل والقلب . . . بين الفكر والإيمان .

The anxiety of modern man is due to the imbalance between the mind and the heart, intellect and religious faith.<sup>(32)</sup>

For the part, Lawrence develops an elaborate system of polarized pairs which, highly mystical and sophisticated as it is, is apt to make Al-Hakim's dualistic viewpoint look all the more simple and straightforward. Briefly and simply stated, Lawrence's theory presupposes a basic polarity inside the individual psyche between the upper and lower planes, both on the physical and the psychical levels, with the diaphragm functioning as the horizontal division-wall. Having said that, Lawrence moves on to assert further polarities on each plane and between the two major planes such as the "spiritual" and the physical, the conscious and the unconscious, the "sympathetic" and the "voluntary," etc.

The great nerve-centers are in pairs, sympathetic and volitional. Again, they are polarized in upper and lower duality, above and below the diaphragm. Thus the solar plexus of the abdomen is the first great affective center, sympathetic, and the lumbar

(31) Lawrence, *Fantasia*, p. 42.

(32) Al-Hakim, p. 18.

ganglion, volitional, is its partner .... But immediately above the diaphragm we have the cardiac plexus and the thoracic ganglion, another great pair of conjugal affective centers, acting in immediate correspondence with the two lower centers ....<sup>(33)</sup>

Time and again, Lawrence complains about the break-down of this original duality and considers the imbalance consequent upon it largely responsible for all man's troubles:

The old polarity has broken down. The primal centers have collapsed from their original spontaneity, they have become subordinate .... We are in the toils of helpless self-consciousness. We can't help ourselves. It is like being in a boat with no oars.<sup>(34)</sup>

By and large, Lawrence's main complaint is centered on the balance between the "spiritual" or the mental and the physical or the intuitive which has been tipped in favor of the first side. By giving the body its full value, the situation will return to its balanced polarity and an all-round living can be accomplished.

Spiritual duality within man is, of course, closely connected with the relationship between man and God. Having asserted that a wholesome spiritual life depends on the equipoise between intellect and feeling, Al-Hakim eventually proclaims his firm belief in a dualistic relationship between man and God:

على أن الحقيقة التي أحب أن تستقر في وضعها الصحيح هي أني «تعادلي» أي أن إرادة الإنسان في كفتها تعادلها الإرادة الإلهية في كفة أخرى، والعقل البشري في كفة يعادله الإيهان في كفة .

The fact which I want to be clearly and rightly understood is that I am a "dualist" who believes that man's will on one side is counterbalanced by God's will on the other, and man's mind on one side is matched by his religious faith on the other.<sup>(35)</sup>

On the other hand, Lawrence uses the Judeo-Christian tradition to express his private religion. Identifying such values as the spirit, the mind, the brain, etc. with the "Love" principle and associating such values as the flesh, the senses, and the body with the "Law" principle, Lawrence envisions a polarity between the Son and the Father who embody the principles of Love and Law. Lawrence then brings the Son and the Father together in one Godhead by the Holy Ghost, a union which provides a model for the man-woman relationship. In contrast with Al-Hakim's monotheism which leads him to view a polarity between man and God, Lawrence's

(33) Lawrence, *Phoenix*, p. 628.

(34) *Ibid.*, p. 629.

(35) Al-Hakim, p. 32.

polytheism prompts him to place a duality between man and all the gods and to assert that God is manifested in nature and in the man-woman relationship in particular:

But that which I may never deny, and which I have denied is the Holy Ghost which relates the dual Infinities into One Whole, which relates and keeps distinct the dual natures of God.<sup>(36)</sup>

The Lovely things are god that has come to pass.<sup>(37)</sup>

I worship Christ, I worship Jehovah, I Worship Pan, I worship Aphrodite .... I want them all, all the gods. They are all God .... But I must serve in real love. If I take my whole, passionate, spiritual and physical love to the woman who in return loves me, that is how I serve God.<sup>(38)</sup>

If Lawrence speaks of dual infinities making One Whole, Al-Hakim, by contrast, talks of traditional polarity between God and Satan, Good and Evil:

الله وحده الواحد الأحد الكامل بذاته . ومع ذلك أوجد بإرادته تعالى قوة أخرى مقابلة هي قوة الشيطان ، كي تبدأ الحياة البشرية في التلون والتحرك .

God is the Almighty and the Omnipotent. Yet He created of His accord another opposing force, the power of Satan in order for human life to take shape and continue its movement.<sup>(39)</sup>

Since the central field of Lawrence's dualistic doctrine is always the study of man, it is not surprising to see him elaborating several other polarities inside the individual and between the individual and other opposing forces. An individual is polarized between male and female qualities. Accordingly, a coherent personality would be that in which the conflicting forces are reconciled:

For every man comprises male and female in his being, the male always struggling for predominance. A woman likewise consists in male and female, with female predominant.<sup>(40)</sup>

A man who is well balanced between male and female, in his own nature, is, as a rule, happy, easy to mate, easy to satisfy, and content to exist.<sup>(41)</sup>

(36) Lawrence, *Twilight*, pp. 52-53.

(37) Quoted from Graham Hough's *Dark Sun*, p. 223.

(38) Lawrence, *Phoenix*, p. 307.

(39) Al-Hakim, p. 122.

(40) Lawrence, *Phoenix*, p. 481.

(41) *Ibid.*, p. 460.

Having reconciled the opposing qualities within themselves, a man and a woman meet as opposites in a new polarity:

The goal of the male impulse is the announcement of motion, endless motion, endless diversity, endless change. When the two are working in combination, as they must in life, there is, as it were, a dual motion, centrifugal for the male, fleeing abroad, away from the centre, outward to infinite vibration, and centripetal for the female, feeling in to the eternal centre of rest. A combination of the two movements produces a sum of motion and stability at once, satisfying.<sup>(42)</sup>

Beyond this duality a man is polarized to other men, to his leader(s), and to society at large.<sup>(43)</sup> Consequently, every person's natural desire for free individualism is offset by the demand for a social being:

You must have a harmony and an inter-relation between the two modes. Because, though man is first and foremost an individual being, yet the very accomplishing of his individuality rests upon his fulfilment in social life.<sup>(44)</sup>

Finally, there is a perennial polarity between the individual and the whole natural order without which man's life is bound to become chaotic:

It is in the living touch between us and other people, other lives, other phenomena that we move and have our being. Strip us of our human contacts and of our contact with the living earth and the sun, and we are almost bladders of emptiness.<sup>(45)</sup>

Apart from man's biological and spiritual polarities, Al-Hakim envisions a moral polarity inside the individual between the forces of good and evil:

فإنسان عندي قيمة ثابتة ، تلحق بها أحوال متغيرة من الخير والشر . . . وأن من يأتي عملا يضر الغير  
يستطيع أن يأتي عملا ينفع الغير.

Man is a fixed value liable to alternating and changing conditions of good and evil .... ,  
Whoever does a harmful action is capable of doing a beneficial deed.<sup>(46)</sup>

Actually, Al-Hakim puts forward a moralistic program which demands that evil-doers should be punished not by depriving them of their freedom but by making them do good deeds commensurate to their evil actions:

(42) Ibid., p. 457.

(43) See Lawrence, *Fantasia*, pp. 105-107.

(44) Lawrence, *Phoenix*, pp. 613-14.

(45) Ibid., p. 190.

(46) Al-Hakim, pp. 44-45.

وثنم الجريمة يجب أن يدفع لا من حرية الإنسان بل من عمل إيجابي يوازن ويعادل العمل الذي ارتكبه .

Crime should be punishable not at the expense of one's freedom but through doing a positive action matching and counterbalancing the wrong action.<sup>(47)</sup>

For Al-Hakim the balance between good and evil is safeguarded by conscience whose function is to remind the individual of the necessity of counterbalancing an evil action by a good one:

فالضمير يذكر النفس أن الشر الذي ارتكب يجب أن يعادل بخير.

Conscience reminds one that wrong doing should be equated by good deeds.<sup>(48)</sup>

Obviously, the polarity of good and evil in this moralistic sense has no counterpart in Lawrence's dualism.

Both writers conceive of man-woman polarity. Like Lawrence, Al-Hakim believes that man and woman are innately different and should remain so without trying to play each other's roles:

وطبيعة المرأة ليست أدنى من طبيعة الرجل في رأيي ولكنها مختلفة عنها، فهي من الناحية العقلية تفكر تفكيرها الخاص، ولها منطقها الخاص المختلف عن تفكير الرجل ومنطقه .

In my opinion woman is not inherently inferior to man but is different from him, for she has her own way of thinking and reasoning which are different from those of man.<sup>(49)</sup>

أما شعوري العام من المرأة باعتبارها تطالب في المجتمع بوظيفة تشابه وظيفة الرجل تماما، فهذا هو ما أخالفها فيه .

My general stand on woman's demand for a role similar to that of man is different from hers.<sup>(50)</sup>

For his part, Lawrence not only stresses the difference between man and woman but also places them in a polarized relationship hardly available in Al-Hakim's dualistic system:

(47) Al-Hakim, p. 46.

(48) Ibid., p. 51.

(49) Taher, p. 133.

(50) Ibid., p. 130.

Man, in the midst of all his effeminacy, is still male and nothing but male. And woman, though she harangue in parliament or patrol the streets with a helmet on her head, is still completely female. They are only playing each other's roles, because the poles have swung into reversion.<sup>(51)</sup>

Whereas Lawrence places the man-woman relationship at the core of his dualistic system, Al-Hakim apparently treats it as a side issue without even making clear reference to their polarization. And even though Al-Hakim gives this subject greater attention in his plays, he stops short of giving it the great importance it receives in Lawrence's expository and imaginative works alike. So central is this polarized relationship in Lawrence's thought that it is treated not only on its own terms but also as part of his major dualistic principles already referred to. It is also interesting to trace the development of Lawrence's attempt to find the ideal polarity between man and woman and how he continually modified his position, describing the relation alternately as "two-in-one," "mutual unison in separateness" and "one up one down." Although Al-Hakim deals with the conflict between man and woman in some of his plays, he does not treat it as a polarity in the same way that Lawrence has done in his novels. Undoubtedly, Lawrence has explored the polarity between man and woman in a deep and farsighted manner hardly matched by any other writer's treatment of the same theme. Actually, the male-female polarity within which the man-woman relationship is subsumed is central to Lawrence's dualism and is elaborately worked out in almost all his writings: Indeed, the man-woman duality epitomizes the kind of unity Lawrence sought in a dualistic universe:

The dual will we call the Will-to-Motion and the Will-to-Intertia. These cause the whole of life, from the ebb and flow of a wave, to the stable equilibrium of the whole universe, .... And the Will-to-Motion we call the male will or spirit, the Will-to-Intertia the female.<sup>(52)</sup>

The polarity of man to other men, to his leader(s) and to his natural surroundings as conceived of in Lawrence's dualistic doctrine has no direct equivalent in Al-Hakim's philosophy. However, Al-Hakim emphasizes the polarized relationship between man's free will and the opposing forces of society and its institutions as well as between it and some invisible powers:

الإنسان حر داخل إطار إرادة أعلى . ما هي؟ هي النظم التي تحكم وجودنا . إطار الزمان والمكان وقوانين الوراثة والغرائز وقوانين المجتمع وقانون الاجتماع . . . إلخ .

(51) Lawrence, *Fantasia*, p. 97.

(52) Lawrence, *Phoenix*, p. 448.

Man is free within the framework of a superior will; what is it? It is the rules governing human existence: time, place, the laws of heredity, instincts, and the laws of society and sociology.<sup>(53)</sup>

الإنسان عندي حر في اتجاهه حتى تتدخل في أمره قوى خارجية أسميها أحيانا القوى الإلهية . . .

For me, man is free to move in any direction until outside forces intervene, which I sometimes call heavenly forces.<sup>(54)</sup>

Moreover, Al-Hakim holds that every society tries to preserve an even balance between good and evil so that when it senses the presence of an injustice, it musters all its forces with an attempt to restore balance either by applying the law or by resorting to popular revolt:

وهنا تقوم الثورات الاجتماعية لتصحيح الوضع وتعيد حالة التبادل التي تسمى العدالة أو العدل الاجتماعي .

Social revolutions erupt immediately to rectify the situation and to restore the state of equipoise called justice or social justice.<sup>(55)</sup>

Apart from these pairs of polarity in man's social life and in society at large, Al-Hakim talks of equilibrium in internal and international politics, arguing that the world had often been dominated not by a single power but by two forces trying to hold a balance between them. By the same token, he asserts that the power of the ruler or the government is counterblanced by the will of the people or the opposition parties:

ففي السياسة الدولية لا بد دائما من توازن: أي تعادل بين القوى. وقلما حدث في تاريخ الأمم أن انفردت طويلا دولة واحدة بالقوة في العالم.

In the area of international politics equilibrium is always essential. Rarely had the world ever been dominated for long by a single power.<sup>(56)</sup>

وفي السياسة الداخلية لا بد دائما أيضا من توازن: أي تعادل بين قوة الحاكم وقوة المحكوم .

(53) Taher, p. 95.

(54) Al-Hakim, p. 31.

(55) Ibid., pp. 51-52.

(56) Ibid, p. 52.

And in the the area of international politics it is always necessary to preserve an equipoise between the power of the ruler and that of the governed.<sup>(57)</sup>

Al-Hakim speaks of other pairs of polarity in several fields such as those between exports and imports, income and expenditure, etc.

أما في الاقتصاد . . . فلا بد أن يكون هناك توازن بين العرض والطلب . . .  
كذلك الحال في الميزان التجاري ، وفي التعادل بين الصادرات والواردات وفي معاملة الميزانيات بين  
الإيرادات والمصروفات .

In economics there should be an equilibrium between supply and demand ...  
The same is true of trade balance, exports and imports, revenues and expenditure.<sup>(58)</sup>

Moreover, Al-Hakim refers in passing to several other pairs of polarity such as those between day and night, spring and autumn, etc. which are, in fact, reminiscent of Lawrence's occasional reference to the same pairs.<sup>(59)</sup> Above all, Al-Hakim stresses the importance of preserving an equilibrium between two forces, namely "Alfikir" (intellect) and "al'amal" (action) to ensure the freedom and independence of literature, art and human thought from political authorities.<sup>(60)</sup>

For his part, Lawrence detects the presence of two opposed forces in human history and in social-political institutions. Through the movement of history Lawrence finds the working of two "great life urges," namely "power" and "love."<sup>(61)</sup> or what he calls "the motive of peace and increase, and the motive of contest and martial triumph."<sup>(62)</sup> For him, the swing to one extreme causes the swing to the other, and this process continues *ad infinitum*: "As soon as the appetite for martial adventure and triumph in conflict is satisfied, the appetite for peace and increase manifests itself, and *vice versa*."<sup>(63)</sup>

Moreover, Lawrence tries hard in a certain phase of his literary career to find an ideal polarity between the ruler and the people. Briefly summed up, his view is that societies should select as their leaders some powerful individuals, provided they

(57) Ibid., pp. 52-53.

(58) Ibid., pp. 53-54.

(59) Ibid., p. 76; see also Lawrence, *Phoenix*, p. 678.

(60) Al-Hakim, pp. 64-65.

(61) D.H. Lawrence, *Aaron's Rod* (London: Penguin, 1968), pp. 345-46. First published 1922.

(62) D.H. Lawrence, *Movements in European History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 306.

(63) Lawrence, *Movements*, p. 306.



observe this basic equation: There must be absolute power, but it must be accompanied by the deep conviction of the governed that their leader rules by their wish and consent.<sup>(64)</sup>

Both writers speak of a cosmological duality. Apparently recouring to scientific theory, Al-Hakim affirms that the opposing forces of attraction and repulsion between the earth and the sun hold them in their orbit:

فلتقع بأهم صفة للأرض . . . وهي أنها كرة تعيش بالتوازن أو التعادل بينها وبين كرة أضخم هي الشمس .

Let us accept the most important quality of the earth, which is the fact that it is a ball surviving through its balance with a greater ball, the sun.<sup>(65)</sup>

Proceeding by intuition enhanced by hints from his prior reading of early Greek philosophers, Lawrence envisions a highly mystical polarized relationship between the earth and the sun as well as between the earth and the moon. To illustrate that polarity in Lawrentian terms is apt to lead us into the “pseudophilosophy” of the *Fantasia*. Suffice it, therefore, to mention that Lawrence believes that the earth is polarized both to the moon and to the sun not only in terms of attraction and repulsion as we have seen in Al-Hakim but also in the form of a dynamic circuit of life and death that makes the survival of every one of them dependent on the life of the other(s).

What holds the earth swinging in space is, first, the great dynamic attraction to the sun, and then counterpoising assertion of independence, singleness, which is polarized in the moon ....

And earth, sun, and moon are born only of our death. But it is only their polarized dynamic onnection with us who live which sustains them all in their place and maintains them all in their own activities. The inanimate universe rests absolutely on the life-circuit of living creatures, is built upon the arch which spans the duality of living beings.<sup>(66)</sup>

Finally, both Lawrence and Al-Hakim consider duality to be the underlying principle of art and literature as it is of life and the universe. As for Al-Hakim, he sees the main polarity in art and literature to be lying between what he calls the power of “expression” and the power of “interpretation”:

(64) Lawrence, *Aaron's Rod*, p. 347 ; idem., *Fantasia*, p. 107.

(65) Al-Hakim, p. 10.

(66) Lawrence, *Fantasia*, pp. 151-56.

هنا أيضا نجد التعادلية تقييم الأدب والفن على أساس قوتين يجب أن يتعادلا هما: قوة التعبير وقوة التفسير.

Here we also find duality establishing art and literature on the basis of two opposing forces: the power of expression and the power of interpretation.<sup>(67)</sup>

For Al-Hakim, the polarized forces of “expression” and “interpretation” roughly correspond to form and content or style and subject matter on the one hand and to the writer’s interpretation of man’s position in society and in the universe on the other:

فالتعبير إذن ليس مجرد الشكل، بل الشكل والموضوع معا.

Expression is therefore not form only but form and content together.<sup>(68)</sup>

ما هو التفسير؟ هو الضوء الذي يُلقى على موضع الإنسان في الكون والمجتمع.

What is interpretation? It is the light shed on man’s position in society and the universe.<sup>(69)</sup>

Moreover, “Expression” itself is polarized between the two forces of style and subject matter.

وقوة التعبير هي أيضا توازن وتعادل بين قوة الأسلوب وقوة الموضوع.

The power of expression is also an equipoise between the force of style and the force of subject.<sup>(70)</sup>

Consequently, an over-emphasis of style or form leads to art-for-art’s sake and an over-emphasis of content results in committed art.

فالفن للفن هو حبس الفنان في هيكل الشكل والفن الملتزم هو حبس الفنان في سجن المضمون.

Art-for-art’s sake is the confinement of the artist to form; committed art is the confinement of the artist in the prison of content.<sup>(71)</sup>

(67) Al-Hakim, p. 70.

(68) Ibid., p. 71.

(69) Ibid., p. 80.

(70) Ibid., pp. 71-72.

(71) Ibid., p. 84.

Lawrence's conception of duality in art offers an approach contrasting with that of Al-Hakim. Like Al-Hakim, he views art as being a polarity between two opposing forces, even though the two writers differ in their conception of the forces that constitute this polarity. If Al-Hakim asserts that duality in art resides in the conflict between "expression" and "interpretation," Lawrence argues that the opposition in all art is between the two principles of "Law" and "Love":

Most fascinating in all artists is this antinomy between Law and Love, between the Flesh and the Spirit, between the Father and the Son.<sup>(72)</sup>

For Lawrence, "Law" is the natural law of the body, and "Love" the counter-movement of the spirit, and these two principles are embodied in God the Father and God the Son, the Female and the Male principles respectively:

In the Father we are one Flesh, in Christ we are crucified, and rise again, and are One with Him in Spirit. It is the difference between Law and Love.<sup>(73)</sup>

Man and Woman are, roughly, the embodiment of Love and the Law: they are the two complementary parts.<sup>(74)</sup>

Great art is that which brings the two conflicting principles together while ensuring that both sides are treated fairly under equal conditions:

Artistic form is a revelation of the two principles of Love and the Law in a state of conflict and yet reconciled.<sup>(75)</sup>

But art must give a deeper satisfaction. It must give fair play all round.<sup>(76)</sup>

The foregoing discussion has revealed to us the basic similarities and the important differences between Lawrence's and Al-Hakim's views of the theory of dualism in life as well as in art. However, the similarities cannot be attributed to a direct influence of the one upon the other, for there is no single evidence to prove that Al-Hakim was directly influenced by Lawrence's dualistic thought. Actually, both writers seem to have come under the influence of more or less the same dualistic philosophies. Both of them appear to have read early Greek philosophers particularly Heracitus and Empedocles. Similarly, they both read Nietzsche<sup>(77)</sup> and were

---

(72) Lawrence, *Phoenix*, p. 476.

(73) *Ibid.*, p. 465.

(74) *Ibid.*, p. 514.

(75) *Ibid.*, p. 477.

(76) *Ibid.*, p. 476.

(77) See Hough, *Dark Sun*, p. 257; see also Al-Hakim, *Zahrat Al-umor (The Prime of Life)* (Cairo: Maktabat Al-Tawkul, 1943), pp. 89-99, 104.

apparently influenced by Freud, Frazer, Newton, Einstein, Darwin, Blake, etc. Evidently, the two writers worked along similar and different lines and sometimes saw eye-to-eye and at others their views were entirely different. Undoubtedly, the similarities between the dualistic doctrines of Lawrence and Al-Hakim and between them and other dualistic philosophies forcibly demonstrate the close relationship among all world philosophies and the ultimate unity of human thought at large.

## مذهب التعادلية عند د. هـ. لورنس وتوفيق الحكيم : دراسة مقارنة

توفيق يوسف

أستاذ مشارك، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها، كلية الآداب، الجامعة الأردنية، عمان، الأردن

ملخص البحث . يهدف هذا البحث إلى إجراء دراسة مقارنة بين الكاتب الإنجليزي د. هـ. لورنس والكاتب العربي المصري توفيق الحكيم لتحديد أوجه الشبه بين نظرية التعادلية عند لورنس وعند الحكيم . وبعد أن يبين الباحث مفهوم التعادلية لدى كل من الكاتبين ينتقل إلى دراسة مفصلة يشرح فيها أوجه التعادل في الحياة والفن كما تناولها كل كاتب . وأخيراً يخلص الباحث إلى أن هناك عدة أوجه من التشابه والاختلاف بين النظريتين مما يؤكد أصالة وجدية كل من النظريتين، وما يجمعنا على الإيمان بوحدة الفكر العالمي بمفهومه الواسع .