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INTRODUCTION

D. H. Lawrence exploits depth psychology most skillfully in Women in Love, which issues his challenge to the established literary convention and which fully manifests his ingenuity as a creative artist. As he states in "Foreword to Women in Love," the work reflects his "passionate struggle into conscious being." Lawrence, however, is not just "driven by his pathology to create;" he "sheds his sickness" not only unconsciously but consciously and artistically.

The main riddle of Women in Love consists in discrepancy between 'what seems to be intention' and performance. The text tells something, and yet, it shows something different. It tells Ursula and Birkin's ultimate love — star-equilibrium amidst the degenerated world in the river of dissolution. By comparison, it also tells the ontological problems of Gudrun and Gerald who cannot accomplish this ultimate love and go on the death process. On the other hand, the text shows some mysterious, magnetizing power of Gerald, the representative disintegrating character, and his tragedy gives the reader an overwhelming impression, surpassing all the love and hope attained by Ursula and Birkin, so that the entire work becomes "purely destructive." Both Gerald and Gudrun have some enigmatic attractiveness, and "fleurs du mal" represented by them are in full bloom throughout the work. To quote Mary Freeman:
What has been regarded as ugly takes on a lurid beauty; what has been considered ethically evil takes on sensual good; what has been in essence death gives a flame of enhanced perception.\(^6\)

In explanation of Lawrence's ambiguous attitude to corruption, Colin Clarke noticed the Romantic "paradox of living disintegration,"\(^7\) however, as Mark Spilka indicated, the "dramatic contrast"\(^8\) of two modes of love and being is significant enough. The interpretation by Spilka focuses upon the intention, whereas one by Clarke is meant to explain the performance of "fleurs du mal." Both intention and performance are the key to the novel. Why, then, is there any discrepancy between them?

The intent of this paper is to find a reason for the discrepancy. Since the reason concerns the deeper layers of the text - how the language works, a psychoanalytical approach will shed light upon this problem. After confirming some basic characteristics of the form of the text and explaining a theory by S. Freud about the two essential classes of instincts in a human being, I attempt to discuss some descriptive features in Gerald's story and analyze them by taking account of possible reader reactions. I hope to show how the work is enriched by unconscious motivation.

There are three important points which should be confirmed about the form of the text. First, *Women in Love* has a unique, organic integrity centering around Gerald's tragedy. It is modelled after Greek tragedies and its plot is carefully organized so that "Peripety or Discovery" may "arise out of the structure of the plot itself,"\(^9\) and
the effect of "catharsis" may be accomplished. Second, the plot is composed of a series of counterpointed scenes which are connected in the deeper, psychic level and in which two modes of love and being are contrasted. Third, in the course of the story, by this dramatic contrast, true natures of the characters are gradually revealed until the final catastrophe. The development of plot bears a striking resemblance to that of *Oedipus the King*. Whereas *Oedipus the King* is built upon the delay of discovery of the truth, *Women in Love* is built upon the slow exposure of the true natures of the characters. While the former is a play of prophecy, the latter makes full use of prophetic equivocations to provoke the sense of inevitability in the reader. Both stories have the same rhythm of implication and denial with the cumulative effect of dreadful endings. Based upon this fundamental structure, the effects of the novel are created considerably intentionally. In fact, it is elaborately composed in expectation of the reader's unconscious reactions.

What is the main subterranean power to work on the reader? In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, Freud forms a hypothesis about life instincts [Eros] and death instincts [Thanatos], the most speculative and one of the most controversial of all his theories. Through his study of the repetition compulsion and his observation of children's *fort/da* game, Freud draws a conclusion that "everything living dies for internal reasons — becomes inorganic once again," because of "the instinct to return to the inanimate state." Then he bases his argument on one of E. Herring's biological theories that "two kinds of processes are constantly at work in living substance, operating in contrary directions, one constructive or assimilatory and the other destructive or dissimilatory," and tries
to "recognize in these two directions taken by the vital processes the activity of our two instinctual impulses, the life instincts and the death instincts." In *The Economic Problem of Masochism*, Freud explains as follows:

In (multicellular) organisms the libido meets the instinct of death, or destruction, . . . The libido has the task of making the destroying instinct innocuous, and it fulfils the task by diverting that instinct to a great extent outwards — soon with the help of a special organic system, the muscular apparatus — towards objects in the external world. The instinct is then called the destructive instinct, the instinct for mastery, or the will to power. A portion of the instinct is placed directly in the service of the sexual function, where it has an important part to play. This is sadism proper. Another portion does not share in this transposition outwards; it remains inside the organism and, with the help of the accompanying sexual excitation described above, becomes libidinally bound there. It is in this portion that we have to recognize the original, erotogenic masochism.13

In *The Ego and the Id*, Freud suggests that possibly "mute but powerful death instincts . . . desire to be at peace and to put Eros, the mischief-maker, to rest."14 He then applies his argument to the cultural dimensions and diagnoses that under the pressure of civilization, the whole of mankind has become "neurotic."15 It is this conflict of Eros and Thanatos, the most fundamental drives in ourselves, that captivates the reader in *Women in Love*. Especially Thanatos has a close connection with Gerald.
1. THE INSTINCT FOR MASTERY

In the "Arab mare" scene, Gerald reveals his strong instinct for mastery. When Ursula and Gudrun come to the railway crossing, they see Gerald Crich on his fine Arab mare. While the colliery train is rambling and passing, making horrible noises, Gerald makes his horse stand with him forcibly. The horse, pressed relentlessly, writhes fiercely to escape in a perfect frenzy, but he doesn't pay any attention even to her bleeding, and his spurs come down on the very wound. In this way, he makes her submit to his will and he is satisfied. Gudrun is deeply attracted by his power, whereas Ursula forgets herself, feeling repulsive to his cruelty. Later Gerald justifies himself in protest against Ursula's accusation of bullying the horse, saying that "it is more natural for a man to take a horse and use it as he likes" than "for him to go down on his knees to it, begging it to fulfill its own marvellous nature." (p. 200) He further adds, "And if your will isn't master, then, the horse is master of you." (p. 201)

The mastery is not described as an ugly, disgusting one. Gerald is a skillful jockey who just executes his will powerfully. His motive is not base and he justifies himself perfectly logically. Furthermore, other people's reactions should be noted here. Gudrun screams: "I should think you're proud." (p. 171) The gatekeeper calls Gerald "a masterful jockey" and explains his motive: "[He's] got to train the mare to stand to anything." (p. 171) Hermione agrees with Gerald, saying, "... it is false to project our own feelings on every animate creature." (p. 200) Even Birkin agrees to this. Her comment is not wrong, which Ursula herself demonstrates at another occasion, by applying it to Gudrun and criticizing her for calling a robin "Lloyd
George. " In fact, words have some magical power to focus our attention on the particular aspects of incidents. Even though Ursula blames his inhuman cruelty, Ursula's argument is somewhat clumsy, so our attention is diverted from the disagreeable sides of his mastery. Furthermore, compared to Ursula's frantic cry, awkward defense and obstinacy, other people's behavior seems more decent, refined and favorable. As if to endorse our impressions, Gudrun shows repugnancy at Ursula's naked shouting. When Gerald yields to Ursula at the end of their talk, he looks even graceful. Aesthetically, logical rationalization and decent behavior surpass emotional outburst.

Thus, with the vivid description of the scene and various reactions of the characters, the reader is left alone to judge the meaning of the scene. The characters' reactions considerably diminish the demonic nature of mastery and contribute to disguise it. If the focus is put on other aspects such as the horse's agony or Gerald's ferocity, the scene could be quite different. But here, ugly aspects of mastery are never mentioned. In this manner, our resistance, that makes us reject the revelation of our unconscious and struggles to suppress and conceal our forbidden desires, is removed. The mastery here is complete: it is rationalized, graced and supported by others; and it demands no sympathy and no sense of guilt. The reader is drawn to it unconsciously.

2. THE DESTRUCTIVE INSTINCT

Gerald shows us the supreme fulfillment of the destructive instinct, the instinct for mastery, or the will to power. In the portrait of Gerald, his great destructive power is focused, but the emphasis is rather on
its affirmative sides than on negative ones. For instance, the nurse gives information about Gerald's babyhood, but her words more lay a stress on the baby's unusual power than blame his naughtiness. In fact, she tells us that he is a born master. Then, the symbolic allusion to Cain beautifully disguises his destructive drive; it tells that he is not a nasty murderer but is mystically, tragically doomed. It covers Gerald with a mysterious veil and his lurking danger makes him even more attractive.

Gerald further shows us the realization of a dream of success.

Now at last he saw his own name written on the wall. Now he had a vision of power.

So many wagons, bearing his initial, running all over the country. He saw them as he entered London in the train, he saw them at Dover. So far his power ramified. (p. 295)

The visual images are intoxicating. Such images are also found in the following passage about his reform:

Expert engineers were introduced in every department. An enormous electric plant was installed, both for lighting and for haulage underground, and for power. The electricity was carried in every mine. New machinery was brought from America, such as the miners had never seen before, . . . Everything was run on the most accurate and delicate scientific method, educated and expert men were in control everywhere, the miners were reduced to mere mechanical instruments. (p. 304)
Here, in the vivid objective description of details, we find many emphatic words such as "enormous," "the most," "everywhere" and "everything." The phrases are, thus, quite impressive among the more abstract, explanatory sentences, and they imprint on us Gerald's extraordinary ability as an industrialist and excellent results of his thorough rationalization.

Besides these intense sensuous impressions, we notice two more outstanding characteristics of description in the explanation of his reform. One is the narrator's ambiguous words. The reform is "the first, great" step in undoing and "the first and finest" state of chaos. (p. 305) The new world is "strict, terrible, inhuman but satisfying in its very destructiveness." (p. 304) Even though "the miners [are] reduced to mere mechanical instruments," belonging to the perfect system is "a sort of freedom," the sort the workers "really [want]." (p. 305) The reform is criticized as a "pure mechanical organization"; however, due to such affirmative suggestion, it does not seem harmful at all. The ambiguous expressions rather support his victory than demonstrate the harms done by the reform. The other is the close connection between Gerald's great reform and his destructive power. By smashing up the old system, he builds up a new one. By firing the old workers, he substitutes them with experts and by saving money relentlessly, he introduces the new machinery. In this way, the destruction seems positively affirmed as an inevitable process. Even his inhuman relentlessness seems desirable, because it contributes to bring about an amazing reformation and the workers' satisfaction.

Gerald's success story intoxicates the reader, because our attention is diverted from its negative sides by the skillful use of focus, by means
of sensuous or mythic images and ambiguous or emphatic expressions; and we are magnetized by his destructive power. His reform is, after all, his triumph. No ugly aspects to spoil his victory are mentioned: Gerald displays no greediness or stupidity; his inhumanity is connected to his rational, practical way of thinking; there is no description of physical violence, blood or tears; and even the cases of the dismissed old workers or the rejected widows are not portrayed to arouse our compassion. We are, thus, released from our own sense of guilt. Moreover, we are further released from the stern reality. We know that humanity often stands in the way to the thorough display of our abilities in our real lives, in which the end is not actually permitted to justify the means. For survival in a capitalistic, competitive society, human sympathy and warm heart could be fatal traps. Thus, Gerald’s demonic nature, his cold inhumanity itself could have the power to magnetize the reader. This—we might deny consciously. However, it captivates something which lurks deep in ourselves.

3. SADISM MASOCHISM

Gerald and Gudrun’s love is the “eternal see-saw” of sadism and masochism, in which Eros is fused with Thanatos. Let us look at a scene in “Water-Party.” Gudrun dances Dalcroze before a cluster of wild castrated bulls. When she moves slowly toward the cattle in the strange eurhythmics, the brutal cattle watch her, as if hypnotized, with helpless fear and fascination. Then, Gerald comes to Gudrun to help her. To Gerald, who drives the cattle away, Gudrun says, “You think I’m afraid of you and your cattle, don’t you?” (p. 236) Gudrun
"[catches] him a blow on the face." (p. 236) She feels "in her soul an unconquerable lust for deep brutality against him." (p. 236) Gerald turns pale with rage, but when Gudrun says, "Don't be angry with me," Gerald says, "I'm not angry with you. I'm in love with you." (p. 237) And beautiful twilight falls on them.

Gudrun, who felt masochistic pleasure through empathy in the Arab Mare scene, now becomes sadistic, and Gerald, masochistic. Here we are reminded of Freud's words, "a sadist is always at the same time a masochist." Freud further explains that the aim of sadism is not only "to humiliate and master," but to "inflict pains." Hence, we understand the significance of the blow in the scene. However, the abnormal nature of their love is not revealed nakedly, but is shrouded in an enigma. The scene is ritual, introduced by Ursula's song which is "like an incantation," and by Gudrun's exotic, erotic dance, that is allusive to Euripides's Bacchae. Gudrun reminds us of Agave and becomes some mythic symbol. Her behavior is inexplicable — but an enigma arouses man's curiosity and plain or familiar things are often boring.

In this way, the unusual intensity of their love scene comes from the physical violence, the sensual eroticism and the mysterious atmosphere, which is the same in "Coal-Dust" and "Rabbit." Through these three scenes the true nature of their love gradually exposes itself. Rituals shroud the demonic nature of their love, with the special language, songs or movement of animals as incantations. Mythic, evocative symbols serve to create illusions. Thus, the reader is irresistibly drawn to the scenes which resound with the reader's forbidden unconscious drive for perverse love.

In the ice-frozen Alps, Gudrun shows her sadistic cruelty. With her
spiritual violence, she torments Gerald.

"Why do you torture me?" he said.

She flung her arms round his neck.

"Ah, I don't want to torture you," she said pityingly, as if she were comforting a child. The impertinence made his veins go cold, he was insensible. She held her arms round his neck, in a triumph of pity. And her pity for him was as cold as stone, its deepest motive was hate of him, and fear of his power over her, which she must always counterfoil.

"Say you love me," she pleaded. "Say you will love me forever — won't you — won't you?"

But it was her voice only that coaxed him. Her senses were entirely apart from him, cold and destructive of him. It was her overbearing will that insisted.

"Won't you say you'll love me always?" she coaxed. "Say it, even if it isn't true — say it Gerald, do."

"I will love you always," he repeated, in real agony, forcing the words out.

She gave him a quick kiss.

"Fancy your actually having said it," she said with a touch of raillery.

He stood as if he had been beaten.

"Try to love me a little more, and to want me a little less," she said, in a half contemptuous, half coaxing tone. (p. 540)

The narrator explains Gudrun's inner secret to show her true nature and the deepest motive for her pity. She loves him no more and just
tries to get rid of him in the outwardly kindest way, which actually is the cruelest way because of her insincerity. The narrator further exposes her supreme artificiality of which Gerald never knows. The reader, in response, clearly sees how Gerald is tormented by Gudrun. Gerald, "the God of the machine," is now powerless to be at Gudrun's mercy. Gerald, however, sticks to his love and feels masochistic pleasure: "This wound, . . . [is] his cruelest joy." (p. 543)

Then, Gerald shows us the extreme form of sadism—murder connected with love. Finally, in the snow he strangles Gudrun.

He took the throat of Gudrun between his hands, that were hard and indomitably powerful. And her throat was beautifully, so beautifully soft, save that, within, he could feel the slippery chords of her life. And this he crushed, this he could crush. What bliss! Oh what bliss, at last, what satisfaction, at last! The pure zest of satisfaction filled his soul. He was watching the unconsciousness come into her swollen face, watching the eyes roll back. How ugly she was! What a fulfillment, what a satisfaction! How good this was, oh how good it was, what a God-given gratification, at last! He was unconscious of her fighting and struggling. The struggling was her reciprocal lustful passion in this embrace, the more violent it became, the greater the frenzy of delight, till the zenith was reached, the crisis, the struggle was overcome, her movement became softer, appeased. (p. 572)

Changing from the objective narratives, the description here suddenly focuses upon Gerald's consciousness. The reader, therefore, is led to
share the experience with Gerald, seeing the scene from his point of view. We follow the act of violence successively, through the vivid description of the changes of Gudrun's physical appearance and reactions. Among the descriptive sentences, however, are scattered many exclamatory ones, which make us feel the pulse of the strong flow of Gerald's ecstasy. With its sensuous, thrilling stimulation, the scene exercises a dangerous power upon the reader. Murder could bring about such a voluptuous fulfillment. It is a consummation of the death instinct with sadistic satisfaction. Thus, as has been noticed, Thanatotic nature of their love draws the reader.

4. THE DEATH INSTINCTS

Gerald's death is another consummation of his death drive. His death drive, which has been in himself from the first ("the great dark void which [circles] at the center of his soul" (p. 405)), motivates Gerald to love Gudrun and leads him to his final disaster, though it is not obvious at a glance. Gerald says to Birkin, "Gudrun seems like the end to me," but there is no reason that Gudrun should be necessarily the end to him. Like Tess in Tess of the D'urbervilles, the true cause of his fate lies in his psychology.

After Gerald stops strangling, he wanders in the snow-covered mountains.

... the cradle of snow ran on to the eternal closing-in, where the walls of snow and rock rose impenetrable, and the mountain peaks above were in heaven immediate. This was the centre, the knot, the navel of the world, where the earth belonged to the
skies, pure, unapproachable, impassable. (p. 492)

It is the white, inhuman, ice-frozen world in silence. Gerald just drifts on and on. He says to himself, "I've had enough — I want to go to sleep. I've had enough." (p. 573)

The twilight spread a weird, unearthly light overhead, bluish-rose in colour, the cold blue night sank on the snow. (p. 573)

Under the painful, brilliant moon, he comes to the hollow basin of snow, and goes to sleep. This is how he ends his life. It is a process of self-destruction; now, he is returning to his former inorganic state. Inside himself, the dominant tendency is to reduce his tension due to stimuli as low as possible or to nothing, the tendency that Freud calls "the Nirvana Principle" which expresses the trend of the death instincts. His death instincts achieve their final consummation.

Death is elevated to the highest aesthetic point here. The scene is beautiful with vivid sensuous imagery. It is a frozen world of white snow with some hard black rocks. Twilight falls on it with small bright moon, and it is a world of silence. Furthermore, the significance of many evocative symbols is revealed now. His connections with Dionysus, the Northern Arctic, and the world of water become meaningful and many prophetic words by Birkin or other characters now prove to be true. The moon is the same moon which shines on the lake at Diana’s death. It is Artemis, and the Goddess of Death. The scene is also mysterious and rich with implications. The crucifix and the Marienhütte remind us of Jesus Christ, and the death in the navel
of the earth is a return back to the earth's womb. There, "the earth [ belongs ] to the sky." The death here is quite different from that of Thomas Crich and those we know. Thomas Crich dies a terribly slow, abominable death. In our actual lives, too, death is horrible, disgusting and extremely ugly at times. However, here, death is elevated to its supreme artistic culmination. The reader can indulge in the consummation of the death instincts in this beautiful illusion of peace and silence.

To die, to sleep —
No more — and by a sleep to say we end
The heartache, and the thousand natural shocks
That flesh is heir to! 'Tis a consummation
Devoutly to be wished. 20

5. THE REALITY PRINCIPLE

I have discussed all the three forms of the death instincts that Freud indicates, but Gerald has another quality which unfailingly attracts us but at the same time, is substantially fatal to him. It is his adaptability to conventional society. His outward adaptability is obvious from his great success as an industrialist. He has a special talent and extraordinary capacity. According to Gudrun, he would be "a Napoleon of peace, or a Bismarck." (p. 511) In addition, he adjusts himself inwardly, too. At the time of the wedding and the funeral, he plays the conventional roles tactfully, and believes in the conventions as a matter of course. Let us examine how his inward adaptability works in the novel.
His successful adaptation is observed in his sophisticated maturity which is effectively conveyed through comparison. For instance, when Diana drowns in the lake, Gerald shows his strong sense of responsibility which manifests his maturity. He tries to search desperately in the water in spite of his exhaustion, while Birkin tells Ursula that Diana had better die. When his father is at his death bed, Gerald says that somebody has to see through his death, to which his mother answers, "Have they?"

In the train to London, realistic Gerald is in stark contrast to Birkin who is eagerly absorbed in his impractical metaphysics. When Birkin tells that we should bust this life completely, Gerald asks "how do you propose to begin?" Birkin's answer is "I don't propose at all. When we really want to go for something better, we shall smash the old." (p. 106) He further asks Gerald about "the aim and object of life," "the finality of love," and "the ultimate marriage," to which Gerald answers from a realistic point of view, being baffled. Finally Birkin declares to himself, "Let humanity disappear as quick as possible." (p. 111) In spite of Birkin's words, "I hate you," Gerald "[wants] to be fond of him without taking him seriously." (p. 110) Birkin seems even childish compared to Gerald's maturity. In the same way, Gerald's words that we have to have some "standard of behavior" (p. 81) are more persuasive than Birkin's "to act spontaneously on one's impulse." (p. 82) When Gerald declines Birkin's offer of special male friendship, Gerald's discretion and common sense somehow seem more reliable than Birkin's unusual project. In this way, Gerald's adaptability to conventional society, which is shown in his success, capacity, and sophisticated maturity, composes an indispensable part of his attractiveness.
However, in order to perform his complete adaptation, he represses his own life instincts. He is "un-believer," (p. 110) who neither believes in a woman nor Birkin. He knows "Birkin could do without him — could forget, and not suffer." (p. 277) He avoids too much commitment and even marriage is "not committing of himself into a relationship with Gudrun," but "a committing of himself in acceptance of the established world." (p. 440) This is his way to defend and to preserve himself, and according to Birkin, "the insistence of the limitation." (p. 278)

Adaptation is the consequence of the replacement of the pleasure principle by the reality principle. Concerning this mechanism, Freud explains that the ego, standing between the id and reality, "gives the death instinct in the id assistance in gaining control over the libido." In order to make Eros renounce its drive temporarily or permanently, Thanatotic drive is necessary to arrest Eros in the process of renunciation. A perfect adaptation like Gerald's requires exceptionally powerful death drive. What attracts us in the name of sophistication, maturity, discretion or common sense, is in fact, his powerful suppression of his Eros. Because of our restless Eros, we often find it difficult to adjust to the existent society; on the other hand, Gerald is never a slave to his Eros. His strong self-control is just desirable for us. We are drawn to the power of his Thanatos for the reality principle.

In this manner, the death instincts in Gerald have some irresistible power to penetrate into the depth of the reader and echo there. His hidden power stems from his instinct of mastery, his will to power, his destructive instinct, his sadomasochistic love and his extreme adaptability to reality. To sum up, it is his Thanatos that powerfully
magnetizes the reader.

6. A PSYCHOPATHOLOGICAL NOVEL

We have recognized how strongly we are drawn to Gerald's Thanatos. We are gripped from inside. Like Gerald, we are proceeding toward death by our own Thanatos. In other words, we are infected with the same fatal malady as Gerald.

What Freud calls "psychopathological drama" is a drama about a conflict between "a conscious impulse and a repressed one," and "the precondition of enjoyment is that the spectator should himself be a neurotic," because "in neurotics the repression is on the brink of failing." He gives Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as an example. According to Freud, Hamlet's Oedipus Complex is the real cause to delay his revenge and the secret power to move the reader. In "Psychopathic Characters on the Stage," he states,

It would seem to be the dramatist's business to induce the same illness in us; and this can best be achieved if we are made to follow the development of the illness along with the sufferer. This will be especially necessary where the repression does not already exist in us but has first to be set up; and this represents a step further than *Hamlet* in the use of neurosis on the stage.

Now we understand the mystery of the effect of Gerald's story. Here the problem is his demonic, overpowering Thanatos. His Thanatos is only vaguely implied at first, and gradually reveals itself with the
development of the story until its final consummation—Gerald’s self-destruction. The reader is drawn to them, because the drive is similarly repressed in all of us. In the novel, we share Gerald’s destructive impulses, perverse love and destructive repression of Eros under the name of adaptation. Especially concerning adaptation, our repression does not "exist," because there is no need to repress it, since the final goal of our adaptation seems to be a fulfillment of our Eros. As the novel shows, however, adaptation can also be destructive, when it is just a blind, mechanical one to the society which is itself off track. Not knowing what we are doing, we enjoy suppressing our Eros, being driven by our Thanatos. We follow the development of the same illness along with the sufferer, Gerald. At this point, we understand the importance of the fundamental structure of the novel confirmed in the beginning of this paper. *Oedipus the King*, to which *Women in Love* bears a striking resemblance, is also a psychopathological drama that is built upon the resistance to liberation of our instinctive drive. Furthermore, we recognize how many rituals and evocative symbols work in the story. The allusions to Dionysus, Cain, Artemis, Cybele and others, the counterpoint of African sensuous passion and Northern Arctic coldness, effective ritual scenes, symbolic animals and many evocative equivocations—all these work as a kind of narcotic. By creating a mysterious atmosphere or cultivating a sense of doom, they induce a hypnotic state in the reader. They remove his resistance and set his unconscious drive free. The process is similar to that of psychotherapy. The text can be called, thus, a "psychopathological" novel.
CONCLUSION

Lawrence consciously tried to create this psychopathological novel. Is it not possible to assume that he knew about Freud's aforementioned paper and was ambitious to go "a step further" than Hamlet? Freud's "Psychopathic Characters on the Stage" was written in 1906 and presented to Dr. Max Graf, so Lawrence might have already known about it before he started writing Women in Love in April, 1916. If we consider Lawrence's antagonism against Freudianism, it may not be possible. Still, it is interesting to notice here that in the same paper, Freud refers to the difference between Greek tragedies and social tragedies, and Lawrence expresses exactly the same view in his Study of Thomas Hardy. Consciously or unconsciously, he was considerably influenced by Freudianism.

Even if he never knew the said paper, the aim of his project is clear enough. In his own way, Lawrence tried to create a "psychopathological novel" intentionally. He was fully aware of Gerald's inner problem, the reader's unconscious reactions and his own unconscious. He knew that the conflicts found in a psychopathological drama were the author's own conflicts and that his own unconscious was set free and poured straight into the text during his creation. He was sure that his inner conflicts would work on the reader and tried to make full use of it.

Lawrence's theory of "the desire of life and the desire of death" is strikingly similar to Freud's Eros and Thanatos.

... there are ultimately only two desires, the desire of life and the desire of death. . . .
All active life is either desire of life or desire of death, desire of putting together or desire of putting asunder. . . .

We cannot admit the desire of death in ourselves even when it is single and dominant. We must still deceive ourselves with the name of life.

This is the root of all confusion, this inability for man to admit, "Now I am single in my desire for destructive death." When it is autumn in the world, the autumn of a human epoch, then the desire for death becomes single and dominant. I want to kill, I want violent sensationalism, I want to break down, I want to put asunder, I want anarchic revolution—it is all the same, the single desire for death.25

Both Lawrence and Freud dare to see the destructive impulses in individuals which expose themselves in dominance, violence or perverse love, and from which we can never be free. Their pessimistic views of the world are quite alike. They lived in a period of crisis, when all of Europe was devastated under the rage of World War I. As for "the desire of life," they both found affirmative factors in sexual desires against the traditional Christianity. Thus, they created this remarkably similar dualism.

However, Freud trusts in science; Lawrence, in art and religion, so their theories differ considerably on some vital points. Freud tries to explain the mechanism of unconscious scientifically, while Lawrence thinks that the unconscious is holy and "inconceivable," and is only known "by direct experience."26 Freud regards Eros and Thanatos as opposing to each other in a struggle. On the other hand, Lawrence insists on the balance between them, like the balance between the dark
and the light.

We are not only creatures of light and virtue. We are also alive in corruption and death. It is necessary to balance the dark against the light if we are ever going to be free. We must know that we, ourselves, are the living stream of seething corruption, this also, all the while, as well as the bright river of life. We must recover our balance to be free. From our bodies comes the issue of corruption as well as the issue of creation. We must have our being in both, our knowledge must consist in both. . . .

Beyond these [two desires] is pure being, where I am absolved from desire and made perfect. This is when I am like a rose, when I balance for a space in pure adjustment and pure understanding.\(^{27}\)

Now we understand why Ursula and Birkin's love is not triumphant in the novel. They are the "living stream of seething corruption," as well as the bright river of life," and are trying to recover their "balance" to be free.

Lawrence further declares:

When we know the death is in ourselves, we are emerging into the new epoch.

That which is understood by man is surpassed by man. When we understand our extreme being in death, we have surpassed into a new being. Many bitter and fearsome things there are for us to know, that we may go beyond them; they have no power over us any more.\(^{28}\)
A psychoanalytic treatment consists in "bringing to [patients'] consciousness, to some extent forcibly, the unconscious whose repression led to their falling ill..." In the same way, Lawrence thinks that for us, "to understand is to overcome." In *Women in Love*, in order to show the way to balance for a space like a "rose of lovely peace," Lawrence strives to make the reader know his own unconscious desire "by direct experience."

In this way, based upon the fundamental structure of tragedy, the text is skillfully composed to derive the reader's unconscious reactions. Gradually, the reader's resistance is effectively removed so that we are magnetized by Gerald's Thanatos, responding to him with our own neurotic tendencies. The secret of the demonic power of Gerald is the reflection of the power of our own unconscious. Thus, the reason for the discrepancy between 'what seems to be intention' and performance is that *Women in Love* is an elaborately organized "psychopathological novel" based upon our vital, unconscious conflicts.

Reference Notes


10. According to Ernest Jones, Freud did not use the word, "Thanatos" in his writings but he did use it in conversations. (Ernest Jones, The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud, New York: Basic Books, 1961.)


12. Ibid., p. 322. They are "Lebenstriebe" and "Todeskriete" in German. The word, "Trieb" retains overtones suggestive of pressure (Treiben = to push) and could mean "drive", "impulse", "urge" or "need". It should be distinguished from the word, "Instinkt" which is connected to heredity. (J. Laplanche, Life and Death in Psychoanalysis, pp. 9-24.)

18. In *Bacchae*, Pentheus was torn to pieces by his mother, Agave and his sisters.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid., p. 127.
28. Ibid., p. 676.
31. Ibid., p. 694.
SUMMARY

*Women in Love* as a Psychopathological Novel

Makiko Mizuta

The main riddle of *Women in Love* consists in discrepancy between 'what seems to be intention' and performance of the text. In the river of dissolution, Ursula and Birkin accomplish the ultimate love — star — equilibrium, but Gudrun and Gerald cannot because of some ontological problems. The negative story of Gerald, nevertheless, has some mysterious power to magnetize the reader, and "fleurs du mal" represented by them are in full bloom throughout the work. The intent of this paper is to find out a reason for the discrepancy by trying a psychoanalytical approach based upon Freud's theory of life instincts [Eros] and death instincts [Thanatos].

In fact, a "psychopathological drama," which Freud explains in "Psychopathic Characters on the Stage" is exactly what Lawrence tried to create in *Women in Love*. The novel is elaborately organized in expectation of the reader's unconscious reactions.