

**AN ARCHETYPAL ANALYSIS OF SONS AND LOVERS AND WOMEN  
IN LOVE BY D.H.LAWRENCE**

**Pamukkale University  
Social Sciences Institution  
Master of Arts Thesis  
The Department of English Language and Literature**

---

**Meltem UZUNOĞLU ERTEN**

**Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Cumhuri Yılmaz MADRAN**

**JUNE 2008  
DENİZLİ**

## YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ ONAY FORMU

Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı öğrencisi Meltem UZUNOĞLU ERTEN tarafından Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cumhur Yılmaz MADRAN yönetiminde hazırlanan “An Archetypal Analysis of Sons and Lovers and Women in Love by D. H. Lawrence ( D.H. Lawrence’ın Oğullar ve Sevgililer ve Aşık Kadınlar Romanlarının Arketipsel Analizi) ” başlıklı tez aşağıdaki jüri üyeleri tarafından 25/06/2008. tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavında başarılı bulunmuş ve Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Doç. Dr. Ertuğrul İŞLER

Jüri Başkanı



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cumhur Yılmaz MADRAN

Jüri Üyesi (Danışman)



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Meryem AYAN

Jüri Üyesi



Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu'nun 0207.2008 tarih ve 10/03... sayılı kararıyla onaylanmıştır.



Doç. Dr. Mehmet MEDER  
Müdür

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that as required by these rules and conduct I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Signature:

Name, Last Name: Meltem UZUNOĞLU ERTEN

To my husband and my family

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I should like to express my sincerest gratitude and thanks to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Cumhuri Yılmaz MADRAN for his guidance and helpful suggestions for my study and my teachers whose wisdom I have profited during my MA education; Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul İŞLER, Assist. Prof. Dr. Turan PAKER and Assist. Prof. Dr. Meryem AYAN. I would also like to express my thanks to the library staff, especially Hasan ATMACA and Ahmet SARGIN who showed their helpfulness and goodness in providing the necessary material for my thesis.

I am deeply indebted to my husband Research Assist. Hüseyin ERTEN and my parents Asuman and Tevfik UZUNOĞLU for their endless support and patience.

My final thanks go to my friend Ayşegül KOÇAK SİĞİNÇ with whom we turned the hardest moments into joy during our education.

**ABSTRACT****AN ARCHETYPAL ANALYSIS OF SONS AND LOVERS AND WOMEN IN LOVE****BY D.H.LAWRENCE**

Uzunođlu Erten, Meltem  
M.A. Thesis in English Literature  
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Cumhuri Yılmaz MADRAN

June 2008, 135 pages

The mythical framework and the archetypes in D.H.Lawrence is the main topic of this study which focuses upon Lawrence's two novels, Sons and Lovers and Women in Love. Lawrence's purpose in using the myths, mythical patterns and archetypes in his works is to reflect the alienation and isolation of man in modern world and the corruption in modern society. Lawrence employs the archetypes of the individual and more universal archetypes to deal with both the man alone and the society as a whole.

The method used in this study is archetypal criticism. Archetypal criticism deals with the archetypes which are primordial images inherited through generations. Archetypes constitute "the collective unconscious" which is a deeper layer and which is inborn and universal for all mankind.

Chapter one identifies the main mythical approaches throughout the ages and the developments in this field. Chapter two deals with Psychoanalytical Criticism introduced by Sigmund Freud and C.G.Jung. Chapter three analyzes Modernism and the period called the Modern Period. Chapter four and Chapter five attempt to scrutinize Sons and Lovers and Women in Love in the light of Archetypal Criticism.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze Lawrence's use of myths, mythical patterns and archetypes of the collective unconscious to reflect his world view. While his archetypes are the archetypes of the individual in Sons and Lovers, they develop into more universal archetypes in Women in Love. This study puts forward how Lawrence communicates his developing vision about the mankind, the society and the world through these developing archetypes.

**Keywords:** Mythology, Archetype, Jung, Lawrence

## ÖZET

### D.H.LAWRENCE'IN OĞULLAR VE SEVGİLİLER VE AŞIK KADINLAR

#### ROMANLARININ ARKETİPSEL ANALİZİ

Uzunoğlu Erten, Meltem  
Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı ABD  
Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cumhuriyet Yılmaz MADRAN

Haziran 2008, 135 sayfa

D.H.Lawrence'ın Oğullar ve Sevgililer ve Aşık Kadınlar isimli iki romanının incelendiği bu çalışmanın ana konusu Lawrence'ın kullandığı mitsel çerçeve ve arketiplerdir. Lawrence'ın eserlerinde mitleri, mitsel kalıpları ve arketipleri kullanmaktaki amacı, insanın modern dünyadaki yalnızlığını ve çevresinden soyutlanışını ve modern toplumun içinde bulunduğu çöküşü anlatmaktır. Hem tek başına insan hem de toplumun tamamı için, Lawrence hem bireysel hem de evrensel arketiplerden faydalanmıştır.

Bu çalışmada kullanılan metod arketipsel eleştiridir. Arketipsel eleştiri nesilden nesile aktarılan ilk imgeler olarak açıklanabilecek arketipler ile ilgilenir. Arketipler, tüm insanlık için evrensel olan ve doğuştan gelen derin bir tabaka olan “kolektif bilinçaltını” nı oluştururlar.

Birinci bölüm, yüzyıllar boyu etkin olmuş belli başlı mitsel yaklaşımları ve bu alandaki gelişimleri tanımlamaktadır. İkinci bölüm Sigmund Freud ve C.G.Jung tarafından öne sürülmüş olan “Psikanalitik Eleştiri” üzerine odaklanmıştır. Üçüncü bölüm Modernizmi ve Modern Dönem olarak adlandırılan dönemi incelemektedir. Dördüncü ve beşinci bölümler ise Oğullar ve Sevgililer ve Aşık Kadınlar isimli romanların Arketipsel Eleştiri yardımı ile analizini içermektedir.

Bu tezin amacı, Lawrence'ın kendi dünya görüşünü yansıtmak amacı ile mitleri, mitsel kalıpları ve kolektif bilinçaltına ait arketipleri nasıl kullandığını incelemektir. Oğullar ve Sevgililer romanında kullanmış olduğu arketipler bireye ait arketipler ile sınırlıyken, bunlar Aşık Kadınlar'da daha evrensel arketiplere doğru gelişirler. Bu çalışma, Lawrence'ın gelişme gösteren arketipler aracılığı ile insanlık, toplum ve dünya ile ilgili ortaya koyduğu düşüncelerini nasıl ifade ettiğini ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mitoloji, Arketip, Jung, Lawrence.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM .....	i
DEDICATION .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
ÖZET .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE	
THE MYTHICAL THOUGHT THROUGH AGES IN THE WESTERN MIND.....	5
CHAPTER TWO	
PSYCHOANALYTIC CRITICISM.....	21
CHAPTER THREE	
MODERNISM.....	35
CHAPTER FOUR	
LAWRENCE’S NOVEL AND SONS AND LOVERS .....	50
CHAPTER FIVE	
WOMEN IN LOVE .....	91
CONCLUSION .....	126
REFERENCES.....	131
VITA .....	135



## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is an analysis of myth, mythical patterns and archetypes in D.H. Lawrence which he uses in order to express his world view. The most appropriate method for the analysis of Lawrence's works is the Archetypal Method since his works are rich in myths and archetypes. The present study analyzes which archetypes he employs to support his ideas, criticisms and suggestions as well as how he makes use of these archetypes in creating a progress developing from individuality to universality. The present study puts forward that Lawrence's archetypes evolve from the archetypes of the individual to the universal archetypes. His archetypes which are limited to the world of the individual characters in Sons and Lovers change into the larger archetypes of universality in Women in Love. This development indicates that Lawrence first focuses on the individual as the smallest unit, and then deals with the society as a whole.

In Sons and Lovers, Lawrence reflects the insecurity and rootlessness of modern life, and especially man as the pitiful victim of a world of brute force who becomes alienated from himself and nature. He dramatizes the complete loneliness which could be caused by an emphasis upon the private world and the interior journey toward personal understanding. In Sons and Lovers Lawrence is preoccupied with the archetypes of the development of the individual. These are the different aspects of the mother archetype and the character archetypes like the shadow, the animus and the anima which function as the stages of individuation process. While the archetypes of the individual are common in Sons and Lovers, the universal archetypes such as death and rebirth take place in Women in Love. Even archetypes such as the Great Mother and the Great Father become universal values in Women in Love in contrast to the mother archetype in Sons and Lovers which is limited to the individual since these archetypes stand for the earth and nature deities in Women in Love. Therefore, Lawrence widens his scope from the corruption of the world of the individual to the corruption of the society which is a necessary step of the process towards a rebirth in

Lawrence's view. Additionally, Lawrence never abandons the archetypes of nature through which he handles the alienation of man both to his own nature and his surroundings. The development in Lawrence's usage of archetypes has been taken as a basis in the analysis of his novels in order to witness his progress as a writer as well as his identity as a twentieth century novelist.

Lawrence is a novelist who focuses upon the inner world of the individual as opposed to his predecessors. He emphasizes the importance of characterization and the psychological dimension of his characters unlike the realist writers of the nineteenth century since he believes in the importance of the individual experience beneath the social surface. His attempts are supported by the newly arising sciences of his period such as psychology and psychoanalysis which emphasize the importance of the unconscious. According to these newly discovered branches of science of the twentieth century, mythological patterns and archetypes are regarded as the products of the unconscious which the individual externalizes especially in literary works. Thus, psychoanalytical, mythological and archetypal methods in literary criticism have become popular as a way of scrutinizing the unconscious of both the writer and his characters. Since Lawrence deals with the mythological patterns and archetypes, his works are appropriate for the application of these methods.

The theoretical basis for this study is Jungian Archetypal Criticism, which deals with mythological patterns and archetypes in literary works. Mythological patterns are the recurrent motifs in myths. They reflect the timeless memory of mankind which continuously repeats itself. Archetypes are mythic symbols which are deeply rooted in the collective unconscious. The hypothesis of the collective unconscious was introduced by C.G.Jung. The collective unconscious is a deeper layer which does not rest upon the personal unconscious or which is not a personal acquisition, but which is inborn and universal, and which has contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals.

The archetypes employed by Lawrence will be analyzed according to the Jungian Archetypal Criticism. Archetypes such as mother, hero, twins, anima, animus, shadow and persona will be emphasized as well as more universal archetypes such as equality, death and rebirth. Both novels will be examined with the same method and

will be supported by the works of psychoanalytical critics. This study aims to shed some light upon the archetypes employed by Lawrence; it never attempts to make suggestions on the theory of archetypes.

The study is composed of two parts: the theoretical and the analytical parts. In the theoretical part, some background information about the method which is employed in the analytical part is given in detail together with the features of the period in which Lawrence wrote his novels Sons and Lovers and Women in Love. The analytical part is composed of the analysis of the two novels according to the Jungian method. Thus, the study is composed of five chapters.

Chapter One is a general overview on myth, the important figures in the mythical criticism and their approaches to mythology. The meaning of the word “myth” and the fields in which it is used are discussed in detail starting from the early Greek philosophers. The relationship between myth and literature and the role of myth in the twentieth century fiction are discussed in this chapter as well. In Chapter Two, the emphasis is upon Psychoanalytic Criticism as a new science which focuses on the psychology and the inner world of the individual. Psychoanalytic Criticism emerged as a result of the changing standards in the twentieth century society which caused man’s isolation and alienation in this new, strange world where “people’s efforts to establish links with others” failed as a result of the “traditional interpersonal structures [that] disappeared” (Frosh, 1991: 6). Two important figures in this field, Sigmund Freud and C.G.Jung and their theories are discussed focusing upon the similarities and differences with references to the relation of their theories to literature. Certainly, in order to understand this progress, a detailed analysis of the period called Modernism is required. Therefore, Chapter Three focuses on what modernism means, where it starts and ends and the alerting forces behind the movement. The meaning of the word “modern” is discussed, the features of the period are compared and contrasted with the previous periods. The characterization of modernity with “uncertainty [and] rapidity of change” (Ibid: 7) and its causes and effects are investigated. Besides, modernism in literature and what makes a work modern have been examined in this chapter since the literary products are more meaningful when they are related with the periods in which they have been created. Completing the theoretical framework in the first three chapters, the last two chapters deal with the analysis of the two novels by D.H.Lawrence. In Chapter

Four, Sons and Lovers is analysed by using the aforementioned theoretical devices. Additionally, brief information about Lawrence's understanding of novel is given in the introduction part of the chapter. Finally, Chapter Five is about Women in Love which is also analyzed by using the same method.

Lawrence's purpose in making use of mythological patterns and archetypes in his works can be accepted as a means of reflecting the inner worlds of his characters and their unconscious psychologies. Focusing on the psychological aspect enables him to reflect the isolation and alienation of modern man in the modern world which "pervades to relationship of man to his work, to the things he consumes, to his fellows, and to himself" (Josephson, 1963: 11). In the simplest sense, alienation means that "man has lost his identity or 'selfhood'" (Ibid: 14). Lawrence communicates the situation of the modern man and his struggle for the search of a self through recurrent mythological patterns and archetypes. The search of the modern man for his lost self is portrayed in Sons and Lovers. The heroic struggle of the individual against the cruel forces of modernity is reflected vividly in his work. Following the emphasis on the world of the individual, Lawrence focuses upon archetypes as reflecting the battling forces of the universe and its cyclical nature of birth and death in Women in Love. In contrast to the individualistic tone in Sons and Lovers, Women in Love focuses upon a society which is on the threshold of corruption. According to Lawrence, the society mentioned in Women in Love should experience a rebirth following its death for salvation. This salvation is possible only by a return to nature, which means a return to the man's nature at the same time. That is why Lawrence emphasizes the significance of nature and "tries to indicate something of his characters' inner natures and something of the emotional conflicts and harmonies that exist between them, through their relations with nature. The inner strength and vitality of the individual characters and of their relationships with one another are judged, that is, by the extent to which they maintain a vital connection with the surrounding natural world" (Poplawski, 1993: 66).

Consequently, Lawrence focuses upon the problems of the modern age and modern man. For the modern man, the only way out of the modern chaos is hidden in nature. Thus, Lawrence's favourite material is always related with nature.

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **THE MYTHICAL THOUGHT THROUGH AGES IN THE WESTERN MIND**

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate what myth is, the disciplines which have figured prominently in the development of myth criticism and to examine the relation between myth and literature. This theoretical framework has been taken as a basis for a more detailed analysis: mythification. Mythification is an artistic form which is used to refer to an extraordinary variety of themes. Throughout history, writers or critics, depending upon the schools or disciplines which they represented have defined myth by emphasizing their points of view. Any account of the relation between myth and literature has a responsibility first to define what myth is. The definition of the key term myth and a discussion upon it are essential for anyone attempting to explain mythological criticism.

Myths are the stories of mankind from time immemorial onwards. Their function, meaning and purpose have occupied and still occupy the minds of generations. People have commented on the role of these ageless products of humanity throughout the centuries. They have tried to answer some crucial questions such as the source of myths, their roles in human life, hidden points under surface stories and why the human mind has needed to create them and so on. Thus there are innumerable conflicting definitions of myth. In order to understand the mythical thought, it will be helpful first to analyze them.

First of all it is known that in the ancient world there was “a widespread notion that myth and ‘fact’ are two distinct but not completely incompatible forms of discourse,” (Meletinsky, 1998: vii) which caused the opposition between the “Greek *mûthos*, ‘legend’, and *logos*, ‘word’ or ‘true story’ (Ibid: vii). This opposition still has power today and is the reason for our modern understanding of myth as a lie. However,

“myths are not lies, or false statements to be contrasted with truth or reality” (O’Flaherty, 1988: 25). On the contrary:

“A myth is a story that is sacred to and shared by a group of people who find their most important meanings in it; it is a story believed to have been composed in the past about an event in the past, or, more rarely, in the future, an event that continues to have meaning in the present because it is remembered; it is a story that is part of a larger group of stories.” (Ibid: 27)

Naturally, philosophers starting from the ancient times could not ignore these stories: stories that keep all “the human experiences and events that we all share-birth, love, hate, death” (Ibid: 1). “Because “no less than we, the Greeks and early Christians were fascinated by the bizarre creatures and the cryptic or terrible happenings which the myths of primitive times described” (Chase, 1969: 1).

The early Greek philosophers Thales and Pythagoras made use of their knowledge about nature and “tried to show that the ancient myths were allegories of nature and that the mythical beings were personifications of natural phenomena”(Ibid: 1). Stoics took the matter from a different way and saw myths as moral allegories under the influence of “their ethical and ascetic religion” (Ibid: 1): “They took the myths to be ingeniously symbolized concepts of the nature of the universe or beautiful veils concealing profound moral principles... The Stoics supposed that certain gods symbolized moral qualities” (Ibid: 2).

Following the allegorical explanations, Euhemerism came to the fore which “is the theory that the gods are deified men who once lived on earth as conquerors, rulers, or renowned philosophers and that myth is history distorted by the fancy of storytellers” (Ibid: 3).

Unlike allegorical comments, Plato’s approach towards myth was a bit ambiguous. Whereas “Aristotle, especially in his Poetics, saw myth as fable” (Meletinsky, 1998: 3), for Plato myth-makers and their art were not only inferior but also dangerous to his ideal state that is based on reason. He banished poets from his ideal state in his Republic for this reason: “What is combated and rejected by Plato is not poetry in itself, but the myth-making function. To him and to every other Greek both things were inseparable. From time immemorial the poets had been the real mythmakers” (Cassier, 1946: 67). Besides his negative attitude, Plato was conscious of

the power of myth. Otherwise he would simply ignore it, but on the contrary, he “advance[d] for the ‘noble lie’ in the Republic, the statement that distorts an outside surface in order to convey an inner truth” (O’Flaherty, 1988: 26). For this purpose he created new myths that serve for practical purposes such as the Cave myth. Absolutely he admitted “that a myth says something that cannot be said in any other way, that cannot be translated into a logical or even a metaphysical statement. A myth says something that can only be said in a *story*” (Ibid: 27).

When we come to the Middle Ages, “Ages of faith” welcomes us in which “any conception of the world from which the supernatural was excluded was profoundly alien to the minds of that age” (Bloch, 1961: 81). In harmony with the general spirit of the age, the views on myth were also under the influence of religion. Since medieval thought which was not original but was composed of old philosophy assumed a new shape whose center was religion, all knowledge inherited from the ancient world was interpreted from a Christian point of view. Because in the medieval world “by a curious paradox, through the very fact of their respect for the past, people came to reconstruct it as they considered it ought to have been” (Ibid: 92). As a result of this reconstruction, the idea of myth as a plagiarism from Judaism and Christianity or as a misinterpretation of these religions was common: “Whatever was undeniably worthy in the pagan religion and mythology was said to have been plagiarized from Judaism. The idea of plagiarism has sometimes been extended in Christian writings to mean that all pagan religion and mythology was taken from the Jews and corrupted by barbarian plagiarists” (Chase, 1969: 4). This view proves that the medieval mind did not make a distinction between the God of the Bible and the gods of the pagan myths. Unity in one god was a thought inspired by “the medieval method of allegorical and spiritual interpretation” (Cassier, 1946: 88).

With the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, the world changed in a radical way, nevertheless, no original idea on myth was favoured. The attitude towards myth was under the dominance of allegorical comments as before or an indifference to the subject replaced all:

“During the Renaissance, interest in the mythology of antiquity emerged once again. Myth was seen positively as a series of poetic allegories tinted by a moralizing veneer; as a manifestation of the sentiments and passions that accompanied human

emancipation; or as an allegorical expression of religious, philosophical, and scientific truths. By contrast, the scholars of the Enlightenment were generally negative toward myth, believing it to be the result of ignorance and delusion.” (Meletinsky, 1998: 3)

In the Enlightenment period, myth was given a pejorative meaning, equated with ignorance and delusion. In the Romantic period, myth was seen as an aesthetic or artistic creation in contrast to the allegorical and visionary treatment of the earlier periods. As opposed to the earlier views, the Romantic view emphasized the importance of symbolism; thus, it changed the route of the mythical thought:

“In the Romantic view, myth is essentially treated as an aesthetic phenomenon that, in contrast to earlier views, is also privileged as the symbolic prototype of artistic creation. The waning of traditional interpretations of myth as allegory... and the growth of the symbolic approach, are the nexus of the Romantic view.” (Ibid: 7/8)

The recurring interest towards myth had to wait until the 19th century in order to gain a scientific character. The emergence of the anthropological school, composed of E.B. Tylor, Andrew Lang and Sir James Frazer, helped to construct a scientific method to analyze myths. In the nineteenth century, with the emergence of anthropology as a scientific discipline which investigated ancient and modern societies, the term myth began to be treated scientifically by anthropologists. They applied recent anthropological discoveries to the understanding of the Greek classics in terms of mythic and ritualistic origins. Consequently, they introduced the comparative method that was the outcome of Darwin’s theory. Unlike the general belief in “the hierarchical supremacy of civilized European man over the animal kingdom,” (Carpentier, 1998: 13) Darwin emphasized the equality of all creatures and how they depend on each other as parts of a chain. In contrast to the previous understanding, Darwinian Theory was based on similarities rather than the differences. This tendency was the birth of the comparative method: “Instead of looking everywhere for humanity's special differences from the rest of creation, scientists now became fascinated with finding similarities” (Ibid: 14).

In short, finding “cultural, religious and even psychological similarities between 'savages' and 'civilized' humanity” (Ibid: 13) became the main purpose of the cultural anthropologists. For Tylor, the similarity of humanity was to be looked for “not only cross-culturally, but throughout time” (Ibid: 15). His theory was based on “survivals” and “animism”.



Tylor was a rationalist who saw primitive religion as a product of human reason and myths as conscious explanations. For this reason he was the leader of those who thought that the savages had a culture to study. According to his theory of “survivals”, “customs such as peasant holidays, proverbs and riddles, children's games and toys, folktales and superstitions, which his researches among native peoples convinced him were survivals of more primitive times, still existing in his own day, in modern “civilized” England” (Carpentier, 1998: 16).

In direct contrast to philologists, Tylor claimed that “myth is... *prelinguistic*” (Chase, 1969: 52). Another member of the comparative school, Andrew Lang, shared this antiphilologist idea. What they did not share was their views on the relation between myth and religion. For Tylor, who “was battling against the pervasive assumption that people who did not believe in one omnipotent creator, as Christians do, had no religion at all” (Carpentier, 1998: 17). Myths and religion were closely associated with each other and both had its ground in “animism” because savage people were like the children who give a soul to every object and who can not separate objective reality from the subjective one. This inability to distinguish between two worlds was the cause of not only the animistic nature of myth that was “not allegoric but experiential” (Ibid: 20) but also the theory of magic introduced by Tylor. Thus, man had no limit for his power. In other words, he believed that he was capable of everything, a view which will be found also in Frazer’s The Golden Bough while dealing with magic.

Concerning religion, unlike Tylor, Lang “saw an embryonic monotheism in the culture heroes of myth” (Meletinsky, 1998: 13). He also believed in the theory of “survivals”, but when religion was under discussion, he pointed to the difference between myth and religion: “Lang perceived a split between religion and myth because he saw myths as the ‘*chronique scandalouse*’, whereas religion must be based upon morality” (Carpentier, 1998: 32). Regardless of their common or conflicting approaches, the vitality of Tylor and Lang’s theories lies in their far-sightedness:

“Lang relied on the Tylorian concept that ‘similar conditions of mind produce similar practices’, but he went further than Tylor in frequently describing mythic images and rites as ‘universal’. Thus Jung’s theory of the communicability of archetypes through a ‘collective unconscious’ had been essentially established 50 years earlier in the work of

Tylor and Lang, who discovered the universality of the mythopoeic mental condition.” (Carpentier, 1998: 26)

Despite the scientific explanations of the anthropological school, some were not satisfied yet. In spite of the fact that it “had a wide-reaching scientific impact and profoundly influenced ethnological research” (Meletinsky, 1998: 13), anthropological school alone was criticised for ignoring the poetic component in mythology and reducing it only to “a kind of ‘primitive science’ ” (Ibid: 14).

With the aim of compensating this lack of the anthropological school, it was Sir James Frazer who combined it with the doctrines of the ritualist school. Thus, as Meletinsky states, he pointed to the source of myth in ritual:

“Frazer is primarily interested in studying myths that are linked to seasonal cycles. He is part of the English anthropological tradition associated with Lang and Tylor and continued to believe in the theory of survivals for most of his life. He does, however, bring many innovations to Tylor’s theory.” (Ibid: 20)

Frazer was a rationalist like most of his contemporaries. He based his theory on this rationalism and developed a hierarchical thinking in his revolutionary work, The Golden Bough. His work was a touchstone since it showed how to make “self-conscious literary-critical analysis using reference to mythological and ritual patterns” (Doty, 1986: 169). It was Frazer’s work “that brought about a literary-critical approach based on the awareness of mythic prototypes, archetypes, and mythic remnants in literature” (Ibid: 169).

In The Golden Bough, Frazer focused not only on the development of human mind starting from primitive times until modern period, but also found parallelisms both between ages and cultures as suggested by Tylor before. For Frazer, magic was the oldest attempt of mankind to explain and order nature. However, unlike Tylor who believed that “magic and animism (the early stirrings of religion) were closely related” (Carpentier, 1998: 49), Frazer thought that they are “not only unrelated, they are opposed” (Ibid: 49). In contrast to Tylor, Frazer saw a connection between magic and science:

“Wherever sympathetic magic occurs in its pure unadulterated form, it assumes that in nature one event follows another necessarily and invariably without the intervention of

any spiritual or personal agency. Thus its fundamental conception is identical with that of modern science.” (1993: 49)

When we come to the difference between magic and science, magic was a misunderstanding of some laws: “The fatal flow of magic lies not in its general assumption of a sequence of events determined by law, but in its total misconception of the nature of the particular laws which govern that sequence” (Ibid: 49).

Only when the inefficacy of magic became apparent did men turn to religion for they had recognized their “powerlessness to influence the course of nature” (Ibid: 58). Although Frazer suggested that “religion was rational and elevated because it resulted from abstract thought” (Carpentier, 1998: 49) and while he saw magic inferior because of its material source and practical end, his views disgusted Andrew Lang who elevated “rational” religion over “irrational” myth. Frazer had a euhemeristic attempt to explain myth. Thus, he shared the general idea of the 19th century:

“Sir James Frazer and many other nineteenth century scholars, saw myth almost exclusively as a problem for modern rationality. Many of the attempts at “explaining” myth... are rooted in “euhemeristic” substitutions of one thing for another: for a mythic story about the family of the gods we may substitute historical reflections of the founding political dynasties; for a mythic account of primeval earth-shaping we may substitute modern geological eras; and so forth.” (Doty, 1986: 5)

Concerning the relation between myth and ritual, Frazer shared his ideas with Tylor and Lang. Myths were the survivals of customs and rituals for Frazer as well. Thus, he is also a member of the ritualist school that flourished in the 1930s and 1940s. According to the ritual theory “myths were seen to have evolved out of seasonal rituals actually performed by people, in ages past all the way up to the present” (Carpentier, 1998: 70). The close relation of ritual and myth can not be ignored since “ritual is the other half of the mythic statement: when myths speak only of the absolute reality, rituals ground it in the relative” (qtd. in Doty, 1986: 20).

One of the prominent figures is Jane Harrison who separated herself from the rational and patriarchal 19th century tradition. For Harrison, religious experience should be a thing that is lived but not rational. She believed that rationalism in religion destroyed its mysticism and vitalism. Unlike Frazer, in Harrison's view, magic and religion were not opposites, but they were linked to each other and moreover free from rationalism: “For Harrison, neither magic nor the rituals of aneikonic religion derived

from human reason or the cognitive attempt to understand nature's laws" (Carpentier, 1998: 52).

Whereas, for Frazer, religion was the line that separated man and the beast, for Harrison, "magic was man's active effort to impose his will, his ego, on nature, something animals are incapable of" (Ibid: 52). While Frazer made a distinction between an elite, rational class and lower classes that still performed the survivals of primitive times, Harrison aimed to understand the savage psychology that created myths and ritual. For Harrison, pagan religion was not as fearful as it was termed by Frazer as "a delusion and a darkness, a savage thing, a snake hardly scotched" (qtd. in Carpentier, 1998: 53).

As for the rituals of this pagan religion, Harrison "declared that primitive magic rituals could not have arisen out of rational or cognitive 'conception,' but expressed rather a collective emotional experience" (qtd. in Carpentier, 1998: 60). In her view; art and ritual resembled each other for both are representations of life and emotions "always with a practical end" (Carpentier, 1998: 62). As a result "human motive in commemorative rituals was not mimesis, but recreation of the original emotional experience" (Ibid: 63).

Bronislaw Malinowski is another member of the ritualist school. For Malinowski myth has a practical purpose as well. In Malinowski's view, it is naturally connected with ritual and magic:

"Myth is not a dead product of past ages, merely surviving as an idle narrative. It is a living force, constantly producing new phenomena... Myth is not a savage speculation about origins of things born out of philosophic interest. Neither is it the result of the contemplation of nature-a sort of symbolical representation of its laws. It is the historical statement of one of those events which once for all vouch for the truth of a certain form of magic." (1948: 83/84)

However, the practical aspect of myth is not limited with magic. As well as magic, myth is related to social and religious issues:

"Myth, it may be added at once, can attach itself not only to magic but to any form of social power or social claim... Also the beliefs and powers of religion are traced to their sources by mythological accounts. Religious myth, however, is rather an explicit dogma, the belief in the nether world, in creation, in the nature of divinities, spun out into a story. Sociological myth, on the other hand, especially in primitive cultures, is

usually blended with legends about the sources of magical power. It can be said without exaggeration that the most typical, most highly developed, mythology in primitive societies is that of magic, and the function of myth is not to explain but to vouch for, not to satisfy curiosity but to give confidence in power, not to spin out yarns but to establish the flowing freely from present-day occurrences, frequently similar validity of belief.” (Malinowski, 1948: 84)

Apart from the English tradition, The French Sociological School played an influential role in the studies of myth. Emile Durkheim and Lucien Lévy-Bruhl were the famous representatives. English tradition was almost completely based on individual psychology. However, Durkheim and his followers emphasized the role of social psychology which they called “collective representations” (Meletinsky, 1998: 25/26).

Durkheim and his followers rejected 19th century theories that tried to explain the function of myths and “stress[ed] that rituals are a form of expressing social life in tangible form and periodically reaffirming the existence of the group” (Ibid: 27). His main thesis was composed of the idea that:

“social values are the highest and most important human constructs and that religious terms such as 'god' are ciphers used to express these values. In this way religion is the means of supporting cultural and social values by grounding them in a transcendent realm, by projecting them outside the culture so that they become models for the society, forming a cohesive 'social cement' that holds the society together.” (Doty, 1986: 43/44)

Additionally, Durkheim pointed out the role of metaphors and symbols both in religious and mythical thinking. For him religion and myth are not “particular aspects of empirical nature but... the products of human consciousness” (Meletinsky, 1998: 27). So, sacred objects or some part of them were the representations of the whole.

Lévy-Bruhl’s theory also abandoned “the nineteenth-century conception of myth as an ingenuous, pre-scientific form of knowledge that exists merely to satisfy primitive man’s curiosity about the world” (Ibid: 27). Instead, he sees myth as a means of participation of the individual in the social group:

“According to Lévy-Bruhl, mystical elements constitute the most “precious” function of myth. They represent participation that is no longer immediately perceived by the social actors-for example, fusion with a culture hero or with mythical ancestors that are half human and half animal.” (Ibid: 29)

If we move from the socially oriented perspective to the personally oriented one, we enter into the sphere of psychology. To put it simply, in this approach the focus is on man rather than society. The inner world of man and the human unconscious are the dominant key terms within the borders of the psychological approach. Certainly, psychoanalysis is an authentic way of commenting on myths. As suggested by Meletinsky, it “links manifestations of the imagination to the hidden layers of the psyche” (1998: 40). These manifestations of the human imagination involve myths, dreams and art in general. Thus, for Freud, myth becomes a key to the unconscious individual psyche. It is his usage of myth that distinguishes Freud from many others because he moved beyond the experimental realm of psychology when he dealt with mythology since mythology is a field connected with religion, anthropology and cultural history.

If we have a closer look at Freud’s theory, we see that he is an individualist. He handles the psychology of the individual alone, and in other words, every single human psyche is unique for him. In Freud’s view, psychoanalysis aims to discover what is hidden in the individual psyche, especially those reflected through dreams. Like dreams “myths are the symbolic projections of a people’s hopes, values, fears, and aspirations” (Guerin, 1979: 155). Freud was aware of its value on the way to the discovery of truth: “It may be true that myths do not meet our current standards of factual reality, but then neither does any great literature. Instead, they both reflect a more profound reality” (Ibid: 156).

A more interesting attempt to connect myth to the unconscious psyche came from Jung, who began as a disciple of Freud, but whose theory later departed radically from that of Freud’s. In contrast to the individualistic approach of Freud, Jung emphasized the role of “collective unconscious”:

“A more or less superficial layer of the unconscious is undoubtedly personal. I call it the *personal unconscious*. But this personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the *collective unconscious*, I have chosen the term “collective” because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche; it has contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us... The contents of the personal unconscious are chiefly the

*feeling-toned complexes*, as they are called; they constitute the personal and private side of psychic life. The contents of the collective unconscious, on the other hand, are known as *archetypes*.” (Jung, 1959: 3/4)

For Jung, collective unconscious is the deepest layer of the psyche, and it manifests itself in collective representations. Thus, as the individual psyche that shows itself in various ways unconsciously in Freud’s theory, the collective unconscious can also be searched for in every product of the mankind. M.H.Abrams makes the distinction between the approaches of Freud and Jung in A Glossary of Literary Terms by focusing on the views of both on literature:

“Jung’s emphasis is not on the individual unconscious, but on what he calls the “collective unconscious,” shared by all individuals in all cultures, which he regards as the repository of “racial memories” and of primordial images and patterns of experience that he calls *archetypes*. He does not, like Freud, view literature as a disguised form of libidinal wish-fulfillment that parallels the fantasies of a neurotic personality. Instead, Jung regards great literature as, like the myths whose patterns recur in diverse cultures, an expression of the archetypes of the collective unconscious.” (1993: 268)

Under the influence of Jungian approach, Joseph Campbell stated that “the study of mythology must include not only the specific or *local* manifestations of myth and ritual within particular cultures -the historical dimensions, the particular or ethnic- but also the *universal* aspects that go beyond the historically determined. The universal aspects are determined by one’s corporate culture as a human being, and they include the influences of our biological makeup” (Doty, 1986: 108).

As well as psychological developments, 20th century witnessed the rise of structuralist theory. The theory was so significant that it shaped the ideas of an entire generation of scholars. The founder of the theory, Lévi-Strauss was essentially interested in the logical aspects of myth in opposition to Jung, who dealt with the psychological (Meletinsky, 1998: 54). His aim was to discover the system or the structure which composed the myths rather than analyzing their meaning. This structure was coded by units called “mythemes”. With the help of mythemes, a myth became “a coded message from a society to its members” (Gould, 1981: 107).

In a different way from Lévi-Strauss, a structuralist, Roland Barthes, also did not pay attention to ancient myths and commented myth as a “social language and ideological event” (Ibid: 116). According to Barthes, myth has duplicity; it is open to

endless meanings: “It is... potentially highly acquisitive in its cultural operation, but it functions in such a way that the openness of its concept is never lost. In its cultural use, the potential for meaning is necessarily narrowed down by readers, listeners, and viewers” (Gould, 1981: 119).

Without doubt, Barthes was not the first to focus on the relation between myth and language. The 19th century linguist and philologist F. Max Müller had the idea that a scientific approach to myth was only possible with linguistics. He was sure that language and myth had the same source. However, while language functioned according to some logical rules, myth had none. To define the nature of both and to answer some questions, Müller suggested that myth was “indeed, nothing but one aspect of language; but it is rather negative than its positive aspect” (Chase, 1969: 18). For Müller, the source of all language was also illusions and fallacies: “The greatest achievement of language itself is a source of defect. Language consists of *general* names- but generality always means ambiguity. The polyonymy and synonymy of words is not an accidental feature of language; they follow from its very nature” (Ibid: 18). As a result, both for Müller and the comparative school, myths were the outcome of this ambiguous nature of language:

“Mythologies were thought... to have been inventions intended to explain underlying causes for natural phenomena. Müller also proposed, with respect to the evolution of language, that the original mythological terms first had been understood metaphorically but eventually were understood to be referring to real persons or deities.” (Doty, 1986: 5)

On the other hand, philologists developed a theory that rested on the searches for the origins of names in mythology. By reaching the origins, they aimed to learn the first meanings and to be free of the misleading language: “Myths grew up around names through a process philologists called the “disease of language,” whereby names became metaphorical as succeeding generations lost their original meaning and resorted to creating “absurd” stories to explain them” (qtd. in Carpentier, 1998: 24). This “disease of language” was sometimes called “metaphor”. Metaphor can be defined as “the substitution of one sign for another in a paradigmatic exchange” (Gould, 1981: 46). Language itself has a metaphoric nature. Since myth is a kind of language, it shares the same feature; “for behind myth lies the ancient desire to make comprehensible that which is not in a shared language” (Ibid: 32).



The above mentioned theories of myth prove that the way to define myth can reach an unpredictable dimension. To explain the nature of myth changes depending on the point where we stand. To put it another way, it can be the variety in the sociological, structuralist, philosophical, anthropological or psychoanalytical views which create the mentioned change in the definition of myth. However, there has not yet been one upon which everyone agreed. So scholars who do not find the already existing ones adequate try to make new definitions. With the help of new discoveries and studies in many fields, new attempts to define myth have been added to the earlier ones.

After discussing what myth has been during the history of mankind and its relation to language, the link between myth and literature is also essential to deal with. Usually we have no simple formula to distinguish literature from myth. They are so deeply interwoven that it is impossible to think of one without the other. Still, there are opinions that can be helpful to understand each and what is between them.

According to Stillman, although “it’s *voiced* as literature,... technically, however, mythology isn’t literature” (Stillman, 1985: 4). First of all, literary works are produced by one or more people and usually written at a specific date. Unlike literary works, “myths don’t originate with any one person, nor were they at first written down” (Ibid: 4). Probably, myths have changed their form and content while passing through centuries and finally become something different from their earliest expressions. Their evolution is still going on of course, and it seems impossible for this evolution to come to an end. Moreover, as we know, they were the part of the oral tradition first. Then, they were recorded. Both in the oral and the written form, many events, characters or figures were either added or subtracted from those texts since they are the product of generations, but not one author. That is why we find myth in every aspect of life: “There is a distinct danger connected with the study of mythology: once you discover that myths are not mere stories but *the story* of humankind-the lens through which we have always seen and understood the world-you are bound to find everywhere, in dreams, rituals, nursery rhymes, any and all art forms, a mythic perspective” (Ibid: 3). In relation to this active nature, it can be said that myth is alive. Its origin is a time no more remembered, like the unknown creators of it. What is important to remember is

the myth itself since “myth is a story about the past whose meaning is remembered in the present” (O’Flaherty, 1988: 31):

“They are remembered because their form, the narrative, codes meaning in a genre of discourse that people find natural, simple, and always fascinating; and also because their content deals with human questions of perennial importance. We always remember what we find easy, interesting, and important. Through an only apparently circular argument, I would say that myths are remembered precisely because they are about the sorts of events in the past that are not bound to the past, that continue to be given meaning in the present. Myths are, moreover, remembered because the need for them persists. Myths encode meanings in forms that permit the present to be construed as the fulfillment of a past from which we would wish to have been descended.” (Ibid: 31)

In addition to the ideas that emphasize what is different in myth and literature, Northrop Frye points to the similarities and states that “without mythology there could be no literature” (Stillman, 1985: 7). He is aware of the fact that the essence of human experience lies in mythology, and “literature as we know it, as a body of writing, always develops out of a mythical framework of this kind” (Ibid: 8). Thus, myth and also literature that come out of it and give true answers to universal questions of humanity. Essentially, whatever we write is about these matters of humanity:

“Any story is necessarily about what it’s like to be human (even if its characters are hobbits) and to experience the perils and miseries and joys that befall humankind. Every story is thus the same story, even though its surface features change from tale to tale. It’s the story of what being us was, is, and will forever be. We don’t just read or listen passively to stories; we participate in them, invest our imagining in them; and by so doing we move beyond the cruelly temporary moment of our individual lives into an endless stream of time.” (Ibid: 5)

This collaboration of myth and literature is the reason for the return of the twentieth-century modern writers back to the old source of myth. This tendency is especially clear in modern novelists. According to Meletinsky, “the desire to overcome the limits imposed by realism has had as its result in the twentieth century a clean break with the traditional novel” (1998: 276). The same generation of modern novelists claimed that “literature must grow out of the writer’s direct, concrete, emotional experience of life, not out of an abstract, conceptual or moral construct imposed on life” (Carpentier, 1998: 1). With this belief, they rejected earlier moralist, ideological or realist approaches and turned their faces to myth, the only source that keeps vitality: “No longer did modern writers consider the classics divorced from life, “mummified

stuff from a museum;” rather, classical myth had become ‘living material’ (Carpentier, 1998: 1).

This change in literary point of view was a normal outcome of the period because “all human relations have shifted –those between masters and servants, husbands and wives, parents and children. And when human relations change, there is at the same time a change in religion, conduct, politics, and literature” (qtd. in Carpentier, 1998: 3). The mentioned change in all fields of life made writers turn back to the old questions about human nature, life and death or as emphasized by Joseph Campbell in his book The Hero With A Thousand Faces to the quest of mankind in this world. Modern novel used not only mythical motifs but also mythical plots. The main purpose was to reflect “the chaotic empiricism of modern social life... organized and presented using symbolic and mythological guidelines” (Meletinsky, 1998: 276). Modern writers favoured mythical plots that included motifs such as the dying-god because these motifs and the myth that contained them resembled real life with their happiness, sorrow and pain together rather than being just a fantasy full of joy:

“They gravitate to these myths in particular because of the gods’ sacred marriage and because of the violence that the gods endure. While the first component of the myths expresses a joy in living and sexuality, the second corresponds to the violence that has in reality pervaded the twentieth century. Although most myths feature pleasure and pain, these stories include the most intense joy and the most intense suffering –and, uniquely, the death- of deities. Dying gods, unlike remote, complacent Olympians, reflect human experience in more than its frivolity. The stories are meaningful because of what they say about human trials and choices.” (Phillips, 1990: 16)

As well as the myths that use repetitions, modern writing applies the same method from time to time. As widely known “repetition is a traditional element in archaic literary and epic forms” (Meletinsky, 1998: 276). These repetitions are called “leitmotifs” in modern writing, and they aim to act “as a new expressive means of overcoming the fragmentation and chaos of everyday life” (Ibid: 276).

The fragmented and chaotic nature of the twentieth century was shaped by the reigning violence and social, cultural and political sacrifices. In many modern writers, characters draw parallels with the personalities of myths. Indeed twentieth century draws parallels with the contents of the myths coming to our age from primitive times. Although we no longer have “any habitual social custom or attitude – calling for human

victims” in modern times, we still call for “human sacrifices” that “still burn” for the gods of this era (Stillman, 1985: 82/83). Normally, so much parallelism between mythic elements and the world in which they lived influenced modern writers and gave them an ironic style as well. Another reason for the twentieth century authors to favour myth that contains fertility gods and goddesses who enjoy their sexuality was to praise sexuality in contrast to the previous centuries.

Finally, if we turn back to the example of the dying god motif or self-sacrificing victim motif, it can be said that the modern authors identify themselves with those gods or in other words with the wounded benefactor of the community: “This analogy to a dying deity often takes the form of artist, assumed to be male, deriving his inspiration from a goddess, assumed to be silent” (Phillips, 1990: 205). The reason for this identification can be the fragmented and hopeless sphere of the twentieth century in which “writing” is the only holy activity left to mankind because now “the artist replaces the priest” (Ibid: 204).

## **CHAPTER TWO PSYCHOANALYTIC CRITICISM**

The close of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth-century is a turning point for the world in various ways because of the technological and political developments. Those developments left their traces on the social order of the period. Industrialism was responsible for the change of social structure, values and life standards. People who used to live in towns and villages until then with the guidance of their customs, religious beliefs and traditional ways were now pushed into the modern urban centres where their values were no longer valid. The rules and the values of capitalism were at work in those new centres of the modern world. This world was shaped by man himself using the latest technological methods. It brought about the estrangement of man not only from his world and the other men but also from himself. It was “a crisis of human relationships, and of the human personality, as well as a social convulsion” (Eagleton, 1996: 131). Detached from his natural surroundings and affairs, man was left alone in an endless struggle of existence. The harsh living conditions of urban life caused permanent social and psychological changes in human personality. Now he was not in his familiar, safe world ordered by the warm human relations and powerful family bonds. Instead, he was in “a world growing each day closer yet more impersonal, more densely populated yet in face-to-face relations more dehumanized; a world appealing ever more widely for his concern and sympathy with unknown masses of men, yet fundamentally alienating him even from his next neighbour” (Josephson, 1963: 10).

In such a world man was mechanized and routinized. He was himself like an object: a machine. As Erich Fromm puts it, man thus became a “thing” and “things have no self and men who have become things can have no self” (qtd. in Josephson, 1963: 55). The great technological developments had a negative effect on man’s nature. Man in the modern world has lost his sense of harmony with his surroundings. Huge expansion of knowledge and technology was the main reason for man’s estrangement

from the world he himself made, his alienation from himself, from the world and from the other members of the society to which he belongs. People began to move to the urban centres where life was much harder than before. Their new style of life in the great cities was totally under the effect of capitalist values. Man encountered with a life and death struggle in their new habitats and was turned into a helpless creature whose personality was under the continuous threat as a result of the great changes which created a variety of psychological disorders. The result was his disintegration. Before these changes, however, man “believed in himself and the work of his hands, had faith in the powers of reason and science, trusted his gods, and conceived his own capacity for growth as endless and his widening horizons limitless” and was “bold in his desires for freedom, equality, social justice and brotherhood” (Josephson, 1963: 10).

Unfortunately violence destroyed all these traditional values. Knowledge, science and all kinds of developments could not produce solutions for war and fear. Rather than becoming each other’s brother, people found themselves more isolated, anxious and uneasy than ever. This isolation and alienation of modern man shifted his focus from social to the personal. The earliest years of the century witnessed the emergence of new ideas. The artists aimed to reflect modern situation in form and content, which involves new methods. They became aware of the fact that modern man’s problems were not solved by the positivist philosophy. In order to fill in the gap left by the positivist philosophy, they began to make use of the newly emerging branches of sciences, such as psychology and psychoanalysis which provided a new way of looking at modern man and his problems. The concept of truth was no longer thought to be as simple as in the late nineteenth century. The movement from the outer sphere to the inner world of man, from the physically oriented view to the spiritual factor, emphasizing the human unconscious found their best expressions in the works of Freud and Jung. The purpose of man was now to understand his inner world and to produce solutions for his individual self. As a result the emphasis was on human psychology, which is defined as “the study of the mind and how it works” by Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1995). Certainly anxiety, the fragmentation of the self and fear of persecution were not new in the recorded history. What distinguished this one from the previous ones was its constitution in a new way as a systematic field of knowledge. That field of knowledge known as psychoanalysis was developed in the late nineteenth century by Sigmund Freud (1865–1939).

Freud's psychoanalytical theory is concerned with the individual mind and the human personality. Freud makes distinctions between manifest and latent layers of the psyche. The latent layer lies beneath the surface level. It is the personal unconscious in which all repressed and forgotten contents are stored. Emotional states, dreams, fantasies led the psychoanalysts to the depths and hidden layers of the psyche. Psychoanalysis focuses on the repressed material of the psyche which constitutes the unconscious part of it. For Freud, language is the system whose rules shape our experiences and through whose symbolic structure, we reflect our veiled desires. Thus:

“Psychoanalysis explores what happens when primordial desire gets directed into social goals, when bodily needs become subject to the mould of culture. Through language, desire becomes subject to rules, and yet, this language cannot define the body's experience accurately. What is of peculiar interest to psychoanalysis is that aspect of experience which has been ignored or prohibited by the rules of language” (Wright, 1984: 1).

These ignored or prohibited experiences find a way out by using the symbolic structure of language, in other words by tricking its censorship. Although we can not know the unconscious directly, we come to know it “through the logic of symptoms and dreams, through jokes and ‘Freudian slips’, through the pattern of children's play” (Ibid: 2).

Besides its clinical sphere for which it was originally developed “as a means of therapy for neuroses, the dynamic form of psychology... called psychoanalysis” (Abrams, 1993: 264) formed a strong relationship with literary criticism that spans much of the twentieth century although it became widespread in the 1920s. In addition to the usage of psychoanalysis in clinical terms, Freud expanded its area and applied the method to the various fields including mythology and religion, as well as literature and the other arts.

The reason for this expansion is the parallelism between the neurotic and the artist according to the Freudian view. He emphasizes this parallelism in his article “Creative Writers and Daydreaming”. For him, the reason which makes the artist produce his art is the desire to make his repressed inner world acceptable by the social, cultural or religious standards like the neurotic whose dreams are the expressions and clues to his most inner sides, which is called the “unconscious psyche”:

“Literature and the other arts, like dreams and neurotic symptoms, consist of the imagined, or fantasied, fulfillment of wishes that are either denied by reality or are prohibited by the social standards of morality and propriety. The forbidden, mainly sexual (“libidinal”) wishes come into conflict with, and are repressed by the “censor” (the internalized representative within each individual of the standards of society) into the unconscious realm of the artist’s mind, but are permitted by the censor to achieve a fantasied satisfaction in distorted forms which serve to disguise their real motives and objects from the conscious mind.” (Abrams, 1993: 264)

This side of the approach, which forms the classical psychoanalytic literary criticism, has a strong connection to psychological criticism which emerged in the late decades of the nineteenth century. Psychological criticism uses a method which is still current today. According to this method, a work of literature or art is primarily an expression of the state of mind and the structure of personality of its author or the artist. It is assumed that there is a mental and emotional bond between the producer of a work of literature or art and its producer. Practically, psychological criticism either uses the author’s or artist’s personality in order to explain and interpret the literary or artistic work or refers to the literary or artistic work to establish the personality of its producer. In other words, the product and its producer are the direct reflections of each other.

There are key terms which are essential to understand Freud’s theory. *Repression*, upon which his theory rests, is the main term. Repressed material forms the content of the unconscious and includes all “which produces powerful effects without itself being conscious and which requires special work before it can be made conscious” (Freud, 1974: 7). Social, individual, religious or moral conflicts and complexes which are the reasons of the disturbances of the individual are restored in the unconscious. Mainly the content of the repressed is the sexual instincts. In his Totem and Taboo (1960), Freud deals with the source of repressed sexuality known as the famous “Oedipus Complex” as a whole. According to Freud, in the earlier social group called “primordial horde”, the father forbids his sons to have any sexual intercourse with their mother. Unhappy with this prohibition, sons kill the father and eat him to share the guilt. This first guilt of the sons is the basis for the formation of many social institutions and rules like religion, morality and family constitution as well as sexual complexes. In The Ego and The Id Freud explains these social institutions, their formation and outcomes as in the following:



“Religion, morality, and a social sense—the chief elements in the higher side of man—were originally one and the same thing. According to the hypothesis which I put forward in *Totem and Taboo* they were acquired phylogenetically out of the father-complex: religion and moral restraint through the process of mastering the Oedipus complex itself, and social feeling through the necessity for overcoming the rivalry that then remained between the members of the younger generation. The male sex seems to have taken the lead in all these moral acquisitions; and they seem to have then been transmitted to women by cross-inheritance. Even to-day the social feelings arise in the individual as a superstructure built upon impulses of jealous rivalry against his brothers and sisters.” (1974: 27)

It is because of this fact that the process of repression always moves from the “pleasure principle” to the “reality principle” which is the powerful pressure of the outside world on the individual. The movement from the “pleasure principle” to the “reality principle” is the starting point for the social and cultural development of the human beings. However, it may also become the reason for neurosis because the repressed material has the possibility of turning back, since it seeks ways of expression. In neurotic people, the repressed material usually comes out of the dreams in disguised form. Likewise, creative people use the situation in an alternative way and express the disturbing content of their unconscious either consciously or unconsciously in their creative works in disguised forms. Thus, the purpose of psychoanalytic criticism is to find out those disguises and their hidden meanings in works of literature.

As parts of the oral and written tradition, myths are among the products of human imagination which reflect the so-called unconscious psyche. Without doubt, “Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalytical insights concerning the human personality and the nature of human culture have influenced the study of myths and rituals profoundly” (Doty, 1986: 132). To understand the process of forming literary, mythical and artistic products by using the unconscious material, it will be helpful to see the structure of the psyche according to the Freudian view.

For Freud, the psyche consists of three layers that are called the ego, id and the superego. The id is the representation of “libidinal and other desires”, the superego stands for the “standards of morality and propriety” and the superego tries “to negotiate the conflicts between the insatiable demands of the id, the impossibly stringent requirements of the superego, and the limited possibilities of gratification offered by the world of ‘reality’ ” (Abrams, 1993: 265). The id is the unconscious part of the mind that hides what is unacceptable by the real world. Some part of it is almost impossible

to become conscious; however, some other parts may reach to the surface passing through the censorship of the superego in disguised form:

“The censorship of the ego can be subverted, however, precisely because of the free shifting of energy in the primary process. The drives or wishes can get through in disguise, as the so-called ‘compromise formations’ of the return of the repressed. It is the nature of these disguises that has occupied classical psychoanalytic criticism...The id wants its wishes satisfied, whether or not they are compatible with external demands. The ego finds itself threatened by the pressure of the unacceptable wishes. Memories of these experiences, that is images and ideas associated with them, become charged with unpleasurable feeling, and are thus barred from consciousness.” (Wright, 1984: 11/12)

The superego which censors the eternal demands of the id is the representation of every institution that stands for the outside reality and its systems as well as the repressed complexes of the individual:

“If we consider once more the origin of the super-ego as we have described it, we shall recognize that it is the outcome of two highly important factors, one of a biological and the other of a historical nature: namely, the lengthy duration in man of his childhood helplessness and dependence, and the fact of his Oedipus complex, the repression of which we have shown to be connected with the interruption of libidinal development by the latency period and so with the diphasic onset of man’s sexual life.” (Freud, 1974: 25)

The ego is the mediator between the id and the superego which controls the approaches to morality and whose content is the conscious part of the psyche. Although the ego is a part of the id which is under the direct influence of the external world, their functions show differences:

“The ego seeks to bring the influence of the external world to bear upon the id and its tendencies, and endeavours to substitute the reality principle for the pleasure principle which reigns unrestrictedly in the id. For the ego, perception plays the part which in the id falls to instinct. The ego represents what may be called reason and common sense, in contrast to the id, which contains the passions.” (Ibid: 15)

These passions are the “second hidden meaning [that] lies beneath the surface level of expression” (Doty, 1986: 133) in every work of art, and the main purpose of the psychoanalytic literary criticism is to find them out. Only then is it possible to see the real, deep meaning. Otherwise, the core of all artistic works of humankind are hidden behind a ‘latent’ content formed by the ‘forbidden’ thoughts, and it can only ‘manifest’ itself through what can pass from unconscious to the conscious:

“The dream-work transforms the ‘latent’ content of the dream, the ‘forbidden’ dream-thoughts, into the ‘manifest’ dream-stories – what the dreamer remembers. Latent content goes piece by piece into the dream-stories via a string of associations (Wright: 1984, 20)... By that we understand the fact that the manifest dream has a smaller content than the latent one, and is thus an abbreviated translation of it.” (qtd. in Wright, 1984: 21)

Like the dream which comes out of the unconscious which is full of the material in disguise, the artistic work itself possesses a literary unconscious. The critic who applies the psychoanalytic method focuses on “three main emphasis in [his] pursuit of the literary ‘unconscious’: on the author (and its corollary, ‘character’), on the reader and on the text” (Selden, 1997: 161). Freud’s studies in clinical sphere needed to be proved scientifically and needed a fixed method in order to be taken seriously as a physical science. However it seemed impossible to prove the theory in a positive way. This fact has still been the reason for an ongoing debate. On the other hand, there is no doubt about Freud as a pioneer in his field despite criticisms and objections towards his views.

The second major theory in field of psychoanalysis was developed by Carl Gustav Jung (1875–1961) who was one-time student of Freud, who broke up with the master, then chose a different way. Whereas sexual complexes and their repression are center to Freud, Jung bases his theory on the deepest layer of psyche which he calls “the collective unconscious”:

“In addition to our immediate consciousness, which is of a thoroughly personal nature and which we believe to be the only empirical psyche (even if we tack on the personal unconscious as an appendix), there exists a second psychic system of a collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals. This collective unconscious does not develop individually but is inherited. It consists of pre-existent forms, the archetypes, which can only become conscious secondarily and which give definite form to certain psychic contents.” (Jung, 1959: 43)

At first sight, Jung’s theory seems to have many similar points with that of Freud’s. Firstly, both share the same ideas about the daily consciousness which is “the only part of the mind that is known directly by the individual” (Hall and Nordby, 1973: 33) in Jungian terms. This daily consciousness is like an island surrounded by water which is the symbol for the unconscious part: “Our consciousness does not create itself- it arises from unknown depths. In childhood it awakens gradually, and all through life it

wakes each morning out of the depths of sleep, i.e., out of an unconscious condition” (qtd. in Jung, 1953: 22).

Secondly, both mention the personal unconscious just under the consciousness, and both think this part acts like a memory bank. Its contents are “chiefly the *feeling-toned complexes*”, and “they constitute the personal and private side of psychic life” (Jung, 1959: 4). In other words, the experiences that fail to gain recognition by the ego do not disappear completely but are stored in the personal unconscious. These experiences are mostly the ones which were once conscious but which have been repressed or disregarded for various reasons such as a moral conflict, an unsolved problem or a distressing idea. However, beneath that level of the personal unconsciousness, there is another level called as the collective unconscious by Jung. Unlike the personal conscious part of the psyche, the collective unconscious is common to all men:

“Personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the *collective unconscious*. I have chosen the term “collective” because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche; it has contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us.” (Ibid: 3/4)

Thus, Jung goes a step further than Freud for whom the unconscious is only personal, and it just stores the forgotten or repressed materials. As for the source of dreams, myths or other creative products, Jung’s approach is universal whereas Freud’s is individual. While, for Freud, creativity is just the result of a sexual conflict and its repression, for Jung, it is the reflection of ‘collective unconsciousness’. In Jungian psychology, this collective unconscious is shared by all humankind, and it has been inherited from time immemorial. Thus, Jung takes the work of art out of the critical analysis of the psychoanalyst who sees it as a neurosis. For Jung, the creativity is a process in which “the poet becomes a mouthpiece for a universal language of symbolism” (Wright, 1984: 72). For him “The great artist is the man who possesses the primordial vision, a special sensitivity to archetypal patterns and a gift for speaking in primordial images that enable him to transmit experiences of the inner world to the outer world through his art form” (164) as he puts forward in Modern Man in Search of

a Soul. This process is called as the ‘autonomous complex’ which manifests itself through the archetypes of the collective unconscious. The archetypes are called by Jung as ‘primordial images’ as well:

“There are no inborn ideas, but there are inborn possibilities of ideas that set bounds to even the boldest fantasy and keep our fantasy activity within certain categories: *a priori* ideas, as it were, the existence of which cannot be ascertained except from their effects... The primordial image, or archetype, is a figure-be it a daemon, a human being, or a process-that constantly recurs in the course of history and appears wherever creative fantasy is freely expressed. Essentially, therefore, it is a mythological figure. When we examine these images more closely, we find that they give form to countless typical experiences of our ancestors. They are, so to speak, the psychic residua of innumerable experiences of the same type. They present a picture of psychic life in the average, divided up and projected into the manifold figures of the mythological pantheon.” (Jung, 1966: 81)

For Jung myths, fairytales and other creative products are the best expressions of these archetypes which belong to all mankind. They are standard models or patterns which may become active in some conditions, and their features in active form may change from one person to another. Despite the special changes, generally the most basic forms of behaviour called as archetypes are characteristics of the whole human kind. By suggesting the presence of archetypes, Jung rejects the *tabula rasa* view:

“It is a great mistake to believe that the psyche of a new-born child is a *tabula rasa* in the sense that there is absolutely nothing in it. Inasmuch as the child comes into the world with a differentiated brain, predetermined by heredity and therefore also individualized, its reactions to outside sense stimuli are not just any reactions but are specific, as a particular (individual) selection and form of apperception necessarily involves. These faculties can be proved to be inherited instincts and even preformations conditioned by the family. The latter are the *a priori*, formal conditions of apperception based on instincts. They set their anthropomorphic stamp upon the world of the child and of the dreamer. They are the archetypes, which blaze a definite trail for all imagination and produce astonishing mythological parallels in the images of a child’s dreams and in the schizophrenic’s delusions and even to a lesser degree in the dreams of both normal and neurotic persons. It is not a question of inherited ideas but of inherited possibilities for these.” (Jung, 1953: 36)

Archetypes are the inherited forms of behaviour which pass from one generation to the other through the structure of the psyche. This idea of the psyche that has an inherited content is supported by the theory of evolution. It is Jung’s success to place the psyche within the evolutionary process:

“The mind, through its physical counterpart, the brain, has inherited characteristics that determine the ways in which a person will react to life’s experiences and even determine what type of experiences he will have. The mind of man is prefigured by evolution. Thus, the individual is linked with his past, not only with his past of infancy but more importantly with the past of the species and before that with the long stretch of organic evolution... In any event, it was Jung who broke free from a strictly environmental determinism of the mind, and showed that evolution and heredity provide the blueprints of the psyche just as they provide the blueprints of the body.” (Hall and Nordby, 1973: 39)

These basic forms of behaviour become visible when they are filled with some conscious material. They can be found in all kinds of creative work performed by mankind and also in dreams. Like Freud, Jung saw the parallelism between dreams and creative works. Man from all parts of the world share the same images in their dreams since their source lies in the memory of mankind. As mentioned, the same images show themselves in creative works such as myths:

“From the unconscious there emanate determining influences which, independently of tradition, guarantee in every single individual a similarity and even a sameness of experience, and also of the way it is represented imaginatively. One of the main proofs of this is the almost universal parallelism between mythological motifs, which, on account of their quality as primordial images, I have called *archetypes*.” (Jung, 1959: 58)

Jung finds similarities between the archetypes of the collective unconscious and the motifs in myths. These motifs are not symbols to represent some disturbances as they are in Freudian theory, but they are natural metaphors that reflect the collective unconscious *unconsciously*. Jung concentrated mainly on anima/animus, shadow and persona since they played an important role in the process of “individuation” which means “the process by which a person becomes a psychological ‘in-dividual,’ that is, a separate, indivisible unity or ‘whole’ (Ibid: 58).

To start with, anima and animus are among those archetypes which are of paramount importance to the literary critic. Anima is regarded as the feminine part of the soul and has nothing to do with the word “soul” in its religious meaning. It is the *yin* of the *yin-yang* pair. It is “historically above all in the divine syzygies, the male-female pairs of deities” (Ibid: 59). Jung explains the archetype in detail:

“Anima means soul and should designate something very wonderful and immortal... The anima is not the soul in the dogmatic sense, not an *anima rationalis*, which is a

philosophical conception, but a natural archetype that satisfactorily sums up all the statements of the unconscious, of the primitive mind, of the history of language and religion. It is a “factor” in the proper sense of the word. Man cannot make it; on the contrary, it is always the a priori element in his moods, reactions, impulses, and whatever else is spontaneous in psychic life. It is something that lives of itself, that makes us live; it is a life behind consciousness that cannot be completely integrated with it, but from which, on the contrary, consciousness arises.” (1959: 26/27)

On the other hand, animus is the masculine side in the female. The existence of a feminine side in all males and a masculine side in all females is parallel with the fact that both sexes are inhabited with the opposite sex up to a point:

“Every man carries within himself an eternal image of woman, not the image of this or that definite woman, but rather a definite feminine image. This image is fundamentally an unconscious, hereditary factor of primordial origin, and is engraven in the living system of man, a “type” (“archetype”) of all the experiences with feminine beings in the age-long ancestry of man, a deposit, as it were, of all the impressions made by woman; in short, an inherited psychical system of adaptation. Even if there were no women, it would be possible at any time to deduce from this unconscious image how a woman must be constituted psychically. The same is true of the woman; that is, she also possesses an innate image of man.” (Jung, 1953: 100)

Both archetypes represent the unconscious opposite sex in our psyches. They are not limited to particular people, but they are patterns to be filled with real people. Moreover, they include our opposite sex experiences especially both as parent and partner:

“Man has developed his anima archetype by continuous exposure to women over many generations, and woman has developed her animus archetype by her exposure to men. Through living and interacting with one another for generations, each sex has acquired characteristics of the opposite sex that facilitate appropriate responses and understanding of the opposite sex.” (Hall and Nordby, 1973: 46)

Unlike anima and animus, persona is the “outward face” of the psyche. In opposition to the anima/animus whose responsibility is to mediate between ego and unconscious, persona works to find the balance between the ego and the world outside the individual. In other words, it is a social mask, a part of the whole personality and is used in the public: “The persona is a complicated system of relations between the individual consciousness and society, fittingly enough a kind of mask, designed on the one hand to make a definite impression upon others, and, on the other, to conceal the true nature of the individual” (Jung, 1982: 81).

Contrary to the persona “which in reality one is not, but which oneself as well as others think one is” (Jung, 1959: 123), shadow is the real personality hidden in the depths of the psyche. The contents of the shadow are so dark and unpleasant that people wish to repress them and bury in the unconscious. Thus, the shadow which is “the inferior half of the personality is for the greater part unconscious. It does not denote the whole of the unconscious, but only the personal segment of it” (Ibid: 244). However, it is impossible to get rid of it no matter how unpleasing it is because the shadow is a living part of the personality which wants to exist in some form. It can not be totally removed or suppressed forever in a harmless position. Surely the shadow finds a way and shows itself in the consciousness since “the shadow is the invisible saurian tail that man still drags behind him” (qtd. in Jung, 1953: 22). Actually the longer the shadow remains unconscious, the darker and denser it becomes. What man should do is not to ignore this dark side but to see it as a gate to his own inner world:

“If the repressed tendencies – the shadow, as I call them – were decidedly evil, there would be no problem whatever. But the shadow is merely somewhat inferior, primitive, unadapted, and awkward; not wholly bad. It even contains inferior, childish, or primitive qualities which would in a way vitalize and embellish human existence.” (Ibid: 22)

Some of other archetypes analysed by Jung are self, old wise man, mother-child and trickster. The mother-child or mother-daughter archetypes represent the continuity of life and rebirth through death. They are the symbols of life cycle, replacing each other endlessly. “The ultimate goal of every personality” on this endless road of life “is to achieve a state of selfhood and self-realization” (Hall and Nordby, 1973: 52). The old wise man is the guide against dangers “who can take various forms: a wise seer, a shaman” (Meletinsky, 1998: 47). In The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, Jung explains this archetype as a figure possible to be found easily through ages and “who goes back in direct line to the figure of the medicine man in primitive society” (Jung, 1959: 36/37): “He is, like the anima, an immortal daemon that pierces the chaotic darkness of brute life with the light of meaning. He is the enlightener, the master and teacher” (Ibid: 37).

The trickster is the dark, suppressed part of the human personality, in short it is the shadow forgotten by the so-called civilized man. For Jung, the trickster “is a very old mythologem, a relic of the epoch in which human consciousness barely separated



itself from the animal world. The trickster is an incarnation of all that is degenerate in an individual, but it is only by transcending the primordial psychological obscurity of archaic collective consciousness that the ego can see itself for what it is. The figure of the trickster is simultaneously superior to (because of his supernatural powers) and lower than other humans (his elemental willfulness and lack of self-awareness)” (Meletinsky, 1998: 48).

Jung became a powerful and effective figure for many. One of them is Joseph Campbell (1904–1987) who based his studies mainly on Jungian approach. In his The Hero with a Thousand Faces, Campbell developed a monomyth which is about the quest of the hero and used this monomyth to examine ritualism from a psychoanalytic point of view. This monomyth is the core of many folktales and literary works. It is a universal history of the hero figure who “ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious adventure with the power to bestow boons on his fellow man” (Campbell, 1968: 30). The hero’s quest usually starts with a call which separates him from his people and country. He has to set off alone to a foreign country full of mystery. During his journeys he comes across with various dangers and temptations against which he should struggle. After he gets successful at his battle, the return starts. The hero comes back to his starting point which emphasizes the cyclical nature of the monomyth. In every quest the hero not only gains something spiritual to expand his world view but also takes back a boon to his people which will restore their world afresh.

Campbell sees the hero as the central character of mythology since his quest is the representation of the way towards maturity experienced by every single man on earth. He simply represents the initiation process or in other words, the search of the self. That is why the hero interests people so much. He is the reflection of our own humanity and the symbol of “that divine creative and redemptive image which is hidden within us all, only waiting to be known and rendered into life” (Ibid: 39).

Although people find themselves in the hero, everyone can not have his features. The hero is usually someone of noble birth with a flaw which will cause his suffering. With a sudden call, he sets off a lonely search into the unknown. On his way

many dangers and adventures wait for him as well as many temptations whose purpose is to drive him out of his way. Despite his loneliness, he wants help from nobody since he is conscious of the importance of this journey: it is a journey to be accomplished personally.

Campbell's idea of putting the hero archetype in the center of archetypal criticism is similar to Jung's idea that the ultimate goal of human life is self-realization. For Campbell mythology, rituals and other practical customs and traditions of mankind symbolize this spiritual way to the wholeness of personality which goes parallel to the hero's.

Consequently, archetypal criticism claims that the parallelism between myth and ritual is a key to understand literature. When myths, rituals and literary products are compared, we come across with similar symbols, images, plots, characters and repetitions. It is the field of mythical criticism in general and archetypal criticism specifically to focus on these similarities.

As stated by Elizabeth Wright, according to archetypal criticism "the collective unconscious is the pure source of art" (Wright, 1984: 72). Thus, literary products are full of archetypal materials, and their creators are the vehicles through whom the collective unconscious speaks.

### CHAPTER THREE MODERNISM

Throughout the history, there has never been a century in which everything was exposed to such a radical motion and dynamism as it was in the twentieth century. Especially the first quarter of the period witnessed such an active process in every field that the same amount of change could only be seen throughout the centuries in previous years. The new ideas and attempts in art alone can be called as a revolution. Certainly there had been revolutions in the history of art before since every generation used its own creativity. These revolutions gave their names to the periods such as the Baroque, the Rococo or the Romantic. However the characteristic of this movement of the twentieth century was different from its predecessors: It is usually not so much identified as “a revolution, which implies a turning over, even a turning back, but rather a break up, a devolution, some would say a dissolution” (qtd. in Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 20) because of its catastrophic character which will be analyzed later. This period which shows the so-called catastrophic character is called “modernism” which takes its name from the word “modern”:

“Modernism is variously argued to be a period, style, genre, or combination of these; but it is first of all a word; one which exists alongside cognate words. Its stem, ‘Modern’, is a term that, from the Latin *modo*, means ‘current’, and so has a far wider currency and range of meanings than ‘Modernism’. In the late fifth century, for example, the Latin *modernus* referred to the Christian present in opposition to the Roman past; modern English is distinguished from Middle English; and the modern period in literature is considered to be from the sixteenth century on, although it is sometimes used to describe twentieth-century writing. More generally, ‘modern’ has been frequently used to refer to the avant-garde, though since World War II this sense has been embraced by the term ‘contemporary’ while ‘modern’ has shifted from meaning ‘now’ to ‘just now’.” (qtd. in Childs, 2000: 12)

Besides giving its name to the period for which expressions such as the Modern Movement, the Modern Tradition, the Modern Age, the Modern Century, the Modern Temper or shortly Modernism are used, the word “modern” is suitable for everything that is in an endless progress since something modern today has no chance of being

modern tomorrow. Thus, the term is linked with things or situations that are subject to change much faster than terms like “romantic” or “neo-classical”. That is why although there are conflicts and varieties about the period’s character, there is an agreement about its name.

The power of the word “modern” is hidden in its characteristic, contemporary feeling which emphasizes that we live in novel times, which is a fresh condition of the human mind. However, the boundaries of these novel times are subject to ambiguity. It means there are various ideas about when it started and ended or whether it came to an end at all. To understand the scope of modernism, it is essential to know that modernism is not a single movement but is composed of movements which became effective in different places and in different times. The submovements covered by the term modernism are various; some of them are the extensions of the realist or the romantic movements such as Impressionism, Post-Impressionism, Expressionism, Cubism, Futurism, Symbolism, Imagism, Vorticism, Dadaism and Surrealism. This plural nature of modernism is what makes it hard for critics to find a clear place or date for it since it looks different depending on its centre, when and where it flourished.

The term was first used by Baudelaire in the mid-nineteenth century in his essay “The Painter of Modern Life” where he “describe[d] modernity as the fashionable, fleeting and contingent in art, in opposition to the eternal and immutable” (Childs, 2000: 14). However, it was not until the 1920s, the term became widely used. It was only possible after the acceptance of all the mentioned –isms above. It is a mistake to think of all the art of those years as “modern”. While speaking of the style of an age, we can either mean the general form of many forms or the dominant or the authentic view of its artists. For modernism the second one is valid since many twentieth century artists rejected the movement despite its inevitable force applied through the daily life apparatuses such as media:

“The assumption that the age demands a certain kind of art, and that Modernism is the art that it demands, has been fervently held by those who see in the modern human condition a crisis of reality, an apocalypse of cultural community. What, though, is clear is that not all artists have believed this to be so-that, indeed, ours has been a century not only of de-realization but of realism, not only of ironic but of expansive modes.” (Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 27)

Whether it was totally accepted or partly denied, modernism became widely influential in literature. The same question about its origins is a subject of debate within the literary sphere as well:

“For the potential of Modernism was long present in the development of literature; it is possible to discern its origins long before we see its fruition. If Modernism is movements, then movements had been coming in increasing waves right through the nineteenth century. If the movements have to be bohemian or *avant-garde*, then bohemia was active in Paris from the 1830s; and the theory of the artist as a futurist, an agent free and loose in the realm of dangerous knowledge, was active throughout romantic thought.” (Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 30)

If we still have the endeavour to limit the period in certain dates, Virginia Woolf points to December 1910 in which “human nature changed” (qtd. in Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 33) for her in an unretrospective manner. The exact date for D.H.Lawrence is five years later: “It was in 1915 the old world ended” (Ibid: 33). For other critics the First World War or the publications of some works such as Ulysses and The Waste Land are determiners for the starting point of modernism:

“Despite minor differences such accounts seem to be in agreement that from some time late in the nineteenth century onwards (for Virginia Woolf’s date of 1910 is clearly too late, at least for the Continent) artists in all media broke decisively with their predecessors, abandoning tonality in music, and turning away in painting and literature from the representational and the mimetic to the abstract and the autonomous. Certain major figures are always associated with this movement-Kafka, Picasso, Pound, Webern, Eliot, Joyce; the names alone assure us that one of the striking characteristics of the movement is that it is international. It is normally seen as including within it various lesser trends: surrealism, dadaism, imagism, vorticism, cubism, acmeism. It is seen as a response to a general breakdown in agreement about continuity and order in society and is consequently marked by fragmentation, discontinuity, and introversion.” (Hewitt, 1988: 130)

However, all those dates are nothing but artificial boundary lines. Because everything has its roots in the past: “In literature this is particularly true, where the modern movement has roots in Baudelaire, Flaubert and Dostoyevsky, as indeed in Nietzsche, Ibsen and the twentieth century’s own discovery, Kierkegaard, who died in 1855” ( Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 68).

When we come to the end of the period, it is usually marked with the post-war period whose art seems to move away from Modernism and stresses the technological and dehumanized universe suggested by post-modernism. Contrary to this idea, some

critics claim that the post-war period can not be accepted as an end for modernism since many modernist works were produced between 1920s and 1930s. Despite these conflicting ideas the years called “modern” can roughly be summarized as following:

“But what is clear is that there is in nearly all of these versions a sense of Modernism as an historical evolution coupled with a notion of crisis and a notion of a point of culmination. And, for most Anglo-American critics, that culmination falls in the first part of the twentieth century. Although the reports vary increasingly in their detail, as the lore begins to shift, they have in common an emphasis on the Anglo-American achievement following on from the innovations of French symbolism, behind which again stand two prime initiators, Flaubert and Baudelaire. The stress may then fall on the new classicism, or else on the continuation of Romanticism. But the period of highest intensity is seen by and large as the first quarter of the twentieth century, within which are two peaks: the years immediately preceding, and the years immediately following the First World War” (Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 36).

It is essential to mention the origins and the alerting forces behind modernism in order to understand its effects both in social and the artistic world. These can be listed as the destruction of civilization, tradition and the individual, social, moral, intellectual and spiritual conflicts and the meaninglessness and alienation in life which can be summarized under the key terms uncertainty and insecurity caused by the war, capitalism, urbanization and technology. The rising power of industrialism in cities destroyed the old, familiar world together with its rules and values leaving the individual in a strange, rootless life. The World War I is the climax of this insecurity, and it is a line that separates the old world from the new one. Focusing on these two worlds which can be named as “pre-war society”, and “post-war society” will be helpful to see the process developing from the nineteenth century towards the “modern” twentieth century although it is so much complex:

“The Great War which tore Europe apart between 1914 and 1918 was so shattering in its impact, so far-reaching in its consequences, that it is profoundly difficult to recapture what preceded it- difficult to avoid exaggerating the sense of conflict in the pre-war years, difficult not to see them building up into a general crisis of European society in which a crash, a resolution by force, was inevitable and felt to be inevitable.” (Ibid: 58)

First of all, when we look at the pre-war society at the beginning of the twentieth century, we come across with a bourgeois civilization living in the European capitals. They were interested in the industrial, financial and commercial communications. Industrial and economical growth was supported by the technological

developments such as electricity, motor cars and the steam turbine. Secondly, because of the opportunities for working, cities were getting bigger and bigger day by day with new immigrants. Life styles of individuals and families were being shaken as a result of the changing economical and cultural standards. This economical and cultural shock caused conflicts both in the social and individual contexts. The situation of the pre-war society summarized above created a crisis all over the world in human relations and daily life; however a self-consciousness and feeling of security were still present probably because of the atmosphere created by the bourgeois class:

“Much has been written nostalgically about *la belle époque* and the Edwardian peace, much of it exaggerated in reminiscence. But there is a truth in this, especially if one was born into the right class. Despite periodic threats of war, strikes, suffragettes, fears of social conflict, the middle and upper classes of England and of Western Europe enjoyed a freedom and a security almost impossible to recapture today. And the benefits of this state of affairs, if very unfairly distributed by modern notions of social equality, were enjoyed by many more people than they had ever been before. With light taxation, no inflation, cheap food, cheap labour, a plentiful supply of domestic servants, many ordinary middle class families with modest incomes lived full and comfortable lives. No wonder that so many who came from such families and survived the War, looking back, felt that there was a grace, an ease, a security in living then which has since been lost for ever. And, curiously, this is not the antithesis of the other factors: open, uninhibited acceptance of inequality, power and wealth, class and racial superiority. Indeed one of the strongest impressions left on the external observer examining this world of the 1900s is of an age remarkably unselfconscious, self-confident, far less troubled by the anxieties, fears and fantasies, the self-consciousness and guilt which may tremble underneath a few of its writings but which have found such vivid expression and subscription in Europe since then. Perhaps it is precisely this that makes that world seem remote to us today.” (Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 62)

The World War I interrupted this old world and its unconsciousness. Its effect was so deadly and fearful that no one could have imagined it before. Thus the post-war society added the feelings of uncertainty and insecurity to their world views. Each individual was isolated in a huge loneliness, and people lost the meaning of life. This is the emotional condition of the people who sought a way out by expressing themselves through modernist works of art. Because, in contrast to the realism of the previous century, twentieth century had nothing to lean against but art as the only dependable reality: “Modernism is viewed as a kind of aesthetic heroism, which in the face of the chaos of the modern world (very much a “fallen” world) sees art as the only dependable reality and as an ordering principle of a quasi-religious kind. The unity of art is

supposedly a salvation from the shattered order of modern reality” (Eysteinnsson, 1990: 9).

That hope of salvation in art is the most powerful link between modernism and literature. This view of literature is what makes it totally different from the literature of any other time. Literature and specifically the novel of the modern period are far from the novel of the nineteenth century. In the nineteenth century, novel was within the realist movement, and its purpose was to reflect the everyday reality by focusing on details. The plot structure was in a linear form ornamented by characters whose inner worlds the reader could never reach. The events and their consequences were much more important than the feelings or ideas of the characters since “Victorian culture accepted literature as socially important, and allowed it to take over some of the functions previously fulfilled by religion. In order to do this, it had to be ethically orientated” (Faulkner, 1977: 15/16). Thus, in the nineteenth century the novel had a moral purpose rather than being just “art”.

As a result the writers of the nineteenth century assumed that they and their readers shared a common reality. Towards the end of the century, as an outcome of the social, cultural and economical reasons mentioned before, writers began to lose their faith in this common reality. The end of the century is marked with divergent and often conflicting ideas about art and culture, which suggests the breakdown of artistic, ethical and social assumptions.

The novelist who struggled to create a new form of fiction in English at that time was Henry James (1843-1916). He had a pivotal position between nineteenth century and modernist fiction. Although today his works are hard to be called as modern, he was a pioneer on the way to modernist fiction. James not only criticized the role of the writer as a “truth teller” who had no courage to stand against anything but had “an easy-going relationship with the public”, but also suggested an organic unity created by “the strange irregular rhythm of life” in the novel rather than a unity just in form (Ibid: 7). Moreover James is the first to stress on subjectivism which means a variety of personal responses instead of the single-minded view of his period. The tendency of looking for new ways in the novel was not the only search of the new



century because it was a time in which everything became questionable with the rise of marginal voices supported by marginal studies:

“The weakening of the idea of subordination in the more open, flexible and competitive situation of increased social mobility meant that the old simple verities no longer seemed true. Accepting one’s place, loyalty to authority, unquestioning obedience, began to break down; patriotism, doing one’s duty, even Christianity, seemed questionable ideals. Man’s understanding of himself was changing. Anthropology was probing the primitive roots of religion: James Frazer’s The Golden Bough appeared in twelve volumes between 1890 and 1915. Philosophers like Nietzsche and Bergson had already emphasized the importance of instinct rather than reason. Psychologists like Freud and Jung were showing the power and significance of the unconscious. Scientific explanations were becoming more subtle and harder for the layman to understand. Put in the most simplified and general terms, it can be said that the world of 1910 was felt to be much more complex than the world as it had been known before, and especially more complex than the orderly world that had been presented to the reader in Victorian literature. The war of 1914-1918 dramatically crystallized and hastened the changes. The sense of complexity was to be the modernist writer’s fundamental recognition.” (Faulkner, 1977: 14)

This complexity was the result of a powerful break with the past which was dominant in all fields as mentioned before. It was not only social or religious or scientific; it was all which made the process impossible to run back and its effects permanent. In this world of changes the novelist still kept his freedom since “there may be poverty in the universe and a trauma in man, but the artist has the means to transcend both history and reality by the dispositions of his technique” (Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 25/26). Focusing on these techniques of the novelist seems to be helpful for a better understanding.

The main purpose of the techniques of the novelist was to emphasize the fragmented reality caused by various reasons listed before. Now “the novel” was “fleeing from material realism not in order to convey consciousness or the feel of life more intensely, but in order to explore the poverty of reality and the powers of art, of perspective and form which lie in the spaces between the data and the creative object” (Ibid: 409). The novelists called the modern were among those who rebelled against aesthetic forms, values of the bourgeois society and tradition:

“[They] sought to create an art that would be purely of their time, ruthlessly ‘modern’ in the root sense of ‘recently, just now’ from the Latin *modo*. In so doing, they extended the boundaries of what had hitherto been considered art, often scandalizing a

conservative public resistant to their innovations in form and offended by their inclusion of previously tabooed subject-matter.” (Blanning, 1996: 255)

To start with, modern novelists saw aesthetic form as independent of, and more important than content. Medium of representation or expression was superior to what was represented or expressed. With this purpose they rejected the traditional plot structure including the plot of resolution and the plot of revelation. Whereas “in the traditional mode problems are solved [and] situations are worked out”, in the modern mode, contrary to the traditional, “the question of ‘what will happen?’” (Sheehan, 2002: 14) is totally ignored. Instead of resolving the events, a state of affairs is revealed. Unlike the Aristotelian view of one thing connected with the other to form a unity, this new method relies “on the principle of one thing *after* another” (Ibid: 14) in a fragmentary form. For modern novelists, form and content were similar, and their focus was on the process of writing itself as mentioned in the quotation from Beckett: “writing is not *about* something; it *is* that something itself” (qtd. in Sumner, 2000: 2).

Certainly the rejection of plot was the result of a shared desire for change both in fiction and in society. According to the modern novelists the linearity of the traditional plot and its movement towards resolution were disturbing elements. Instead of stating the familiar subjects in familiar forms, modern novelists offered mysteries with no solutions, no certainties and no conclusions which made their novels expand, deepen and more complex on each rereading.

Besides a new understanding of plot, modern novelists made use of a technique called “defamiliarization”. In a world that had lost its sincerity, “modern literature act[ed] out the loss of something primary that it wish[ed] to regain” (Meisel, 1987: 1). The technique of defamiliarization served to catch this lost sincerity by “exposing the deceptive techniques used by traditional art to hide its means of production and occlude the traces of its raw materials” (Blanning, 1996: 264/265). Their attempts can be interpreted as a struggle to rediscover a lost language of authenticity and the naivety of being just human.

While comparing the two worlds before and after the World War I, it was claimed that the pre-war society was living in a kind of self-unconsciousness which ended with the painful gain of consciousness through the experience of war. However,

the catastrophic experience of war itself was not the only factor of the fresh developing self-consciousness and the emphasis on the individual both in the society and fiction:

“The consciousness of the modern artist has been rendered more self-directed by the influence of psychological investigation, revealing the complexity of the human personality, and of philosophical enquiry, emphasizing the role of the agent in creating the reality which he experiences. The decline of respect for authority is another aspect of the situation.” (Faulkner, 1977: 21)

The scientific discoveries of Freud on the consciousness and the unconsciousness of the individual opened a new age. By the end of the nineteenth century science had created doubts about the certainties of the previous ages. As a result, religion changed its way for a decline. Darwin’s books shook the faith in the holy books and in a divine creator. Freud’s studies followed him and emphasized the inner world of the individual as an outcome of certain psychological processes which could only be solved by using scientific methods. This scientific approach was in harmony with the modern tendencies that rejected mysticism of religion and was the most appropriate view for the modern humanity which sought to control his own individuality:

“The starting point of Modernism is the crisis of belief that pervades twentieth century western culture: loss of faith, experience of fragmentation and disintegration, and the shattering of cultural symbols and norms. At the centre of this crisis were the new technologies of science, the epistemology of logical positivism, and the relativism of functionalist thought-in short, major aspects of the philosophical perspectives that Freud embodied.” (qtd. in Childs, 2000: 48)

Although the modern novelists were not directly influenced by Freud’s writing, their insistence on reflecting the consciousness of their characters via the method called “stream-of-consciousness” shows their shifting from moral and social purposes to the world of the individual on the contrary to their realist predecessors:

“With the advent of psychoanalysis, among other new ideas, theological search for God had been replaced by the epistemological quest for selfknowledge; enlightenment was not to be found in Christianity or in society but in the self, in individual subjective consciousness.” (Childs, 2000: 54)

So the concentration on the mind’s activity in perceiving the world became the most important area of novelistic enquiry. For novelists like James and Joyce, the mind was not just a passive agent that receives impulses from the outer world but is creative.

Moreover, the “outer objects were just symbols and correlatives for inner states of feeling” (Bergson, 1986: xii). Thus, the centre was moving from the society to the individual who became aware of his right over his own self:

“The wanderer, the loner, the exile, the restless and rootless and homeless individual were no longer the rejects of a self-confident society but rather those who, because they stood outside, were uniquely placed in an age when subjectivity was truth to speak with vision and authority.” (Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 68)

If we turn back to “stream-of-consciousness”, the concept is in relation with the perception of time. Apart from Freud, the French philosopher Henri Bergson is another name from the field of psychology and philosophy to have a deep effect on modernist fiction. In his Time and Free Will (1889), Bergson suggested that unlike clock-time which had a linear structure, psychological time was measured by *duration*. Thus the individual feeling of time was unique for each person. The technique “stream-of-consciousness”, introduced into the modern fiction by Virginia Woolf, has its source in the idea of Bergson. In Woolf’s novels the opposition between the clock-time and the psychological time are given by the long discussion of the characters’ thoughts which take place just in a few seconds. The concept of *duration* comes forward here where the time matters to the individuals is only the psychological time as noted by Proust in his claim that “reality takes shape in the memory alone” (qtd. in Childs, 2000: 50). Contrary to the linear time, the past and the future are together in present in the minds of the individuals. The idea of past and future condensed in an endless present is supported by time-shifts, juxtapositions and flashbacks. These features are among the alterations of the new plot structure without a beginning and a conclusion as well:

“For many Modernists, it is the clock, which regulates and parcels out time, that is to blame for the tyranny of space over the psychological flow of time in the mind. It is of course only in the mind that the past is preserved, and Bergson, like many others argued that nothing was forgotten: all was stored in the mind even if it was not brought to the surface. Understandably, this new conception of the world led to the use of different techniques in art, such as the abrupt beginning and open-ended conclusion to many Modernist novels. Bergson’s conviction that experience is understood by intuition rather than rational reflection combined with Freud’s belief that past events shape the psyche, resulted in the view that reality only exists in subjective apprehensions becoming widespread in artistic circles.” (Childs, 2000: 50)

The innovations about the perception of time resulted in the privilege of cyclical time over linear time by modern novelists. The fascination with cyclical time favoured

the usage of myth. There was only one story to be told about them who had a “desire to lift art above the meaningless course of everyday life, to achieve what became known as ‘absolute art’ ” (Blanning, 1996: 261). Thus, they placed myth over history in their search for a new “reality” within art because using myth as a device for the modern fiction was seen as a “way in which the modernist writer has felt able to give coherence to his work, the myths often being of the most general kind, concerned with death and regeneration, the cycle of nature, the order of the seasons, though sometimes, as in the case of Ulysses, more specifically literary” (Faulkner, 1977: 18).

According to Eliot, who comments on Joyce’s use of Homer’s Odyssey in his Ulysses, the use of myth is “a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history” (qtd. in Eysteinnsson, 1990: 9). Usage of the techniques analyzed in detail and myth consequently serves to reflect this anarchy mentioned by Eliot:

“Indeed Modernism would seem to be the point at which the idea of the radical and innovating arts, the experimental, technical, aesthetic ideal that had been growing forward from Romanticism, reaches formal crisis-in which myth, structure and organization in a traditional sense collapse, and not only for formal reasons. The crisis is a crisis of culture; it often involves an unhappy view of history-so that the Modernist writer is not simply the artist set free, but the artist under specific, apparently historical strain. If Modernism is the imaginative power in the chamber of consciousness that, as James puts it, ‘converts the very pulses of the air into revelations’, it is also often an awareness of contingency as a disaster in the world of time: Yeats’s ‘Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold.’ If it is an art of metamorphosis, a Daedalus voyage into unknown arts, it is also a sense of disorientation and nightmare, feeling of dangerous, deathly magic in the creative impulse explored by Thomas Mann.” (Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 26)

In addition to the techniques introduced, modern novel is original in giving its readers an active role in the creative process. It means that while reading a modern novel, the readers are not passive audiences any more, but they are so much participated in it without them the novel is incomplete. As readers “we are at once conscious of using faculties hitherto dormant, ingenuity and skill, a mental nimbleness and dexterity such as serve to solve a puzzle ingeniously” (qtd. in Faulkner, 1977: 37). In modern novel, the reader is not expected to investigate characters in terms of morality, but to examine their nature of human sensibility and perception. By this way, the novel becomes a means of creating the world, not reporting it:

“Putting the means and modes of art at the centre of the work, they demand the reader’s involvement in its significant order; so they set limits upon the realistic level of the novel’s operation, and require our comprehension of *this* particular order and structure as an articulated whole. One of the great themes of the Modernist novel has been, in fact, the theme of the art of the novel itself: a theme that, by forcing the reader to pass beyond the reported content of the novel, and enter into its form, has given Modernist fiction a dominantly Symbolist character.” (Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 396)

This is the distinction suggested by Barthes between the readerly and the writerly texts. Most of the novels are readerly, according to Barthes, which means they are realist. Those readerly texts are usually based “upon shared conventions between writer and reader”, and “they encourage the reader to be passive” whereas the writerly texts belong to the modernist tradition and are “commonly experimental” (Childs, 2000: 76). It is ironical for modernism to become a “tradition” itself despite its attempts to break the tradition with which its name has a dialectical opposition.

D.H.Lawrence is among the writers who are included within the tradition of those writerly texts defined by Barthes. Sometimes he is regarded as being outside modernism, but his views on novel and the techniques he used are enough to put him within the borders of modernist movement.

For Lawrence novel is the reflection of the highest truth. Novel is the genre which can interpret life as it is. That is why he sees novel above not only philosophy, religion, poetry and science but also other books from all fields. In Lawrence’s view novel is the *book of life* although all other books are not about life. In his essay “Morality and the Novel”, he claims that even the books like Bible or the works of Homer and Shakespeare are all novels which tell things related to men. Since their subject matter interests men, they have wholeness. To turn back to the superiority of the novel, he says it has such a great value on the contrary to philosophy, religion and science which are busy with nailing things down by putting “rules” and “laws”, since in the novel “everything is true in its own time, place, circumstance, and untrue outside of its own place, time, circumstance” (in Faulkner, 1986: 139). Moreover, the method applied by philosophy, religion and science are deadly to the novel because “if you try to nail anything down, in the novel, either it kills the novel, or the novel gets up and walks away with the nail” (Ibid: 139). In addition to its reflecting life rather than limiting it, the novel is superior because of its power of shaping the future which Lawrence focuses on in his essay “Surgery for the Novel-or a Bomb?”:

“The novel has a future. It’s got to have the courage to tackle new propositions without using abstractions; it’s got to present us with new, really new feelings, a whole line of new emotion, which will get us out of the emotional rut. Instead of snivelling about what is and has been, or inventing new sensations in the old line, it’s got to break a way through, like a hole in the wall. And the public will scream and say it is sacrilege: because, of course, when you’ve been jammed for a long time in a tight corner, and you get really used to its stuffiness and its tightness, till you find it suffocatingly cosy; then, of course, you’re horrified when you see a new glaring hole in what was your cosy wall. You’re horrified. You back away from the cold stream of fresh air as if it were killing you. But gradually, first one and then another of the sheep filters through the gap and finds a new world outside.” (in Faulkner, 1986: 137)

When compared with the novelists of the nineteenth century within the moralist sphere, Lawrence is also a moralist although his attitude is sharply different. Instead of morality of the nineteenth century which is a substitute for religion, Lawrence understands morality as truth to life and its inter-relatedness:

“If a novel reveals true and vivid relationships, it is a moral work, no matter what the relationships may consist in. If the novelist *honours* the relationship in itself, it will be a great novel... The only morality is to have man true to his manhood, woman to her womanhood, and let the relationship form of itself, in all honour. For it is, to each, *life itself*.” (Ibid: 141/142).

Certainly, as his critical writings imply as well, Lawrence is a novelist who has more direct moral and social intention than the characteristic approach of modernism. The reason for this fact may be the result of Lawrence’s relationship to modernism. Although he usually rejected and attacked the modernist tradition, and sometimes criticized the modern methods of novel harshly, he was a conscious innovator as a novelist who aimed to give a message to his audience. He was not only “a novelist but... a diagnostician of the ills of the modern world” (Hewitt, 1988: 167) who aimed helping the “folk-English folk-to alter, and have more sense” (qtd. in Faulkner, 1977: 64) by writing: “There was in Lawrence an aspiration additional to that of the explorer of the psyche which is less compatible with Modernism, and that is his moral and prophetic stance.” (Faulkner, 1977: 64)

The main features of modernism shared by Lawrence are the rejection of plot and the shift from realist representations of character. The rejection of plot goes back to Thomas Hardy’s first and unpublished novel The Poor Man and the Lady in 1868 with a subtitle “A Story with No Plot Containing some original verses”. In the middle of the

nineteenth century a novel without a plot meant new intentions and new forms which resulted in a ban. Almost fifty years after Hardy's first novel, Lawrence planned to write novels without plots. Despite discouraging effects, he insisted and did not allow his creativity to be avoided. His books were banned for various reasons as well. However, they survived and were published years later since in the fifty years between Hardy and Lawrence, innovations became much more acceptable as a result of the changes in society and science. Instead of a unity created by the plot in a novel, Lawrence's purpose was to reach a "harmony of mind and body, of the individual with others, of humanity with the cosmos" (Sumner, 2000: 7). This harmony was the only thing desirable in life in Lawrence's view; thus he worked on how all this could be treated in the novel.

Lawrence's rejection of the traditional novel is also apparent in his episodic style applied in Women in Love. Episodes break the continuity of the realist novel since "every new chapter should pose new problems, serve as a new beginning, a new impulse, a new plunge ahead" (Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 437).

When we come to the character aspect of the novel, Lawrence inquires into the depths of the self in his characters. He expresses his search for the self and his opposition to the traditional characters with moral purposes in a letter written in 1914: "Somehow-that which is physic-non-human, in humanity, is more interesting to me than the old-fashioned human element-which causes one to conceive a character in a certain moral scheme and make him consistent. The certain moral scheme is what I object to" (qtd. in Faulkner, 1986: 23).

This idea of character not with a stable ego but with a depth to explore suggests Lawrence's attempt to show what lies below the personality projected in ordinary social life. Consequently, despite the conflicting and opposite ideas on the nature of modernism and Lawrence as a modernist, there is one thing to be sure of, which is the fact that the modernist period was a period of creativity that flourished out of loss and destruction. Maybe the ideas of modernism could not be understood comprehensively in its time, but this is not the matter since they were designed for the future:

"What these radical new developments-in art, thought, literature, science-have in common is their awareness of the future. What they had to say was listened to and



understood by only a minority at the time; only later, when the War had swept away the old order of European society and finally destroyed its values in a way which everyone could see, was it recognized that the imagination of the painters and poets, the scientists and the thinkers of 1900s had reached out to see in advance the world (which they were helping to create), that improbable, disturbing, fragmented world in which we still live.” (Bradbury and McFarlane, 1991: 70)

The future which modernism aimed to reach is the world of today and it is easier to understand modernity by looking back. Likewise, today will be better understood in the future when it creates an order in itself.

#### **CHAPTER FOUR**

#### **LAWRENCE'S NOVEL AND SONS AND LOVERS**

D.H.Lawrence (1885-1930) tried his hand on every literary form during his writing career. He wrote novels, short stories, plays, poems, essays, reviews and travel books. However, it is widely accepted that the novel is the form in which he best showed his talent and made his most lasting contribution to English literature. This is not to say he was not so much successful in other forms. His short stories, poetry and plays have widely been recognized and appreciated. However, Lawrence himself preferred the novel as well since his purpose of writing was didactic rather than being a pure desire to be aesthetically appraised. For him, the purpose of art was “moral, not aesthetic, not decorative, but moral” (qtd. in Salgãdo, 1982: 65). Lawrence put forward his aim of morality which caused him to be a novelist as the thing that made him “superior to the saint, the scientist, the philosopher, and the poet, who are all great masters of different bits of man alive, but never get the whole hog” in his article “Why the Novel Matters?” (in Faulkner, 1986: 145).

It is significant to focus on Lawrence's concept of morality for a better understanding. First of all, Lawrence was a writer who was born in the Victorian age that covered the years between 1837 and 1901. This period was the age of revolutionary developments in technology, agriculture and moral standards as a result of the dominant imperialism and capitalism. Like all writers whose works have documentary features for the age in which they lived, Lawrence reflected those changing standards in the society in all his works. He was clearly the writer of his time who created a vivid picture of the social developments of his age in his novels. Certainly those changes are the main reasons that affected Lawrence's views. While morality was limited to the social, cultural and sexual norms in the Victorian society, for Lawrence it was “that delicate, for ever trembling and changing *balance* between me and my circumambient universe, which precedes and accompanies a true relatedness” (Ibid: 139). When it comes to morality in the novel, it is the balance which is free from the novelist's

predilection. The novel is in danger of becoming immoral when one idea or purpose is dominant:

“Because *no* emotion is supreme, or exclusively worth living for. *All* emotions go to the achieving of a living relationship between a human being and the other human being or creature or thing he becomes purely related to. All emotions, including love and hate, and rage and tenderness, go to the adjusting of the oscillating, unestablished balance between two people who amount to anything. If the novelist puts his thumb in the pan, for love, tenderness, sweetness, peace, then he commits an immoral act: he *prevents* the possibility of a pure relationship, a pure relatedness, the only thing that matters: and he makes inevitable the horrible reaction, when he lets his thumb go, towards hate and brutality, cruelty and destruction.” (in Faulkner, 1986: 140)

The possibility of a pure relationship between man and woman was the main question in Lawrence’s mind. Moreover, it was the central theme of almost all his prose. He believed in a balance between man and woman as he believed in the balance of ideas for the novel. Besides this balance between sexes, which would especially be helpful in the emancipation of the females, he emphasized the physical sex as a major theme in his novels.

For Lawrence sexual act was “a great psychic experience, a vital experience of tremendous importance” (qtd. in Ecker, 1995: 30). He was dealing with topics such as homosexuality, lesbianism and sexuality outside marriage that were taboos for his own time. Lawrence’s purpose was to free society from its fears and prejudices about sexuality and to show them their own nature which they lost long ago. His belief in life force was the element that made him a “vitalist” (Spilka, 1957: 4). “Organicist” is probably a more suitable word “since the goal of life, for Lawrence, was organic wholeness” (Ibid: 4). This wholeness, he claimed no one could achieve, but the novelist:

“can develop an instinct for life, ... instinct of the whole consciousness in a man, bodily, mental, spiritual at once. And only, in the novel are all things given full play... For out of the full play of *all* things emerges the only thing that is anything, the wholeness of a man, the wholeness of a woman, man alive, and live woman.” (in Faulkner, 1986: 148)

Lawrence’s emphasis on wholeness made his art religious. He was prophetic and didactic in his novels where he could “speak to the whole man about wholeness, and speak with full authority” (Spilka, 1957: 4/5).

If we turn back to his vitalist approach, we come across Lawrence's romantic ideas. Although he was not a Romantic like Blake or Wordsworth, "one of the fundamental Romantic insights which Lawrence made thoroughly his own was the double vision of a living universe and of man's true fulfillment being dependent on being *rooted* in it. It was a vision shaped in fierce reaction to the mechanistic cause-and-effect rigidity of the new science" (Salgãdo, 1982: 77). The metaphor in which Lawrence expressed his ideas on man and his relation to the universe was itself a Romantic imagery, the Tree of Life: "Sometimes the tree is human life rooted in the cosmos, sometimes the cosmos itself is the tree, in which the human species, or the individual is bud, leaf or flower" (Ibid: 78). While using this metaphor, Lawrence's idea was to discuss man's deep and strong relationship to other creatures. As opposed to this connection between the parts of the whole life, Lawrence put the mechanical bonds of his age between man, money and machines. Unlike the living, organic tree which is the source of unity, mechanical life was the symbol of the dying universe.

In such a meaningless world, Lawrence tries to awaken a living "soul". In his search "what was most urgently needed... was a 'climbing down' on the part of the mental consciousness and the recognition of man's relation to a living cosmos" (Ibid: 80). Likewise, he focuses on his characters' minds to find a meaning in their unconsciousness which he believes is the source of life, individuality and creativity. That is why he believes "that the important story of a human being takes place inside" and why "the important events for his characters are mental and emotional events, and are never articulated" (Marsh, 2000: 8).

Since Lawrence was aware of the fact that neither body nor soul or neither the mental nor the physical universe alone was sufficient enough for the desired meaning, he intended for the complete wholeness in the life of both the individual and the society. Like his contemporary modern writers, he made use of myths and archetypes in his works. His preceding purpose was to express his grief about the disintegration of the society, especially during the war. In order to express his feeling, he referred to the myth of Isis and Osiris: "My heart is quartered into a thousand fragments, and I shall never have the energy to collect the bits-like Osiris-or Isis" (qtd. in Phillips, 1990: 138).

As well as the power of the mythical world in figuring the current situation of the world and the emotion it created for individuals, Lawrence's usage of myths and archetypes aimed to remind his readers of a forgotten past in which unity and harmony was dominant. He was longing for a perfectly united society composed of healthy individuals who did not have any fragmentation in their personalities as opposed to the modern life and its masses living in despair: "[Lawrence] wanted to destroy machines and money, not to control them. He desired a world without factories, capitalists, and proletariat, a world in which, as he called the turns, theosophists would dance tenderly about a sacred cow" (qtd. in Phillips, 1990: 143/144). Myths and archetypes served as the survivors of the modern age which Lawrence yearned for. He knew that myths and archetypes are the ageless patterns which can guide the humankind.

However, the role of myth as an instrument for creating harmony and unity in twentieth century novel is a matter of debate since myths in modern novels can be regarded just as the parodies of a fragmented world which has no hope for becoming a whole again. Using myths in this way creates an ironical effect; a feature belonging to modernity.

Lawrence's third novel Sons and Lovers, which was written in 1913, is rich in mythical features and archetypes. It includes a psychological aspect as well despite its similar characteristics with the autobiographical novels of the nineteenth century. By focusing on the psychological framework of his characters, D. H. Lawrence tried to reflect the insecurity and rootlessness of modern life, and especially, man as the pitiful victim of a world of brute force who becomes alienated from himself and nature. He dramatizes the complete loneliness which an emphasis upon the private world and the interior journey toward personal understanding could cause. In order to expose this, Lawrence makes use of different archetypes which require to be evaluated in terms of their contribution to his work. The way of making sense of his archetypes is to concentrate on the nature of his archetypes. In Sons and Lovers Lawrence is preoccupied with the archetypes of the development of the individual such as the different faces of the mother archetype and the character archetypes like the shadow, the animus and the anima. These archetypes function as the stages of individuation process.

The whole plot of the novel follows the archetypal quest of Paul who represents the archetypal hero. The novel starts with the early marriage life of the Morels. Soon Paul is born, and his self-quest from his birth until his maturity through his childhood and adolescence with its various steps, conflicts and temptations occupies the rest of the novel. His relationship with his brother William, with his parents and lovers are examined or discussed thoroughly and carefully, taking account of all the small points which need to be considered. His emotional state and psychology is examined so deeply that during the novel the world is told through his eyes. His jealous love for his mother and his hatred for his father are the great conflicts which make his quest unavoidable. The main purpose of his archetypal quest is the concretion of his consciousness with his unconsciousness which are the “two incongruous halves which together should form a whole” (Jung, 1959: 287). Indeed the wholeness acquired at the end of the quest is the rebirth of the hero into a richer and fuller life which is the highest goal of individuation.

The dominant archetype in the novel is the mother archetype. According to Jung “the mother carries for us that inborn image of the *mater natura* and *mater spiritualis*, of the totality of life of which we are a small and helpless part” (Ibid: 92). The first experience with the mother archetype is usually the personal mother:

“The carrier of the archetype is in the first place the personal mother, because the child lives at first in complete participation with her, in a state of unconscious identity. She is the psychic as well as the physical precondition of the child. With the awakening of ego-consciousness the participation gradually weakens, and consciousness begins to enter into opposition to the unconscious, its own precondition. This leads to differentiation of the ego from the mother, whose personal peculiarities gradually become more distinct.” (Ibid: 102)

When the ego of the infant is separated from the personal mother, the archetype is transferred to another person. Since the mother archetype may appear in a variety of aspects as a general characteristic of all archetypes, after the transfer it may be represented by the personal female relatives of a person. However, the grandmother is preferred generally as the closest relative.

Besides the personal representatives, the transfer of the mother archetype may be towards more abstract figures such as the Great Mother or the Virgin. For Neumann, “when analytical psychology speaks of the primordial image or archetype of the Great

Mother, it is referring, not to any concrete image existing in space and time, but to an inward image at work in the human psyche” (1963: 3). The various representations of the archetype are present as recurring images in myths and literature. Some examples from mythology are “the mother who reappears as the maiden in the myth of Demeter and Kore; or the mother who is also the beloved, as in the Cybele-Attis myth” (Jung, 1959: 81).

While the existence of the Archetypal Feminine goes back to the first human beings, the abstraction of some part of the archetype as the Great Mother is the product of a more developed consciousness in a late period:

“And indeed, it is only relatively late in the history of mankind that we find the Archetypal Feminine designated as *Magna Mater*. But it was worshiped and portrayed many thousands of years before the appearance of the term... The term “Great” expresses the symbolic character of superiority that the archetypal figure possesses in comparison with everything human and with created nature in general.” (Neumann, 1963: 11)

Whether with the name “the Great Mother” or without it, early mankind experiences the Archetypal Feminine in a paradox of good and evil or friendly and terrible at the same time. The worship of good and bad goddesses separately belongs to the level of a higher consciousness:

“The primordial archetype belongs to a consciousness and an ego that are still incapable of differentiation. The more contradictions that are combined in it, the more confounding and overwhelming are its actions and manifestation. Because so many contradictory motifs and symbols are joined in the archetype, its nature is paradoxical: it can neither be visualized nor represented.” (Ibid: 12)

In the first phases of consciousness the representations of the archetype are usually negative such as “the chimerical creatures composed of different animals or of animal and man—the griffins, sphinxes, harpies, for example –and also of such monstrosities as phallic and bearded mothers” (Ibid: 13). When mankind reaches a higher portion of consciousness, a separation between the features and symbols that are characteristics of different aspects of the same archetype takes place. Thus, a “benevolent” and a “malevolent” goddess are born out of the united Great Feminine of the previous times that are represented by opposite qualities and symbols (Jung, 1959: 81). The benevolent goddess is symbolized by the life-giving symbols of nature such as “a rock, a cave, a tree, a spring, a deep well” (Ibid: 81) while the symbols of the

malevolent goddess are related with death such as “the witch, the dragon, the grave, the sarcophagus, deep water, death, nightmares and bogies” (Jung, 1959: 81/82). The variety in these symbols proves that the Great Mother is not a particular goddess but the combination of many aspects manifested in rites and myths whose sum composes her identity:

“This wreath of symbolic images, however, surrounds not only *one* figure but a great number of figures, of Great Mothers who, as goddesses and fairies, female demons and nymphs, friendly and unfriendly, manifest the one Great Unknown, the Great Mother as the central aspect of the Archetypal Feminine, in the rites and myths, the religions and legends, of mankind.” (Neumann, 1963: 12)

The opposite qualities of the Great Mother which are represented in various forms and the symbols of her which stand for her different modes point to the character of the Archetypal Feminine as the source of every polarity in the universe. Its positive aspect is related with the qualities of “maternal solicitude and sympathy; the magic authority of the female; the wisdom and spiritual exaltation that transcend reason; any helpful instinct or impulse; all that is benign, all that cherishes and sustains, that fosters growth and fertility” (Ibid: 82). On the contrary, the negative, evil aspect employs “anything secret, hidden, dark; the abyss, the world of the dead, anything that devours, seduces, and poisons, that is terrifying and inescapable like fate” (Ibid: 82). In its negative aspect, the Archetypal Feminine “uses the ‘withdrawal of love’ as an instrument of power, as a means of perpetuating the rule of the Great Mother, of preventing her offspring from achieving independence” (Ibid: 68). The dual nature of the mother archetype is represented by examples such as Sophia as the projection of the Good Mother and the terrifying figure of the Gorgon with the snakes writhing round her head as the projection of the Terrible Mother (Ibid: 22). Thus, the Archetypal Feminine not only gives and directs life but also takes everything back to herself. She is both “the womb and the tomb” (Campbell, 1968: 114); light and dark; life and death. She is “the first world of the child and the last world of the adult” (Jung, 1959: 94). She has a dynamic movement within herself whose symbol is the circular snake of the uroboros, the Great Round or the Wheel (Neumann, 1963: 30). These symbols all have a continuous character with ambiguous beginnings and ends. Likewise, mother is the one who “at once bears, begets, and devours” (Ibid: 30).



According to Neumann, the combining features of the Terrible and of the Good Mother corresponds to the archetype of the Great Mother as in the figure of Isis. Great Mother is the malevolent and the benevolent goddess at the same time. She is the goddess of Western antiquity and the Eastern cultures in which the opposites remain united in contrast to the Christian or Muslim god who is exclusively good and pure while Satan becomes the embodiment of all evil.

In Sons and Lovers, Gertrude Morel is the Great Mother with both the negative and positive aspects of the archetype. Her dual character is symbolized by the two contrasting colours; black and white of her clothes. She usually wears black which stands for her evil side because “in pictorial or plastic representations the Mother is dark deepening to black” which is one of “her principle colours” (Jung, 1982: 146). She always wears “her little black bonnet and her cloak” (Lawrence, 1995: 4) or “put[s] on her black apron” (Ibid: 81). She rarely wears white instead of dark colours like dark blue if it is not black. Even her white blouses or bonnets are not pure white which stresses her ambiguous and mixed character. She wears either white “with a little sprig of heliotrope and black” or black with “white tips in her bonnet, and some white in her blouse” (Ibid: 122/244). However we learn that she has not always worn black, even that her black bonnet once had flowers which is “now... reduced to black lace and a bit of jet” (Ibid: 74). The significant point here is the growing tendency in Gertrude Morel towards darkness throughout the years.

In the first chapters of the book, Gertrude shows her good motherly side for whom it is important to have “her home... behind her, fixed and stable” (Ibid: 5). First of all, she is usually at home which is her symbolical place because “originally of the cave, later of the house (the sense of being inside, of being sheltered, protected, and warmed in the house), has always borne a relation to the original containment in the womb” (Neumann, 1963: 137). She is the governer of all affairs at home, and she is responsible for activities such as sewing, baking and cooking. These activities which organize the family life are the features which belong to the good goddess. For Neumann “baking, like weaving, is one of the primeval mysteries of the Feminine” (Ibid: 234) since she is associated with nourishment:

“The archetypal experience of the Feminine as all-nourishing is evident in the multiplication of the breast motif... The breast motif involves the symbolism of milk

and cow. The Goddess as cow, ruling over the food-giving herd, is one of the earliest historical objects of worship... As celestial cow, the Great Goddess nourishes the earth with her milky rain." (Neumann, 1963: 124/128)

As well as the nourishing Feminine, the Great Mother is associated with protection and warmth which is expressed in the symbolism of fire. Likewise Mrs. Morel always keeps the fire on the hearth in her kitchen. This emphasizes not only her good motherly side but also stands for her domination in the house because according to Neumann, the female domination is symbolized by the fireplace as the centre of the house. In the same way, in Morels' house which is the castle of matriarchy "the hearth is sacred to the family" (Lawrence, 1995: 199). Both with its warmth and the symbolism for matriarchy, the fire belongs to the feminine like the kitchen in which it takes place: "The kitchen was full of the scent of boiled herbs and hops. On the hob a large black saucepan steamed slowly. Mrs. Morel took a panchion, a great bowl of thick red earth, streamed a heap of white sugar into the bottom, and then, straining herself to the weight, was pouring in the liquor." (Ibid: 21) Certainly, fire symbolism does not stand only for warmth and protection. Its association with nourishment makes it a symbol of the good mother as well:

"At the center of the mysteries over which the female group presided stood the guarding and tending of the fire. As in the house round about, female domination is symbolized in its center, the fireplace, the seat of warmth and food preparation, the "hearth," which is also the original altar. In ancient Rome this basic matriarchal element was most conspicuously preserved in the cult of Vesta and its round temple. This is the old round house or tent with a fireplace in the middle." (Neumann, 1963: 284/285)

The hearth and the kitchen in which the hearth is placed are the places where the good mother activates her transformative character. She is the natural nourishing principle herself who is responsible for gathering fruit and preparing food in early cultures. While the male group in these cultures is responsible for the hunting of animals, female group is engaged with the responsibility of the life and fertility of the animals where they make use of their transformative character. She is the Lady of Transformation whose feature of fertility controls the whole life:

"The transformation of matter and of life is subordinated to her, whether as goddess of the water... she commands the magic of rain; whether as goddess of the earth she commands the fertility of the soil; whether as Lady of the Beasts she governs the

fecundity of the animals; or whether as goddess of the blood she ordains the transformation of blood into milk or rain.” (Neumann, 1963: 286)

Besides fire as the symbol and instrument of transformation, the Great Mother uses vessels such as the saucepan or the bowl in her transformation mysteries. By this way food becomes improved, transformed into a new form. The shape of the vessels reminds the source of the transformative character of the feminine. They are shaped in rounds and curves like the uterus; the centre of the “woman as body-vessel [which] is the natural expression of the human experience of woman bearing the child ‘within’ her and of man entering ‘into’ her in the sexual act” (Ibid: 42). Likewise transforming the grain into bread by baking has a special importance in the transformative character of the feminine since bread is the basic food in all cultures which is almost sacred and whose lack means the danger of hunger. Baking bread, the feature of the good mother is parallel to her life giving in her womb; good mother nurtures her children not only in the womb but also outside it.

Besides her association with food and nourishment, the good mother is engaged with the production of medicine and the process of healing. Similarly, Gertrude Morel buys “elixir of vitriol” which is his husband’s “favourite first medicine” when he gets sick (Lawrence, 1995: 45). Moreover she nurses him with great care either at home or in the hospital.

Despite her sheltering, nourishing and healing aspects which make Gertrude Morel a perfect wife, she has a great conflict with her husband indeed. When she meets her husband Walter Morel at a Christmas party at the age of twenty-three, she can not guess the severity of the future battle although she is aware of their opposition:

“[Walter Morel] had that rare thing, a rich, ringing laugh. Gertrude Coppard had watched him, fascinated. He was so full of colour and animation, his voice ran so easily into comic grotesque, he was so ready and so pleasant with everybody... She herself was opposite. She had a curious, receptive mind which found much pleasure and amusement in listening to other folk. She was clever in leading folk to talk. She loved ideas, and was considered very intellectual. What she liked most of all was an argument on religion or philosophy or politics with some educated man.” (Ibid: 9)

Unlike Walter Morel, Gertrude Morel likes books, especially the Bible as a result of her Christian upbringing. She is clever and is governed by reason rather than emotion. Gertrude Morel’s religious background is effective in her world view. She is

the member of a puritan society which shapes her attitude against life and turns the “sensuous flame of life... into incandescence by thought and spirit” (Lawrence, 1995: 10) in her. She is the “soul” who seeks her body. Contrary to her search for her body, she denies everything related to body and physical pleasures as an outcome of her puritanity.

Besides her intellectuality and puritanity, Gertrude Morel is differentiated from Walter Morel with her place in the society. She comes from “a good old burgher family, famous independents who had fought with Colonel Hutchinson” and “her father, George Coppard, [is] an engineer” (Ibid: 7). On the contrary, Walter Morel is the grandson of “a French refugee who had married an English barmaid-if it had been a marriage” (Ibid: 9). Moreover, Gertrude is an ex-school teacher herself whose ambition is to live a bourgeois life. She is so far away from Walter Morel’s life that when she meets him, she realises the lives of the miners for the first time. When they move to the Bottoms, she can not find what she has expected for. Thus, “she [shrinks] a little from the first contact with the Bottoms women” (Ibid: 2). Instead, she enjoys the company of people with a status such as the clergyman who visits her after the birth of her baby. When she is together with her company, she is away from the miners’ world of Walter Morel: “Occasionally the minister stayed to tea with Mrs. Morel. Then she laid the cloth early, got out her best cups, with a little green rim, and hoped Morel would not come too soon: indeed, if he stayed for a pint, she would not mind this day” (Ibid: 33).

Moreover, she keeps alive the life which she longs for in her house with her friends. She makes use of the materials such as her clothes and cups which she believes are not suitable for Walter Morel who comes home “too tired to care about cloths” (Ibid: 34).

In contrast to Gertrude, Walter Morel is a man who stands for everything the “body” symbolizes. He is a man who loves fun, laughter and dancing full of “colour and animation” (Ibid: 9). He likes eating and especially drinking. He lives by instinct without rules following his bodily desires. He is “physical and worldly” while Gertrude is “spiritual and moral”. Their duality is a characteristic of Lawrence who believes that the principle of duality is central to human life: “Polarity, or action and reaction, we meet in every part of nature; in darkness and light; in heat and cold; in the ebb and flow

of waters; in male and female; in the inspiration and expiration of plants and animals” (qtd. in Ebbatson, 1980: 244).

As the contrasting halves of a whole, both are fascinated with each other. Gertrude feels that “a new tract of life suddenly open[s] before her” (Lawrence, 1995: 11). However their harmony does not last long, which is foreshadowed by the rejection of dancing by Gertrude in the very first night they met. She rejects everything related to body. In Jungian terms, she rejects her shadow represented by Walter Morel. The qualities of Walter Morel are the ones which Gertrude wants to repress behind her persona, which she pretends to be unaware of under the values of her puritan culture. However this rejection of the shadow leads to the conflict in Mrs. Morel. By developing a strong, civilized persona, she ignores her other part:

“In order for a person to become an integral member of the community, it is necessary to tame his animal spirits contained in the shadow. This taming is accomplished by suppressing manifestations of the shadow and by developing a strong persona which counteracts the power of the shadow. The person who suppresses the animal side of his nature may become civilized, but he does so at the expense of decreasing the motive power for spontaneity, creativity, strong emotions, and deep insights. He cuts himself off from the wisdom of his instinctual nature, a wisdom that may be more profound than any learning or culture can provide. A shadowless life tends to become shallow and spiritless.” (Hall and Nordby, 1973: 48/49)

Likewise, Mrs. Morel denies her shadow which makes her life incomplete. However she should accept it if she wants harmony because “when the ego and the shadow work in close harmony, the person feels full of life and vigor” (Ibid: 49). Otherwise she can not reach her wholeness without it. On the other hand Walter Morel is a part of Gertrude Morel since she thinks “what he did to himself he did to her” (Lawrence, 1995: 46). His being shadow or the representation of unconscious instincts is symbolized by his going down into the mines everyday metaphorically. He is associated with the depth and darkness.

The opposite forces embodied by Gertrude and Walter Morel start a battle in the house which becomes worse with Gertrude’s attempt to have her children on her side. This causes both the separation and alienation of the father from the family and the development of the possessive aspect of the terrible mother in Gertrude. Gertrude and the children are united against the father who is left outside the family circle. Even the existence of Walter Morel in the house causes an anxiety for them:

“There was a feeling of misery over all the house. The children breathed the air that was poisoned, and they felt dreary. They were rather disconsolate, did not know what to do, what to play at... Both children hushed into silence as they heard the approaching thud of their father’s stockinged feet, and shrank as he entered... When he had gone, they sighed with relief.” (Lawrence, 1995: 41/42)

In the absence of their father they are happier. They share all daily events with their mother every evening before Walter Morel comes home. Mrs. Morel makes the children her allies and Walter Morel’s enemies in her battle against her husband:

“He was shut out from all family affairs. No one told him anything. The children, alone with their mother, told her all about the day’s happenings, everything. Nothing had really taken place in them until it was told to their mother. But as soon as the father came in, everything stopped. He was like the scotch in the smooth, happy machinery of the home. And he was always aware of this fall of silence on his entry, the shutting off of life, the unwelcome.” (Ibid: 62)

Although Mrs. Morel sometimes reminds her children to share an important event with their father, they hate him so much that they find the communication impossible since “he [is] an outsider” (Ibid: 63). Similarly for Walter Morel the conversation between him and his children is impossible although he “dearly [likes] the children to talk to him” (Ibid: 62) because Morel belongs to another world into which he enters when he works among his own people. Thus, there is a great separation into two among the members of the family. Mrs. Morel feels her life is “nothing but [a] dreary endurance- till the children grew up” (Ibid: 5). As the battle gets more violent, she slowly leaves her husband just to make the children the centre of her life, her only purpose. Moreover, Walter Morel is aware of this fact: “His wife was casting him off, half regretfully, but relentlessly; casting him off and turning now for love and life to the children. Henceforward he was more or less a husk. And he himself acquiesced, as so many men do, yielding their place to their children” (Ibid: 46).

Instead of the love and care of her husband, Mrs. Morel now has the love of her children. By excluding the father and replacing him with the children, Mrs. Morel causes an unhealthy environment in the house. She sacrifices her children to win her battle and creates a world of their own without the father. Mrs. Morel is aware of the fact that she and her husband are opposites which are impossible to come together. Thus, she does not struggle anymore:

“Before, while she had striven against him bitterly, she had fretted after him, as if he had gone astray from her. Now she ceased to fret for his love: he was an outsider to her. This made life much more bearable. Nevertheless, she still continued to strive with him. She still had her high moral sense, inherited from generations of Puritans. It was now a religious instinct, and she was almost a fanatic with him, because she loved him, or had loved him. If he sinned, she tortured him. If he drank, and lied, was often a poltroon, sometimes a knave, she wielded the lash unmercifully. The pity was, she was too much his opposite. She could not be content with the little he might be; she would have him the much that he ought to be. So, in seeking to make him nobler than he could be, she destroyed him. She injured and hurt and scarred herself, but she lost none of her worth. She also had the children.” (Lawrence, 1995: 16)

The quarrel between the parents becomes a significant factor which shapes the future lives, happiness and the psychology of the children. When Mrs. Morel draws away from her husband, she joins her life with her children, especially with William at first who is her oldest and favourite son. He is a little boy who lives for the love and happiness of his mother. Whatever he does is only for the mother of whom he is very proud. On the other hand, he hates his father “with a boy’s hatred for false sentiment, and for the stupid treatment of his mother” (Ibid: 35). When he gets older, he becomes the hope of Mrs. Morel who will make “the world glow again for her” (Ibid: 47). He is the embodiment of his mother’s dreams who, she hopes, will fulfill what his father could not. Mrs. Morel never sends him to the pit which is the symbol of everything related with Walter Morel. She brings William up away from his father’s world and does not want to let him to the worldly pleasures which the darkness of the pit stands for. When William becomes interested in dancing like his father, this makes Mrs. Morel unhappy and anxious: “He went about with the bourgeois of Bestwood... [He] began to consort with the sons of the chemist, the schoolmaster and the tradesmen. He played billiards in the Mechanics’ Hall. Also he danced-this in spite of his mother” (Ibid: 52/53). Mrs. Morel makes her manner clear against her son’s interests although it does not make William happy. She states that she does not approve of the girls whom her son meets at dances.

Indeed Mrs. Morel’s domination over William starts when he is still an infant. She knows how the boy is dependent on her, and what he does is done only for her sake. He is full of excitement when he goes somewhere with his mother and listens to her as if spellbound while she tells him a story. For the boy “no other woman [looks] such a lady as she [does]” (Ibid: 4).

When William gets older she aims to make him a gentleman who lives the bourgeois life she wants for herself. She lives her desires of success in him since she knows he still runs for her when he wins a first prize in a race at the age of twelve. She has so much control and possession over him that she clearly puts forward her ideas about the girls her son meets. She calls her son a dog following the girls who scratch its head. She does not hide her jealousy, and she leaves William feeling bad by not sharing his joy for the suit he hires to wear in a fancy-dress ball:

“The Highland suit came home. Mrs. Morel received it coldly and would not unpack it... She was rather pale, and her face was closed and hard. She was afraid of her son’s going the same way as his father. He hesitated a moment, and his heart stood still with anxiety. Then he caught sight of the Highland bonnet with its ribbons. He picked it up gleefully, forgetting her. She went out.” (Lawrence, 1995: 54)

Despite Mrs. Morel’s effort to have the whole of him, William moves London. This creates a great shock for Mrs. Morel. She feels as if she lost him forever:

“She loved him so much! More than that, she hoped in him so much. Almost she lived by him. She liked to do things for him: she liked to put a cup for his tea and to iron his collars, of which he was so proud. It was a joy to her to have him proud of his collars. There was no laundry. So she used to rub away at them with her little convex iron, to polish them, till they shone from the sheer pressure of her arm. Now she would not do it for him. Now he was going away. She felt almost as if he were going as well out of her heart. He did not seem to leave her inhabited with himself. That was the grief and the pain to her. He took nearly all himself away.” (Ibid: 55)

Now Gertrude, the Great Mother is in much pain since she is afraid of losing her authority and control over her son with whom she has “the satellite relationship that characterizes the elementary character of the Archetypal Feminine” (Miliaras, 1987: 99). However her power is effective on William although she is not close to him. They write each other regularly, and Mrs. Morel still has the chance to criticize his girlfriends. William sends her a photo of Lily about which Mrs. Morel comments in turn: “Yes,” wrote Mrs. Morel to her son, “the photograph of Louie is very striking, and I can see she must be attractive. But do you think, my boy, it was very good taste of a girl to give her young man that photo to send to his mother-the first?” (Lawrence, 1995: 99/100). She does not approve the bare shoulders of the girl in the photograph. However, she still is not pleased when the second photo of the girl-this time in an evening dress-arrives. She is so much jealous of her son that she can not find any woman suitable for him. She is criticized even by Paul for her manner.



Mrs. Morel is jealous and anxious about her son's new life since she does not want to lose her son-lover as Great Mother. She wants the whole and eternal possession of her hero through whom she has the chance to make her ambitions and dreams real. William is "her knight who [wears] *her* favour in the battle" (Lawrence, 1995: 79). When William decides to get married to Lily, Mrs. Morel does not oppose the idea directly, but she discourages him by emphasizing that "there are worse things than breaking off an engagement" (Ibid: 132).

Mrs. Morel's passionate love for her sons has negative effects not only on William but also on his second son, Paul whose name means "the one wondrously chosen or... the small one" (de Voragine, 1994: 341). He is the son of his mother both with his physical resemblance and his soul which is always attentive to her. He and his mother have a special bond which makes Paul to die rather than disappoint her and Mrs. Morel's heart to ache for his hypersensitiveness. Mrs. Morel expresses the existence of this bond when she feels "as if the navel string that had connected its frail little body with hers had not been broken" (Lawrence, 1995: 37). This bond becomes stronger when mother and son are symbolically tied with blood again when Walter Morel hurts his wife, but this time the son is outside the womb: "[Walter Morel] was turning drearily away, when he saw a drop of blood fall from the averted wound into the baby's fragile, glistening hair. Fascinated, he watched the heavy dark drop hang in the glistening cloud, and pull down the gossamer. Another drop fell. It would soak through to the baby's scalp. He watched, fascinated, feeling it soak in" (Ibid: 40). Walter Morel is always aware of the strong tie between mother and son. He knows Paul is the one who hates him most among the children and who has an Oedipal desire to replace him. If we analyze the relation between Mrs. Morel and Paul from the Freudian point of view, we come across with a love between the mother and son shaped by an Oedipus complex.

Mrs. Morel as the Terrible Mother is the main cause of Paul's Oedipal complex. Like a snake which is the symbol of the Terrible Mother, she poisons her children. First she brings William up away from his father and makes them enemies. Then, it reaches its climax with Paul. Her possessiveness and negative power over her children is similar to the features of the terrible aspect of the Great Mother: "The winged Gorgons

with snakes for hair and girdle, with their boar's tusks, beards, and outthrust tongues, are uroboric symbols of the primordial power of the Archetypal Feminine, images of the great pre-Hellenic Mother Goddess in her devouring aspect as earth, night, and underworld" (Neumann, 1963: 169).

As the Terrible Mother, Mrs. Morel destroys the lives of her children. She dominates over them and creates psychologically paralyzed individuals out of them. Since she can not bear even the presence of her husband, she is always anxious and full of hatred. She transmits these negative feelings to the children in order not to "[suffer] alone any more" but having "the children [suffering] with her" (Lawrence, 1995: 61). Furthermore, the hostility against the father evoked by the Terrible Mother causes an unhealthy relationship and intimacy between the mother and her sons, which ends in Oedipus complex.

Oedipus complex is a kind of neurosis put forward by Sigmund Freud. According to Freud's view, the first relation of the infant is to his mother. However, this two sided relationship does not last long and opens up "into a triangle consisting of child and both parents; and for the child, the parent of the same sex will come to figure as a rival in its affections for the parent of the opposite sex" (Eagleton, 1996: 134). Thus, the little boy's "identification with his father... takes on a hostile colouring and changes into a wish to get rid of his father in order to take his place with his mother" (Freud, 1974: 22) which explains Paul's prayer of "Lord, let my father die" (Lawrence, 1995: 60). His passion for his mother is so great that he sees Walter Morel as a rival for her love. He feels responsible for his mother's happiness. When his father is late from work, he shares his mother's suffering and gets angry with the father for his making Mrs. Morel upset:

"Mrs. Morel sat alone. On the hob the saucepan steamed; the dinner-plate lay waiting on the table. All the room was full of the sense of waiting, waiting for the man who was sitting in his pit-dirt, dinnerless, some mile away from home, across the darkness, drinking himself drunk... Paul almost hated his mother for suffering because his father did not come home from work." (Ibid: 61)

Although he has a strong antagonism towards Walter Morel, Paul's attitude is full of conflicts. Besides his powerful wish for his father's death, he prays for the reverse

when he is much late from work: “‘Let him not be killed at pit,’ he prayed when, after tea, the father did not come home from work” (Lawrence, 1995: 60).

However, he enjoys being the man in the house when his father is in the hospital. Then, the family finds peace and happiness in Walter Morel’s absence who stands for the God archetype here because of the authority he symbolizes:

“And whilst Morel was progressing favourably in the hospital, the family was extraordinarily happy and peaceful... ‘I’m the man in the house now,’ he used to say to his mother with joy. They learned how perfectly peaceful the home could be. And they almost regretted-though none of them would have owned to such callousness-that their father was soon coming back.” (Ibid: 87/88)

In their father’s absence, especially Paul does not have to share his mother with anybody, which makes him glad. Moreover, Mrs. Morel who has “both the constructive and destructive aspects of the Great Mother archetype... manipulates her son lover satellite, Paul, into conflict with her demonic and tyrannical brother-spouse, Walter” (Miliaras, 1987: 127/128). Thus, he feels a victory over Walter Morel since now he is ill in the hospital. In the mythological level, Paul resembles Zeus of archaic myths who is courted by the mother for the purpose of destroying the tyrant, Kronos whom Walter Morel stands for. Paul, who does not want to share her mother and her love, rebels against the paternal authority like the sons in the “primal horde” of Freud. For Freud, the rebellion against authority has roots in primitive times. In the “primal horde” which was a social group, a dominant primal father banned his sons to have any sexual intercourse with the females in the family. The sons who rebelled against this prohibition killed their father and ate his body to gain his powers. Freud states that “this totem feast, which is perhaps mankind’s first celebration, would be the repetition and commemoration of this memorable, criminal act with which so many things began, social organization, moral restrictions and religion” (Freud, 1960: 183). Thus, the prohibition of incest and patricide became the cornerstones in the development of human psychology which is the main determiner of Paul’s as well. His plans for the future prove his desire to have his mother totally after he deactivates his father: “We’ll have a pretty house, you and me, and a servant, and it’ll be just all right. I s’ll perhaps be rich with my painting... And then you s’ll have a pony-carriage. See yourself-a little Queen Victoria trotting round” (Lawrence, 1995: 246).

Mrs. Morel is the queen, the highest woman on earth for Paul. She is the Great Mother for whom he makes his little offerings like mushrooms and berries which come from the world of the Great Mother as well to make her happy by being in her service:

“Mrs. Morel must buy fruit for puddings on the Saturdays; also she liked blackberries... In that region of miningvillages blackberries became a comparative rarity. But Paul hunted far and wide. He loved being out in the country, among the bushes. But he also could not bear to go home to his mother empty. That, he felt, would disappoint her, and he would have died rather.” (Lawrence, 1995: 68)

His love is so obsessive that he lives for her mother alone and under her protection symbolised by the dark valley in front of their house where the children play. As we know, darkness and the valley which are the symbols of the dark womb of the female stand for the Great Mother. Another representation of her sheltering and protective features is the huge ash tree in front of the house. Tree is associated with the mother archetype because of its fruitfulness and fertility. It stands for the Great Mother who brings forth all life from herself. Additionally the Tree of Life in mythologies is a familiar symbol which stresses the life giving feature of the mother archetype together with its deadly aspects:

“All... trees have from ancient times been symbols of the Semitic love- and mother-goddess. A holy tree always stood beside her altar on high places. In the Old Testament oaks and terebinths are oracle trees. God or angels are said to appear in or beside trees. David consulted a mulberry-tree oracle. The tree in Babylon represented Tammuz, the son-lover, just as it represented Osiris, Adonis, Attis, and Dionysus, the young dying gods of the Near East.” (Jung, 1958: 388)

The ash tree has both aspects. It is the symbol of the good mother when its “green fruits that the children call ‘pigeons’ were twinkling gaily down on a little breeze, into the front gardens of the houses” (Lawrence, 1995: 101). Conversely, it becomes the representative of the terrible aspect of the archetype when all children hate it because of its “demoniacal noise” (Ibid: 59). Thus, trees belong to the Great Mother who is “the protectress... who feeds man with its fruits and tubers and grains, but also poisons him and lets him hunger and thirst in times of drought, when she withdraws from living things (Neumann, 1963: 52).

Likewise the love of Mrs. Morel poisons her children by showing her terrible side. William, for whom she has the passionate love of a lover, can not be happy with his girlfriend since he compares her with his mother who is his first and dearest lover.

He accuses her of being shallow within whom nothing goes deep unlike his mother. The mother complex created by the terrible side of his mother is the source of his tragedy which ends in death. Since he can not love truly, he has no chance of becoming a whole. In Jungian terms, he suffers from Don Juanism which means “he unconsciously seeks his mother in every woman he meets” (Jung, 1959: 85). Besides, he is the victim of his girlfriend Lily, who stands for the witch-woman aspect of the mother archetype. She is Lilith or Circe who is the figure of fatal enchantment. Her dark side is symbolized by “her jet-black hair” which makes her “look like a young witch-woman” (Lawrence, 1995: 129). Thus, William becomes the victim of the terrible mother. The fatality of the archetype is evident in the ash tree which stands dark and monstrous when William’s coffin comes home.

With William’s death the fight between the brothers for their mother’s love comes to an end. However, until his death, the brothers share the twin archetype as well as their relationship to their mother as her satellites. The twin archetype stands for the desire and division kind of relationships. The roots of this archetype depend on “the astrological sign Gemini referring to the heroes Castor and Pollux” (Lash, 1993: 6). Besides Castor and Pollux, the twin motif appears in myths, stories and folklore identified in endless variety throughout the world. The motif has some common characteristics. First of all, it is not necessary for twins to have any physical resemblance. The physical similarity is not emphasized strongly in myths. For example, the story of Jacob and Esau in the Old Testament is based upon the dissimilarity of the twin brothers. In order to substitute his brother Esau, Jacob covers his arms with a fleece since we are told “that Esau is ‘red and hairy’ while Jacob is ‘smooth’ (Ibid: 8). Secondly, one of the twins has usually a supernatural power as in the myth of “Castor and Pollux and Helen and Clytemnestra, of whom one of each pair [is] mortal (Castor and Clytemnestra, offspring of Tyndareus), the other immortal (Helen and Pollux, children of Zeus)” (Ibid: 6). These facts about the twins in myths lead to the idea that although twins are the parts of a whole, they are neither equal nor polar opposites. That is why “they will not resolve into a final and harmonic unity” (Ibid: 6). Instead the relationship between the twin pairs is based upon desire and division in which they “are continually interacting, aligning themselves and then displacing each other” (Ibid: 7) which makes rivalry a key term for the archetype.

One aspect of the twin archetype is the rival brothers for whom inequality is a basic feature. Unlike their human counterparts, the mythological twins are always in conflict with each other. The inequality between the twins is emphasized to point the inequal and shifting forces of nature: “The bonding of rival twins is illustrated over and over again in trickster tales of the Americas, where one twin is strong and wily, the other weak and dull-witted, yet always capable of enough ingenuity to confound the activities of his superior... Very similar motifs occur in the conflict between Romulus and Remus, associated with the foundation of Rome... In the conflict between Twins, the fate of one may be decided by the superior strength of the other, or by a seemingly accidental factor or event. This illustrates the arbitrary and haphazard nature of violence, making it a matter of great awe to the primitive mind. In some cases there is no apparent conflict at all, and one twin will appear as inferior from the outset, having no chance to overmaster the other. This illustrates the ruthless inequity of nature, the way the balance of forces is continually shifting” (Lash, 1993: 13).

Likewise the brothers William and Paul are not equal to each other although they have the closest bond on earth. First of all, they are separated by their physical aspects. “Paul [is] rather a delicate boy, subject to bronchitis” (Lawrence, 1995: 65), while William is “a big, raw-boned man, who [looks] as if he would go to the world’s end if he [wants] to (Ibid: 132). Furthermore, they have an endless conflict caused by the desire to have the whole life and time of their mother. The problem is partly solved with William’s departure: “But when William went to Nottingham, and was not so much at home, the mother made a companion of Paul. The latter was unconsciously jealous of his brother, and William was jealous of him. At the same time, they were good friends” (Ibid: 69).

Being jealous of each other while sharing a friendship at the same time is suitable for the desire and division principle in the nature of the archetype. Moreover, their opposition and struggle is tempted by the passionate love of Mrs. Morel for William while her “intimacy with her second son [is] more subtle and fine” (Ibid: 69). As a result when William leaves for London, Paul finds a good opportunity to replace him. Thus, he aims to eliminate his rival William after his father, which will make him one and the only lover for the Great Mother.

With William's death, Paul replaces his rival brother totally. Since her older son is dead now, Mrs. Morel turns her face to Paul. She feels her "life now rooted itself in Paul" (Lawrence, 1995: 141). Paul becomes the son-lover of the Great Mother.

The relationship between the Great Mother and her son-lover Paul develops in a cyclical structure which supports the mythological and archetypal aspects of the novel. This cyclical construction of the plot serves for the death and rebirth cycle of the son-god Paul. To start with, Mrs. Morel meets her husband at a Christmas party. Next Christmas they are married, and the third Christmas she gives birth to her first child, William who is her first son-lover. When Paul is born, she feels "the thought of being the mother of men [is] warming to her heart" (Ibid: 31) because "these men would work out what *she* wanted; they were derived from her, they were of her, and their works also would be hers," (Ibid: 101) which means her sons are the means through which the Great Mother will live along. However, with William's death, she is left only with Paul who becomes everything on earth for Mrs. Morel. When he comes home on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of December with pneumonia, Mrs. Morel turns him to watch "the living, not the dead" (Ibid: 140). Thus, this Christmas becomes the rebirth of the new son-lover following the death of the former for Mrs. Morel. This new-born god now denies "the God in Morel" (Driskill, 1999: 71) and celebrates himself as his rival more than before.

When we turn back to the relationship between Mrs. Morel and Paul, we see how Paul takes over the role of his father. When they go Nottingham together, both feel "the excitement of lovers having an adventure together" (Lawrence, 1995: 92). Paul's names which he uses to call his mother "my pigeon" (Ibid: 301) or "my dear" (314) belong to the diction of a lover. He kisses her "gently, tenderly, as if she were a lover" (Ibid: 376). His desire for a closer intimacy with his mother is clearly expressed when he feels like "a fellow taking his girl for an outing" (Ibid: 240) or in his rebellion when he says "Why can't a man have a *young* mother? What is she old for?" (Ibid: 242). His language and attitude towards his mother prove both his Oedipus complex and his identity as son-lover.

Their relationship fits into the Isis-Osiris type in which Isis is the Great Mother whose son-lover represents the dying-god of fertility. Osiris is known under different names in different places such as Tammuz, Attis or Adonis. Osiris is the Egyptian

version of this deity who is responsible with all vegetation and who is a culture hero. Like all other dying gods, Osiris lives in an endless birth-death-rebirth cycle. In association with this cycle, the plot story of Sons and Lovers can be analyzed in terms of the hero's quest. Thus, Paul is the hero archetype, and the whole plot is the quest story of the hero which starts with his birth towards his maturity.

However, Paul's quest is composed of two layers; the first one is the natural individuation process whereas the second layer is the development of an artist. In both fields, Paul's struggle is to find his "Self", his individuality and free identity. The journey of the individual from childhood into adulthood is a struggle of the newly developing consciousness against the dominant and powerful unconscious which is the symbol of the Great Mother. Only by victory over the darkness of the unconscious may the hero gain freedom. According to Jung, the process of individuation "follows the natural course of life- a life in which the individual becomes what he always was" (1959: 40). In the individuation process, the consciousness of a person becomes differentiated from others:

"The goal of individuation is knowing oneself as completely as possible, or self-consciousness. In modern terminology it would be called expanding consciousness. ... Individuation and consciousness go hand in hand in the development of a personality; the beginning of consciousness is also the beginning of individuation. With increasing consciousness, there is also greater individuation. A person who remains oblivious of himself and of the world around him cannot be a very individuated person." (Hall and Nordby, 1973: 34)

Complexes, conflicts and temptations which wait for the hero on his way may prevent the hero from completing his cycle in success. However, he has a long way before he comes to the end.

According to Campbell the quest archetype can be summarized as "a separation from the world, a penetration to some source of power, and a life-enhancing return" (1968: 35). The first necessary step for the quest is a call to adventure and new experiences. For Paul, the call comes from his mother when she advises him to "look in the paper for the advertisements" (Lawrence, 1995: 89). Although he answers the call, he feels anxious since "his freedom in the beloved home valley was going now" (Ibid: 89). His anxiety is the fear of the unknown outside the realm of the familiar mother symbolized by the "home valley": "Freud has suggested that all moments of anxiety



reproduce the painful feelings of the first separation from the mother... Conversely, all moments of separation and new birth produce anxiety” (Campbell, 1968: 52).

Now Paul is afraid of getting far away from his mother, a situation which he will try to recover by telling her every day every detail “as if it were her own life” (Lawrence, 1995: 113). He is sent “into the jaws of the dragon” (Ibid: 93) by his mother like William who was sent to the battle before. As a result of his effort, the ash tree seems like a friend when he comes home back from work because he is in the service of the Great Mother.

The second influential female in Paul’s life, Miriam, is the Maiden of the fairytale. As we know, heroes usually tend to be males. This fact may make people think that women in myths and fairytales have inferior roles, which is quite incorrect. Indeed, female characters of the myths and fairytales have more complex and important roles than the heroes. According to Campbell “woman, in the picture language of mythology, represents the totality of what can be known. The hero is the one who comes to know” (1968: 116). She is the source of life, its mysteries and magic. She becomes the guide of the hero like Medea to Jason, Antigone to Oedipus or Eve to Adam if the hero comes and knocks on her door.

Miriam lives in Willey Farm, a paradise which promises Paul a return to the womb. She is the princess, Cinderella, closed within the walls of her castle waiting to be rescued by her knight whom she recognizes in Paul:

“The girl was romantic in her soul. Everywhere was a Walter Scott heroine being loved by men with helmets or with plumes in their caps. She herself was something of a princess turned into a swine-girl in her own imagination. And she was afraid lest this boy, who, nevertheless, looked something like a Walter Scott hero, who could paint and speak French, and knew what algebra meant, and who went by train to Nottingham every day, might consider her simply as the swine-girl, unable to perceive the princess beneath; so she held aloof.” (Lawrence, 1995: 142)

She chooses Paul because she believes he is different from other men, “a new specimen, quick, light, graceful, who could be gentle” (Ibid: 143) in contrast to the male sex whom she scorned. Since she suffers under the brutal treatment of her brothers in Willey Farm, where the patriarchy dominates in contrast to Mrs. Morel’s house where matriarchy dominates, “Miriam looks to Paul as her rescuing knight” (Driskill,

1999: 101). Although she is raised by the counsel of her mother who advises indulging in the order of the male, she wants to free herself from this ideal Gretchen-Griselda woman figure represented by her mother:

“The Gretchen-Griselda or *Mater Dolorosa* aspect of the Great Mother, [is] a sacrificial figure who will willingly participate in any humiliation, debasement, even ritual murder or sacrifice, in her submission to the sexual gratification and acknowledgement of the power of the male. Thus Griselda patiently submits to twelve years of systematic humiliation and psychological torture from her spouse, abetting and, inspiring him to ever new heights of sexual exploitation. During the course of her marriage, she unquestioningly turns over her new-born infants to the father (ostensibly to be slain) and willingly subjects herself to her husband’s cruelest whims... Finally... she returns upon his command to adorn his newly-elected bride. Only at the last moment is the bride revealed to be the daughter whom Griselda believed had been murdered at *his* command and with *her* implicit compliance.” (Miliaras, 1987: 96/97)

Like Griselda, Miriam’s mother, Mrs. Leivers, is a willing sacrifice who believes in the superiority of men and patiently endures their cruelty. She is another face of the Great Mother suffering under the patriarchal Christian order. Her feminine qualities are so much paralyzed that she comments on the sex act as the only unbearable thing in marriage. Under the influence of Mrs. Leivers, Miriam is spiritual and religious. She is the Virgin Goddess who is pure. The conflict of body and soul between Mr. and Mrs. Morel is reflected upon Paul and Miriam, which leads them to fail in their affair.

Like Paul, Miriam suffers from a mother-complex. Paul’s mother-complex caused by the Oedipal love for his mother results in Don Juanism in which “he unconsciously seeks his mother in every woman he meets” (Jung, 1959: 85) like his brother William. This complex which “may be seen in the ideology of the Cybele and Attis type” ends in “self-castration, madness and early death” (Ibid: 85). The short life of William which ends in his youth proves him as the dying son-lover of the Great Mother.

Similarly, Miriam’s complex is the result of her upbringing during which Mrs. Leivers teaches her everything related to house and family life except sexuality which she finds disgusting. Thus, Miriam’s mother-complex is called as the “hypertrophy of the maternal element” in Jungian terms (Jung, 1982: 115). For Jung, this kind of mother-complex leads to the exaggeration of the maternal instinct and creates women

whose only goal is childbirth: “To her the husband is obviously of secondary importance; he is first and foremost the instrument of procreation, and she regards him merely as an object to be looked after, along with children, poor relations, cats, dogs, and household furniture” (Jung, 1982: 115).

The features of this kind of a mother-complex are clearly present in Miriam when she desires to take care of Paul during his illness or in her question to Paul while quarreling upon their first sexual experience:

“You see,” she said, taking his face and shutting it out against her shoulder-“you see-as we are-how can I get used to you? It would come all right if we were married.”

....

She was trembling with agitation.

“You see,” she said, “I’m not used to the thought-“

“You are lately,” he said.

“But all my life, Mother said to me: ‘There is one thing in marriage that is always dreadful, but you have to bear it.’ And I believed it.”

“And still believe it,” he said.

...

“No,” she said, taking his head in her arms and rocking in despair. “Don’t say so! You don’t understand.” She rocked with pain. “Don’t I want your children?”

“But not me.” (Lawrence, 1995: 290/291)

For Miriam love is spiritual. She loves Paul as she loves Christ or the heroes in her books by ignoring sexuality. The relationship between Paul and Miriam fits the soul-mates aspect of the twin archetype. They are connected to each other with a powerful love and hate relationship. If “love is the quest of the Twin to find itself through the other” (Lash, 1993: 24), they are the halves of a whole which can never unite properly. That is why their affair goes on in endless motion and dynamism. Their twinship is symbolized many times by the constellation Orion placed by Artemis among the stars.

In Jungian terms, Miriam is Paul’s anima which means his soul and the feminine inside him. As Jung points out, the mother archetype and the anima work together in the mother-complex of the son: “The effects of the mother-complex differ according to whether it appears in a son or a daughter... Because of the difference in sex, a son’s mother-complex does not appear in pure form. This is the reason why in every masculine mother-complex, side by side with the mother archetype, a significant role is played by the image of the man’s sexual counterpart, the anima” (Jung, 1959:

85). Thus, the mother-complex of a man is never pure but is always mingled with his anima. Likewise, anima is shaped by the personal mother. However, the archetypal experience of the feminine has a great role in the development of anima as well. Usually the anima archetype which is formed in a man by the help of both his personal mother and the Great Mother is projected upon the woman whom he chooses as lover:

“The anima image, which lends the mother such superhuman glamour in the eyes of the son, gradually becomes tarnished by commonplace reality and sinks back into the unconscious, but without in any way losing its original tension and instinctivity. It is ready to spring out and project itself at the first opportunity, the moment a woman makes an impression that is out of the ordinary.” (Jung, 1959: 69)

Finding one’s anima is a chance to achieve a spiritual wholeness. Despite he has such a chance, Paul rejects it by rejecting Miriam’s love each time. The key to this rejection lies again in his mother-complex intensified by Mrs. Morel in every opportunity. Now she is absolutely the Terrible Mother figure whose antagonism is tempted by the love of Miriam for Paul. She is afraid of losing his son’s soul, which is a distress that she can not cope with a second time. She can not bear their affair when she sees the deep love of Miriam, which destroys rather than constructs in her view: “She could feel Paul being drawn away by this girl. And she did not care for Miriam. “She is one of those who will want to suck a man’s soul out till he has none of his own left,” she said to herself” (Lawrence, 1995: 160).

In other words, Mrs. Morel and Miriam share the same negative qualities which make Mrs. Morel afraid of her rival. As put forward by Neumann, “the anima figure has also a positive and a negative aspect; it preserves the ambivalent structure of the archetype and, like the Great Mother, forms a unity in which positive, negative, and ambivalently balanced constellations stand side by side” (1963: 34). As a result, not only Miriam but also Mrs. Morel has the same soul sucking love, which causes a great war between the two. Mrs. Morel fights against the powerful effect coming from the Willey Farm. Her most successful way of suspending Paul from Miriam is to make him feel guilty for she knows “he was hurt between the past glamour with Miriam and the knowledge that his mother fretted” (Lawrence, 1995: 161). On the other hand, Paul rejects Miriam just because of her similarity with his mother. He feels the presence of the same possessive qualities in both women, and this similarity reminds him of his repressed incestuous desire for his mother. So he is stuck in a double-edged guilt which

is the reason for his moodiness. He feels “guilt for abandoning the mother who lived for him alone, guilt for desiring sexually a woman who was like his mother” (Driskill, 1999: 80). Thus, Paul fights on both sides. He tries to make his mother believe that he does not love Miriam when she tells she can bear any woman but not her. The Oedipal love between mother and son becomes clear as a result of Mrs. Morel’s jealousy:

“I can’t bear it. I could let another woman-but not her. She’d leave me no room, not a bit of room-.”

And immediately he hated Miriam bitterly.

“And I’ve never-you know, Paul-I’ve never had a husband-not really-.”

He stroked his mother’s hair, and his mouth was on her throat.

“And she exults so in taking you from me- she’s not like ordinary girls.”

“Well, I don’t love her, mother,” he murmured, bowing his head and hiding his eyes on her shoulder in misery. His mother kissed him a long, fervent kiss.” (Lawrence, 1995: 213)

On the other side, Paul hates Miriam for her spirituality and her possessive desire against which he resists by stating in his heart that he does not “want another mother” (Ibid: 296). However, it is clear enough that what makes Miriam a terrible, possessive lover is the fact that she has to fight with Mrs. Morel first in order to have Paul. When Paul comes home and is welcomed with the coldness of his mother, “his soul, warm and exposed from contact with the girl, [shrinks]” (Ibid: 161). His feeling proves that Mrs. Morel is the real spiritual vampire when compared with Miriam who is warm. Actually, she only demands that Paul should face “a mature relationship between himself and another woman, not his mother” (qtd. in Driskill, 1999: 90). Paul, who is afraid of facing the reality, still accuses Miriam of maternal possessiveness in self-deception.

If we turn back to the twin archetype, Paul and Miriam are archetypally similar with the divine twins Artemis and Apollo. While “like Apollo, Paul excels at music, art, and science (algebra), Miriam is enchanted with the beauty of the natural world” (Miliaras, 1987: 132). The pleasure Miriam takes in walking in the oak wood and her interest in every kind of plants remind the Virgin Goddess: “Miriam’s fondness for the flora and fauna of the woods adjoining her home and her hatred of, indeed, her very inability to perform routine household tasks, identify her moreover, with Artemis, the virgin huntress, the chaste goddess of the moon” (Ibid: 132). Like Artemis, she enjoys being solitary in the wilds, and she herself has a wildness in her distant looks. She lives

in a world which is shaped by religion, nature and the stories of the characters which she reads in her books. She creates this dream world to escape the brutality of people represented by her brothers at Willey Farm: “Miriam loitered behind, alone. She did not fit in with the others; she could very rarely get into human relations with anyone: so her friend, her companion, her lover, was Nature” (Lawrence, 1995: 165).

The setting in which Paul first meets Miriam foreshadows her identity which is closely bound with the elements of nature. When Paul comes to Willey Farm with Mrs. Morel in a spring day, he finds himself in the middle of wilderness: “The mother and son went through the wheat and oats, over a little bridge into a wild meadow. Peewits, with their white breasts glistening, wheeled and screamed about them. The lake was still and blue. High overhead a heron floated. Opposite, the wood heaped on the hill, green and still” (Ibid: 123). In harmony with the setting, Miriam is a wood nymph who appears and disappears quickly:

“Mother and son went into the small railed garden, where was a scent of red gillivets. By the open door were some floury loaves, put out to cool. A hen was just coming to peck them. Then, in the doorway suddenly appeared a girl in a dirty apron. She was about fourteen years old, had a rosy dark face, a bunch of short black curls, very fine and free, and dark eyes; shy, questioning, a little resentful of the strangers, she disappeared.” (Ibid: 124/125)

As a wood nymph her colours, brown and red are emphasized innumerable times. While brown refers to her connection with the nature and natural life, red, which is used in various forms such as “crimson” (Ibid: 158), “reddish” (201), orange-red” (173) and “scarlet” (305) symbolize the virginity as well as the potential sexuality and fertility in Miriam. Additionally, she is described as having a dark face with black hair around. She is in the principal colours of the Great Mother whose Virgin aspect she represents. The colour archetype reaches its peak with the metaphor of the pomegranate whose “redness... symbolizes the woman’s womb, the abundance of seeds, its fertility” (Neumann, 1963: 308):

“She bent forward, trying to see and understand. Her free, fine curls tickled his face. He started as if they had been red hot, shuddering. He saw her peering forward at the page, her redlips parted piteously, the black hair springing in fine strands across her tawny, ruddy cheek. She was coloured like a pomegranate, for richness.” (Lawrence, 1995: 208)

This Virgin Goddess, who is the Maiden responsible with the spiritual guidance of the Hero in his quest, falls in love with the Christ-knight Paul in the bosom of nature. Now Paul is not Mrs. Morel's knight any more, which tempts her hatred against Miriam.

The elements of nature such as the gardens, flowers and moon which Lawrence uses in order "to express some close relationship between man and nature" (Spilka, 1957: 40) are formerly identified with Mrs. Morel as the Great Mother. According to Jung, "the Earth Mother is... occasionally related to the moon, either through the blood sacrifice... or through a child-sacrifice, or else because she is adorned with a sickle moon" (Jung, 1959: 185). As for the flowers, Jung claims they represent the mother since most of them are "vessel shaped... like the rose or the lotus" (Ibid: 81). Moreover, flowers belong to the Great Mother because "everywhere vegetative life is born out of this depth and darkness of the nocturnal beginning" (Neumann, 1963: 261) which is the darkness of the mother's womb. In the first half of Sons and Lovers, natural elements connect Mrs. Morel to her son-lover, Paul who stands for Osiris, the god of vegetation. For Mrs. Morel "the garden [is] an endless joy" (Lawrence, 1995: 164). However, Miriam, the Virgin Goddess now shares her field besides taking her knight from Mrs. Morel. When the lovers go out for walking "together they traverse the countryside visiting haunts and country ruins which had formerly belonged to the spiritual suzerainty of [Paul's] mother" (Miliaras, 1987: 137). Miriam invites Paul to walk in the oak-wood, the sacred place of the divine pair and she shows him a wild-rose bush "to have a communion together" (Lawrence, 1995: 159) or she enjoys walking under "an enormous moon" which is "staring at them from the rim of the sandhills" (Ibid: 178). Miriam is so much connected to the nature that her brothers call her "The Lady of the Lake" because of her solitude and worship of the plants (Ibid: 126).

Despite the fact that now Miriam holds "the keys to his soul" (Ibid: 223) which proves her role as Paul's anima, he turns back to his mother in every spring like Osiris of Isis. The lovers who struggle to overcome the crisis in their affair are beaten by the Terrible Great Mother each spring, which makes Easter time archetypally important like the Christmas cycle in the book. Actually both are important stages in the yearly cycle of seasons which mark the death and rebirth of not only the dying-god of the ancient myths but also Christ:

“Although Christianity underlies that Christ died and resurrected once and for all, historically, whereas the mythical gods die and revive every year with the seasons, the proselytizing early church in fact emphasized similarities rather than differences between the new religion and various fertility cults, so that rabbits and eggs and solstitial evergreens could work their way comfortably into Easter and Christmas.” (Phillips, 1990: 21)

Thus, Paul is Adonis who turns back to Venus cyclically and whose “tears and blood on the earth are turned to flowers” (Gayley, 1939: 128) as well as Christ whose rise announces the spring time every year. His relationship with Miriam is shaped within a spring time circle. To start with, it is spring time, particularly May, when Paul and Miriam meet for the first time, the time when the romances usually start. The walk to the Hemlock Stone on Good Friday marks the beginning of spring as well. Finally, following the conflicts between lovers, Easter becomes the time when Paul offers Miriam to break off to return his Great Mother: “Paul was dissatisfied with himself and with everything. The deepest of his love belonged to his mother. When he felt he had hurt her, or wounded his love for her, he could not bear it. Now it was spring, and there was battle between him and Miriam” (Lawrence, 1995: 215).

When Miriam asks the reason for their break off, he answers; “Nothing-it’s all in myself-it only comes out just now. We’re always like this towards Easter-time” (Ibid: 221). When Miriam suggests walking in the wood just before their conversation on breaking off, Paul rejects although he accepts first. He is afraid of the dark wood, which stands for both the depths of his unconscious and his chance of rebirth since the hero should descend into darkness if he wants to be successful on his self-quest: “At the climax of the quest tale the hero must go alone to the dreaded place. This is the ultimate test, and the hero will feel profound fear and despair when it approaches” (Stillman, 1985: 40).

Paul is not alone, and he is guided by the Maiden. However, he is afraid of facing his unconscious emotions about his mother and the fact that the real cause of his unhappiness with Miriam is Mrs. Morel. Thus, he denies his self, his anima and his rebirth:

“And he came back to her. And in his soul was a feeling of the satisfaction of self-sacrifice because he was faithful to her. She loved him first; he loved her first. And yet it was not enough. His new young life, so strong and imperious, was urged towards something else. It made him mad with restlessness.” (Lawrence, 1995: 222)



However, despite his efforts, his sexual instincts predominate and make him leave his mother for Miriam. During the process for his making a decision, “he [fights] against his mother almost as he [fights] against Miriam” (Lawrence, 1995: 223).

With spring their affair refreshes itself. It is Easter Monday when Miriam decides to make a sacrifice out of herself. When she discovers “a serpent in her Eden” (Ibid: 171), she takes it as a sacrifice to God whose gift love is. It is impossible to dare such a thing for Miriam otherwise. She sacrifices herself to man-god Paul who is nearly a religion to her. As for Paul, he seeks the rebirth he has denied so far in the darkness of Miriam’s womb:

“The descent... is seen as a metaphor for death and rebirth; as a sacrificial rite in which the hero’s suffering will renew the vigor of society; as a purification rite in which one is cleansed of sin... as a self-annihilating act, after which one will transcend one state of life and enter a higher, exalted state; or simply as a growing-up, leaving innocence and childhood behind.” (Stillman, 1985: 40)

Paul as the dying god hopes to find his rebirth in the womb because he knows “one way of fighting death is through loving, through sex, as the dying god defies his imminent death with his sacred marriage” (Phillips, 1990: 32). However, Paul can not find what he seeks and feels “the sense of failure and of death” (Lawrence, 1995: 290) after any sexual contact with Miriam. He thinks about death and after-life on his way home back from Miriam’s grandmother’s cottage which reminds the dream cottage of Paul in which he will live with his mother alone: “His ambition, as far as this world’s gear went, was quietly to earn his thirty or thirty-five shillings a week somewhere near home, and then, when his father died, have a cottage with his mother, paint and go out as he liked, and live happy ever after” (Ibid: 89).

The cottage and the week he passes with Miriam is so similar with his dream that he feels guilty again; first, the guilt of leaving his mother alone when he enjoys being with Miriam and second, the guilt of incest which is associated by his affair with Miriam. Thus, the Paul-hero can not reach the rebirth promised by the transformative qualities of the Virgin Goddess. He can not have the possession of fertility hidden in her womb and symbolized by the pomegranate before.

Paul is not alone in his failure. Instead of the desired rebirth for both Paul and Miriam, not only Paul and their relationship but also Miriam metaphorically dies following this physical contact since “Miriam, realizing that sexual love threatens to destroy her spiritual self, attempts to transcend the loss by shifting ground and making it a part of a new spiritual ideal of self-sacrifice” (Burns, 1980: 40). She is the Maiden who is caught in romance’s double bind: “Continued renunciation will drive him away, yet the polarities of romance’s moral code suggest Paul will abandon her, too, if she “falls” from the pedestal on which he has placed her. Both solutions bring Miriam the “pain” promised by the code; neither awards her the knight’s love” (Driskill, 1999: 102). Although the sexual act is a means of rebirth with its transformative character which takes its source from the life giving force of the female womb, the spiritual and religious identity of Miriam as well as her mother-complex together with Paul’s mother-complex prevents both from a spiritual rebirth into a new life. Conversely, the sexual act puts an end to their affair by leaving no hope.

Miriam’s fate which is stuck into death is clear in Paul’s feelings towards her when he thinks, “if he were really with her, he had to put aside himself and desire. If he would have her, he had to put her aside” (Lawrence, 1995: 290). He is suffering from the results of his mother-complex which makes him unable to value any woman but his mother. Miriam fails as the Virgin Goddess, who is able to actualize the miracle of life by the transformative qualities of her womb, as well as the Maiden of the fairytale. She is unsuccessful in transforming herself into the Lady of the Plants who is the life vessel in Neumann’s Jungian terms. She can give life neither to Paul nor herself.

Miriam’s symbolism as vessel fits her role as the Muse of the young artist. She is the guide of Paul’s artistic quest besides her role as the Maiden, the companion of the hero. Paul, the artistic hero, is fed by the comments and criticisms of Miriam as well as Mrs. Leivers. These two women are different from his mother whose world view is based on reason rather than emotion. When Paul goes on a holiday with his mother, he sends his sketches to Miriam and Mrs. Leivers. He thinks his mother can not give the same advices although her role is “the life-warmth, the strength to produce” (Ibid: 158). For this reason, he shares all his work with Miriam first: “He was conscious only when stimulated. A sketch finished, he always wanted to take it to Miriam. Then he was stimulated into knowledge of the work he had produced unconsciously. In contact with

Miriam he gained insight; his vision went deeper” (Lawrence, 1995: 158). Despite the life force he drew from Miriam, he accuses her of being unable to be with him. However, Paul himself is also unable to tempt the princess inside Miriam. Indeed, with a little courage, he can help Miriam to discover the vitality hidden in her:

“Then he began to talk about the design. There was for him the most intense pleasure in talking about his work to Miriam. All his passion, all his wild blood, went into this intercourse with her, when he talked and conceived his work. She brought forth to him his imaginations. She did not understand, any more than a woman understands when she conceives a child in her womb. But this was life for her and for him.” (Ibid: 202)

Although she is unconscious, Miriam offers Paul what he seeks for as the romantic Maiden or the Muse of the fairytale offers the knight who is questing to reunite his soul and body. However it is impossible for the Maiden to be successful without the hero’s help: “If the hero is at a point of readiness in wisdom to understand her rather than treat her as a sex object or an inferior, she will unlock her secrets for him and will ultimately allow him to become king in a world where she reigns as queen” (Stillman, 1985: 42). Miriam strives to stay together and she “[seems] to blossom for him alone” (Lawrence, 1995: 295). However, Paul foreshadows another break off with her just after their week at her grandmother’s when he first chews a pink flower, then spats into the fire before kissing his mother and going to the bed. Paul-hero does not have the necessary wisdom yet. He still accuses Miriam of their failure and claims that she has never believed in him. Miriam’s feeling on his decision to break off supports her function as Paul-artist’s Muse. She calls him “an infant which, when it has drunk its fill, throws away and smashes the cup” (Ibid: 296). For Driskill, “Paul does not abandon Miriam because she has failed him as a Muse, but because he is at the stage where he would have to liberate himself from any muse. He does not leave Miriam because he “gets nothing from” her, but because he has taken everything she had to give him” (1999: 136). However, it is clear that both Paul and Miriam can not awaken the potential vitality in each other and thus can not start the rebirth process.

The third woman in the triangle, who determines the hero’s way, is Clara. Leaving the Maiden, Paul-hero finds himself in an affair with her. Clara is both the representation of the materialistic love of the twentieth century and the woman as temptress in the hero’s quest. She uses her sexuality to gain Paul. She has no speciality except being “a woman, warm, something he loved and almost worshipped, there in the

dark” (Lawrence, 1995: 353). According to Campbell, “no longer can the hero rest in innocence with the goddess of the flesh; for she is become the queen of sin” (Campbell, 1968: 123). Although Paul is under the spell of this queen of sin, Miriam believes “that there [are] in him desires for higher things, and desires for lower, and that the desire for the higher would conquer” (Lawrence, 1995: 228/229). Miriam sees Paul’s experience with Clara as a test which will prove him “his chief need in life [is] herself. If she [can] prove it, both to herself and to him, the rest might go; she [can] simply trust to the future” (Ibid: 228).

Clara is the opposite of Miriam and Mrs. Morel both in her physical and emotional characteristics. Paul, who can not free himself from the terrible aspects of the Great Mother in his mother and Miriam, “searches instead, on a completely unconscious level, for the spiritual and physical opposite of both Gertrude and Miriam... in the person of Clara Dawes” (Miliaras, 1987: 147). First of all, unlike Miriam, she has “scornful grey eyes, a skin like white honey, and a full mouth” (Lawrence, 1995: 184). Secondly, if Miriam is the spirit, Clara is the body. When Paul is with Clara, he takes “on a smart, worldly, mocking tone very antagonistic to Miriam” (Ibid: 249). She is Miriam’s shadow and reflects what she can not achieve and thus denies. Because of these opposite qualities and Clara’s vital force as the Lady of the Plants which Miriam lacks, Paul blesses her as his new goddess with a floral rite: “Suddenly, without knowing, he was scattering a handful of cowslips over her hair and neck... The chill flowers fell on her neck. She looked up at him, with almost pitiful, scared grey eyes, wondering what he was doing. Flowers fell on her face, and she shut her eyes” (Ibid: 238). Their engagement symbolically expressed with the pagan flower ritual demonstrates Spilka’s claim that “flowers are the most important of the ‘vital forces’ in Sons and Lovers. Paul and his three sweethearts are judged, again and again, by their attitude toward them” (1957: 459).

The opposition between Mrs. Morel and Clara helps Paul to live sexuality without feeling the guilt of incest. On the other hand, it can easily be claimed that Paul unconsciously fulfills his desire of incest with Clara both in a symbolical and moral way since, despite her differences from Mrs. Morel; Clara is similar to her in the psychological level. Especially in her relationship with her husband Baxter Dawes who can be Walter Morel’s twin, she shares Gertrude’s place. Having unconsciously felt the

similarity, Paul wants to solve his conflict with his father by healing Dawes at the hospital and reuniting the couple finally.

Paul's failure in his affairs both with Miriam and Clara roots in his Oedipal relationship with his mother. He is the son-lover of the Great Mother whom she destroys with her love. His ability to love a woman except his mother is paralyzed by the powerful effect of the mother love. Paul diagnoses the problem himself and expresses it: "You know, mother, I think there must be something the matter with me, that I *can't* love... And I never shall meet the right woman while you live" (Lawrence, 1995: 350/351). He is aware of the fact that the main barrier between him and his happiness with a woman is Mrs. Morel. Indeed he feels wholeness when "he [has] her hand in his, and her bosom [leaves] its warmth in his chest" (Ibid: 351). However when he feels the instinct for possession in Clara, which reminds him of Mrs. Morel and Miriam, he leaves Clara feeling "some part, big and vital in him, she [has] no hold over" (Ibid: 360).

Paul feels as the hero caught within the circles of the fairytale. "The feeling that things [are] going in a circle [makes] him mad" (Ibid: 351), and he can not find a way out of this conflict. He is like Herakles who works hard to win the favour of his stepmother Hera. No matter how hard he tries, she never appreciates and drives him mad finally in despair. Like Herakles, Paul feels fury and regrets both for his and his mother's unhappiness. Jung prefers the Cybele-Attis myth to emphasize the destructive motherhood of the Great Mother. There are two versions of the story. In the first one a boar slays Attis whereas in the second, he castrates himself. However, "Jung prefers the latter, interpreting that Cybele drives her son mad with smothering love" (Phillips, 1959: 214). Paul finds the only way out of the circles in getting rid of the Great Mother. He does not have any other alternative on this step of his self quest:

"The phases in the development of consciousness appear then as embryonic containment in the mother, as childlike dependence on the mother, as the relation of the beloved son to the Great Mother, and finally as the heroic struggle of the male hero against the Great Mother. In other words, the dialectical relation of consciousness to the unconscious takes the symbolic, mythological form of a struggle between the Maternal-Feminine and the male child, and here the growing strenght of the male corresponds to the increasing power of consciousness in human development." (Neumann, 1963: 148)

The liberation from the mentioned feminine-maternal unconsciousness is a hard and painful struggle for Paul as well. However, when he sees its impossibility in none other way, he decides to poison her with milk as she poisoned her children “in a form of slow suicide” (Neumann, 1963: 258). Because the Terrible Mother does not want to let him free now, she collapses upon him in the form of “black clouds... like a low ceiling” (Lawrence, 1995: 390). First he gives her milk mixed with water in order not to nourish her, then poisons her completely just before Christmas: “Certainly the ironic admixture of poison and milk to kill the mother who had bore him and suckled him seems a morbidly fitting way to end the maternal possessiveness that poisoned his ability to love another woman” (Driskill, 1999: 91/92). Thus, he closes the Christmas circles opened with his birth after William’s death to get out of this circular labyrinth. He hopes for a rebirth to himself by this Christmas matricide. He behaves like “young men [who] should be like Marduk, Jung counsels, not like Attis, and slay the female dragon Tiamat, overcoming their dependence on too demanding women” (Phillips, 1990: 215). Although morning and light come with her death, they bury “her in a furious storm of rain and wind (Lawrence, 1995: 401). She is not physically with Paul now, but she does not stop her terrible qualities. Paul feels “she is-in [him]” (Ibid: 411) now although she is dead. He feels “[he’s] got to carry forward her living” (Ibid: 412).

Unsuccessful with his attempt for a rebirth, Paul feels alone in darkness. He wants to take refuge in Miriam. However, he is still in the realm of the Great Mother unconsciously when he wants to “leave himself to her” for “she [is] better and bigger than he” to “depend on” (Ibid: 413). In their last meeting she is “in dark claret colour” (Ibid: 416), the colour of the Great Mother. When he becomes aware of her terrible qualities, Paul makes his last move which will guarantee his downfall as the hero instead of a long searched rebirth with her: “The knight enters the dark forest to discover that the maiden, not the Dionysian dragon, must be destroyed, that the young women who had “urged” them to life had begun to suffocate them” (Driskill, 1999: 228). Now she seems like the dragon that stands between the hero and success. Paul can not take a breath because of her intense love and feels smothered in her pocket where she wants to put him in. Thus, he believes he should get rid of Miriam as well as his mother for a total independence.

When he rejects Miriam's love for the last time, he kills the Maiden. He can not do anything else. Still he gives the flowers of life to Miriam, for whom "they are the rootless flowers of death" (Spilka, 1957: 56). He leaves the Maiden "feeling dead" (Lawrence, 1995: 417). He fails as the hero who can not awaken the sleeping beauty, and Miriam as the spiritual guide who can not take him but: "She could only sacrifice herself to him-sacrifice herself every day-gladly. And that he did not want. He wanted her to hold him and say, with joy and authority: "Stop all this restlessness and beating against death. You are mine for a mate." She had not the strength" (Ibid: 418). Instead she leaves him alone to "destroy himself like a perverse child" (Ibid: 419) unlike a Muse who should accompany her hero forever.

The problem in Paul's relationship with women is caused by his deep love for his mother Mrs. Morel as mentioned so far. As the Terrible Great Mother, Mrs. Morel is so powerful that she becomes effective in the lives of everybody around her. First of all, she hurts her husband while she struggles to reshape him according to her own limits which become a failure at the end. Then, turning away from Walter Morel, Mrs. Morel's love and care spreads out into the lives of her sons like an illness. She possesses William first whose death leaves her alone with Paul. With fear of losing Paul too, she paralyzes his ability to love another woman, which is the conflict that causes William's death.

Mrs. Morel's terrible qualities are not limited to Paul's life, but they are transmitted to the women with whom he shares something as well. In his affair with Miriam, Mrs. Morel is deadly jealous of the girl, and she sees her as a rival for Paul's love. Thus, Mrs. Morel starts an implicit psychological war against Miriam since she is "too wise to have any open rupture" (Ibid: 174). She aims to affect Paul negatively towards Miriam, but she does not tell him to break her off openly:

"And she went to bed, leaving the door unlocked for him; but she lay listening until he came, often long after. It was a great bitterness to her that he had gone back to Miriam. She recognised, however, the uselessness of any further interference. He went to Willey Farm as a man now, not as a youth. She had no right over him. There was a coldness between him and her. He hardly told her anything. Discarded, she waited on him, cooked for him still, and loved to slave for him; but her face closed again like a mask. There was nothing for her to do now but the housework; for all the rest he had gone to Miriam. She could not forgive him. Miriam killed the joy and the warmth in him." (Ibid: 280)

Although Paul knows well enough his mother's objection to his affair with Miriam, he insists on it since he feels "warm and happy and religious at once" (Lawrence, 1995: 192) when he is together with both women. However, Mrs. Morel tries every way to keep him away from Miriam. She demands his coming home earlier, and even she accuses him of being out with Miriam when she gets ill at home, which she knows will make Paul feel guilty. When she thinks all her efforts are not enough to keep him back from Miriam, she quarrels with him about their affair directly in which she does not care to hide her jealousy: "If I *wanted* you to go to Selby on Friday night, I can imagine the scene," said Mrs. Morel. "But you're never too tired to go if *she* will come for you. Nay, you neither want to eat nor drink then... Is she *so* fascinating that you must follow her all that way?" (Ibid: 211). She is so much in fury that Paul feels a necessity to explain his relationship with Miriam to Mrs. Morel by claiming that they are only friends who share books and talk about art:

"I do like to talk to her-I never said I didn't. But I *don't* love her."

"Is there nobody else to talk to?"

"Not about the things we talk of. There's a lot of things that you are not interested in, that—"

"What things?"

Mrs. Morel was so intense that Paul began to pant.

"Why- painting- and books. *You* don't care about Herbert Spencer."

"No," was the sad reply. "And *you* won't at my age."

"Well, but I do now-and Miriam does—"

"And how do you know," Mrs. Morel flashed defiantly, "that I shouldn't. Do you ever try me!" (Ibid: 212)

Because of Mrs. Morel's jealousy and emotional stress upon Paul, he has to make her believe that he does not love Miriam at all:

"Yes, I know it well-I am old. And therefore I may stand aside; I have nothing more to do with you. You only want me to wait on you-the rest is for Miriam."

He could not bear it. Instinctively he realised that he was life to her. And, after all, she was the chief thing to him, the only supreme thing.

"You know it isn't, mother, you know it isn't!"

She was moved to pity by his cry.

"It looks a great deal like it," she said, half putting aside her despair.

"No, mother-I really *don't* love her. I talk to her, but I want to come home to you." (Ibid: 212/213)

Paul suffers with the thought that his mother is tortured by the idea of his love for Miriam. Thus, he hates Miriam since she causes his mother's suffering which makes



him feel hopeless between the two women. Although Paul can be easily affected by Mrs. Morel which is clear in his struggle to persuade her, Miriam is aware of Mrs. Morel's antagonism towards herself. She knows Mrs. Morel too well to believe her goodwill:

"Mother- and the others. They say at this rate everybody will consider me engaged, and I ought to consider myself so, because it's not fair to you. And I've tried to find out-and I don't think I love you as a man ought to love his wife. What do *you* think about it?" Miriam bowed her head moodily. She was angry at having this struggle.

...  
 "This is your mother," she said. "I know she never liked me."  
 "No, no, it isn't," he said hastily. "It was for your sake she spoke this time..."  
 (Lawrence, 1995: 225)

She struggles against her terrible qualities and believes that Paul belongs to herself even at the most hopeless moments. However, Mrs. Morel's terrible qualities have such a powerful effect on Paul that he leaves Miriam again to his mother's great relief:

"It was nine o'clock when he got home, falling dark. He entered the house in silence. His mother, who had been waiting, rose anxiously.  
 "I told her," he said.  
 "I'm glad," replied the mother, with great relief.  
 He hung up his cap wearily.  
 "I said we'd have done altogether," he said.  
 "That's right, my son," said the mother. "It's hard for her now, but best in the long run. I know. You weren't suited for her." (Ibid: 300)

It is clear what Mrs. Morel implies here. Miriam is not suited for Paul since Mrs. Morel is afraid of her strong love and control over her son. On the contrary she does not care so much when Paul starts meeting Clara since she knows their affair has no depth. Mrs. Morel feels Paul has turned back to her again after his break with Miriam even he is with Clara now for Clara is not a threat for her reign over her son. She accepts Clara as she has never accepted Miriam before because she knows what she shares with Paul is only sexuality:

"There was now a good deal of his life of which necessarily he could not speak to his mother. He had a life apart from her-his sexual life. The rest she still kept. But he felt he had to conceal something from her, and it irked him. There was a certain silence between them, and he felt he had, in that silence, to defend himself against her; he felt condemned by her. Then sometimes he hated her, and pulled at her bondage. His life wanted to free itself of her. It was like a circle where life turned back on itself, and got no farther. She bore him, loved him, kept him, and his love turned back into her, so that

he could not be free to go forward with his own life, really love another woman.” (Lawrence, 1995: 345)

When Paul discovers the problem with himself, he leaves Clara. He sees he is unable to love really. He is unable to share love and sexuality with a woman in a united form. He can not have any sexuality if he focuses on love, and likewise, he can not value any woman with whom he has sexual intercourse. These are the problems which are created by his mother-complex. His ability to love is bound with his mother whose passionate love remains no room for anyone else. Since his love for his mother contains no sexual dimension, he undervalues sexuality. Thus, he sees both Miriam and Clara just as “woman” while they share anything sexual since he can not accept sexuality as a healthy part of a love affair but lives it as an instinct to be fulfilled with any woman.

To sum up, the terrible aspects of the Great Mother, Mrs. Morel gives Paul no chance to have a life of his own. Moreover, her negative effect destroys other lives connected to her children as if it is an endless chain. She is so powerful and dominating that she continues her existence in Paul’s life even after her death which is the evidence for the dignity of the Great Mother and her authority in changing man’s life whether towards goodness or evil as the determiner of fate. Thus, women, each of whom is the representative of the Great Mother individually, have the potential for directing the rootless and corrupt individuals of the modern world towards a rebirth since they are the spinning goddesses of destiny, whereas people are the fabric produced by their bodies.

## CHAPTER FIVE WOMEN IN LOVE

Mostly accepted as Lawrence's masterpiece, Women in Love was intended as a major project entitled The Sisters. However, it was divided into two, the first part of which was called The Rainbow. The book was published in September 1915 only to be suppressed in November on grounds of obscenity. Following the ban, all unsold copies of the novel were destroyed as well. Although The Rainbow has a totally new and different story from Lawrence's previous novel Sons and Lovers, it deals with the corruption of both the individual and the society as well. In other words, "the family tragedy described in [Lawrence's] autobiographical Sons and Lovers, the devouring of the child by the parent, becomes in The Rainbow the collective problem created by the rise of industrialism" (Adelman, 1991: 3). Thus, in both novels, Lawrence focuses on the psychological consequences of industrialism on the human relationships especially within the family circle. He summarizes a series of effects such as "male dependency, incest between parents and children, homosexuality, routine work-saying that this social pathology, which [is called] 'the psychology of industrialism,' and on which the novel is based, is the perverse consequence of Christianity" (Ibid: 4).

The second part of the first project, which is called The Sisters, is Women in Love. The novel evolves originally from The Rainbow and shares the same vision about the problems of the society which is quite understandable since it was written during the last three years of World War I. The date in which Lawrence completed the novel is 1917. However, he could publish it only in 1920 in New York.

Although Women in Love is not a novel about war, it contains the psychology and the atmosphere created by the horror and death brought by war. It stands for the final point of the corruption of the modern world which Lawrence started to criticize with Sons and Lovers first:

“In a sense, the novel is Lawrence’s attack on civilization for having caused the war, its destruction symbolized by the apocalyptic trench like sewer filled with mud, rats, and human flotsam. Christianity, mechanization, perverse sexual desire, and the war are inseparably linked in Lawrence’s mind with what he later called ‘the barbed wire moral enclosure’ of modern consciousness.” (Adelman, 1991: 4)

For Lawrence, the corruption basically in human relations as well as in all fields of life which is both among the reasons and results of war is created by the false moral standards of the Victorian society, the hypocrisy of religion and the industrialism: “In Women in Love instincts are feared, desire is covertly experienced as a will to dominate, and a thin line separates the hunger for sensation from a lust for violence. The novel is also a search for a new society, a new consciousness” (Ibid: 5). Thus, in addition to his earlier novels, Lawrence offers a way to salvation in Women in Love without giving up his criticisms. In Sons and Lovers he focuses on the vital force of the women in shaping the society and points to the creative potential of the Life Giving Magna Mater. Women have the power to create a fresh beginning for mankind, which resembles their creating life in their wombs. However, in Sons and Lovers, desperation, which is quite apparent in its closure, is dominant because of the degenerated features of the women. Compared to Sons and Lovers, in Women in Love Lawrence’s hopes are more alive because of the “new woman” who is capable of the star-equilibrium between man and woman which is offered by Lawrence for the desired balance in the whole society. Birkin, who stands for Lawrence and who sets forth his ideas in the novel, explains Ursula the star-equilibrium as “a pure balance of two single beings: - as the stars balance each other” (Lawrence, 1996: 174).

In Women in Love, Lawrence’s ideas on the salvation of the society are much more developed than it was before. In addition to his early claims about women as the saviours of modern mankind, now Lawrence strongly emphasizes the importance of equilibrium between sexes for order in the world instead of the domination of one sex: “Such forms of love involve the loss of selfhood; they depend upon the ancient theory that men and women are but broken fragments of one whole, while Birkin insists that men and women have been singled out from an original mixture into pure individuality; accordingly, they must polarize rather than merge in love” (Spilka, 1957: 126). Thus, men and women have the chance of existing alone while he or she is the one half of a whole with a lover at the same time. As put forward by Ecker, “in the novels The Rainbow and Women in Love he is never tired of propagating the importance of a

perfect balance between man and woman and the consequences of the destruction of this equilibrium” (1995: 30). In Women in Love, he pictures these consequences and the struggle of his characters to get out of the modern foulness to achieve this equilibrium.

For Lawrence, the only way to achieve the mentioned equilibrium is a return to the nature, thus, the “cataclysmic falling away from Nature, and the quest for deliverance from self-alienation,” according to Ebbatson “is a theme [in] Women in Love” (1980: 6). Unlike the general tendency of the modern world, Lawrence seeks the salvation in the natural world with which he never disengages in his novels since for him the happiness and existence of mankind is tied up with nature:

“The cutting-off of man from Nature, whether wrought by Christianity, intellectual consciousness, industrialism and mechanisation, or by an insidious combination of all these forces, resulted in a civilisation based upon democracy and technology. This development may be traced in Lawrence’s thought from the warmth of colliery life in Sons and Lovers and the plays, through the portrayal of death of a culture in Women in Love, to the redemption offered in Lady Chatterley’s Lover- a development in which Nature is placed antithetically to mass humanity in a tradition harking back to the Romantics.” (Ebbatson, 1980: 30/31)

Besides natural life as opposed to the urban centres of modernism, Lawrence means the pure self of the individual by the word “nature”. In his view, the vital source of mankind lies inside and waits to be rediscovered by each individual to allow the desired rebirth of their souls: “There still remains a God, but not a personal God: a vast, shimmering impulse which waves onwards towards some end... When we die, like raindrops falling back again into the sea, we fall back into the big shimmering sea of unorganised life which we call God” (qtd. in Ebbatson, 1980: 29).

What Lawrence means by God is “the natural order constantly evolving towards new modes of being” (Ibid: 29). This natural order is hidden in the archetypes of the psyche which are commonly used by Lawrence since he believes a return to the archetypes can help mankind to find out his lost self. Thus, he employs archetypes as a means of the quest out of self-alienation.

Lawrence tried to prove the insecurity and rootlessness of modern life and especially modern man who becomes alienated from himself and nature. His perception of the myths and archetypes in Women in Love stems from earth and nature deities.

The central vision of his novel is the ecstatic experience of oneness with nature. His mythological characters gain an archetypal quality which has a total and universal aspect. We witness the transformation of the characters to archetypal ones which embrace the whole universe. What makes Women in Love distinct from his earlier novels is the richness of the mythology behind it. For Lawrence, the best way of understanding the twentieth century man who is in search of a soul is myth and mythical symbols which are expressive of elemental universal forces. Lawrence saw ancient mythology as a force uniting body and soul. Man in the twentieth century society was a split personality, torn between evil and good forces. His aim was to restore man's divided soul the unity that he believed had once been man's. His method was to find through myths and mythological symbols a sense of order.

In Women in Love, Lawrence's archetypes gain universality and become the archetypes of equality, death and rebirth. They are unlike his archetypes in Sons and Lovers which are the archetypes of the individual. This proves that whereas in Sons and Lovers Lawrence deals with the individual which he calls a cell in the body, in Women in Love he is prone to focus on the "movement, evolution and disintegration within a whole society" (qtd. in Ebbatson, 1980: 35). In addition to these universal archetypes, Lawrence uses the archetypes of nature such as the Great Mother and the Great Father. However, these archetypes do not belong to an individual anymore, but they refer to the universality of these forces. Lawrence makes use of the archetypes of nature since for him archetypes of nature serve for the return of the mankind to their inner worlds where they can reach the thousands of years' wisdom to establish a fresh world.

The struggle between the Great Mother and the Great Father symbolizes the struggle of mankind to gain a new consciousness. This process aims to get rid of every ruined piece of mankind to recreate new values instead, and a birth-death-rebirth cycle stands for it in Women in Love. Lawrence employs these archetypes because he believes in the life-saving equality of balance which will be possible when the cycle runs its course.

Unlike Sons and Lovers, which centres on the Great Mother archetype represented by Mrs. Morel, in Women in Love Lawrence creates a balance between the couples Ursula-Birkin and Gudrun-Gerald, each of whom stands for the Great Mother

and the Great Father archetypes. This dual structure of the novel serves Lawrence's idea of balance between the polarities as well: "Gerald and Gudrun illustrate the fatal compulsions of modern consciousness; Birkin and Ursula indicate the sacrifices necessary to alter that fate" (Adelman, 1991: 52).

To start with, the sisters Ursula and Gudrun are the representations of the two opposite aspects of the Great Mother archetype. Ursula stands for her good side while Gudrun is the embodiment of the terrible aspect. According to Jung, the mother archetype has a dual nature which employs both the kindness and the cruelty together as in "the Virgin Mary, who is not only the Lord's mother, but also, according to the medieval allegories, his cross" (Jung, 1959: 82). Likewise, "in India, 'the loving and terrible mother' is the paradoxical Kali" who has "three... fundamental attributes: goodness, passion, and darkness" which are the "three essential aspects of the mother: her cherishing and nourishing goodness, her orgiastic emotionality, and her Stygian depths" (Ibid: 82). However, each of the sisters represents only one aspect of the archetype unlike the usual dual character of the Great Mother. Thus, Ursula stands for "the Hellenistic-Jewish-Christian Sophia" while Gudrun stands for "the pre-Hellenic Gorgon" (Neumann, 1963: 22) in contrast to Mrs. Morel in Sons and Lovers who has the characteristics of both.

Lawrence creates Ursula Brangwen in The Rainbow first. Only by following her past, which is recorded in The Rainbow, is it possible to understand Ursula's character in Women in Love since her family background, the mythical framework of The Rainbow and her sexual history shape Ursula in the later novel. Although in the opening chapters of Women in Love she is portrayed as an ordinary, middle-class school teacher, we know from The Rainbow that she has an amount of life experience gained from her destructive sexual affair with Anton Skrebensky as well as her lesbian affair with the schoolmistress Winifred Inger. Ursula's past makes us aware of her power as an Archetypal Feminine which Lawrence projects her upon mythological frame both in The Rainbow and Women in Love. According to Miliaras, "[Ursula's] sexual experience in The Rainbow, therefore, provides mythic resonance and force to the credibility of her transformation from school teacher to *Magna Mater* at the climax of Women in Love, and, hence, is essential to our understanding of her metamorphosis as it transpires in the later novel" (1987: 230). She experiences all kinds of sexuality to

fulfill her life-giving aspect and to reach a perfect union. She represents all faces of the Great Mother as Miliaras puts it: “Like the *Magna Mater*, she can thus be all things to all men, because she, herself, has experienced the full range of human sexuality, both positive and negative, female, male and androgynous” (1987: 231).

Completing her destructive and negative phase in The Rainbow, Ursula personifies the positive, life-enforcing aspect of the Great Mother archetype in Women in Love. However, Gudrun has an oppositional position to Ursula. In contrast to Ursula, she corresponds to the negative facet of the Great Mother which she feels and is scared of from time to time: “Gudrun has a subterranean quality in her soul that she herself recognizes and fears. It was this fear that overwhelmed her as she walked with Ursula through the mining district of Beldover, where she felt the glamour of the miners and thrilled to it.” (Miliaras, 1987: 254)

When the sisters walk towards Beldover, we see Gudrun fascinated with the gloominess of the miners’ district which she likens to “a country in an underworld” where “the people are all ghouls and everything is ghostly” (Lawrence, 1996: 24). Her feeling towards these people is the mixture of delight with hatred at the same time: “A sudden fierce anger swept over the girl, violent and murderous. She would have liked them all annihilated, cleared away, so that the world was left clear for her” (Ibid: 25/26).

Gudrun’s violence and demolishing qualities associate her with her namesake Gudrun of The Nibelungenlied saga who is known as Kriemhild as well. Although Gudrun of Norse mythology has no major role in the Eddas, she becomes “the monumental implacable manslayer of the medieval... Nibelungenlied” (Miliaras, 1987: 246). Gudrun’s name comes from the Norse earth mother Gerd, and she “appears as the daughter of the King of the Nibelungs, whom the medieval Germans associated in their legends with the Burgundian kings, but whose name translates, actually, into ‘children of darkness’ ” (Ibid: 246). The Nibelungs are believed to be black dwarves and they are thought to be the ancestors of miners in British folklore. Thus, “Gudrun’s fascination in Women in Love with the miners, the dark people of the Beldover underworld, and her fixation, as a sculptress, with the creation of tiny animals and people, ... project forceful mythic parallels with the spectrum of these associations” (Ibid: 246).



In The Nibelungenlied, Gudrun or Kriemhild is described as a bloody avenger of her husband Siegfried's death. Although she "begins as a charming young princess" in the first half of the poem, she "ends as a *vâlandinne* or 'she-devil', a woman who has sacrificed her nature to revenge" (Hatto, 1969: 316/317). She causes the death of many people including her son Ortlieb whom she puts forward as a sacrifice to start the battle which she desires for her revenge:

"The queen went to table with King Etzel and his men. She had laid a deadly plot against their guests. Kriemhild's old grief was embedded deep in her heart. Since there was no beginning the fighting in any other way, she had Etzel's son carried to the board. (How could a woman ever do a more dreadful thing in pursuance of her revenge?) Four of Etzel's followers went immediately and returned bearing the young Prince Ortlieb to the King's table, where Hagen, too, was seated, owing to whose murderous hate the boy must needs soon die." (Ibid: 236/237)

Kriemhild of The Nibelungenlied is clearly a good representation of the Terrible Mother who causes the death of everything around together with those which she gives birth at the same time. While she should be the female who is associated with positive qualities such as life-giving, fertility and production despite her features of "menstruation, deflowering, conception, and childbearing [which] are intimately bound up with a sacrifice of blood" (Neumann, 1963: 279), her positive qualities turn into negative ones in the world of the male where she needs power. Thus, her bloody rites become the symbol of death instead of life. As the life-giving female, she possesses the power of "assur[ing] the fertility of game, women, and fields, the rising of the sun, and success in warfare" (Ibid: 279) indeed. However, the female has another face which she shows when it is needed and which turns her into the male-like female. This goddess of death sacrifices for her wrath instead of the continuity of life for which she sacrifices her blood in childbirth. Thus, Kriemhild's sacrifice means the end of lives instead of a guarantee for fertility and the goodness of people. Besides The Nibelungenlied, Kriemhild's wrath is told more violently and demoniacally with little differences in The Prose Edda:

"A little later Guðrún killed her two sons and had goblets decorated with silver and gold made from their skulls. Then the funeral feast of the Niflungar was celebrated. From these goblets Guðrún had King Atli served with mead which was mixed with the boys' blood, and she had their hearts roasted and given the king to eat at the same banquet. When this had been done she told him about it in many ugly words. There was no lack of intoxicating mead there so that most people fell asleep where they were

sitting. That same night she went to the king when he was asleep, and with her Högni's son, and they made an armed attack on him and that was his death. Then they set fire to the hall and burned the people inside it." (Nordal, 1954: 115/116)

Gudrun in Women in Love shares these deadly qualities of her namesake which will make her a death-bringer later. Her negative features become clearer when she is compared with Ursula within the archetype of twins. If the sisters are considered as cosmic female sources which are able both to create and to destroy the universe, Ursula is the Eve of Judaeo-Christian creation myth produced by the single and supreme being called Yaweh. She is Eve because, as we will see, in her relationship to Birkin, she acts in a positive way within the principle of desire and division. However, Gudrun is the negative, disobedient twin embodied by "Lilith, who figures as the demonic half-sister or twin-sister of Adam... created from dust as his twin and equal" (Lash, 1993: 10). Likewise, Gudrun is the demonic sister of Ursula in Women in Love. As the negative element, "Lilith is rejected and, as we read in Isaiah 34:14, cast out into the realm of wild dogs, screech owls and satyrs" (Ibid: 10). She becomes associated with darkness, terror and everything related to death. She is isolated in her own darkness like Gudrun. The opposition between the sisters becomes apparent in their attitudes towards the wedding ceremony of Laura Crich in the opening chapters of the novel. First of all, according to Miliaras "the Dioscures often "[serve] as guardians at the wedding rites of young people" (1987: 244), which supports the twinship of Ursula and Gudrun. Moreover, in Laura Crich's wedding, Ursula is described as the good twin who is inclined to see the ceremony: "Shall we go out and look at that wedding?" "[Gudrun] asked at length, in a voice that was too casual. "Yes!" cried Ursula, too eagerly, throwing aside her sewing and leaping up" (Lawrence, 1996: 23). While watching the ceremony, Ursula is anxious about the possibility of anything going wrong: "The bridegroom and the groom's man had not yet come. There was a growing consternation outside. Ursula felt almost responsible. She could not bear it that the bride should arrive and no groom. The wedding must not be a fiasco, it must not." (Ibid: 31) Ursula's anxiety about the wedding is so strongly emphasized that we think she feels a personal responsibility for it. According to Miliaras, thus, "she fulfils on the symbolic level her Dioscuran duty, and at the same time establishes her connection with the life-giving, traditional forces of society" (1987: 244).

However, Gudrun stands for the hostile twin. Although she offers to watch the wedding ceremony first, she wants to go back home at the moment they arrive the church as well. As her twin “Ursula [can] feel her suffering” (Lawrence, 1996: 25) and “[wishes] to be alone, freed from the tightness, the enclosure of Gudrun’s presence” (Ibid: 26). Despite her displeasure, Ursula accepts not to go inside the church for Gudrun’s sake, and they watch the ceremony from the churchyard which emphasizes Gudrun’s dark side connected with death: “Gudrun’s withdrawal, her very hostility toward the event, viewing it as she does from the graveyard, stresses her role as negative Dioscure and “hostile” twin” (Miliaras, 1987: 244/245).

In Women in Love, Lawrence focuses on the battle between oppositions more closely than ever. To emphasize the modern relationships between people which are based upon endless conflict, “as the novel develops, Lawrence unveils a world in which everything is in dissolution. Sister is at odds with sister, husband with wife, parent with child, brother with brother, and beyond the magic circle of family relationships lie only the various sordid aspects of soiled experiences in the wider world” (Ibid: 234/235). This pessimistic view of the world resembles the images that foretell the end of the world according to the Nordic tradition in Sybil’s Vision:

“Brothers will fight  
and kill each other,  
siblings  
do incest;  
men will know misery,  
adulteries be multiplied,  
an axe age, a sword-age,  
shields will be cloven,  
a wind-age, a wolf-age,  
before the world’s ruin.” (Nordal, 1954: 86)

In the modern world, which Lawrence constantly criticizes, relationships even between the family members are as degenerated as they are described in Sybil’s Vision. Hatred is common among sisters and brothers; incest, homosexuality and sexuality outside marriage which creates a barren world are ordinary facts of the modern society preparing itself for its own end. Lawrence employs images which remind us of this Nordic doomsday throughout his novel since “Women in Love is Lawrence’s testament to what he sees as the unrelieved and irrevocable corruption of Western society. It is his *Ragnarök*, the *Götterdämmerung* brought about by twentieth century spiritual malaise,

unfolding against a background of unrelieved industrial squalor and decay” (Miliaras, 1987: 232).

Opposite forces represented by the sisters occupy the rest of the novel in their relationships with other characters. For example in her affair with Birkin, Ursula is still the representation of vital forces while Birkin is associated with destruction and negative forces. Birkin stands for Lawrence himself in the novel. Therefore, he continually expresses Lawrence’s criticisms about modernity. He is a character who is outside the ordinary people which gives him right to criticise them:

“You don’t believe in having any standard of behaviour at all, do you?” [Gerald] challenged Birkin, censoriously.

“Standard- no. I hate standards. But they’re necessary for the common ruck. Anybody who is anything can just be himself and do as he likes.” (Lawrence, 1996: 47)

Birkin believes that he has right to criticise the society since he knows the impossibility of personal salvation alone like Lawrence. On the contrary, he is aware of the necessity of a total regeneration for the society:

“English society... in the whole of Women in Love is seen as irredeemably corrupt and wholly incapable of providing those conditions either of employment or social intercourse where an authentic self could develop. This dilemma is responsible for much of the pessimism in the book. The hostility with which Birkin regards English society is critical for one who holds, as Lawrence does, that the growth of the self is dependent upon its ability to exist as a part of a living, believing community.” (Burns, 1980: 73)

In their long discussions with Gerald, Birkin attacks the modern world and the modern way of life. He criticizes the modern man who is even alienated to himself and whose only purpose is to have some up-to-date materialism which he hopes to find happiness in:

“We are such dreary liars. Our one idea is to lie to ourselves. We have an ideal of a perfect world, clean and straight and sufficient. So we cover the earth with foulness; life is a blotch of labour, like insects scurrying in filth, so that your collier can have a pianoforte in his parlour, and you can have a butler and a motor-car in your up-to-date house, and as a nation we can sport the Ritz, or the Empire, Gaby Deslys and the Sunday newspapers. It is very dreary.” (Lawrence, 1996: 71)

When Gerald asks whether he offers to leave their houses in response, Birkin replies that “[he] would have nothing at all” (Ibid: 71). Birkin’s criticism of the modern world

and suggestion for a return to the nature implies Lawrence's purpose of finding our true selves by being closer to nature.

However, despite his opposition towards the modern way of life and the society in corruption, Birkin can not achieve to be out of these totally. He feels "his life seem[s] uncertain, without any definite rhythm, any organic meaning" (Lawrence, 1996: 69). He thinks he moves around aimlessly. He is not alone in feeling lost indeed. Like Birkin, Gerald feels the meaninglessness of life. Modern man has no roots; he is not bound up with anything any more. There is no centre to collect the pieces of his life. Gerald expresses the absence of a natural centre, and he suggests social mechanism as an artificial one. Contrary to Gerald, Birkin believes the only remaining chance for creating a new centre in the lives of men is women, an idea which Gerald rejects but Birkin accepts like a new religion:

"I don't believe a woman, and nothing but a woman, will ever make my life," said Gerald.

"Not the centre and core of it- the love between you and a woman?" asked Birkin.

Gerald's eyes narrowed with a queer dangerous smile as he watched the other man.

"I never quite feel it that way," he said.

"You don't? Then wherein does life centre, for you?"

"I don't know- that's what I want somebody to tell me. As far as I can make out, it doesn't centre at all. It is artificially held *together* by the social mechanism."

Birkin pondered as if he would crack something.

"I know," he said, "it just doesn't centre. The old ideals are dead as nails- nothing there. It seems to me there remains only this perfect union with a woman- sort of ultimate marriage- and there isn't anything else."

"And you mean if there isn't the woman, there's nothing?" said Gerald.

"Pretty well that- seeing there's no God." (Ibid: 74/75)

As a solution to the disease of the society caused by its mechanical routine and the absence of a God, Birkin offers the union with a woman, which can start a rebirth. He believes the life-giving force of the Great Mother can be a new hope for people who live in an ongoing collapse in the modern world.

Not only Birkin and Gerald but also Ursula is locked within the endless routine of the industrial world. She sees her life composed of the same patterns which follow each other without a pause. Thus, her life becomes senseless:

"The sisters went home again, to read and talk and work, and wait for Monday, for school. Ursula often wondered what else she waited for, besides the beginning and end

of the school week, and the beginning and end of the holidays. This was a whole life! Sometimes she had periods of tight horror, when it seemed to her that her life would pass away and be gone, without having been more than this. But she never really accepted it. Her spirit was active, her life like a shoot that is growing steadily, but which has not yet come above ground.” (Lawrence, 1996: 67/68)

Like Birkin, Ursula longs for the birth of a new life. She is hopeful for a better life. Thus, she waits and never surrenders in her struggle to win Birkin, which prepares a way to rebirth for both.

The other major male character in Women in Love is the industrial magnate Gerald Crich whose “first name derives, etymologically, from his association with Odin” (Miliaras, 1987: 263) who is “the ruler of heaven and earth” and who “is called All-father because he is the father of all the gods” according to The Prose Edda (Nordal, 1954: 34/48). Gerald’s Nordic, god-like quality is emphasized when he is first introduced in Women in Love as well which makes him fitting to the Great Father archetype: “[Gerald] was of a fair, sun-tanned type, rather above middle height, well-made, and almost exaggeratedly well-dressed. But about him also was the strange, guarded look, the unconscious glisten, as if he did not belong to the same creation as the people about him” (Lawrence, 1996: 27). Besides Odin, Gerald can be associated with the more ancient Norse war God Tyr because of his Great Father aspect as well. Tyr has only one hand as a result of his battle with the wolf Fenrir who will get free of its chains when Ragnarök starts:

“When the gods tried to persuade the wolf Fenrir to allow the fetter Gleipnir to be placed on him, he would not believe that they would free him until they put Týr’s hand in his mouth as a pledge. Then, when the Æsir would not loose him, he bit off the hand at the place now known as the “wolf-joint”. [So Týr] is one-handed and he is not called a peace-maker.” (Nordal, 1954: 53)

Likewise, Gudrun thinks of Gerald as a wolf when she meets him for the first time at Laura Crich’s wedding which supports his similarity with the God Tyr:

“Gudrun lighted on him at once. There was something northern about him that magnetized her. In his clear northern flesh and his fair hair was a glisten like sunshine refracted through crystals of ice. And he looked so new, unbroached, pure as an arctic thing. Perhaps he was thirty years old, perhaps more. His gleaming beauty, maleness, like a young, good-humoured, smiling wolf, did not blind her to the significant, sinister stillness in his bearing, the lurking danger of his unsubdued temper. “His totem is the wolf,” she repeated to herself. “His mother is an old, unbroken wolf.” (Lawrence, 1996: 27)

Gerald's identification with Tyr is quite apparent in the water party when he needs Birkin's help to get his canoe down since his one hand is injured. To sum up, Gerald's story about injuring his hand and his association with the wolf are the aspects that connect him with Tyr:

"What have you done to it?" asked Ursula, who had been aching to put the question for the last half-hour.

"To my hand?" said Gerald. "I trapped it in some machinery."

"Ugh!" said Ursula. "And did it hurt much?"

"Yes," he said. "It did at the time. It's getting better now. It crushed the fingers." (Lawrence, 1996: 191)

Like Tyr who loses his hand in Fenrir's mouth, Gerald injures his hand by the machinery which is the modern wolf of the modern world. Moreover, Gerald both as the wolf and the God bitten by the wolf is a striking point which indicates the self-destructive nature of this machine god.

Unfortunately, Gudrun with whom Gerald has an affair which will cause his ruin has the same destructive features. She feels this devastating sense towards Gerald the moment she first sees him although she can not understand what it is:

"And then she experienced a keen paroxysm, a transport, as if she had made some incredible discovery, known to nobody else on earth. A strange transport took possession of her, all her veins were in a paroxysm of violent sensation. "Good God!" she exclaimed to herself "what is this?" and then, a moment after, she was saying assuredly, "I shall know more of that man." She was tortured with desire to see him again, a nostalgia, a necessity to see him again, to make sure it was not all a mistake, that she was not deluding herself, that she really felt this strange and overwhelming sensation on his account, this knowledge of him in her essence, this powerful apprehension of him. "Am I *really* singled out for him in some way, is there really some pale gold, arctic light that envelops only us two?" she asked herself. And she could not believe it, she remained in a muse, scarcely conscious of what was going on around." (Ibid: 27/28)

Gudrun's thrill when she recognizes her own darkness as well as the potential but controlled lust for violence in Gerald foreshadows their future together. The churchyard from where she watches Gerald is significant as pointing Gerald's end as well. The churchyard points to the destructiveness of Gudrun at the same time by associating her "with graves, cemeteries, and negative death magic" which belongs to "the blood-drinking goddess of death" (Neumann, 1963: 72). However, Gudrun is not happy with her own destructive force and "attempts to suppress the darkness which she

feels in herself and which has been the precipitating factor in her return from London. Yet she is unable to. She recognizes that it is on its way to becoming the dominant element in her personality” (Miliaras, 1987: 250).

Thus, the couple “Gudrun and Gerald are the novel’s chief illustration of the death process” (Adelman, 1991: 52) whose relationship is an alternative to that of Ursula and Birkin while it is at the same time the necessary collapse before the foundation of a new world according to Lawrence: “Women in Love symbolically alludes to the long process of disintegration, which in 1916-1917 Lawrence believed must necessarily run its course before anything new could begin.” (Ibid: 13). This idea is expressed by Birkin in the novel when he claims we need to “get rid of the old before anything new will appear-even in the self” (Lawrence, 1996: 70). It is the result of Lawrence’s belief that it is impossible for the society to order a new consciousness until the complete destruction of everything old. Therefore, he includes a dark, pessimistic tone symbolized by the Nordic end-of-the-world images embodied by Gudrun and Gerald both in their personalities and their affair. Gerald and Gudrun represent the negative part of the forces which constitute life:

“In Women in Love, as in the literature of romanticism, destructive energies are admitted as an organic part of the whole life process, and that there is no clear and final distinction between the creative and the destructive, the morally healthy and the decadent, Birkin and Ursula on the one hand, Gudrun and Gerald on the other, Gerald is beautiful to Gudrun not in spite of, but because of the “death, hurt, horror, reduction” he embodies for her.” (Adelman, 1991: 72)

In contrast to the common approach to death and evil, Lawrence claims that these negative forces are necessary to trigger a new beginning. He makes no distinction between good and bad but combines them both since he thinks “Destruction and Creation are the two relative absolutes between the opposing infinities. Life is in both. Life may even, for a while be almost entirely in one, or almost entirely in the other” (qtd. in Adelman, 1991: 73). Thus, Lawrence points to the necessity of the dual character of the Great Mother who is the “mistress both of life and death” (Neumann, 1963: 107).

Gudrun and Gerald’s self-destructive forces such as sadism and masochism are symbolized through their relations to animals in the novel. The first scene occurs when Ursula and Gudrun see Gerald at the railroad crossing on horseback. Gerald’s struggle



against the horse is described as a sexual rape. It is apparent that he takes pleasure from this struggle which causes horror and pain for the animal:

“Whilst the two girls waited, Gerald Crich trotted up on a red Arab mare. He rode well and softly, pleased with the delicate quivering of the creature between his knees. And he was very picturesque, at least in Gudrun’s eyes, sitting soft and close on the slender red mare, whose long tail flowed on the air. He saluted the two girls, and drew up at the crossing to wait for the gate, looking down the railway for the approaching train... The locomotive chuffed slowly between the banks, hidden. The mare did not like it. She began to wince away, as if hurt by the unknown noise... But Gerald was heavy on the mare, and forced her back. It seemed as if he sank into her magnetically, and could thrust her back against herself... Gudrun was looking at him with black-dilated, spellbound eyes.” (Lawrence, 1996: 132/133)

Unlike Ursula who hates Gerald for his cruelty, Gudrun watches the scene with fascination. According to Adelman, she identifies herself with “the Arabian mare, delicate and bred for a cultured society” but is “utterly incongruous in the coarse atmosphere of a colliery district” (1991: 69). That is why Gudrun is fascinated with the scene. She associates herself with the horse which is under Gerald’s domination and his cruelty satisfies her self-destructive, masochistic soul.

The second scene related with a rabbit this time takes place at Shortlands. Gudrun and Gerald try to keep the rabbit Bismarck still to allow Winifred to draw the animal. When the rabbit tries violently to get free of Gudrun’s hands, she struggles to keep it despite the injuries it causes. When Gerald comes near, he witnesses “her sullen passion of cruelty” (Lawrence, 1996: 277). She is not the only one to have pleasure in the beastly struggle of the fearful rabbit. Indeed, the chapter “ ‘Rabbit’ shows the kind of love of which Gerald is capable, as he is fatally bonded to Gudrun through their mutual desire for sadism” (Adelman, 1991: 88). Like Gudrun, Gerald has pleasure in striking the rabbit’s neck with “a sudden sharp, white-edged wrath” (Lawrence, 1996: 278). Both feel “the mutual hellish recognition” (Ibid: 279) when they watch the motionless rabbit and show their injured arms to each other:

“How many scratches have you?” he asked, showing his hard forearm, white and hard and torn in red gashes.

“How really vile!” she cried, flushing with a sinister vision. “Mine is nothing.” She lifted her arm and showed a deep red score down the silken white flesh.

“What a devil!” he exclaimed. (Ibid: 279)

The corruptive affair between Gudrun and Gerald, which is doomed to failure because of the desire for pain and cruelty hidden in their deepest souls, starts in spring. It is spring time when Gudrun meets Gerald at his sister's wedding. However, as the novel develops, "the narrative proceeds from a spring day to the symbolic zero winter of civilization" (Adelman, 1991: 52). Parallel with the process moving from spring to winter, both the relationship between Gudrun and Gerald and the world draw close to corruption together. The modern couple who has no vitality left in their souls represents the cursed modern society whose fate is corruption. In order to emphasize their parallelism, Lawrence makes use of the symbols such as coldness, ice and snow as well as archetypal characters from Norse mythology for both the personal failure of Gudrun-Gerald couple and the failure of the whole society. However, the symbols appear first with Gerald and are usually related to him and as a whole "allusions to Gerald's 'clear northern flesh', his hair with its 'glisten like sunshine refracted through crystals of ice' and to the wolf as his totem and to Cain as his prototype establish and carry through the novel his cold desperation, born of his past and prophetic of his future" (Clarke, 1994: 99): "Gudrun's imaginative apprehension of Gerald expresses the destructive character and fate of their relationship, for Lawrence's symbol for the culmination of the love/death process is snow. It expresses the idea of freezing out from the inside, when life becomes pure will and reductive motion" (Adelman, 1991: 54). The end of the world which will come with the expanse of ice everywhere belongs to the Nordic doomsday called Ragnarök as mentioned before. According to The Prose Edda, Ragnarök means the eternal winter which will be the end of both the gods and men: "First will come the winter called Fimbulvetr. Snow will drive from all quarters, there will be hard frosts and biting winds; the sun will be no use. There will be three such winters on end with no summer between. Before that, however, three other winters will pass accompanied by great wars throughout the whole world" (Nordal, 1954: 86). Throughout the novel Gerald draws near his end while the world moves towards its freezing end at the same time. Following the first meeting of Gudrun with Gerald where she identified him with an arctic personality, the icy water in which Gerald swims in Willey Water stands for the isolation and loneliness of man in which he is locked up in the modern world. He seems happy "without bond or connection anywhere" (Lawrence, 1996: 63); however, "Lawrence constantly suggests that most people in the 'civilized' world are not truly happy, however much they might pretend to be, and that this is

because the full free play of their human faculties, the expression and satisfaction, especially, of many of their most profound desires, is disabled by the mechanisms of convention and conformity” (Poplawski, 1993: 11).

The water image continues in the water-party where “the lake illustrates the psychology of Western man: the surface unreality, the deadly violence within” (Adelman, 1991: 80). For Jung, it is “a living symbol of the dark psyche” (1959: 17) as well. He claims “whoever looks into the water sees his own image, but behind it living creatures soon loom up; fishes, presumably, harmless dwellers of the deep-harmless, if only the lake were not haunted” (Ibid: 24). Gerald who dives into the depths of his unconscious sees death there which diverges with his outside appearance.

Gerald is not the only person who comes across with the hidden layers of his own self at the water-party. Gudrun also acts in a peculiar way when she suddenly feels “a strange passion to dance before the sturdy, handsome cattle” (Lawrence, 1996: 196). This strange passion which she can not even understand herself is connected with her deathly qualities as well: “The Wili (Vili) of Slavic mythology wore pale white dresses and danced, like the Nixen, in the moonlight before the cattle of men. Onlookers suffered death by drowning if they were so unfortunate to witness this ritual” (Miliaras, 1987: 252).

Gudrun’s dance reminds The Swan Maiden or The Sirens who incline men to death under their spell. According to the information in Homer’s Odyssey, “there is no homecoming for the man who draws near them unawares and hears the Sirens’ voices; no welcome from his wife, no little children brightening at their father’s return. For with their high clear song the Sirens bewitch him, as they sit there in a meadow piled high with the mouldering skeletons of men, whose withered skin still hangs upon their bones” (1991: 180). Additionally, for Jung, “the nixie is an even more instinctive version of a magical feminine [who] can also be a siren, *melusina* (mermaid), wood-nymph, Grace, or Erlking’s daughter, or a lamia or succubus, who infatuates young men and sucks the life out of them” (1959: 25). Likewise, Gudrun bewitches Gerald and takes life out of him slowly. Moreover, these dark features of Gudrun foreshadow the approaching fate not only for Gerald but also for her sister Diana. She bewitches

everyone around which makes the cattle mad “with helpless fear and fascination” (Lawrence, 1996: 196) and Gerald anxious:

“Ursula began to sing, in a false quavering voice:

“Way down in Tennessee---”

She sounded purely anxious. Nevertheless, Gudrun, with her arms outspread and her face uplifted, went in a strange palpitating dance towards the cattle, lifting her body towards them as if in a spell, her feet pulsing as if in some little frenzy of unconscious sensation, her arms, her wrists, her hands stretching and heaving and falling and reaching and reaching and falling, her breasts lifted and shaken towards the cattle, her throat exposed as in some voluptuous ecstasy towards them, whilst she drifted imperceptibly nearer, an uncanny white figure, towards them, carried away in its own rapt trance, ebbing in strange fluctuations upon the cattle, that waited, and ducked their heads a little in sudden contraction from her, watching all the time as if hypnotized, their bare horns branching in the clear light, as the white figure of women ebbed upon them, in the slow, hypnotizing convulsion of the dance. She could feel them just in front of her, it was as if she had the electric pulse from their breasts running into her hands. Soon she would touch them, actually touch them. A terrible shiver of fear and pleasure went through her. And all the while Ursula, spell-bound, kept up her high-pitched thin, irrelevant song, which pierced the fading evening like an incantation.” (Ibid: 196)

Ursula explains the situation when she says “we’ve all gone mad” (Ibid: 197). Gerald is also mad since he finds Gudrun’s dance dangerous. However, his fury makes Gudrun more violent, and she catches a blow on his face. Her comment over the blow is a foreshadowing of her deadly effect upon Gerald’s life when she claims that she will “strike the last” (Ibid: 199) blow as she does the first. With her magical dance Gudrun takes Gerald under her spell which makes him confess his love for her just before the party starts:

“Gerald, white like a presence in his summer clothes, was following down the open grassy slope. Gudrun waited for him to come up. Then she softly put out her hand and touched him, saying softly:

“Don’t be angry with me.”

A flame flew over him, and he was unconscious. Yet he stammered:

“I’m not angry with you. I’m in love with you.”

His mind was gone, he grasped for sufficient mechanical control, to save himself. She laughed a silvery little mockery, yet intolerably caressive.” (Ibid: 200)

Her “fixed eyes” and “crooning and witch-like” (Ibid: 201) voice supports the negative power of Gudrun on Gerald who is “completely under the spell of his enchantress” (Miliaras, 1987: 253). Thus, “Gudrun emerges once and for all as a Celto-Slavic variation on the aspect of the ‘Terrible Mother’ as Goddess of Death” (Ibid: 201)

whose malice is responsible for the following deaths as well as the slow suicide of her lover. She is the Nixe who dances before the divine cattle as well to make youths fall in love with her and “quickly tires of her human lover and leaves him, often causing him to die of a broken heart” (Miliaras, 1987: 255) as she will do with Gerald.

The balance between the opposite forces symbolized couples are clearer now since Gudrun and Gerald’s fate becomes fixed with the tragedy at the water party. Now Gerald knows one “can’t put a thing right, once it has gone wrong” (Lawrence, 1996: 214). He knows that his fate is shaped by Gudrun whose personality as a sculptress associates her with the “goddess of time, and thus of fate” (Neumann, 1963: 226) since both lick men’s life into shape. Gudrun, as Goddess of Fate “holds the tables of fate, the all-determining constellations of heaven, which is herself” (Ibid: 226). Therefore, she leaves no way out for Gerald whose only choice is to follow her towards his death. Birkin expresses the death-drive hidden in both Gudrun and Gerald while chatting with Ursula just after the cattle scene. But before, he focuses upon the opposition between the silver river of life and the dark river of unconscious which people tend to ignore most of the time:

“It seethes and seethes, a river of darkness,” he said, “putting forth lilies and snakes, and the *ignis fatuus*, and rolling all the time onward. That’s what we never take into account-that it rolls onwards... The other river, the black river. We always consider the silver river of life, rolling on and quickening all the world to a brightness, on and on to heaven, flowing into a bright eternal sea, a heaven of angels thronging.-But the other is our real reality-... The dark river of dissolution.-You see it rolls in us just as the other rolls-the black river of corruption.” (Lawrence, 1996: 201)

Thus, Birkin not only points to the unconscious as the source of creativity and darkness as a necessary power for acquiring light but also the source of the destructive force of both Gudrun and Gerald which will ruin them:

“And our flowers are of this-our sea-born Aphrodite, all our white phosphorescent flowers of sensuous perfection, all our reality, nowadays... I mean she [Aphrodite] is the flowering mystery of the death-process, yes... When the stream of synthetic creation lapses, we find ourselves part of the inverse process, the flood of destructive creation. Aphrodite is born in the first spasm of universal dissolution-then the snakes and swans and lotus- marsh-flowers- and Gudrun and Gerald- born in the process of destructive creation.” (Ibid: 201)

Birkin's comments upon Aphrodite as the Goddess of Death are significant as well since Gudrun and Gerald's affair stands for the destructive relationship between the goddess and her lover like Cybele and Attis or Venus and Adonis.

Moreover, what is striking in their conversation is the rejection of being *fleurs du mal* by Ursula. Although Birkin accepts to be the "flowers of dark corruption" (Lawrence, 1996: 202) to some degree, Ursula claims to be "a rose of happiness" (Ibid: 202) herself. Despite Birkin's tendency towards death, she believes that "the beginning comes out of the end" (Ibid: 202) as the representation of the Good Mother.

However Ursula is still afraid of the dark side of life and is unwilling to embrace it as a part of her identity. Like Ursula, Birkin has some fears especially focused upon his tendency for a homosexual love which focuses upon Gerald. This tendency in Birkin is one of the elements which make him the negative side in his affair with Ursula since "Lawrence continue[s] to see homosexuality as a symptom of the destructive influence of industrialism" (Adelman, 1991: 31). He is so much irritated even by the idea that he describes these people as rats and beetle living in darkness and dirt which will be common images for the homosexual artist Loerke in Women in Love later: "These horrible little frowsty people, men lovers of men, they give me such a sense of corruption, almost putrescence, that I dream of beetles" (qtd. in Adelman, 1991: 11).

Lawrence's opposition to homosexuality can be explained by his fear of the lack of hope for regeneration. He is afraid of the modern relationships since they are not based on productivity and fertility principle any more. What dominates the modern relationships is just a will to dominate without any life-giving aspect. Thus, there is no room for real love in modern relationships because "where love rules, there is no will to power; and where power predominates, there love is lacking" (Jung, 1953: 87):

"The polarity, then, that runs through Women in Love like the polarity that runs through The Rainbow depends ultimately upon the same division of light and darkness which has prevailed in the earlier novels... In Women in Love, however, Lawrence adds to this vision a new dimension of an expressed and open preference for homosexual relationships on the part of the protagonist, a preference against which Birkin struggles but which, in its most far-reaching consequences, precludes the positive resolution of the apocalyptic mode and corrupted relationships of Women in Love. For one cannot build a new world, nor can the myth of the eternal return upon which Lawrence's dream of regeneration is based prevail in a world where the affinities

between man and woman dissolve into exclusively homosexual, corrupt, or even purely platonic relationships.” (Miliaras, 1987: 240/241)

This is what Gudrun complains by saying “nothing materializes! Everything withers in the bud” (Lawrence, 1996: 21). Even in the heterosexual relationships of the modern world, the result is barrenness most of the time. Here Lawrence accuses the modern women of being the temptresses of men by serving the terrible aspect of the Great Mother with their high-consciousness and of destroying femininity in men’s world. He creates Hermione with this aim as opposed to Ursula. Unlike Ursula, Hermione, who shares the name of the death goddess Harmonia, has negative qualities. She is pictured as a cultured and powerful woman who has authority in fields where men reign, which draws her far away from her benevolent feminine qualities at the same time: “[Hermione] was a woman of the new school, full of intellectuality, and heavy, nerve-worn with consciousness. She was passionately interested in reform, her soul was given up to the public cause. But she was a man’s woman, it was the manly world that held her” (Ibid: 28).

Hermione as representing the terrible aspect of the Great Mother and acting as a temptress for Birkin make him the archetypal hero who struggles to find his true self. As an archetypal hero, Birkin battles with the Terrible Mother and seeks a way out since “life’s ways are puzzling [and] labyrinth-like” (Stillman, 1985: 37):

“[For] a vision which would attribute the dissolution of the pastoral paradise to the heightened consciousness and sensation-seeking nature of modern woman’s quest for identity, Lawrence still needed the archetype of the Feminine in her “terrible” aspect. For this purpose, undoubtedly, he had originally intended Hermione to serve. Rubert Birkin would, as archetypal hero, subdue the death goddess Harmonia, in her gorgon-serpent phase, and achieve integration with the benevolent Ursula.” (Miliaras, 1987: 241)

As a result, Ursula saves the archetypal hero Birkin both from his homosexual tendencies and from the Terrible Goddess Hermione since she is aware of the emptiness and futility in both relationships as she experienced them before in The Rainbow. She eliminates Hermione to keep the balance as well because no star-equilibrium is possible in triangular affairs of the modern world. However, salvation is possible only with the balance between the Great Mother and Great Father represented by Ursula and Birkin. A rebirth for both is possible through their unity. For Birkin “this marriage with [Ursula

is] his resurrection and his life” (Lawrence, 1996: 420) since he knows the power hidden in women as saviours of mankind.

However Ursula and Birkin’s battle as the Great Mother and the Great Father does not come to an end even at the end of the novel. The struggle between the forces of the Great Mother and the Great Father is represented by the moon symbolism which is “one of Lawrence’s favourite symbols of the Magna Mater” (Ecker, 1995: 54) as opposed to sky and sun symbolism of masculine power which makes Gerald “glisten like sunshine” (Lawrence, 1996: 27) and Birkin’s face “gleaming like fire” (Ibid: 49). As the Great Father who seeks a balance with the Great Mother, Birkin is afraid of the power she possesses because he knows Ursula is a woman who can worship a man “with a worship of perfect possession” like “a woman worships her own infant” (Ibid: 233):

“But it seemed to him, woman was always so horrible and clutching, she had such a lust for possession, a need of self-importance in love. She wanted to have, to own, to control, to be dominant. Everything must be referred back to her, to Woman, the Great Mother of everything, out of whom proceeded everything and to whom everything must finally be rendered up. It filled him with almost insane fury, this calm assumption of the Magna Mater, that all was hers, because she had borne it. Man was hers because she had borne him. A Mater Dolorosa, she had borne him, a Magna Mater, she now claimed him again, soul and body, sex, meaning, and all. He had a horror of the Magna Mater, she was detestable.” (Ibid: 232)

Birkin has a negative view about Magna Mater which is the source of the battle between him and Ursula since he experienced the terrible, possessive side of The Great Mother’s power with Hermione:

“She was on a very high horse again was woman, the Great Mother. Did he not know it in Hermione. Hermione, the humble, the subservient, what was she all the while but the Mater Dolorosa, in her subservience, claiming with horrible, insidious arrogance and female tyranny, her own again, claiming back the man she had borne in suffering. By her very suffering and humility she bound her son with chains, she held him her everlasting prisoner. And Ursula, Ursula was the same-or the inverse. She too was the awful, arrogant queen of life, as if she were a queen bee on whom all the rest depended.” (Ibid: 232/233)

He is afraid of the Great Mother since she wants the possession of the whole in her terrible aspect leaving no chance to the balance between her and the Great Father. In the chapter “Moony”, Birkin’s attempt to destroy the moon which stands as the symbol



of the protecting mother supports his fear from the Magna Mater who is the mother of all men with a power to devour the souls of her children:

“He stood still, looking at the water, and throwing upon it the husks of the flowers.  
“Cybele- curse her! The accursed *Syria Dea*! Does one bedrudge it her! What else is there-?”

...

He stood staring at the water. Then he stooped and picked up a stone, which he threw sharply at the pond... And his shadow on the border of the pond was watching for a few moments, then he stooped and groped on the ground. Then again there was a burst of sound, then a burst of brilliant light, the moon had exploded on the water... But at the centre, the heart of all, was still a vivid, incandescent quivering of a white moon not quite destroyed, a white body of fire writhing and striving and not even now broken open, not yet violated... Birkin stood and watched, motionless, till the pond was almost calm, the moon was almost serene. Then, satisfied of so much, he looked for more stones... Like a madness, he must go on. He got large stones, and threw them, one after the other, at the white-burning centre of the moon.” (Lawrence, 1996: 285/286)

Birkin’s opposition of the negative power possessed by women is the opposition of the tendency in modern women for domination over men and anger and hatred towards the male sex which Lawrence suggests the women must liberate themselves from by turning back to their nature because “the industrial world has generated this sickness, just as it has generated equivocal sexuality in men” (Adelman, 1991: 89). Following the scene in which Hermione attacks Birkin with the ball of lapis lazuli, Birkin runs out towards the hills. He escapes from the Terrible Mother in Hermione who is created by her ambition for domination and control over man. He takes shelter in the nature which stands for both the Great Mother who secures her children and the unconscious into which Birkin sinks after Hermione’s attack. He goes along in the nature where he feels happy. To purify himself from the destructive effects of the modern world and relationships, he experiences some kind of ritual among the bushes and flowers. He gets undressed for a complete contact with nature: “He took off his clothes, and sat down naked among the primroses, moving his feet softly among the primroses, his legs, his knees, his arms right up to the armpits, lying down and letting them touch his belly, his breasts. It was such a fine, cool, subtle touch all over him, he seemed to saturate himself with their contact” (Lawrence, 1996: 128). This experience of Birkin in the isolation of wildness is a communion with nature. Additionally, it is his unification with the Magna Mater represented by earth and plants as the Great Father of vegetation whose marriage will guarantee the life on earth. The sacred marriage of the

gods or their representatives is a ritual which is told by Sir James Frazer in his The Golden Bough and which he claims to be common around the world:

“As the mate of Diana [the priest of Nemi] represented originally Dianus or Janus... His title of King of the Wood clearly indicates the sylvan character of the deity whom he served... he not only served but embodied the great Aryan god of the oak; and as an oak-god he would mate with the oak-goddess, whether she went by the name of Egeria or Diana. Their union, however consummated, would be deemed essential to the fertility of the earth and the fecundity of man and beast. Further, as the oak-god was also a god of the sky, the thunder, and the rain, so his human representative would be required, like many other divine kings, to cause the clouds to gather, the thunder to peal, and the rain to descend in due season, that the fields and orchards might bear fruit and the pastures be covered with luxuriant herbage.” (1993: 167)

Thus, Birkin’s communion with the Magna Mater of earth and plants foreshadow his union with Ursula since she is the Great Mother of fertility who will compose the sacred couple with Birkin. The rain which starts to fall when Birkin is walking towards the hills supports his sacred character as the mate of the Great Goddess and emphasizes the life-giving force embodied in them.

However, Birkin and Ursula still have to wait for perfect harmony in their relationship. Birkin needs to get purified of his fears and destructive tendencies first which are personified by Hermione as the destructive love of the female and by Gerald as Birkin’s hidden homosexuality. As opposed to Birkin’s harshness, Ursula shows the positive approach of the Good Mother and calms him down. She has this great power over him. She can either incline him to anxiety or suspend from his fears because “Lawrence’s attitude toward women is rooted in a familiar tradition of male supremacy, in which women are destroyers and restorers of men” (Adelman, 1991: 103). Therefore, Ursula creates the balance which Birkin struggles for by offering him “a piece of purple-red bell-heather” (Lawrence, 1996: 354) in return for the rings he offers her. These gifts stand for “the coming together in perfect equilibrium of masculine and feminine principles in the persons of Birkin and Ursula” (Marsh, 2000: 106) because the rings which are produced artificially as the ideal beauty are “a gift of masculinity” while the flower is “a gift of femininity” as created by nature (Ibid: 106/107). Thus, their gifts symbolize not only the perfect uniqueness both in the nature of man and woman but also the glamour created by their unity. As a result of this unity, Birkin feels “his mind [is] sweetly at ease, the life flow[s] through him as from some new fountain, he [is] as if born out of the cramp of a womb” (Lawrence, 1996: 355).

Thus, they reach the threshold of a spiritual rebirth which is explained by Jung as an “increase of personality [which] means consciousness of an enlargement that flows from inner sources” (1959: 120) as well as from the sources outside. It is completed by their sexual experience following their quarrel and offering gifts to each other. With the life-giving quality of the sexual act, both are renewed and “escape a fate analogous to that of Gerald and Gudrun” (Adelman, 1991: 103). Additionally, “Birkin is freed from his fear of becoming a self-loathing homosexual and is capable of spiritual leadership; and [Ursula] has been freed of her hatred of men” (Ibid: 103):

“After a lapse of stillness, after the rivers of strange dark fluid richness had passed over her, flooding, carrying away her mind and flooding down her spine and down her knees, past her feet, a strange flood, sweeping away everything and leaving her an essential new being, she was left quite free, she was free in complete ease, her complete self.” (Lawrence, 1996: 359)

Following this experience, Ursula and Birkin go to Sherwood Forest which is “a piece of England unspoiled by the spread of industrialization” (Adelman, 1991: 103) and where they are closer to their real selves as well as nature. Birkin was alone in his previous experience in nature; however, he is with Ursula this time which points to the completeness of their sacred union. The sacred couple of fertility, the Great Mother and the Great Father who are united finally go to nature where they reunite with the vital forces of creativity. On the way to the woods, Ursula feels the balance which is finally achieved in their affair and which is achieved only by their discovery of their real identities as man and woman: “Soon they had run on again into the darkness. She did not ask where they were going, she did not care. She sat in a fullness and a pure potency that was like apathy, mindless and immobile. She was next to him, and hung in a pure rest, as a star is hung, balanced unthinkably.” (Lawrence, 1996: 364)

The darkness of the forest stand for Ursula and Birkin’s unconscious where they take shelter from the degenerated and deadly qualities of modern life. The forest and its darkness stand for the Great Mother and the unconscious which she symbolizes with both its life-giving and life-taking aspects according to Jung:

“In this primordial world of vegetation, dependent on it and hidden in it, lives the animal world, bringing danger and salvation; under the ground the snakes and worms, uncanny and dangerous; in the water fishes, reptiles, and aquatic monsters; birds flying through the air and beasts scurrying over the earth. Roaring and hissing, milk-giving

and voracious, the animals fill the vegetative world, nestling in it like birds in a tree. And this world, too, is in transformation, bursting eggs and crawling young, corpses decomposing into earth, and life arising from swamp and muck. Everywhere mothers and suckling cubs, being born, growing, changing, devouring and devoured, killing and dying. But all this destroying, wild, terrifying animal world is overshadowed by the Great Mother as the Great World Tree, which shelters, protects, nourishes this animal world to which man feels he belongs.” (Neumann, 1963: 52)

Thus, Ursula and Birkin spend their first night together in Sherwood Forest which is the bosom of the Great Mother in which they feel happy, natural and in balance. Birkin achieves the unity with the Great Mother as the Great Father. However, he is not alone in representing the Great Father archetype like the representation of the Great Mother by Ursula, Gudrun and Hermione with her various aspects in the novel. The second representative of the Great Father archetype Gerald experiences a totally different process from Birkin.

Gerald’s physical features are described in such a way that he reminds of an ancient God from mythology. The effect continues through the novel where he is named as “the God of machine” many times. According to Clarke, Gerald himself is “hard in his muscles and full of energy as a machine” (1994: 44/45). However, he is doomed to failure and death like the dying-lover of the Great Mother because of his degenerated and destroyed life by industrialization. His end is foreshadowed again and again throughout the novel and is caused by his rejection of salvation through a woman’s love unlike Birkin. Instead, he prefers relationship with a woman like Minette, which is based on money and which stands for the shallow affairs of the twentieth century. His life is so much aimless that he himself can feel no hope despite Birkin’s efforts:

“I don’t believe I shall ever make up *my* life, at that rate.”

Birkin watched him almost angrily.

“You are a born unbeliever,” he said.

“I only feel what I feel,” said Gerald. And he looked again at Birkin almost sardonically, with his blue, manly, sharp-lighted eyes. Birkin’s eyes were at the moment full of anger. But swiftly they became troubled, doubtful, then full of a warm, rich affectionateness and laughter.

“It troubles me very much, Gerald,” he said, wrinkling his brows.

“I can see it does,” said Gerald, uncovering his mouth in a manly, quick, soldierly laugh.

...

“Don’t you feel like one of the damned?” asked Birkin, as they sat in a little, swiftly-running enclosure, and watched the hideous great street.

“No,” laughed Gerald.

“It is real death,” said Birkin.” (Lawrence, 1996: 77/78)

Death is a concept which is familiar to Gerald indeed since he causes the death of his brother when he is a boy. This tragedy clings on him like a curse and follows him everywhere:

“Gerald was Cain, if anybody. Not that he was Cain, either, although he had slain his brother. There was such a thing as pure accident, and the consequences did not attach to one, even though one had killed one’s brother in such wise. Gerald as a boy had accidentally killed his brother. What then? Why seek to draw a brand and a curse across the life that had caused the accident? A man can live by accident, and die by accident.” (Ibid: 40)

However, according to Birkin’s theory, there is not “such a thing as accident” but “it all hung together, in the deepest sense” (Ibid: 40). This is a belief which makes Gerald the hostile brother within the archetypes of twins like Cain or Romulus who slay their brothers. This darkness hidden in Gerald is the death-drive which directs his relationship with Gudrun. His death-drive gains a desire to punish himself as well with the guilt he feels:

“No man,” said Birkin, “cuts another man’s throat unless he wants to cut it, and unless the other man wants it cutting. This is a complete truth. It takes two people to make a murder: a murderer and a murderee. And a murderee is a man who is murderable. And a man who is murderable is a man who in a profound if hidden lust desires to be murdered.”

...

“It’s a nasty view of things, Gerald,” said Birkin, “and no wonder you are afraid of yourself and your own happiness.”

“How am I afraid of myself?” said Gerald; “and I don’t think I am unhappy.”

“You seem to have a lurking desire to have your gizzard slit, and imagine every man has his knife up his sleeve for you,” Birkin said. (Ibid: 48)

Her sister’s drowning in the lake increases the tragedy for Gerald because he feels guilty for her death in addition to his brother’s. He seeks peace in Birkin first whom he can not find at home, so “he then sets off for Gudrun like a drowning man making for the shallows” (Adelman, 1991: 105). When he secretly enters Gudrun’s room, he is physically described as the dying vegetation god who is destined to die: “There was about him a curious and almost godlike air of simplicity and naïve directness. He reminded her of an apparition, the young Hermes... [who] was so beautifully blond, like wheat” (Lawrence, 1996: 392). However, before his death he

seeks the healing power of the good, nurturing mother in Gudrun since he is unaware of her as “the sensation-seeking Aphrodite who drives men to their graves like beds” (Miliaras, 1987: 255):

“And she, she was the great bath of life, he worshipped her. Mother and substance of all life she was. And he, child and man, received of her and was made whole. His pure body was almost killed. But the miraculous, soft effluence of her breast suffused over him, over his seared, damaged brain, like a healing lymph, like a soft, soothing flow of life itself, perfect as if he were bathed in the womb again. His brain was hurt, seared, the tissue was as if destroyed. He had not known how hurt he was, how his tissue, the very tissue of his brain was damaged by the corrosive flood of death. Now, as the healing lymph of her effluence flowed through him, he knew how destroyed he was, like a plant whose tissue is burst from inwards by a frost.” (Lawrence, 1996: 393)

While he is happy with the new life he discovered, Gudrun who is conscious of her own destructive force knows the impossibility of their staying together. During Gerald’s sleep in Gudrun’s bed, she never sleeps. To act like the Good Mother is a torture to her. However, she endures it till morning when she wants him to go away with a cold voice, and Gerald knows “that then [is] the end” (Ibid: 397).

Gerald’s fate is drawn irrevocably when he rejects Birkin’s offer for a blood-brotherhood and chooses Gudrun. His reason for rejecting Birkin is his being unable to feel anything about a friendship between men. However, he can not feel anything for a marriage with Gudrun either. Despite this knowledge he chooses Gudrun because he knows “he would not make any pure relationship with any other soul” (Ibid: 402).

Gudrun and Gerald have much in common indeed. Like Gerald, Gudrun is a lonely soul who is damned with eternal isolation and uneasiness. Her emotions are frozen so she is unable to be happy or unhappy, but she just feels nothing:

“[Gudrun] lay perfectly still, with a still, child-like face and dark eyes, looking at him. She was lost, fallen right away.

“I shall always love you,” [Gerald] said, looking at her.

But she did not hear. She lay, looking at him as at something she could never understand, never: as a child looks at a grown-up person, without hope of understanding, only submitting... Blue evening had fallen over the cradle of snow and over the great pallid slopes. But in the heaven the peaks of snow were rosy, glistening like transcendent, radiant spikes of blossom in the heavenly upper world, so lovely and beyond. Gudrun saw all their loveliness, she *knew* how immortally beautiful they were, great pistils of rose-coloured, snow-fed fire in the blue twilight of the heaven. She could *see* it, she knew it, but she was not of it. She was divorced, debarred, a soul shut out.” (Ibid: 455)

Gudrun is alone and isolated in the world like Hermione who has “no sensuality” but only “will” and “lust for power” (Lawrence, 1996: 57) described by Birkin as “the real devil who won’t let life exist” (Ibid: 58). Although she and Ursula are sisters in flesh, Gudrun is the spiritual sister of Hermione with her demonical power.

If we group the characters of Women in Love in triangulars, we put Ursula, Birkin and Hermione together among whom the positive qualities of Ursula and the negative qualities of Hermione clash. Ursula becomes victorious at the end, which means she is able to achieve the plurality necessary for a perfect relationship. However, the triangle in which Gudrun, Gerald and the German artist Loerke whom they meet at the hotel Hohenhausen where they spend their holiday take place, is shaped in a rather different way. Unlike the first triangle in which two opposite forces embodied by Ursula and Hermione battle, in the second one two negative forces represented by Gudrun and Loerke attack on the dying-god Gerald which means there is no equality of forces.

What destroys the equality of forces and the possibility of the star-equilibrium in the relationship of Gudrun and Gerald is the dwarfish sculpture Loerke. Loerke stands for the Loki of Norse myths in some of which he “is the devil” (Clarke, 1994: 175): “Also reckoned amongst the gods is one that some call the mischiefmonger of the Æsir and the father-of-lies and the disgrace-of-gods-and-men... his name is Loki... [he] has an evil disposition and is very changeable of mood. He excelled all men in the art of cunning, and he always cheats” (Nordal, 1954: 55).

This cunning and cheating figure fits to the trickster archetype which “is a collective shadow figure, a summation of all the inferior traits of character in individuals” (Jung, 1959: 270). Likewise, Loerke is Birkin’s shadow which he finds disgusting “like a rat in the river of corruption” (Lawrence, 1996: 483). He is what Birkin is afraid of becoming and from what he is saved by Ursula because “Loerke is both homosexual and sadistic; [preferring] brutal, stupid men or thin, adolescent girls as his love-partners” (Spilka, 1957: 139). In the earlier chapters of the novel, Birkin’s tendency to become a trickster figure is emphasized:

“Now I see,” cried the Contessa excitedly, watching his purely gay motion, which he had all to himself. “Mr. Birkin, he is a changer.”

Hermione looked at her slowly, and shuddered, knowing that only a foreigner could have seen and have said this.

“*Cosa vuol dire*, Palestra?” she asked, sing-song.

“Look,” said the Contessa, in Italian. “He is not a man, he is a chameleon, a creature of change.”

“He is not a man, he is treacherous. Not one of us,” said itself over in Hermione’s consciousness. And her soul writhed in the black subjugation to him, because of his power to escape, to exist, other than she did, because he was not consistent, not a man, less than a man.” (Lawrence, 1996: 112/113)

Birkin loses much of his identity as trickster after being saved by the Good Mother embodied in Ursula. However, in the final chapters of the novel, Ursula feels uncomfortable with their holiday on the snow covered mountains and offers to leave. Thus, Birkin and Ursula leave Gudrun and Gerald to travel south where “there [are] stretches of land dark with orange trees and cypress, grey with olives” (Ibid: 490). She knows “this utterly silent, frozen world of the mountain-tops [is] not universal! One might leave it and have done with it. One might go away” (Ibid: 490). As the Magna Mater, she longs for the dark fruitful earth which is her symbol of “[bringing] forth all life from herself” (Neumann, 1963: 48). She and Birkin need to leave this frozen world of death to start live afresh. Thus, they take no part in the drama in which “Gudrun seems like the end to [Gerald]” (Lawrence, 1996: 496). While leaving Gudrun and Gerald alone in the world of ice, Birkin reminds Gerald of his love for him, which Gerald answers coldly:

“I’ve loved you, as well as Gudrun, don’t forget,” said Birkin bitterly. Gerald looked at him strangely, abstractedly.

“Have you?” he said, with icy scepticism. “Or do you think you have?” He was hardly responsible for what he said.” (Ibid: 497)

Although “something [freezes] Birkin’s heart, seeing them standing there in the isolation of the snow” (Ibid: 497), he leaves Gerald to the terrible hands of the life-taking Magna Mater Gudrun. “Knowing Gudrun’s nature, and intuitively recognizing Loerke’s” he should definitely “have been his brother’s keeper” (Miliaras, 1987: 262), but he does not. Gerald’s words to Birkin in their last conversation are heart-breaking; however, he is injured by the betrayal of Birkin who becomes the hostile brother now as well as the trickster. Thus, Birkin and Loerke emerge in the final chapters as true spiritual twins who cause Gerald’s fall.



As soon as Ursula and Birkin leave, the love and hate relationship between Gudrun and Gerald is divulged more freely. Gerald is mad with fury since he is trapped under Gudrun's spell and suffers badly. He thinks the only way to be free again is to kill Gudrun because "it seem[s] to him that death [is] the only severing of this Gordian knot" (Lawrence, 1996: 500) which ties him to this Goddess of Death. He is aware of the fact that in order "to exist at all, he must be perfectly free of Gudrun" (Ibid: 503). However, he is not able to. Conversely, Gudrun and Loerke injure this dying-god to death in every opportunity:

"A strange rent had been torn in him; like a victim that is torn open and given to the heavens, so he had been torn apart and given to Gudrun. How should he close again? This wound, this strange, infinitely-sensitive opening of his soul, where he was exposed, like an open flower, to all the universe, and in which he was given to his complement, the other, the unknown, this wound, this disclosure, this unfolding of his own covering, leaving him incomplete, limited, unfinished, like an open flower under the sky, this was his cruellest joy. Why then should he forgo it?" (Ibid: 503)

Gerald is aware of the affair between Gudrun and Loerke although he seems ignorant. He hates Loerke "as a noxious insect" (Ibid: 505), but he feels a strange pleasure from this torture at the same time like the voluntary victims sacrificed themselves for their Great Goddess. Sir James Frazer mentions these priests who wound and castrate themselves in honour of the goddess in The Golden Bough: "Asiatic goddesses of fertility were served by... eunuch priests. These feminine deities required to receive from their male ministers, who personated the divine lovers, the means of discharging their beneficent functions: they had themselves to be impregnated by the life-giving energy before they could transmit it to the world" (1993: 349). Like the priests of the Asiatic goddesses, Gerald sacrifices himself to the Great Goddess whom Gudrun represents. However, Gudrun is not the fertility goddess. Yet, Gerald's sacrifice is necessary for starting the vital flow of a new life.

Gerald does not keep himself away from the torture which Gudrun and Loerke cause. He gives himself pain like the voluntary victims again. He spends his time together with Gudrun and Loerke at the hotel unless he goes ski-ing and patiently endures Gudrun's attacks who "look[s] like a vivid Medusa" (Lawrence, 1996: 507) or Lilith together with "her ally, the old-Logos, Satan, the fallen angel, the new prince of Darkness" (Miliaras, 1987: 286) represented by Loerke. However, he does not have

much power as there is no one supporting him, not even Birkin. Therefore, he is fragile and feels like losing his patience: “But he felt something icy gathering at his heart. This strange mood of patience and innocence which had persisted in him for some days was passing away, he would be left again a prey to the horrible passions and tortures” (Lawrence, 1996: 519).

Gudrun continues her cruelty and ignores the man in Gerald whom she has created and who is full of hatred for her. She wants to pass by and forget as if nothing has happened as if Gerald is not tortured so much, which tortures him more:

“A sudden desire leapt in his heart to kill her. He thought what a perfect voluptuous fulfilment it would be to kill her... Then he would have had her finally and for ever; there would be such a perfect voluptuous finality. Gudrun was unaware of what he was feeling, he seemed so quiet and amiable, as usual.

...

“I have been thinking, Gerald,” she said, with an insulting nonchalance, “that I shall not go back to England.”

“Oh,” he said, “where will you go then?”

But she ignored his question. She had her own logical statement to make, and it must be made as she had thought it.

“I can’t see the use of going back,” she continued. “It is over between me and you--”

She paused for him to speak. But he said nothing. He was only talking to himself, saying: “Over, is it? I believe it is over. But it isn’t finished. Remember, it isn’t finished. We must put some sort of a finish on it. There must be a conclusion, there must be finality.” (Ibid: 520)

Gudrun is tortured by Gerald’s inability to stand on his own feet, she feels “under the intolerable burden of her thoughts, and her sensations” (Ibid: 524). However, she defends herself against her own thoughts: “What then! Was she his mother? Had she asked for a child, whom she must nurse through the nights, for her lover. She despised him, she despised him, she hardened her heart. An infant crying in the night, this Don Juan. Ooh, but how she hated the infant crying in the night. She would murder it gladly” (Ibid: 526). Despite the ebbs and flows in her heart and her hesitations, Gudrun can not help her deadly features to be effective. She is in a strange joy on the day Gerald dies to hide death beneath:

“To Gudrun this day was full of a promise like spring. She felt an approaching release, a new fountain of life rising up in her. It gave her pleasure to dawdle through her packing, it gave her pleasure to dip into books, to try on her different garments, to look at herself in the glass. She felt a new lease of life was come upon her, and she was

happy like a child, very attractive and beautiful to everybody, with her soft, luxuriant figure, and her happiness. Yet underneath was death itself.” (Lawrence, 1996: 527/528)

Gudrun feels like on a “threshold of all possibility” where “death was inevitable” (Ibid: 528) which trembles her with excitement. “She [does] not want things to materialize” (Ibid: 528) any more but only ambiguity and corruption as the Terrible Mother together with the cheater Loerke. Both are satanic figures waiting for the doomsday in enthusiasm:

“They played with the past, and with the great figures of the past, a sort of little game of chess, or marionettes, all to please themselves. They had all the great men for their marionettes, and they two were the God of the snow, working it all. As for the future, that they never mentioned except one laughed out some mocking dream of the destruction of the world by a ridiculous catastrophe of man’s invention: a man invented such a perfect explosive that it blew the earth in two, and the two halves set off in different directions through space, to the dismay of the inhabitants: or else the people of the world divided into two halves, and each half decided it was perfect and right, the other half was wrong and must be destroyed; so another end of the world. Or else, Loerke’s dream of fear, the world went cold, and snow fell everywhere, and only white creatures, Polar bears, white foxes, and men like awful white snow-birds, persisted in icy cruelty.” (Ibid: 511)

Loerke’s dream reminds of the Nordic Ragnarök, when the whole world will be captured under snow in an eternal winter:

“The wolf will swallow the sun and that will seem a great disaster to men. Then another wolf will seize the moon and that one too will do great harm. The stars will disappear from heaven. Then this will come to pass, the whole surface of the earth and the mountains will tremble so [violently] that trees will be uprooted from the ground, mountains will crash down, and all fetters and bonds will be snapped and severed. The wolf Fenrir will get loose then. The sea will lash against the land because the Miðgarð Serpent is writhing in giant fury trying to come ashore.” (Nordal, 1954: 86/87)

As this final day approaches, the death of the dying-god Gerald approaches as well who represents the Nordic dying-god Balder slayed by the tricks of Loki. Gudrun and Loerke do not act directly but “proceed to slay the once confident and powerful industrial magnate with words and looks, just as Balder was slain by the insignificant mistletoe” (Miliaras, 1987: 282). Thus, Gerald undergoes a mythological process in which he turns to the dying-god Balder from the powerful Odin-Tyr figure. He is similar with Christ figure as well who chooses to die “below the *Marienhütte*, a way station dedicated to the Virgin Mary, the Christian counterpart of the Indo-Germanic, Celtic, and Oriental Great Goddesses, by a crucifix of Jesus” (Ibid: 282): “There was

something standing out of the snow. He approached with dimmest curiosity. It was a half-buried crucifix, a little Christ under a little sloping hood at the top of a pole. He sheered away. Somebody was going to murder him. He had a great dread of being murdered. But it was a dread which stood outside him like his own ghost” (Lawrence, 1996: 534). This place where the icy doomsday takes place and which becomes the centre of the death and rebirth cycle is described by Lawrence as the world navel which is “the point of entry” into “the symbolic circle of the universe... around which the world may be said to revolve” (Campbell, 1968: 40/41): “Beneath this spot is the earth-supporting head of the cosmic serpent, the dragon, symbolical of the waters of the abyss, which are the divine life-creative energy and substance of the demiurge, the world-generative aspect of immortal being” (Ibid: 41).

The Tyrol Mountains where the couples go to spend their holiday reminds the world navel when the endless birth-death-rebirth process goes on: “When the two couples first come to the Tyrol inn, ... the mountains rise up before them and cradle between their icy slopes a great white valley, a cul-de-sac of snow and mountains which Lawrence calls “the centre, the knot, the navel of the world, where the earth belonged to the skies, pure, unapproachable, impassable” (Spilka, 1957: 141/142).

The description of the world navel on the Tyrol Mountains has great similarity with the world centre in the deepest point of hell pictured by Dante in The Divine Comedy. The centre of the world is the place where Satan is prisoned. Cold and ice rules over there where the great beating wings of Satan cause the icy wind called Cocytus which is the source of evil. Dante portrays the place as “ice at the center to which flow all the rivers of guilt; and as [Satan] beats his great wings as if to escape, their icy wind only freezes him more surely into the polluted ice” (The Norton Anthology, 1985: 1419) Following Gerald’s death in this world navel as a god sacrificed for rebirth, Gudrun still continues her terrible qualities which make her unable to cry even. She feels nothing and can not “escape the cold devil of irony that froze her soul” (Lawrence, 1996: 536):

“Ursula came straight up to her.

“Gudrun!” she cried, the tears running down her cheeks.

...

“Ha, ha!” she thought, “this is the right behaviour.”

But she could not weep, and the sight of her cold, pale, impassive face soon stopped the fountain of Ursula's tears. (Lawrence, 1996: 536)

Finally, witnessing the hardness and coldness in Gudrun's heart, Birkin regrets for both his leaving Gerald alone and Gerald's rejecting his love offer which makes him a "denier" (Ibid: 541). For Birkin, if Gerald accepted his offer, they could unite against the deadly power of the Terrible Mother represented by Gudrun as the Great Fathers. However, they do not. Instead of Birkin's love, Gerald chooses "to break himself in the struggle with Gudrun Brangwen" (Spilka, 1957: 164) Thus, they "conform to the 'hostile twin'... archetypes for both refuse to participate in the joint effort to overcome the destructive and coercive principle in society by joining forces against it (Miliaras, 1987: 271) which makes them the fallen heroes of this tragic end. This is a tragic end in which both the machine world of Gerald and the love theories of Birkin collapse.

To sum up, Lawrence puts forward his ideas about the future of the world and mankind in Women in Love which is also called as his "Book of the Dead" (Friedman, 2000: 208). The name is appropriate because of the pessimism and the following deaths in The Crich family. However, as mentioned before, this pessimism and the obsession of Lawrence in Women in Love is not an unhealthy thing. On the contrary, death is a step on the way to rebirth which composes the main idea of the novel when it comes to its end.

## CONCLUSION

This study has attempted to analyze D.H.Lawrence's use of myth, mythical patterns and archetypes in his efforts to express his world view by using a Jungian approach. An analysis of the archetypes which he employs in his works sheds light on both his development as a writer and the development of his ideas about mankind, the society and the world. The idea of this study is the development of Lawrence's myth, mythical patterns and archetypes from the limited area of the individual to the larger area of the society. Focusing upon the two novels, Sons and Lovers and Women in Love by D.H.Lawrence, it is clear that he starts to express his ideas on the private world of the individual first, and then, he shifts to the broader world which is composed of the private worlds of individuals who make up the society.

While following the development both in Lawrence and the myths, mythical patterns and the archetypes he employs, it is essential to take account of the period in which Lawrence lived and wrote. Lawrence is a writer of the Modern Period whose writing is called modern because of some features it has such as his emphasis upon the psychology of his characters despite its tendencies to the nineteenth century realism. Modern Period was a period in which great changes both in the social and the economical areas took place. The changes in the social field ended up in new formations of culture, ideology, religion and philosophy which enlarged Lawrence's perspective and put him also in a developmental process as an individual and a writer at the same time. Lawrence deals with individuals in search of their authentic selves in all his works since he believes there is a fragmentation between the body and soul of the modern man in the twentieth century. He scrutinizes the problems created by the twentieth century such as the corruption of the inner world of the individual, the disruption of the harmony in the family and the relationships between the family members, parents and children and men and women. He criticizes modernity because of the alienation and the isolation which it created in the modern society. He longs for the

golden past in which values such as equality, brotherhood, justice and freedom were valid. He is anxious for the society which expected benevolent results from the economical and technological developments but which found death, sorrow and destruction instead. Thus, Lawrence's main purpose in his writing is to restore man to the unity which he possessed in the past which is not alive anymore. Therefore, he focuses upon the psychology of the modern man and his inner world in his works. While doing so, he makes use of the myths, mythical patterns and archetypes which are the gates opening to the forgotten parts of the human psyche and which, he believes, will be helpful in restoring mankind to his previous state when he had a perfect unity between his body and soul.

In Sons and Lovers, Lawrence focuses on the individual tragedy of Paul Morel who is brought up in a collier's family. Paul's father, Walter Morel is a worker who is simply alienated from his work, his family and finally from himself under the hard conditions of his living. Likewise, Paul's mother, Gertrude Morel is a woman degenerated by the twentieth century impact upon the family as an institution. She is a woman who has the control of her children's lives who lack the feeling of the existence and authority of a father in the family because of the changing life standards. These paralyzed relationships between the members of the family prepare the tragedy of Paul Morel which is investigated in detail by Lawrence with references to his psychological development. Following Sons and Lovers Lawrence tells the family tragedy in The Rainbow which is not included in this study. The Rainbow witnesses England on the way to full industrialization which will put an end to everything belonging to the old world. Women in Love comes after The Rainbow, in which we see a society which is about to corrupt wholly as a result of industrialization, mechanization and the trauma caused by them in all fields of life. Thus, it can be claimed that "all three novels [of Lawrence] together... can be seen as telling one story: the story of the struggle into being and towards a 'complete' relationship" (Marsh, 2000: 170).

Unlike Sons and Lovers, which lays stress upon Paul Morel's private life and relationships with other people, Women in Love is based upon the relationship between two couples whose experiences and fates imply universal conclusions. Lawrence expands and extends the scope of his work and archetypes. His archetypes turn into universal archetypes, which stand for more than themselves. Lawrence's universal

archetypes reflect the main dilemmas modern man is confronted with. The spiritual sterility of modern man and the dilemma of modern man led Lawrence to look for some universal archetypes to which modern man can cling. First of all, the women characters of the couples, the sisters Ursula and Gudrun stand for the Great Mother archetype which holds both life and death in her hands. However, each represents one aspect of the archetype, thus, “if Ursula is the Magna Dea in her creative aspect, Gudrun is Hecate, a Queen of the Night” (Clarke, 1994: 215). Likewise, the men characters, Birkin and Gerald represent the Great Father archetype which is in a constant fight with the Great Mother for the desired balance in the universe which constitutes the archetype of equality. While Birkin mates with Ursula and shares her productive feature, Gerald becomes the symbol of death in his association with the Death Goddess Gudrun. Therefore, the couples become the symbols representing the inevitable fate of the society and the hope for a new beginning which are the concepts embodied in the archetypes of death and rebirth. Lawrence believes in the necessity of death before a rebirth. For Lawrence, the process of dissolution or disintegration is a natural part of the process of growth and creation. Only when the process of corruption is denied decay becomes unhealthy and perverse.

The consequences of dissolution and disintegration are discussed in Women in Love. Finally, Lawrence’s assertion in Women in Love is his belief “that new life depends on death” (Phillips, 1990: 13). That is why “death is the act from which all the other acts in the novel derive their significance” (Doherty, 1999: 61). As emphasized by Birkin various times in the novel, the modern society is in need of a rebirth “supposing this old social state [will be] broken and destroyed” (Lawrence, 1996: 123). Moreover, for Birkin “mankind is a dead tree, covered with fine brilliant galls of people” (Ibid: 150) which has to undergo destruction before shooting out afresh.

Gerald, who personifies the death and rebirth process, is “a chained wolf in his relations with Pussums, in his reorganization of the mines, in his contempt for Loerke, and in his icy death” (Clarke, 1994: 99) who has great role in the beginning of the Nordic doomsday whose images dominate the whole novel. He is the dying-god figure whom Lawrence employs “as metaphor for individuals or whole civilizations in need of rebirth” (Phillips, 1990: 138). Thus, Gerald stands for the modern man as part of mechanization, who is violently torn apart from his “inorganic body, that is, nature



apart from the human body itself” (Josephson, 1963: 99). Nature stands for both the surroundings of man and his inner world at the same time. Thus, “to say that man lives on nature means that nature is his body with which he must remain in constant and vital contact in order not to die. And to say that man’s physical and spiritual life is linked to nature is simply an expression of the interdependence of all natural forces, for man himself is part of nature” (Ibid: 99). As a result, Gerald and the modern society which he stands for is doomed to die because of their rejection of both nature as a part of their existence and their own nature as man, not machine.

Contrary to Gudrun and Gerald, Ursula and Birkin represent the hopeful rebirth of the society into a fresh and fuller life which is only possible by “examining and transforming all our established patterns of thought, feeling, action, and reaction” (Poplawski, 1993: 37). All the characters of the novel are transformed indeed, however, “Birkin and Ursula move positively and confidently toward greater creative potentiality” which makes Gerald’s death “a *bitter* tragedy precisely because it could have been otherwise... as the achievement of Birkin and Ursula demonstrates” (Ibid: 37). Like Gerald, Gudrun lacks the belief necessary to turn the transformation process towards a fresh existence.

In his search for the unity of man’s body and soul, Lawrence turned back to the harmony of the previous ages which he represented by his usage of earth and nature archetypes. Thus, he resisted the damage caused by industrialism and technology. The expansion of machinery and all technological equipment among people resulted in their isolation, which means a break between their past and present as well as a break between them and the others. To alter this fact, Lawrence appealed to nature and saw nature as the only way to salvation of the modern man for whom the modern reality was insufficient. The harmony hidden in myths and archetypes which are the oldest and the most rooted realities of mankind seemed Lawrence as the only way out of the modern chaos which is associated with rootlessness and decay. With a return to this harmony which is reminded by the primordial images he used, Lawrence aimed to fight against alienation, isolation and mechanization which cleaned out past values. He aimed to resist the machine culture represented by Gerald in Women in Love and to revitalise humanity and its forgotten values. Thus, technology and industrialization became his main enemies against which he endlessly struggled. Lawrence’s usage of

myths, mythological patterns and archetypes provided a universal quality to his works as well, which can be summarized as a search for the lost self of the modern man.

To sum up, he believed that restoring the self back for the modern man is only possible by restoring his connection with nature which will be followed by his connection with his unconscious, surroundings and the others around him. Only then can the modern man achieve the unity of his body and soul which is necessary for his happiness. That is why he concluded Women in Love both in a pessimistic and optimistic tone. The optimistic tone stands for Lawrence's belief in an approaching rebirth while the pessimistic tone strongly emphasizes the seriousness of the situation. However, his feelings of "the spring coming back, the youth surging in" (Friedman, 2000: 209) which he wrote in a letter during the war proves his choosing life despite his pessimism.

## REFERENCES

- Abrams, M.H. (1993). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Adelman, Gary. (1991). *Snow of Fire: Symbolic Meaning in The Rainbow and Women in Love*, New York, Garland Publishing Inc.
- Bergonzi, Bernard. (1986). *The Myth of Modernism and Twentieth Century Literature*, Great Britain, The Harvester Press Ltd.
- Blanning, T.C.W., ed. (1996). *The Oxford Illustrated History of Modern Europe*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Bloch, Marc. (1961). *Feudal Society: Volume 1- The Growth of Ties of Dependence*, Trans: L.A.Manyon, England, The University of Chicago Press.
- Bradbury, Malcolm and James McFarlane, ed. (1991). *Modernism 1890-1930*, England, Penguin Books.
- Bulfinch, Thomas. (1993). *Bulfinch's Mythology: The Age of Fable, The Age of Chivalry, Legends of Charlamenge*, New York, The Modern Library.
- Burns, Aidan. (1980). *Nature and Culture in D.H. Lawrence*, New Jersey, Barnes & Noble.
- Campbell, Joseph. (1968). *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Carpentier, Martha C. (1998). *Ritual, Myth and The Modernist Text. The Influence of Jane Ellen Harrison on Joyce, Eliot, and Woolf*, Amsterdam, Gordon and Breach Publishers.
- Cassier, Ernest. (1946). *The Myth of the State*, New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Chase, Richard. (1969). *Quest for Myth*, New York, Greenwood Press, Publishers.
- Childs, Peter. (2000). *Modernism*, London, Routledge.
- Clarke, Colin. (1994). *D.H. Lawrence The Rainbow and Women in Love: A Casebook*, London, Macmillan Press Ltd.

- Doherty, Gerald. (1999). *Theorizing Lawrence*, New York, Peter Lang Publishing.
- Doty, William G. (1986). *Mythography. The Study of Myths and Rituals*, Alabama, University of Alabama Press.
- Driskill, Richard T. (1999). *Madonnas and Maidens Sexual Confusion in Lawrence and Gide*, New York, Peter Lang Publishing.
- Eagleton, Terry. (1996). *Literary Theory*, USA, Blackwell Publishing.
- Ebbatson, Roger. (1980). *Lawrence and the Nature Tradition: A Theme in English Fiction 1859-1914*, Great Britain, The Harvester Press Ltd.
- Ecker, Michael. (1995). *The Serpent of the Sun D.H. Lawrence's Moral Ego Revisited*, New York, The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Eysteinnsson, Astradur. (1990). *The Concept of Modernism*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Faulkner, Peter. (1977). *Modernism*, London, Methuen.
- Faulkner, Peter, ed.(1986). *A Modernist Reader: Modernism in Enland 1910-1930*, London, B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Feinstein, Elaine. (1993). *Lawrence's Women*, London, HarperCollins Publishers.
- Frazer, James George. (1993). *The Golden Bough. A Study in Magic and Religion*, Great Britain, Wordsworth Editions Ltd.
- Freud, Sigmund. (1960). *Totem and Taboo: Resemblances Between the Psychic Lives of Savages and Neurotics*, New York, Vintage Books.
- Freud, Sigmund. (1974). *The Ego and the Id*, London, The Hogarth Press.
- Friedman, Alan W. (2000). *D.H.Lawrence: Pleasure and Death*, Studies in the Novel, Academic Research Library, [www.highbeam.com](http://www.highbeam.com) (20.05.2008).
- Frosh, Stephen. (1991). *Identity Crisis: Modernity, Psychoanalysis and the Self*, England, Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Gayley, Charles Mills. (1939). *The Classic Myths in English Literature and in Art*, USA, Xerox College Publishing.
- Gould, Eric. (1981). *Mythical Intentions in Modern literature*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Guerin, L.F, Labor E., Morgan L. and Willingham, J. (1979). *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*, New York, Harper & Row Publishers.

- Hall, Calvin S. and Vernon J. Nordby. (1973). *A Primer of Jungian Psychology*, New York, Taplinger Publishing Co., Inc.
- Hewitt, Douglas. (1988). *English Fiction of the Early Modern Period 1890-1940*, London, Longman.
- Hirai, Masako. (1998). *Sisters in Literature*, Great Britain, Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Homer. (1991). *The Odyssey*, England, Penguin Books.
- Josephson, Eric and Mary. (1963). *Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society*, Ed: with an Introduction, by Josephson, Eric and Mary, New York, A Laurel Edition.
- Jung, Carl. (1933). *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, Trans: W. S. Dell and Cary F. Boynes, San Diego, Harvest/HBJ Book.
- Jung, Carl. (1953). *Psychological Reflections*, Ed: Jolande Jacobi, New York, Pantheon Books.
- Jung, Carl. (1958). *Psychology and Religion: West and East*, New York, Princeton University Press.
- Jung, Carl. (1959). *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Jung, Carl. (1966). *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature*, New York, Princeton University Press.
- Jung, Carl. (1982). *Aspects of the Feminine*, London, Ark Paperbacks.
- Lash John. (1993). *Twins and the Double*, London, Thames and Hudson.
- Lawrence, D.H. (1995). *Sons and Lovers*, England, Penguin Books Ltd.
- Lawrence, D.H. (1996). *Women in Love*, England, Penguin Books Ltd.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (1995). England: Longman Group Ltd.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. (1948). *Magic, Science, and Religion and Other Essays*, New York, Anchor.
- Marsh, Nicholas. (2000). *D.H. Lawrence: The Novels*, New York, St. Martin's Press.
- Meisel, Perry. (1987). *The Myth of the Modern: A Study in British Literature and Criticism after 1850*, New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Meletinsky, Elezar. M. (1998). *The Poetics of Myth*, Trans. Guy Lavone and Alexander Sacletsky, New York, Garland Publishing Inc.
- Miliaras, Barbara A. (1987). *Pillar of Flame: The Mythological Foundations of D.H.*

- Lawrence's Sexual Philosophy*, New York, Peter Lang Publishing.
- Neumann, Erich. (1963). *The Great Mother*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Nordal, Sigurdur. (1954). *The Prose Edda of Snorri Sturluson Tales From Norse Mythology*, Trans: Jean I. Young, USA, University of California Press.
- O'Flaherty, Wendy Doniger. (1988). *Other Peoples' Myths: The Cave of Echoes*, New York, Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Philips, K. J. (1990). *Dying God in Twentieth Century Fiction*, London, Associated University Press.
- Poplawski, Paul. (1993). *Promptings of Desire: Creativity and the Religious Impulse in the Works of D.H. Lawrence*, USA, Greenwood Press.
- Sālgado, Gamini. (1982). *A Preface to D.H. Lawrence*, England, Pearson Education Ltd.
- Selden, Raman. (1997). *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*, Great Britain, Hartnolls Ltd.
- Sheehan, Paul. (2002). *Modernism, Narrative and Humanism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Spilka, Mark. (1957). *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, USA, Indiana University Press.
- Stillman, Peter. R. (1985). *Introduction to Myth*, New York, Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Sumner, Rosemary. (2000). *A Route to Modernism: Hardy, Lawrence, Woolf*, New York, St. Martin's Press.
- The Nibelungenlied*. (1969). Trans: by A.T. Hatto, England, Penguin Books.
- The Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces. (1985). Ed: Maynard Mack, New York, W.W.Norton.
- Vickery, J. B. (1973). *The Literary Impact of The Golden Bough*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Voragine, Jacobus de. (1994). *The Golden Legend*, Trans. Granger Ryan and Helmut Ripperger, New Hampshire, Ayer Company, Publishers, Inc.
- Wright, Elizabeth. (1984). *Psychoanalytic Criticism: Theory*, London, Methuen.

## VITA

Name and Surname: Meltem UZUNOĞLU ERTEN

Mother's name: Asuman

Father's name: Tevfik

Birth Place and Date: Denizli/1982

B.A.: Ege University  
Faculty of Letters  
English Language and Literature Department

Graduation Date: 2004

Work Place and Position: Pamukkale University  
School of Foreign Languages -Instructor