

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
Department of Foreign Literature



**A Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism of D. H.
Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* with its
Possibility of Patriarchal Subversion**

By
Kedist Belete

June, 2012

**A Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism of D. H.
Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* with its
Possibility of Patriarchal Subversion**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Foreign
Literature in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for
Master of Arts in Literature**

By: Kedist Belete

Advisor: Dr. Pradeep Sharma

June, 2012

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Kedist Belete, entitled: A Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism of D.H. Lawrence's Novel, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and its possibility of Patriarchal Subversion and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Foreign Literature complies with the regulations of the university and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Dr. Pradeep Sharma (Advisor)

Signature

Date

Dr. Melakneh Mengistu (Examiner)

Signature

Date

Dr. Berhanu Matthews (Examiner)

Signature

Date

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Olga Yazbee for the suggestions she provided me with at the beginning to come up with ideas to carry out this project as she did the same when I wrote my undergraduate senior essay on a Feministic Criticism of Ibsen's *A Doll's House*.

When I approached her, she first asked me what I was planning to work on and I replied, I wanted to present a critique of the work(s) of D. H. Lawrence. She then suggested to me on how I could use both feministic and psychoanalytic approaches eclectically.

Based on her suggestions, as I did a reading, I stumbled upon the new burgeoning field of criticism which is called Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism that stands on its own and I found it to be the most appropriate theory for the work that I was planning to carry out.

Next, I approached my advisor, Dr. Pradeep Sharma with the idea and he was kind enough to allow me to see into it and asked me to come up with a proposal. After that, he has always been kind, understanding and always there for me anytime I needed his support. His inputs have always been exceptional and he has been guiding me throughout the writing of this work. I am indebted to him deeply.

Finally, I would like to thank GOD, the ONE who never gives up on those who put their trust in HIM.

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Prologue	vii
Key Terms	viii
Abstract	x
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.1.1. D.H. Lawrence	1
1.1.2. Lawrence and <i>Sons and Lovers</i>	4
1.1.3. Lady Chatterley's Lover	7
1.2. Statement of the Problem	9
1.3. Objectives of the Study	9
1.4. Research Questions	10
1.5. Significance of the Study	10
1.6. Methodology	11
2. Review of Related Literature	12
2.1. The Development of Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism	16
2.1.1. Feministic Criticism and Psychoanalysis during Post-structuralism	16
2.1.2. Feminism, Psychoanalysis and Literary Interpretation	18
3. Conceptual Framework: Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism	25
4. Analysis	30
4.1. The Beginning	30
4.2. Constance: Married Life	31
4.3. Life before Marriage	32
4.4. The First World War	34
4.5. Clifford: Crippled	35
4.6. Connie's Affair with Michaelis	38

4.7. Clifford and His Friends	39
4.8. Connie: Feeling down	42
4.9. Clifford's Suggestion for a Baby: An Heir	44
4.10. Mellors Walked into Constance's Life	45
4.11. Connie's Desire to Mother a Child and Her Dilemma	47
4.12. Constance Found Real Love in Mellors	47
5. Conclusion	49
Bibliography	52

Prologue

We cannot be good citizens – either of a particular country or of the world – by succumbing to the endless forces operating worldwide that encourage us to remain ignorant, to follow blindly, whether in the form of blind nationalism, blind religiosity, or blind chauvinism in all its manifold guises. One of the keys to counteracting those forces which would keep us in darkness lies in education, and in particular in the process which forms the core of education: the individual and institutional practice of reading, of close, careful, critical reading. Such reading entails a great deal more than merely close attention to the words on the page, or the text as it immediately confronts us. We need to know why a text was written, for whom it was written, what religious or moral or political purposes motivated it, as well as its historical and cultural circumstances. Then, indeed, we can move on to the issues of its style, its language, its structure, and its deployment of rhetorical and literary techniques.

(Habib, 2005: 1-2)

Key Terms

Unconscious - the irrational part of the psyche unavailable to a person's consciousness except through dissociated acts or dreams.

Freud's model of the psyche:

- **Id** - completely unconscious part of the psyche that serves as a storehouse of our desires, wishes, and fears. The id houses the libido, the source of psychosexual energy.
- **Ego** - mostly to partially (a point of debate) conscious part of the psyche that processes experiences and operates as a referee or mediator between the id and superego.
- **Superego** - often thought of as one's "conscience"; the superego operates "like an internal censor [encouraging] moral judgments in light of social pressures."

Lacan's model of the psyche:

- **Imaginary** - a preverbal/verbal stage in which a child (around 6-18 months of age) begins to develop a sense of separateness from her mother as well as other people and objects; however, the child's sense of sense is still incomplete.
- **Symbolic** - the stage marking a child's entrance into language (the ability to understand and generate symbols); in contrast to the imaginary stage, largely focused on the mother, the symbolic stage shifts attention to the father who, in Lacanian theory, represents cultural norms, laws, language, and power (the symbol of power is the **phallus**--an arguably "gender-neutral" term).
- **Real** - an unattainable stage representing all that a person is not and does not have. Both Lacan and his critics argue whether the real order represents the period before the imaginary order when a child is completely fulfilled--without need or lack, or if the real order follows the symbolic order and represents our "perennial lack" (because we cannot return to the state of wholeness that existed before language).

Psychoanalysis: is defined as a psychological theory conceived in the late 19th and early 20th centuries by Austrian neurologist Sigmund Freud. This theory has been criticized and also

expanded and developed in different directions mostly by Freud's students like Karen Horney and later by 'neo-Freudians' of these one is Jacques Lacan.

And its 'basic tenets' are stated as follows:

1. Human behavior, experience, and cognition are largely determined by irrational drives; those drives are largely unconscious;
2. Attempts to bring those drives into awareness meet psychological resistance in the form of defense mechanisms;
3. Beside the inherited constitution of personality, one's development is determined by events in early childhood;
4. Conflicts between conscious view of reality and unconscious (repressed) material can result in mental disturbances such as neurosis, neurotic traits, anxiety, depression etc.;
5. The liberation from the effects of the unconscious material is achieved through bringing this material into the consciousness (via e.g. skilled guidance).

Abstract

D. H. Lawrence's novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928) was initially, especially after the 1960 trial, hailed as a great achievement in depiction of tender love as the foundation of an emotionally satisfying life for men and women. However, after 1970, the novel started getting critical attention from leading feminist critics who took Lawrence to task for what they perceived in the novel a thinly disguised patriarchal ideology, as endorsing only the male-centered view of sexuality and heterosexual relationship as the only emotionally satisfying sexual preference. The idea of womanhood as seeking pleasure and emotional fulfillment only through mothering has also attracted attention of some critics.

The present study tries to look at the novel from psychoanalytic feministic perspective with the view that since Lawrence spoke openly against British mainstream culture, especially presenting in his novels a pithy criticism of the prevalent colonialist capitalist mindset and the prejudice of the bourgeoisie against working class people, he does stand for women's freedom as well, and therefore, he does not endorse a patriarchal ideology. Thus, the present study is a modest attempt to show that the feminist reading of Lawrence's novels, especially of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, is definitely a misreading which doesn't take into consideration Lawrence's views on the industrialist capitalist world, the world torn apart through World War I and his anticipation of the stress on the unconscious, the body and the irrational motives in various areas of contemporary criticism.

The present study, through a reading of the novel from the psychoanalytic feministic perspective, arrives at the conclusion that *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is an attempt to find a solution to the problems of man-woman relationship which, Lawrence felt, had gone completely out of focus and thus scattered.

1. Introduction

Trying to understand some aspects of how and why we behave and do the things as we do is better than judging, disrespecting and mistreating one another as it may keep us from self destruction. And reading literature critically may be one of the ways in which individuals may come to learn about themselves as well as others given the fact that a work of literature could be considered as one of the possible places to encounter and see different types of human natures at work as they are revealed through characters that make up the imaginary world of literary texts.

By its very nature literature is an interdisciplinary field of study and is highly interrelated to subject matters that deal with individuals and society at large like psychology, sociology, ideology, linguistics, psychoanalysis, etc. And, the subject matter of literary theory and criticism which may come about as a result of this interdisciplinary nature of the subject may provide students of literature with different possible tools to critically read works of literature.

Students may use different theories available to critically read, analyze and interpret literary works so as an in-depth understanding of a literary work could be reached at and at the same time a better understanding of the characters could be had, hence a possible better understanding of human nature. This effort, if undertaken properly, could play a significant role in safeguarding us from self destruction and may help us to flourish.

Keeping all that in mind I have embarked upon the study of D.H. Lawrence's well-known and last novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover* as I feel that Lawrence had a vision to share with the humanity, to save the fundamental man-woman relationship from going astray which is clearly enunciated in the novel selected for this study.

1.1. Background of the Study

1.1.1. D.H. Lawrence

David Herbert Richards Lawrence who was born on the 11th of September 1885 is one of England's 20th century novelists, whose works were published under the name of D.H. Lawrence. His parents were 'a barely literate miner' by the name of Arthur John Lawrence and 'a former school mistress' called Lydia (née Beardshall) and he spent his formative years

in the coal mining town of Eastwood, Nottinghamshire. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/D._H._Lawrence)

Lawrence being a sickly baby was confined to bed most of his early childhood and as a result became very much attached to his mother, Lydia. (Lawrence, 2005: IX) And this, “psychologically intimate relationship with his mother would serve as the grounds for many of his novels” (Lawrence, 2005: V). Arthur and Lydia, as husband and wife, did not get along well and Lawrence later on described his parents’ marriage in short as “one carnal, bloody fight.” (2005: V)

In the work of Ellman (1994), it is stated how Lawrence “was an avowed irrationalist who saw the modern industrial world as sexually repressive and as having stunted human potential.” (p. 561) And it is also added that how “in his own highly idiosyncratic way, Lawrence anticipates the stress on the unconscious, the body and the irrational motives in various areas of contemporary criticism.” (Ibid., 561) This aspect of Lawrence’s anticipation would be one of the aspects that will be tried to be revealed in this project that looks at one of the author’s novels, ‘*Lady Chatterley’s Lover*’ using psychoanalytic feminist criticism.

In his works, this so called irrationalist author “... confronts issues relating to emotional health and vitality, spontaneity, and instinct” (Wikipedia). Lawrence was also one of the neo-romantic critics in England who reacted against “the rationalism of the bourgeois world” (Ellman, 1994: 561). He was a gifted student and was also the first one to get a county scholarship to Nottingham High School in nearby Nottingham. And besides being a novelist, he was also a poet, a playwright, an essayist, a literary critic and also a painter. (Wikipedia)

Leaving Nottingham in 1901, Lawrence started working at a surgical appliances factory; but sadly, he ended up contracting pneumonia. During his convalescing, he started visiting ‘Hagg’s farm’ which was the home of the Chambers and he began friendship with their daughter Jessie. And an “important aspect of this relationship with Jessie and other adolescent acquaintances was a shared love of books, an interest that lasted throughout Lawrence’s life.” (Wikipedia)

Between the years 1902 and 1906, Lawrence served as a teacher at the British school, Eastwood. In 1910 his first novel *The White Peacock* came out and shortly afterwards that

same year, his mother died. Lawrence was very much devastated by her death that he called the next few months his 'sick year' (Wikipedia).

The next year, in 1911, he got to know Garnett, a publisher's reader who became his close friend. Throughout his sick year, Lawrence revised the first draft of 'Paul Morel' what later became *Sons and Lovers* and sadly, that same year, he came down again with pneumonia. Once he recovered, Lawrence decided to quit teaching to become a full time writer. (Wikipedia)

In March 1912, Lawrence met Frieda Weekley who was six years older than he was and who used to be the wife of his professor at the university where he studied, and with whom he spent the rest of his life. Frieda eloped with him to her parents in Germany and then Lawrence and she went to Italy where he completed the final version of *Sons and Lovers*. World War I breaks out in 1914 and Frieda and Lawrence got married on July 13 of that same year but were unable to leave England as they could not get passports (Lawrence, 2005: X). Hence, they were forced to stay in different places within England during the war and in 1917, the two ended up being suspected of spying for the Germans (Lawrence, 2005: X).

The war years had been traumatic for Lawrence and as a result the Lawrences made their journey to the US in September of 1922. Few years later, the author made a brief journey to his home, England and it turned out to be a disastrous experience and once in the US, he decided that his life as an author should be spent there. However in March 1925, Lawrence suffered an attack of malaria and tuberculosis that nearly claimed his life and this condition forced him to return to Europe. Back in Europe, the Lawrences started living in Florence, Italy, where he wrote the various versions of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. (Wikipedia)

That same year, Lawrence was asked as to what it was that made him write, by an American journalist and despite his wife Frieda's quickly answering that it was because of the fact that he was egoistic and he wanted the world to know how clever he was, he "...protested that he wrote from a deep moral sense – for the race, as it were," and then added that, "A writer writes because he can't help writing, and because he has something in him that he feels he can say better than it has been said before, and because it would be wrong, entirely wrong, to possess a talent and have thoughts without sharing them with the world." (Lawrence, 2007: 12)

And, in the last months of his life, Lawrence wrote poems, essays etc. Lawrence finally died in Vence, France, from complications of tuberculosis on the 2nd of March, 1930 aged 44. (Wikipedia)

Poor health cut short his prolific writing, but the works that Lawrence created, such as *Sons and Lovers*, *Women in Love*, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, *The Lost Girl*, and *The Rainbow*, brought a new energy to twentieth century literature, introducing frank and challenging discussions of such difficult topics as politics, religion, and sexuality. (www.dailylit.com/books/sons-and-lovers)

His posthumous reputation was rather unsympathetic and hostile. However, there were few individuals who stood in his defense. One was Catherine Carswell who was his friend. In a letter she wrote in response to Lawrence's critics to the periodical, 'Time and Tide' which was published on the 16th of March 1930, she stated:

To do his work and lead his life in spite of them took some doing, but he did it, and long after they are forgotten , sensitive and innocent people – if any are left – will turn Lawrence's pages and will know from them what sort of a rare man Lawrence was. (Wikipedia)

1.1.2 Lawrence and *Sons and Lovers*

Sons and Lovers is considered to be an autobiographical novel and it was the third published work of D.H. Lawrence and it tells the story of 'Paul Morel', a young and budding artist. The 1913 original edition was heavily edited and had nearly a tenth of Lawrence's work removed. It was later in 1992 that the missing pieces are put back together when the Cambridge University Press edition came out. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/sons_and_lovers) Before being sent to the publisher for the first time, it had undergone four separate phases of composition by the author (Lawrence, 1991: IX).

Lawrence lost the draft that he worked on before his mother's death and he started working on another draft after three months of her death. And in it he often expresses this sense of his mother's wasted life through the female protagonist in the novel, Gertrude Morel. Near the

end of 1911 “Lawrence showed Jessie Chambers over three hundred pages of a novel which he then called ‘Paul Morel’” (1991: IX).

Jessie had known Lawrence since he was sixteen and gradually became his confidante: the one person in a working – class community where miner’s sons were not usually expected to turn to literature with whom he could discuss freely his ambition to write. She devoted herself to the encouragement of his exceptional abilities and, by sending a selection of his poems to the *English Review*, was directly responsible for his first appearance in print. By 1911 their close relationship – an unofficial engagement – was over and Lawrence was in fact engaged to someone else; but he went back to Jessie with the second version of his novel because he had developed a strong dependence on her advice and the story it told was in any case almost as much hers as his. (1991: IX)

Jessie did have no trouble at quickly identifying herself with the Miriam in the novel and what is more she also advised Lawrence to include his Brother Ernest, the William of *Sons and Lovers* in the third version. Then she “... urged Lawrence to ‘write the whole story again, and keep it true to life’, and to help him on his way began writing some pieces of her own about their early days together” (1991: IX-X). And what Jessie was hoping for from all she did in supporting Lawrence was, as she later admitted, was that first Lawrence might be able to see ‘his strange obsession with his mother’ and then being free from it he might also see into how his relationship with his new found fiancée did not have depth and then finally he might return to her. (1991: X-XI)

Sons and Lovers seems to focus mostly on Paul, “...but enough is conveyed of Miriam’s character and feelings for a reader so inclined to pronounce her treatment unfair, without the benefit of Jessie Chambers’s memoir” (1991: XXIV). However, it is difficult to blame Lawrence, the Paul of the novel as he is in great trouble himself, he being a young man fighting for his psychological life. And as the narrative, D. Ellisy demonstrates, such a young man “... is likely to be a cruelly destructive creature” (1991: XXVI).

Later on, Lawrence sent the third draft of ‘Paul Morel’ to the Heinemann publishing and he got a rather violent reaction for the fact that his work put forward “‘... the degradation of the mother (as explored in this novel), supposed to be of gentler birth, is almost inconceivable’ ...”. Further, Heinemann also suggested that Lawrence altered the title ‘Paul Morel’ to ‘Sons and Lovers’. (Wikipedia)

Lawrence, then altered the title 'Paul Morel' to the more thematic 'Sons and Lovers' as suggested by Heinemann and then sent it to Garnett to be published but defended it as 'coherent work of art'. And, "In order to justify its form, Lawrence explains in a letter to Garnett, that it is a 'great tragedy' and a 'great book', one that mirrors the 'tragedy of thousands of young men in England'." (Wikipedia)

As could be seen from Lawrence's summary of *Sons and Lovers* that was sent in a letter to Garnett on the 12th of November 1912,

It follows this idea: a woman of character and refinement goes into the lower class, and has no satisfaction in her own life. She has had a passion for her husband, so her children are born of passion, and have heaps of vitality. But as her sons grow up she selects them as lovers — first the eldest, then the second. These sons are urged into life by their reciprocal love of their mother — urged on and on. But when they come to manhood, they can't love, because their mother is the strongest power in their lives, and holds them. It's rather like Goethe and his mother and Frau von Stein and Christiana — As soon as the young men come into contact with women, there's a split. William gives his sex to a fribble, and his mother holds his soul. But the split kills him, because he doesn't know where he is. The next son gets a woman who fights for his soul — fights his mother. The son loves his mother — all the sons hate and are jealous of the father. The battle goes on between the mother and the girl, with the son as object. The mother gradually proves stronger, because of the ties of blood. The son decides to leave his soul in his mother's hands, and, like his elder brother go for passion. He gets passion. Then the split begins to tell again. But, almost unconsciously, the mother realizes what the matter is, and begins to die. The son casts off his mistress, attends to his dying mother. He is left in the end naked of everything, with the drift towards death. (en.wikipedia./Sons_and_Lovers)

The researcher believes that the theme of *Sons and Lovers* very much turns out to be an important aspect of the new theory and criticism that comes about as a result of the coming together of Feminism and Psychoanalysis, that is, Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism, which focuses on the child's pre-oedipal development, that is the moment before the oedipal complex imposes itself on the child, which brings about the mother figure's involvement in the psychosexual development of her child that could result in a devastating influence on his later manhood, that Lawrence testified to it being 'a great tragedy'.

As we have gathered by now from Lawrence's biography, Lawrence had a psychologically intimate relationship with his mother Lydia while she nursed him, he being a sickly baby. And all that time Arthur, Lawrence's father was at the pit trying to meet ends meet but not succeeding, even losing the passion in his marriage since he was being rendered less passionate as he spent more and more time down in the pit.

And later at the age of sixteen when Lawrence met Jessie Chambers, the Miriam of *Sons and Lovers* who tried to win over Lawrence's love, the Paul of *Sons and Lovers* that he had for his mother which she found to stand on their way and did her best to overcome but failed all the same. Since Paul was never able to have a healthy sexual relationship with any woman in his life even after the death of his mother.

The mentioned above aspect, Paul's mother tragic influence on the psychosexual development of her son that rendered him hopeless is a very important aspect of Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism which is used in this project. And this is the reason why an interest is shown and a look at Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers* is taken.

1.1.3. Lady Chatterley's Lover

The novel *Lady's Chatterley's Lover* was published for the first time privately in Florence, Italy in 1928 as Lawrence could not have it published at home, in England. It was considered disreputable as it depicts "... the physical relation between a working- class man and an aristocratic woman, its explicit descriptions of sex, and its use of (at the time) unprintable words" (en.wikipedia.org/Lady Chatterley's Lover).

It is about a Lady Chatterley, a young married woman who lives with her impotent husband, who is paralyzed from the waist down during the First World War. At first this lady tries to accept her husband as he is and starts living with him as he returns from the war. However, as time goes by she turns to the game keeper at the estate where she and her husband live at to meet her sexual needs as she grasps the fact "that she cannot live with the mind alone; she must also be alive physically." (en.wikipedia.org/Lady Chatterley's Lover)

When Lawrence was done with the first version of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in 1926, he did not openly state the sexual encounters between Lady Chatterley and the gamekeeper who

Lawrence named then Parkin. (Lawrence, 2007: V) Soon after, Lawrence wrote a second version where he used the four letter words without any restraint. Only one or two of these words were to be found in the first version. Hence, this version proved to be unpublishable. (2007: VI) Lawrence then rewrote the novel for the third time and had it published himself, as stated above, privately in Florence, Italy and then he sent out copies of it to Britain and the US and this paid off handsomely as it helped the author to manage his life better at a time when he needed financial support the most (2007: VI).

In America a heavily censored, authorised abridgement of this novel was published in 1928, the same year it was published in Florence, by Alfred A. Knopf which was later reissued in paper back in America both by Signet books and by Penguin books in 1946.

It was however finally on the second of November 1960 that this last novel of the author came out to the public in the United Kingdom, after Penguin Books who was prosecuted under the Obscene Publications Act, 1959 at the Old Bailey in London from 20 October to 2 November 1960 was declared not to be guilty of the charges that was brought against them.(en.wikipedia.org)

Lady Chatterley's Lover is a novel where the dominant feature represented in it is the 'sexual relations' that is taking place between Lady Chatterley and the game keeper, Mellors. And it is quite hilarious what "...the director of public prosecutions attempted in the 1960 to prevent Penguin Books from publishing an expurgated version,..." of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* as he "... may have been wrong to claim that it contained nothing except sex, but sexual relations are quite clearly and designedly its main topic." And as for Lawrence's "... intention in describing those relations in such detail was not to titillate, however often since that may have been the effect" (2007: VI).

The critical circles who assault *Lady Chatterley's Lover* as indecent work may be equating pornography with the explicit sexual descriptions used by Lawrence. But, Lawrence defines pornography as "... the attempt to insult sex, to do dirt on it . . . The insult to the human body, the insult to a vital human relationship!"(SLC: 69) And defending *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in the court, the Bishop of Woolwich, one of the expert witnesses as to the merits of the book, said that "... [w]hat Lawrence is trying to do is to portray the sex relationship as something essentially sacred ..." (Coetzee 1) and recommended it, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* to Christians. (ktnd.pr.yzu.ac.kr/lawrence/paper/)

1.2. Statement of the Problem

As a student at the undergraduate level, the researcher did not have a chance to come across the works of D.H. Lawrence, but now at MA level, she has come across his works a number of times mentioned as necessary readings. As a result, she has developed an interest in the author, especially intrigued by his views on sexuality which from a certain standpoint seems to be endorsing the ideas of male superiority, almost in all of his novels and his portrayal of female characters in his novel that feminist critics find to be controversial.

The researcher, to her knowledge and endeavour, has not come across any work, i.e., BA Senior Essays, MA Projects or PhD theses, etc., on D.H. Lawrence's works at the Addis Ababa University. As far as net sources are concerned, there is not much critical work available on Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Hence, it seems that there is little critical attention paid to this writer world wide in general and in Ethiopia in particular. So, the researcher has identified a knowledge gap there.

Finally, it seems that there has not been much work done especially on the issues that this research plans to carry out. Hence, it is hoped, in this work, by making a reading of Lawrence's novel using a psychoanalytic feministic literary criticism that interests the researcher, it is possible to come up with a reading that is quite enlightening in relation to human nature.

1.3. Objectives of the study

The primary objective of this study is to critically analyze the selected novel of D. H. Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* from psychoanalytic feministic perspective. Since the most prominent charge brought against this author is endorsement of patriarchal anti-women view with regard to sexual behaviour of women, the researcher's hypothesis is that as Lawrence is well known for his views being strongly critical of the capitalist imperialist bourgeois English society, he might not have been endorsing the patriarchy and its subjugation of women. Therefore, the works of Lawrence need critical re-evaluation. And that exactly is the secondary objective of the present study. In conjunction with these two objectives is the third objective of the study, that is, to set the prejudice against Lawrence right through psychoanalytic feministic criticism of his work that he endorses subjugation of women in a disguised manner.

1.4. Research Questions

Thus, keeping in view the objectives of the present study stated above, the researcher has formulated the following research questions.

1. What is/are the major theme(s) of D.H. Lawrence in the novel selected?
2. Does Lawrence's view, as reflected in the novel analysed, endorse suppression of women thinly disguised as support of male dominance in sexual behaviour?
3. Does a psychoanalytic feministic criticism of Lawrence present a deeper layer of meaning in the work selected?

And another objective of this study is to come up with possible answers to the *hows* and *whys* of human actions as they are revealed in the selected novel of Lawrence, through a reading using Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism.

1.5. Significance of the Study

What is hoped to be the first significance of this study is a social one. And as far as this project's social significance is concerned, it is hoped that this reading might enlighten readers of the thesis as to the importance of trying to understand the *whys* of the action of people instead of reaching at wrong conclusions that might widen the gap between them and the individuals concerned, which in turn might entail in the creation of irreconcilable differences amongst them.

There is also an academic significance that is in store in light of what the literary critic and scholar, Ellmann (1994) has said in her work. The "... outlines of contemporary critical theories are now often taught as a standard feature of a degree in literary studies". Then, the scholar moves onto how instructors "...of literary studies can no longer fall back on a standardised received methodology..." and how they are "... now urgently looking for guidance in a rapidly changing critical environment" (VI).

Ellmann also said how the revolution in literary theory has played a great role in loosening the hold of 'traditional empiricist and romantic assumptions' that we had about literature and

language. And she also speaks of the need of staging the new literary theories in practice. (Ibid)

Considering the above facts this project tries to apply the newly come across criticism by Lawrence's last novel to come up with a new reading of the work. And in doing this, it is hoped to disseminate the best of recent criticism and to show that it is possible to re-read the canonical texts of literature in new and challenging ways.

1.6. Methodology

To undertake this research, qualitative study is made. Qualitative analysis basically relies upon opinion formation based on textual analysis and interpretation. Psychoanalytic feministic literary theory and criticism is chosen to analyse and interpret Lawrence's selected novel. Textual extracts will also be used to reveal valid justifications as to the analysis and interpretation of the literary text using the above mentioned theory and criticism. Secondary sources are utilized to support the argument built on the basis of the primary source, i.e., the novel; also, the internet is used to access soft copies of almost all books used in this project.

The researcher's ideas that are believed to be existent in our society are also included in the analysis. The researcher is anxious that these inputs may not be found acceptable to some readers and the researcher begs readers to consider them as such, just the researcher's views.

2. Review of related literature

As mentioned in the Statement of the Problem as well, the researcher has not come across any work, i.e., BA Senior Essays, MA Projects or PhD theses done on D.H. Lawrence's work/s at the Addis Ababa University. As far as net sources are concerned, there is not much critical work available on Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. There are a few research articles available on the Internet that are going to be reviewed in order to establish that the present study is much different from the studies undertaken by scholars so far. But, still it is an undeniable fact that there is no study yet on Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* interpreting the novel from the perspective of psychoanalytic feminist literary theory. This implies that the present study doesn't overlap with any other existing studies on the novel.

The first work in this part is Veronica Beechey's article that appeared in the *Feminist Review* (1979) 3, 66-82 (www.palgrave-journals.com/fr/journal/), that mentions how "... Politically, feminists of a variety of different persuasions have seized upon the concept of patriarchy in the search for an explanation of feelings of oppression and subordination, and in the desire to transform feelings of rebellion into a political practice and theory. And then it adds how "... theoretically the concept of patriarchy has been used to address the question of the real basis of the subordination of women, and to analyse the particular forms which it assumes."(palgrave-journals.com)

Beechey also states how Kate Millet, one of the radical feminist writers, defines patriarchy at its most general level as standing for "... male domination and to the power relationships by which men dominate women..."(Millet, 1969) unlike, for example, Marxist feminists who tried to come up with an account for "... the relationship between the subordination of women and the organization of the various modes of production."(palgrave-journals.com)

Beechey puts that, "The most fundamental unit of patriarchy in Millett's analysis is the family, which she considers to be a patriarchal unit within a patriarchal whole; it functions to socialize children into sexually differentiated roles, temperaments and statuses, and to maintain women in a state of subordination." Then when the question of why this patriarchal relationships comes about and why is it still pervading, according to Beechey Millet "... rejects the view that biological differences between the sexes can explain gender differentiated temperaments, sex roles and social statuses. (This is the view known as

biological reductionism or biological determinism).” However, “... while rejecting this explanation, Kate Millett has no other theory of the foundations of patriarchy apart from a fairly generalized conception of power relationships.” (palgrave-journals.com)

Beechey argues how though radical feminism has introduced the concept of patriarchy in contemporary feminist discourse, “ ... its analysis leaves unexplained specific forms of male domination and female subordination; nor does it explain the relationship between patriarchal social relations and the social relations of production, that is, between sex classes and social classes.”(palgrave-journals.com)

Beechey then puts different definitions that are used to define patriarchy in the Marxist feminist literature:

Juliet Mitchell (1974) uses patriarchy to refer to kinship systems in which men exchange women, and to the symbolic power which fathers have within these systems, and the consequences of this power for the 'inferiorized . . . psychology of women' (Mitchell, 1974: 402). Heidi Hartmann (1979) has retained the radical feminist usage of patriarchy to refer to male power over women and has attempted to analyze the inter-relationship between this and the organization of the capitalist labour process. Eisenstein (1979) defines patriarchy as sexual hierarchy which is manifested in the woman's role as mother, domestic labourer and consumer within the family. Finally, a number of the papers in *Women Take Issue* (1978) have used the concept to refer specifically to the relations of reproduction which exist within the family. (palgrave-journals.com)

Beechey also states how “Revolutionary feminism has recently developed the radical feminist analysis of female subordination, and claims that gender differences can be explained in terms of the biological differences between men and women.” And she adds how “Revolutionary feminism in fact develops a theory of patriarchy and sex class which is rooted in women's reproductive capacities.” (palgrave-journals.com) Beechey then informs readers how the above mentioned theory developed by Revolutionary Feminism “... follows the analysis of *The Dialectic of Sex* (Firestone, 1971) in which Shulamith Firestone tried to resolve the dilemma posed by *Sexual Politics* by asserting that the basis of women's oppression does lie in women's reproductive capacities insofar as these have been controlled by men.” (palgrave-journals.com)

Then this paper of Beechey moves on to taking a look at Mitchell's *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (1974). And she states aspects of it as follows:

“At one level of psychoanalysis provides a theory of the complex process whereby the child with a bisexual disposition is initiated into human culture, thereby acquiring the specific forms of femininity and masculinity which are appropriate to her or his place within the culture.” (palgrave-journals.com) Then as Beechey puts it, Juliet Mitchell's book contribution is “... to provide a theoretical account of the development of femininity and the constitution of womanhood which is grounded in psychoanalytic concepts and which has been of great importance in the formation of psychoanalytic theories of femininity.” (palgrave-journals.com)

Where as patriarchal culture is concerned, for Mitchell within this culture the father assumes, symbolically, power over the woman, and she asserts that it is fathers and their 'representatives' and not men (as in radical and revolutionary feminist analyses) who have the determinate power over women in this culture. Juliet Mitchell argues against biological forms of explanation of why the father should be endowed with this power (that is, she argues against biological reductionist forms of analysis) and asserts that the father assumes this power symbolically at the inauguration of human culture. Why should this be so? In answering this question she turns to Levi-Strauss' analysis of kinship systems (1969). (palgrave-journals.com)

The second work reviewed here is concerned about Kate Millet's criticism of D.H. Lawrence and it starts with how he seems to hold conflicting views on feminism and continues how this could be seen from his portrayal of his female characters. Lawrence is committed “... to representing women as strong, independent and complex; he produced major works in which young, self-directing female characters were central” (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/D.H. Lawrence). But despite this fact, it seems that he has a lot of oppositions from feminist writers. Notable one is Kate Millet. This radical feminist criticized and “indeed ridiculed Lawrence's sexual politics, claiming that he uses his female characters as mouthpieces to promote his creed of male supremacy.”(en.wikipedia.org/wiki/D.H._Lawrence)

But then again, there are other writers who contradict Millett's views on Lawrence and his works. One is a Hongsunghuyn. In relation to Lawrence's *Chatterley's Lover*, he says the following.

D. H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is commonly renowned for its explicit love scenes and the heroine's sexual awakening to the man as a phallus-bearer. For instance, Kate Millett's scathing condemnation refers to *Lady Chatterley's Lover* related to "largely a celebration of the penis of Oliver Mellors, gamekeeper and social prophet (335). These criticisms targeting an identification of Lawrence as a male chauvinist seem to be obsessed with the idea that the female character finds her identity through her subjugation to phallic power. But I do think that feminist criticism has not quite got Lawrence right in his thinking about men and women. Sex is not what *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is all about because Lawrence asserts the redemptive power of warmth, tenderness, and love between both sexes. (ktnd.pr.yosu.ac.kr/lawrence/paper/)

Another is the work written by Jen (ok4rj.org/2012/01/feminist-theory-series-psychoanalytic-approaches) which states how feminist psychoanalytic theory has rejected Freudian theory of sexuality since Freud said that girls have 'penis-envy' when they first realize and encounter boys and see the 'awesomeness' of the penis as some kind of symbolic monument for power. And early feminist critics offered that if girls were jealous, it was just of the male privilege they saw given to their brothers and friends.

Then Jen states how in terms of gender and sexuality, psychoanalysis locates problems and solutions with the ways we are raised and treated as infants and in our psychosexual development based on our anatomy and gender. Then she puts how Freudian psychoanalysis does not account for sexual, gender, or anatomical diversity and how feminists like Luce Irigaray criticize Lacan, who echoes Freud in his views, on these points and offer that the vulva/vagina as a symbolic and physical structure is not "nothing" or "lacking" (there is *something there*, after all!), but has a positive presence that is essentially different from masculinist ways of thinking and knowing about the Self and Other.

Then Jen discusses how Nancy Chodorow (*The Reproduction of Mothering*) argues that how we raise men and women reproduces social relationships and structures; men are raised to function in a capitalist world of production, and women are raised to function in the domestic world of reproduction, especially to reproduce the practice of mothering. Chodorow also

argues that the division of labor both produces and reproduces these psychosexual roles, and that we reproduce misogyny when we agree with Freud that men must reject his mother, as a symbol of the feminine, for full psychological development to occur. Her solutions come from reevaluating the structure of parenting and the family, and encouraging group and community parenting to break this cycle. (ok4rj.org/2012/01/feminist)

2.1. The development of Psychoanalytic Feminism Criticism

2.1.1. Feminist criticism and Psychoanalysis during Post-Structuralism

Feminist literary criticism properly begins in the aftermath of ‘second wave’ feminism, the term usually given to the emergence of women’s movements in the United States and Europe during the Civil Rights campaigns of the 1960s. Clearly, though, a feminist literary criticism did not emerge fully formed from this moment. Rather, its eventual self-conscious expression was the culmination of centuries of women’s writing, of women writing about women writing, and of women – and men – writing about women’s minds, bodies, art and ideas. (Plain & Sellers, 2007: 2)

In her well known work in relation to Feminist Literary Criticism, ‘A Room of One’s Own’, Virginia Woolf states how Woman “... is ‘the most discussed animal in the universe’...”. (Ibid) And whether,

misogynist or emancipatory, the speculation excited by the concept of woman, let alone by actual women and their desires, created a rich history upon which second-wave feminism could be built. From the beginning feminist literary criticism was keen to uncover its own origins, seeking to establish traditions of women’s writing and early ‘feminist’ thought to counter the unquestioning acceptance of ‘man’ and male genius as the norm. (Ibid)

Since Post-Structuralism, however, there emerges a ‘paradigm’ shift in Feminist Literary Criticism as this is a “... period in which the meaning of ‘woman’ as a signifying term is subject to its most radical destabilisations – and hence what it means to be a feminist or to practice feminist literary criticism undergoes significant change.” (Plain & Sellers, 2007: 10) And the reason as stated is because ‘woman’ as it is known as a socio-cultural entity was problematised. The implication as it turns out is to think about women was also to think about

gender: masculinity as much as femininity became available for interrogation and reinscription. (Ibid)

As a result of this, Feminism as a discipline started asking basic questions in relation to 'language and human subjectivity', questions that are also at the same time are the subject of intense debate in a range of complementary theoretical discourses, from linguistics to psychoanalysis. During this period as post-structuralism was taking an in-depth look at the part played by language in individual and social formation, psychoanalysis was analysing the construction of gendered identity in the embryonic adult. And as a result of this hybrid forms of feminist literary criticism emerged that, while continuing to examine the complexity of gendered identities in contemporary society, also brought renewed energy to ongoing debates questioning the status of the term 'woman' as a coherent theoretical point of origin. (Ibid) And this ongoing hybridity of feminist literary criticism and its unity with 'complementary discourses' gives it a different shape.

Colebrook in (Plain & Sellers, 2007) who states how "Western metaphysics that recognises only 'man' ..." is what engenders Feminism and Feminist inquiry in the first place also adds how it seems since the development of post-structuralism that feminist literary criticism had left its activist origins behind. (pp. 211-212)

The feminist scholar Claire Colebrook who was mentioned above also states how unlike the term 'post modernism', it is possible to exactly define post structuralism. She then puts how post structuralism is "... a quite specific consequence of accepting the premises of structuralism." (Plain & Sellers, 2007: 214) Structuralism as a discipline has asked about the genesis of structure and it has answered it by resorting to 'sexual difference' and it is this conclusion of structuralism that post structuralism has repeatedly 'revisited' and 'problematized'. (Ibid: 216) According to structuralism, we become cultural by abandoning our biological immediacy; culture is therefore the other of nature and immediacy and, for humans at least, our image or figure of the natural and immediate is 'Woman'. The anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss also offers a similar explanation,

culture takes the form of a system of relations: we do not just live the world in immediate animal desire, but defer our desires in accord with the demands of culture. The entry into this system takes the form of a prohibition of incest: we abandon the first object of desire – the mother who meets all our bodily needs – and establish relations of alliance with

other families, whose women we exchange for those of our own (Levi- Strauss, 1969).
(Ibid : 216)

Culture then according to Strauss and structuralists begins with the exchange of women. Woman becomes that first desired and denied object that is renounced in order that we might recognise each other as cultural subjects.

And the Post-Structuralist scholar, Derrida who questions Strauss' explanation to the riddle of genesis argues that "... any attempt to explain relative systems has to adopt some point of view outside those systems, some point of truth: there is always one term that opens a structure and that cannot be accounted for within the structure." (Ibid: 217) For post-structuralism, then, any posited structure has to be delimited by at least one term that cannot be reduced to the structure, and which therefore precludes closure. In Levi-Strauss' anthropology this inaugurating term is 'incest' or the prohibition of the original union with the mother." (Ibid : 217) And as for Derrida, Strauss' seeing woman as the original prohibited object does not concern him directly, although it was this aspect of structuralism that became pertinent for the theories of sexuality in poststructuralist psychoanalysis. And for feminist criticism, post structuralism has also immediate relevance as it both precludes the possibility of a pure, neutral and universal viewpoint, and at the same time demonstrates that any simple abandonment of universality merely becomes another universalism. (Ibid : 216-217)

2.1.2. Feminism, Psychoanalysis and Literary Interpretation

Concerning the relationship between Feminism, Psychoanalysis and Literary interpretation the feminist scholar Madelon Sprengnether in (Plain & Sellers, 2007) states that these three mentioned "have more in common than their early histories might seem to suggest – or promise." (p. 235) She then adds that every one of

...these intellectual and socially engaged activities is based on premises (about text, psyche and culture) that undermine familiar or received wisdom. At times, they seem to ignore one another, but often they have coincided – and collided – in startling and productive ways (2007: 235).

Then she presents a bird's eye view of their encounters starting with,

... Freud's analyses of female hysterics in the 1890s, continuing into the 1920s with the first wave of feminist encounter with Freud, jumping to the early second-wave critique of Freud's oedipal phallicism, then moving to an interrogation of the possibilities of pre-oedipal subversion into something that we might describe as our current decentred, post-Freudian, post-post modernist era. (2007: 235)

There is a possibility that one may confuse psychology with psychoanalysis if he /she is new to the disciplines. Damousi (2005) puts what psychoanalysis is and its difference from psychology as follows:

Psychoanalysis – the body of thought which brings Freudian ideas into a coherent theory – differs from other theories of the self because it takes the unconscious as its key organising principle. Unlike psychology, which is concerned with the conscious world and aspects of socialisation, psychoanalysis privileges the life of the unconscious as the way to understanding psychic life. (2005: 1)

Ironically, it is Freud's own writings that give evidence of his ambivalence about what it means to be a woman. But the signs of his ambivalence would not become fully 'readable' until new strategies of feminist literary interpretations became available. A brief review of Freud's 'Ur' dream in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, the work that he expected to launch his career in the field of psychoanalysis, demonstrates the degree to which Freud's own text offer themselves to feminist deconstruction. (Plain & Sellers, 2007: 236-237)

For example The Dora case history in Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams* may be the most closely read text by feminists seeking to deconstruct and transform Freud's assumption about women. The upshot of this story is that Dora, a reluctant subject from the beginning not only did not accept Freud's interpretation, but also took matters into her own hands, leaving treatment. And Freud's reconstruction of their interaction occurred in the charged atmosphere of her rejection. (Plain & Sellers, 2007: 240)

Interestingly, most of Freud's own patients including Dora later became psychoanalysts themselves and later on made their own theoretical contributions. Some of them saw no problem with Freud's pronouncements of the second nature of femininity. But some of them though did not break up with him completely offered modifications of his theories with their own subversive possibilities. Melaine Klein was one of these women who considered herself

a true heir of Freud and yet who undermined Freud's emphasis on the primacy of the phallus through her theorisation of the child's relationship to the breast. (2007: 238)

Then in the aftermath of the Second World War, women left their wartime jobs, compelled to return to husbands and children to cultivate the 'feminine' arts of house keeping and child-rearing. During the years that followed the aftermath, "... the history of Freud's early women followers- including their unconventional ideas and life choices - went missing, and it was not until the early 1960s, with a new generation of activist women, that another level of questioning began to arise." (2007: 239) Susan Kingsley Kent (quoted in, Damousi, 2005) says that Freudian patriarchy was responsible for diminished profile of feminism in the interwar (relating to period between World War I and II) years. (Ibid)

Elaine Showalter explains the improvement of Feminist theory of Psychoanalysis as having a number of phases. "Two benchmark books, Simone de Beauvoir's *The second sex* (1953) and Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), presented cogent arguments against the philosophical and cultural ideologies that relegated women to inferior status in society and in the home." (Plain & Sellers, 2007: 239) Then suddenly there was an outpouring of books interrogating received wisdom about women, and the (retrospectively named) second wave of feminism was born. (Ibid)

Freud did not take time to theorise about "... the child's earliest phase of development, including its relationship to the shadowy figure of the mother, his followers were less hesitant." (Plain & Sellers, 2007: 241)

For example Otto Rank (1952) has brought forward how the moment of birth could be a traumatic experience for the child before recognition of 'the father's authority and threat of castration' and suggesting that this might be the child's "... first experience of separation, or 'castration', "... hence obliterating Freud's crucial distinction between the sexes." (Ibid)

Freud did consider Rank's suggestion but then ignored it and "... reaffirmed the centrality of the father's prohibition on incest as the defining factor in the (male) child's abandonment of his tie to his mother and subsequent submission – and final accession – to patriarchal authority." (Ibid: 242)

In spite of all these, "... the (necessary, compelling and insufficiently theorised) figure of the mother continued to beckon." (Ibid) And this popping up of the mother figure into the picture finally gives into results. "Two converging, but also philosophically opposed, understandings of the pre-oedipal period emerged in Freud's wake." The first traces back its origin "...to a body of writings evolved over time, now commonly referred to as 'Object Relations' theory." Where as the second is come about from the work of Lacan. (Ibid) These two share a common interest in relation to "... the pre-oedipal period and its potential for the reformulation – and subversion – of oedipal norms." (Ibid)

Object Relations theory has evolved with the writings of a number of British and American analysts who questions Freud's assumption that the child's ego is self-contained, or narcissistic. And what the newly evolved theorists of Object Relations theory claim is the fact that "... a baby develops selfhood in the context of its relationship with its earliest caregiver(s), typically the mother." And the result is 'a new phase of psychoanalytic inquiry' which moves 'attention' from the "...father's oedipal authority to the pre-oedipal period and the figure of the mother." (Ibid)

And as a result of the developments that has come about starting with Freud's ambivalence as to what it means to be a woman being questioned, the "... nearly universal practice of women's care of children (hitherto considered natural and hence unworthy of study) constituted a new field of inquiry. (Ibid)

Incorporating Object Relations theory into her analysis, Nancy Chodorow, in her groundbreaking book *The Reproduction of Mothering* (1978), offered an elegant, psycho-social explanation for why mothers raise daughters who mother. Our current social arrangements, she argued, support the way in which daughters identify with their mothers. These primary dispositions have life-long consequences in the ways that women are inclined to foster and value close affiliative ties, while men seek competition and the rewards of individual achievement. To alter this set of psychological conditions, Chodorow maintained, would also require altering the conditions of childrearing that induce them. For Chodorow, psychology is rooted inmutable cultural practices, yet the immediate impact of her argument was to open a space for a reevaluation of women's relationships with one another – as mothers, daughters, sisters. (Plain & Sellers, 2007: 243)

Unlike Freud's explanation that the mother's lack leading the daughter to the realization of her own lack, Object Relations Theory came up with a positive explanation of daughter's attachment to their mothers as their first loves. (Ibid: 243) And, as a result, daughters seem to be having better days. But, what about mothers? (Ibid: 243-244)

Juliet Mitchell's *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (1974) introduced Anglo-American feminists to the complex French thinker Jacques Lacan. Psychoanalysis, she argued, describes (rather than prescribes) gender arrangements under patriarchy. As such, it illuminates the unconscious structure of this particular social organisation, rather than confirming its universality. In essence, Mitchell pointed to the arbitrary nature of collectively held and unconsciously inscribed belief-systems regarding women. Like Chodorow, she emphasised the material and social organisation of the unconscious. Yet her reliance on Lacan led to different subjects and emphases in feminist literary criticism. (Ibid: 244)

Jacques Lacan, who was profoundly influenced by the surrealist and Dada movements of his generation, attacked the emerging phenomenon of ego psychology, which he deemed a betrayal of Freud's insights into the revolutionary workings of the unconscious. He offered a re-reading of Freud's texts – mediated by contemporary developments in linguistics and structuralism – as a means of restoring a proper emphasis on the radical instability of conscious mental life. Lifting Freud's theory of castration out of the realm of physical threat ('if you violate the incest taboo and try to have sex with your mother, your father will cut off your penis') into that of language, Lacan posited the notion of the phallus as signifier – a (more or less) arbitrary marker of the child's entry into the Symbolic Order of language and culture. Although patriarchal social organisation requires such a move, it is not authorised by anatomy. In this view, patriarchy is something of a sham – so why not have some fun with it? One senses Lacan's wry critique of phallocentrism and implicit alliance with the party of the devil, but also his unwillingness finally to overturn Freud's oedipal paradigm. With hindsight, one can detect Lacan's ambivalence. On the one hand, he seemed to side with those who would valorise the pre-oedipal phase of fluid psychic organisation. On the other, he seemed to endorse the necessity of the child's entry into the order of language and culture, represented by the name ('nom') and threat of castration ('non') of the father. Lacan played one side against the other, nimbly moving back and forth across this boundary, simultaneously subverting and affirming the structure of patriarchy. (2007:244)

A group of 'French' feminists (most prominently He'le`ne Cixous, Luce Irigaray and Julia Kristeva) exploited the weakness in Lacan's position, by focusing on the potential of his formulation of the pre-oedipal period to disrupt the order of language, hence patriarchy. Valorising the fragmented and disorganised rhythmic pulsions and babblings of the child as an aspect of its fluid boundary state in relation to its mother, these women imagined new forms of writing. Such writing, they maintained, would imitate or recreate the preverbal condition of the child (male or female), prior to the imposition of the father's name and law. This form of writing could be practiced by men as well as women, and many male precursors were invoked (for example, Nietzsche, Joyce, Genet). In effect, certain forms of avant-garde writing received new consideration through this philosophic / psychoanalytic lens. It also authorised, and helped to inaugurate, innovative forms of women's writing. Cixous, Irigaray and Kristeva – all intimately acquainted with the philosophical traditions Lacan inherited and invoked – played with the formal structures of language in order to interrogate these traditions. The difference between these women and Lacan was that they imagined the possibility of transforming the existing social order. (2007: 245)

He'le`ne Cixous, who celebrated the eruption of unconscious energies in men's writing, also found special authorisation for this capacity in women's experience of maternity. 'How could the woman', she asked, 'who has experienced the not-me within me, not have a particular relationship to the written?' (Cixous and Cle'ment, 1986: 90). For Cixous, the body of the mother, which must make a space for the inclusion of an absolute 'Other', becomes a model for the kind of discourse that allows itself to be traversed by the voice of the ultimate other, the unconscious. She draws an analogy between the process of parturition, and that of ecstatic speech.

Luce Irigaray, in *Speculum of the Other Woman* (1985a), indicted the tradition of Western philosophy for its exclusion of women's sexual difference. Freud's construction of femininity, she argued, is a special instance of this phenomenon. In Freud's account, she maintained, there is only one sexual organ – the penis. Measured against this norm, women can only be found wanting. There is no room in such a view for the plurality of women's sexual organs (clitoris, vulva, vagina) or desires. In *This Sex Which Is Not One* (1985b), she elaborated on this conviction, suggesting that women's sexuality is multiple and diffuse, thus undermining the singular status (and authority) of the phallus. Women's two- (or perhaps four-) lipped vulva is never completely open, nor closed, thus provoking analogies with the process of

speech itself. Finally, she extends this analogy into the realm of the mother-child relationship, which begins in a condition of radical two-ness, hence violating the (phallic) fiction of self contained individuality and consciousness. In 'And the One Doesn't Stir Without the Other', Irigaray lyrically evokes the condition of pregnancy, through the voice of a young woman addressing her mother:

'Of the two of us, who was the one, who the other? What shadow or what light grew inside you while you carried me? And did you not grow radiant with light while I lived, a thing held in the horizon of your body?'

Later, she extends this meditation into a reverie about the mutual openness and connection of women's bodies: 'From your/my mouth, an unending horizon. In you/me and out of you/me . . . Neither wide open nor sutured. Not rent, but slightly parted' (Irigaray, 1981: 65-7).

Even Julia Kristeva, who essentially agreed with Lacan's account of the child's necessary movement from the Imaginary to the Symbolic, was impelled to theorise a pre-Symbolic form of communication, rooted in the reproductive function and the child's pre-oedipal bond to its mother. She conceived of a prelinguistic, 'semiotic' phase, marked by fluid drives, pulsions and energies that later find expression through disruptions of Symbolic discourse. At the same time, she suggested that a woman's experience of pregnancy, in its condition of doubled selfhood, might afford special access to semiotic expression. 'A mother', she states in 'Stabat Mater', where she imagines the Virgin's maternal discourse, 'is a continuous separation, a division of the very flesh. And consequently a division in language' (Kristeva, 1986: 178).

It is hoped that the review of related literature and the section about the development of psychoanalytic feministic criticism that are included here in part two of this paper would allow readers with a better understanding of the conceptual framework that follows.

3. Conceptual Framework: Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism

At the beginning of the 1970's, American feminist critics had no time for psychoanalytic criticism. It was ignored together with what Ellman called 'phallic criticism' (Gallop, 1987: 313). This is because of the fact that "Freud and his science were viewed by feminism in general as prime perpetrators of patriarchy." (Ibid, pp. 313-314)

However, at the end of the 1970's, psychoanalytic criticism has developed in recognition and influence and a new criticism that is known as 'psychoanalytic feministic criticism' has come to the picture of contemporary literary criticism. And the scholar Jane Gallop claims that two significant factors have played their roles to the development of psychoanalytic criticism in America. (Ibid, pp. 314-315)

First, the rise of feminist criticism, in its revolt against formalism, has rehabilitated thematic and psychological criticism, the traditional mainstays of psychoanalytic interpretation. Because feminism has assured the link between psychosexuality and the socio-historical realm, psychoanalysis is now linked to major political and cultural questions. Glistening on the horizon of socio-political connection, feminism promises to save psychoanalysis from its ahistorical and apolitical doldrums. (Ibid, 315)

Gallop then puts how the second factor "... that is responsible to the rehabilitation of psychoanalytic reading in the US is certainly more widely recognized..." and it is

... the impact of French post-structuralist thought on the American literary academy. There is, of course, the direct influence of Lacanian psychoanalysis which promotes language to a principal role in the psychoanalytic drama and so naturally offers fertile ground for crossing psychoanalytic and literary concerns. (Ibid)

This scholar then states how yet she thinks, the larger role to the rehabilitation mentioned before is the result of Derridean deconstruction. (Ibid)

Although deconstruction is not strictly psychoanalytic, Freud's prominent place in Derridean associative networks promises a criticism that is, finally, respectably textual and still, in some recognizable way, Freudian. (Ibid)

Next, Gallop puts the following. Though "... this second, foreign factor in the growth of American psychoanalytic criticism seems far away from the realm of homespun feminist criticism, ..." she would argue that "... there is a powerful if indirect connection between the two."(Ibid) Then she speculates how "... the phenomenal spread of deconstruction in American departments of English is in actuality a response to the growth of feminist criticism."(Ibid)

At a moment when it is no longer possible to ignore feminist's criticism's challenge to the critical establishment, deconstruction appeared offering a perspective that was not in opposition but rather beyond feminism, offering to sublimate feminism into something supposedly 'more radical'. (Ibid, pp. 315-316)

Hence according to Gallop, feminist criticism has played a role both directly and indirectly in providing viability to psychoanalytic criticism in the US and "... central to this viability has been the burgeoning new field of psychoanalytic feminist criticism." (Ibid, pp. 316-317)

Once more, Gallop as she did with the development of psychoanalytic criticism sees two main factors playing significant role to the development of psychoanalytic feminist criticism and states the factors as follows:

One is actually another effect of the French post- structuralism- likewise stemming from Lacan and Derrida but, significantly, passing through those women thinkers we Americans have come to call the 'French feminists.' Through writers like Luce Irigaray, Helen Cixous, and Julia Kristeva, we have seen a way of thinking that appears to be at once feminist and psychoanalytic, and also highly literary. (Ibid, p. 316)

The other factor is the quite significant role played by Nancy Chodrow in studying 'Mothering'.

Chodrow has taken an object – relations view centred on the pre- oedipal relation to the early mother and set in a feminist framework cognizant of the sociohistorical determinants of the institution of mothering. (Gallop, Jane: 1987, p. 316)

And this "... particular mix of mother – centred psychoanalysis and American social scientific feminism has proven especially suggestive for feminist literary critics." (Ibid) And

this new burgeoning field of Psychoanalytic feminist criticism "... thus provides the vehicle which allows two heretofore unlikely couples to meet." (Ibid)

And in this vehicle, we not only see feminism coming to terms with psychoanalysis but also "... behind that more obvious couple in what constitutes a theoretical double date, we might possibly glimpse the coming together of post-structuralism and American feminist social science, a pair that has rarely been known to speak." (Ibid)

Despite the fact that Psychoanalytic feminism comes about from the subversion of Freudian psychoanalysis by feminists still it is based on Freud and his feminist theory of psychoanalysis. And this new burgeoning field maintains that

... gender is not organic, but is based on the psycho-sexual development of the individual. Psychoanalytical feminists believe that gender inequality comes from early childhood experiences, which lead men to believe them to be masculine, and women to believe them feminine. It is further maintained that gender leads to a public system that is dominated by masculine, which in turn influences the individual psycho-sexual development. (classof1.com/homework_answers/gender)

And Gallop tells us that this unity of Psychoanalysis and Feminism is obviously "... conducive to good reading, writing and thinking." (Gallop, 1987, pp. 316-317)

The base of the psychoanalytic feministic criticism is the 'unconscious' and as could be imagined is sort of radical as it puts the belief since Aristotle, that man is 'rational' into question. But it could also explain a lot into our nature as could be revealed in the moving of literary theories and criticism in to places that seems to be quite unthinkable, unimaginable as in post structuralism/ post modernism. And D.H. Lawrence as mentioned before in the background of this paper did imagine (anticipate) this revolution in literary theories with stresses on the unconscious, the body and the irrational motives.

The positing of an unconscious as the ultimate source and explanation of human thought and behaviour represented a radical disruption of the main streams of Western thought which, since Aristotle, had held that man was essentially a rational being, capable of making free choices in the spheres of intellection and morality. To say that the unconscious governs our behaviour is to problematize all of the notions on which philosophy, theology, and even literary criticism have conventionally rested: the ideal of self-knowledge, the ability to know others, the capacity to make moral judgments, the

belief that we can act according to reason, that we can overcome our passions and instincts, the ideas of moral and political agency, intentionality, and the notion – held for centuries – that literary creation can be a rational process. In a sense, Freud postulated that we bear a form of “otherness” within ourselves: we cannot claim fully to comprehend even ourselves, why we act as we do, why we make certain moral and political decisions, why we harbour given religious dispositions and intellectual orientations. (Habib, 2005, p. 571).

And it is psychoanalysis that develops a theory about the unconscious that links sexuality and subjectivity ineluctably together. (plato.stanford.edu/entries) The centrality of sex and gender in the categories of psychoanalysis coupled with the tenacity, emotional centrality and sweeping power in our lives of our sense of gendered self, made psychoanalysis a particularly apposite source of feminist theorizing. Object relation theorists, emerging from and reacting to the work of Melanie Klein, imagine a course of transactions between self and other(s) that help form our first subjectivity and sense of self, and that throughout life are renegotiated to recreate the sense of self and others in terms of connection, separation and in between. These transactions give depth and richness of meaning to experience, by resonating with the past and with constructions of the past. And working towards a more theoretical psychoanalytic feminism, object relational transformation has turned the traditional psychoanalysis from the son and father relationship to a psychology of the relation to the mother in children of both sexes, a reading not as directly tied to the idea of cultural gender as Freudian thought. (www.webster.edu)

Although they are in often uneasy alliance, the psychoanalytic account of the unconscious provides feminist theory with resources for both political and ontological inquiry. Ontologically, psychoanalysis offers a distinctively psychical understanding of sexual difference, how we come to inhabit our bodies and our identities, and misinhabit them, an analysis reducible to neither social nor biological categories. Politically, psychoanalysis offers a depiction of the forces that impel us to organize, disorganize, and reorganize the bonds that hold us together. By offering insight into the formation of subjectivity and the animating fantasies of social life, psychoanalysis thus also facilitates feminist analysis of the obdurate elements of patriarchal social relations, including the symbolic bonds and internal forces that undergird identity and attach sexed subjects to relations of dominance and subordination. Psychoanalytic feminist attention to the core constituents of civilization, to the nuclei of sexual difference and communal affiliation, helps explain the perpetuation of

masculine power and enables feminist theorists to articulate possible correctives, challenges, routes of amelioration, or ethical interruptions that go to the roots of political life and to its beyond and do not simply operate on the given social terrain. (plato.stanford.edu/entries)

And the bottom line is psychoanalytic feminists focus on pre-oedipal stage of psychosexual development and they state that individual and social problems are the result of women having a monopoly on mothering. (www.public.iastate.edu)

As a result of this women's monopoly on mothering, the following devastating psychological consequences are observed in men and women. Men, not wanting to experience dependence again seek to control women and nature. And women fearing the mother within themselves want to be controlled by men. (www.public.iastate.edu)

And what is more, because of their single headedly raising their children women are being made accountable for all the frailties of the human condition. But, there is a solution, a corrective that is put by psychoanalysts to overcome the psychological consequences that lead to the seeking to control by men and the desire to be controlled by women that resulted from women monopoly on mothering. And this solution is arrived at through instituting dual parenting within a family. (www.public.iastate.edu)

4. Analysis

4.1. The Beginning

Chapter One, page one of D.H. Lawrence's novel, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* starts with what "... was more or less the psychoanalytic feministic heroine, Constance Chatterley's position, as the first world war had brought the roof down over her head and makes her see despite all that happened one must live and learn. And this stand of hers could be summarized as follows:

Ours is essentially a tragic age, so we refuse to take it tragically. The cataclysm has happened, we are among the ruins, we start to build up new little habitats, to have new little hopes. It is rather hard work: there is now no smooth road into the future: but we go round, or scramble over the obstacles. We've got to live, no matter how many skies have fallen. (Lawrence, 2007: 1)

The source of all that happened to Constance and the rest mentioned in the heroine's summary above was the result of an aggression endangered by patriarchal authority during the first world war and as explained in the work of Plain & Sellers (2007) entitled *A history of Feminist Literary Criticism*, the same aggression got repeated again later in history, after the death of Lawrence who foresaw and stated how it was not a worthy authority to live under since his say got disregarded and patriarchy once more got the chance to prove itself for what it is. And this point is summarized as follows by Calvin Thomas in the work that is mentioned above:

The twentieth century's history of two world wars, genocidal conflict, cultural modernity and postmodernity, combined with new global configurations of wealth and power, have succeeded in redefining the nature of patriarchal authority. No longer the romanticised psychic structure that Freud conceived – based on the visible, genital emblem of male superiority – patriarchy reveals itself for what it is: an arbitrary assumption of power, founded in a set of widely shared belief systems, historical conditions and material, social practices, which combine to instil and compel individual (and sometimes mass) assent. Oedipus with a small 'o', if you wish." (2007: 253)

Next Thomas again says

It may seem ungenerous to fault Freud for not having imagined the world we inhabit today. I hope I have not left that impression. Rather, I have tried to indicate how time-bound, yet also useful, his texts have proved for feminists who have laboured to detect the loopholes in his arguments regarding sexual difference(s) and practices, and the construction of social authority, while also proposing flexible, productive and challenging alternatives. (2007: 253)

And it is with this in mind that it is planned to make a reading of this novel of Lawrence with Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism that still has respect for Freud and however has succeeded in finding loopholes in his arguments and has come up with the possibility of subverting patriarchal authority from its base, having identified how its source is located deep in the psyche, unconscious part of individuals, revealing how it keeps on perpetuating itself despite attempts done by feminists of all sorts of concern to subvert it. This authority having been able to sustain itself is still keeping on pushing humanity into more mess, making it more and more inhumane to the point that the whole of it could end up with its own destruction.

Taking a look at Constance's stand mentioned above, one could see how she, Lady Chatterley, Lawrence's heroine is talking in the 'we' rather than in the 'I'. In doing this, she proves from the beginning to be a character who is not selfish as she speaks of all those concerned instead of just being self-centred talking about herself. It could also be seen how What happened during the First World War that is the destruction of the lives of lots of people including Constance's could be seen as an aspect of the patriarchal norm of appropriation that the western metaphysics has always been encouraging to no avail but to the destruction of individuals and society at large all around the world. The heroine, Lady Chatterley could also be seen as an individual who does not give up easily as she states that one has to take any of the possible ways available so as one could move forward to something possibly 'better'.

4.2. Constance: Married Life

Constance, Lady Chatterley also known as by the name Connie married her husband, Clifford Chatterley when he was back in England for a two months leave from the war. Then he went back to the battle and returned home six months later "... more or less in bits." (Lawrence, 2007: 1) At the time Constance was 23 and Clifford 29, six years older than Constance.

Clifford was resilient and finally after two years in 1920, the little bits came together but unfortunately he was paralysed from the waist down. The couple then returned to live at Clifford's home, his family seat that is called Wragby Hall. Clifford's father had passed away from chagrin seeing what has happened to his remaining son, who he thought was his sole source of an heir, a son to Wragby, and hence Clifford became a baronet and Constance lady Chatterley. (Ibid)

Clifford's older brother was also dead in the war and his living sister had left Wragby and the couple started life though short of money being the owners of Clifford's family estate. Clifford knowing that he was crippled and could have no children returned home as the man of the house at Wragby Hall with the determination to keep his family names alive 'while he could'. (Ibid)

Clifford as could be seen did not care about his wife but only the estate (appropriation). Though he knew that he could never have children had nothing on his mind except that he needed to prove himself manly the only way he knew how and that was by keeping the name of his family alive. In planning this he never gave a thought to Constance's needs except the fact that she was there as his possession not as an individual, who could have problem with the status in their marriage, that is the fact that he could never meet her bodily, sexual needs. This seems to be very selfish of him though he is not to be accused of it as he could not help himself since he had to prove himself manly the only way he could being driven by his unconscious drives that rendered him inhumane since he turned out to be an individual who did not consider his wife as another individual like him with her own possible unconscious drives.

Besides, it also seems that Clifford never loved Constance as he did not mind subjecting her to the position that she assumed at Wragby Hall being a wife to a man who knew could never father a child as mentioned before.

4.3. Life before Marriage

Constance though looked like a country girl with slow movements with her feet, she was quite a woman who had been well travelled and well informed thanks to the fact that she was born into a mother and a father who were with quite a taste in the arts and politics. She was not the

only child, she had a sister named Hilda who also shared the positive impacts that Constance has shared of being raised by parents who were artistic and into politics. Lawrence describes the two girls' upbringing as 'an aesthetically unconventional one.'

They had been taken to Paris and Florence and Rome to breathe in art, and they had been taken also in the other direction, to the Hague and Berlin, to great Socialist conventions, where the speakers spoke in every civilized tongue, and no one was abashed. (p.2)

Given this upbringing of theirs, Constance along with her sister Hilda had free lives as students. They discussed philosophical, sociological and artistic matters with other students. The two also had affairs with the young men of their choices by the time they were eighteen. What the two girls preferred to do was have the talks with their young men but as the men insisted on having sex, the two girls gave in. When the girls went back home, their father could see that his girls had had 'the love experience'. « *L'amour avait possé par là*, as somebody puts it. But he was a man of experience himself, and let life take its course." As for their mother "a nervous invalid in the last few months of her life, she wanted her girls to be 'free', and to 'fulfil themselves'." (p.4)

Constance's father, Sir Malcolm seems to be caring, understanding as he left his girls to do as they pleased knowing that as a man of the world who did not want to force patriarchal thoughts that might have them to be considered cheats and unbecoming of girls, he let them be as he well knew how life is not something that you could force over someone but how one needs to be understanding to the needs of others as his children tried to find themselves and make a place for themselves with in their society. Furthermore, the father of Constance and Hilda seems to be paying a deserved attention to the sexuality of his children which was quite an important aspect for their individuality and what they would later on play a role as being parents themselves if given that they would want to be one.

When Lawrence described the sexual relationship that Hilda and Connie (Constance) had with their lovers, it goes like this:

And if after the roused intimacy of these vivid and soul-enlightened discussions the sex thing became more or less inevitable, then let it. It marked the end of a chapter. It had a thrill of its own too: a queer vibrating thrill inside the body, a final spasm of self-

assertion, like the last word, exciting, and very like the row of asterisks that can be put to show the end of a paragraph, and a break in the theme (P.4)

And then it follows:

In the actual sex-thrill within the body, the sisters nearly succumbed to the strange male power. But quickly they recovered themselves, took the sex-thrill as a sensation, and remained free. Whereas the men, in gratitude to the woman for the sex experience, let their souls go out to her. And afterwards looked rather as if they had lost a shilling and found sixpence. Connie's man could be a bit sulky, and Hilda's a bit jeering. But that is how men are! Ungrateful and never satisfied. When you don't have them they hate you because you won't; and when you do have them they hate you again, for some other reason. Or for no reason at all, except that they are discontented children, and can't be satisfied whatever they get, let a woman do what she may. (Pp. 4-5)

This aspect of the girls and the boys experience could reveal how the boys are unable to have a satisfaction out of their sexual relationship that they have with the girls as they only had their sexual passions fulfilled that they seemed to die for but soon they are in a rebuffed position but the girls since they were into the boys just for the sake of the talk and not the sex, they seem ok afterwards unlike the boys who insisted on it but left still unsatisfied.

The above aspect could relate to the tragedy that Lawrence mentioned in his novel *Sons and Lovers*, the fact that how many young men suffered like him due to the fact that they could not have successful relationships with women in their lives as they keep on looking for their mothers in the girls/ women they meet and the dissatisfaction they build inside of them as they just keep on moving from one woman to the next just so as they could have their sexual passion fulfilled.

4.4. The First World War

Then when war broke out, the girls went back home.

...again after having been home already in May, to their mother's funeral. Before Christmas of 1914 both their German young men were dead: whereupon the sisters wept, and loved the young men passionately, but underneath forgot them. They didn't exist any more. (P. 5)

This aspect reveals how women need sex and love together and it seems that they got over the death of their lovers real fast since they never loved them in the first place. Afterwards, Hilda

got married and Connie started doing "... a mild form of war-work, and consorted with the flannel-trousers Cambridge intransigents, who gently mocked at everything, so far." (p.5) And it was by that time that Connie got hitched with Clifford as he returned from Bonn where he was doing his studies in 'the technicalities of coal-mining'. "Returning home, Clifford became a first lieutenant in a smart regiment, so he could mock at everything more becomingly in uniform." (p.5)

Clifford though had all the privilege that his aristocratic back ground could provide, he was shy and

... nervous of all that other big world which consists of the vast hordes of the middle and lower classes, and foreigners. If the truth must be told, he was just a little bit frightened of middle-and lower-class humanity, and of foreigners not of his own class. He was, in some paralyzing way, conscious of his own defenselessness. (P. 6)

Lawrence puts it this way how this position in which Clifford was in as curious, but a phenomenon of our day. This could be explained how Clifford was suffering due to no fault of his own again but due to the norm that he was brought up under where he should only accept those who are on the same social class as he was if not just to say no to others. This position that he needed to abide by left him a poor sad man despite all that he had that was supposed to keep him superior and content.

Hence Connie's confidence pulled him in since she was independent unlike him who was not sure of himself and found everything to be ridiculous.

In fact everything was a little ridiculous, or very ridiculous: certainly everything connected with authority, whether it were in the army or the government or the universities, was ridiculous to a degree. And as far as the governing class made any pretensions to govern, they were ridiculous too. Sir Geoffrey, Clifford's father, was intensely ridiculous, chopping down his trees, and weeding men out of his colliery to shove them into the war; and himself being so safe and patriotic; but, also, spending more money on his country than he'd got. (P. 6)

4.5. Clifford: Crippled

In 1916, Clifford's older brother died and his father wanted his remaining son to get a wife and beget him an heir as mentioned before. Clifford thought very little of his father though now he could not see himself where he differed "... except in a wincing sense of the

ridiculousness of everything, and the paramount ridiculousness of his own position? For willy-nilly he took his baroncy and Wragby with the last seriousness.” (p.6)

Clifford married Connie, nevertheless, and had his month's honeymoon with her. It was the terrible year 1917, and they were intimate as two people who stand together on a sinking ship. He had been virgin when he married: and the sex part did not mean much to him. They were so close, he and she, apart from that. And Connie exulted a little in this intimacy which was beyond sex, and beyond a man's `satisfaction`. Clifford anyhow was not just keen on his `satisfaction', as so many men seemed to be. No, the intimacy was deeper, more personal than that. And sex was merely an accident, or an adjunct, one of the curious obsolete, organic processes which persisted in its own clumsiness, but was not really necessary. Though Connie did want children: if only to fortify her against her sister-in-law Emma. But early in 1918 Clifford was shipped home smashed, and there was no child. And Sir Geoffrey died of chagrin. (p.8)

And again as mentioned before, Connie (Constance) and Clifford came finally to live at Wragby Hall and Constance did not and could not like it. Connie also could not help but wonder how her husband had little relation ship with the people around. Clifford considered the miners “...as objects rather than men, parts of the pit rather than parts of life ... their queer, crude life ... as unnatural as that of hedgehogs.” (p. 11)

He was remotely interested; but like a man looking down a microscope, or up a telescope. He was not in touch. He was not in actual touch with anybody, save, traditionally, with Wragby, and, through the close bond of family defence, with Emma. Beyond this nothing really touched him. Connie felt that she herself didn't really, not really touch him; perhaps there was nothing to get at ultimately; just a negation of human contact. (P. 11)

But the thing was Clifford completely depended on Connie and asked for her presence every second. It seems so unfair Connie's being there at Wragby since she could herself see that she was not that important to her husband except that she felt that it was her duty. Despite everything, Clifford was quite ambitious and wrote stories that were 'personal', about people he knew. The stories seemed as if they were composed in vacuum. However, at that turbulent time, Clifford's stories “... were curiously true to modern life, to the modern psychology, that is.” (P. 11) His stories appeared in the 'most modern magazines' and were at the same time 'praised and blamed' and Clifford took it hard when his work got blamed as he just only wanted to be praised. Clifford had discussion with Connie about what he was writing in detail

and she helped him with all her might. “It was as if her whole soul and body and sex had to rouse up and pass into these stories of his. This thrilled her and absorbed her.” (Ibid)

Other than this, Connie really hated Wragby as revealed before despite its “... mechanical cleanliness and ... mechanical order” as it has no “... warmth of feeling united it organically.” (P. 12) The second winter since her arrival at Wragby, Connie’s father who used to pay her visits however fleeting ones came by and told his daughter how she needed to have a sexual life unless and otherwise she was inclined otherwise. Sir Malcolm also had discussion on this issue with Clifford who got real mad. Her husband said nothing on what her father had said to him but Connie suspected that her father must have said something to him though he failed to mention it. And what happened was

Time went on. Whatever happened, nothing happened, because she was so beautifully out of touch. She and Clifford lived in their ideas and his books. She entertained ... there were always people in the house. Time went on as clock does, half past eight instead of half past seven. (P. 14)

Connie imagined that she could live with her husband Clifford at Wragby without the needs of her body being met; content with what other outlets life has to offer. But as things turned out she just could not, as she herself was about to find out.

Out of her disconnection, restlessness was taking possession of her like madness. It twitched her limbs when she didn't want to twitch them, it jerked her spine when she didn't want to jerk upright but preferred to rest comfortably. It thrilled inside her body, in her womb, somewhere, till she felt she must jump into water and swim to get away from it; a mad restlessness. It made her heart beat violently for no reason. And she was getting thinner. (P. 14)

The heroine, Constance (Connie) tried running into the woods to run away from it all, Wragby, Clifford and others included. But she did not find solace since she felt not at home even there.

Vaguely she knew herself that she was going to pieces in some way. Vaguely she knew she was out of connection. She had lost touch with the substantial and vital world. Only Clifford and his books, which did not exist ... which had nothing in them! Void to void. Vaguely she knew. But it was like beating her head against a stone. (P. 15)

4.6. Connie's Affair with Michaelis

And her father again suggested to Connie to get herself a man as it would do her a lot of good. Then, that winter a young man by the name of Michaelis who was a successful playwright and was seen with reverence out in the US but who was also seen at that time with 'revulsion' at home in England for being found out to be Anti-English and a pretender came to Wragby at Clifford's request. Clifford was thinking that the well known playwright would help to promote his name in the US though Clifford well knew how at home Michaelis was having a hard time and was treated as if he were dirt. (p.20)

And as things turned out Constance was taken by him and the two started having an affair. But as things turned out, Mick was a curious and very gentle lover, very gentle with the woman, trembling uncontrollably and yet at the same time detached, aware, aware of every sound outside. (Ibid)

Then again the next time they made love, where Connie went to his room after he asked to come to hers, again, he turned out to be

... the trembling excited sort of lover, whose crisis soon came, and was finished. There was something curiously childlike and defenseless about his naked body: as children are naked. His defenses were all in his wits and cunning, his very instincts of cunning, and when these were in abeyance he seemed doubly naked and like a child, of unfinished, tender flesh, and somehow struggling helplessly. (Pp. 22-23)

And, the heroine found out how inside her Mick "... roused ... a wild sort of compassion and yearning, and a wild, craving physical desire..." that he could not help her to quench during the sexual intercourses they were having. Clifford never suspected anything went on between the two since Michaelis was so good at remaining being the same as the first day he arrived at Wragby when he was with both Connie and Clifford at the same time. When it came to Michaelis,

Connie never really understood him, but, in her way, she loved him. And all the time she felt the reflection of his hopelessness in her. She couldn't quite, quite love in hopelessness. And he, being hopeless, couldn't ever quite love at all. (P. 23)

Their affair continued for quite a while and they at times met in London.

She still wanted the physical, sexual thrill she could get with him by her own activity, his little orgasm being over. And he still wanted to give it her. Which was enough to keep them connected. (P. 23)

And during this period, Constance was 'terrifically cheerful' and she used it to help Clifford to write his best at that time. But when the affair stopped, she once again fell into depression. (p.24)

Connie always knew that what she was having with Michaelis would not last. However, other men meant nothing to her as she was attached to Clifford. She provided her husband with all what he asked for but in return could not get all what she wanted from the life of a man as he could not help but not providing her as he was rendered impotent. There were occasional spasms of Michaelis." But as could be seen above, Constance knew that would come to an end.

Mick couldn't keep anything up. It was part of his very being that he must break off any connexion, and be loose, isolated, absolutely lone dog again. It was his major necessity, even though he always said: She turned me down! (P. 24)

Here, one could see how Connie was not so selfish again as she once again looked into the personality of Michaelis, his need for his privacy that might bring their affair, her only way out at the time to an end despite the fact that she did not know what awaited her if Michaelis left as could be seen under in Lawrence's words.

The world is supposed to be full of possibilities, but they narrow down to pretty few in most personal experience. There's lots of good fish in the sea...maybe...but the vast masses seem to be mackerel or herring, and if you're not mackerel or herring yourself you are likely to find very few good fish in the sea. (P. 24)

4.7. Clifford and His Friends

And what happened at that time was, with the support of Connie who was getting what of a man she could get from Michaelis. "Clifford was making strides into fame, and even money. People came to see him. Connie nearly always had somebody at Wragby. But if they weren't mackerel they were herring, with an occasional cat-fish, or conger-eel." (p.24) Amongst the men who came to Wragby regularly were Clifford's friends from his days in Cambridge University. One is Tommy Dukes who was a Brigadier-General who thanks to the army for

providing him with lots of time to think on his hand instead of worrying about how he would lead his life. Another is an Irishman by the name of Charles May who wrote about stars scientifically and there was also a writer, Hammond.

These men were all about the same age and were the 'young intellectuals' of the time.

They all believed in the life of the mind.' And as far as they are concerned what '... you did apart from that was your private affair, and didn't much matter. No one thinks of inquiring of another person at what hour he retires to the privy. It isn't interesting to anyone but the person concerned.' (Pp. 24-25)

And this belief of theirs included

... most of the matters of ordinary life...how you make your money, or whether you love your wife, or if you have 'affairs'. All these matters concern only the person concerned, and, like going to the privy, have no interest for anyone else. (P. 25)

Hammond, the writer with a wife and two kids stated how it was not important to be interested about another man's sexual life since doing that as far as he was concerned was to follow another man to the toilette which as mentioned before is a no no. Then in reply Charlie May who flirted with Hammond's wife, Julia replied: "Quite, Hammond, quite! But if someone starts making love to Julia, you begin to simmer; and if he goes on, you are soon at boiling point." (P. 25)

And May added how Hammond thought he would be better off to success with the backing of a woman, Julia by his side and told him this was why he was so jealous of another man having sex with his wife. As May put it to Hammond sex was,

'...a vital little dynamo between you and Julia, to bring success. If you began to be unsuccessful you'd begin to flirt, like Charlie, who isn't successful. Married people like you and Julia have labels on you, like travellers' trunks. Julia is labeled Mrs. Arnold B. Hammond---just like a trunk on the railway that belongs to somebody. And you are labeled Arnold B. Hammond, c/o Mrs. Arnold B. Hammond. (Pp. 25-26)

This is the aspect- how men see sex and how appropriating they feel to women and success, the modern ones.

Clifford hardly ever said anything when such issues were raised since he felt he had of no value to speak of. And he was too confused and emotional. Now he blushed and looked uncomfortable. (p.27)

Connie had to sit it out and listen to such discussions of these four men and at times another one or two added to the four but she never hated it as she enjoyed hearing to what they were saying especially at the times when Dukes was there.

... It was fun. Instead of men kissing you, and touching you with their bodies, they revealed their minds to you. It was great fun! But what cold minds! And what is more, their discussions were a little bit annoying. (28)

The heroine respected Michaelis more than either Clifford and his Cambridge friends who considered Mick as if he were dirt and "... on whose name they all poured such withering contempt, as a little mongrel arriviste, and uneducated bounder of the worst sort. Mongrel and bounder or not, he jumped to his own conclusions." Unlike the supposedly educated ones, those were Clifford and his friends (cronies), he "... didn't merely walk round them with millions of words, in the parade of the life of the mind." (p.28)

The fact was

Connie quite liked the life of the mind, and got a great thrill out of it. But she did think it overdid itself a little. She loved being there, amidst the tobacco smoke of those famous evenings of the cronies, as she called them privately to herself. She was infinitely amused, and proud too, that even their talking they could not do, without her silent presence. She had an immense respect for thought...and these men, at least, tried to think honestly. But somehow there was a cat, and it wouldn't jump. They all alike talked at something, though what it was, for the life of her she couldn't say. It was something that Mick didn't clear, either. (Pp. 28-29)

Then there was the following consideration in the heroin's head following what was stated in the above paragraph as she as usual tried to sort and understand the *whys* and *hows* of the actions of those around her.

But then Mick wasn't trying to do anything, but just get through his life, and put as much across other people as they tried to put across him. He was really anti-social, which was what Clifford and his cronies had against him. Clifford and his cronies were not anti-social; they were more or less bent on saving mankind, or on instructing it, to say the least. (P. 29)

4.8. Connie: Feeling down

Then, Lawrence builds a scene, after Constance's affair with Mick was over and she was left all alone once where the heroine got into her bedroom and started having a look at her naked body in front of the huge mirror letting the lamplight shine full on her naked body so as she would have a good view of her reflection and all the time she did this, she did not know what she was looking for. (P. 58) And Constance did not like what she was seeing. "Instead of ripening its firm, down-running curves, her body was flattening and going a little harsh. It was as if it had not had enough sun and warmth; it was a little greyish and sapless." (Ibid)

And further her body disappointed "of its real womanhood, it had not succeeded in becoming boyish, and unsubstantial, and transparent; instead it had gone opaque." (Ibid) And she felt really hopeless. Next, she took a look at her back in the huge mirror and the realization hit her how she became thinner and Connie did not find it to be becoming of her. Further,

...the crumple of her waist at the back, as she bent back to look, was a little weary; and it used to be so gay-looking. And the longish slope of her haunches and her buttocks had lost its gleam and its sense of richness. (P. 59)

And Connie felt how all was lost.

Gone! Only the German boy had loved it, and he was ten years dead, very nearly. How time went by! Ten years dead, and she was only twenty-seven. The healthy boy with his fresh, clumsy sensuality that she had then been so scornful of! Where would she find it now? It was gone out of men. They had their pathetic, two-second spasms like Michaelis; but no healthy human sensuality, that warms the blood and freshens the whole being. (P. 59)

However, when it came to her front part, she felt that it was already beginning to slacken, with a slack sort of thinness, almost withered, going old before it had ever really lived. And then she thought of the child she might somehow bear. Was she fit, anyhow? She asked herself. Afterwards, she put on her night dress and went to bed and she wept bitterly. "Unjust! Unjust! The sense of deep physical injustice burned deep in her very soul." (P. 59) But when morning came, she went down to see to Clifford's needs as he would have for his intimate needs "... no man, and refused a woman – servant." (P. 60)

But still the fact remained that Constance was overwhelmed with a sense of being unjustly defrauded. "The physical sense of injustice is a dangerous feeling, once it is awakened. It must have outlet, or it eats away the one in whom it is aroused." (Ibid) And when Constance thought of it all, she realized how Clifford had neither been warm to her,

..., nor even kind, only thoughtful, considerate, in a well-bred, cold sort of way! But never warm as a man can be warm to a woman, as even Connie's father could be warm to her, with the warmth of a man who did himself well, and intended to, but who still could comfort a woman with a bit of his masculine glow. (P. 60)

But as Constance was made to be aware of, her husband was not even as warm to her as her father was to her. Maybe he did not have it in him along others of his race. "They were all inwardly hard and separate." (Ibid)

As things turned out warmth to them was just bad taste. You had to get on without it, and hold your own; which was all very well if you were of the same class and race. Then you could keep yourself cold and be very estimable, and hold your own, and enjoy the satisfaction of holding it. But if you were of another class and another race it wouldn't do; there was no fun merely holding your own, and feeling you belonged to the ruling class. What was the point, when even the smartest aristocrats had really nothing positive of their own to hold, and their rule was really a farce, not rule at all? What was the point? It was all cold nonsense. (p.60)

And Connie started asking herself what was the good of it all, her sacrificing her life to her husband who was full of cold spirit of vanity, that had no warm human contacts.

As usual there were still people staying at Wragby. Amongst them was Clifford's aunt Eva, Lady Bennerley, who warned Connie how a woman need to have her life lived or she would live to regret it all the rest of her remaining years. (p.61) Then the lady suggested that she came to London.

But Connie was not keen on going to London, and being steered into the smart world by Lady Bennerley. She didn't feel really smart, it wasn't interesting. And she did feel the peculiar, withering coldness under it all; like the soil of Labrador, which his gay little flowers on its surface, and a foot down is frozen. (p.62)

4.9. Clifford's Suggestion for a Baby: An Heir

One chilly February morning where there was little sun, Clifford and Connie took a walk in the woods that Clifford loved and now rehired a game keeper after the war to protect and keep "... shut of from the world..." as he believed that "... they were his own through generations." (Pp. 33-34)

As the two reached on the barren part of the forest, a place that is left out of Clifford's father cutting down for trenches during the war and on seeing it which rendered Clifford unusually mad, he told Connie how he considered the wood as if it was "... the old England, the heart of it and how he wanted the wood 'perfect', 'untouched' and then added how he wanted no one to trespass in it. (p.34)

Then as he "... sat in the pale sun, with the light on his smooth, rather blond hair, his reddish full face inscrutable...", Clifford told Constance how he minded not being able to have a son at its worst when he was there in the woods. Then he said to her how " ' it would almost be a good thing if you had a child by another man ..." as he did not as he put it " ' ... believe very intensely in fatherhood.'" (p.35) Then Clifford put a proposition to Connie and it went like this " ' if we brought it up at Wragby, it would belong to us and to the place. ... if we had the child to rear, it would be our own, and it would carry on. ...'" Then he asked her if she thought it was worth considering. (Ibid)

Connie thought of Mick in relation to fathering a child but realized how he just was a man she had a fling with as "...an excursion from her marriage with Clifford; the long, slow habit of intimacy, formed through years of suffering and patience." Then she said to herself how maybe "... the human soul needs excursions, and must not be denied them. But the point of an excursion is that you come home again." Then she said to Clifford " "And wouldn't you mind what man's child I had?"" (p.36)

And in reply, Clifford told her that he would trust her "... natural instinct of decency and selection." And he added that how she would not let the wrong kind of man have his ways with her. (Ibid)

From this it would be concluded that Clifford has no idea of what love is. This could be the influence of the patriarchal ideology that he has lived and grown up under as it forced him to put a label on who he could love. As far as the researcher is concerned, this is one aspect of

the wrongs that is perpetrated against humanism through the sustenance of patriarchal ideology.

Then, the psychoanalytic feministic heroine did a nice search into her soul, realizing how we are run by unconscious drives and not know what comes next into our heads. And her thoughts were as follows:

Was it just that? She was to be content to weave a steady life with him, all one fabric, but perhaps brocaded with the occasional flower of an adventure. But how could she know what she would feel next year? How could one ever know? How could one say Yes? For years and years? The little yes, gone on a breath! Why should one be pinned down by that butterfly word? Of course it had to flutter away and be gone, to be followed by other yes's and no's! Like the straying of butterflies. (p.37)

Then, things changed.

4.10. Mellors Walked into Constance's Life

A man with a gun strode swiftly, softly out after the dog, facing their way as if about to attack them; then stopped instead, saluted, and was turning downhill. It was only the new game-keeper, but he had frightened Connie, he seemed to emerge with such a swift menace. That was how she had seen him, like the sudden rush of a threat out of nowhere. (p.37)

This man was the one who would change the life of the heroine.

As the keeper was about to go quickly down the hill, Clifford called him by his name, Mellors and asked him to help out as Clifford moved down the hill. He was of medium height, slim and quite. And as he came to them he just looked at Clifford's chair and not at Connie. (p. 38)

And when Constance asked him if he liked it there and then looked into his eye, Mellors eyes narrowed a little, with irony, perhaps with impudence. And he replied, "Why, yes, thank you, your Ladyship! I was reared here." (p.38)

And later on after they went up a steep rise of the knoll in the park, her husband looked back for her as his "... chair waited at the top of the pink path..." and asked her "Not tired, are you?" and she lied telling him how she was not tired.

But she was. A strange, weary yearning, dissatisfaction had started in her. Clifford did not notice: those were not things he was aware of. But the stranger knew. To Connie,

everything in her world and life seemed worn out, and her dissatisfaction was older than the hills. (p.39)

As could be seen, she was full of dissatisfaction though she is married and all and supposed to be happy. She chose this life of hers but now as things turn out, she did not like it and funnily enough a stranger, Mellors noticed unlike her supposed to be husband to whom she did everything he needed.

And Clifford was also started to change. Though he seemed alert on the outside, on the inside he was "... like the Midlands atmosphere, haze, smoky mist." And what was more "... the haze seemed to be creeping forward." And as it was "...when he stared at Connie in his peculiar way, giving her his peculiar, precise information, she felt all the background of his mind filling up with mist, with nothingness. And it frightened her." (pp. 40-41)

And a realization hit the heroine as to

...one of the great laws of the human soul: that when the emotional soul receives a wounding shock, which does not kill the body, the soul seems to recover as the body recovers. But this is only appearance. It is really only the mechanism of the re-assumed habit. Slowly, slowly the wound to the soul begins to make itself felt, like a bruise, which Only slowly deepens its terrible ache, till it fills all the psyche. And when we think we have recovered and forgotten, it is then that the terrible after-effects have to be encountered at their worst. (p.41)

Lawrence reveals the circumstance in which the heroine lived under as follows:

Poor Connie! As the years drew on it was the fear of nothingness in her life that affected her. Clifford's mental life and hers gradually began to feel like nothingness. Their marriage, their integrated life based on a habit of intimacy, that he talked about: there were days when it all became utterly blank and nothing. It was words, just so many words. The only reality was nothingness, and over it a hypocrisy of words. (pp.41-42)

Despite the fact that the heroine had been kind to Michaelis and accepted him for who he was as a lover, one of the modern men who came so quickly, he ended up putting the blame on her accusing her of grinding her own coffee after he had his own crisis. (p.45) And after breaking it off with him, Connie decided to settle for what she just had with Clifford making up her mind about the fact that

Love, sex, all that sort of stuff, just water-ices! Lick it up and forget it. If you don't hang on to it in your mind, it's nothing. Sex especially...nothing! Make up your mind to it, and you've solved the problem. Sex and a cocktail: they both lasted about as long, had the same effect, and amounted to about the same thing. (p.53)

4.11. Connie's Desire to Mother a Child and Her Dilemma

But still, the issue of motherhood was eating at her and she couldn't stop to contemplate about it.

...Connie had the child at the back of her mind. Wait! Wait! She would sift the generations of men through her sieve, and see if she couldn't find one who would do... 'Go ye into the streets and by ways of Jerusalem, and see if you can find a *man*.' It had been impossible to find a man in the Jerusalem of the prophet, though there were thousands of male humans. But a *man! C'est une autre chose!* (p.54)

Since Constance had given up on Clifford and his alikes, the idea that the man who would father her child/ren would have to be a neither an Englishman, nor an Irish man, but a foreigner - a real one at that hit her. And she thought:

But wait! wait! Next winter she would get Clifford to London; the following winter she would get him abroad to the South of France, Italy. Wait! She was in no hurry about the child. That was her own private affair, and the one point on which, in her own queer, female way, she was serious to the bottom of her soul. She was not going to risk any chance comer, not she! One might take a lover almost at any moment, but a man who should beget a child on one...wait! wait! it's a very different matter.---`Go ye into the streets and byways of Jerusalem...' It was not a question of love; it was a question of a *man*. Why, one might even rather hate him, personally. Yet if he was the man, what would one's personal hate matter? This business concerned another part of oneself. (p.54)

4.12. Constance Found Real Love in Mellors

Later on as she began having relationship with the gamekeeper Mellors, the heroine realized that she had been played by the belief that it was only the mind that matters. After she started seeing Mellors, Constance asked Clifford if he really liked it if she were to have a baby and he told her that it would be all right so long as it would not change the love that they had for one another. God only knows what Clifford was talking about as to the love between them since he never loved her even to begin with and neither did she as she came to realize. (p.95)

The heroine then fell in love with Mellors and she thought what if I had his child and "... her limbs turned molten at the thought, and she realized the immense difference between having a child to oneself, and having a child to a man whom one's bowels yearned towards." (p. 117)

The former seemed in a sense ordinary: but to have a child to a man whom one adored in one's bowels and one's womb, it made her feel she was very different from her old self, and as if she was sinking deep, deep to the centre of all womanhood and the sleep of creation. (P. 117)

After a while the heroine went to Venice with Hilda and her dad. And there, she told her beloved dad the one who adored her how she was not sure that she should go back to Wragby and also how she was going to have a baby. (P. 241)

And later, when she told Mellors about the baby that she was expecting and how she wanted to live with him, meeting him in Scotland after he left his post at Wragby, he informed her how he would love to be her husband and the father of their child if she found him worth having. (P.244)

And later on as they made love, Mellors who stood for "... the touch of bodily awareness between human beings..." unlike Clifford and other male characters in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* was so glad that he found a woman he really loved and who loved him back completely and he said:

'... she is my mate. And it is a battle against the money, and the machine, and the insentient ideal monkeyishness of the world. And she will stand behind me there. Thank God I've got a woman! Thank God I've got a woman who is with me, and tender and aware of me. Thank God she's not a bully, nor a fool. Thank God she's a tender, aware woman.' (P. 247)

Then Mellors decided to learn about farming till the baby was due so as he would be able to provide for Connie and the baby in few months time at a farm that they would own for themselves as a family.(pp. 264-265)

5. Conclusion

From the start, it seems that Lawrence puts a heroine in the picture. And this heroine as could be seen later on, cared about not only herself but also her future child (children) and about the loving relationship that is required to raise her child (children) in.

As could also be seen at the beginning of the novel, Constance was feeling lost as the war had torn to pieces all that she had and known. The war could be explained as one aspect of the patriarchal ideology that feminists have always been trying to undermine but have not been succeeding as the problem, according to psychoanalytic feminist critics, lies deeper in the unconscious (psyche) of individuals and needs both sexes to work together so as they might have a chance in becoming conscious of the unconscious hand of patriarchy and may be with better chance in succeeding to overcome the male desire to appropriate even at the cost of millions of lives of men, women and children.

It seems that there is a possibility that this heroine had the love of both parents from the beginning. And what is more, one could see Constance's father, Sir Malcolm's, positive influence with regard to his daughter's sexuality. One possible conclusion that could be drawn from this is the fact that Sir Malcolm could be seen as a man that society needs to encourage within a family so as it could produce individual children who would become psychosexually complete.

From this work, it could be gathered that there is the importance of dual parenting and the need not to be selfish especially when one is well-learned as in the case of Clifford when he insisted on Connie having a child so long as she kept up being the good wife of him. But, it seems that he could never be a good father since he was so much involved in his own affairs. And nothing gave him meaning as he was unconsciously so much in deep with the sustenance of the patriarchal beliefs.

It seems that this reading is quite a good one as it might facilitate better understanding into our nature and this criticism as a discipline is aiming at the possibility that we might have a better future for us as well as those that would come along to spend their times in this world which we seem to do our best to destroy to the maximum.

Having a look at some aspects of human nature at work and the *whys* behind the actions of some of the characters, it seems that trying to understand others' actions and feelings is better than creating an unbridgeable gap amongst the individuals concerned. This could be seen in Constance's effort to understand and tolerate Clifford's deeds despite their malevolent nature and with the heroine's understanding of Michaelis' nature.

From Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers*, one could see the disastrous impact that woman's sole parenting has on every individual within the family. From Lawrence's summary of the novel that he sent to Garnett, we have seen how Paul's mother died of heartbreak having seen in what sort of psychological trap her son has landed in. Also the father figure, despite his effort to provide for his family, working at the pit, the only way he knew, has lost even the passion he had in his marriage and his sons have come to hate him. As to Paul, we have seen how he was not able to love and have normal sexual relationship with any woman in his life. And his incapacity to love continued even after the death of his mother. According to psychoanalytic feministic criticism, all this is a result of the mother figure raising her babies on her own that left her beloved children psychosocially incomplete and washed all her love and effort raising them down the drain. Furthermore, the mother figure unconsciously sustained patriarchy with just the kind of individuals it needed to live on, in her sons who were psychosexually incomplete ones. With his last work, Lawrence has shown the solution to the problem that we see ravaging the whole family in *Sons and Lovers*, which he called tragedy.

To break the above vicious circle of sustaining patriarchy unconsciously, it takes both men and women to work together. And that is the only way for humanity to save itself from self destruction by rescuing the man-woman relationship that has been going berserk over the years with the love that is filled with both sensuality and tenderness, a love made of both mind and body – a whole as shown with Constance and Mellors in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

Lawrence, as mentioned at the beginning of this paper, has been accused of writing works that are all for the subjugation of women, though seem on the outside feministic. But, psychoanalytic feministic reading of his work has revealed the reverse. Indeed, he has always been aiming at the complete liberation of women through the subversion of patriarchy that has been sustained unconsciously over the times.

It seems like, with psychoanalysis putting on its side feminism, has come up with a new criticism that entertains both sexes, which might bring them together not one against the other but to the point where both might play a role together to their benefit – to the whole beings on the world.

Women have always been oppressed socially, economically, politically and psychologically and Feminism has always been trying to counteract these oppressions so as women might have a better day. But as it turns out, these oppressions are changing their colours and still remain prevalent as they are found buried deep within each one of us as feministic psychoanalytic criticism brings out to light. And for these oppressions to be overcome both sexes need to be involved in the struggle to subvert patriarchy.

Bibliography

Apollon, Willy, Bergeron, Danielle and Cantin, Lucie (2002). *After Lacan: Clinical Practice and the Subject of the Unconscious*. State University of New York Press, New York.

Balbert, Peter (1989). *D.H. Lawrence and the phallic imagination: essays on sexual identity and feminist misreading*. Macmillan, London

Barron, Janet (1991). *D.H. Lawrence*. Prentice Hall, New York.

Brennan, Teresa (1989). *Between Feminism and Psychoanalysis*. Routledge, London.

Brooks, Peter and Woloch, Alex (2000). *Whose Freud? The Place of Psychoanalysis in Contemporary Culture*. Yale University Press, London.

Buhle, Mari Jo (1998). *Feminism and Its Discontents: A Century of Struggle with Psychoanalysis*. Harvard University Press, London.

Burack, Charles (1998). "Revitalizing the Reader: Literary Techniques and the Language of Sacred Experience in D.H. Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover." *Style* (Spring 1998, Northern Illinois University).

Carswell, Catherine (1981). *The Savage Pilgrimage: A Narrative of D.H. Lawrence*. Cambridge: CUP.

Chodorow, Nancy J. (2006). Freud and Followers Bisexual – Heterosexual. In: Cooper Arnold M. (ed.) *Contemporary Psychoanalysis in America Leading Analysts Present their Work*. American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc. Washington DC.

Cowan, James C (1994). "D.H. Lawrence's Sexual Fallacies." *The Journal of the History of Sexuality*, Vol. 5, No. 1, July 1994.

Damousi, Joy (2005). *Freud in the Antipodes: A Cultural History of Psychoanalysis in Australia*. UNSW Press. Australia.

Deutscher, Penelope (1997). *Yielding Gender: Feminism, Deconstruction and the History of Philosophy*. Routledge, London.

Dorothy, Gerald (1996). "The art of appropriation: the rhetoric of sexuality in D.H. Lawrence - Rhetoric and Poetics." *Style* (Summer 1996).

- Ellis, David (2007). "Introduction and Notes," in, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Wordsworth Classics, London.
- Ellmann, Maud (1994). *Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism*. Longman, London.
- Flax, Jane (1990), *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*. University of California Press. Berkeley, USA.
- Freedman Estelle B. (2002). *No Turning Back: The History of Feminism and the Future of Women*. The Random House Publishing Groups. New York.
- Freud, Sigmund (1905). Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality. Standard Edition, 7.
- Gallop, Jane (1987). "Reading the Mother Tongue: Psychoanalytic Feminist Criticism." *Critical Inquiry*. Vol. 13, No. 2, The Trial(s) of Psychoanalysis (Winter, 1987), pp. 314-329.
- Habib, M.A.R. (2005). *Modern Literary Criticism and Theory: A History of Literary Criticism*. Blackwell publishing, USA.
- Jarrett-Kerr, Martin (1951). *D.H. Lawrence and Human Existence*. SCM Press, London.
- Jung, C. G. (1966). *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, Collected Works, 7 (2nd ed.). Routledge, London.
- Jung, C. G. (1981). *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, Collected Works, 9 (2nd ed.). Princeton: NJ: Bollingen, USA.
- Lacan, Jacques (1998). *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. W.W. Norton, London.
- Lawrence, D.H. (1913/1991). *Sons and lovers*. David Campbell Publishers Ltd., London.
- Lawrence, D.H. (1928/2005). *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Barnes and Noble Books, New York.
- Lawrence, D.H. (1928/2007). *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Wordsworth Editions Ltd., Great Britain.
- Leavis, F. R. (1967). "The Orthodoxy of Enlightenment," in, *Anna Karenina and Other Essays*. Chatto and Windus, London.
- Lessing, Doris (2006). "Testament of Love." *The Guardian*, 15 July.

Millett, Kate (2000). *Sexual Politics*. Granada Publishing/ University of Illinois Press, USA.

Mitchell, Juliet (1974). *Psychoanalysis and Feminism: A Radical Reassessment of Freudian Psychoanalysis*. Pantheon Books, New York.

Oliver, Kelly and Walsh, Lisa (2004). *Contemporary French Feminism*. Oxford University Press Inc., New York.

Plain, Gill & Susan, Sellers (2007). *A History of Feminist Literary Criticism*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Salecl, Renata (1994). *The Spoils of Freedom: Psychoanalysis and Feminism After the Fall of Socialism*. Routledge, London.

Salgado, Gamini (1982). *A Preface to Lawrence*. Longman, New York.

Salgado, Gamini (ed.) (1969). *D.H. Lawrence: Sons and Lovers*. Macmillan, London.

Simpson, Hilary (1982). *D.H. Lawrence and Feminism*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Weiss, Daniel A (1962). *Oedipus in Nottingham: D.H. Lawrence*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Zuk, Marlene (2002). *Sexual Selections: What We Can and Can't Learn About Sex from Animals*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Internet sources (accessed on March 28, 2012):

http://classof1.com/homework_answers/gender_studies/feminism_theory_of_pschoanalysis

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/D.H._Lawrence

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Feminist_theory

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kate_Millett

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lady_Chatterley's_Lover

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matthew_Arnold

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sigmund Freud](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sigmund_Freud)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sons and Lovers](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sons_and_Lovers)

<http://ktnd.pr.ysu.ac.kr/lawrence/paper/9-2hongsunghyun.htm>

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-psychoanalysis>

<http://public.iastate.edu/~cfehr/338%20psychanalytic%20feminism.htm>

<http://www.dailylit.com/books/sons-and-lovers>

<http://www.guypetersreviews.com/rearwin.php>

<http://www.kristisiegel.com/theory.htm>

<http://www.literature-study-online.com/essays/arnold.html>

[http://www.mendeley.com/research/feminist-psychoanalytic-theory-american-french-reactions-freud/journal of The American Psychoanalytic Association \(1996\)](http://www.mendeley.com/research/feminist-psychoanalytic-theory-american-french-reactions-freud/journal_of_The_American_Psychoanalytic_Association_(1996))

<http://www.palgrave-journals.com/fr/journal/v3/n1/full/fr197921a.html>

<http://www.palgrave-journals.com/fr/journal/v75/n1/abs/9400115a.html>

<http://www.public.iastate.edu/~cfehr/338%20psychoanalytic%20feminism.htm>

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/68955316/29/LAWRENCE%E2%80%99S-LADY-CHATTERLEY%E2%80%99S-LOVER>

<http://www.webster.edu/~woolflm/chodorow.html> Nancy Chodorow

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the present thesis 'A Psychoanalytic Feministic Criticism of D. H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* with its Possibility of Patriarchal Subversion' is my original research work. The works cited in the study are appropriately acknowledged. The thesis has not been presented for any other degree at any other university.

Name: Kedist Belete Shibeshi

Signature: _____

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university advisor.

Name: Dr. Pradeep Sharma

Signature: _____

Place and date of submission: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

June, 2012