



Humans and Animals: Psychosexual bonding in *St Mawr* and “Karnelko Ghoda”

Keshav Raj Chalise

Ph. D. Lecturer, Nepal Sanskrit University, Bijauri, Nepal

Abstract

Two psychological writers: Koirala from Nepalese narrative writings and Lawrence from English fiction writings, share common aspects of depicting human psychic realities in their creations. Koirala's short story, “Karnelko Ghoda” and Lawrence's novella, *St. Mawr* have the common aspects of human and animal bonding. With similar plot structure, both stories present female characters being psychologically attached with the animal character, the horse. Both females suffer from the distorted impulses with impotent and sterile marriage relationship. The relation has automatically led them to hate the males they are married with, and they develop some sort of relationship with the male horse they have. They have seen the reflection of the power, strength and potency in the horse. They realize the sense of self-object, feeling of love or affection of the love toward him or her. They expose the love, affection and even devotion to the horse greater than to their married husbands. They feel the notion of self-psychology, understanding the psychology of the animals within themselves. The mode of self-psychology, in general and self-object in particular reveals their psychosexual relation to the horse. The male central characters in both the stories do hate the horse. Their hatred and anger appears to be the result of their sexual antagonism. This paper tries to examine human-horse relation as related to psychic reality of self-object and antagonism.

Keywords: psychic reality, distorted impulse, self-psychology, self-object, sexual antagonism

Introduction

Having the theme of human inner observation, D. H. Lawrence's *St. Mawr* (1925) [11] provides psychological conflict between two central characters, Louise and Rico. As a very carefully structured short novel (novella), it begins with the reference of madly loving relation between an artist, Henry Rico Carrington and a beautiful lady, Louise Carrington and grows to the gradual dissatisfaction in the relation. Also Lawrence presents a clash between animal world (horse) and man world (Rico) on the one hand and a good relation between animal world (horse) and woman world (Louise) on the other. Lawrence has treated animals in his writings with special roles. The appearance of various animals in his writings hints his preference to animal world. He finds comfortable with animal characters. He enjoys within the role of cat, dog, fox and horse in his writings. The stories, “The Rocking Horse Winner”, “St. Mawr”, “The Rainbow”, “The Boy in the Bush” and “The First Lady Chatterley” illustrate his significance of the horse image in his writings.

Emerged from Hindi short story writing, B. P. Koirala has firstly come up with “Chandrabadan” as his first Nepali story in a journal, *Sharada*. He has published other Hindi stories in other journals like “Vishal”, “Bharat” and “Himalaya”. He published his first collection of short stories entitled *Basibiyalo* in 1999 BS and it was renamed as *Doshi Chasma* in 2006 [7] BS. It was the first book in Nepali literature “which initiates the psychological discussion in Nepali literary tradition” (Gautam 390). “Karnelko Ghoda” (Colonel's Horse) is one of the stories collected in *Doshi Chasma*. Koirala's arrival in Nepali fictional writing has introduced a new trend in Nepalese literature, especially through his preference on human psychological reality. It was the time Guruprasad Mainali was writing social reality in Nepali short stories and formally inviting realism and

modernism in Nepali literature and “the complete formation of modernism in Nepali literature got shaped with Koirala's trend of presenting social reality in relation with human psychology which gave a new direction and speed in Nepali short story trend” (Gharti 315). Koirala has appeared with the mode of the sense of violation of social norms as the issue of human psychology. Most of his stories reflect “the inner human feelings, especially sexual ones and socially unaccepted and forbidden issues of human moral values” (316) directed towards the freedom and desire of breaking so-called moral values of the society from the very core of the psychology. Social desire and personal desire collide together where individual desire gets collapsed and becomes the victim because of the social desire of the norms, rules and morality. His stories try to go into the depth of this reality. Best known for writing human psychic in his creation, Koirala has admitted that he was influenced by the writings of D. H. Lawrence, the originator of psychological expression in American literature. It is possible to see similarity between their writings on the mode of the representation of human psychological state. This study plans to observe the image of human psychic reflected in Koirala's short story, “Karnelko Ghoda (Colonel's Horse)” and Lawrence's *St. Mawr*.

Freud, Human Unconscious and Psychic Reality

Born in Moravia, then Austrian Empire, and received education in medical science, Sigmund Freud has initiated the human psychic discourse in the mode of human psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis, as a means of “investigating the unconscious dimension of human mind” (Buchanan 387), is a theory that attempts to explain the functioning of psychic apparatus systematically. He has realized that “what people say, without suggestion, is more not less indicative of what is happening in their

unconscious" (388); hence, the path of psychoanalysis enhances to comprehend the mechanisms of the unconscious. The unconscious, where the instincts reside, and "these instincts exert a constant pressure on the other parts of the psychical apparatus" (389). These instincts cannot pass through the preconscious and conscious process and hence, become repressed. The repression of the instincts does not necessarily mean the complete negation, but also it is the distortion of thoughts and impulses. Socially unaccepted impulses and distorted impulses appear from the core unconscious in the modes of dream, madness and free expression, and the errors, spoken or written. Everything that strikes a person as being real is psychic reality. It can be different from the real reality. It feels real to the person who experiences it and the person has no sense that it might not be real. Swiss analytical psychologist, Carl Jung has used this term to explain the fact that two people may encounter a specific event quite differently. It also explains how one person may apprehend quite different things in fundamentally the same way. In Jung's theory, psychic reality exists as an interim phase between the physical world of sense, on the one hand, and the spiritual world of thought and cognition on the other. In Freud's term, the concept refers to the force of reality allied with the subject's internal unreal. This may resist and even govern the insight of external reality; it can appear, in fact, as more "real" than reality itself. From the beginning, the prominence of psychic study depends on the objective nature of subjectivity, even at the expense of its relationship to external reality. As the product of subjective mental activity or unconscious mental activity, "psychic reality clearly projects the difference between biological reality and the "psychic" reality because biological reality is objective or anatomical whereas the psychic reality is the production of unconscious" (Arlo 661). Existence of an autonomous realm of psychical life and the unconscious psyche, including the reality of fantasies, could henceforth be asserted with growing confidence. Another aspect to the emergence of psychical reality is "sexual trauma and its value in terms of the debate around the role of real life events as opposed to fantasy. The infantile and sexual fantasies that such scenes represented replaced the traumatic cause of neurosis" (Friedman 93). These fantasies, an important type of psychical reality, impacted the psychic apparatus with all the force of "reality" and more.

Thus, the concept of psychical reality, advanced initially to point out the imperious nature of fantasy, can somehow dominate external reality. Any trace of opposition between external and internal as the concept currently working is complicated further by the question of how to determine the source of the subjectively "real" character of psychical reality. Two kinds of premises can be advanced in this regard. Not necessarily antagonistic, they represent two major strands in psychoanalytic thought. The first type relates psychical reality to the impact of external reality. Psychical reality in this sense would indicate a previous encounter with reality; it would represent a reality that has become psychical through trace of impact. Fantasies, according to this view, are 'hybrid' structures that contain a core of reality, a kind of transformed recollection, the source of which lies at a remote point in time. They are the psychic apparatus from the past reality. The second type of hypothesis relates psychic reality to the limitations intrinsic to psychical activity, to its laws and operational principles.

The representations of desire can be revived through the pleasure principle, a wish fulfilled, even to the possible loss of perception of the real world. Anna and Sigmund Freud were both pet owners. And while their respective personal experience with their dogs helped them become aware of what Freud called a "pure love" relationship between a pet and its companion. In fact, psychoanalytic writing leaves unexplained the quality of shared psychic environment between animals and humans. This article tries to investigate some of the fundamentals of human animal relationship and its adaptive function.

***Karnelni* and Louise: Fatalities of distorted impulse**

Personality development takes place through constant activation of the life instinct. Sex being the most important life instinct in an individual, engagement in different erotic activities is a must to activate the life instinct. Sex is a biological instinct, which needs to be gratified. When present, it creates tension, and when met with, leads to satisfaction. The earliest manifestations of sexuality arise in relation to bodily actions, which are basically nonsexual, such as feeding and elimination of body wastes. But later manifestation with the onset of genital stage, sex becomes a central part for the creation of personality because there is "a close connection between sexuality and identity" (Tyson 26). If sexuality gets distorted, it creates the different mode of personality even to a dangerous situation because "sexuality is one of the clearest and one of the most consistent barometers of the psychological state" (27). Sexuality, in this sense, is not only the biological drive, but also it is a matter of meaning.

Karnelni, in *Karnelko Ghoda* (Colonel's Horse) is a young lady of nineteen married with a matured colonel aged forty-five. Karnel would love her as his best, but "the love of a forty-five years old Karnel was always insufficient to a young Karnelni^[1]" (Koirala 40). Supposing love as a part of material prosperity, he "would bring many things, including expensive clothing and cosmetics while coming back from out every time" (40), but these materials would give her no more than the pain. He thinks that all these material things are the means of her happiness and it is the way to love to a young lady. Love has many dimensions. Material things can have been one of them, but the psychological satisfaction and the satisfaction in the sex are the major factors in love. Marrying with a matured and rich Karnel, she "imagined and dreamed of a happy and pleased life in the marriage" (40), but it has become useless. He has not only misunderstood and misinterpreted the essence of love seeing in material prosperity, but also he has distorted her impulse, "the string of her dream got broken when Karnel could not stand the weight of his wife when she dropped herself on him and he fell down" (41). It is the point when Karnel has missed his potency with her. Based on the very core of the unconscious, one "area of psychological experience is human sexuality" (Tyson 26), and from the deeper core of her psychic sexuality, She "began to look at him with hatred as he felt hyperventilated" (Koirala 41). With unfulfilled desire, Karnelni has begun to perceive him as a sexual failure.

Similarly, Louise, usually addressed as Lou, the central female character in D. H. Lawrence's novella, *St. Mawr*, has suffered similar situation of distorted impulses. American

¹ The citations from Nepali text are my translations.

by origin, Louise fell in love with an Australian young man, Rico, three months older than her and has got married with him. Professionally an artist, Rico looks smart and likes flirting. Right after the marriage, in her youth of twenty-five, Louise “had failed in her grand love affair with Rico. And then she had had something really to despair about” (Lawrence 1). They have the bond to each other, they are fond of one another but they have “a nervous attachment, rather than a sexual love” (4). She has strongly felt that “it was a marriage, but without sex. Sex was shattering and exhausting” (4). This very lack of the physical relation has created uneasiness and chagrin in her.

How Louise has granted Rico is that “she knew Rico means nothing but a kindness by her” (21). He looks smart, keeps everything perfect but stands impotent, which has led Louise to the condition that she “remained at a loss. She felt almost always a little bit dazed as if she could not see clear nor feel clear” (21). This feeling extends in such a disorder that there exists “a curious sadness upon her, like a first touch of death” (21) leading to numbness, deadness and muted experiences. This experience of death does not really signify to the physical death, but it signifies to the extreme hopelessness, shame and humiliation, hence the psychic effect of the loss of sexuality. She has realized that she has become the victim of “the battle of wills” (21) or drives. The distorted impulse in her has led her to the feeling that Rico and Louise “were like a couple of bombs, timed to explode someday” (21) and “his love was a destruction itself” (21). She has felt that the relation could explode anytime with no cause. Similar to that of Karnel in Karnelko Ghoda, Rico loves her, but there exists some sense of lack in the love, lack of satisfaction, completeness and fulfillment. It appears as if his physicality has teased him to his extreme impotency castrating Louise to the point of psychic impact. Both Karnelni and Louise have experienced extremity of the distorted impulse leading to the sense of abnormality.

The Stallion: Displaced sexuality and human-animal relation

Sigmund Freud has observed the mechanism of displacement in the human unconscious while analyzing the symptoms of neurosis and hysteria in the mode of the interpretation of the dream as the expression of the unconscious. It is “the representation of an instinct one makes to oneself and its affect or libidinal charge are effectively semi-autonomous” (Buchanan 135). The unconscious shifts the libidinal charge of sexual imagery onto products “in the hope that the idea of that product will have a libidinal affect too” (135). The term displacement refers to “the process whereby the emphasis or intensity of an unconscious idea is detached from that idea and transferred to a second and less intense idea to which it is linked by chains of association” (Payne and Barbera 150). It is an unconscious defense whereby the mind substitutes either a new aim or a new object for goals felt in their original form to be dangerous or unacceptable or unfulfilled. The effect or emotional charge attached to a highly sexualized idea may, for instance, be displaced on to a more neutral image or idea. In such cases displacement is an effect of censorship. The displacement of one object to another, “as the psychical emphasis” (Habib577) fulfills the repressed wish. This displacement crosses all the social, cultural physical and material barriers into the depth of psychic roots. Displacement does not only occur in the

latent dream thoughts in which one particular thing stands out for another, but also it occupies the psychic state in the real activities of life

Both Karnelni (Karnelko Ghoda) and Louise (St. Mawr) have undergone the similar problem of unfulfilled desire. They have searched for an alternative way of fulfilling their desire through their psychic attachment with a stallion, the horse, which otherwise would have been unacceptable culturally and socially. The stallion attends to and interacts with its human companion by non-cognitive and non-discursive communication. The displacement of the image of their husbands operates in their mind unconsciously through the power of the stallion they have seen. The stallion transfers the emotions, ideas, or wishes being most often used to allay anxiety in the face of aggressive or sexual impulses. Sexually displeased from her husband, Karnelni gets attracted with the white horse when “its eyes were shining in the dark stable, the nostrils were widened when neighing and the veins were tightened in its legs like the snake. This horse was a thing of desire for Karnelni” (Koirala 42). The angry behaviour of the horse does not become the matter of fear for her, but it has become the matter of attraction to her because she likes the strength, power and virility in the male domain. She decides to take care of the horse herself instead of the groom, spends long hours with the horse. Soon the horse begins to sense accompanied by her, perceives he emotively with bodily movement. They do share the feelings quite silently, Karnelni displaces the image of her husband as a powerful male with the image of the horse.

Similar thing happens in Louise. Oppressed sexual impulse has helped her to reflect her image of powerful male quality in the stallion, St. Mawr, “she was startled to feel the vivid heat of his life come through to her, through the lacquer of red-gold gloss. So slippery with vivid hot life” (Lawrence 10). The colour, the physical strength, the movement and the response on the touch of the horse have impressed her too much and “she wanted him to belong to her. For some reason the sight of him, his power, his alive, alert intensity, his unyieldingness, made her want to cry” (10). The mysterious fire of the horse’s body has “split some rock in her” (10) and she has really cried because she has realized that the heart seems to look at her from another world, the world different from the world of her husband.

In both situations, the horse readily shares the sensorimotor-emotive world of its human companions, especially the females, though its sensory acuity is quite different. It conveys meanings by actions, touches with its body, never matures in a human sense, yet grows old and dies. It apprehends and responds to gesture, verbal emotional tone, expressions of emotion, and sense the presence of separation, death, and loss. It often bonds to its owners and becomes emotionally and responsively fixed on the companion through sight, sound, and smell. Hence, an aspect of the self is projected (displaced) onto someone else; the females have seen the self of their husbands reflected in the objectivity of the horse.

Self-Psychology, Self-object and women-horse relation

Self-psychology, a modern psychoanalytic theory was conceived by Heinz Kohut in Chicago in the 1960s, is still developing as a contemporary form of psychoanalytic treatment. In self-psychology, the effort is made to understand individuals from within their subjective

experience via displaced introspection, basing interpretations on the understanding of the self as the central agency of the human psyche. Essential to understanding self-psychology are the concepts of empathy, self-object and mirroring, idealizing alter ego and the triploid self. Though self-psychology also recognizes certain drives, conflicts, and complexes present in Freudian psychodynamic theory, these are understood within a different framework. Self-psychology was seen as a major break from traditional psychoanalysis and is considered the beginnings of the relational approach to psychoanalysis.

In self-psychology, the animal as self-object provides an important function to the person. Whether or not the animal is actually demonstrating or feeling something, such as love, is not important. What is important is that the person believes he or she feels love from the animal. The actual, objective reality of the situation is not necessarily a factor in the person's perception of the self-object function. At perceived feeling of being loved may fulfill some essential psychological function, such as allowing the person to feel sustained, vitalized, or supported.

Some important aspect of the particular external "object" stirs an inner experience (feeling validated and connected) inside the person. The objective, physical aspects of a self-object (whether a person or animal), would make little difference to the self or person. What matters would be the psychological functions that the self-object fulfills for the person. The self-object is a real aspect of another being and has a concrete anchoring in an inter-subjective reality.

Self-psychology can explain humans may feel the animals are their essential or even primary reason for living, even though the animals themselves are in horrible health and may even be dead. Although complex urbanization and social isolation do limit the choice of animals, now they are more likely chosen for the satisfaction they may provide for their owners. Animals are seemingly available for a variety of psychological need and drives. They may be watched, shown off, touched, fondled, and held. Animals can be there when no one else is there, and also can be abused physically, psychologically, or sexually.

Lawrence has used animals to serve, primarily, as correctives for degrading human values. *St. Mawr* replaces the values of the males in the perception of Louise. The horse stands as a powerful and strong male with potency for her. His ideology assigns the stallion with its respective space with the metaphysics of opposites. The image of stallion exists almost to fix upon the mind of the reader the importance of life that is spontaneous and instinctive. The story shows how nonhuman animals and humans are intuitively and sensually in tune, "why I think *St. Mawr* would understand perfectly.... She could feel a response gradually coming from him" (Lawrence 15). The relation between the horse and Louise does not stand just as a long-held Aristotelian perspective on animals as merely sensual though Louise has supposed, "perhaps the old Greek horses had lived in *St. Mawr's* world" (15); rather it stands as a rational, being to identify what is good and what is bad even to keep relation. It shows arrogance to Mr. Rico, but it appears loving to his wife, Louise. It identifies the sense of love and hatred. It does not respond just sensually, but unites its sensuality with some sense of rationality. The horse stands with the sensual capacity as a kind of knowing. The horse of *Karnelni* responds to her in the way *St. Mawr* does to Louise. She feels comfortable looking after the

horse, "she was satisfied in providing a good care to the horse" (Koirala 43), and feels that her time with the horse is even more meaningful than the time she spends with her husband. The horse substitutes the desire she wants to get from her husband.

Lawrence's intention in *St Mawr* is "to show the vitality of a splendid stallion which is lacking in men" (Rasheed 10). Man (Rico) has abused his own power, or has become powerless and impotent to uncover power, and the stallion; *St Mawr* embodies the phallic power. It ultimately allows woman to become powerful, the female principle to assume the ascendant. It is quite clear that *St Mawr* conveys a lament for the loss of maleness, which Lawrence attributes to the modern, mechanistic, money grubbing world – the world of men. It is only in the face of such a loss that women can become powerful and independent.

The stallion, as a powerful and vital animal, "makes Louise sense the emptiness of her life and discovers the illusion of her marriage" (10). Thus, at the end of the novel she decides, after realizing that men are not men enough, to live alone with her mother in a ranch in Mexico, as men have broken her heart. She prefers to stay alone and starts new life with nature; she thinks that nature will keep her soul and sex from being cheap. In this respect, Lawrence believes that if men refuse to be men, then it is right that women should forsake them and find new ways to live without them. Such as an action is not a denial of sexuality, but a proper respect for it, not a denial of relation and community, but refusal to cheapen either, not a negative and cynical move, but a brave and positive one.

Louise has found the horse even more powerful than the man, "It was as if she had had a vision, as if the walls of her own world had suddenly melted away, leaving her in a great darkness, in the midst of which the large, brilliant eyes of that horse looked at her with demonish question ...and his great body glowed red with power" (Lawrence10). It is her impression to the horse that "She had felt the eyes of that horse; great, glowing, fearsome eyes, arched with a question, and containing a white blade of light like a threat" (11). She has chosen the horse because she has found no dangerous man in her life, "I am dying of these empty danger-less men, who are only sentimental and spiteful" (44). Like that of the notion of self-object, she has felt that the horse has the sense of love to her too because she has strange and loving feeling to him mixed with the fear:

It had looked at her as she had never been looked at before: terrible, gleaming, questioning eyes arching out of darkness, and backed by all the fire of that great ruddy body.... that black fiery flow in the eyes of the horse was not attitude. It was something much more terrifying, and real, the only thing that was real. Gushing from the darkness in menace and question, and blazing out in the splendid body of the horse. (12)

Louise attraction with *St. Mawr* causes her to respond in fear mixed with pleasure from the horse's great and splendid body. This fearful form of being is not to be confused with the fear alone but it is blended with her psychology. Certainly, the horse's bodily energy represents traditional notions of power, strength, nobility, mystery and energy that she is expecting from the male power, especially from Rico. As a result, she feels herself contempt at the presence of Rico, "she was glad that Rico was away for a while" (32).

Similar state of contempt does Karnelni feel when Karnel makes questions on the time she spends with the horse on the way she loves to the horse, "have you ever thought of me as much as you have done to the horse...I have a jealousy to the horse" (Koirala 44). She feels comforted being with the horse rather than being with her husband. Whether the horse loves her or not is a different mode of study on human and animal relation, but what gives primary emphasis on the psychological state of Karnelni is that she has generated the state of self-object in which the love of the horse, the masculinity of the horse and the physicality of the horse are greater than the one she has received from her old husband.

The horse has really haunted Louise. As a result, her human relationships begin to seem superficial by contrast; "She hid herself away from Rico. She could not bear the triviality and superficiality of her human relationships. Looming like some god out of the darkness was the head of that horse, with the wide, terrible questioning eyes "(Lawrence 11). It is not simple case of sexual frustration, but it also indicates the repression of the greater sex, which is demonic and impersonal, promising rebirth:

What was it? Almost like a ^[1]sep[?]god looking at her terribly out of the everlasting dark, she had felt the eyes of that horse; great, glowing, fearsome eyes, arched with a question and containing a white blade of light like a threat. What was his non-human question, and his uncanny threat? She didn't know, He was some splendid demon and she must worship him (11)

It is the subjective reality to both the female characters, Louise and Karnelni, that the horse can be an alternative source for the love in their life. Karnelni has hatred to Karnel, and Louise has detestation to all other types of human relations and she prefers to spend all her life with nature and accompanied by the nature. Their love to the horse is an example of their attachment to nature rather than humans. Humans having no human qualities are no humans at all for them.

Man-Horse relation: A sexual antagonism

The relationship between man-animal emerges differently than woman-animal relation in both the texts. The only man character in Karnelko Ghoda, Karnel seems as the horse loving man at the beginning of the story. He has kept the cows and taming a horse is his great interest. He likes and loves his white horse, "he would feed the horse and he would make the groom serve the horse in front of him and would go riding it every morning" (Koirala 42). But, his love and devotion to the horse changes into the hatred, and even to the point of antagonism as soon as he finds his wife attached with the horse; spending much time with the horse caring it, looking it and feeding and combing it.

The behaviour of the horse changes at the similar state. He does not take care of the horse, does not look after it and even does not ride it much. As a result, the horse throws him down as he tries to ride it. At the same time, the horse accepts his wife very well, as she rides the horse "with the sense of her victory over her husband" (45). His antagonism reaches to its peak that he has a shoot on it. Karnel's antagonism is the result of his weak sexuality and his sense of inferiority complex grown out of his sexual incompetence with his wife. Mr Rico and St. Mawr share some

commonalities in their nature. Rico possesses some physical traits of the horse, "from his big blue eyes: just like a horse" (Lawrence 1), "Rico was really more like a horse than a dog, a horse that might go nasty any moment. For the time, he was good, very good, dangerously good" (7). This sameness in their physicality does not match with their perception to each other. Rico, the male protagonist in *St Mawr* is the reverse of the horse, *St Mawr*. He represents the permanent defeat of all that *St Mawr* stands for. He has appreciated the horse as "If ever I am made a lord... I shall be Lord *St. Mawr*" (19). But Louise's attachment to the horse has made him feel different, "Rico's face grew longer and angrier" (19). He has begun to hate the horse and says, "What good is a horse like that? Better shoot him" (26). Rico, even being against of the having *St. Mawr*, has managed to control it and ride it for a couple of times. But, the horse has always remained a matter of threat since Louise has given the horse to him. They do have some antagonism.

The horse has sensed closer feelings with Louise than with Rico. Rico has the self-psychology that the horse may cause any danger any moment because it is wild. So does it happen that it has thrown Rico and made him injured. Louise's sympathy goes to *St. Mawr* greater than to her husband, which led Rico think to take revenge to the horse. Wounded Rico wants to shoot the horse or geld it but Louise opposes it. He has sold the horse to Flora, but Louise does not like it to be. On the one hand, Louise has always love, sympathy and liking to the horse, but Rico has always antipathy towards the horse. This antipathy to the horse is partly because the horse is wild, but mostly because Rico has antagonism to the horse because of Louise's fondness to it.

Conclusion

Two psychological writers: Koirala from Nepalese narrative writings and Lawrence from English fiction writings, share common aspects of depicting human psychic realities in their creations. Influenced by the writing of Lawrence, Koirala has followed similar modes of presenting human psychological realities to Lawrence. Koirala's short story, "Karnelko Ghoda" and Lawrence's novella, *St. Mawr* have the common aspects of human and animal bonding. With similar plot structure, both stories present female characters being psychologically attached with the animal character, the horse. Both females suffer from the distorted impulses with impotent and sterile marriage relationship.

The relation has automatically led them to hate the males they are married with, and they develop some sort of relationship with the male horse they have.

They have seen the reflection of the power, strength and potency in the horse. They realize the sense of self-object, feeling of love or affection of the love toward him or her. They expose the love, affection and even devotion to the horse greater than to their married husbands. They feel the notion of self-psychology, understanding the psychology of the animals within themselves. The mode of self-psychology, in general and self-object in particular reveals their psychosexual relation to the horse.

Similarly, the male central characters in both the stories do hate the horse. Their hatred and anger appears to be the result of their sexual antagonism. Karnel shoots the horse because his wife loves the horse more than she does to him and Rico intends to shoot or geld the horse because the horse

becomes arrogant towards him but loving to his wife, Louise. In both conditions, man-horse relationship is based on the sexual antagonism.

References

1. Arlow Jacob. The concept of psychic reality- how useful. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 1996; 77:659-666.
2. Bell Michael DH. *Lawrence: Language and Being*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1992.
3. Brown Sue-Ellen. *Theoretical Concepts from Self Psychology Applied to Animal Hoarding*". *Society and Animals*, 2011.
4. Buchanan Ian. *A Dictionary of Critical Theory*. New York: Oxford, 2010.
5. Friedman, Lawrence. *Psychic Reality in Psychoanalytic Theory*. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 1995, 76.
6. Habib MAR. *A History of Literary Criticism and Theory: From Plato to the Present*. United Kingdom Blackwell, 2008.
7. Koirala, Bishweshwor Prasad, Karnelko Ghoda. *Doshi Chasma*. Varanassi Prasanta Prakashan, 2006. BS.
8. Lawrence DH. *St. Mawr*. <http://Gutenberg.net.au/ebooks07/0700621h.html>
9. Norris Margaret. *The Ontology of D.H. Lawrence's St. Mawr*. *Modern Critical Philosophical Studies*. 2005; 13:4.
10. Pyne Michael, Barbera Jessica Rae. ed. *A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory*. 2nded. Singapore, Blackwell, 2010.
11. Rasheed Lamia Ahmed. *The Significance of the Stallion in D. H. Lawrence's St. Mawr*. *AL Faith Journal*, 2009.
12. Steeves Peter H. Ed. *Animal Others: On Ethics, Ontology, and Animal Life*. Albany: SUNY, 1999.