

Psychoanalytic Theory in Daphne du Maurier's *Rebecca*. Symbolic Portrayal

TAHRA ABD ELGADIR MOHAMED AHMED

The aim of this article is to figure out the influence of the psychoanalytic theory of personality in the novel *Rebecca* (1938) by the English novelist Daphne du Maurier (1907 – 1989). The story is narrated by a nameless heroine, a needy 21-years-old orphan who was married to Maximilian de Winter (Maxim), a wealthy man double her age who was previously married to the eponymous villain, Rebecca. The narrative traces the heroine's struggle to cope with her life in Manderley, where she had to surmount many hurdles. She had to face the antagonism of Mrs Danvers (the housekeeper who had brought up Rebecca). Rebecca's presence in the house, sustained by Mrs Danvers, was another obstacle. The fight going on within herself was the paramount experience. In the article, I will enlarge the psychological analysis initiated within the framework of a study I have conducted in vindication of the novel, to assert it as part of the period's general discourse. Freud's theories were among the major influences on British fiction of the early 20th century. The 1930s writers "traced influences of family and school, devoured Freudian and Marxist accounts of personal, social and historical experience. . . . they tended to explain themselves and others in inflexible chains of cause and effect, in terms of social and historical necessity." (Gindin, 1992, p.9) As identifiable in *Rebecca*, du Maurier's consciousness of the

Freudian accounts is as profound and intensive as that of her contemporaries.

The story starts and closes with a dream. 'Last night I dreamt I went to Manderley again.' (5) This is the opening sentence and the dream occupies the entire opening chapter. Their journey back from Barnet in the last chapter, takes us '[b]ack again into the moving unquiet depths.' (395) By dreams we can enter one of the key concepts of Freud's theory, the id. "The primary methods for unmasking its content, according to Freud, are the analysis of dreams and free association." (Encyclopædia Britannica, 2016) It is not my intention here to investigate those dreams or the unguarded imagery and symbolism stamping Freud's treatment of the concept because they are inconsistent with the characteristic decency of the novel. Besides, they have been, justifiably, the subject of much controversy. I rather assume that by surrounding the narrative with dreams, du Maurier is hinting at the impossibility of evading the psychological province in fiction as in fact since human nature is the object of concern in both realms. I do not intend either to go deep in the science. These are mere outlines, which I hope best-qualified enthusiasts may find interesting and help elaborate them. My aim is to examine Freud's theories concerning the tripartition of the human psyche in their simplest form. Though scarcely more immune to criticism, those speculations have by large been agreed upon as effective methods for the interpretation of human motives and behaviour. "Many psychoanalysts now consider the conception of an id overly simple, though still useful in drawing attention to the unconscious motivations and irrational impulses within even the most normal human being." (Encyclopædia Britannica) Rebecca explores the unconscious motivation within normal as well as abnormal people. Through characterization, du Maurier has contrived a masterful and thorough exploration of the psychoanalytic approach.

Slight deviation from the balance required for human perfection, on the part of Beatrice (Maxim's sister) and Giles (her husband) is "useful in drawing attention to the unconscious motivations and irrational impulses within even the most normal human being." Their behaviour reflects partial lack of self-control over these motivations and impulses.

"There's no reserve about me. . . . I lose my temper on the slightest provocation . . . forgive me if I've asked you a lot of rude questions, my dear, and said all sorts of things I shouldn't. Tact never was my strong point, as Maxim will tell you." (105,112)

By so describing herself, Beatrice is disclosing the weakness of her ego in governing the id. "The id is the impulsive (and unconscious) part of our psyche which responds directly and immediately to the instincts." (Saul McLeod, 2016) According to the Encyclopædia Britannica, "it belies its content in . . . partly nonrational modes of expression." The contents of the id and the superego are muddled up with Beatrice. She is good and kind with a revulsion against evil. 'Bee did not like Rebecca. I believe, in her funny abrupt, downright way she saw through her, guessed something was wrong.' (288) She loves the heroine: 'I can see Beatrice, dear friendly tactless Beatrice . . . nodding encouragement, the bangles jangling on her wrists, the veil slipping continually from her overheated forehead.' (233-4) Much can be read from the statement. Kindness intermingles with disregard for social shackles on the id impulses in her friendly tactlessness, and 'the bangles jangling on her wrists,' implies a certain degree of psychic discordance caused by her ego's tendency to loosen the curbs of the superego. Frequent withdrawals of the superego in its struggle with the id are devised, in analogy, by 'the veil slipping continually from her overheated forehead.' We may understand the analogy if we know that the ego, symbolized by the forehead, "is the organized part of the personality structure that includes

defensive, perceptual, intellectual-cognitive, and executive functions.” (Wikipedia, 2016) The overheated forehead refers to the fact that it is the locus of the ongoing battle between the id and superego symbolized by the veil and, elsewhere by the wig: ‘Dear old Bee always looks just wrong on these occasions, bless her. I remember her once . . . her wig came adrift.’ (215)—the superego literally means “‘the Over-I’ (or ‘I above’)” (Wikipedia). It “incorporates the values and morals of society which are learned from one’s parents and others.” (McLeod, 2016) Those hidden components seem to be the theme of the heroine’s meditation.

She must have many memories locked inside her heart. I wondered if she ever thought about the days that were gone, ever remembered the lanky pig-tailed child that she had been once, so different from the woman she had become (110).

‘Beatrice again, her veil pushed back off her forehead’ (236), entices me to look for the cause of the weakness of her ego. Ego is “that portion of the human personality which is experienced as the ‘self’ or ‘I’ and is in contact with the external world through perception.” (Encyclopædia Britannica) Beatrice displays total lack of interest in perceptive enrichment. ‘She never opens a book if she can help it.’ (146) She never encourages intellectual pursuit, not even for her son. “Roger goes up to Oxford next term,” she said, “heaven knows what he’ll do with himself. Awful waste of time I think, and so does Giles, but we couldn’t think what else to do with him.’ (185–6)

With similar unwillingness to strengthen his ego, Giles hardly succeeds in achieving a fair settlement of the struggle between the id and superego; Giles falls short of complying with the restrictions on biological demands whereas Beatrice is disposed to act against social decorum. He is, considerate, kind, and sincere: ‘I blessed him for his pathetic simple gesture of understanding and sincerity’ (234). Where the feelings of others are not at risk, however, he may sometimes, in favour of

“instant self-gratification”, deliberately turn a blind eye to social etiquettes: ‘Giles lay down on his back and tipped his hat over his eyes. After a while he began to snore, his mouth open.’ (108) This last phrase turns our eyes to the area where his superego is overpowered by the id; as far as biological needs are concerned, Giles is generally a bit over submissive. He is fat. ‘You imagine everyone ill who doesn’t look as fat as Giles’, says Maxim (99). ‘How fat Giles is getting,’ says Beatrice. (107) His behaviour, same as his appearance, is well indicative that the superego is giving in to the id in this regard. In the last fancy dress ball he ‘came as a cook, and sat about in the bar all night’ (215). In the present one he has ‘led a team of stragglers to the buffet table in the drawing-room.’ (239) When it is over, Beatrice goes ‘off to find Giles in the supper room.’ (240) He is ‘more concerned with food than with the conversation,’ (102) and food is the favourite stuff of his conversations:

‘Same cook I suppose, Maxim?’ he said, when Robert had offered him the cold soufflé for the second time. ‘I always tell Bee, Manderley’s the only place left in England where one can get decent cooking. I remember this soufflé of old.’ . . . Giles saw Maxim at the dinner. Poor food, he said, but excellent wine. . . . ‘Have you got Mitchell’s to do the catering as usual?’ asked Giles. (102–3, 183, 216)

Like his wife, the demands of the two forces with certain degree of excess at certain areas are somewhat confused. Notice how the primitive instincts, marking him with some sort of animalism, are curiously intermingled with human attributes. ‘Giles stretched out an enormous paw . . . genial eyes smiling from behind horn-rimmed glasses.’ (98) With ‘dog-like sympathy and kind heart [he] would take no refusal, but must steer’ the heroine ‘as he would one of his own horses at a meet. (234)

I have chosen Beatrice and Giles as a starting point because theirs are the most common types of character. The portrayal of their characters is nonetheless scarcely as

suggestive as those of Favell (Rebecca's cousin), Maxim (the protagonist), and Frank (his agent). In their respective order, the three men embody the concepts of the id, ego, and superego as they are defined by Wilfred L. Guerin and others: "Whereas the id is dominated by the pleasure principle and the ego by the reality principle, the superego is dominated by the morality principle." (2005) Guerin goes on to explain:

We might say that the id would make us devils, that the superego would have us behave as angels (or, worse, as creatures of absolute social conformity), and that it remains for the ego to keep us healthy human beings by maintaining a balance between these two opposing forces. It was this balance that Freud advocated—not a complete removal of inhibiting factors. (p.158)

What qualifies Maxim to stand for the ego is his ability to abide by the dictates of the superego without frustrating the id's demands. This balance distinguishes him from the other characters. He is the greatest of them all. "The greatest" is the meaning of his full name, Maximilian (MEANING-OF-NAMES.COM). His forename signifies as well behavioural correctness; it means "a well-known phrase that expresses something that is usually true or that people think is a rule for sensible behaviour". (Oxford Dictionaries) He is the best to manage these powers in a systematic manner: 'how different . . . his steady, well-shaped hands peeling a mandarin in quiet, methodical fashion . . . compared to Mrs Van Hopper, her fat, bejewelled fingers questing a plate heaped high with ravioli' (14). How dexterous he is in operating the dynamics of his psychic apparatus, compared to the heroine: 'while I, sick and giddy, clung to the seat with both hands, he manoeuvred the car gently, very gently' (33). Unlike Beatrice, he 'loses his temper once or twice in a year,' (105) and Giles 'looks quite repulsive beside' him (107). In terms of morality, Maxim is far superior to Favell and more realistic than Frank.

I saw Frank's lips about to form the inevitable and idiotic remark about an angel passing overhead, when Lady Crowan, balancing a piece of cake on the edge of her saucer, looked up at Maxim who happened to be beside her. (200)

More of this symbolic portrayal of balance is observable in the delineation of his character. Initially, the heroine has 'noticed . . . the line between his brows.' (19) The reference to the symmetry of his body draws attention to that of his psyche (the equality between two opposing sides not the exact sameness in the strict sense of the word). He is the owner of Manderley with its 'perfect symmetry' (6). Balance is also visible in his connectivity with the notion of middleness. The fork of Mrs Van Hopper is 'pausing in mid-air' while she is talking of him (37). There is the 'half angry expression on his face.' (82) He looks 'half amused, half angry.' (148.) His gift to stir a middle course enhances our understanding of his character as representative of a proper-functioning ego. His age and the richness of his experience place him at least in a more advanced stage of ego development: 'he was always just a little ahead of me. I could not keep up with him.' (182) His ego possesses sufficient strength to keep the balance between the id and superego.

By virtue of the morality principle, Maxim is plausibly up to standard. He is a virtuous, well-principled character. He is kind, considerate, unaffectedly gallant, modest, and free of conceit. He treats the heroine respectfully despite her age and social inferiority on account of which she is usually ignored by other people (17). He hastens to 'mop the cloth' on her table. (25). He is surprised to hear that Mrs Van Hopper considers him important person (26). Compassionate as he is, he rushes to help the people in the stranded ship, and gives orders to the servants to be ready to receive them in the house (259).

'Maxim is splendid at anything like this,' said Frank. 'He always gives a hand if he can. You'll find he will invite the whole crew back to Manderley, and feed them, and give them beds into the bargain.'

‘That’s right,’ said the coastguard. ‘He’d give the coat off his back for any of his own people, I know that.’ (266)

‘Not like other people’, his marriage proposal is sincere and straightforward. ‘Not like younger men . . . being very incoherent, very passionate, swearing impossibilities.’ (61) He excels in social interactions, ‘punctilious in these matters’ (129). He is a loving grandson, a devoted brother, and a caring husband. Conformity to the superego, however, is not carried to an excess. With high degree of consciousness, he evaluates its values and subjects them to social and physical realities; he does not believe in exclusive domination of its commands that “are largely determined in childhood from parental values and how you were brought up.” (McLeod, 2016) Listen to his advice to his wife: ‘it’s not a question of bringing up, as you put it. It’s a matter of application. You don’t think I like calling on people, do you? It bores me stiff. But it has to be done’ (151–2). He recommends his moderate attitude. “One day,” he went on, spreading his toast thick, “you may realize that philanthropy is not my strongest quality.’ (57) By ‘spreading his toast thick’, he teaches her practically that the superego must not be gratified at the expense of the basic needs of the id.

Although treated with sufficient regard, the instinctual demands of the id, same as the restraints of the superego, are governed with all possible wisdom and rationality: ‘I could see him moody, difficult, irritable perhaps, but not angry as she [Beatrice] had inferred, not passionate.’ (114) He seldom loses his temper: ‘I could tell by the tightening of Maxim’s muscles under my arm that he was trying to keep his temper. . . . I thought I should go mad. I kept my temper though.’ (99, 332) Naturally, he is prone to minor errors, but he is well able of a sensible management in case of their occurrence.

Never for a moment did he interrupt or glance at his watch; it was as though he had set himself a standard of behaviour, since the original lapse when he had made a fool of her in

front of me, and clung to it grimly rather than offend again.
(21)

Also significant within this context is his capacity to regulate the conflict between the reality and the pleasure principle. “The ego operates according to the reality principle, working out realistic ways of satisfying the id’s demands, often compromising or postponing satisfaction to avoid negative consequences of society.” (McLeod, 2016) Maxim loves the heroine ‘so much,’ (279) but the discharge of his feelings is delayed until legitimacy is secured by marriage. He postpones the avowal of his love not only to the wedding day but until the barriers between them are removed and his wife is ready to respond: ‘he had not said anything about being in love. Just that we would be married. Short and definite, very original. . . . anyway those things are not easily said, they must wait their moment.’ (61, 65) Their moment comes when she is able to break away with her reserve and come close to him: ‘This is what I have wanted him to say every day and every night, I thought, and now he is saying it at last. This is what I imagined in Monte Carlo, in Italy, here in Manderley.’ (279–80) It is months after the wedding that full satisfaction is obtained. Only then, they begin ‘to kiss one another, feverishly, desperately, like guilty lovers who have not kissed before.’ (371) The schedule of their first day at Manderley offers another clue of his regulating capacity. Early in the morning he is ‘up and dressed and writing letters, even before breakfast’ (84). In the afternoon, he has to endure the duty of entertaining his guests patiently although he has ‘looked tired, rather jaded.’ (103) In the evening, he sets off to the Happy Valley to ‘smell the azaleas . . . happy and cheerful’ (114).

Skillful maneuvering of the pleasure-pain principle (the id) is central to Maxim’s characterization as a model of what is stated by the Encyclopædia Britannica as “more-advanced ego

functions.” He suffers the loss of his dear Manderley severely, but he can manage to tolerate and hide the pain.

He is wonderfully patient and never complains, not even when he remembers...which happens, I think, rather more often than he would have me know.

I can tell by the way he will look lost and puzzled suddenly, all expression dying away from his dear face as though swept clean by an unseen hand, and in its place a mask will form, a sculptured thing, formal and cold, beautiful still but lifeless. (8–9)

The narrative continues to present a Freudian explanation of how the ego deals with a painful reality by performing more-advanced functions.

He will fall to smoking cigarette after cigarette, not bothering to extinguish them, and the glowing stubs will lie around on the ground like petals. He will talk quickly and eagerly about nothing at all, snatching at any subject as a panacea to pain. (9)

The ego is allowing a partial indulgence of the id in order to perform its task that helps alleviating the otherwise intolerable pain. “By not reacting directly, the ego develops the capacity to test reality vicariously (*Encyclopædia Britannica*). While falling to smoking and talking eagerly about nothing exemplify the pleasure-pain principle in literal sense, the simile dramatizes a sophisticated strategy of the ego. In order to deal with conflict and problems in life,’ McLeod writes, ‘Freud stated that the ego employs a range of defense mechanisms. Defense mechanisms operate at an unconscious level and help ward off unpleasant feelings (i.e. anxiety) or make good things feel better for the individual. (2009) The image of ‘the glowing stubs [lying] around on the ground like petals’ is an emblem of his ego’s policy to substitute a pleasure-giving experience for a harmful one.

Maxim was always at the other end of the room, showing a book to a bore, or pointing out a picture, playing the perfect host in his own inimitable way, and the business of tea was a side-issue that did not matter to him. His own cup of tea grew cold, left on a side table behind some flowers, and I, steaming behind my kettle, and Frank gallantly juggling with scones and angel cake, were left to minister to the common wants of the herd. (200)

In the above passage, Du Maurier has skillfully gathered the elements of intellect and art to reveal his capacity to contrive an aesthetic compromise and how this capacity distinguishes him from both the heroine and Frank.

To think of a typical image of the superego as described by Guerin, Frank Crawley is the man. 'Frank gallantly juggling with scones and angel cake . . . left to minister to the common wants of the herd' would suffice to answer to Guerin description of the superego, which would have "us behave as angels (or, worse, as creatures of absolute social conformity)" (supra). Nonetheless, I cannot resist the temptation to give more evidences for the text is teaming with them. We have already seen his lips about to form the remark about 'an angel passing overhead'. The harmony between him and the heroine, who has 'got angel's eyes,' (162) is another testimony of his angelic tendency: 'I turned to the agent, a colourless, rather thin man with a prominent Adam's apple, in whose eyes I read relief as he looked upon me.' (99) They share many angelic qualities: 'Like to like. ' (134) Frank is an ideally good person, very sincere, very honest: 'what a good fellow he was, so thorough and reliable, and devoted to Manderley. . . . What a Frank-ish expression, too, "above board".' (114, 140) He is incredibly loyal to Maxim: 'I realized that his loyalty to Maxim was such that he would not let himself be drawn into a discussion, even with me.' (327) He never succumbed to Rebecca's seduction although she 'never left him alone . . . always going to his house, trying to get him to the cottage.' (288) Considering her extraordinary beauty

and charm, his resistance testifies to the extremity of his faithfulness just as it reflects his unnatural abstinence from gratifying the vital drives of the id. “The id is the primitive and instinctive component of personality” that, according to Saul McLeod, “consists of all the inherited (i.e. biological) components of personality present at birth, including the sex (life) instinct – Eros (which contains the libido)” (2016). His conception about them, purely “dominated by the morality principle”, is clearly symptomatic of libidinal restraint; his preference, if any, is for a super-ego oriented woman with total indifference to sensual aspects.

I'm a bachelor, I don't know very much about women, I lead a quiet sort of life down here at Manderley . . . , but I should say that kindness, and sincerity, and – if I may say so – modesty are worth far more to a man, to a husband, than all the wit and beauty in the world.’ (140)

Frank is exceedingly committed to social conventions. “We're very conventional down here,’ (202) he says. “Oh, but that would not look right at all,’ said Frank seriously. ‘People would be very offended. You must dance with the people who ask you.’” (203) His remarks are invariably ‘conventional, very correct.’ (134) He is ‘that sort of person’ who would never drop titles: ‘Even if we had been thrown on a desert island together and lived there in intimacy for the rest of our lives, I should have been Mrs de Winter.’ (134) There are many bits and pieces that evince his unfailing veneration for social decorum and etiquette. ‘Dear Frank Crawley, how tactful he was and considerate. . . . Dear Frank. I loved his little solemn air of gallantry . . . Frank is being so gallant’ (135, 203). These are too scattered to be collected. Therefore, I must stop at this comment on the excess of his social conventionality: ‘How pompous and stupid it sounded. I wished Frank would not always be so terribly correct.’ (203)

One has only to look at the phonetic affinity of his name with 'devil' and 'evil' to be convinced that Favell, so terribly incorrect, is the exact opposite of Frank. In contrast to Frank, '[s]ome people would consider him attractive. Girls in sweet shops giggling behind the counter, and girls who gave one programmes in a cinema.' (208) Frank has 'dull appearance.' (100) He is considered by some 'a dull creature . . . never has anything interesting to say.' (107) Sharper still is the contrast between their physical appearances.

He was a big, hefty fellow, good-looking in a rather flashy, sunburnt way. He had the hot, blue eyes usually associated with heavy drinking and loose living. His hair was reddish like his skin. In a few years he would run to fat, his neck bulging over the back of his collar. His mouth . . . was too soft, too pink. . . his skin was deeply tanned. His eyes were rather bloodshot. (166-7, 335)

An 'enormous pair of motoring gloves' (170) with his car into the bargain is another telltale of the contrariety between him and Frank. 'Round the bend in the drive' (168), his car, 'concealed like that from the house . . . drawn up behind the rhododendrons,' (164, 165) can still give him away. 'The lie was too obvious.' (168) It is an extended metaphor of the distance between the two men, not just the frankness of Frank versus the furtiveness of Favell: 'It was not Frank's Morris. I knew that well. This was a long, low car, a sports car.' (164) Frank's, by the way, is a 'little Morris car' (326). The low car, 'typical of its owner' (169), is leading us fast to our destination, the discovery of Favell as a template of the id. "The id is, in short, the source of all our aggressions and desires. It is lawless, asocial, and amoral. Its function is to gratify our instinct for pleasure without regard for social conventions, legal ethics, or moral restraint." (Guerin, 157)

That is what Favell reflects through his appearance, behaviour, social and ethical orientations, and speeches. Boasting that his car is '[m]uch faster than anything poor old

Max ever has' (168), Favell is boasting of his capability to overstep the ego, with apparent indisposition to listen to its wisdom: 'how low his ears were set on his head.' (349) It is not just the lowness of the id that Favell embodies. His car 'snorting explosive fury from the exhaust,' (170) is a reminder of Freud's metaphor describing the force of the id as "a cauldron of seething excitement" (Guerin, 156). For the id as "a chaos," in the very Freudian description, "[with] no organization and no unified will," (Guerin, 156) Favell can serve as well: 'He looked much the same as before but a little rougher if possible, a little more untidy. (335) He also reflects the destructiveness of the id: 'Those florid good looks would not last him very long. Already he was out of condition' (349). Under no circumstances may he sacrifice the id demands or even bother to compromise them. He would have sacrificed the secrecy of his visit to Manderley to accept the invitation given by the heroine as mere gesture of politeness having discovered him accidentally: 'I've been asked to stay to tea? By heaven, Danny, I've a good mind to.' (168) He consumes the self-demanded 'whisky and soda . . . greedily, like an animal.' (350) Like the id, he is predisposed to celebrate the absence of the ego and superego. Mrs Danvers has 'entertained' him 'in the morning-room when Maxim and I [the heroine] were out of the way.' (166) His conduct is utterly unacceptable from both perspectives. His irrational practices surely incur Maxim's dislike. 'He had a black, filthy record.' (290) Maxim tells the heroine 'the very thought of him walking about the woods in Manderley, in places like the Happy Valley, made [him] mad.' (290) He certainly exasperates the heroine: 'I did not like his laugh. There was something offensive about it. I did not like him, either.' (167-8) His whole conduct is a manifest breach of social conventions: 'I never minded those things, but it seemed odd to me, in somebody else's room. It was surely rather bad manners? Not polite to me.' (167) For her he is the 'unpleasant Favell' (208) who has 'a queer ugly smile . . . unpleasant smile'

(351, 386). She agrees with Beatrice calling him an 'awful bounder.' (187)

Favell is defiant of every law and authority. He likes to expose his efforts in promoting vicious schemes. He prides himself on having Robert out 'on the razzle' (336), pities him for not being as laxative as himself, and he is rudely critical of his preventer. "Poor kid," said Favell. "I don't suppose he's been on the loose since. That old ass Frith keeps him on a leading string." (337) Not only his sense of guilt is sinking to the zero as regards the illicit relationship between him and the married Rebecca, but also he vehemently recommends it as the best of common social ideology. 'I'm a bit of a Socialist in my way, you know, and I can't think why fellows can't share their women . . . What difference does it make? You can get your fun just the same.' (341) It is curious what way his energy is spent in proving his betrayal, indecency, and illegitimate practices; he kept asking his witnesses to verify his 'clandestine meetings with' Rebecca (354) instead of asking them to verify his accusation against Maxim. He is never reluctant to 'blackmail' Maxim in the presence of his wife and his friend. Nor does he care a bit to show any respect for 'the magistrate of the district.' (345) The text is stuffed with details that expose his devil-like leanings, but it is high time I proceeded to his partner—the female version of the id.

Rebecca offers a stronger version of the id. She is all id. "In the iceberg metaphor the entire id and part of both the superego and the ego", states Wikipedia, "would be submerged in the underwater portion representing the unconscious mind. The remaining portions of the ego and superego would be displayed above water in the conscious mind area." With Rebecca, they are all submerged in the underwater portion in her boat. Her ego is dead. 'She was sinking too. Sinking by the head.' (294) Nevertheless, she is an epitome of what Guerin calls "the strong vitality of the id" (157). 'She was dead,' the heroine muses, 'and one must not have thoughts about the

dead. They slept in peace' (62). It is quite a different matter with Rebecca: 'How alive was her writing though, how full of force. Those curious, sloping letters. The blob of ink. Done yesterday. It was just as if it had been written yesterday.' (62) Thanks to Mrs Danvers, the 'scent' of her clothes 'is still fresh' (178). Her name is standing 'out black and strong' (37) Rebecca is a dead villain, and yet, she is the eponymous character; do we need a more powerful testimony of her vitality?

She was universally known as a reservoir of pleasure. She had 'boundless popularity.' (140) Though never succumbing to it Frank cannot deny the fact: "Yes, she was the most beautiful creature I have ever seen." (243) Beatrice says she 'had an amazing gift . . . of being attractive to people; men, women, children, dogs.' (195) In view of the bishop's wife 'she was a very lovely creature. So full of life.' (131) Both colonel Julyan and Doctor Baker agree that she was 'very handsome' (382). For Mrs Danvers, she is an icon of beauty. 'She was lovely . . . as a picture; men turning to stare at her when she passed . . . A man had only to look at her once and be mad about her.' (254, 256)

Few can be more radical than Rebecca in tackling the pleasure-pain principle. "The id demands immediate satisfaction and when this happens we experience pleasure, when it is denied we experience 'unpleasure' or tension." (McLeod, 2016) The management of the pleasure gain or pain reduction business can be extremely damaging if it is done away from the two regulating agencies (ego and superego). "Unchecked, it would lead us to any lengths—to destruction and even self-destruction—to satisfy its impulses for pleasure." (Guerin, 157) The fact that 'the growth was deep-rooted' (383) in Rebecca's body, wedded to the assumption of her suicide is the very concreteness of the Freudian notion. It 'must have some bearing on the case and her subsequent – suicide.' (381) Rebecca was unhealthily desirous of avoiding pain. 'Of course some people have a morbid dread of it,' said Colonel Julyan.

'Women especially. That must have been the case with your wife. She had courage for every other thing but that. She could not face pain.' (387) She was worried by nothing except 'the idea of getting old, of illness' (359). She said that 'a score of times' to Mrs Danvers: "I want to go quickly . . ." That used to be the only thing that consoled me, after she died. They say drowning is painless, don't they?" (359) She chose to die rather than tolerate the pain although it 'was slight as yet,' (383) thus confirming herself as an archetype of the id, the coexistence between 'the life instincts that are crucial to pleasurable survival . . . [and] the death drive . . . the task of which is to lead organic life back into the inanimate state.' (Wikipedia) Her behaviour also exemplifies Freud's idea about "'the death instinct . . . as an instinct of destruction directed against the external world and other organisms" through aggression." (Wikipedia). Mrs Danvers says:

She had the strength of a little lion too. I remember her at sixteen getting up on one of her father's horses, a big brute of an animal too, that the groom said was too hot for her to ride. She stuck to him, all right. . . slashing at him, drawing blood, digging the spurs into his side, and when she got off his back he was trembling all over, full of froth and blood. (254)

In a way, Rebecca is portrayed as a very organized person, leading methodical, orderly, and planned life. That may seem inconsistent with the claim that Rebecca is all id. The following fact will make one think differently. "It is important to realize however," so states Wikipedia, "that 'the three newly presented entities, the id, the ego and the superego, all had lengthy past histories (two of them under other names)'—the id as the systematic unconscious, the super-ego as conscience/ego ideal." Indeed Rebecca is "the systematic unconscious," because it is only on superficial level that she is orderly and methodical; it is a camouflage to cover up a dishevelled inside— an inner deformed reality. "Outwardly of course she was a perfectly healthy woman," the doctor states, but the 'X-rays showed a

certain malformation of the uterus,' (383) and she 'was very seriously ill.' (382) There is no match to the duplicity of her form than the duplicity of her marriage and behaviour.

The lie we lived . . . together. Before friends, before relations, even before the servants, . . . They all believed in her down here, they all admired her, they never knew how she laughed at them behind their backs, jeered at them, mimicked them. . . . Her behaviour was faultless, outwardly. (286, 289)

Three persons have discovered her though. Beatrice 'saw through her, guessed something was wrong.' (288) Maxim was not entirely deceived like his grandmother who told him about Rebecca's merits: 'I believed her, or forced myself to believe her. But all the time I had a seed of doubt at the back of my mind. There was something about her eyes...' (284) Ironic though it may seem, the truth about Rebecca has been unmasked too by the idiot Ben, 'with his narrow idiot's eyes.' (120) He saw the devil in Rebecca: 'You've got angel's eyes . . . You're not like the other one . . . Tall and dark she was . . . She gave you the feeling of a snake.' (162) More than Favell, Rebecca is identical to the devil. She is a 'thought forbidden, prompted by demons.' (62) She 'was vicious, damnable' (283). Maxim tells the heroine he was 'living with the devil.' (285)

As far as betrayal goes, Rebecca, far lower than Favell, had reached the bottom. 'They were a pair, I tell you,' (254) but the circumstances are different. He is a bachelor and is actually fond of her: 'I suppose I was fonder of Rebecca than anyone else in the world.' (338) As a married woman, Rebecca was sinking below the zero betraying her husband within his own property 'in that cottage on the beach.' (354) She went beyond the limits being so guiltless and defiant, 'and what's more she had no motive.' (380) Rebecca was not in love with Favell or with anyone else; she was 'incapable of love, of tenderness, of decency. She was not even normal.'" (283) She did that for the sake of evil doing. It was intentional premeditated infidelity. 'Love-making was a game with her' (355-6). Not even Favell is

able to conceive that. When he hears Mrs Danvers saying it, he stares 'at her blankly, as though he had not understood.' (356) She was determined to win her game: "Rebecca has won . . . I remembered that slow treacherous smile. . . . She knew she would win in the end." (277–8) She told him of her prior will to be disloyal to him 'five days after [they] were married.' (284) She was sure of her victory. 'What a leg-pull, Max!' she said, 'what a God-damn triumph!' She sat there on the hillside, laughing, tearing a flower to bits in her hands." (285) Her triumph could not stop at meeting her own friends at Manderley or in her 'own sink in London.' (291) She tried to seduce him. She started on Frank and Giles (288). 'She might get hold of one of the workmen on the estate, someone from Kerrith, anyone...' (289) All that was 'only a game.' (356) Favell has been cowed into silence, but she was laughing to the last minute: 'When I killed her she was smiling still.' (292–3)

What could be the cause of such excess? Du Maurier has the answer. The lack of proper moral tutoring (superego) added to the potency of her id had resulted in this libidinous obsession. If Favell 'was the sort of man who invariably went hatless,' (335) Rebecca was the sort of woman who went 'with her hat in her hand.' (207)—That is how she appeared in the last ball. 'She twisted her father round her little finger, and she'd have done the same with her mother, had she lived.' (254) She did the same with Mrs Danvers.

Whether Freud has addressed the subject of a distorted superego I cannot tell, but I quite agree with du Maurier on the existence of such a concept as on her selection of Mrs Danvers to incarnate it. She brought up Rebecca: 'I had the care of her as a child.' (253) "The superego develops during the first five years of life in response to parental punishment and approval." (Encyclopædia Britannica) Therefore, it was impossible for Rebecca to develop a superego since she was granted approval to go her own way as early as that. "I shall live as I please, Danny," she told me, "and the whole world won't stop me."

(256) Rebecca 'did what she liked, she lived as she liked' (254), and was defiant of every law and authority because Mrs Danvers had turned into a collaborator rather than protector as she was supposed to be: 'that's how she went at life, when she grew up. I saw her, I was with her. She cared for nothing and for no one.' (254-5)

Mrs Danvers represents a superego that is, unnaturally, devoid of ethical and good values: 'I had caught one glimpse of her face. It was grey with anger, distorted, horrible.' (198) She is 'cruel and evil.' (251) Her 'great, hollow eyes gave her a skull's face . . . set on a skeleton's frame.' (72) Nothing could be more dangerous than an empty susceptible superego. Mrs Danvers with her 'hollow eyes' represents that danger (notice the phonetic resemblance between Danvers and dangers). After Rebecca's marriage things went the other way round, and Mrs Danvers was downgraded from her parental status to a servile position, from a supervisor to an employer, a maid: 'though I managed for her, she liked to supervise things herself. . . . I always had to refer to her. . . . 'You maid me better than anyone, Danny,' she used to say,' (79, 92, 176) The superego had to live under the dominion of the id and be entirely in its service: 'Do you realize that I could get Danny, as my personal maid, to swear anything I asked her to swear, in a court of law?' (291) Not only did Mrs Danvers endorse Rebecca's abnormal tendencies but also she highly respected her for that: 'She was not in love with you, or with Mr de Winter. She was not in love with anyone. She despised all men. She was above all that.' (355) The superego went below all that it stands for; it degenerated and dissolved into the id. 'The situation was mad, unreal.' (252) It struck Doctor Baker as incredible: 'it never entered my head for a moment that Mrs de Winter and Mrs Danvers could be the same person.' (384) With 'that diabolical smile on her white skull's face,' (251) you may conceive her as a grotesque mixture of the two opposing forces—a devil superego: 'It was Mrs Danvers. I shall never forget the expression on her

face, loathsome, triumphant. The face of an exulting devil . . . a weird gaunt figure in her black dress,' (224, 260)

In the wake of Rebecca's death, Mrs Danvers turns into 'a fanatic' (254) worshiper of Rebecca and is resolutely set against any alternative. "No, you see," Beatrice tells the heroine, 'she resents your being here at all, that's the trouble.'" (107) To know that the alternative is the exact reverse of her idol, we may be able to imagine how far her contempt and hatred can go.

I found myself held by those eyes, that had no light, no flicker of sympathy towards me. . . . Yet there was something beside scorn in those eyes of hers, something surely of positive dislike, or actual malice? . . . how malevolent, how full of hatred. (78–9, 181)

Mrs Danvers is doggedly intent to preserve Rebecca's system and to obstruct the heroine's progress towards her lost ego. We had better go to Manderley to witness her shock having 'collected the whole damned staff in the hall and on the estate to welcome' the heroine (71) 'coming to Manderley for the first time,' as 'the wife of Maxim de Winter.' (67)

Du Maurier virtually draws a rough sketch of the "ego ideal" (superego) by this immaculate bride. Here is a milder version of the superego (as compared to Frank), one that had not yet been adjusted by contact with reality: 'How young and inexperienced I must have seemed, and how I felt it, too. One was too sensitive, too raw' (14). The heroine, 'unsuitably dressed as usual,' (66) represents the unsystematic conscience, the contrast to Mrs Danvers's idol—the systematic unconscious: 'I think it was the expression on her face that gave me my first feeling of unrest. Instinctively I thought, 'She is comparing me to Rebecca'; and sharp as a sword the shadow came between us...' (12) What an easy prey! 'I could see she despised me,' says the heroine, 'marking with all the snobbery of her class that I was no great lady, that I was humble, shy, and diffident.' (78)

That is the reality at Manderley at the arrival of the heroine. 'The ego, driven by the id, confined by the superego, repulsed by reality,' so states McLeod, 'struggles to master its economic task of bringing about harmony among the forces and influences working in and upon it; and we can understand how it is that so often we cannot suppress a cry 'life is not easy!'" (2009) It is the same cry uttered by our heroine. Life is not easy at Manderley. It has been a tough struggle for her poor ego to bring about harmony among the powerful forces and influences working in and upon it: life at Manderley (reality), her own self (the superego), and the id (Rebecca).

Staying beneath the waters and leading the battle from within the cabin of her boat, Rebecca is a fine analogue of what is described by the editors of Wikipedia as 'the dark, inaccessible part of our personality,' the id. It is no coincidence that Rebecca assumed Mrs Danvers' identity when she went to the doctor. (382) It was her plan for resuming the war after her death, her will to wage a war by proxy. No one could be more suitable for the role of the acting manager than a fanatic agent with the powers of a superego. Having realized the heroine's vulnerability from the very moment of their encounter, Mrs Danvers has realized she could be the virtual mistress of the house with no great difficulty: 'I began to walk down the stairs, and she came with me, by my side, as though she were a warder, and I in custody.' (96) On the background of the new reality, there is Beatrice, 'sympathetic but a little vague,' (104) and there is Giles, 'sympathetic but rather curious' (228). There is Frank, a faithful ally. Maxim is the propeller of the change. A model of a strong ego, he has triggered her long absented ego into action.

The story of the heroine's transformation goes like an amazing tale. I will tell it in a bit different context though. My aim is to explore the therapeutic possibilities of the psychoanalytic theory afforded by the novel in as far as possible

scientific light. Please join me to hear it from the start in the second part of this analysis.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Du Maurier, Daphne. (1992). *Rebecca*. London: Arrow Books Limited.
2. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. (2016) "ego". Retrieved Aug. 2016 from <<https://www.britannica.com/topic/ego-philosophy-and-psychology>>.
3. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. (2016) "id". Retrieved Aug. 2016 from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/id-psychology>.
4. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. (2016) "superego". Retrieved Aug. 2016 from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/id-psychology>
5. Gindin, James. (1992). *British Fiction in the 1930s: The Dispiriting Decade*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
6. Guerin, Wilfred L, Earle Labor, Lee Morgan, Jeanne c. Reesman & John R. Willingham, (2005). *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. New York • Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. McLeod, S. A. (2009). *Defense Mechanisms*. Retrieved January, 2016 from www.simplypsychology.org/defense-mechanisms.html
8. McLeod, S. A. (2016). *Id, Ego and Superego*. Retrieved January, 2017 from www.simplypsychology.org/psyche.html
9. MEANING-OF-NAMES.COM. (2017). Maximilian. Retrieved January 9, 2017 from <http://www.meaning-of-names.com/>
10. Oxford Dictionaries, Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. (2016). MAXIM. Retrieved February 14, 2016 from <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/>

11. Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. (August, 2016) Id, ego and super-ego. Retrieved August 21, 2016 from http://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page.