ISSN 3041-217X (print)
ISSN 3041-2188 (online)
ALFRED NOBEL UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, 2026, 1(31)

Comparative Trajectories: A Dialogue of Cultures and Ages

Компаративні траєкторії: діалог культур та епох

UDC 82.091
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32342/anuJPh.2026.31.9

Markers of the Subconscious in Dramatic Text: D.H. Lawrence's *The Widowing of Mrs Holroyd* and H. Javid's *Afet*

Javida Mammadova
Nizami Ganjavi Institute of Literature,
Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences (Azerbaijan)

Статтю присвячено дослідженню способів художнього вираження підсвідомого у драматургічних творах західноєвропейської та азербайджанської літератур початку XX ст. Актуальність роботи зумовлена сталим інтересом сучасного літературознавства до міждисциплінарних методів аналізу художнього тексту, а також необхідністю розширення міжкультурного контексту вивчення модерністської драми. Попри значний масив наукових досліджень, присвячених психоаналітичній інтерпретації літератури, проблема репрезентації підсвідомого в драматургії різних культурних традицій залишається недостатньо розробленою в зіставному аспекті. У цьому зв'язку звернення до західноєвропейської та азербайджанської драматургії початку XX ст. дає змогу виявити як універсальні, так і культурно-специфічні моделі художньої репрезентації підсвідомого.

Метою дослідження є виявлення та зіставлення способів художнього вираження підсвідомого в драматургічних текстах двох літературних традицій, а також визначення ролі психоаналітичних механізмів у формуванні внутрішнього конфлікту й еволюції жіночих образів.

Методологічну основу роботи становить синтез психоаналітичного та порівняльно-типологічного підходів із залученням структурно-семантичного аналізу тексту.

У результаті дослідження встановлено, що в п'єсах Д.Г. Лоуренса та Г. Джавіда внутрішній конфлікт героїнь постає структуротвірним елементом драми й відображає глибинні психічні процеси. Переживання травми (дитячої, моральної, екзистенційної) є ключовим чинником, що визначає поведінкову стратегію персонажів і динаміку конфлікту. Паузи, фрагментоване мовлення, емоційні спалахи й ремарки, фрагментарність часу функціонують як художні маркери підсвідомого, фіксуючи внутрішні коливання та кризу ідентичності персонажів. Отже, драматургічну форму розглянуто як простір взаємодії свідомого й підсвідомого рівнів особистості.

Порівняльний аналіз дав змогу виявити універсальні психодинамічні моделі (амбівалентність почуттів, конфлікт між обов'язком і пристрастю, переживання провини) та водночас установити

культурно зумовлені відмінності у способах їх художнього вираження. У п'єсі Лоуренса внутрішній конфлікт частіше розгортається через поступове накопичення психологічної напруги та побутову конкретику, тоді як в азербайджанській драматургії він набуває більш експресивного й символічно насиченого характеру. Водночас в обох випадках простежується спільна тенденція до поглибленої психологізації та звернення до сфери підсвідомого.

Отримані результати підтверджують продуктивність синтезу психоаналітичного та порівняльно-типологічного методів для аналізу драматичного тексту й розширюють уявлення про модерністську драму як міжкультурне явище. Дослідження сприяє розвитку теорії драми, уточнюючи розуміння драматичного конфлікту як форми художньої репрезентації внутрішньої психічної динаміки та утверджуючи драматургічний текст як простір діалогу культур.

Ключові слова: підсвідоме, драматургічний текст, психоаналітичний метод, порівняльно-типологічний аналіз, внутрішній конфлікт, жіночий образ, травма, модерністська драма.

To cite this article: Mammadova, J. (2026). Markers of the Subconscious in Dramatic Text: D.H. Lawrence's *The Widowing of Mrs Holroyd* and H. Javid's *Afet*. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, 1 (31), 149-170, DOI: https://doi.org/10.32342/anuJPh.2026.31.9

Introduction

The question of how the subconscious is expressed in a dramatic text is, it would seem, not a new one—the psychoanalytic method in literature has been developed and applied for quite some time. However, in the context of contemporary humanities scholarship, which is oriented towards interdisciplinarity and an in-depth understanding of the internal structure of the literary work as such, and of the dramatic text in particular, this method takes on particular relevance. In drama, the subconscious—as a realm of repressed desires, fears, traumas and ambivalent feelings—takes on specific forms of expression that reveal a character's underlying psychological logic, which cannot be reduced to direct statements. At a time of heightened interest in issues of identity, trauma, and gender and cultural conflicts, the analysis of a dramatic text from the perspective of the mechanisms through which the subconscious is expressed becomes particularly interesting and productive. Drama at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—both in Western Europe and in the East—developed during a period of intense re-evaluation of conceptions of human nature. The emergence and development of psychoanalysis, associated with the name of Sigmund Freud, who established the role of unconscious impulses in human behaviour, radically altered perceptions of the nature of human behaviour, the creative process and, of course, the literary process as a whole. Playwrights increasingly turned to portraying the hidden motives behind characters' actions, their inner conflict, and irrational impulses that defy rational explanation, yet are, to some extent, influenced by the individual's cultural background. From this perspective, the comparative aspect of the study takes on particular significance, as it enables the identification of both universal and culture-specific modes of artistic expression of the subconscious in works of early twentieth century Western European and Azerbaijani drama. A comparative analysis makes it possible to trace how universal psychological mechanisms are reflected in different cultural models, and which elements of a work's content and form are involved in depicting these psychological mechanisms, shifts and impulses.

The relevance of this research also lies in the fact that, by focusing on intercultural dialogue, contemporary humanities aim to identify not so much the differences as the points of convergence between the artistic traditions of the West and the East. A comparison of Western European and Azerbaijani drama from the early twentieth century demonstrates that the processes of modernisation, the crisis of traditional values, and the re-evaluation of women's roles in society and marriage took place in parallel across different cultural spheres, and the choice of artistic approaches to interpreting these processes—whether similar or profoundly different—is determined by the specific nature of the historical and socio-cultural contexts.

Thus, an examination of the ways in which the subconscious is expressed in the drama of Western Europe and Azerbaijan in the early twentieth century is relevant for several reasons. Firstly, it reflects current trends towards interdisciplinarity and the psychological dimension in literary analysis. Secondly, it allows for a fresh interpretation of the internal structure of dramatic conflict, revealing its underlying, not always obvious foundations. Thirdly, the comparative aspect

offers an opportunity to explore the universal and culture-specific features of artistic thinking across different cultural traditions. Finally, its exploration of female characters and the theme of marriage as a space of oppression and resistance makes this study significant in the context of contemporary gender and cultural studies debates.

Psychoanalysis in drama: approaches to research

the Freudian interpretation of drama draws on a wide range of studies that explore, in various ways, the interplay between psychoanalytic theory and theatrical form. One of the key areas of research continues to be works that view the theatre as a space in which the unconscious manifests itself. In K. Neuringer's article "Freud and the Theatre," it is emphasised that Freud's influence on drama extends far beyond the thematic level: drama adopts the very logic of the unconscious. Thus, Freud's psychoanalytic ideas become one of the key factors that expand the moral and psychological boundaries of contemporary drama. According to Neuringer, the theatrical stage becomes a kind of "external space of the psyche," where repressed conflicts are played out in symbolic form. It is for this very reason that monologues, breaks in linear time, dreamlike episodes and a fragmented structure become devices akin to psychoanalytic techniques of interpretation. This approach is important as a methodological foundation, enabling us to view the dramatic text not merely as a reflection of Freud's ideas, but as a form that employs psychological mechanisms in its composition [Neuringer, 1992, pp. 146–147].

J.M. Rabaté offers a detailed theoretical framework, noting that dramatic action is often structured along the lines of a dream, in which associations and symbols play a central role. Here, the play is conceived as a manifestation of a "symptom": it captures a repressed conflict, which becomes open to interpretation thanks to the structure of the plot and the characters' dialogue. Rabaté emphasises that a Freudian reading, "which seeks to penetrate directly into the unconscious, bypassing the authors' conscious intentions," is not merely a search for direct allusions to Oedipus or the Oedipal model; it is far more important to see how the internal logic of desire, guilt and prohibition takes shape within the dramatic fabric itself [Rabaté, 2014, p. 27].

The Oedipus complex as a dramatic model is most fully explored in R.H. Armstrong's study *Freud and the Drama of Oedipal Truth*. The author demonstrates that drama employs the structure of the revelation of a family secret as a mechanism for constructing conflict: the truth about origins, family ties and repressed desires becomes the structural principle governing the development of the plot. Armstrong emphasises that the "Oedipal truth" is revealed in a dramatic manner—through monologues, flashbacks and stage symbols—and in this way models the inner workings of the individual [Armstrong, 2012].

M. Stearns's article "Hamlet and Freud" [1949] remains a classic example of the application of psychoanalysis to drama, in which he analyses the Freudian interpretation of the tragedy *Hamlet*. The researcher notes that "Freud's greatest contribution to literary criticism is in the province of imagery and symbolism, which he and later authors have established as the source of unconscious revelations" [Stearns, 1949, p. 272]. Although many of the articles are now considered somewhat simplistic, it demonstrates how Freudian theory can be applied to the analysis of a character's motivations, flashbacks, and visions, as well as to the function of symbols in a theatrical text. This historical example helps to contextualise contemporary psychoanalytic analysis within the framework of early attempts to interpret drama through the lens of the unconscious. A theoretical perspective linking psychoanalysis and the dramatic function of catharsis is presented in J. Vives's study "Catharsis: Psychoanalysis and the Theatre." Vives reveals how the Freudian concept of the discharge and working through of unconscious drives reinterprets Aristotelian catharsis as an effect that transforms tragedy into a process of symbolic reworking of repressed impulses. Drawing on Freud and Lacan, the researcher explains that, within the framework of psychoanalytic theatre, catharsis should be understood as a process of deeper analytical exploration of the subject's subconscious desires: "Catharsis is to be understood not so much as a mechanism of discharge linked to abreaction, but rather as the actual analytic process itself during which the Subject is 'unveiled' and thus faced with the enigma of his own desire" [Vives, 2011, p. 1009].

A significant body of research focuses on theatrical practice. The collection *Psychoanalysis and Performance* [Campbell, Kear, 2001] demonstrates that psychoanalytic ideas are applied by directors and actors: working with transference, modelling unconscious states on stage, and

interpreting dramatic conflict as a therapeutic process. As Adrian Kear notes, the study represents an attempt "to situate performance and psychoanalysis within a dialogical framework that speaks to the affiliations and correspondences between the two fields" [Kear, 2001, p. xiii].

The contextual dimension of psychoanalytic influence is explored in D. Sievers' book *Freud on Broadway: A History of Psychoanalysis and the American Drama* [1970]. According to Sievers, the dramas of the 1920s clearly demonstrate that one of the most notable changes in American attitudes, brought about by psychoanalytic concepts, was the desentimentalisation of the role of the mother [Sievers, 1970, p. 76]. This approach highlights the integration of psychoanalytic ideas into American theatre, enabling playwrights of the time to portray the figure of the mother in a more diverse and realistic context. Sievers notes that "Apart from the Oedipus complex, the most prevalent psychoanalytic concept in the dramas of the 1920s was the theme of sexual repression and frustration" [Sievers, 1970, p. 79]. The researcher demonstrates how the psychoanalytic culture of the US fostered an interest in characters' underlying motivations and family dynamics, whilst playwrights themselves adapted Freudian ideas to suit the tastes of a mass audience.

Continuing the theme of the reflection of the subconscious in dramatic works, Prayer Elmo Raj offers an interpretation of Shakespeare's tragedy through the lens of classical psychoanalysis, particularly the Freudian view of the unconscious [Raj, 2016]. The author argues that *Hamlet* should be viewed not merely as a political drama or a tragedy of revenge, but as a "psychopathological" play in which the dramatic action is shaped by repressed desires, internal conflicts and mechanisms of repression. According to Raj, the complex nature of Hamlet's unconscious, his tendency towards an Oedipal complex and his autobiographical rejection of the impossibility of desire form the basis for a psychoanalytic approach to *Hamlet* [Raj, 2016, p. 22]. Particular attention is paid to how the protagonist's monologues, his hesitations and outbursts of aggression express the struggle of repressed desires, which are made dramaturgically visible. Although the study at times oversimplifies the play's complexity, reducing its multi-layered nature to the protagonist's psychological conflict, it demonstrates how psychoanalysis transforms *Hamlet* into a space for the manifestation of hidden desires and inner traumas, broadening traditional interpretations and introducing an additional dimension to the understanding of the tragedy's character and structure.

The issue of expressing the subconscious in drama and theatre is explored in numerous articles devoted to individual plays—ranging from Shakespeare's tragedies to the works of Miller and Williams—which demonstrate the practice of specific Freudian analysis. They offer a variety of interpretative models: from the classical interpretation of symbols and drives to a combination of psychoanalytic perspectives with gender, postcolonial or cultural criticism. These studies reveal how the universal categories of psychoanalysis are adapted to specific dramatic texts and scenes. Thus, Maria Grazia Turri returns to the classical foundations of psychoanalysis and theatre, demonstrating how the character, the actor and the audience are connected through the unconscious, and that theatre is a space where the unconscious manifests itself and is experienced by the audience [Turri, 2021]. The researcher notes that the character's function is not merely a means of releasing emotional tension. It is rather an "emotional field" in which the viewer's emotions meet the actor's interpretation and travel a path from the unconscious to the conscious thanks to the actor's alpha function" [Turri, 2021, p. 17]. The study examines the phenomenon of audience perception and the psychological processes at work within the audience, which goes beyond the analysis of individual characters—in other words, drama is viewed as a socio-cultural phenomenon rather than merely the internal dynamics of the characters.

C. Bashir, M. Rehman, S. Ullah, and D. Ahsan propose an analysis of Ibsen's plays through the lens of psychoanalytic criticism; the authors demonstrate how internal psychological processes, the unconscious, and conflicts of desire and guilt can be discerned in the texts of playwrights whose work has absorbed social and cultural realities. The researchers note that "Ibsen's exploration of psychological and emotional themes in his characters predates formal psychoanalysis, but his works offer rich material for later interpretations through a psychoanalytic lens" [Bashir et al., 2023, p. 63]. In our view, this study provides a fine example of a classical psychoanalytic interpretation of drama, in which symbols, motifs and the psychodynamics of the characters are explored. At the same time, since Ibsen is a playwright closely tied to his social context, this approach proves useful for understanding the socio-psychological realities of his era—that is, psychoanalysis is used not only for internal psychology, but also as a tool for historical and social

analysis. All these sources paint a multi-layered picture of the influence of Freudian theory on drama: from its deep theoretical foundations and historical context to an analysis of its staging and the practice of interpreting individual plays. They demonstrate that a Freudian reading of drama involves a comprehensive examination of form, the structure of conflict, character dynamics, and the ways in which the stage becomes a space for the manifestation and exploration of the unconscious. However, despite the considerable body of research devoted to the psychoanalytic interpretation of drama and the issue of the unconscious in modernist literature, a systematic analysis of the structural markers of the subconscious in dramatic texts has, to date, been virtually non-existent. Existing works focus primarily on the theme of the unconscious, psychoanalytic readings of individual works, or general questions of subjectivity, whilst formal-structural methods of representing subconscious processes in drama remain insufficiently systematised.

Thus, the studies by Marvin Carlson [2006] and Patrice Pavis [1982] analyse linguistic plurality, corporeality and the semiotics of stage discourse, yet they examine these elements primarily from the perspectives of communication studies, theatre studies and semiotics. The works of Erika Fischer-Lichte [1992; 2008] deepen our understanding of the pause, silence and physical presence as signifying and performative phenomena, but do not conceptualise them as a system of indicators of a character's unconscious psychodynamics within the structure of the dramatic text. Bert O. States [1985] examines the stage pause and the phenomenon of presence in detail. Nevertheless, in this study, silence and the pause are analysed primarily as aesthetic, phenomenological or compositional categories, rather than as structural markers of subconscious processes. Thus, individual aspects of the problem—language as a vehicle for fragmented subjectivity, the pause as a form of meaning-making, silence as an active structural element, fragmented speech and breaks in communication—are examined within the frameworks of theatre studies, semiotics, linguistics and discourse theory; yet they are rarely considered as a coherent system of markers of the subconscious as an element of poetics, let alone within a comparative intercultural context where Western European modernist drama and Eastern dramatic traditions might be juxtaposed. The existing works provide an important theoretical and methodological foundation, but do not yet offer a comprehensive model in which a formal-structural analysis of the dramatic text is combined with psychoanalytic interpretation and comparative-typological cross-cultural research. It is precisely this that makes the present article so relevant.

Aim and methodology

The aim of this study is to identify and conduct a comparative analysis of the artistic expressions of the subconscious in dramatic works of early twentieth century Western European and Azerbaijani literature (based on D.H. Lawrence's *The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd* and H. Javid's *Afet*), as well as to determine the role of psychoanalytic mechanisms in the formation of internal conflict and the characterisation of female characters.

Achieving this objective involves addressing the following *tasks*:

– to analyse the specific nature of the internal conflict of the central female characters as a manifestation of their subconscious impulses and traumatic experience;

– to identify the artistic devices used to represent the subconscious in dramatic texts;

– to compare models of the development of internal conflict in works belonging to different cultural traditions, identifying common psychoanalytic foundations and differences.

The methodological framework of this work is comprehensive in nature and brings together several complementary approaches:

– *The psychoanalytic method* focuses on interpreting literary texts from the perspective of the mechanisms of the subconscious. Within this approach, particular attention is paid to identifying the hidden motivations behind the characters' actions and reconstructing the underlying psychological causes of their inner conflict.

– *A comparative-typological analysis* aims to compare artistic approaches in Western European and Azerbaijani drama, enabling the identification of similar psychodynamic patterns (for example, the conflict between duty and passion, feelings of guilt following an act, the fear of losing one's footing), as well as to identify the culture-specific features of their artistic expression—the degree of their universality and distinctiveness.

– *Structural-semantic analysis* involves examining elements of stage design that indirectly convey the characters' inner states. An analysis of fragmented speech, ellipsis, intonational pauses and symbolic details reveals how the subconscious is represented at the level of form.

Markers of the expression of the unconscious in a dramatic text: theoretical background

In the context of our study, the aesthetics of the subconscious are of interest as a factor influencing the formation of the poetics of a dramatic text and determining its key elements. In this case, the literary text functions as a complex system of symbols through which the unconscious is transformed into an artistic image. On the other hand, the aesthetics and inner potential of the artistic image prove capable of explaining the motivation behind actions, the hidden causes of conflicts, and the emergence of secret desires at the level of the character—as a kind of fictional experience capable of transforming into an empirical one. To paraphrase Anthony Kubiak slightly, "What is of interest here is the theater represented in the scene is a theater which, in its most important manifestations, always occurs elsewhere" [Kubiak, 2001, p. 35]. Jean-Michel Rabaté emphasised the importance of this point and, in my view, reached a very accurate conclusion: "Literature becomes all the more valuable when it can represent, or stage, the psychic opacity of a given person, whether alive or fictional" [Rabaté, 2014, p. 28].

Within the field of psychoanalysis, scholars pay particular attention to the study of recurring motifs, symbolic images, repressed impulses and suppressed desires, which may point to hidden layers of meaning in a work [Murray, 1987, 2001, 2013; Nuetzel, 2000; Read, 2001; Turri, 2015 and others]. It follows from the approaches of most researchers that the psychoanalytic method manifests itself in drama primarily as a representation of psychological content, rather than as a poetological system. From this perspective, the events depicted in dramatic works are of interest first and foremost as manifestations of an inner, hidden and symbolic stage. Psychoanalytic thought has, in essence, focused primarily on the study of stage drama, presenting it as a structure that reveals the characters' inner conflicts through theatrical production (acting, movement, music, lighting, etc.). What interests us, however, is the application of the psychoanalytic approach to the interpretation of literary drama, that is, to the interpretation of a dramatic text intended primarily for the reader. Here, it would appear, the psychoanalytic approach acts as one of the main factors involved in shaping the internal and aesthetic structure of the dramatic text.

The development of psychoanalytic theory in the twentieth century significantly expanded its potential applications in literary studies. In particular, Jacques Lacan proposed viewing the unconscious as structured in a manner analogous to language, which opened up new perspectives for the analysis of literary texts. In Lacan's interpretation, literature was conceived as a space in which the structure of subjectivity manifests itself, whilst the literary text was regarded as a form of the symbolic construction of desire [Lacan, 1966, 1986]. From a psychoanalytic perspective, action in a drama may be seen as a unique form of the realisation of subconscious processes, in which inner experiences are given textual embodiment. As Patrick Campbell notes, "In making the hidden visible, the latent manifest, in laying bare the interior landscape of the mind and its fears and desires through a range of signifying practices, psychoanalytic processes are endemic to the performing arts" [Campbell, 2001, p. 1]. It seems that this idea put forward by the scholar can be applied to the text of a literary drama as well.

Following Freud, contemporary research emphasises the close link between dramatic form and the psychoanalytic understanding of subjectivity, noting that the structure of classical tragedy can be likened to the process of psychoanalytic unravelling of repressed knowledge, where the truth about the subject's desire is gradually revealed through a series of revelations and interpretations, as demonstrated by an analysis of the tragedy *Oedipus Rex*. Campbell emphasises that her dramatic action unfolds according to a logic similar to that of the analytical process: the revelation of the truth occurs gradually, through a series of delays, hints and symbolic clues, which makes the dramatic structure akin to the process of psychoanalytic interpretation [Ibid., p. 5]. In other words, the unconscious does not remain merely an "element" that explains the character's inner world but manifests itself in the temporal structure of the play, its language and the construction of the stage action. Thus, psychological concepts such as trauma, repressed emotions and desire are expressed not so much in the content of the text as in its formal structure. Internal monologues, recurring motifs, character motivation, etc. reflect unconscious processes in the character's psyche, and

the use of symbolic devices becomes more widespread. For example, in drama, trauma is no longer depicted through a narrative thread that clearly expresses its cause-and-effect relationship, but rather through a rupture or fragmentation of time and events. Thus, the disruption of the sequence of events and the blurring of the boundaries between past and present are presented as a poetic embodiment of traumatic experience. At the same time, the timeline may unfold in a non-sequential manner, returning to past events whilst the present remains unresolved. In dramatic works, such a disruption of time does not, of course, explain the trauma, but vividly reflects it through formal means—via the fragmentation that occurs within the structure of the dramatic text. In other words, the reader does not learn about the trauma experienced by the character through any kind of explanation but rather experiences it and feels it through the instability of time. Desire, as a category of action in dramatic texts, is generally realised through conscious motivation; however, it can also be expressed through an algorithm of unconscious repetition, where the same situation, the same phrase or the same action is repeated. This reveals the irrational, compulsive nature of the unconscious in the text, giving repetitions and motifs an aesthetic form of expression for the character's unconscious conflicts. According to Blauf, repetition is an attempt to recapture the lost "present"; however, this attempt does not restore the same thing, but rather reveals difference and lack. In any case, as A. Kear rightly points out, "logic of repetition serves as an insistent reminder of the event's materiality" [Kear, 2001, p. 198]. The compulsion to repeat, which operates through representation and reproduction, "not only underlies mimetic behaviour... it is also inherent in the very environment in which these actions take place, and lies at the heart of the psychoanalytic tradition" [Read, 2001, p. 162]. The effect of repetition plays a significant role in dramatic texts, from the structure of the scene to the dialogue. For example, in Pirandello's play *Six Characters in Search of an Author* (1921), events are recounted from the perspective of each character, but each time a different emotional and psychological experience is revealed. Each time, the audience is presented with a different experience and a new "present." In other words, the same events—the girls' fate, love and betrayal—are recounted through the eyes of different characters; the same event evokes fear in one character, and regret and guilt in another. Although the events are repeated in the same form, each perspective creates its own meaning. Or, for example, in Eugene O'Neill's play *Strange Interlude*, Nina's behaviour, in which she "*repeats his words as if she were memorizing a lesson*" [O'Neill, 1928, p. 60], demonstrates the heroine's inner conflict and her attempt to relive the very same moment. The characters' repeated return to the same conflict, dialogue, and emotional states is a poetic expression of unconscious compulsion in drama. Archie K. Loss notes that in *Private Lives*, Eliot and Amanda repeat their relationship: "They are bound to repeat themselves, playing out their scene again and again with different words and different props but always with the same result" [Loss, 1984, p. 300].

This repetition does not advance the plot, but rather oscillates between the past and the present, portraying this desire as a futile, endless impulse. Pauses, silence and structural gaps, which are frequently found in dramatic works, are regarded as a poetic expression of repression. Unfinished dialogues and thoughts, a lack of reaction, and sometimes incomprehensible scenes or events with unclear causes and consequences are the key elements of this poetic expression. In some works, a temporal rupture—that is, a rupture between the past and the present, a 'loss' of time, and so on—is characterised as a repressed aspect of trauma. In such works, speech becomes a means not for resolving conflict, but for concealing it. In other words, the very words and ideas that are meant to be expressed are actually absent from the text. From a psychoanalytic perspective, these gaps manifest as a poetic form of repression that distances the dramatic text from its fundamental structure—that is, from its "speaking, expressing, showing" nature.

In drama, one of the ways in which the unconscious is expressed at the level of poetics is through the unconventional qualities of the language used in dramatic works. The repetition of both clear and obscure words, symbols and metaphors, as well as silence, restraint and pauses, express unconscious conflicts and repressed emotions; the inner monologue helps to convey unconscious processes on stage. The language of the dramatic text, drawing on psychoanalytic theory, poetically conveys the character's inner world and psychological state to the reader and the audience. In this light, even the objects in the play take on a symbolic function, and the depicted space becomes a stage that brings unconscious and repressed emotions to life. Scholars have noted that in Eliot's play *Sweeney Agonistes* (1932), one of the experimental examples of modernist drama, speech

ceases to be a means of psychological self-expression and becomes a stream of words formed on the basis of free associations, beyond the control of consciousness. In this context, the dramatic text appears to function as a "symptom" [Ellmann, 2014]; the actions on stage are not explained, and the incomplete motivations and lack of an explicit resolution to the dramatic conflict bear traces of the unconscious. Speech loses its communicative function, much as occurs in the Theatre of the Absurd, which Martin Esslin regarded as a form of theatre in which language's capacity to create meaning is weakened, and dialogue and the structure of the text lose their traditional communicative function [Esslin, 2014]. In this regard, it can be said that psychoanalysis enables us to rethink the structure and development of dramatic poetics, revealing the stage as a space for the poetic representation of psychological and emotional processes. Consequently, the poetic structure of drama is transformed into a dynamic and multi-layered space shaped by the interplay between the conscious and the subconscious. In the creation of a dramatic text as a unique space for expressing the subconscious, stage directions play a crucial role, providing a narrative framework for the action and the author's narrative. In this context, as Christine Schwanecke rightly observes, "…what is actually para-textual becomes part of a narrative strategy to guide reception" [Schwanecke, 2022, p. 332]. In this case, the characters' inner mental states, repressed impulses and hidden desires are not revealed directly, but through hints or symbolic imagery. The researcher emphasises that stage directions in a dramatic text function as a fully-fledged narrative tool, capable of shaping the meaning, atmosphere and interpretative framework of the work. Schwanecke, in her analysis of the play *Mary Rose,* concludes that stage directions can imbue space and actions with subjectivity, transforming the stage into an active participant in the narrative [Ibid., pp. 294–295]. According to Schwanecke, stage directions in a play can have several effects. Firstly, they serve to set the mood. Through detailed descriptions of the setting, rich in visual and intermedia references, they create an emotional backdrop that shapes the audience's perception of the ensuing action. Secondly, stage directions serve a prognostic (proleptic) function. They foreshadow the development of the action, hinting at key motifs and events, and shaping expectations regarding the further development of the plot. The third important function is cognitive-interpretative. Stage directions establish what is known as the "macro-framework" of perception, enabling the reader to make sense of complex ontological categories such as being and non-being, life and death, presence and absence. They guide interpretation, helping the reader to perceive events not as literal actions, but as manifestations of deeper, hard-to-express states. In this sense, stage directions act as a mediator between the text and the reader, facilitating an understanding of what lies beyond immediate experience. Finally, stage directions serve a representational function: they give form to experiences that are, in principle, difficult or impossible to express directly—loss, uncertainty, liminality. Through images of a crumbling space, a "living" room or frozen time, the dramatic text is able to articulate the liminal states of human existence: "As a narrative frame to the story level, *Mary Rose's* stage directions help narrativise and thus tackle events that defy telling: the ruthless passing of time, the withering of lives, regretful absences, and the thin line between life and death" [Schwanecke, 2022, p. 294]. It should be noted, however, that the narrative framework referred to by Schwanecke constitutes a form of authorial narrative that does not coincide with the level of action and the characters' dialogue. Its distinctive feature lies in the fact that it establishes the ontological, temporal and interpretative parameters of the dramatic world. Theoretically, such a narrative can be defined as metadiscursive: it operates at a level that structures and organises the perception of events but does not belong to any of the characters and cannot be reduced to their points of view. Through stage directions, the authorial instance introduces a particular perspective within which the stage space, time and the state of the world acquire an additional—often symbolic or metaphysical—dimension. This allows us to speak of stage directions as the vehicle for an implicit narrative that unfolds in parallel with the dramatic action. Essentially, this narrative is aimed at constituting ontological uncertainty, serving to model liminal states that are difficult to represent within an exclusively dialogic structure. Furthermore, the authorial narrative, conveyed through stage directions, constructs a specific temporality. In contrast to the linear flow of the action, a multi-layered, "condensed" time emerges here, in which the past is preserved in the present in the form of traces, imprints, signs of decay, or memory. Such time does not so much unfold as accumulate and manifest itself through material or spatial metaphors. In this sense, the stage directions establish not the chronotope of an event, but the chronotope of a

state. A key feature of this narrative is its ability to represent extreme and elusive phenomena—loss, trauma, uncertainty and existential anxiety. Since such states cannot always be adequately articulated by the characters, stage directions take on the role of expressing them indirectly through imagery, spatial transformations and symbolic details. In this way, they act as a mediator between inexpressible experience and its textual form, lending "visibility" to hidden psychological processes. Unlike dialogue, which directly belongs to the characters, stage directions constitute the author's voice, capturing emotional states, gestures, pauses, intonations, and other non-verbal manifestations of a character's behaviour. From a psychoanalytic perspective, such elements may be interpreted as signs of those inner impulses that do not find direct expression in the character's speech. A gesture, silence, a pause, or a sudden change in behaviour often indicates the presence of a hidden inner conflict. It is precisely in stage directions that the playwright gains the opportunity to reveal those aspects of the character's psychological life that remain unexpressed at the level of conscious speech.

Particularly significant are stage directions that describe pauses, hesitation, indecision, or the characters' physical reactions. Such details may indicate a tension between the character's conscious intentions and their repressed impulses, which emerge indirectly. In this sense, stage directions function as a kind of "psychological commentary", revealing a deeper level of dramatic action.

An equally important element in the expression of unconscious processes is the structure of dialogic and monologic speech. Features of dialogue such as its abundance of ellipses, evasions, repetitions, and discontinuities in speech point to the presence of hidden psychological tensions. In psychoanalytic interpretation, dialogue often functions as a form of indirect expression of the unconscious. Characters may use indirect statements, metaphors, or ambiguous phrasing, allowing them to simultaneously express and conceal their desires. The latent conflict in dialogue is evident in the fact that the characters' lines do not always follow on one another logically; on the contrary, there may be shifts in meaning or unexpected associations between them, reminiscent of the associative logic of mental life, where different thoughts and images are linked not by strictly rational connections, but by a complex system of emotional and symbolic relationships.

The structure of monologue speech is often characterised by fragmentation, repetitions and associative transitions between different themes. This structure reflects the specific nature of mental dynamics, in which thoughts and experiences arise not in a strictly sequential manner, but through chains of association. This is precisely why the monologue is a form of expressing the stream of consciousness, where logical sequence gives way to emotional and symbolic coherence. Recurring motifs or images in a monologue may indicate the presence of repressed experiences that return to the character's consciousness time and again.

The images of the main female characters and the specificity of conflict in D.H. Lawrence's *The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd* and H. Javid's *Afet*

The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd and *Afet* were written at roughly the same time. Javid wrote *Afet* between 1906 and 1909, and revised and published it between 1917 and 1920. Lawrence wrote the work in question in 1911, and it was published in 1914. Lawrence created the character of Mrs Holroyd, drawing inspiration from the life of his aunt Polly, who lived in a tiny cottage by the railway line near Eastwood [Boulton, 1997, p. 553]. Javid's play was written against the backdrop of a complex socio-cultural situation in Azerbaijan and captures the spirit of the early twentieth century—a time of intense cultural transformation, including the rise of national consciousness, the rapid development of the theatre, and debates surrounding the modernisation of society, the status of women, and the interplay between tradition and European influences (Westernisation). Drawing on the real-life context, both authors created plays of different genres—a psychological drama (Lawrence) and a philosophical tragedy with symbolic undertones (Javid) —yet they both addressed the same issue: the tragic fate of women who occupied a subordinate position in marriage and were subjected to humiliation and cruelty at the hands of their husbands. In both plays, this tragic fate is caused by a profound incompatibility between female nature and the existing model of marriage.

There is a striking similarity between the lives of 32-year-old Mrs. Holroyd and 33-year-old Afet; both women were compelled to marry at a very young age in order to escape difficult living

conditions. In speaking about her past, Mrs. Holroyd states the following: "*I was left an orphan when I was six. My Uncle John brought me up, in the Coach and Horses at Rainsworth. He'd got no children. He was good to me, but he drank. I went to Mansfield Grammar School. Then he fell out with me because I wouldn't wait in the bar, and I went as nursery governess to Berryman's. And I felt I'd nowhere to go, I belonged to nowhere, and nobody cared about me, and men came after me, and I hated it. So to get out of it, I married the first man that turned up*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 58]. Similar circumstances are also known from Afet's past: "*Eşitdiyimə görə pək kibar və alafranqa bir ailəyə mənsub imiş. Fəqət böyük bir fəlakət birdən-birə evlərini söndürmüş, varyoqları əldən çıqmış, babası fəqir düşüncə qızını Özdəmirə vermiş... Şu hərif də gündən-günə pusulayı şaşıraraq ailəsini düşünəməz olmuş... Şimdi hər gün bir oteldə sərxoşca vaqıt keçiriyor. Evə gəldiyi zamanlarda Afəti pək qabaca təhqir ediyormuş...*" (From what I have heard, she belonged to a very refined and Westernised aristocratic family. However, a great catastrophe suddenly ruined their home, and they lost all their wealth. When her father fell into poverty, he gave his daughter in marriage to Ozdemir... This man, with each passing day, loses his way and ceases to care for his family. Now he spends his days drunk in a hotel. When he does return home, he is said to treat Afet with great cruelty...") [Javid, 2005, p. 110]. Both women were subjected to social pressure that forced them into marriage, which caused serious psychological problems.

In the images of the main female characters in the plays of Lawrence and Javid, the shared theme of marriage as a form of unfreedom is explored, but the artistic logic of its development is fundamentally different. In Lawrence, the tragedy unfolds in the psychological and social sphere of industrial England, whereas in Javid it takes on a symbolically fateful character associated with the cult of passion and destructive will. The heroine of Lawrence, Mrs Holroyd, lives in an atmosphere of constant humiliation and harshness. Even at the beginning of the play, her desperate lines are heard: "*You're a drunken beast*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 32]; "*For I'm sick of the sights and sounds of you*" [Ibid., p. 34]; "*The beast!*" [Ibid., p. 38]; "*you vulgar, low-minded* brute" [Ibid., p. 41], in which her entire assessment of her husband is encapsulated. Holroyd is rude and aggressive; he oppresses her both physically and emotionally. She states quite plainly: "*I only want to be rid of you*" [Ibid., p. 34]; "*I wish he was dead*," "*I do, with all my heart*" [Ibid., p. 44], and this hatred becomes the defining emotion of her existence. However, in Lawrence's depiction, the heroine's hatred is not equated with strength: Mrs. Holroyd is internally torn; her defiance is tempered by helplessness. When her husband dies, her reaction is paradoxical: she feels no sense of triumph; on the contrary, she is overcome by horror and guilt. At the climax, she exclaims: "*It's my fault… I've killed him, that is all… But we've killed him*" [Ibid., p. 88], Although she did not commit the murder, this sense of complicity reveals the profound psychological depth of the character: her imagined desire for her husband's death is transformed into moral responsibility.

In contrast, Javid's Afet embodies the image of an aesthetically exceptional being from the very outset: in the list of characters, she is described as "*a thirty-three-year-old, graceful, enchanting woman*" [Javid, 2005, p. 105]. Even in the opening scenes, her attractiveness and allure to men are already emphasized. Dr. Karatay speaks of her in rapturous hyperbole: "*Zatən sənin könlünü bulmaq, sənin məhəbbətinə nail olmaq hər məcnunu aqil, hər aqili məcnun edə bilir*" (Indeed, to win your heart and attain your love is enough to turn every madman into a sane man, and every sane man into a madman) [Ibid., p. 107]. These words acknowledge her fatal power: love for her is enough to drive anyone mad. But while Mrs Holroyd suffers at the hands of male violence, Afet proves to be a more active and dangerous figure. Her husband, Ozdemir, publicly humiliates her, calling her alternately "çiçək" (a delicate flower) and "ördək" (a duck wading through the mud) [Ibid.]. This scene of humiliation brings the situation closer to the themes of Lawrence's play; yet the heroines' reactions differ: Mrs Holroyd retreats and withdraws into herself, and her protest is impulsive, whereas Afet makes an inner decision to commit a crime. Her words sound like a conscious choice.

At the same time, both heroines exist in a world shaped by male interpretations. Mrs Holroyd is regarded as a shrewish woman, incapable of being a "good wife" ("*And what man wouldn't leave a woman that allowed him to live on sufferance in the house with her, when he was bringing the money home?.. Some women could have lived with him happy enough*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 72]); Men talk about Afet as if she were a dangerous force of nature. Yavuz says: "*As innocent as she (Alagöz) is, Afet and that seductive woman are just as dangerous*" [Javid, 2005,

p. 109]. Afet is described as 'atəş', 'alav' ("*Ah, şu qadın öylə bir atəş ki, öylə bir alav ki…*" (Ah, this woman is such a fire, such a flame...) [Cavid, 2005, p.110) —a fire that burns those around her. Lawrence's heroine is not imbued with such a metaphysical aura: her character is entirely grounded and mundane. She is a working-class woman, confined within a cramped home and oppressed by the industrial factory world. Afet, on the other hand, is set within a romantic-symbolist context: her beauty and passion are interpreted as a cosmic force. It is no wonder that her husband exclaims in a drunken toast*: "Bən şu mümtaz qədəhi... bütün mühit və kainatın şərəfinə içiyorum... Həpsi şu gözəl və füsunkar Afətə qarşı əyiliyor*" (I raise this exquisite goblet… in honour of the entire milieu and the universe… and all of them bow before this beautiful and enchanting Afet) [Javid, 2005, p. 116]. Nevertheless, both tragedies revolve around marriage as a broken marital bond. In Lawrence's drama, the husband's death frees the heroine physically but not spiritually: she remains trapped by her inner guilt. In Javid's play, Ozdemir's death is the result of Afet's deliberate intervention: "*Çünki zəhri içirdim*" (Because I made him drink the poison) [Ibid., p. 116]. While Mrs Holroyd does not actively commit murder, Afet is the direct cause of her husband's death. However, in Javid's work, the character is not reduced to a straightforward demonisation. Afet feels humiliated and miserable. She speaks of her wretched fate. Her cruelty springs from a sense of wounded pride. In this sense, both heroines are victims of patriarchal marriage. The difference lies in the fact that Lawrence emphasises the social determinants of the tragedy (the living conditions of a working-class family), whereas Javid highlights the passionate, almost symbolist nature of the destruction. The different contexts also account for the difference in the artistic tone of the ending. In Lawrence's work, the ending is quiet, psychological, and imbued with inner turmoil. In Javid's, it is theatrical and dramatic, accompanied by murder and suicide almost in the same instant. The immediacy of death heightens the sense of fatality.

At the same time, the characters Mrs Holroyd and Afet represent two forms of female resistance against a humiliating marriage. The former is a victim whose hatred turns into a torment of conscience; the latter is a femme fatale who transforms passion into a deliberate crime. Lawrence explores the psychology of the repressed personality, while Javid explores the psychology of destructive beauty. Both heroines are tragic, and both are moral tragedies, linked to the problem of inner identity.

Thus, the inner psychological conflict in the plays of Lawrence and Javid revolves around a similar situation—the crisis of a marriage shattered by humiliation, alienation and a hidden longing for a different life. However, the nature of this conflict is fundamentally different. In Lawrence's work, it takes the form of a deeply intimate, moral and psychological breakdown, where feelings of guilt and suppressed hatred gradually lead the heroine to a tragic realisation of her own condition. In Javid's work, the internal conflict takes the form of a passionate conflict between love and honour, between desire and duty, leading to a conscious crime.

In Lawrence's play, Mrs Holroyd's conflict takes a latent form from the very beginning. She feels at odds with her surroundings and her marriage. Her irritation and despondency find expression in the minutiae of daily life. When the children tell her about their father's behaviour at the pub, she says bitterly: "*I'm sick of it—disgracing me*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 10]. This line captures the heroine's central emotion—not so much resentment as a sense of humiliation and social isolation. She lives in a state of constant inner tension. The psychological conflict deepens in the scenes with Blackmore. In conversation with him, a different side of Mrs Holroyd's personality is revealed—a hidden need for warmth and understanding. When Blackmore places his hand next to hers, an almost unconscious attraction arises: "*They sort of go well with one another*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 14]. This remark sounds like an unconscious admission of attraction. There is no direct declaration of love here—on the contrary, the desire is expressed indirectly, through the observation of hands, and the subconscious is revealed in the detail where the gesture precedes the word. Lawrence emphasises that the impulse arises before rational comprehension and is involuntarily suppressed when the children enter the room—the illusion of unity is shattered by a subconscious sense of taboo, reflected in the following stage direction: "*They stand still, near one another, with bent heads, for a moment. Suddenly she starts up and draws her hand away*" (Ibid.). Several conflicting impulses are at play within Mrs. Holroyd—a longing for intimacy, a fear of committing a moral transgression, a fear of losing her sense of security, and a subconscious attachment to her husband, come what may. All this, hidden in the recesses of her soul, gives rise to conflicting feelings and bursts forth in her conversations with Blackmore:

***Blackmore**: I suppose you 're fond of him, really.*
***Mrs. Holroyd**: No more.*
***Blackmore**: You were fond of him?*
***Mrs. Holroyd**: I was—yes.*
***Blackmore**: What did you like in him?*
***Mrs. Holroyd** (uneasily): I don't know.*
***Blackmore**: I suppose you really care about him, even now.*
<...>
***Mrs. Holroyd**: I did care for him – now he has destroyed it—* [Lawrence, 2002, p. 49].

Mrs Holroyd's indecision in this dialogue—her evasion of the question by saying "I don't know" and her fleeting smile—reveals that she is experiencing conflicting emotions and is striving to conceal them. In this dialogue, the anger she feels towards her husband, alongside the attachment she feels for him. Her indecision regarding Blackmore and his proposal to leave with him and the children was largely due to childhood trauma—Mrs Holroyd herself grew up without parents and endured many hardships. In her marriage to Charles Holroyd, she saw salvation from male harassment and social insecurity and hoped that marriage would protect her. In this sense Charles has created the impression of family, salvation and trust in her unconscious mind. She subconsciously felt that if she leaves Charles, she will lose all of this—and, most importantly, the sense of security. The heroine projects this very anxiety about safety onto her children—realising that Charles is an ineffectual father, she subconsciously felt that without him the children would be left defenceless (reflecting the widespread belief that a bad father is better than no father at all). Therefore, despite Blackmore's assurances that he loves them and will take good care of them, the woman says she is constantly worried about her children:

***Blackmore**: Why not? If wishing of mine would kill him, he'd soon be out of the way.*
***Mrs. Holroyd**: But the children!*
***Blackmore**: I'm fond of them...*
***Mrs. Holroyd**: But he's their father* [Lawrence, 2002, p. 56].

The depth of the psychological trauma caused by the loss of her father influences all her decisions. Mrs Holroyd is actually afraid not that her children will not be loved by Blackmore, she is subconsciously convinced that only their biological father can truly protect them, because all the difficulties she has faced stem from the loss of her father. That is why she cannot answer Blackmore's questions definitively:

***Blackmore**: Is it him that keeps you?*
***Mrs. Holroyd**: No* [Lawrence, 2002, p. 57].

Unlike Mrs Holroyd, Afet, who, at first glance, seems to be devoid of fear—for the sake of her love for Karatay, she kills her husband without hesitation—and who, it would seem, is capable of standing up for herself. However, in reality she is just as much in need of protection, subconsciously sensing that she can only find a sense of security in the arms of her beloved. Therefore, the only thing she fears is betrayal by her beloved, and it is precisely this fear that compels her to threaten him:

Afət: *Bən bütün bənliyimi, bütün həyat və səadətimi yoluna fəda etməyə hazırım. Hətta sənin uğrunda cinayətdən belə çəkinməm. Ancaq şu qadar var ki, aldadılmaq istəməm, aldandığımı duysam məhv olurum. Həm də pək kinliyim, anlıyormusun? Bəni aldatmaq istəyənləri əsla əfv etməm. İki gözüm olsa belə intiqam alırım, intiqam!.. Əvət, bən, pək kinliyim. Bəni təhqir edənlər Əzrailin qucağına atılmış olurlar*.

(**Afet**: I am ready to sacrifice my entire being, my whole life and my happiness for your sake. I would not even hesitate to commit a crime for your sake. But *I do not want to be betrayed*; if I realise I have been betrayed, I will be destroyed. And I am very vengeful, do you understand? I will never forgive those who try to betray me. Even if that man were my own flesh and blood, I would take my revenge. Revenge! Yes, I am very vengeful. Those who insult me will be cast into the arms of the Angel of Death) [Javid, 2005, pp. 108–109].

It should be noted that both Mrs Holroyd and Afet are suspicious of the sincerity of their lovers. Both authors express this repressed sense of doubt through fragmented speech and pauses, conveying the characters' inner state, their hesitations, and emotional tension:

Lawrence	Javid
Mrs. Holroyd: But I couldn't—you don't love me— **Blackmore**: I don't know what you mean by I don't love you. **Mrs. Holroyd**: I can feel it. **Blackmore**: And do you love me? (*A pause*) **Mrs. Holroyd**: I don't know. Everything is so—so—(*There is a long pause*) [Lawrence, 2002, p. 53].	**Afət**: Səndən, səndəki eşqin əbədiyyətindən əmin ola bilsəm... (**Afet:** From you, from the eternity of your love… if only I could be certain…) [Javid, 2005, p. 108]. **Afət**: (şux qəhqəhələrlə). Ah, şu yalan nəvazişlər, şu yaldızlı pərəstişlər!.. (Sükut) (**Afet:** (with lively laughter). Ah, these false caresses, these gilded adorations!.. (Silence). [Ibid., p. 107].

The nature of the conflict in both plays is shaped by the characters' experiences of psychological trauma (childhood trauma in the case of Mrs Holroyd, and moral trauma in the case of Afet).

In Lawrence's play, the scene in which she argues with her husband serves as an intermediate climax of the psychological conflict in the first act. Mrs Holroyd says: "*I've had enough. I've tried, I've tried for years, for the children's sakes. Now I've had enough of your shame and disgrace*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 34]. Here, the conflict takes on a clear form: years of repression, attempts to keep the family together for the sake of the children, and utter exhaustion. But her protest does not lead to liberation; it only deepens the inner rift. A key moment comes when Holroyd accuses her of having an affair with Blackmore. He shouts: "*It's him tha cuts thy cloth by, is it?*" [Ibid., p. 40], and then: "*She wants Mr. Blackymore*" [Ibid., p. 41]. These accusations are painful precisely because they contain a grain of truth: in her soul, a forbidden attraction truly exists. Yet she vehemently denies it: "*Stop your mouth, you—you vulgar, low-minded brute*" [Ibid.], though this denial betrays not only obvious anger but also a subconscious fear of exposure. However, her main inner conflicts come to the fore after her husband's death. As she bends over his body, her former hatred gives way to a realisation of the horror of what has happened. In the climactic line, she says: "*I've killed him*" [Ibid., p. 73]. This is not a literal confession, but an expression of a moral sense of complicity. She realises that her coldness and her inner detachment have made her husband even lonelier: "*He would have come up with the rest… if he hadn't felt me murdering him*" [Ibid., p. 88]. The psychological conflict reaches its climax here: hatred turns into guilt, and defiance into tragic self-flagellation. This inner breakdown forms the central theme of the finale. In Javid's play, the conflict unfolds differently. From the very beginning, Afet is torn by the duality of her situation: she is beautiful and desirable yet bound by marriage to a man who humiliates her. Her inner conflict arises as a struggle between self-respect and enforced submission. Unlike Mrs Holroyd, Afet is aware of her passion for another man and does not hide it. She says: "*Bən bütün bənliyimi, bütün həyat və səadətimi yoluna fəda etməyə hazırım*" (I am ready to sacrifice my entire being, my whole life and my happiness for your sake) [Javid, 2005, p. 118]. Here, the internal conflict is brought into the open—Afet chooses passion. Her conflict is a struggle between love and moral law, in which passion prevails. Here, the conflict is resolved in a radical manner: first, to kill her husband; then, if necessary, to take her own life. However, behind this resolve lies a tragic inner conflict, as the heroine realises the criminal nature of her intention, and after the crime has been committed, the conflict shifts inward—into the realm of agonising realisation, a sense of betrayal and the awareness that she has been manipulated. Ultimately, in both plays, the heroines experience a sense of guilt after the event, which, in Afet's case, ultimately leads to her death.

At the same time the internal conflict that unfolds in Javid's play is more complex than in Lawrence's, as it is more multilayered. At first, the decision to kill her husband—as an attempt to resolve the conflict between duty and passion—seems to be the heroine's own choice. However, Afet subsequently realises that her choice was not as free as she had thought; she was pushed, she was guided. This realisation becomes the source of a new trauma—the trauma of deception. Whereas previously her internal conflict was framed as a struggle between love and duty, it now turns into a struggle between illusion and truth. She begins to see that the passion for which

she resolved to commit murder was mediated by someone else's will. The doctor, under the guise of sympathy and concern, was in fact manipulating her feelings, and the realisation of this manipulation shatters her former confidence. A sense of being used and humiliated arises—no longer at the hands of her husband, but at the hands of her lover. This echoes the theme of wounded pride, but now it is directed at another man. Whereas before the humiliation came from her husband, now it comes from her lover, who has rejected Afet and turned his attention to a new object of passion. Thus, the traumatic structure of her fate is reproduced: she once again finds herself the object of male power. This realisation gives rise to a new internal conflict—between love and a thirst for retribution. The realisation of the betrayal triggers a burst of rage and jealousy in her, mixed with despair. Now the murder of her lover becomes not only an act of revenge, but also an attempt to restore her shattered sense of self. By destroying the manipulator, she is, as it were, attempting to regain control over her own destiny. Yet this second act of violence does not resolve the conflict but intensifies it; Afet finds herself in a state of complete inner isolation—love is shattered, her marriage destroyed, trust lost, and even her stepdaughter's honour is tarnished due to Afet's moral downfall. In this sense, Afet's inner conflict spirals outwards. The first phase is humiliation and a thirst for self-respect; the second is passion and a readiness to commit a crime; the third is the realisation of manipulation; the fourth is revenge and ultimate self-destruction. In this progression, the tragedy becomes deeper and more complex.

Thus, the distinctive feature of the psychological conflict in both plays lies in the gradual revelation of hidden animosity, suppressed passion and belated moral insight. Mrs Holroyd experiences the conflict as an agonising process of self-discovery, which culminates in a tragic sense of guilt. In Javid's work, Afet's conflict is a dramatic struggle between passion and honour, resolved through a deliberate crime and subsequent self-punishment. In both cases, the tragedy takes the form of a moral catastrophe, and in both cases, the internal conflict determines the structure of the play. But in Lawrence's work, it is built upon the subtlest psychological evolution—from irritation to guilt, from hatred to compassion – and is cemented in the play's open ending: Mrs Holroyd exclaims, "*I've killed him*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 73], experiencing a moral upheaval, yet is left to live with this knowledge and sense of guilt. In Javid's work, the focus is on the tense symbolist juxtaposition of love and duty, and subsequently love and revenge, where the choice is made consciously and with no turning back. It is precisely this difference that defines the specific nature of the tragedy in both plays.

Markers of the subconscious in the plays of Lawrence and Javid

In the plays of David Herbert Lawrence and Huseyn Javid, the expression of the subconscious takes various artistic forms; yet in both cases, it is precisely hidden desires, repressed fears and unconscious traumas that shape the development of the action. In the play *The Widowing of Mrs Holroyd,* the subconscious is expressed through repressed hatred, repressed erotic desire, and a deep sense of guilt. In *Afet*, it appears as passionate obsession, wounded pride, and a destructive impulse that is gradually rationalised and transformed into a deliberate act of destroying both another and oneself. At the same time, both authors employ similar dramatic devices, including dialogues with repetitive formulas, fragmentary lines, stage directions marking pauses, physical reactions and gestures, the symbolisation of the interior space, the subjective fragmentation of time, and symbolic images and motifs. However, the aesthetic outcomes differ: Lawrence presents a psychological tragedy of guilt, while Javid presents a symbolist tragedy of passion. The means of expressing subconscious impulses and hidden motives common to both plays include subjective temporal fragmentation, which actualises the past in the present through fragments of memory; the symbolisation of space (interior); symbolic images and motifs; and stage directions. The artistic organisation of speech differs in Lawrence's and Javid's plays: the English playwright emphasises pauses and repetitions in the characters' speech, whilst the Azerbaijani playwright focuses on the subtext. In both plays, the protagonists' psychological trauma is presented through the collision of scattered memories, fluctuating emotions and fragmented thoughts. For Lawrence, the fragmentary nature of time serves as one of the ways in which Mrs Holroyd's repressed emotions are expressed. Outwardly, the plot retains a fairly clear narrative framework (waiting for her husband, the news of his death, the final scene with the body); however, within this structure, time constantly "breaks down," ceases to be linear and begins to obey not the logic of events, but

the logic of the psyche. One of the main techniques is the alternation of scenes that do not form a continuous chronology of experience, functioning instead as psychological flashes. The present moment of the action is frequently interrupted by intrusions of memory, emotional reactions, and sudden shifts in focus (the tense silence Mrs Holroyd experiences whilst alone at home, the anxiety and worry stemming from her husband's late return; her sudden admission to Blakmore of her husband's familiarity and that she once loved him whilst expressing her hatred for him; the sudden recollection of past arguments, the desire to leave her husband, and the arrival of the unexpected news of his death). This creates a pulsating effect: dramatic time moves in fits and starts, mirroring the fluctuations in the heroine's inner state, as her reflection on the past merges with the present. This is most vividly expressed in the episode of mourning her deceased husband, where the past (the accumulated conflicts of the marriage) and the present (physical death) are not separated, but overlap. The moment of realisation for the heroine arises as a sudden breakthrough of hidden knowledge, where time seems to "collapse" into a point of intense experience. It is at this very point that the unconscious content of the relationship becomes apparent. The psychological trauma of Afet manifests itself in rapidly shifting, unstable moods and thoughts, as well as in hasty decisions. The subjective perception of time creates a sense of its fragmentation—the woman's feelings and thoughts oscillate between the past and the present; she cannot focus on tomorrow. Ozdemir represents the past that Afet has abandoned, along with all her hopes and dreams, whilst Qaratay embodies the present that brands her as "immoral." The past and the present have lost their connection to the future; by eliminating Ozdemir and Qaratay—that is, her own past and present—Afet renders her own destruction inevitable.

The temporal structure of the play is highly revealing: a month passes between the first and second acts (the death of Ozdemir and the events that follow), while a year elapses in the third act. During this period, Afet experiences a transition from a state of determination (killing her husband without hesitation) to inner destruction brought on by Karatay's betrayal and her own self-annihilation. For Afet, the news that Karatay will marry Alagöz one month later endows these thirty days with symbolic significance:

Afət: *Bir ay sonra, otuz gün sonra, ah, nə qadar gec, nə qadar çabuq!.. (Qəhqəhə). Bir ay otuz yıldan daha uzun, otuz dəqiqədən daha qısadır. (Qəhqəhə)*

(**Afet:** In a month, in thirty days—ah, how late, how swift!.. (Laughs.) A month is longer than thirty years, shorter than thirty minutes. (Laughs) [Javid, 2005, p. 131];

Afət: *Ah, bir ay, otuz gün!.. Otuz yıldan uzun, otuz dəqiqədən qısa... (Acı qəhqəhələrdən sonra). Əvət, ölmək istəyənlər için pək gec, uzun... Sevmək və yaşamaq istəyənlər için pək çabuq, pək qısa...*

(**Afet**: Ah, a month, thirty days!.. Longer than thirty years, shorter than thirty minutes... (After bitter laughter). Yes, for those who wish to die, it is far too late, far too long... For those who wish to love and live, it is far too early, far too short...) [Ibid., p. 132];

Afət: (*mütəəssir təbəssümlərlə). Ah, bir ay!.. Otuz gün!.. İştə, ayrılıq çəkənlər için otuz yıldan daha uzun, qavuşub birləşənlər için otuz dəqiqədən daha qısa...*

(**Afet**: (with a sad smile). Ah, a month!.. Thirty days!.. For those who suffer separation, it is longer than thirty years; for those who are reunited, it is shorter than thirty minutes…) [Ibid, p. 133].

Here, the repetition serves three functions: firstly, it concentrates the temporal fragment; secondly, it heightens the tension in the conflict, foreshadowing an imminent tragic resolution—to which Afet herself also alludes: "*Bir ay sonra dünya dağılacaq, ümidlər solacaq, ağlayanlar güləcək, gülənlər qəhr olacaq (həyəcandan yaşarmış gözlərini silərək, pək sinirli)*" (After a month, the world will collapse, hopes will wither, those who cry will laugh, and those who laugh will mourn" (wiping tears very agitated) [Javid, 2005, p. 133]; thirdly, it suggests that Afet is reflecting on death.

In the works of both authors, events progress through the fragmentation of time and sudden interruptions. However, this temporal rupture does not manifest directly in the disruption of chronological order, but rather in the subject's emotional state, unconscious actions and decision-making processes. In this context, the violation of the boundaries between past and present occurs not in the structure of the scene, but on the subject's psychological plane; this fragmented subject experience is conveyed to the viewer.

Equally significant in both plays is the portrayal of space. In Lawrence's play, the description of the interior in the opening stage direction sets the atmosphere of a repressed existence: a cramped room in a miner's house, a sense of soot and physical exhaustion. The interior becomes a projection of Mrs Holroyd's inner state: the confinement of the space corresponds to her inner constriction.

In contrast, in Javid's play, the description of the interior in the opening stage direction evokes a sense of a romantic space: "*Süslü bir salon... Sağ və soldakı odalara açılır birər qapı, qarşıda iki böyük pəncərə, gözəl mənzərələr, ilk bahar, məhtablı gecə... Pərdə açıldıqda bağçadan gələn incə və həzin bir kaman səsi iki-üç dəqiqə sami'ələri oqşar*" (gaily-furnished drawing-room… doors opening to the right and left rooms, two large windows opposite, lovely views, spring, a moonlit night… As the curtain rises, a soft and plaintive violin-sound from the garden is heard) [Javid, 2005, p. 105]. However, almost immediately, the beauty of the interior and the garden stands in stark contrast to Afet's mood; despite her admiration for the garden, she regrets her visit to Handemir's house. The richly decorated salon and the beautiful spring evening clash sharply with the characters' mood and state of mind, heightening the sense of unease, highlighting the heroine's emotional brokenness all the more, and, as the play progresses, transforming into a space of death.

It is worth noting that the theme of death in the play *Afet* emerges as early as the first act, manifesting itself in the plot (Afet kills her husband), and is further brought to the fore throughout the play in the symbolic motif of a consuming, destructive fire, which heightens the sense of impending tragedy ("*Çünki onun bir atəş olduğunu bilir. Yanmayım deyə çəkinir… Əvət, bir atəş, həm də qorqunc və sevimli bir atəş!..*" (Because she knows that woman is a fire. She is afraid of being burned… Yes, a fire—a fire that is both terrifying and beautiful at the same time!..) [Javid, 2005, p. 127]), as well as in the symbolic imagery of flowers—wilting and dying—which symbolise Afet's tragic fate and foreshadow the play's tragic conclusion ("*Solğun çiçək!.. Əvət solğun bir çiçək nasıl qurursa, nasıl qara topraqlara təslimi-nəfs edərsə, bən də... ah, bən də...*" (A faded flower!.. Yes, just as a flower fades, just as it dries up and falls to the black soil, so do I… ah, so do I…) [Ibid., p. 135]; "*hənuz açılmadan solmuş pənbə gülü andırıyor*" (it resembles a pink rose that has faded before it could even bloom) [Ibid., p. 127]; "*Əvət elmas! Fəqət ləkəli bir elmas!.. Çiçək! Fəqət çamurlu bir çiçək... Mələk! Fəqət qəhr olmuş bir mələk...*" (Yes, a diamond! But a stained diamond!.. A flower! But a muddy flower… An angel! But a ruined angel…) [Ibid., p. 138]).

The symbolic imagery employed by Lawrence is not particularly poetic. In his play, the symbolic image of the rat stands out, embodying the characters' repressed psychological impulses—above all, their suppressed fears, aggression and a sense of the inner decay of family life. In this sense, it does not contrast with the characters' state of mind, as in Javid's work, but is, on the contrary, a mirror image of their unconscious world.

The image of a rat appears right at the start of the play's first act:

> ***Mrs Holroyd:*** *Do you know, this place is fairly alive with rats. They run up that dirty vine in front of the house—I'm always at him to cut it down—and you can hear them at night overhead like a regiment of soldiers tramping. Really, you know, I hate them.*
>
> ***Blackmore:*** *Well—a rat is a nasty thing!* [Lawrence, 2002, p. 13].

and goes on to reveal not a coincidence, but the systemic nature of psychological problems. The rat appears in the kitchen—that is, at the very heart of the domestic world, traditionally regarded as a space of order, warmth, and care. In Lawrence's work, however, this interior is imbued with a sense of unease from the outset; food, warmth, and home—everything is tainted by a hidden threat. The miner's home is associated with the underground, dark, industrial world. The rat, appearing within this space, becomes, as it were, the material embodiment of what is already present in the depths of the characters' psyche—fears, feelings of vulnerability, and helplessness. Just as the rat emerges from the cellar to the surface, so within the play it seems to intrude upon the stage, symbolising the eruption of the unconscious into the fabric of everyday life, much as animal instinct breaks through the rational aspect of the human being. The image of a rat scurrying into the kitchen in a domestic scene ("*There is a smash of pots, and a rat careers out of the scullery*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 19]), serves as an external trigger for the underlying tension that is already

present in the scene (a drunken Mr Holroyd stumbles into the house accompanied by two women); therefore, the rat's appearance does not disrupt the harmony—it merely brings to light what is already there as a latent state.

On the other hand, the rat symbol represents the subject's marginalisation and devaluation within the social structure, whilst also being interpreted as an indication of the constant sense of threat that modern industrial society imposes upon the individual. In this context, the rat represents not only an external danger, but also the materialised form of the anxiety experienced by the subject on an unconscious level. The children's, particularly Minnie's and Mrs Holroyd's fear of the rat reveals the subject's vulnerable position in the face of the 'other', as well as feelings of helplessness, worthlessness and insecurity.

It is precisely this feeling that breaks through in the emphasis on Mrs Holroyd's chronic exhaustion, manifesting itself at the textual level in her recurring lines filled with irritation. Her phrase, "*I'm sick of it—disgracing me*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 9] sounds like an outburst, but one in which the accumulated trauma is already audible. The word "sick" expresses not only weariness, but also a physically felt revulsion. This feeling returns again and again, forming a motif of chronic humiliation.

The subconscious impulses are expressed particularly vividly in her reactions to Blackmore. In the scene where their hands end up next to each other, the stage direction "*He has put his hand on the table near hers*" captures an almost accidental bodily contact, followed by the remark: "*They sort of go well with one another*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 14]. This observation sounds like an unconscious admission of attraction. There is no direct declaration of love here—on the contrary, desire is expressed indirectly, through the observation of hands, and the subconscious manifests itself in the detail where the gesture precedes the word. Lawrence emphasises that the impulse arises before rational comprehension and is involuntarily suppressed when the children enter the room—the illusion of unity is shattered by a subconscious sense of taboo, reflected in the following stage direction: "*They stand still, near one another, with bent heads, for a moment. Suddenly she starts up and draws her hand away*" [Ibid.].

In this scene, where Mrs Holroyd and Blackmore speak of love for the first time [Lawrence, 2002, pp. 52–53], the syndrome of repressed desire is most strongly evident. The pauses indicated by the author in the stage directions play a key role in conveying this. When Blackmore asks whether Mrs Holroyd will go away with him, she replies "*after a reluctant pause*," expressing the heroine's indecision. When the dialogue turns to the subject of love, it is the pauses that convey the mounting tension. Blackmore asserts: "*Because I want to*," avoiding the word "love." When she says, "*But you don't love me*," he replies, "*Why don't I?*", but in the very next line he admits: "*I don't know about that. I don't know anything about love*." Here, the pause is not indicated by a stage direction, but it is felt within the sentence: the repetition of "*I don't know*" is the verbal equivalent of a mental hesitation. He does not possess the language of emotion. His subconscious desire ("*this wanting you*") outstrips his ability to comprehend it. Particularly telling is his admission: "*Now I can't get away from it, at no hour and nohow*," in which desire transforms into an obsession, as it is described as something compulsive, almost autonomous, existing beyond the subject's control. And the remark "*He still avoids direct contact with her*" reinforces this disconnect: the physical avoidance of contact contrasts with the internal fixation on the object of his desire. The scene's climactic pause occurs after Blackmore's question: "*And do you love me? (A pause)*". Mrs Holroyd's reply ("*I don't know. Everything is so—so—*") —trails off, left unsaid. This is followed by the stage direction: "*There is a long pause*," in which one senses a concentrated inner turmoil as the heroine struggles to find the words. In this "*So—so—*", the author's desire to convey a state that defies precise definition – love, flight, guilt, fear, desire—is all mixed together.

In addition to the pauses indicated in the stage directions, repetition is the most important means of expressing repressed desires. During an argument with her husband, Mrs Holroyd exclaims: "*I've tried, I've tried for years*" [Lawrence, 2002, p. 34]. The repetition of "*I've tried*" captures the inner trauma that has developed over years of trying to save the marriage. In these repetitions, there is an echo of her own self-sacrifice, reinforcing the sense of accumulated powerlessness. A subconscious fear of exposure is revealed in the scene of accusations. When Holroyd shouts: "She wants Mr. Blackymore" [Ibid., p. 41], Mrs Holroyd answers: "*Stop your mouth, you—you vulgar, low-minded brute*" [Ibid.]. The double "you—you," with a pause indicated by a dash, conveys a faltering speech pattern that reflects an emotional disintegration.

Mrs Holroyd does not immediately find the right word; her speech seems to stumble, and in this microsyntactic break one can glimpse a trace of the fear of exposure. Therefore, the insult appears as an attempt at psychological self-defence, behind which lies the fear that what her husband has said might turn out to be true. Thus, the dialogue embodies the struggle between repressed desire and social prohibition. The play's finale shows that social prohibition proves stronger. In the scene following her husband's death, the stage directions are particularly detailed and expressive, capturing the heroine's behaviour—she bends over the body, touches it: "*She weeps bitterly, so her tears fall on the dead man's face; suddenly she kisses him… She weeps as she wipes his face gently*." And suddenly, a sound rings out: "*I've killed him*" [Lawrence, 2002, pp. 73, 89]. This confession is the culmination of a subconscious process. She did not commit physical murder, but her hatred and her mental desire for liberation turn into a sense of guilt. The following phrase, "*He would have come up with the rest… if he hadn't felt me murdering him*" [Ibid., p. 74] reveals the mechanism of projection: she attributes physical action to her inner coldness. The subconscious sense of guilt becomes an interpretation of reality. Lawrence shows how the repressed desire for her husband's death is transformed into a conviction of her own moral murder. Repetition creates a particularly expressive effect in the scene where Mrs Holroyd attempts to stand up for herself: "*I've had enough. I've tried, I've tried for years, for the children's sakes*" [Ibid., p. 34]. Here, the rhetorical device serves as a symptom of accumulated traumatic experience. The repetition highlights the cyclical nature of her life: years of monotonous effort that yield no results. Her inner helplessness is expressed in an automatic return to the same word, representing an almost obsessive verbalisation of her own trauma and victimhood.

The expressive nature of the unfolding tragedy in Javid's work leads to the use of different means of expressing the subconscious than those found in Lawrence's play. In *Afet,* these include the symbolic images and motifs (of fire and a withering flower) mentioned above, as well as stage directions and subtext.

In Javid's tragedy, stage directions play a structuring role, constantly "breaking through" the surface dialogue and bringing to the fore what is either repressed or masked in the characters' direct speech. It is often through stage directions that the reader or audience discovers the subconscious level of the characters' personalities, revealing their hidden traumas, repressed desires and fears.

What immediately catches the eye is that, very often, the emotional movement within a scene is accompanied by stage directions that capture the physical manifestations of the experience: "*weeps like a child*," "*with a bitter laugh*," "*nervously and agitatedly*," "*in a state of great agitation*," "*with a mocking laugh*," "*agitatedly*." These markers translate the characters' inner states into a physical register. What cannot be said directly is expressed through the body: laughter does not express joy but becomes a form of hysterical defence; nervous movements are a symptom of inner disintegration. In this sense, the stage directions function as a psychoanalytical "witness," recording the subconscious that breaks through speech.

Equally significant are the stage directions relating to physical contact: "*embraces*," "*kisses*," "*pulls away abruptly*," "*presses close*," "*wants to embrace*" —these create a physical map of desire that is never stable: it is always interrupted by fear, rejection, or an abrupt break in contact. It is particularly telling that every time an opportunity for physical intimacy arises (the kiss with Gorkmaz, the attempt to embrace Alagoz), the stage direction records an abrupt interruption of the action, thereby expressing a symbolic representation of the trauma that makes lasting intimacy impossible.

Within the structure of dialogues and monologues, subconscious impulses break through when stage directions contradict the spoken dialogue. For example, Afet speaks of love, but the stage directions note bitter laughter, nervous movements and abrupt transitions. This creates a double-code effect: the conscious level of speech affirms one thing, whilst the stage directions, which characterise the subconscious level, demonstrate the opposite, becoming a tool for deconstructing the meaning of the characters' speech.

In this sense, Javid's stage directions serve as a "second text" that reveals the characters' unconscious drama at the level of bodily truth and affect. Through them, traumas (Afet's guilt, Alagoz's sense of being tainted), fears (the fear of losing love, the fear of ageing and losing one's beauty), and desires (the desire for absolute love, union, the elimination of distance) are revealed.

Subtext is another equally significant means of expressing subconscious impulses in the play. Like stage directions, subtext relies on the constant discrepancy between what the characters say and what they are actually feeling and expressing through their actions. The play's surface layer

consists of melodramatic dialogue about love, jealousy, "taintedness," duty and forgiveness. But beneath this layer, a far darker and more coherent logic unfolds: a struggle for control over one's own identity, a fear of moral collapse, an unconscious drive towards self-destruction, and an attempt to transform trauma into meaning. For example, when Afet speaks of a "*sensitive mirror*" that is "*more trustworthy than some treacherous hearts*," this is formally a remark expressing mistrust, but in essence it is a projection of her own inner conflict. She accuses another of having a "*reacherous heart*," yet the entire course of events that follows shows that the main object of her suspicion remains herself. This is the split between external accusation and internal self-incrimination.

The other characters in the play are also woven into the overall tragic framework. Even the relationship between Alagoz and Ertogrul, which at first glance appears to represent a "lighter" storyline, is subject to the same tragic logic. Ertogrul speaks of death as the "mother of mysteries," elevating the conversation to a philosophical level, where it is death (Afet) that connects him to Alagoz. Their love arises as a reaction to the trauma they have endured: Alagoz takes on the story of the "*fallen mother*," Ertuğrul—the burden of tragic knowledge. Their bond is built on the acceptance of pain, not on overcoming it, confining them within the boundaries of constantly relived trauma.

A comparative analysis of the plays by H. Javid and D. H. Lawrence reveals that the aesthetic of Javid's play bears many similarities to that of early twentieth century European modernist theatre (particularly its Symbolist-Expressionist strand), including through its exploration of the subconscious, hidden impulses and the inner duality of the personality. At the level of dramaturgical aesthetics, this manifests itself in psychological depth and the bringing to the fore of internal conflict; in the conventionality of the stage space and its symbolic function; in the expressionist hyperbolisation of the characters' speech and emotions; in the deconstruction of classical dialogue and the intensification of fragmentation; and in the symbolisation of objects and the characters' actions.

At the same time, *Afet* maintains a clear connection with the national literary tradition (the rhetorical style of Eastern speech, a wealth of metaphor, the poeticisation of nature, and the use of imagery relating to honour, fate, and family and social hierarchies).

It is this duality—modernist psychological depth combined with cultural and national roots—that defines the play's artistic character.

Conclusions

A comparative analysis of the plays by D.H. Lawrence and H. Javid suggests that the subconscious functions within the dramatic text as a structuring principle for the organisation of conflict. It manifests itself implicitly, in the forms of speech fragmentation, pauses, stage directions, repetitions, shifts in motivation and breaches of dialogue logic.

In *The Widowhood of Mrs Holroyd,* the psychological dynamics are built through a gradual escalation of verbal and physical disharmony. The dialogue loses its stability; the characters seem not to coincide with one another in the moment of communication, and it is precisely this lack of coincidence that becomes the source of the play's internal movement. In Javid's work, the conflict is structured differently: it is more articulated and socially defined, yet beneath its outward certainty lies a layer of internal tension that cannot be reduced to social issues.

This comparison highlights the difference in their artistic approaches: whereas in Lawrence's work the internal energy of the conflict is dissolved within the structure of the dialogue, in Javid's play it is concentrated in the heroine's character and her extreme states of mind. In both cases, however, the narrative is sustained by what remains unspoken.

In both plays, the heroines' inner conflict revolves around repressed desire and ambivalence, yet the ways in which this is artistically articulated differ. In Lawrence's work, the subconscious is signalled through the psychological tension of the dialogue, breaks in communication, and physical and sensory details that create a sense of mounting internal pressure. In Javid's work, the internal conflict takes on a more explicit character, yet retains a structural duality: the heroine's inner protest is rooted in a traumatic core that cannot be reduced to external conflict.

A comparison of the plays demonstrates that universal psychological mechanisms (repression, ambivalence, displacement) are expressed in different cultural contexts through various poetic strategies. Thus, the difference between Western European and Azerbaijani drama of the early 20th century is evident in the ways in which psychological issues are structured within the text.

The study confirms that an analysis of markers of the subconscious allows for—new interpretation of the nature of dramatic conflict as the dynamics of the invisible—that which is not spoken of directly, but which organises the action on stage. This opens up the prospect of further study of the subconscious as a category of poetics, suggesting that it extends beyond the framework of the psychoanalytic mode of interpretation.

The synthesis of psychoanalytic and comparative-typological methods made it possible, on the one hand, to reconstruct the internal psychodynamics of the characters and, on the other, to determine the degree of universality of the mechanisms identified. The psychoanalytic approach provided an opportunity to interpret the deep structures of the text, whilst the comparative-typological approach allowed us to view these structures from an intercultural perspective, which facilitates an understanding of the dramatic text as an element of a broader cultural system, opening up prospects for expanding the boundaries of the literary canon and rethinking the role of "peripheral" literatures in the overall development of European and world drama.

References

Armstrong, R.H. (2012). Freud and the Drama of Oedipal Truth. In K. Ormand (Ed.), *A Companion to Sophocles* (pp. 477-491). New York: Wiley Blackwell.

Bashir, C., Rehman, M.U., Ullah, S., Ahsan, D.M. (2023). Psychoanalytical Theory and its use in Henrik Ibsen's Plays: A Comparative Study. *Al-Aijaz Research Journal of Islamic Studies & Humanities*, 7 (3), 57-65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10514598

Boulton, J.T. (Ed.). (1997). *The selected letters of D.H. Lawrence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, P. (2001). Introduction. In P. Campbell, A. Kear (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis and Performance* (pp. 1-17). London: Routledge.

Campbell, P., Kear, A. (Eds.). (2001). *Psychoanalysis and Performance*. London: Routledge.

Carlson, M. (2006). *Speaking in Tongues: Languages at Play in the Theatre.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.91254

Javid, H. (2005). *Əsərləri. Beş cilddə*. III cild. Bakı: Lider nəşriyyat (in Azerbaijani).

Ellmann, M. (2014). *Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism*. London: Routledge. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315845074

Esslin, M. (2014). *The Theatre of the Absurd*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Fischer-Lichte, E. (1992). *The Semiotics of Theater*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Fischer-Lichte, E. (2008). *The Transformative Power of Performance: A New Aesthetics*. London: Routledge. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203894989

Kear, A. (2001). Preface. The returns of psychoanalysis, and performance. In P. Campbell, A. Kear (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis and Performance* (pp. xii-xiv). London: Routledge.

Kear, A. (2001). Speak whiteness: staging 'race', performing responsibility. In P. Campbell, A. Kear (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis and Performance* (pp. 192-202). London: Routledge.

Kubiak, E. (2001). As if: blocking the Cartesian stage. In P. Campbell, A. Kear (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis and Performance* (pp. 34-46). London: Routledge.

Lacan, J. (1966). *Écrits*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Lacan, J. (1978). *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. New York: Norton.

Lawrence, D.H. (2002). *The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd.* Philadelphia: Pine Street Books.

Loss, A.K. (1984). Waiting for Amanda: Noël Coward as Comedian of the Absurd. *Journal of Modern Literature*, 11 (2), 299-306. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3831250

Murray, T. (1987). *Theatrical Legitimation: Allegories of Genius in Seventeenth-Century England and France*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Murray, T. (2001). Scanning sublimation: the digital Pôles of performance and psychoanalysis. In P. Campbell, A. Kear (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis and Performance* (pp. 47-59). London: Routledge.

Murray, T. (2013). *Drama Trauma: Specters of Race and Sexuality in Performance, Video and Art*. London: Routledge. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315005775

Neuringer, C. (1992). Freud and the theatre. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 20 (1), 142-148. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1521/jaap.1.1992.20.1.142

Nuetzel, E.J. (2000). Psychoanalysis and Dramatic Art. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* 2, 41-63. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010131102524

O'Neill, E. (1928). *Strange Interlude*. Retrieved from https://coldreads.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/strange-interlude.pdf

Pavis, P. (1982). *Languages of the Stage: Essays in the Semiology of the Theatre*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

Rabaté, J.-M. (2014). *The Cambridge Introduction to Literature and Psychoanalysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139226509

Raj, P.E. (2016). *Hamlet*: A Psychoanalytic Point of View. *Daath Voyage: International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in English*, 1, Special issue, 22-34.

Read, A. The placebo of performance: psychoanalysis in its place. In P. Campbell, A. Kear (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis and Performance* (pp. 147-166). London: Routledge.

Schwanecke, Ch. (2022). *A Narratology of Drama: Dramatic Storytelling in Theory, History, and Culture from the Renaissance to the Twenty-First Century*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110724110

Sievers, D.W. (1970). *Freud on Broadway: A History of Psychoanalysis and the American Drama*. New York: Cooper Square Publishers.

States, B.O. (1985). *Great Reckonings in Little Rooms: On the Phenomenology of Theatre.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Stearns, M.W. (1949). Hamlet and Freud. *College English*, 10 (5), 265-272. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/371685

Turri, M.G. (2015). *A Psychoanalytic Perspective on Theories of Spectator- Character and Actor-Character Identification in the Theatre* (PhD Thesis). Exeter: University of Exeter Publ.

Turri, M.G. (2021). Psychoanalysis and theatre revisited: the function of character in mediating unconscious processing in spectatorship. S*inestesieonline*, 32, pp. 1-18.

Vives, J. (2011). Catharsis: Psychoanalysis and the theatre. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 92 (4), 1009-1027. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-8315.2011.00409.x

Markers of the Subconscious in Dramatic Text: D.H. Lawrence's *The Widowing of Mrs Holroyd* and H. Javid's *Afet*

Javida Mammadova, Nizami Ganjavi Institute of Literature, Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences (Azerbaijan)
e-mail: memmedovacavide12@yahoo.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32342/anuJPh.2026.31.9
Keywords: *the subconscious, dramatic text, psychoanalytic method, comparative-typological analysis, internal conflict, the female character, trauma, modernist drama*

This article examines the ways in which the subconscious is artistically expressed in the dramatic works of early twentieth-century Western European and Azerbaijani literature. The relevance of this work stems from the sustained interest in contemporary literary studies in interdisciplinary methods of analysing literary texts, as well as the need to broaden the intercultural context of the study of modernist drama. Despite a substantial body of academic research devoted to the psychoanalytic interpretation of literature, the issue of the representation of the unconscious in the drama of different cultural traditions remains under-explored from a comparative perspective. In this regard, an examination early twentieth-century Western European and Azerbaijani drama reveals both universal and culturally specific models of artistic representation of the subconscious.

The aim of this study is to identify and compare the ways in which the subconscious is artistically expressed in dramatic texts from two literary traditions, and to determine the role of psychoanalytic mechanisms in the formation of internal conflict and the evolution of female characters.

The methodological basis of this work is a synthesis of psychoanalytic and comparative-typological approaches, incorporating structural-semantic text analysis.

The study found that, in the plays of D.H. Lawrence and H. Javid, the inner conflict of the female protagonists serves as a structuring element of the drama and reflects deep psychological processes. The experience of trauma (whether childhood, emotional or existential) is a key factor in shaping the characters' behavioural strategies and the dynamics of the conflict. Pauses, fragmented speech, emotional outbursts and stage directions, and the fragmented nature of time function as artistic markers of the subconscious,

capturing the characters' inner turmoil and identity crisis. In this way, the dramatic form is viewed as a space where the conscious and subconscious levels of the personality interact. A comparative analysis has made it possible to identify universal psychodynamic patterns (ambivalence of feelings, the conflict between duty and passion, feelings of guilt) whilst also identifying culturally determined differences in the ways in which these are expressed artistically. In Lawrence's play, internal conflict tends to unfold through a gradual build-up of psychological tension and the specifics of everyday life, whereas in Azerbaijani drama, it takes on a more expressive and symbolically rich character. However, in both cases, a general tendency towards deeper psychological exploration and a focus on the subconscious is evident.

The findings confirm the effectiveness of combining psychoanalytic and comparative-typological methods for the analysis of dramatic texts and broaden our understanding of modernist drama as an intercultural phenomenon. This study contributes to the development of drama theory by refining our understanding of dramatic conflict as a form of artistic representation of internal psychological dynamics and by establishing the dramatic text as a space for intercultural dialogue.

Дата надходження до редакції / Submitted: 28.07.2025
Дата прийняття до публікації / Accepted: 14.03.2026
Дата публікації / Published: 04.06.2026