Modernism and Psychoanalysis

Matt ffytche

Our understanding of the encounters between modernism and psychoanalysis have, for much of the last century, been dominated by too programmatic a conception of that relationship. Most obviously this concerns the typical associations of Freud with the sexual: 'What did Freud find?', asked Lawrence, 'Nothing but a huge slimy serpent of sex, and heaps of excrement';[1] what Rilke knew of Freud was 'to be sure, uncongenial and in places hair-raising';[2] while for Pound 'the Viennese sewage' had been going forty years 'and not produced ONE interesting work'.[3] But it is not just what was focused *on* so insistently – the sources of creativity in neurosis; the transcription of creative works into the language of unconscious sexual instincts; the reading of texts for their specific Oedipal subtexts. It is as much the *form* of the engagement – the sense that when psychoanalysis comes to literature, it comes as science, from the outside; it renders literature as project or evidence, turns the ambiguities and complexities of narration into knowledge of a more typical kind.

---

[1] D.H. Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious* and *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975), p.203.

[2] Rainer Maria Rilke, Letter to Lou Andreas Salomé, Jan 20 1912, *Rainer Maria Rilke and Lou Andreas Salomé, The Correspondence* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006), p. 184.

[3] Ezra Pound, Letter to Wyndham Lewis, January 1952, *Pound/Lewis: The Letters of Ezra Pound and Wyndham Lewis* (London: Faber and Faber, 1985), p.269.

Wyndham Lewis spurned the 'dogma of the Unconscious';[4] but Thomas Mann, too, in his lengthy encomium to Freud, conceived of the relationship as an 'official meeting between the two spheres' of literature and science, an 'hour of formal encounter', which maintains an equally formal distance between them.[5] Auden's 1934 attempt to sum up the implications of Freud for modern literature was also convinced of the necessity of that engagement, but this conviction again takes very positive form in a set of numbered points: 'The driving force in all forms of life is instinctive'; 'the nature of our moral ideas depends on the nature of our relations with our parents'; 'Cure consists of taking away the guilt feeling'.[6] Literature and psychology thus share a task, 'To understand the mechanism of the trap'.[7] But compare this with Leonard Woolf's review of Freud's *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, written as early as June 1914 for the *New Weekly*. Here we gain a fleeting glimpse of a psychoanalysis that does not come to literature from the outside, but is already suggestively and metaphorically entwined with it. Freud, for Woolf, is a 'difficult and elusive writer' – mysterious and peculiar are the terms to which the review constantly resorts – while his 'sweeping imagination' is 'more characteristic of the poet than the scientist or

[4] Wyndham Lewis, *The Art of Being Ruled* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1926), p.400.

[5] Thomas Mann, 'Freud and the Future', *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, No. 37 (1952), p.106, p.111.

[6] W. H. Auden, 'Psychology and Art To-day', in Edward Mendelson, ed., *Prose: Volume I, 1926-1938* (London: Faber and Faber, 1996) pp.101-103. See Mendelson, *W.H. Auden, A Biography* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1981) p.56, for details of Auden's own reading of Freud and Jung in the mid-20s.

[7] Ibid, p.103.

medical practitioner.'[8] This is a Freud who rarely gives a systematic exposition of any subject. His books appeal to those who have 'felt the fascination of speculating upon the mysteries of the memories of childhood'.[9]

If for much of the century we have been reading the 'wrong' Freud – the one who cures literature of its detours, and renders self-knowledge newly positive – it has also been hard not to read the dialogue with modernism as one bound to failure. On the one hand, the failure of psychoanalysis to respond to modernism with any real interest in its alternative creative and psychological possibilities. Thus what André Breton hoped might be an explosive encounter with Freud, when he engineered a trip to Vienna at the tail-end of his honeymoon in 1921, only confirmed the impossibility of fruitful dialogue.[10] Freud was later to write to Breton, 'I am not in the position to explain what surrealism is and what it is after. It could be that I am not in any way made to understand it.'[11] Likewise, for all its penetrating insights into Joyce's attack on sentimentality, Carl Jung's 1932 essay on *Ulysses* insistently underlines his

[8] Leonard Woolf, 'Freud's *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*', in S.P.Rosenbaum, ed., *A Bloomsbury Group Reader* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993), p.189.

[9] Ibid, p.190.

[10] See André Breton's disparaging 'Interview du Professeur Freud', *Les Pas Perdu* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969) pp.94-95.

[11] Freud, Letter to André Breton, Dec 26 1932, in *Communicating Vessels* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997) p.152.

boredom with the text. Jung read to page 135 'with despair in my heart, falling asleep twice on the way' and compared the book to a tapeworm.[12]

From the other side of the divide, there are various examples of modernist writers who refused analysis on the grounds that it might destroy their sources of creativity. This was certainly the case for Rilke, who considered undergoing analysis to cure himself of symptoms including depression, exhaustion, hypersensitivity in the period 1911-1912, round the time of work on the 'Duino Elegies'. The connection came partly through his close companion Lou Andreas Salomé, who attended the First Psychoanalytic Congress at the end of 1911 and would soon begin psychoanalytic training as well as becoming an important correspondent of Freud's. However, though keen to 'track down this malaise and discover the source from which this misery forever stalks me',[13] in the end he shied instinctively away from 'getting swept clean', which might result in a 'disinfected soul', and Lou herself sought to persuade him against it.[14] Alix Strachey arrived at a very similar conclusion as to why Virginia Woolf was not persuaded to seek psychoanalytic help for her nervous breakdowns: 'Virginia's imagination, apart from her artistic creativity, was so interwoven with fantasies – and indeed with her madness – that if you stopped the madness you might

[12] C.G. Jung, *'"Ulysses": A Monologue', The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature, The Collected Works of C.G. Jung Volume 15* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971), p.111.

[13] Rainer Maria Rilke, Letter to Marie von Thurn und Taxis, in Wolfgang Leppmann, *Rilke: A Life* (New York: Fromm International, 1984), p.268.

[14] Rilke and Salome, *Correspondence*, p.184. Rilke and Freud were to meet a couple of times in the following years (see *Leppmann*, Rilke, p.270).

have stopped the creativeness too'.[15] This mistrust of what psychoanalysis had to offer writers also found its way into modernist literature in the form of caricatures of psychoanalytic technique. Dr. Krokowski in Thomas Mann's *The Magic Mountain*, parodies contemporary psychotherapy, while the main conceit of Italo Svevo's *The Confessions of Zeno* (1923) is that the novel is a piece of autobiographical writing, begun as part of a course of psychoanalysis undertaken in order to cure the author of his addiction to smoking. The novel thus takes shape by spiralling garallously out of the control of Dr S. and his Oedipal interpretations.[16]

But looking back at psychoanalysis and modernism from beyond the boundaries of the so-called Freudian century, the picture begins to look rather different. It is as if the unconscious or repressed moments of that cultural interchange can finally be heard. Firstly, our own understanding of modernism is more alive to its cultural and technical diversity, to the micro-histories rather than the canonical authors, and this

---

[15] Alix Strachey, quoted in Perry Meisel and Walter Kendrick, ed, *Bloomsbury/Freud: The Letters of James and Alix Strachey 1924-1925* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1986), p.309. Compare also Katherine Mansfield's observation on May Sinclair that her work suffered 'the eclipse of psychoanalysis', 'Ask No Questions' in John Middleton Murry, ed., *Novels and Novelists* (London: Constable, 1930), p.274.

[16] Svevo, in reality, Ettore Schmitz, had at one point intended to translate Freud's 'On Dreams' into Italian, however, his interest in psychoanalysis soured after the failure of the analysis of his brother-in-law, sent to Vienna in 1910 and seen by Freud and Tausk. 'It was he', wrote Schmitz, 'who convinced me how dangerous it was to explain to a man how he is made', quoted in Aaron Esman, 'Italo Svevo and the First Psychoanalytic Novel', *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 82, p.1228.

necessarily shifts our understanding of the way psychoanalysis is implicated in that culture. Alongside the more obvious statements, we can now observe a huge range of experiments, interventions and developments of psychoanalytic ideas happening across a range of international experimental cultures, and in response to diverse points of contact with the theory itself. Neurosis and sexual desire feature prominently, but so also do dreams, myths, memories, jokes, symbolisation, free association, aggression, melancholia, and the structure of the mind and its unconscious mental processes. By following these kinds of routes one never arrives at a psychoanalytic 'message', of the kind that Auden proposed, but one does get a powerful sense of just how much the period *belonged* to psychoanalysis; how broadly and variously it infiltrated the culture of its day.

Alongside this, one could place shifts in psychoanalytic historiography itself that are beginning to stress *its* diversity, its own ceaseless transitions. Here, too, it now seems less appropriate to extract from Freud's work a single dogmatic code.[17] Instead, psychoanalysis appears increasingly as an incredibly suggestive but also mobile set of ideas, that underwent various transformations in the 1920s and 30s, which have led to the construction of quite different 'Freuds' (the hysterical Freud; the Freud of the id and the ego; the Freud of the death drive, or the transference; but also the Freud concerned with the field of speech and the Other; the neuro-scientific Freud, and so on). More importantly, our sense of psychoanalysis in relation to modernist culture is now less wholly dominated by the figure of Freud himself. What for instance of the role of Jung, whose markedly different perspectives on the collective unconscious

[17] See for instance the critique of reductive psychoanalytic criticism in Maud Ellmann, ed, *Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism* (London: Longman, 1994), pp.25.

found their way into the *Arcades Project* of Walter Benjamin and the work of Thomas Mann. What of Otto Rank's enthusiastic responses to expressionist cinema, or Eric Neumann's to Kafka?[18] What of the further development of psychoanalytic ideas around the concepts of phantasy and depression by Melanie Klein, or by W.R. Bion, who psychoanalysed Beckett and whose psychoanalytic novel of the 1970s was influenced by experimental modernist techniques.[19]

Finally, one could argue that our view of the cultural reception of psychoanalysis must become even more complex than this, because our understanding of modernist interpretations of neurosis, the unconscious, dream and desire, remains incomplete, so long as we fail to see that this dialogue was mediated by yet other voices, falling outside the sphere of psychoanalysis, and yet which, from the point of view of the time, may have appeared thoroughly entangled with it. How much of the modernists' attitude to sex was acquired from Freud, and how much from Havelock Ellis, Kraft-Ebbing or Otto Weininger? How 'Freudian' is their understanding of the unconscious, and what do they owe instead to readings of Henri Bergson, Pierre Janet or Samuel Butler? Bearing these complexities in mind, the following is an attempt to indicate some key points of reference in the dialogue of psychoanalysis with modernism. It can by no means pretend to be exhaustive, but aims at least to sample that encounter from a more diverse set of viewpoints than has often previously been allowed.

---

[18] Otto Rank, *The Double: A Psychoanalytic Study* (London: Maresfield Library, 1989); Erich Neumann, *Creative Man: Five Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979).

[19] W.R. Bion, *A Memoir of the Future* (London: Karnac Books, 1991).

Freud and London Life: The Bloomsbury Set

The Bloomsbury set provides one of the best examples of the early cultural reception of Freud in Britain (let alone in modernist circles) and of how ubiquitous psychoanalysis appears, once one directs one's gaze away from single works and towards the broader network of intellectual affiliations in which they are embedded. One of the earliest of these points of contacts was via the Society for Psychical Research, founded in 1882, and by the early 1900s centred in Cambridge around the figure of Arthur Verrall. The society had come together initially to investigate Spiritualism and the paranormal, but the nature of these researches led to the Society in turn becoming a conduit for knowledge of new European psychologies. F.W. H. Myers, one of the founding members of the Society, provided a report on Breuer and Freud's work on hysteria as early as 1893, and Freud himself was elected an honorary member in 1911.[20] James Strachey joined the Society in 1908, but it also attracted the attentions of James' brother Lytton, Leonard Woolf and Maynard Keynes – all of them friends of Thoby Stephens at Cambridge (brother of Virginia Woolf, nee Stephens) as well as members of the overlapping intellectual society the Cambridge Apostles. It was this group of Cambridge friends, along with Virginia and her younger brother Adrian, who formed the nucleus of the early Bloomsbury group. So already in the early years of the new century, the future Bloomsbury participants were marginally aware of developments in the psychology of the unconscious.

[20] See Roger Luckhurst, 'Religion, Psychical Research, Spiritualism and the Occult', in this volume.

On a second front, there is Bloomsbury's sexological interests – that side of the group associated with a measured libertarian revolt against Victorian sexual mores and frank sexual discussion. Virginia Woolf's diary for January 1918 records how Lytton Strachey 'gave an amazing account of the British Sex Society', which had met to discuss the theme of 'Incest between parent & child when they are both unconscious of it… derived from Freud'.[21] Back in 1911 Strachey had delivered an address to the Apostles in which he wondered what there was in 'self-consciousness to distrust the current of our emotions, and make impossible the impulsive, spontaneous, exquisite expressions of our love?'[22] By 1914 he had written a psychoanalytic skit in which two characters meet seemingly by accident in a summer house. Rosamund has been reading Freud's *The Psycho-Pathology of Everyday Life* (just translated into English) and aims to teach her companion 'all about the impossibility of accidents, and the unconscious self, and the sexual symbolism of fountain-pens [she takes his up], and – but I see you're blushing already.'[23] In the same year, Leonard Woolf's review of *The Psycho-Pathology of Everyday Life* suggested that Freud's book was fascinating both for dealing with the mysterious recesses of the heart, but also for its 'subtle analysis of many other ordinary mental processes' including, 'writing a letter, forgetting a name, or misquoting lines of poetry'.[24] Virginia Woolf, in turn, reported in a letter of 1911 that Leonard had interpreted her dreams one night, applying 'the Freud system to my

[21] Virginia Woolf, *The Diary of Virginia Woolf: Volume I 1915-1919* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1983), p.110.

[22] Lytton Strachey, 'The Really Interesting Question', *The Really Interesting Question and Other Papers* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972) p.126.

[23] Lytton Strachey, 'According to Freud', *Interesting Question*, pp.113-114.

[24] Leonard Woolf, Review, pp.190-191.

mind, and analysed it down to Clytemnestra and the watch fires'.[25] Psychoanalysis is thus being woven into the fabric of daily life on all sorts of different fronts.

It was no doubt the Bloomsbury tendency towards social experimentation that enabled them to pick up on psychoanalytic tendencies at such early dates. By the late 1920s the impact on certain members of the group was strong enough for them to take on the burden of formal psychoanalytic training. This includes both Virginia Woolf's younger brother Adrian and his wife Karin Stephens as well as James and Alix Strachey who went to study with Freud in Vienna in 1920. Soon after, the Strachey's began to translate Freud's clinical papers into English, and in 1924, through James' initiative, the Woolf's own Hogarth Press began publishing volumes for the International Psycho-Analytic Library, and eventually the *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Freud*, under Strachey's editorship.

Beyond these 'official' projects, there are further ones that deserve notice. One is Lytton Strachey's historical work *Elizabeth and Essex* (1928) which incorporates psychoanalytic theory in its reconstruction of Elizabeth's emotional life. A copy was sent to Freud, and Freud wrote back explaining he had read all Lytton's earlier works with great enjoyment, but this time 'you have moved me more deeply, for you yourself have reached greater depths'.[26] Even more at a tangent, the economist John Maynard Keynes, associated with Bloomsbury from its earliest days, was well-

[25] Virginia Woolf, Letter to Saxon Sydney-Turner, Feb 3 1917, *The Question of Things Happening: The Letters of Virginia Woolf, Volume II: 1912-1922* (London: The Hogarth Press: 1976), p.141.

[26] S. Freud, Letter to Lytton Strachey, Dec 25 1928, in *Bloomsbury/Freud*, p.332.

acquainted with Freud's thought and deepened his researches in the mid-20s with a view to developing aspects of his economic theory. His *Treatise on Money* (1930) cites both Sandor Ferenczi and Freud as sources for his own investigations into the motives for monetary hoarding: 'Dr. Freud relates that there are peculiar reasons deep in our subconsciousness, why gold in particular should satisfy strong instincts and serve as a symbol'.[27]

Sinclair, Lawrence, H.D.: Unconscious Interiors

Not a single message, then, but so many different Freuds and so many different ways of knowing Freud. Freud is a ubiquitous reference-point within modernist culture, a radical psychological thinker for a self-styled radical age. 'I am going to prove that I belong to the present day – that I'm a contemporary of Dr Freud', says Rosamund in Strachey's sketch.[28] But what of deeper engagements with psychoanalysis on specifically literary ground? The novels of Virginia Woolf have attracted a lot of psychoanalytic attention in recent years, much of it focusing on the nature of Freud's presence, or absence, in her work.[29] Woolf can hardly be considered as a 'Freudian'

[27] John Maynard Keynes, *A Treatise on Money, Volume II: The Applied Theory of Money* (London: MacMillan, 1930), p. 290.

[28] Strachey, *Interesting Question*, p.117.

[29] See, for instance, Elizabeth Abel, *Virginia Woolf and the Fictions of Psychoanalysis* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1989), Daniel Ferrer, *Virginia Woolf and the Madness of Language* (London: Routldege, 1990), Bob Hinshelwood, 'Virginia Woolf and Psychoanalysis, *International Review of Psycho-Analysis*, 17 (1990) pp367-371, Thomas Szasz, *'My Madness Saved Me': The Madness and*

novelist, but when it came to explaining the writing of *To the Lighthouse*, she described it as an exorcism for the obsessive memories of her mother, who had died when she was 13. Once it was written, she reflected, 'I no longer heard her voice; I do not see her', adding, 'I suppose I did for myself what psychoanalysts do for their patients. I expressed some very long felt and deeply felt emotion', and in doing so 'laid it to rest'.[30] This is a sidelong acknowledgment of the presence of Freud, as a point of reference, if not a point of departure, in her reflections on the psychical legacy of motherhood. But there were other writers who took Freud more closely to heart than this, who felt their own narrations of subjectivity to be deeply implicated in psychoanalytic terrain. If much modernist writing was committed to over-turning outworn accounts of the ethos of the self, it also involved a reinvention of the interior life – Proust, Joyce, Woolf, Rilke and the Surrealists give very different examples of this. But such explorations necessarily proceed across psychoanalytic terrain, if only to develop alternative strategies, an independent version of depth psychology.

May Sinclair

Marriage of Virginia Woolf (Transaction Publisher, 2006); Bahun, Sanja, 'Virginia Woolf and Psychoanalytic Theory', *Virginia Woolf in Context*, ed. Jane Goldman and Bryony Randall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[30] Virginia Woolf, *Moments of Being: Unpublished Autobiographical Writings* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1976), p.94.

May Sinclair is an intriguing example of the complex ways in which modernism could engage with psychoanalytic notions of the unconscious.[31] She was a Georgian novelist who by the early 1920s had developed an increasingly psychological approach to narrative. *Mary Oliver: A Life* (1919) and *Life and Death of Harriett Frean* (1922) are oriented substantially around the inner life of their central protagonists, lives which still in adulthood are struggling to get beyond the deep impressions of childhood. Credited with introducing the term 'stream of consciousness' in a review of Dorothy Richardson's narrative experiments,[32] her own explorations of the production of 'womanhood', out of the development of childhood consciousness, were strongly motivated by feminist purposes (from 1908-1912 she was involved in the Women's Freedom League). However, they also combined naturally enough with an interest in psychoanalysis. Already in 1913 Sinclair was administratively involved in the founding of the Medico-Psychological Clinic in Brunswick Square, the first British institution formally committed to the exploration of psychoanalytic techniques in psychotherapy (during the war years it was soon to capitalise on a stream of shell-shocked patients). By 1916, she was publishing 'Clinical Lectures on Symbolism and Sublimation' in the *Medical Press and Circular*. *The Three Sisters* (1914) is an early example of how ideas such as neurosis and sexual repression found their way into her writing, but by *Mary Oliver* her explorations of sexual knowledge and childhood fantasy had become much more sophisticated, the stream of consciousness technique lending complexity to the interweaving of memory, fantasy and perception. The infant Mary lies in her cot – or remembers it –

[31] See Suzanne Raitt, *May Sinclair: A Modern Victorian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

[32] May Sinclair, 'The Novels of Dorothy Richardson', *Egoist*, 5, (Apr. 1918), pp.57-9.

toying with the knob in the green painted railing for reassurance, as with her mother's nipple: 'your finger pushed it back into the breast'.[33] In between such dependable objects is an unstable world of images and anxieties: 'When the door in the hedge opened you saw the man in the night-shirt. He had half a face… You opened your mouth but before you could scream you were back in the cot… behind the curtain Papa and Mamma were lying in the big bed.'[34]

Life opens with a classically Freudian scene; but there are also 'rogue facets' to these coincidences of feminism and psychoanalysis. For instance, Sinclair orients her reading of the theory around her own assumptions concerning celibacy, aired in *Feminism* (published by the Women's Suffrage League in 1912). The idea that sexual enjoyment should be renounced in order to liberate creative powers winds its way through her understanding of the formation of female writers in both *Mary Oliver* and her critical work on the Brontës[35] – essentially it is the route by which some women (not all) may achieve their independence from the families which have sought to silence them; but this is not wholly a Freudian idea. In a different way, her 1916 review of Jung's *Psychology of the Unconscious* (the English translation of *Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido*, 1912) is fascinating for the way it takes Jung's analysis of the psychical importance of symbolisation and reads it in conjunction with concerns of her own. On the one hand, this meant her interest in the modernist mediation of myth (in the war years Sinclair wrote on Eliot, Pound and H.D.). Thus 'Language is a perpetual Orphic song' that goes 'sounding away into the dark

[33] May Sinclair, *Mary Oliver: A Life* (London: Virago, 1980), p.4.

[34] May Sinclair, Ibid, pp.3-4.

[35] May Sinclair, *The Three Brontës* (London: Hutchinson, 1912).

underworld we came from, evoking endless reverberations there'.[36] The psychoanalyst 'is Mercury and Orpheus, the enabler of bridges between past and future.'[37] On the other hand, she was reading Jung in relation to her own theories of celibacy and sublimation. Jung was himself already diverging from Freud in this work, particularly over his interpretation of libido in a more transhistorical and vitalist sense, as an impulse towards life. Civilisation, then, is 'one vast system of sublimations' of the 'eternal indestructible Libido'.[38] But these sublimations are more than the redirection of repressed sexual impulses. Sublimation is also the capacity for a once primitive instinct to transform itself into ever higher cultural syntheses: it is 'the freedom of the Self in obedience to a higher law than preceding generations have laid upon him'.[39] Such ideas in turn fed back into the contemporary psychoanalytic community. The *Psychoanalytic Review* for 1923 reported on Sinclair's *Anne Severn and the Fieldings*: 'In May Sinclair's latest and incomparable novel, the core of [sublimation] is exposed, turned hither and yon to flash with diamond facets upon her story of human striving'.[40]

However, Sinclair's engagement with psychoanalysis also stretches ambiguously beyond it. Her work on the Brontës testified to a concern with the supernatural, and in

[36] May Sinclair, 'Clinical Lectures on Symbolism and Sublimation', I, *Medical Press*, (Aug 9, 1916) p.121.

[37] Ibid, p.121.

[38] Ibid, p.119.

[39] May Sinclair, 'Clinical Lectures on Symbolism and Sublimation', II, *Medical Press*, (Aug 16, 1916) p.144.

[40] S. Stragnell, 'A Study in Sublimations', *Psychoanalytic Review*, 10, (1923), p.209.

1914 she joined the Society for Psychical Research. In the mid-20s (so in parallel with her more psychological novels) she was praising not William, but Henry James, for 'The Turn of the Screw', suggesting that 'Ghosts have their own atmosphere and their own reality'.[41] The boundaries of psychoanalysis as seen by modernists are hard to determine here. After all, it was in those immediate post-war years that Freud, too, was publishing on 'The Uncanny' and 'On Telepathy'. Looking in yet another direction, 1917 saw the publication of a philosophical work, *A Defence of Idealism*, which found Sinclair exploring the ultimate nature of identity with reference to yet other notions of the psyche and the unconscious, drawn from William McDougall and Samuel Butler, though again, these are seen by her as the corollary of psychoanalysis, rather than its displacement.[42]

D.H. Lawrence

D.H. Lawrence also encountered psychoanalysis at an early stage in its international development.[43] And as with Sinclair, one learns more about his understanding of psychoanalysis by reconstructing conversations amongst early psychoanalytic experimenters in Britain, rather than by focusing on the impact of more canonical Freudian texts. When Lawrence met David Eder in 1914, their intense discussions

[41] Supplement to *The Bookman* (December 1923), p.144.

[42] May Sinclair, *A Defence of Idealism* (London: MacMillan and Co, 1917).

[43] According to Reinald Hoops' 1934 study, '*Sons and Lovers* is the first English novel influenced by psychoanalysis'. *Der Einfluß der Psychoanalyse auf die englische Literatur* (Heidelberg: Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1934) p.73.

probably ranged over the work of both Freud and Jung.[44] Eder had published on 'Freud's Theory of Dreams' in 1912, but was drawn to Jungian theory, like May Sinclair, partly because of the room Jung made for metaphysical impulses. As Sinclair was reviewing *The Psychology of the Unconscious* for the *Medical Press*, Eder was doing so for *The New Age*, and Lawrence himself would read it in 1918. Jung's central concern with the need to sacrifice the yearning for maternal security was bound to appeal to him: '"Mother!" he whispered – "mother!". She was the only thing that held him up, himself, amid all this.'[45] As with Sinclair, too, the interest ran both ways. Psychoanlysts early on picked up on Lawrence's novels as corroborating Freudian theory. A.B. Kuttner's commentary on *Sons and Lovers* in the *Psychoanalytic Review* (1916) found that Lawrence was able 'to attest the truth of what is perhaps the most far-reaching psychological theory ever propounded'[46] – this is 'the struggle of a man to emancipate himself from his maternal allegiance and to transfer his affections to a woman who stands outside of his family circle'.[47] With the aid of the Freudian theory, *Sons and Lovers* would help one to see the role played by 'abnormal fixation upon the parent' in the psychic development of the individual.[48]

---

[44] See John Turner, 'David Eder: Between Freud and Jung', *D.H.Lawrence Review*, 27, 2-3, pp.289-309.

[45] D.H. Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers* (London: Heinemann, 1974), p. 420.

[46] A.B. Kuttner, ''Sons and Lovers': A Freudian Appreciation', *Psychoanalytic Review*, 3, (1916), p.317.

[47] Ibid, p.296.

[48] Ibid, p.311.

Once more, caution has to be exercised in how literally these connections with psychoanalysis are understood. The assumption is easily made that Lawrence's concentration on sexual initiation and sexual vitality is explicitly Freudian, but there was a much wider set of influences here, all operating, ultimately, in the service of Lawrence's own reconstruction of subjective life. Lawrence's relationship with Frieda Weekley back in 1912, had already introduced him to the ideas of Austrian psychoanalyst Otto Gross, with whom Weekley had had an affair in 1907. But Gross's work was itself a radical departure from the psychoanalytic mainstream, a conflation of Freud with Nietzsche (Gross was a major influence on German Expressionism). An early draft of *Sons and Lovers* from 1911 testifies also to the influence of Schopenhauer on Lawrence, and alongside this he had read widely in German biological and vitalist theory.[49] When Lawrence wrote to Bertrand Russell in 1915 about 'another seat of consciousness than the brain and the nerve system' – one that has 'a sexual connection' – he framed this not in Freudian terminology, but developed his own account of a 'blood consciousness'.[50]

More importantly, when Lawrence in 1919 began to set down his own interpretation of unconscious life – published as *Pyschoanalysis and the Unconscious* (1921), followed by *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (1922) – it was specifically as a critique of the Freudian notion that 'at the root of almost every neurosis lies some incest

[49] See David Ellis, 'Lawrence and the Biological Psyche', *D.H.Lawrence: Centenary Essays*, ed, Kalnins (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1986) pp.89-109.

[50] D. H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume II: June 1913-October 1916* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1981) p. 470.

craving'.[51] For Lawrence, such fantasies were at most logical deductions, perverse products of cultural repression projected inwards, thus muddying the true and primal sources of the self. By contrast, what he set out to communicate was the nature of the 'pristine unconscious in man', the 'fountain of real motivity'.[52] Here he again reverted to non-psychoanalytic, vitalist and Schopenhauerian ideas, mingled with theosophical influences concerning 'the passional nerve centre of the solar plexus' and in the thorax, from which 'the unconscious goes forth seeking its object'.[53]

H.D.

Ten years later, Lawrence was to ghost his way into the dreams of H.D., who was at that time in analysis with Freud in Vienna: 'in my dream, I take out a volume from a shelf of Lawrence novels. I open it; disappointed, I say, "But his psychology is nonsense."'[54] Freud, in turn, said that Lawrence impressed him as 'being unsatisified

---

[51] D.H. Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious* and *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975), p.205.

[52] Ibid, p.207.

[53] Ibid, p.221, p.230.

[54] H.D., *Tribute to Freud*, rev. ed. (Boston: David R Godine, 1974) p.140. This edition contains in addition, her diary 'Advent', a journal of notes on dreams from the time of the analysis itself, and from which this dream is quoted. See also Susan Stanford Friedman, ed., *Analyzing Freud: Letters of H.D., Bryher, and Their Circle* (New York: New Directions, 2002), and H.D.'s poem 'The Master', H.D., *Collected Poems 1912-1944* (New York: New Directions, 1983), pp.451-460.

but a man of real power'.[55] H.D.'s companion and lover, Bryher, was an early supporter of psychoanalysis, subscribing to the *International Journal* from the early 20s, and it was at her instigation that H.D. entered analysis, first with Mary Chadwick at Tavistock Square in 1931, and eventually for five days a week with Freud for some months in 1933 and again in October 1934. H.D.s account of her analysis, written up as *Tribute to Freud* in 1944, is both fascinatingly indirect (attention in the opening sections centres on the patient she always passes in the stairwell) and full of intriguing insights into the more informal aspects of Freud's practice. This is a Freud who 'will sit there quietly, like an owl in a tree', but who also pounds the head-piece of the horsehair sofa with his hand and complains: 'The trouble is – I am an old man – *you do not think it worth your while to love me.*'[56] The indirectness stems partly from H.D.'s quasi-Imagist technique which eschews linear narrative in favour of a subtle and elusive system of vignettes – a mosaic of memory. At its heart (or perhaps ultimately displaced from it, preserved from analysis) are the series of visions she experienced on a wall in Greece while on a trip with Bryher in 1920 – a face, a chalice, a tripod, a Nike. These are things which 'had happened in my life… actual psychic or occult experiences',[57] they channel the writer's memories of the trauma of war, her own mental disturbance, and her anxieties concerning the return of conflict in Europe. H.D sought Freud's opinion of these experiences, but also resisted it. Thus alongside memories and premonitions of real and unreal wars, a subtle war emerges in the text between her sense of where Freud wants to take her – an insight into her own narcissistic desire for wonder and religious renewal – and where she wants to take

[55] Ibid, p.144.

[56] Ibid, p.22, p.16.

[57] Ibid, p.9.

him, ‘outside the province of established psychoanalysis’. Beyond Freud’s ‘caustic implied criticism’ there is ‘another region of cause and effect, another region of question and answer’.[58] Thus while Freud is keen to pursue her ‘Princess dream’, in which she witnesses the finding of Moses in the bulrushes, back to its material connections (an image in the Doré Bible she read as a child), her own impulse is to lift the memory out of the causal flow of experience: ‘it is a perfect moment in time or out of time’ – an image of transcendence.[59]

The *Tribute* is ultimately a testimony to how one must circumvent Freud, ‘I was here because I must not be broken’.[60] The Nike, for H.D., is a premonition of war, but also of her own future release from depressive anxiety: when the war had ended, ‘I… would be free, I myself would go on in another, a winged dimension’.[61] The return of myth not as symptom then, but cure. Gradually, out of the numinous fragments of memory, emerges not the psychoanalytic solution of her neuroses, but her mystical solution to the puzzle of Freud’s: ‘It worried me to feel that he had no idea … that he would ‘wake up’ when he shed the frail locust-husk of his years, and find himself alive’.[62]

Surrealism: Dreaming the Revolution

[58] Ibid, p.99.

[59] Ibid, p.37.

[60] Ibid, p.16.

[61] Ibid, p.83.

[62] Ibid, p.43.

There remains one other key area of psychoanalytic influence on modernist experimentation and this is dreams. Dreams occupy a strange position with respect to the Freudian corpus. *The Interpretation of Dreams* is perhaps the foundational work of psychoanalysis in the sense that it inaugurated the psychoanalytic era and brought together most of Freud's original insights – into unconscious thought processes, the structure of neurotic symptoms, and nascent ideas concerning the Oedipus complex. However, the discovery of the meaning of dreams itself was in some ways tangential to the main framework of psychoanalytic enquiry. The modernist movement most pervasively interested in dreams was surrealism. In Breton's 'Manifesto of Surrealism' (1924) man is introduced as 'that inveterate dreamer', and dream is quickly imbricated in series of terms – freedom, imagination, childhood, the marvellous. Most famously, dreams are a constituent part of the project of surrealism itself: 'I believe in the future resolution of these two states, dream and reality… into a kind of absolute reality, a *surreality*.'[63]

If the Manifesto returns again and again to the dream, it also gives thanks specifically to Freud for recovering this neglected aspect of mental life. The homage is by no means superficially meant. Breton had already encountered the technique of free association while working with psychiatric patients as a war-time nurse at Saint-Dizier. Thus as early as 1916 he was discovering links between psychoanalytic and poetic technique. Writing to Guillame Apollinaire he described the ability of the insane to produce 'the most distant relations between ideas, the rarest verbal

[63] André Breton, 'Manifesto of Surrealism', *Manifestoes of Surrealism* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1972), p.14.

alliances'.[64] The Manifesto recalls that period in order to link it to Breton's breakthrough experimentation with automatic writing in 1919. After being struck by the spontaneous emergence of word and image combinations at the point of falling asleep, Breton sought consciously to reproduce such conditions by obtaining from himself 'a monologue spoken as rapidly as possible without any intervention on the part of the critical faculties'.[65] Freud thus shadows Breton's own triangulation of dream, madness and free association. The result of these experiments with psychical techniques (which drew also on the example of Pierre Janet and Fredric Myers) was *Magnetic Fields*, written in collaboration with Philippe Soupault and often named as the first surrealist publication (an inscribed copy was sent by Breton to Freud).

Freud's interest in the operation of particular symbolic processes, such as condensation and displacement, behind the dream's absurd juxtapositions and compound images, are reminiscent of the montage explored by cubism and Dada. But Freud's assumption of an underlying logic behind the confusion, his evocation of depths of subjectivity and secret motives of desire, mark surrealism's own shift from games with chance and spontaneity towards a more organic interest in nature, fate and the unconscious. However, key aspects of the surrealist dream run very much counter to Freudian theory. There is the surrealist fascination with nineteenth-century precursors, including Saint-Pol-Roux and the Marquis d'Hervey-Saint-Denis. A more crucial divergence involves the status of the dream image itself. Where for Freud the dream needs to be dissected into its elements, translated, and related to specific kinds

[64] Letter to Apollinaire, 15 Aug. 1916, cited in Mark Polizzotti, *Revolution of the Mind: The Life of André Breton* (London: Bloomsbury, 1995), p.52.

[65] Breton, *Manifestoes*, p.23.

of experiences in the recent past, and in the dreamer's infantile life, Breton appears to be struck by the luminous, revelatory quality of the image itself. The 'light of the image' is one to which we are 'infinitely sensitive', its value depends 'on the beauty of the spark obtained'.[66] For Aragon it is equally the 'light radiating from the unusual' which rivets the attention of modern man.[67] In contrast, Freud wrote to Breton in 1937, after being asked to contribute to a volume called *Trajectory of the Dream*, explaining that: 'The superficial aspect of dreams, holds no interest to me. I have been concerned with the 'latent content' which can be derived from the manifest dream by psychoanalytical interpretation. A collection of dreams without associations and knowledge of the context in which it was dreamed does not tell me anything, and it is hard from me to imagine what it can mean to anyone else.'[68]

A third important departure from psychoanalytic theory is the surrealists' association of dream with radical freedom. Surrealism 'asserts our complete non-conformism';[69] the imagination revolts against its enslavement by the rational; the depths of our mind contain 'strange forces capable of augmenting those on the surface, or of waging a victorious battle against them.'[70] Such sentiments depart from Freud in a double sense. Firstly, at the level of social ideology, Freud's instincts are far more conservative – one never finds him seeking to reverse the relations between reality and desire, or to unseat the structures of authority with which the language of psychic

[66] Breton, *Manifestoes*, p.37.

[67] Louis Aragon, *Paris Peasant* (London: Pan, 1980), p.28.

[68] Polizzotti, *Revolution*, p.453.

[69] Breton, Manifestoes, p.47.

[70] Ibid, p.10.

structures are so heavily encoded (the superego, the censor). His attitude to social revolution, for instance in the work of Marxist psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich, was entirely sceptical, his assumptions concerning human instincts bound to those of Darwin and Hobbes. But secondly, what comes through in both the surrealists concentration on the image itself, and its assertion *against* external reality, are not strictly Freudian notions, but idealist ones. Breton, when he first came across Freud's ideas partly assimilated them to his own previous readings of Hegel and the German Romantics. Hence the evocation of dream life as the language of an inner objectivity, more real than the empirical pact between consciousness and external objects. Aragon, confronted by a phosphorescent vision of a mermaid in the *Passage de l'Opera* cries out 'The Ideal'.[71] In a later description of the same venue, Freud has been downgraded to a puppy-dog, taken for a walk by the divine figure of Libido whose temple is built of medical books; it is Hegel whom Aragon goes on to quote at length about the relations between individuals and the sexes.[72]

The nod to idealism helps to clarify why Freud was important to the surrealists up to a point, but also how they purposefully misread him. For all their fascination with sexual desire, the reality the surrealists posited in dreams was not the psychoanalytic one of unconscious infantile wishes. When Breton talks about childhood, it is as a realm of freedom, strangely closer to German Romantic associations of childhood with the marvellous. Childhood is 'where everything nevertheless conspires to bring about the effective, risk-free possession of oneself';[73] children 'set off each day

[71] Aragon, *Paris*, p.37.

[72] Ibid, pp.47-8.

[73] Breton, *Manifestoes*, p.40.

without a worry in the world'.[74] This is not the Freud of *Three Essays on Sexuality*; nor even of the *Interpretation of Dreams*.[75]

If dreams are more 'real' than external life, they are also revelatory of that life's untapped potential. What they reveal are not the distorted vestiges of archaic instincts, but the most intensely significant features of emergent futures: 'Freud is again quite surely mistaken in concluding that the prophetic dream does not exist'.[76] This much more teleological reading of dreams, in which the historicity of the present in relation to the future is emphasised (rather than to the past) is in fact much closer to Jung's psychology, for which dreams also reveal processes of development within both individual and historical life. Dreams point forwards, they resolve or develop issues (rather than repeating and disguising them). But for Breton, to hold that the dream is 'exclusively revelatory of the past is to deny the value of motion'.[77]

The Myths Outside: Benjamin and Mann

[74] Ibid, pp.3-4.

[75] Likewise when the surrealist group met, between 1928 and 1932, for a series of controversial discussions on the nature of their own sexual lives, what organises their lines of enquiry is repeatedly not the nature of instinct, or the Oedipus complex, but the desire to sustain a more absolute and philosophical demand concerning the nature of passion and the possibility of reciprocity. See, José Pierre, ed, *Investigating Sex: Surrealist Discussions 1928-1932* (London: Verso, 1992).

[76] Breton, *Communicating*, p.13.

[77] Ibid, p.13.

This interest in a dialectics of desire connects the surrealists back with trends in German Romanticism, as well as across to Jung. However, these same points of reference would enable Breton and Aragon from 1930 onwards to link their interests ever more closely to Marxism and dialectical materialism; to transform the imperatives of the dream from creative to political ones. After arguing that the dream is in historical motion, Breton quite naturally moves on to ally his project with that of Lenin. The dream confronts the new image of things with the old one (its unexpected juxtapositions now primarily historical) and aids the dreamer in eliminating 'the least assimilable part of the past'.[78] Its primary usefulness is 'taking a stand against the past, a stand that gives us our momentum'.[79] The dream thus parallels, in the life of the individual, the process of revolution in the socio-political field.

This reading of the dream image in terms of historical dialectics had a galvanising effect on another significant project of the 1930s, Walter Benjamin's monumental and unfinished account of Paris in the nineteenth century, which exemplifies the extension of psychoanalytic ideas to the wider cultural sphere. For Benjamin, Freud enabled the surrealists to find a modernist viewpoint on the dream, one which in his view protected them from mere mysteriousness, via the stress on a materialist investigation, as well as the dream's own implication in the daily experience of the metropolis.[80] These influences from surrealism fused in Benjamin's work with

[78] Ibid, p.46.

[79] Ibid, p.46.

[80] See Walter Benjamin, 'Surrealism: The Last Snapshot of the European Intelligentsia', *Selected Writings, Volume 2: 1927-1934* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), pp.207-221.

concepts taken from other aspects of Freud. For instance, Adorno urged Benjamin to read everything he could by Freud and Ferenczi to help shed light on the fetish character of commodities.[81] But Freud's impact was exerted most decisively in relation to Benjamin's conception of memory. In connection with Proustian *mémoire involontaire*, Benjamin drew on ideas put forward by Freud in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* which shed new light on the relation between memory and consciousness. Quoting the interpretation of Freud given by another early psychoanalyst, Theodor Reik, Benjamin sought to examine the way in which the act of conscious recollection could dissolve memory traces: 'The function of memory is to protect our impressions; reminiscence aims at their dissolution. Memory is essentially conservative; reminiscence, destructive'.[82]

In the mid-30s these two concerns – memory and dream, awakening and remembering – started to merge and form the basis of a grand theoretical enterprise. If dreams are themselves a historical phenomenon, and history equally contains its own collective dreams, then to remember the nineteenth century, to actively recollect its various forms of commodity fetishism and consumer mythos, might enable one to free oneself from its repetition, to awake from the dream.[83] This train of thought led Benjamin to

---

[81] Theodor Adorno and Walter Benjamin, *The Complete Correspondence 1928-1940* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), p.93.

[82] Walter Benjamin, *Selected Writings: Volume 4 1938-1940* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), p.316

[83] Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press: 1999), p.908.

write to Adorno asking if he knew of any psychoanalytic study of waking'.[84] There are also indications that he was preparing a critique of Jung, 'whose Fascist armature I had promised myself to expose.'[85] Famously, Adorno was to criticise these developments in Benjamin's work, for 'the disenchantment of the dialectical image as a 'dream'' runs the risk of psychologising it, thus trapping it within 'the spell of bourgeois psychology.'[86] That is to say, the attempt to think oneself beyond the myths of capitalism, was itself in danger of situating itself methodologically within the very domain of bourgeois private consciousness which both Benjamin and Adorno were keen to overcome.

It is interesting to compare these uses of Freud, with another from the mid-1930s which equally sees the analytic revelation as a 'revolutionary force', one capable of overcoming the 'systematic glorification of the primitive and the irrational' in the present day, robbing it of its charge of energy by 'becoming conscious through the analytic procedure'.[87] This is the speech 'Freud and the Future' delivered by Thomas Mann to the Viennese academy for Medical Psychology in honour of Freud's 80th birthday. As with Benjamin, Mann is concerned with the intersection between the terms of individual psychology and much larger issues of social experience – Freud's therapeutic method has long outgrown its purely medical implications and 'become a

[84] Adorno and Benjamin, *Correspondence*, p.99.

[85] Walter Benjamin, Letter to Fritz Leib, July 9 1937, *The Correspondence of Walter Benjamin 1910-1940* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994). p.542.

[86] Adorno and Benjamin, *Correspondence*, pp.106-7.

[87] Thomas Mann, 'Freud and the Future', *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, No. 37 (1952), p.109 and p.115.

world movement which has penetrated into every field of science', but also into religion and prehistory, mythology, folklore and pedagogy.[88] Mann thus found himself coming upon Freud precisely when, in his late work *Joseph and His Brothers*, he 'took the step in my subject-matter from the bourgeois and individual to the mythical and typical'.[89] However, in contrast with Benjamin, the Freud that Mann was drawing on was not the unraveller of dreams, but the anthropologist who had emerged in *Totem and Taboo* and in the 1912 postscript to the study of Judge Schreber: '"In dreams and in neuroses," so our thesis has run, "we come once more upon the *child*"' – but we also come upon '"the *primitive* man, as he stands revealed to us in the light of the researches of archaeology and ethnology"'.[90] For Mann, then, psychoanalytic penetration into the childhood of the individual, 'is at the same time a penetration into the childhood of mankind into the primitive and the mythical'.[91] It is thus a Freud who, rather than exposing inner myths to the concrete experience of the everyday, returns the everyday to 'those profound time-sources where the myth has its home and shapes the primeval norms and forms of life'.[92] Mann is interested in a Freud who can retrace certain guiding mythical patterns within a life which has become derailed by even more irrational and threatening subjective impulses. Thus

[88] Ibid, p.108.

[89] Ibid, p.112.

[90] S. Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Volume XII (1911-1913) p.82.

[91] Mann, 'Freud', p.112.

[92] Ibid, p.112.

'myth is the legitimization of life',[93] and it is this aspect of psychoanalysis that one might look to for 'a new and coming sense of our humanity'.[94]

Coda: The Destructive Element

There is no single modernist conception of psychoanalysis or response to Freud. The psychoanalytic understanding of dream, sexuality, the unconscious, intersect with different kinds of radical, sceptical and conservative agendas. Psychoanalysis both founds and dissolves the myths of the future; it now confirms, now subverts aesthetic practices; it sometimes illuminates the mechanism of the trap, sometimes *is* the trap, and in yet other cases opens a way beyond the most alienating traps of modernity. We have seen how many modernist writers – Sinclair, Lawrence, Breton and members of the Bloomsbury set – came upon psychoanalysis at a very early stage in its international reception, before many of Freud or Jung's works had been widely translated. By 1920, according to Bryher, 'you could not have escaped Freud in the literary world'.[95] But which Freud? In the same years that modernist writers were

[93] Though compare also Jung, 'Wotan', *Civilization in Transition*, *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Volume 10* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970) for a description of Nazism as the welling up of an archetypal pattern from the past – that of Odin, the storm-bringer. See also, Paul Bishop, 'Thomas Mann and C.G. Jung, in Paul Bishop, ed, *Jung in Contexts: A Reader* (London: Routledge, 1999).

[94] Mann, 'Freud', p. 115.

[95] Bryher, Letter to Susan Stanford Freeman, October 1, 1971, in *Psyche Reborn: The Emergence of H.D.* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 1981), p.18.

beginning to talk in terms of sublimation, repression and neurosis, Freud's model was already shifting – first in his metapsychological explorations of the war years (including the development of the concept of narcissism) and then, by the early 1920s, towards the later topographical structure of the psyche in terms of the id, the ego and the superego, as well as the concept of the death drive. By the end of the 20s, then, there were yet new Freud's to discover, as well as the first glimmerings of further radical departures in psychoanalytic theory which would foreground not so much sexuality and the dream, in the classical Freudian sense, but phantasy, destruction and paranoia. The modernism of the 30s, then, already sees the emergence of quite different engagements with psychoanalytic ideas, than those addressed so far. A prime example of this is in the work of the surrealist Salvador Dali, who probably read *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* in the late 1920s and began to fuse that works conceptualisation of the death drive with his own pre-existing interest in the imagery of excrement and bodily corruption.[96] At the same time, Dali's development of a 'critical paranoiac' method in his artworks, concerning the creation of images capable of double readings, impacted on the young Jacques Lacan who was associating with the circles of surrealism at this time, and who came across Dali's article 'The Rotting Donkey' in 1930.[97] According to Elizabeth Roudinesco, this paper, and subsequent meetings with Dali, made it possible for Lacan to break with the theory of

[96] See Dawn Ades, 'Morphologies of Desire', in Michael Raeburn, ed., *Salvador Dali: The Early Years* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1994) and Margaret Iversen, *Beyond Pleasure: Freud, Lacan, Barthes* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007).

[97] Salvador Dali, 'L'Âne pourri', *La Femme Visible* (Paris: Editions Surréalistes, 1930).

constitutionalism and develop a new understanding of psychosis, to be aired in his doctoral thesis on paranoid psychosis published in 1932.[98]

On a different front, much recent work on psychoanalysis and modernism has shifted its focus from the influence of Freud to that of the young Melanie Klein, who published throughout the 1920s and who by the early to mid-1930s had begun to develop a conceptual focus on mourning and anxiety in the earliest years of infancy. For Lyndsey Stonebridge, the death drive and destruction insistently 'curl around our consciousness of the early twentieth century'.[99] Such narratives of modernism through the lens of Klein, rather than Freud or Jung, have seemed increasingly compelling, not just because of the demonstrable overlap between Klein's early work and that of British modernism (Klein was after all based in London from 1926), but also because of the way Klein's concern with hostility, mourning and internal fragmentation, tie in so successfully with modernist preoccupations – during and between the wars – as well as with modernist experiment with fragmentation at the level of aesthetic practices.[100] While the psychoanalytic criticism of modernist literary texts in classical

[98] See Elizabeth Roudinesco, *Jacques Lacan* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997), pp.31-2.

[99] Lyndsey Stonebridge, *The Destructive Element: British Psychoanalysis and Modernism* (London: Routledge, 1998), p.1.

[100] See also, Jacqueline Rose, *Why War? – Psychoanalysis, Politics, and the Return to Melanie Klein* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993); John Phillips and Lyndsey Stonebridge, ed., *Reading Melanie Klein* (London: Routledge, 1998); Esther Sanchez-Pardo, *Cultures of the Death Drive: Melanie Klein and Modernist Melancholia* (Duke University Press, 2003).

Freudian terms has long seemed to be in eclipse (eclipsed most markedly by the influence of Jacques Lacan on literary theory from the 1970s onwards),[101] new psychoanalytic readings of modernism, and archaeologies of modernist contact with psychoanalysis, are still in the process of unfolding. As in certain models of therapy itself, the narration of psychoanalysis in the 1920s and 30s, is still being unearthed and being re-invented.

[101] See, for instance, Elizabeth Wright, *Psychoanalytic Criticism: A Reappraisal* (Cambridge: Polity, 1998), and Ellmann, *Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism.*

Works Cited

Abel, Elizabeth. *Virginia Woolf and the Fictions of Psychoanalysis* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1989).

Adorno, Theodor and Walter Benjamin. *The Complete Correspondence 1928-1940* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999).

Aragon, Louis. *Paris Peasant* (London: Pan, 1980).

Auden, W. H. 'Psychology and Art To-day', in Edward Mendelson, ed., *Prose: Volume I, 1926-1938* (London: Faber and Faber, 1996) pp.93-105..

Bahun, Sanja. 'Virginia Woolf and Psychoanalytic Theory', *Virginia Woolf in Context*, ed. Jane Goldman and Bryony Randall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press: 1999).

--- *The Correspondence of Walter Benjamin 1910-1940* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

--- *Selected Writings, Volume 2: 1927-1934* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999).

--- *Selected Writings, Volume 4: 1938-1940* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003).

Bion, W.R. *A Memoir of the Future* (London: Karnac Books, 1991).

Bishop, Paul, ed., *Jung in Contexts: A Reader* (London: Routledge, 1999).

Breton, André. *Communicating Vessels* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997).

--- 'Interview du Professeur Freud', *Les Pas Perdu* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969).

--- *Manifestoes of Surrealism* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1972).

Dali, Salvador. 'L'Âne pourri', *La Femme Visible* (Paris: Editions Surréalistes, 1930).

Ellis, David. 'Lawrence and the Biological Psyche', *D.H. Lawrence: Centenary Essays*, ed, Kalnins (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1986).

Esman, Aaron. 'Italo Svevo and the First Psychoanalytic Novel', *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 82, pp.1225-1233.

Ellmann, Maud, ed., *Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism* (London: Longman, 1994).

Ferrer, Daniel. *Virginia Woolf and the Madness of Language* (London: Routldege, 1990).

Freud, S., *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Volume XII (1911-1913) (London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1955).

Friedman, Susan Stanford, ed. *Analyzing Freud: Letters of H.D., Bryher, and Their Circle* (New York: New Directions, 2002).

--- *Psyche Reborn: The Emergence of H.D.* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 1981).

H.D. *Collected Poems 1912-1944* (New York: New Directions, 1983).

--- *Tribute to Freud*, rev. ed. (Boston: David R Godine, 1974)

Iversen, Margaret. *Beyond Pleasure: Freud, Lacan, Barthes* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007).

Hinshelwood, R. 'Virginia Woolf and Psychoanalysis', *International Review of Psycho-Analysis*, 17 (1990) pp.367-371.

Hoops, Reinald. *Der Einfluß der Psychoanalyse auf die englische Literatur* (Heidelberg: Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1934).

Jung, C.G. '"Ulysses": A Monologue', *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature, The Collected Works of C.G. Jung Volume 15* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971), pp.109-134.

--- 'Wotan', *Civilization in Transition, The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Volume 10* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), 179-193.

Keynes, John Maynard. *A Treatise on Money, Volume II: The Applied Theory of Money* (London: MacMillan, 1930).

Kuttner, A.B. ''Sons and Lovers': A Freudian Appreciation', *Psychoanalytic Review*, 3, (1916).

Lawrence, D.H. *Fantasia of the Unconscious* and *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975).

--- *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume II: June 1913-October 1916* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1981).

--- *Sons and Lovers* (London: Heinemann, 1974).

Leppmann, Wolfgang. *Rilke: A Life* (New York: Fromm International, 1984).

Lewis, Wyndham. *The Art of Being Ruled*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1926)

Mann, Thomas. 'Freud and the Future', *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, No. 37 (1952).

Mansfield, Katherine. 'Ask No Questions', in John Middleton Murry, ed., *Novels and Novelists* (London: Constable, 1930), pp.274-9.

Mendelson, Edward. *W.H. Auden, A Biography* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1981).

Neumann, Erich. *Creative Man: Five Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979).

Pierre, José, ed., *Investigating Sex: Surrealist Discussions 1928-1932* (London: Verso, 1992).

Phillips, John, and Lyndsey Stonebridge, ed., *Reading Melanie Klein* (London: Routledge, 1998).

Polizzotti, Mark. *Revolution of the Mind: The Life of André Breton* (London: Bloomsbury, 1995).

Pound, Ezra and Wyndham Lewis. *Pound/Lewis: The Letters of Ezra Pound and Wyndham Lewis* (London: Faber and Faber, 1985).

Raeburn, Michael, ed. *Salvador Dali: The Early Years* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1994).

Raitt, Suzanne. *May Sinclair: A Modern Victorian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Rank, Otto. *The Double: A Psychoanalytic Study* (London: Maresfield Library, 1989).

Rilke, Rainer Maria and Lou Andreas Salomé. *The Correspondence* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006).

Rose, Jacqueline. *Why War? – Psychoanalysis, Politics, and the Return to Melanie Klein* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993).

Roudinesco, Elizabeth. *Jacques Lacan* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997).

Sanchez-Pardo, Esther. *Cultures of the Death Drive: Melanie Klein and Modernist Melancholia* (Duke University Press, 2003).

Sinclair, May. Contribution to 'Christmas Symposium on Dreams, Ghosts and Fairies', *Bookman* (December 1923), pp.142-9.

--- 'Clinical Lectures on Symbolism and Sublimation', I, *Medical Press*, (Aug 9, 1916) and II, *Medical Press*, (Aug 16, 1916).

--- *A Defence of Idealism* (London: MacMillan and Co, 1917).

--- *Mary Oliver: A Life* (London: Virago, 1980).

--- 'The Novels of Dorothy Richardson', *Egoist*, 5, (Apr. 1918), pp.57-9.

--- *The Three Brontës* (London: Hutchinson, 1912).

Stonebridge, Lyndsey. *The Destructive Element: British Psychoanalysis and Modernism* (London: Routledge, 1998).

Strachey, James and Alix Strachey. *Bloomsbury/Freud: The Letters of James and Alix Strachey 1924-1925*, ed. Perry Meisel and Walter Kendrick (London: Chatto and Windus, 1986).

Strachey, Lytton. *The Really Interesting Question and Other Papers* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972).

Stragnell, S. 'A Study in Sublimations', *Psychoanalytic Review*, 10, (1923).

Szasz, Thomas. *'My Madness Saved Me': The Madness and Marriage of Virginia Woolf* (Transaction Publisher, 2006).

Turner, John. 'David Eder: Between Freud and Jung', *D.H.Lawrence Review*, 27, 2-3, pp.289-309.

Woolf, Leonard. 'Freud's *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*', in S.P.Rosenbaum, ed., *A Bloomsbury Group Reader* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993), pp.189-191.

Woolf, Virginia. *The Diary of Virginia Woolf: Volume I 1915-1919* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1983).

--- *Moments of Being: Unpublished Autobiographical Writings* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1976).

--- *The Question of Things Happening: The Letters of Virginia Woolf, Volume II: 1912-1922* (London: The Hogarth Press: 1976).

Wright, Elizabeth. *Psychoanalytic Criticism: A Reappraisal* (Cambridge: Polity, 1998).