

UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN, TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

**Modernism Processing Psychoanalysis:
Freud, Lawrence, Nin, Joyce**

Genevieve Sartor

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for Doctorate of Philosophy

School of English

Trinity College Dublin

2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	v
Summary	vi
Introduction <i>Psychoanalysis, Process, and the Territory of the Literary</i>	1
Chapter One <i>Sigmund Freud: Between Science and the Literary</i>	19
1.1 Positivism, Charcot, and Freud's Early Work	24
1.2 <i>Studies on Hysteria</i> : Language, Talking, Sexuality	35
1.3 "Project for a Scientific Psychology" as Paratextual Workbook	46
1.4 Self-Analysis Through Dreamdrafts: <i>The Interpretation of Dreams</i>	56
Conclusion	74
Chapter Two <i>D.H. Lawrence: The Pristine Unconscious, Blood Wisdom, and Aesthetic Purpose</i>	76
2.1 Lawrence's Psychoanalytic Beginnings: "The Religion of the Blood"	80
2.2 The Psychoanalytic Works: in Defence of the Literary	92
2.3 The Psychoanalytic Works as Paratextual Trial Pieces	110
2.4 A Paratextual Reading of <i>Lady Chatterley's Lover</i>	120
Conclusion	136
Chapter Three <i>Anais Nin: Editorial Diarist of the Female Unconscious</i>	139
3.1 Early Edits: Nin's Green and Red Notebooks, <i>Henry and June</i>	143
3.2 Psychoanalysis, and the Unexpurgated <i>Incest</i>	157
3.3 Otto Rank, Creative Will, Diary as Intertextual Resource	167
3.4 Revising Drafts of the Self in <i>House of Incest</i>	182
Conclusion	193
Chapter Four <i>James and Lucia Joyce: Literary Genetics and the Mind of the Text</i>	196
4.1 A Literary Biography of Lucia Joyce	199
4.2 Lucia's Dance Career, First Breakdown, Illuminated Letters	205
4.3 Psychoanalysis, Genetic Criticism, and <i>The Mime</i>	216
4.4 Lucia's Treatments 1934–1936, <i>transition 23</i> , and <i>Storiella</i>	226
4.5 "Lisp!": Genetic Connections between II.2 and IV of <i>Finnegans Wake</i>	238

Conclusion	251
Conclusion <i>Redefining the Territory of the Literary</i>	253
Bibliography	260

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express thanks to my supervisor Christopher Morash, who contributed to the vision and the development of this thesis. His expertise on modernist texts, the intellectual climate of the early 20th century, and contemporary scholarship on these topics was essential for cultivating its objectives. I am grateful to Trinity College Dublin for supporting my work with the internally allocated Ussher Award from 2015 to 2018. Receiving this award was an honour and allowed me unhindered concentration on the early development of my material, which could not have been accomplished otherwise. I am also appreciative of the ongoing support given by the James Joyce Foundation, Zürich, and director Fritz Senn. A two-month fellowship at the Zürich Foundation contributed to some of the archival research presented in this thesis. Resounding thanks are also owed to Finn Fordham, Julia Brünhe, Creston Davis, Robert Brazeau, and Tim Conley who read various chapter drafts, invited me to present talks on my research at their home institutions, and addressed questions and concerns that I had during the writing of this dissertation.

SUMMARY

This dissertation's focus is grounded in literary modernism's engagement with psychoanalytic theory and its therapeutic applications in the early 20th century. It examines how the ubiquity of Freud's theories at that time contributed to the compositional development of modernist texts by D.H. Lawrence, Anaïs Nin, and James Joyce. The comparative approach in this thesis deviates from scholarship on modernism and psychoanalysis that applies psychoanalytic concepts to reading literature and literary authors symptomatically, or to psychoanalyse authors to form a psychobiography. Instead, this dissertation contributes to existing scholarship through an original process-based and paratextual approach. It analyses the exchange between modernist literary texts and psychoanalytic theory at the level of textual process prior to publication. It argues that expanding the possibilities of paratextual analysis as a method can enhance our ability to analyse how literary texts challenge the foundations of psychoanalytic interpretation; namely, its focus on the instability of language, memory, and symbolic or aesthetic representation.

Modernist writing was composed in Freud's wake, and in studying the modernist text compositionally, we can navigate how authors Lawrence, Nin, and Joyce intervened, responded to, and challenged psychoanalytic concepts in writing and over time. A distinguishing feature of this study is that, rather than concentrating on final published texts to form an analysis between theory and narrative, it focuses on how material peripheral to complete texts can foster a durational understanding of how textual process runs parallel to modernism's engagement with psychoanalysis. It examines different forms of literary media, such as notebooks, letters, journals, essays, drafts, and illustrations. A text-based approach homes in on authors who spurned psychoanalytic interpretations of their work during their lifetime or who engaged in psychoanalytic therapy at the time of writing. There is an intellectual reciprocity between modernist literary authors and psychoanalysts, who brushed shoulders during the early 20th century, that can be developed through a grounded focus on the text.

Chapter one begins by setting out an initial problem we will first consider; the dilemma between scientific and aesthetic theories of the self. Freud's early developments leading up to *The Interpretation of Dreams* started with mentorship under Jean-Martin Charcot from 1885 to 1886. The positivist approach Freud learnt when studying under Charcot at the Salpêtrière was based on the outward observation of patients. Freud would reject Charcot's theses, particularly his endorsement of hereditary degeneracy, while working with Josef Breuer on *Studies on Hysteria*. This pivotal text indicates Freud's early focus on the significance of language, trauma, and memory in action, and the possible alleviation of neurotic symptoms by way of "talking out." Freud's abandoned "Project for a Scientific Psychology," viewed in this thesis as a paratextual workbook, shows how he struggled to form a conciliation between scientific psychology and the aesthetic methods of psychoanalytic interpretation. He abandoned these efforts shortly before his father died in 1886. This event provoked Freud's self-analysis, which, as argued, was a "writing cure." He analysed his dreams like drafts of a text, and in doing so was his most successful patient. The insights Freud gleaned in his self-analysis form the conceptual basis of *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

Literary process is engrained in psychoanalytic theory, though Freud sought to establish psychoanalysis as a scientific discipline despite frequently using literary texts, rather than epistemological data, to evince many of his claims. Chapter two begins with how D.H. Lawrence railed against interpreting literary works for evidence that might establish the validity of psychoanalytic concepts. Reviews of *Sons and Lovers* deemed

it to be an Oedipal text indistinguishable from Lawrence's own biography. Lawrence not only strongly disagreed with such readings, he also wrote two now largely forgotten essays that reject psychoanalytic theory and its interpretive methods in general. In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* Lawrence put forth original concepts meant to replace Freudian theory. In considering these texts from an aesthetic perspective, it is argued that they are draft-like resources that can enhance our conceptual understanding of his fictional works. Lawrence's late literature, when read in conjunction with his attempts to construct a new psychology, illustrate his belief in aesthetic representation attuned to the experiencing body, which he believed could revise or even replace psychoanalytic concepts.

Chapter three focuses on Anaïs Nin and her diaries, specifically the intertextual process at work between editions of her various edited journals and the unexpurgated versions of her diaries. The fairly recent publication of *Incest*, the second unexpurgated diary, reveals how Nin cultivated her own self-representation as a fastidious editor. *Incest* includes how Nin breached the incest taboo with her father in 1933, which allows a new way to approach how Nin sought therapy with Otto Rank shortly thereafter. We will see that their analytic sessions established her methods as a writer imbricated in Rank's theories of creative will. She sublimated her affair with her father into writing her first work of fiction: *House of Incest*. This text, which she considered to be the "seed of all my work," is derived from an intertextual use of her diaries as material for revising her experience and self-understanding. This process came to define one of her principal ambitions: to portray the unconscious of women.

Chapter four shifts from Nin's focus on her father to a father's focus on his daughter: Joyce was preoccupied with his daughter Lucia's mental instability that began with her first breakdown in 1932. In an effort to cure what was commonly diagnosed as schizophrenia, Joyce had Lucia work on a series of illustrations to accompany his work: a deluxe edition of *Pomes Penyeach*, and two pre-publication fragments of *Finnegans Wake*—*The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies* and *Storiella as She is Syung*. In focusing on these works, this chapter applies genetic criticism to show how Joyce's efforts to understand Lucia is not only visible in his attempt to collaborate with his daughter to enact a "writing cure," but that her mental condition features in the text and contributes to its conclusion. It compares content in *Storiella as She is Syung* with the last emendations that Joyce made to chapter II.2 in *Finnegans Wake* to argue that a genetic study of Lucia's impact on *Finnegans Wake* can allow us to reassess that text as well as the value of genetic criticism as a process-based methodology.

To conclude, this dissertation evaluates how the challenges psychoanalysis poses to reading literature have been developed through focus on textual process and suggests what this might mean for future study.

Introduction:

Psychoanalysis, Process, and the Territory of the Literary

I try to be among the number of those who write as they progress and who progress as they write.

—Saint Augustine¹

This dissertation first began with a fairly straightforward proposition: that studying James Joyce’s literary process leading up to the publication of *Finnegans Wake* can allow us to examine how his daughter’s deteriorating mental health affected the composition of that text over time. The subject of Lucia Joyce’s alleged schizophrenia and her influence on Joyce’s work has instigated much speculative conjecture and popular debate in recent years.² By establishing a manuscript-based approach for exploring how she might have impacted her father’s writing, the ambition was to formulate a tangible confluence between genetic literary process, biography, and the burgeoning developments of psychoanalytic theory and practice in the early 20th century. However, and as the research progressed, it became evident that analysing the textual process of other modernist writers who were directly impacted by psychoanalytic theory could further generate new ways to consider the intersection between psychoanalysis and process-based textual analysis. This dissertation is the culmination of that research and includes readings of D.H. Lawrence and Anaïs Nin as well as James Joyce, extending the original genetic method to include other paratextual process documents, both published and unpublished. It examines how an awareness of the challenges posed by psychoanalysis shaped the development of key modernist texts and argues that a focus on writerly process offers advantages that can reframe our understanding of how literature challenges psychoanalysis.

This work contributes to a longstanding tradition of scholarship on literary modernism and psychoanalytic theory while offering something original by moving beyond a

¹ Saint Augustine, *Omnia Opera* (Paris: Gaume, 1836), 8: 1218. Translation by Patrick Mahony, “Psychoanalysis—Writing Cure,” in *Writing in Psychoanalysis*, eds. Emma Piccioli, Pier Luigi Rossi, and Antonio Alberto Semi (London: Karnac Books, 1996), 14.

² The recent surge of public interest in Lucia has largely coincided with the expiration of copyright on Joyce’s works in 2011. See Gordon Bowker’s article “An end to bad heir days: The posthumous power of the literary estate,” *The Independent* (January 2012), which discusses the topic and its significance for Joycean scholars. A discussion of recent scholarship and summary of present, public interest in Lucia Joyce is provided at length in chapter four.

tendency to read the literary work as symptom. There has been much scholarship done on how this association began. Elizabeth Abel describes the role played by Leonard and Virginia Woolf in the 1920s that disseminated English translations of Freud's work to form a "singularly literary version of psychoanalysis."³ E. Ann Kaplan traces the connections between literature and psychoanalytic interpretation in Germany in the 1930s, when literary works became "treated like a record of symptoms" that frequently "amount[ed] to the neglect of specifically literary qualities."⁴ As we shall see, D.H. Lawrence strongly retaliated against psychoanalytic interpretations of his work during his lifetime, and Anaïs Nin insisted upon her own method for portraying the "female unconscious" in her diaries that deviates from traditional psychoanalytic principals.⁵ Italo Svevo and others have argued that Joyce largely ignored psychoanalytic theory, yet it is evident that Joyce attempted to understand his daughter Lucia's condition and frequent long-term institutional care while he was writing and revising *Finnegans Wake*.⁶ Although the tendency to read literature for symptomatic significance has been well established, a principal feature of this dissertation is its focus on the autonomy of the modernist author, whose literary process dynamically engaged psychoanalytic theory and practice at the time of writing.

Hélène Cixous's, Jacques Derrida's, and Jacques Lacan's work on James Joyce provide examples of a poststructuralist tradition that has repurposed Freud's methods of reading literature to develop the theoretical possibilities offered by psychoanalytic interpretation. These canonical figures have, like Freud, used literary texts to cultivate conceptual insight into the self and the "symptom" through the analysis of literary texts.⁷ However, and as Geert Lernout pointedly notes in *The French Joyce*, such readings often forgo fidelity to the literary text, regarding the author and their work as

³ Elizabeth Abel, *Virginia Woolf and the Fictions of Psychoanalysis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 15.

⁴ E. Ann Kaplan, "From Plato's Cave to Freud's Screen," in *Psychoanalysis and Cinema*, ed. E. Ann Kaplan (Los Angeles: The American Film Institute, 1990), 2.

⁵ Anaïs Nin, *Mirages: The Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin (1939–1947)*, ed. Paul Herron (Ohio: Swallow Press, 2013), 305.

⁶ Italo Svevo cited in Rose Maria Bollettieri's "The Importance of Trieste in Joyce's Work, with Reference to His Knowledge of Psycho-Analysis," *James Joyce Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (Spring 1970): 181.

⁷ See Hélène Cixous, *The Exile of James Joyce*, trans. Sally Purcell and David Lewis (London: John Calder Publishers, 1976); Jacques Lacan, *Seminar XXIII: The Sinthome* (1975–1976), ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. A.R. Price (New York: Polity, 2016).

material for extrapolating the *theoretical* significance of published literature.⁸ It is problematic, as Lernout rightly argues, that the important and unique attributes of literary composition, aesthetic style, and author intent become neglected in such interpretations. Building upon Lernout's argument, this dissertation claims that it can be especially short-sighted to form theoretical concepts based on modernist literary texts composed by writers who historically, and critically, were engaged with psychoanalytic theory and clinical practice while they were writing. As such, and as is argued here, there is ample precedence for reading the development of the modernist text as an opportunity to revisit, and question, psychoanalytic concepts in relation to literary process. This dissertation seeks to investigate how the *composition* of the modernist text offers insight into the challenges that psychoanalysis poses to literature. It explores how attention to literary process can build upon the methodological approach of paratextual and literary genetic scholarship to innovate the way we think about what literary process offers to psychoanalysis.

Some residual debates continue on the topic of Freud's place in contemporary psychology.⁹ However, psychoanalytic theory (and its post-structural developments) maintains its place for interpretive value in the humanities, and for studying literary modernism in particular. Characteristics that define modernist literature include what John Fletcher and Malcom Bradbury call "narrative inversion."¹⁰ Aesthetic modes of literary representation, such as free indirect discourse, stream-of-consciousness, and dream narratives, self-reflexively draw attention to dynamics of the literary text, characterising the stylistic uniqueness of modernist literature. These qualities depict, as Violeta Sotirova has discussed, alternative states of consciousness, and accordingly provide fertile ground for interdisciplinary, psychoanalytic interpretations.¹¹ Scholars

⁸ Although Lernout does not focus on the implications between textual process and psychoanalytic theory, he offers a compelling critique of French interpretations of James Joyce's work by Cixous, Derrida, and Lacan. He ultimately criticises a number of these readings due to "questionable translations, inaccurate quotations, and shaky biographical evidence" in *The French Joyce* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 87.

⁹ For a summary of such ongoing debates, see Robert F. Bornstein, "Reconnecting Psychoanalysis to Mainstream Psychology: Challenges and Opportunities," *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 22, no. 3 (2005): 323–340.

¹⁰ John Fletcher and Malcom Bradbury, "The Inverted Novel," in *Modernism: A Guide to European Literature (1890–1930)*, eds. Malcom Bradbury and James McFarlane (London: Penguin, 1991), 395.

¹¹ See Violeta Sotirova, *Consciousness in Modernist Fiction: A Stylistic Study* (New York: Palgrave Mcmillan, 2013). Associations between modernist fiction, consciousness, and stylistics have recently extended to the burgeoning field of literary cognitive studies. An extensive and informative summary of these developments are offered by Sowan Park's "The Dilemma of Cognitive Literary Studies" in

from Lionel Trilling to Shoshana Felman have examined the ways that modernist literature engages psychoanalytic concepts and vice versa.¹² Indeed, Stephen Marcus has argued that Freud himself can be considered a literary modernist: “Freud’s case histories are a new form of literature—they are creative narratives that include their own analysis and interpretation.”¹³

Jean-Michael Rabaté’s work provides ongoing resources that blend the study of psychoanalysis with the study of modernist literature.¹⁴ From *The Ghosts of Modernity* in 1996, Rabaté has reframed key debates over modernism in terms of concepts of the return of the repressed that imbricates psychoanalytic theory in literature.¹⁵ A vast wealth of scholarly texts on literature and psychoanalysis make evident that the unconventional narratives of modernist literature can elaborate psychoanalytic theory’s preoccupation with the self as interpreted through language. David Lodge argues “literature is a record of human consciousness, the richest and most comprehensive we have.”¹⁶ In focusing on the multifaceted process of literary composition; i.e. the extensive, pre-published, and paratextual materials of the modernist text, we can methodologically approach *how* modernist literary process extends aspects of psychoanalysis’s interpretation of narrative consciousness in tangible and productive ways.

English Studies: The State of the Discipline, Past, Present, and Future, ed. Helena Goodwyn et al. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015): 67–81.

¹² Correlations between psychoanalysis and literature are extensive, however notable titles include the classic early text, Lionel Trilling’s extract “Freud and Literature” in *The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society* (New York: New York Review of Books, 2008) originally published in 1940, and Steve Marcuse’s “Freud and Dora: Story, History, Case History,” *Freud: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Perry Meisel (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1981), and Shoshana Felman’s work, referenced below in relation to her essay on Henry James’s *Turn of the Screw*, which is included in her invaluable edited volume *Literature and Psychoanalysis: The Question of Reading: Otherwise* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982). More recent publications that provide broad surveys of psychoanalysis and literature are Ruth Parkin-Gounelas *Literature and Psychoanalysis: Intertextual Readings* (London: Palgrave, 2001), and Jeremy Trampling’s *Literature and Psychoanalysis* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012).

¹³ Steven Marcus, “Freud and Dora: Story, History, Case History,” *Freud: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Perry Meisel (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1981): 210.

¹⁴ Jean-Michel Rabaté’s interdisciplinary fluency frequently focuses on Lacanian theory, and a critical resource that explores Lacan and modernist literature is *Jacques Lacan: Psychoanalysis and the Subject of Literature* (New York: Palgrave, 2001)

¹⁵ Jean-Michel Rabaté describes the exchange between literary studies and psychoanalysis in the introduction to his recently edited volume *The Cambridge Introduction to Literature and Psychoanalysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

¹⁶ David Lodge, *Consciousness and the Novel: Collected Essays* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 10.

In his influential study, *Reading for the Plot*, Peter Brooks describes psychoanalysis as “a primarily narrative art,” concerned with stories, storytelling, and the interpretation of stories.¹⁷ Brooks’s title indicates how “reading for the plot” can take Freudian theory as an interpretive method for deciphering narrative or plot in relation to connections that emerge, much in the way that Freud puts it in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, through reoccurrence and points of “psychical intensity.”¹⁸ For Brooks, Freud’s methods offer a framework for analysing literature, though he makes clear that this should not be done “in the attempt to psychoanalyse authors or readers or characters in narrative.”¹⁹ It is rather that in “attempting to superimpose psychic functioning on textual functioning, we may discover something about how textual dynamics work and something about their psychological equivalents.”²⁰ In spite of Brooks’s reservations, the temptation to use literary works to psychoanalyse the author has been strong. In chapters two and three, we will review examples of how studies on D.H. Lawrence’s *Sons and Lovers*, and Anaïs Nin’s journals, frequently apply psychobiographical readings between author and text.

Formulating a “psychobiography” of literary authors has been influenced by Freud’s own interpretations of literature and myth. With regards to the former, this approach risks establishing tenuous, speculative connections between author and text that we will see in relation to recent scholarship on Lucia and James Joyce. It is argued that it is particularly problematic to apply psychoanalytic interpretations to authors such as Lawrence, Nin, and Joyce, given each strongly objected to or critically engaged with psychoanalytic interpretations of their work, a situation made even more complex for Nin because of her own psychoanalytic therapy and critical approach to it. At the same time, such considerations inevitably lead us into the complex, and sometimes fraught, area of modernist writing and autobiography, a topic that has been written on at length, and with compelling clarity by Georges Gusdorf and James Olney, among others.²¹

¹⁷ Peter Brooks, *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), xiv. This passage paraphrases a citation in Helen Tookey, *Anaïs Nin, Fictionality and Femininity: Playing a Thousand Roles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 47.

¹⁸ Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams (First Part), Standard Edition, Volume IV*, ed. James Strachey, from *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (London: Vintage, 2001), 306.

¹⁹ Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 90.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ The topic of autobiography, fiction, and particularly modernist fiction has been published on extensively. Some key resources (notably by feminist literary scholars) build upon James Olney’s work on autobiography and literature. His work in *Memory and Narrative: The Weave of Life Writing*

Susan Nalbantian's recently published *Aesthetic Autobiography: From Life to Art in Marcel Proust, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf and Anaïs Nin* develops Olney's work. Nalbantian makes a strong case for the ways in which the creative aspects of autobiographical writing are essential to viewing autobiography as a genre for literary study and, like Shari Benstock, Nalbantian establishes how Olney's work can be particularly relevant to feminist studies.²² However, in its focus on the correlations between biography and textual process, this thesis avoids an autobiographical line of study. The potential speculative pitfalls implicit in forming autobiographical connections between author and text, much like applying symptomatic interpretations to literary works, risks compromising the authors it studies. As such, this dissertation distances itself from analysing the modernist text in relation to the symptom and autobiography.

In the introduction to *Literature and Psychoanalysis* Shoshana Felman argues for the "implication" rather than the "application" of psychoanalysis in literary studies. Felman explains how the task presents itself by

...bringing analytical questions to bear upon literary questions, *involving* psychoanalysis in the scene of literary analysis, the interpreter's role would have to be, not to *apply* to the text an acquired science, a preconceived knowledge, but to act as a go-between, to *generate implications* between literature and psychoanalysis—to explore, bring to light and articulate the various (indirect) ways in which the two domains do indeed *implicate each*

(Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1998) develops the autobiographical in relation to Samuel Beckett. In a recent, republication of his work *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), originally published in 1980, the importance of the autobiographical as literary genre is argued with compelling clarity. Feminist scholars, however, have built upon much of Olney's work to include how female writers, such as Nin, blur autobiography with fiction. For examples dedicated to such research, see Shari Benstock, "The Female Self Engendered: Autobiographical Writing and Theories of Selfhood," *Women's Studies* 20, no. 1 (Fall 1991): 5–14; and Susan Nalbantian *Aesthetic Autobiography: From Life to Art in Marcel Proust, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf and Anaïs Nin* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1994). Clare Oropeza provides a recent and extensive summary of work on autobiography and literature, as well as its relevance to feminist scholarship, in *Anaïs Nin: A Myth of Her Own* (New York: Routledge, 2019).

²² Nalbantian frequently discounts Freud in her work. This is discussed by Susan Pavloska in her review of Nalbantian's book; see Susan Pavloska, "Aesthetic Autobiography: From Life to Art in Marcel Proust, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, and Anaïs Nin [Review]," *Biography* 18, no. 3 (Summer 1995): 265–267.

other, each one finding itself enlightened, informed, but also affected, displaced, by the other.²³

Felman's distinction between *application* and *implication* opens up interdisciplinary possibilities for reading literature within the context of psychoanalysis; she suggests that the *implications* of psychoanalytic theory can be intertextually, and thus reciprocally, developed with the narratives of literary texts. This endeavour can enhance and "bring to light" the more literary *caveats* of psychoanalytic theory in literature. However, Felman's distinction also pairs "application" with methods of "acquired science," which she explains should be avoided in the process of comparatively analysing the intersections between literature and psychoanalysis.

In seeking to generate intertextual discourse between modernist literary texts and psychoanalytic theory (thus examining the implications between the two) this dissertation determines that applied psychoanalytic methods were foundational to the writerly process of the modernist authors focused on. Therefore, the methodological use of intertextuality uses an applied process in a very specific sense: it develops the possibilities of a manuscript-based approach to examine the paratextual materials of the "works in progress" of modernists who were directly influenced by psychoanalytic theory while writing. This comparative study, between psychoanalysis, modernist literature, and genetic literary scholarship, stays within the historical context of literary modernism. Its methodological approach is vastly different from, for example, Maud Ellmann's more theoretical and retroactive *implications* in *The Nets of Modernism*, which interprets Felman's statement, quoted above, as guidelines for ways in which: "the psychoanalytic critic should attend to the ways in which the literary text invites, resists, pre-empts, and transforms the theories brought to bear upon it."²⁴ Ellmann's focus on the implication of psychoanalytic concepts to published modernist texts is marked by the influence of Felman's now canonical work on Henry James's *Turn of the Screw*.²⁵ Ellmann *implicates* psychoanalytic readings through Henry James, Virginia

²³ Shoshana Felman, "To Open the Question," in *Literature and Psychoanalysis, The Question of Reading: Otherwise*, ed. Shoshana Felman (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), 8–9, author's emphasis.

²⁴ Maud Ellmann, *The Nets of Modernism: Henry James, Virginia Woolf, James Joyce and Sigmund Freud* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 11.

²⁵ See Shoshana Felman, "Turning the Screw of Interpretation," in *Literature and Psychoanalysis*, 94–207.

Woolf, and James Joyce by tracing themes of the navel, scars, and rats as they appear in the texts she examines.²⁶

The Nets of Modernism provides a recent example of scholarly work on modernism and psychoanalysis that shows how its approach differs from the methods used in this thesis, to which we will shortly turn. Ellmann's monograph engages the connection between modernist authors and psychoanalysis to, for example, read Joyce's *Ulysses* in relation to what she calls "skinscapes."²⁷ Ellmann connects Joyce's work to Franz Fanon and Didier Anzieu and implicates race (Fanon) and the concept of the skin-ego (Anzieu) to investigate "the importance of skin."²⁸ She examines how skin disease is "rife" in the "Lotus Eaters" chapter of *Ulysses*, and that this area of the text questions notions of what the "epidermis" constitutes, which she relates to the Freudian ego by way of Anzieu's work on this topic.²⁹ Ellmann's corporeal yet highly conceptual reading, along with her psychoanalytic interpolations, *implicate* theoretical nuances provided by psychoanalytic theory in relation to the published modernist texts she examines. She intertextually implicates psychoanalytic theory in her theoretical approach to reading the final published texts of modernist writers.

Conversely, this thesis, situated within the reciprocal engagement between psychoanalysis and literary modernism occurring in the early 20th century, resists Ellmann's way of implicating the content of psychoanalytic theory within the context of modernism as a narrative that can be analysed retrospectively. A process-based methodology allows us to study the immanent, durational literary process of authors Lawrence, Nin, and Joyce within the modernist context. Each of these writers dynamically incorporated, and deviated from, psychoanalytic theory in their works. In this study, a subterranean approach to how literary process and psychoanalytic interpretation coalesce within the act of writing expand the literary connotations inherent in psychoanalytic interpretation. The challenges that psychoanalysis poses, particularly concerning interpretation of the self through language, impacted the aesthetic strategies of the modernist authors we will examine.

²⁶ Ellmann, *The Nets of Modernism*, 14; 62; 129–128.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 151–166.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 154.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 158–166.

In the original research that established the foundational questions of this project, concerning textual process and the implications of psychoanalysis imbedded in modernist literature, the possibility for establishing how Lucia impacted Joyce's writing aesthetically and *durationally* was pursued. To paraphrase Stanley Fish's work in *Is There a Text in this Class?*, a text is not just a material object, but rather a temporal process.³⁰ Although Fish's reference to temporality is to develop the ways in which readers and interpretive communities create meaning for the text, his insistence on the importance of *temporal* process contributed to establishing the goals this project set for itself. Namely, to find a method for analysing the durational process of textual composition that illuminates the path of its construction. In this dissertation, that focus is cultivated outside of reader-response, poststructural theories, or phenomenological interpretations of extended mind in relation to literature; it instead concentrates on manuscript-based study.

Establishing a process-based method for locating Lucia's influence on the textual development of *Finnegans Wake* began with recent genetic literary scholarship concerning the vast resources of Joyce's paratextual material: drafts, notebooks, letters, pre-publication volumes, and excerpts of that text published in the modernist journal *transition*.³¹ It steadily became clear that little published scholarship had been done on the *genetic* impact of Lucia on Joyce's writing over time. By comparing the work Joyce did prior to the final publication of *Finnegans Wake* as a complete volume *with* Lucia's aesthetic contributions to pre-publication volumes of that text (additionally cross-referenced with biographical information), it became possible—as we shall see in chapter four—to construct a feasible and text-based, genetic argument for how her psychological breakdown and numerous psychoanalytic and medical treatments influenced the development of the text prior to its final publication. However, in expanding the possibilities for a paratextual analysis of other modernist writers

³⁰ Stanley Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

³¹ Archival attention to Joyce's work was established by David Hayman, Michael Groden, Danis Rose, and others who compiled the *James Joyce Archive* in the 1970s. Hans Walter Gabler's *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition*, published in 1984, established the importance of reading the textual development of that work. Geert Lernout, Daniel Ferrer, and Vincent Deane, who edited the *Finnegans Wake* notebooks at Buffalo, furthermore, facilitated scholarly resources for examining editorial emendations and textual developments in Joyce's final text.

influenced by psychoanalytic theory and practice, the scope of manuscript-based studies in relation to modernist texts required a new and dynamic articulation of its definition.

The basic methodological approach of paratextual, avant-textual analysis, which established the foundations of manuscript-based study or genetic criticism, was first introduced in the early 1970s, most notably by French structuralists Gérard Genette, Jean Bellemin-Noël, and Louis Hay. For Genette, the term paratext, most fully developed in his influential study *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, is classified according to materials that surround a main text or book, which include cover art, front and back matter, footnotes, illustrations. Genette defines the paratext as “a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of transaction [...] a threshold.”³² Jean Bellemin-Noël elaborates Genette’s designation of textual resources that surround a body of work, particularly its bibliographic details, under the framework of the “paratextual” through his definition of the *avant-texte*. In *Le Texte et l’avant-texte*, Bellemin-Noël’s definition of the *avant-texte* describes the paratextual in a manner most frequently used in this dissertation. He summarises that studying the *avant-texte* encompasses “the sketches, manuscripts, proofs and ‘variants’—all material which precedes a work and which can form a single textual criticism of that work.”³³ While scholars have always worked with manuscripts, recent developments in genetic criticism allow us to place emphasis on text-as-process that can reanimate the structuralist idea of the paratext, in the current instance, to explore ways that psychoanalytic discourse affected modernist narrative process.

In defining the method of genetic criticism, or studying paratextual resources, Louis Hay describes that “present at the birth of genetic studies [was] the spirit of paradox,” a quality that contributed to why literary, genetic research was initially greeted with scepticism.³⁴ The contradiction or paradox Hay refers to concerns the tenuous line between the study of the aesthetics of a text versus the more “scientific methods” of genetic analysis in studying the evolution of a text. The structural features and organic

³² Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 1–2.

³³ Cited in Oliver David, “The Author at Work in Genetic Criticism,” *Paragraph 25*, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 92.

³⁴ Louis Hay, “La Critique génétique: Origines et perspectives,” in *Essais de critique génétique*, ed. Louis Hay (Paris: Flammarion, 1979), 227.

growth of a text's composition implicate a scientific method that differs from narrative analysis. Dirk Van Hulle writes that Antoine Compagnon and Jean-Yves Tadi on were among the first to question how Hay's definition could be distinguished from textual criticism and scholarly editing, and indeed how genetic and paratextual scholarship is distinguished from attempting to apply scientific methods to analysing texts.³⁵ In avoiding a single, unifying, or reductive theory of genetic criticism, Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden collectively discuss the issue of evading a form of scientific positivism in relation to the literary genetic method and its potential association with a "science of literature."³⁶ They question whether plotting the "genetic" development of a literary text indicates a method that applies forms of scientific inquiry onto literary works.

While not forming a single textual criticism of any of the literary works in this thesis, a study of *avant-textes*, paratexts, and drafts are essential to portraying how the individual authors developed their literary works in relation to psychoanalysis. Therefore, while this dissertation employs methods derived from genetic criticism, it develops its methods by expanding the range of materials it would usually accommodate. In this way, it bears some resemblance to work that Dirk Van Hulle has done in his recent monograph *Modern Manuscripts: The Extended Mind and Creative Undoing*. In *Modern Manuscripts*, Van Hulle emphasises how "evolution is a process that does not go anywhere in particular [...] it implies an unknown outcome."³⁷ He connects the evolution of textual process to a theory of textual evolution that is dynamic and non-reductive. This dissertation contends that the writerly, interpretive process in modernist texts-in-progress influenced by psychoanalytic theory and practice indicate the process of psychological, narrative articulation over time. This means that the focus here is not on the more common approaches to Freud's thought, in terms of ideas such as the incest motive, the ego, the Oedipal complex. Instead, it sequentially develops the writerly nature of Freud's enterprise, particularly in his early work leading up to *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Accordingly, in chapter one, it is argued that Freud's early

³⁵ Luca Crispi and Sam Slote, eds., *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake: A Chapter-by-Chapter Genetic Guide* (Wisconsin Wisconsin University Press, 2007), 36–37.

³⁶ Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, eds., *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-Textes* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 10.

³⁷ Dirk Van Hulle, *Modern Manuscripts: The Extended Mind and Creative Undoing* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 120.

work is preoccupied with exploring consciousness as itself a “work in progress” that not only bears resemblance to methods of literary interpretation and creative process but is recognised by Freud himself as being akin to the inconclusive work of the writer.

This focus guides the way that this dissertation approaches and implements paratextual and genetic criticism. In particular, it means that an awareness that the literary already inhabits psychoanalysis, which must inform any attempt to understand how subsequent writers engaged with the challenge that psychoanalysis posed to the challenge of literature, and vice versa. Stephen Richmond explains how the examination of lived experience operates outside of the validity criteria specific to the scientific method: “science tends to be very good at increasing the *span* of our knowledge, whereas art attempts to increase our *depth* of understanding.”³⁸ Likewise, literary process cultivates depth in our understanding of the self, not least through an aesthetics that attempts to account for durational experience. Like conjured memory, an understanding of the self operates through referential, unstable networks that cannot be simply evaluated or analysed on the basis of a truth test or validity criteria like those required by scientific study. The contention here is that non-scientific forms of knowledge, particularly through language and writing, is inscribed in psychoanalysis (at least insofar as it is connected with Freud) from the outset.

In advance of his categorical insistence on the Oedipal complex for configuring the importance of sexuality and repression on human psychology and culture, Freud’s *The Interpretation of Dreams* defends a system of analysing the mind through symbolic interpretation familiar to textual analysis. As we shall see in chapter one, by Freud’s own admission, analysing the symbolism of dreams to uncover unconscious activity through language represents his highest achievements. In the 1932 preface to the third English edition of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, he elaborates on the singular importance of that text: “it contains...the most valuable of all the discoveries it has been my good fortune to make.”³⁹ Those discoveries were largely based on his own self-analysis. George Makari writes about how, during his self-analysis, Freud “developed techniques, like writing out his dreams, then rewriting them and analysing

³⁸ Stephen Richmond, “Psychoanalysis as Applied Aesthetics,” *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 85, no. 3 (July 2016): 614, author’s emphasis.

³⁹ Sigmund Freud, *SE IV*, xxiii.

the differences between drafts.”⁴⁰ The ultimately creative and writerly process of Freud’s self-analysis was crucial to establishing the groundwork of his “valuable discoveries” presented in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. In short, a study of his self-analysis demonstrates how aesthetic *process*, bound up in writing, is fundamental to the conceptual architecture of psychoanalysis’s methodology, concepts, and the evocative challenges that it poses.

Although the scientific aspirations Freud ultimately had for psychoanalysis have today largely been discredited, the challenges that psychoanalysis poses were strongly felt by the writers who were his near contemporaries, or who wrote in his wake.

Psychoanalytic theory formulates an approach to language meant for qualitatively examining the variability of the self, the dynamic interplay of memory and desire, and the associative impact language has on consciousness. These are, to put it simply, the territory of the literary author. Each chapter of this thesis steadily develops the notion of the paratextual and writerly process in relation to psychoanalytic theory by approaching the question of process from a range of differing perspectives; accordingly, it draws on a range of differing paratexts. Each author represents part of a spectrum that allows us to explore how writerly process can change the way we read psychoanalysis in dialogue with the challenges posed by reading modernist textual process.

This dissertation develops scholarly debate in relation to the works of Lawrence, Nin and Joyce, each who have varying levels of reputation in the modernist canon, and each with a unique and different entanglement in psychoanalytic theory. It thus moves on from a consideration of Freud to a study of Lawrence’s work in chapter two, which begins with his rejection of the impact of psychoanalytic theory. Lawrence’s first public foray into psychoanalytic theory began when he retaliated against psychoanalytic readings of *Sons and Lovers*. Reviews of this seminal text, a “more or less autobiographical” record of his relationship with his mother, most notably by Alfred Kuttner, determined the book to be evidence of his biographical experience that confirmed psychoanalytic theories pertaining to the Oedipus complex.⁴¹ While Oedipal

⁴⁰ George Makari, *Revolution in Mind: The Creation of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Harper Collins, 2009), 75.

⁴¹ James T. Boulton and Andrew Robertson, eds., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume III: 1916–1921* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 526; Alfred Kuttner, “*Sons and Lovers*: A Freudian Appreciation,” *Psychoanalytic Review* 3, no. 3 (July 1916): 295–317.

readings of *Sons and Lovers* have continued to persist, during his lifetime Lawrence combatted such interpretations by attempting to challenge and rewrite central concepts in psychoanalytic theory itself. He wrote two, now largely forgotten, essays on psychoanalysis in the 1920s: *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*.⁴² Though both texts were heavily criticised by T.S. Eliot and other high modernists shortly after publication, the concepts Lawrence put forth in these works indicate his determination to denounce psychoanalytic “ideation” and Freud’s theories of the unconscious and sexuality that have been interpreted in *Sons and Lovers*.⁴³ Although published, it is the contention here that Lawrence’s psychoanalytic texts function as paratexts, in much the same way that drafts (both published and unpublished) of *Finnegans Wake* can be read in terms of process.

Lawrence sought to write a new and dynamic edition or re-transcription of the self, one based on intuition and the experiencing body in his essays on psychoanalysis. As we will explore, the style in which he wrote them allude to his belief that literary aesthetics can uniquely portray a form of non-intellectual knowledge. Although the texts were largely rejected as having little to no scientific value, in this dissertation they are examined as avant-textes to his later fiction. The concepts in the psychoanalytic essays were repurposed in his fictional depictions of sexual love and cultural rejuvenation that followed. We will examine the unfinished novel *Mr. Noon*, which Lawrence was composing while working on the analytic texts, to examine textual and conceptual comparisons between them. We then will turn to a close reading of scenes in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* that enact concepts from his psychoanalytic works. The significance of the essays, when taken as paratextual trial pieces, can enhance our reading of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* as Lawrence’s attempts to catalyse cultural regeneration through aesthetic applications of his independent psychoanalytic theories.

In chapter three, we turn to Anaïs Nin, whose first published volume was a slim study of Lawrence’s work, *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*. She greatly admired the Lawrence’s ability to convey the “white heat” of experience through language. Most

⁴² See Keith Segar, *The Art of D.H. Lawrence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 19–30; Brian Edward, “The Inhibited Temperament in *Sons and Lovers*,” *Style* 44, nos. 1 & 2 (Spring/Summer 2010): 62–78.

⁴³ See Jennifer Spitzer, “On Not Reading Freud: Amateurism, Expertise, and the ‘Pristine Unconscious’ in D.H. Lawrence,” *Modernism/modernity* 21, no. 1 (January 2014): 97, for a summary of Lawrence’s detractors concerning his psychoanalytic texts.

famously known as a diarist, Nin maintained the process of writing several diaries at once, eventually relying on material in the diaries to create her fiction. Her rigorous self-editing led to her technique of repurposing material from her diaries into “fictional texts,” further complicating the relationship between text and paratext. Her unedited diaries have been recently published in a series of unexpurgated volumes. Nin’s use of the diaries as a personal archive to actively draft, re-write and edit her “self” was developed during her time in psychoanalytic therapy with Otto Rank, with whom she also trained as an analyst. Here our engagement with psychoanalysis and textual process is, on one level, quite literal and on another more complex and elusive: Nin underwent therapy with Rank in the 1930s in order to overcome the grip that her father had on her, and to become the writer she longed to be. This directly affected her editorial methods and textual process in the diaries. Hence, Nin’s diaries provide us with a means of studying the intertextual process of writing in a context explicitly framed within the practice (indeed, the therapeutic practice) of psychoanalysis.

In chapter four, we turn to the influence Lucia Joyce had on James Joyce as he was composing *Finnegans Wake*. Joyce largely ignored psychoanalytic theory; however, after Lucia had her first breakdown in 1932, he enlisted her efforts to provide aesthetic contributions to several pre-publication volumes of *Finnegans Wake* in an effort to mitigate her condition. Attention to the *James Joyce Archive*, letters, pre-publication fragments in *transition*, and pre-book publications offer a compendium of paratextual, comparative resources that allow us to plot how Joyce’s traumatic concerns for his daughter are chronologically incorporated into areas of the text prior to its final publication. More than in the previous chapters, Joyce’s process best merits the use of genetic criticism, and we can “genetically” read through draft stage material to examine how areas of the book indicate how Joyce was attempting to understand Lucia through writing, in an effort to remedy her mental disturbances.

Unlike the other authors studied, Joyce had to actively engage aspects of mental illness and therapies offered. The deterioration of Lucia’s mental health led to numerous medical treatments, such as long-term institutional care, psychoanalytic therapy with Carl Jung, saltwater baths, and much more. These efforts did little to cure Lucia. However, Joyce employed Lucia’s illustrative work and participation in his writing as a potential curative act, though she eventually was no longer well enough to contribute. It

will be suggested that Joyce “took over,” by incorporating aspects of her increasingly erratic behaviour, particularly in relation to her abandoned dance career and desire to be married, within the text. Through the study of multiple examples, which show that the “riddle” of solving what ailed her found its way into the multiple plotlines of the text, we can see how biographical events and literary activity occurred simultaneously through a focus on genetic activity. It will be argued that, when her condition became so severe that it seemed to leave only the option of permanent institutionalisation, he wrote the concluding epilogue to *Finnegans Wake* as a rehabilitative and open-ended dedication to her. This conclusion is based on last minute manuscript changes in the text prior to its publication, which are imperceptible in the final text.

In short, it is the contention here that if we are to rethink some of the questions psychoanalysis poses regarding the mind and its relationship to language, and its relationship to literature, we need to examine literary process. Literary art can be understood as more than the creation of fictional artifice or artefacts. Indeed, this way of thinking about literature is inscribed within literary modernism and summarised in Eugene Jolas’s twelve-point manifesto on “The Revolution of the Word” in the journal *transition* in which two of the authors considered here, Joyce and Nin, were published. There Jolas proclaims, along with signatories Kay Boyle, Hart Crane and others, a commitment to the expansion of language and literary aesthetics: “Narrative is not mere anecdote, but the projection of a metamorphosis of reality.”⁴⁴ That is, literary narrative can actively expand or re-transcribe our understanding of consciousness as a metamorphosis of reality, which can impact culture. Psychoanalysis dedicated itself to something similar. By analysing how “[M]emory traces [are] subjugated...to a re-arrangement in accordance with fresh circumstances—to re-transcription,” the psychoanalytic encroaches on modernist literary objectives for revisions of the self.⁴⁵

To that effect, we will first turn to how Freud’s early work fundamentally incorporated the literary leading up to his foundational text, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, before then looking at how Lawrence rejected psychoanalytic readings of his work, attempting

⁴⁴ Eugene Jolas, “Manifesto: The Revolution of the Word,” in *transition workshop*, ed. Eugene Jolas (New York: Vanguard Press, 1949), 173.

⁴⁵ Freud in a letter to Wilhelm Fliess, dated 6 December 1896, cited in Adam Philips, *Becoming Freud: The Making of a Psychoanalyst* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 16.

to create, in his literature, a portrait of the self of pure experience. We will then turn to how Nin used her diaries as open-ended, intertextual resources to engage psychoanalysis, from which she created her first literary work, *House of Incest*. And then, finally, we will study—through genetic scholarship—how Joyce can be understood as seeking alternatives to psychoanalysis while trying to understand his daughter in writing. In focusing on each of these particular modernist writers we can incrementally engage the process of writing as an exploration of consciousness fundamental to psychoanalytic inquiry. We will change the way we read the modernist text through a methodology that expands the terms of genetic critical study to include paratextual materials that expand the question of process as an object of literary inquiry. By proceeding in this way, the aim of this dissertation is to provide a set of answers to a central research question: how can a focus on literary process challenge the way we read the influence psychoanalysis had on key modernist texts?

Chapter One

Sigmund Freud: Between Science and the Literary

It still strikes me myself as strange that the case histories I write should read like short stories and that, as one might say, they lack the serious stamp of science. I must console myself with the reflection that the nature of the subject is evidently responsible for this, rather than any preference of my own.

—Sigmund Freud, *Studies on Hysteria*¹

Freud frequently acknowledged the literary aspects of his psychoanalytic enterprise. However, the question of whether interpreting the “short story” form of case histories occludes the “serious stamp of science” referenced in *Studies on Hysteria* reminds us of how the study of the mind, when Freud came to it, was strongly oriented towards more empirical, and hence more obviously scientific approaches.² One of Freud’s most influential early mentors, the French neurologist Jean-Martin Charcot, was heavily influenced by Auguste Comte’s positivist philosophy, and favoured an empirical and hereditarian approach to studying neurosis.³ It is well established that Freud’s methods took a different course, drawing on the significance of trauma, memory, and sexuality as the root cause of dispositional hysteria, leading him to a theory of repression and the unconscious that can be explored through the “talking cure.”⁴ However, Freud’s theories of the psyche following *Studies on Hysteria* also developed into a focus on writing as a form of interpretation during his rigorous self-analysis and personal dreamwork in the late 1890s. This chapter specifically explores how Freud’s focus on language evolved into the methodologies of interpretation provided in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. This is to emphasise how that text combines scientific inquiry with literary methods in ways that would make his work impossible to ignore for many among the generation of writers to come after him. It also demonstrates that methods of

¹ Sigmund Freud and Josef Breuer, *Studies on Hysteria, Standard Edition Volume II*, ed. James Strachey from *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (London: Vintage, 2001), 160. Subsequent references to the *Standard Edition* cite volume and page number. However, where appropriate, references will include the title of a specific text, such as in the first volume of the *Standard Edition*, which comprises a number of Freud’s pre-psychoanalytic publications, his unpublished drafts, and his letters.

² *Ibid.*

³ For a discussion on Comte’s influence on Charcot, see George Makari, *Revolution in Mind: The Creation of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Harper Collins, 2009), 30.

⁴ “the significance sexuality has for the aetiology of the neurosis.” – see Peter Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Time* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988), 63.

dream interpretation emphasise the value of narrative and symbolic analysis in the exploration of consciousness that cannot be exclusively achieved through scientific methods.⁵

Jean-Michel Rabaté notes that an awareness of the literary qualities of his work made “Freud aware of the lack of scientific status of his texts.”⁶ Freud frequently aligned himself with positivism’s preference for “fact over theory” despite employing methods similar to forms of literary analysis.⁷ In 1930 Freud recorded in his diary that he was “conclusively” overlooked in nominations for the Nobel Prize, and he frequently described a litany of external antagonisms in relation to his insights being scientifically undervalued.⁸ Freud had long been concerned that psychoanalysis did not pass muster as a scientific discipline, and was aware that his early disciples, namely Otto Rank and Carl Jung, had gone on to focus on literary texts, mythology, and visual art for psychoanalytic and archetypal significance.⁹ Yet the crucial differentiating factor in Freud’s methodological approach was in devising a system outside of an exclusively hereditary explanation of neurosis offered by his mentor Charcot. His analytic methods developed a theory of the mind beyond any univocally positivist or materialist definition, and therein lies one of its greatest strengths. While a wealth of contemporary scholarship affirms some of Freud’s described anxieties that psychoanalysis lacked scientific rigour, namely the contemporary “diminishing state of Freudian theory within psychological circles” and its relegation to studies in the humanities, the early

⁵ Biographical material on Freud is extensive. This chapter relies on selective biographical accounts: the abridged version of Ernest Jones’s early *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, eds. Lionel Trilling and Steven Marcus (New York: Basic Books, 1974); Peter Gay’s acclaimed *Freud: A Life for Our Time*; Adam Phillips’s biography on Freud’s early years, *Becoming Freud: The Making of a Psychoanalyst* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014); and Frederick Crews’s substantial disavowal of Jones’s biography and biographical facts on Freud in *Freud: The Making of an Illusion* (New York: Macmillan, 2017) as an important contemporary source. The pagination of Crews’s text is according to the Applebooks e-book edition.

⁶ Rabaté, *The Cambridge Introduction to Literature and Psychoanalysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 17.

⁷ Gay, *A Life*, 51.

⁸ That year the prize would go to Karl Landsteiner for his discovery of human blood groups; see *The Diary of Sigmund Freud 1929–1939: A Chronicle of Events in the Last Decade*, translated, annotated, and edited by Michael Molnar (London: The Hogarth Press, 1992), 86. See also Sigmund Freud, *The Resistances to Psychoanalysis*, cited in Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 35.

⁹ Chapter three of this thesis includes an examination of some of Rank’s theories of the artist, the literary examples from which both Rank took in constituting the “uncanny” or “double,” as well as the break between them by April 1926. However, the thesis does not include a study of the separation between Freud and Jung. A recent article by Christine Doran details the development of their relationship from 1909 to 1913, and the reason for its end, in great detail: see “Rage and Anxiety in the Split between Freud and Jung,” *Humanities* 6, no. 3 (Fall 2017): 53–66.

formation of psychoanalysis as an interdisciplinary field is of considerable value to be explored here.¹⁰ The more literary aspects of Freud's work are explored separately from the Oedipal complex and his theories of sexuality. A focus on language and process strongly appears in the catalysing text, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, which he considered to be his most significant work.¹¹

While a compendium of information exists on nearly every facet of his life and work, this chapter concentrates on Freud's process-based approach to how language provides unique access to the mind's dynamic processes in order to propose a distinctly modernist turn. In this context, *The Interpretation of Dreams* can be read as an interdisciplinary hybrid: a study of the mind (pure psychology) carried out by means of the literary methods engrained in interpretative analysis. This chapter suggests that a focus on narrative analysis importantly accords with the *dynamic* study of human consciousness as it is durationally experienced, as opposed to objective accounts of observations. This resembles how literary modernists actively adopted stylistic techniques for representing consciousness through the activity of writing itself; the process of editing, revising, and writing as a form of "working through" questions of the self and unique, mimetic representations of perceptual intersections between inner and outer worlds.

By primarily focusing on Freud as a writer, this chapter develops Jean-Michel Rabaté's contention that "we can learn a lot about literature when focusing on Freud as a writer more than Freud as a theoretician."¹² It also elaborates Patrick Mahony's view that Freud's self-analysis was essential to the development of his central concepts. Freud's self-analysis represents a "writing cure" provoked by the death of his father, which led to the interpretive methods described in *The Interpretation of Dreams*.¹³ Indeed, Freudian critic Frederick Crews begrudgingly remarks that Freud truly broke new ground in *The Interpretation of Dreams* "not as a scientist but as a literary artist,"¹⁴ and despite Freud's reticence in admitting to the "short story" form of case histories in

¹⁰ See Robert F. Bornstein, "Reconnecting Psychoanalysis to Mainstream Psychology: Challenges and Opportunities," *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 22, no. 3 (2005): 323–340. The most substantial attack on Freud's credibility is from Crews, *Freud*, which is referenced in this chapter where relevant.

¹¹ Breger, *Freud*, 3.

¹² Jean-Michel Rabaté, *Cambridge Introduction*, 17.

¹³ Patrick Mahony, "Psychoanalysis—Writing Cure," in *Writing in Psychoanalysis*, eds. Emma Piccioli, Pier Luigi Rossi, and Antonio Alberto Semi (London: Karnac Books, 1996): 13–37.

¹⁴ Crews, *Freud*, 941.

Studies on Hysteria, he privately viewed himself as the central protagonist within a “heroic” narrative of his own making.¹⁵ Leo Bersani has written of the necessity of “reading the Freudian text as if it were a work of art,”¹⁶ and Louis Breger asserts that “Freud used his literary and rhetorical skills to control and shape his personal legend as well as the history of the psychoanalytic movement” to emphasise the importance of Freud’s creative approach to writing his new psychoanalytic method.¹⁷ In short, there is ample precedent for examining Freud’s early methods of self-analysis as a writer, as well as for considering the various techniques he provides for analysing dream narratives in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, such as displacement, condensation, and free-association, as writerly techniques.

This chapter limits itself to exploring the value of language between Freud’s early career and his autobiographical and literary approach to self-analysis essential to producing *The Interpretation of Dreams*. It first locates Freud within the positivist intellectual climate of late 19th century Europe and considers the impact of his training with Jean-Martin Charcot from 1885 to 1886. It follows his subsequent break from the neurologist after he translated Hippolyte Bernheim’s *On Suggestion and Its Therapeutic Applications* in 1888. It considers Freud’s work with Josef Breuer in their co-authored *Studies on Hysteria*, which would formally begin the concept of the “talking cure,” the cathartic method, abreaction, and transference, where language is primarily interpreted through *speech* that cathects physical symptoms of hysteria.¹⁸ It then turns to the impact of the death of Freud’s father after *Studies on Hysteria* was published. In the spring of 1895 Freud had begun working on an independent study, “Project for a Scientific Psychology,” that was never completed. The text represents Freud’s attempt to provide a scientific language to “extract from psychopathology a gain for normal psychology,” and contains the conceptual blueprint of notions such as dreams as wish-fulfilment, resistance, defence, and displacement.¹⁹ It was abandoned shortly before his father’s death in 1896, when Freud turned to a process of self-analysis with particular attention

¹⁵ Jeffrey Masson, ed., *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887–1904* (Cambridge MA: Belknap Press, 1986), 202.

¹⁶ Leo Bersani, *The Freudian Body* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 5.

¹⁷ Louis Breger, *Freud: Darkness in the Midst of Vision* (New York: Wiley, 2000), 3.

¹⁸ With regard to the evolving definitions of Freud’s various concepts, this chapter refers to Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (London: Karnac Books, 1988).

¹⁹ Marie Bonaparte, Anna Freud, and Ernst Kris, eds., *The Origins of Psychoanalysis: Letters to Wilhelm Fliess, Drafts and Notes: 1887–1902* (New York: Basic Books, 1954), 119–20.

to his dreams, which would redefine and refine many of his concepts, including his approach to sexuality, the unconscious, and methods for dream interpretation. Studying Freud's self-analysis as a form of "writing out" rather than "talking out" is an essential component to understanding how language becomes an interpretive process that can be developed through writing, which is built into his theory of psychoanalysis. By analysing his dreams in conjunction with autobiographical content, literature, and mythology, Freud retained components of what he had learnt studying with Charcot and working with Breuer, while advancing into new interpretive territory that blends the literary with the scientific in *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

In that text, we see the transformation from Freud as a strict proponent of scientific neurology to the Freud who, as Adam Phillips puts it, became "more of a poet than a machine."²⁰ Although Freud would repeatedly attempt to defend his psychoanalytic work as a science, examining the development of his early work as an interpreter of his own unconscious (with a focus on the interpretive role of language) Freud's early journey provides the crucial introduction to this thesis's focus on aesthetics and textual process used by literary modernists. As we shall see in subsequent chapters, D.H. Lawrence, Anaïs Nin, and James Joyce would go on to develop alternatives to what they understood to be the challenges posed by psychoanalysis through a literary process that engages with, yet diverges from, Freud's foundational text and methods.

1.1 Positivism, Charcot, and Freud's Early Work

The mid-19th century philosopher Auguste Comte coined the term "positivism" in his 1848 text *Discours sur l'ensemble du positivisme* [*A General View of Positivism*]. In defining his theory, Comte presents a transhistorical "law of three stages."²¹ He writes that humanity "passes through three theoretical stages: the theological or fictitious stage, the metaphysical or abstract stage, and the scientific or positive stage."²² Each stage corresponds to a law that defines it. In the theological stage, for example, the mind invents the "law" of religion in order to explain universal anomalies through the invention of mythological agents or religious icons.²³ Philosophical metaphysics bears a

²⁰ Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 110.

²¹ Auguste Comte, *Introduction to Positive Philosophy*, trans. Frederick Ferré (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1988), 1.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

similar construct, where invented supernatural agents are replaced by “abstract entities.” For Comte this second stage is “only a transitional method,” and positivism, represented in the third and final stage, is a favourable replacement for the previous two stages.²⁴ This is because the “law” that governs human development stops searching for abstract causes of phenomena. Instead, the “positive” stage limits itself to empirical methods guided by laws that govern causes. Comte argues that all phenomena, including social phenomena, can and should “be explained based on natural law.”²⁵ Because he produced such categorical distinctions and advocated a materialist approach to the examination of living phenomena, Comte is largely considered to be the first philosopher of science. A preference for categorical empiricism and insistence on natural hierarchy is also why Comte held some contempt for the field of psychology. He refers to the “so-called psychological method” as “the last transformation of theology,” which creates fictional entities to account for human phenomena.²⁶

Comte’s positivist methods emphasise the importance of reductive, scientific rigour in studying human and natural phenomena. His criticisms of psychology as a theology indicates his critical apprehension towards abstract examinations of the human mind. This brief summary of Comte’s philosophy is important because his work strongly influenced the approach of one of Freud’s most influential mentors, the French neurologist and psychologist Jean-Martin Charcot. George Makari describes how Charcot’s advancements in neurological psychology, conducted at the Salpêtrière in Paris in the late 19th century, were defined by “positivist methods [used] for clinical medicine and advocated [for the] close observation of patients as a way of newly classifying diseases.”²⁷ The large-scale studies that Charcot and his team performed on hundreds of hysteric patients at the Salpêtrière adhered to close external examination, based on “objectively observable outward signs alone.”²⁸ Charcot sought to validate psychological study as a neurological science in light of Comte’s criticisms that psychological inquiry resembled theological law defined by the fictional creation of mythological icons or abstract ideas. Comte dedicated himself to working within the

²⁴ Ibid., 2.

²⁵ Marcia Ferraz et al., “Science and History of Science: Between Comte and Canguilhem,” *Traversal: International Journal for the History of Science* 4 (2018): 109.

²⁶ Comte, *Introduction to Positive Philosophy*, 20.

²⁷ Makari, *Revolution in Mind*, 18.

²⁸ See J.M. Charcot, *Leçons du Mardi à la Salpêtrière: Policlinique 1887–1888* (Paris: Aux Bureaux du Progrès Médical, V.A Delahaye et Lecrosnier, 1982), 103–05.

framework of “the hereditarian and degeneration theory” that was popular in the 19th century, influenced by Théodule Ribot’s *Heredity: A Psychological Study of its Phenomena, Laws, Causes and Consequents*, published in 1873.²⁹ In short, Charcot’s methods amalgamated the positivist rigour of Comte’s mid-century empirical methods with contemporary theories of selection made popular by Darwin, breaking new ground in the field of neurology as a scientific study of psychology.

Every Tuesday in front of a large audience at the Salpêtrière, Charcot examined and hypnotised outpatients and presented the developments in his work. In *An Autobiographical Study*, Freud describes Charcot as a charismatic man, and recounts how he invited interventions and commentary from students and resident physicians.³⁰ Some of these open lectures were subsequently published as the *Leçons du Mardi de la Salpêtrière* [*Tuesday Lectures*, alternatively translated as *Tuesday Lessons*] that Freud would eventually translate into German.³¹ In his lectures, Charcot argued that hysteria can be classified as a neurological disorder to which patients are predisposed due to hereditary features constituted within their nervous systems, “transmitted from one generation to another.”³² Hysterics, who displayed “a special morbid predisposing condition inherent in the individual,” were prone to the power of suggestion, evident in their susceptibility to hypnosis.³³ Outward observation was a necessary evaluation for deducing and potentially alleviating hysteric symptoms. In implementing hypnotism as a method, Charcot repurposed the discredited attributes of mesmerism popular in the early 19th century.³⁴ From Charcot’s perspective, hypnotism had the effect of making symptoms visible, and thus amenable to empirical scrutiny, and this for him justified

²⁹ For an extremely helpful resource on the history of French scientific psychology and the interactions between Charcot and Ribot, see Vincent Guillin, “Théodule Ribot’s Ambiguous Positivism: Philosophical and Epistemological Strategies in the Founding of French Scientific Psychology,” *Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences* 40 (2002):165–181. For a helpful summary of Charcot’s use of the degenerative hypothesis, see John Fletcher, *Freud and the Scene of Trauma* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013), 32–35.

³⁰ Sigmund Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1950), 22.

³¹ In Freud’s report after returning from Paris he praised Charcot’s interactive methods that encouraged comments from those working under him; see Sigmund Freud, “Report on My Studies in Paris and Berlin,” *SE I*, 8–11.

³² Ibid. Makari reminds readers that “in the second half of the nineteenth century, hereditary causes were extremely popular in French medicine, particularly psychiatry [...] after 1870, biologic inheritance was widely accepted as the cause of psychic functions and the central precondition that led to a mind breaking during accidental events.” *Revolution in Mind*, 34.

³³ J.M. Charcot and Pierre Marie, “Hysteria Mainly Hystero-Epilepsy,” in *A Dictionary of Psychological Medicine*, ed. D. Hack Tuke, 2 vols. (London: Churchill, 1892), vol. 1, 628.

³⁴ Crews provides a brief account of mesmerism, hypnosis, and Charcot’s methods; see *Freud*, 286.

the role of hypnosis as a tool for scientific investigation.³⁵ Charcot was able to conjure the symptoms of hysteria in hysterical patients, and the dramatic visual effect of hypnotism coupled with his theatrical and open-format lecturing style contributed to his fame and notoriety. The Salpêtrière was thus regarded as a mecca for ground-breaking work in neurological study.

As such, when a young, 30-year-old Freud received a grant to study at the Salpêtrière in 1885, he was understandably elated, and the grant could not have come at a better time. He was virtually penniless and had few prospects, having been publicly denounced for his promotion of the therapeutic properties of cocaine in his 1884 paper “On Coca.”³⁶ Freud’s attempts to cure his close friend and colleague, physiologist Ernst von Fleischl, of morphine addiction through cocaine use was a personal failure.³⁷ Given Charcot’s notoriety and the lack of other immediately foreseeable financial and professional opportunities (stalling his marriage to long-term fiancée Martha Bernays), Freud was enthused by the opportunity to study at the Salpêtrière. When he first arrived in Paris in October 1885, he was relegated to research in one of Charcot’s laboratories. He spent the first six weeks working on the “microscopic study of children’s brains in Charcot’s Pathological Laboratory” due to the neurological and anatomical research for which his grant was intended.³⁸ However, as Peter Gay writes, the “powerful presence of Charcot propelled him away from the microscope,” towards the behaviour of living patients.³⁹ Witnessing the dramatic effects of hypnosis that Charcot conducted on hysteric patients

³⁵ See Jean-Martin Charcot’s *The Tuesday Lessons: Excerpts from Nine Case Presentations on General Neurology Delivered at the Salpêtrière Hospital in 1887–88* (New York: Raven Press, 1987), 100. For a discussion of the use of women for hysteric performance and photographs of “hysteria,” see also Janet Wolff, “Reinstating Corporality: Feminism and Body Politics,” in *The Feminism and Visual Culture Reader*, ed. Amelia Jones (New York: Routledge, 2002), 414–425, and Georges Didi-Huberman, *Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpêtrière*, trans. Alisa Hartz (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2004).

³⁶ For a study dedicated to Freud’s use and promotion of cocaine, see David Cohen, *Freud on Coke* (London: Cutting Edge Press, 2011). Cohen argues that Freud’s use of the drug continued for far longer than had been discussed in existing biographical literature and significantly impacted his work, a topic pursued by Crews; see *Freud*, 781–784.

³⁷ Freud’s prescription of cocaine to Fleischl led to his addiction to both drugs. Freud’s attempts to hide Fleischl’s subsequent addiction and serious decline in physical and mental health (and eventual death) is brutally examined in Crews, *Freud*, 139–167, who references the newly available *Brautbriefe* [engagement letters] exchanged between Freud and his fiancée Martha Bernays, where Freud reveals the extent of his guilt and the increasingly dire state of Fleischl’s condition. Fleischl’s death is referred to in relation to Irma’s injection in *SE IV*, 111.

³⁸ Gay, *A Life*, 48; Crews, *Freud*, 334–345. For a detailed and virtually undisputed account of Freud’s early medical career, see Jones, *The Life and Work*, 74–88. For a brief account of Freud’s early studies and publications on the brain prior to his studies in Paris, see Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 76–77.

³⁹ Gay, *A Life*, 48.

during his lectures overwhelmed and deeply impressed Freud.⁴⁰ Freud wrote of Charcot's demonstrations as having the profound effect of "producing symptoms and then removing them."⁴¹ In a letter to fiancée Bernays he describes coming out of such lectures "with an entirely new idea of perfection"⁴² and considered each lecture to be "a little work of art in construction and composition."⁴³ In order to become closer to Charcot, Freud offered to translate some of his work into German. Charcot accepted, and as Freud recounts, "from that time forward I took full part in all that went on in the clinic."⁴⁴

Freud extended his stay in Paris by a further two months and travelled back to Vienna by way of Berlin. In his submitted report on his studies after returning to Vienna in April 1886 he explains that during the months he spent at the Salpêtrière "my work...took on a different shape from what I had originally laid down for myself."⁴⁵ He defends a shift in his focus from anatomical studies of the brain to Charcot's work on neurosis, detailing how working directly with Charcot had ignited his interest in the study of neurological psychology, and in particular hysteria. Makari describes Freud's determination to "become Charcot's man in Austria."⁴⁶ He promptly opened a private practice specialising in neurological disorders and implemented Charcot's model while practising hypnotism and publishing material promoting Charcot's approach.⁴⁷ Peter Gay writes that Freud paid Charcot "every homage at his command: in addition to translating Charcot's lectures into German, he kept on propagating Charcot's ideas and quoting him as an authority."⁴⁸ Charcot's work sought to demonstrate that if studies on neurosis focused on natural laws and materialist or organic components to deduce psychological phenomena, it was possible to validate psychology's position as a

⁴⁰ The performative quality of Charcot's hypnotic treatments is examined in detail in Jonathan Marshall, *Performing Neurology: The Dramaturgy of Dr. Jean-Martin Charcot* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016). It has also been criticised by Crews, who explains that many of the women whom Charcot hypnotised were drugged, and "patients who balked at continuing to perform illustratively in lectures could expect to be rendered submissive through forced drugging." Crews, *Freud*, 333–334.

⁴¹ Freud, *Autobiographical Study*, 28.

⁴² Letter to Bernays, dated 11/24/85, cited in Crews, *Freud*, 343.

⁴³ Gay, *A Life*, 49.

⁴⁴ Sigmund Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, 21.

⁴⁵ Freud, "Report on My Studies in Paris and Berlin," *SE I*, 8.

⁴⁶ Makari, *Revolution in Mind*, 28.

⁴⁷ When Freud approached Charcot with an offer to translate the third and last volume of *Leçons sur les maladies du système nerveux* [Lectures on the Diseases of the Nervous System] into German, his fellowship in Paris was extended beyond the travel bursary until February 1896. See "Report on my Studies," *SE I*, 14, and Crews, *Freud*, 353–355.

⁴⁸ Gay, *A Life*, 52.

scientific and medical discipline, and Freud wholeheartedly supported these developments. In effect, Freud's early work on neurosis was rooted in the positivist tradition and echoed its axioms. He was focused on the empirical and scientific methods that Charcot had demonstrated in studying the plausible connections between neurosis and hereditary degeneracy.

Charcot's work, however, was not universally applauded. The Jewish neurologist Hippolyte Bernheim, working at Nancy, was one of the first to openly criticise Charcot's methods and observations.⁴⁹ In his seminal 1886 text *De la suggestion et de ses applications à la thérapeutique* [On Suggestion and its Therapeutic Applications] he describes that his experimental practice of hypnosis had revealed that nearly everyone was susceptible to it.⁵⁰ While Charcot had determined "the hypnotic state can *only* be produced in hysterics," Bernheim's evidence presented in this text frankly conveys that if Charcot's connection between hypnosis and degeneration was correct, it would result in the logical conclusion that nearly everyone was degenerate, given nearly everyone could in fact be hypnotised.⁵¹ If that was truly the case, as Freud would write in his translator's preface to Bernheim's work, "all the observations made at the Salpêtrière are worthless; indeed, they become errors in observation."⁵² That most people are susceptible to hypnosis and the power of suggestion further displaced Comte's insistence on scientific materialism in relation to the field of psychology. That is, if ideas held sway over people's bodies, psychology's task would accordingly have to forgo an exclusive reliance on neurological or biological factors as the sole origin or cause of neurosis.⁵³ Following Bernheim's strong refutation of Charcot's work, Freud wrote to the neurologist for guidance. Charcot responded by reiterating his belief in degenerative heredity and encouraged Freud to check for himself by "studying the genealogies of Jewish families"—Jews had been determined as predisposed to neurosis

⁴⁹ See Crews, *Freud*, 376–377.

⁵⁰ Hippolyte Bernheim, *De la Suggestion et de ses applications à la thérapeutique* (Paris: Octave Doin, 1886); the point is elaborated in *Hypnotisme, Suggestion, Psychothérapie* (Paris: Octave Doin, 1891), 167–169. For a helpful account, see André M. Weitzenhoffer, "What did He (Bernheim) Say?" in *Hypnosis at its Bicentennial*, eds. Fred Frankel and Harold S. Zamasky (New York: Springer, 1978), 47–56.

⁵¹ Gay, *A Life*, 51, emphasis mine.

⁵² Freud, "Preface to Bernheim," *SE I*, 77–78.

⁵³ Details concerning Bernheim's text and the "Nancy School" versus the studies conducted at the Salpêtrière under Charcot are summarised to great effect in Makari, *Revolution in Mind*, 29–32.

due to “hereditary taint.”⁵⁴ Passages in Charcot’s *Leçons*, which Freud began translating in 1892, “dwelled pointedly on Jewish family trees and even on exemplars of ‘the wandering Jew’ that he had encountered as outpatients” at the Salpêtrière.⁵⁵

Instead, Freud translated Bernheim’s *On Suggestion* into German in order to control its reception in Austria and Germany and to defend Charcot’s theories. Makari describes how the commentary Freud provides in this translation suggests an internal battle. Although Freud’s translation endorses Bernheim’s text, he simultaneously warns readers against it. Makari writes how, when German readers purchased the translation, they encountered

...an intrusive translator who begged to differ with the author. The translator [Freud] railed against those who might use Bernheim’s work to deny the reality of hypnosis and conclude that all these accounts were based on a mixture of naïve belief and trickery.⁵⁶

In the preface, Freud writes that while “Bernheim’s work goes beyond the field of hypnosis...it leaves a portion of its subject-matter out of account.”⁵⁷ That is, Freud’s preface emphasises that even if Bernheim’s suggestion hypothesis—that nearly everyone is prone to suggestion—is in fact true, it ultimately does not discredit *all* of the work that Charcot and his team were conducting in Paris. Freud was dedicated to what he had learnt studying with Charcot and was keen to defend both his mentor and the ideas that he had adopted as his own, as indicated in a letter: “I tried to defend Charcot’s point of view in the preface.”⁵⁸

However, in 1889 Freud travelled to Nancy to visit Bernheim in person.⁵⁹ Shortly after this visit, we can see in his writing that Freud had begun to question Charcot’s model, as discussed below. While it is difficult to know precisely what Freud discussed with

⁵⁴ Cited in Makari, *Revolution in Mind*, 36. A number of examples of Freud’s own anti-Semitism and disparaging remarks against individuals whom he saw as too outwardly Jewish looking, “sly,” and “mendacious” are listed in Crews, *Freud*, 45–47.

⁵⁵ Crews, *Freud*, 411. This work inspired a book titled *The Wandering Jew at the Salpêtrière*, which was published while Freud was halfway through annotating the *Leçons*. Though not written by Charcot, it was composed under his supervision: see, Crews, *Freud*, 411–412.

⁵⁶ Makari, *Revolution in Mind*, 32.

⁵⁷ Freud, “Preface to Bernheim,” *SE I*, 85.

⁵⁸ A letter from Freud to Fliess dated 28 July 1888, cited in Crews, *Freud*, 401.

⁵⁹ Strachey notes that Freud claimed he had visited Bernheim *before* translating the work; however, “the book was published before the visit took place.” See “Editor’s Note,” *SE I*, 74. Crews claims that Freud had already translated the book before the visit took place; *Freud*, 399.

Bernheim during this visit, it is plausible that it included Charcot's view of the degenerative Jewish family and his hereditarian approach to hysteria more broadly, especially given both men were Jewish. In Freud's *An Autobiographical Study* he does not mention that connection. Instead, in the study, he recounts how his visit with Bernheim was significant and influential to the development of psychoanalytic techniques:

I was a spectator of Bernheim's astonishing experiments upon his hospital patients, and I received the profoundest impression of the possibility that there could be powerful mental processes which nevertheless remain hidden from the consciousness of men.⁶⁰

This quote indicates how Freud's thinking was moving towards a process-based approach to illuminating what is "hidden" from consciousness through language—a central attribute of psychoanalytic practice. External observation and studies of heredity, as Freud would soon determine with his colleague Josef Breuer, cannot wholly account for what is imperceptible in neurotic symptomology. In Freud and Breuer's development of a theory of trauma, memory, and the talking cure in *Studies on Hysteria*, the origin of any symptom can be made accessible through interpreting the narration of traumatic memories, rather than the empirical study of potentially degenerative, hereditary traits as observable through hypnosis. In *An Autobiographical Study*, Freud credits what he learnt during his visit with Bernheim in developing several therapeutic techniques. Accessing what is hidden from consciousness can be facilitated through a "pressure method" that encourages free-association. He applied this technique in his case study of Emmy Von N. (the pseudonym for Fanny Moser) in *Studies on Hysteria*, and would use a version of it in his self-analysis discussed below.

Changes in Freud's theoretical orientation and his criticisms of Charcot become distinct in texts published after his visit with Bernheim. By 1890, after returning from his visit with Bernheim, Freud wrote "Psychical (or Mental) Treatment." The article refutes Charcot and his followers' materialist approach to psychology. Freud writes that their methodology disregards "the effect of the mind upon the body" by instead privileging "the physical side of things... [such physicians are] glad to leave the mental field to be

⁶⁰ Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, 29. See also Jones, *The Life and Work*, 211, and Crews, *Freud*, 483–483, for a discussion of how witnessing Bernheim's approach turned his attention towards the unconscious and repression that would begin his critique of Charcot.

dealt with by the philosophers whom they despised.”⁶¹ By 1892 it was Charcot’s work that Freud would begin to critically translate, and he heavily annotated the final segment of the *Tuesday Lectures*.⁶² In considering his commentary in the annotations we can see the stages of Freud’s thought at this time textually and conceptually. Many of his notes to the text echo drafts on hysteria he was exchanging with Breuer leading up to their publication of “A Preliminary Communication” in advance of *Studies on Hysteria*, which they had begun that same year.⁶³ Comparing Freud’s annotations to Charcot’s work with “Early Drafts on Hysteria” indicates a textual correspondence for understanding the process of Freud’s developing ideas. For example, in the drafts to *Studies on Hysteria*, Freud writes of how memory “forms the content of a hysterical attack...it is the return of the event which caused the outbreak of hysteria—the *psychical trauma*.”⁶⁴ A focus on trauma and the “psychical” is likewise referenced in the annotations to his translation of Charcot’s text.

Here Freud writes that he has uncovered “new findings” concerning hysterical patients in hypnotic states and asserts that it is traumatic memories, rather than heredity, that is the actual cause of acquired hysteria:

The core of a hysterical attack, in whatever form it may appear, is a *memory*, the hallucinatory reliving of a scene which is significant for the onset of the illness. It is this event which manifests itself in a perceptible manner in the phrase of ‘*attitudes passionelle*’ [scenes of passionate movement]... The *content of the memory* is as a rule either a *psychical trauma* which is qualified by its intensity to provoke the outbreak of hysteria in the patient or it is an event which, owing to its occurrence at a particular moment, has become a trauma.⁶⁵

This excerpt, taken from one of Freud’s lengthy annotations to his translation of Charcot’s text, openly discredits his mentor’s idea that hysteria stems from hereditary degeneracy, and he would conclude that Charcot’s “conception of the *famille*

⁶¹ Sigmund Freud, *SE VII*, 284.

⁶² For details on Charcot’s response to Freud’s critical translation, see Toby Gelfand, “Charcot’s Response to Freud’s Rebellion,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50, no. 1 (1989): 293–307.

⁶³ For details on the separate publication of “Preliminary Communication” and its reception, see *Studies on Hysteria*, *SE II*, xvi.

⁶⁴ Freud, “Early Drafts on Hysteria,” *SE I*, 152, author’s emphasis.

⁶⁵ Freud, “Footnotes to Charcot (1887–8),” *SE I*, 137, author’s emphasis. For an extensive analysis of how Freud assimilated hysteria to a model of traumatic neurosis, see Fletcher, *Freud and the Scene*, 36–56.

néuropathique—which...embraces almost everything we know in the form of nervous diseases, organic and functional, systematic and accidental—could scarcely stand up to serious criticism.”⁶⁶ In the annotations, Freud informs readers that he and a colleague, namely Josef Breuer, considered hysteria to be acquired or dispositional. That is, neurosis is the result of trauma and memory rather than hereditary predisposition, and therefore requires a new method of interpretive analysis.⁶⁷

Breuer, the physician whom Freud had first come to know while working at Ernst Bürke’s lab in Vienna before his fellowship with Charcot, had begun to discuss with Freud his therapeutic work with a patient known as “Anna O.” (Bertha Pappenheim).⁶⁸ In describing the case in greater detail following Freud’s return from Paris, they began to collaborate on *Studies on Hysteria*, a text described by Gay and others as the “founding case of psychoanalysis.”⁶⁹ In working with Pappenheim, it was discovered that “her symptoms had a meaning and were residues or reminiscences of...emotional situations.”⁷⁰ Thoughts or emotions she suppressed while nursing her ailing father afterwards appeared in the form of hysterical symptoms that could be dramatically alleviated through talking.⁷¹ The text in its entirety was published in 1895, just a year after the last instalment of Freud’s translation of the *Tuesday Lectures*. For Fletcher, who has studied the role of trauma in Freud’s work, the emphasis on trauma described in Freud’s annotations to Charcot’s *Tuesday Lectures* anticipates his ambitions in *Studies on Hysteria*. Fletcher writes how Freud’s “movement of thought...was to subsume the whole symptomatic field of the hysterias under the reign of a generalised traumatic causality.”⁷² In other words, Fletcher’s work accounts for how Freud began to actively work on a replacement of Charcot’s systemic model of neurological, hereditary degeneracy by building a theory of trauma and memory as the true origin of dispositional, or “acquired” neurosis with Breuer.

In writing, Freud distinguishes two positions, hereditary predisposition and dispositional neurosis, in a manner that pays careful, though critical, homage to his mentor. He acknowledges that Charcot was correct in considering hereditary traits for

⁶⁶ Freud, “Footnotes to Charcot,” 143.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 138.

⁶⁸ Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, 32–33.

⁶⁹ Gay, *A Life*, 63.

⁷⁰ Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, 35.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² Fletcher, *Freud and the Scene*, 36.

the diagnoses of conditions such as Graves' disease. However, he asserts that Charcot makes the mistake of not separating "the disposition to neurosis from that of organic nervous disorders, which take no account of the part played by *acquired* nervous diseases (which cannot be over-estimated)."⁷³ In doing so, he critically intervenes on Charcot's theory that the neuropathic family and consequent understanding of hysteria are the result of degenerative hereditary traits. Freud began to segue into a new theory of neurosis centred on trauma and memory meant to replace, or at the very least strongly amend, positivist methods, and he soon abandoned the practice of hypnotism. That "hysterics suffer mainly from reminiscences" became Freud's focus in exploring the cause of acquired neuroses, which is explored in *Studies on Hysteria* and refined in his work to follow, such as in the dream analysis he conducted on himself through writing and the interpretive methods provided in *The Interpretation of Dreams*.⁷⁴

Scholars like Adam Phillips have considered Freud's rejection of Charcot's hereditary degeneracy theory partly as a response to the increasingly anti-Semitic tenor of pre-World War I Europe.⁷⁵ Indeed, in *Studies on Hysteria* Freud writes: "we should do well to distinguish between the concepts of 'disposition' and 'degeneracy' as applied to people; otherwise we shall find ourselves forced to admit that humanity owes a large proportion of its great achievements to the efforts of 'degenerates.'"⁷⁶ Phillips rightly argues that Freud wanted to create a "secular language in which frustrations, and their possible satisfactions could be felt and [universally] figured out."⁷⁷ This appears evident in his rejection of an innate, hereditary theory of neurosis. In moving away from positivist methods, it is quite plausible that Freud wanted, along with Jewish colleague Breuer, to counteract studies in "hereditary taint" that catalogued neurosis within the dossier of a so-called "natural" hierarchy.⁷⁸ In short, there were factors in the

⁷³ "Footnotes to Charcot," *SE I*, 139, author's emphasis.

⁷⁴ *SE II*, 7.

⁷⁵ Phillips describes the impact of Judaism on Freud, as well as the decline of Orthodox Judaism in the 19th century and the subsequent development of the Haskalah—the Jewish Enlightenment—as a version of the more general European Enlightenment identity emerging at the turn of the 20th century in favour of sceptical humanism that was "suspicious of dogma and traditional forms of authority" in detail: see *Becoming Freud*, 31–35. For more on the extensive topic of Judaism and Freud, see Stanley Rothman and Phillip Isenberg, "Sigmund Freud and the Politics of Marginality," *Central European History* 7 (1974): 58–78; Sander L. Gilman, *Freud, Race, and Gender* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), and more recently Mark Edmundson, *The Death of Sigmund Freud: Fascism, Psychoanalysis and the Rise of Fundamentalism* (London: Bloomsbury, 2008).

⁷⁶ *SE II*, 104.

⁷⁷ Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 41.

⁷⁸ Eugen Dühring's malicious tract of 1881, *The Jewish Question as a Racial, Moral and Cultural Question*, had, as Crews puts it, "served as match to the tinder of Viennese anti-Semitic sentiment" and

world around him that would encourage Freud to look beyond heredity as a cause for the disorders of the mind. Instead, Freud focused on building associative connections between trauma and memory into an immanent and markedly narrative, process-based theory of the unconscious. His efforts, on which this chapter increasingly focuses, rely on language, narration, and the analysis of both as the primary means of interpreting mental processes. His focus on language most distinctly begins with the theory of “talking out” as a form of accessing the unconscious through speech, which would take the place of external examination through hypnosis he had learnt from Charcot.

1.2 Studies on Hysteria: Language, Talking, Sexuality

In moving away from positivist explanations of heredity as a neurological foundation for studying the brain and the aetiology of neurosis, Freud and Breuer analysed how the mind processes traumatic memories over time. In doing so, they looked at how the durational impact of traumatic reminiscences can be symptomatically manifested in the body, and how speech can alleviate those symptoms. The link between manifest, physical symptoms of neurosis (coughing, paralysis, sporadic muteness, etc) and latent explanations (traumatic memories) are established in *Studies on Hysteria*. This text introduces the “talking cure,” a provisional theory of the unconscious, and a new and distinctly Freudian approach: “neurasthenia [emotional disturbance] is always only a sexual neurosis.”⁷⁹ That latter supposition represents Freud’s and Breuer’s principle difference and is perceptible in the text, especially in Freud’s independent focus on sexuality in its final section. Ernest Jones recounts that “Breuer’s unwillingness to follow Freud in his investigation of his patients’ sexual life, or rather the far-reaching conclusions Freud was drawing from it,” led to the decline of their partnership while simultaneously forming the basis of Freud’s more autonomous studies to follow.⁸⁰

The methodology and postulations presented in *Studies on Hysteria* include case studies separately conducted by Freud and Breuer, along with a two-part theoretical section also written separately, wherein each was able to give a “closer and clearer account of

the following year “the German nationalist movement...produced the splinter Austrian Reform Association, whose platform included repealing the civil rights of Jews.” *Freud*, 49.

⁷⁹ See Sigmund Freud, “Draft B: Aetiology of the Neurosis,” *SE I*, 179, author’s emphasis. The term “psycho-analysis” was first employed in a paper published in French on 30 March 1896: it occurs in German for the first time on 15 May 1896; both papers had been sent off on the same day (5 February); see Jones, *The Life and Work*, 217.

⁸⁰ Jones, *The Life and Work*, 224.

those points for which insufficient evidence was adduced or which were not given enough prominence in ‘Preliminary Communication.’”⁸¹ While both of their conclusions differ from the introduction, the volume as a whole is fundamentally influenced by Breuer’s analysis of the patient Bertha Pappenheim. Gay draws attention to how it was Pappenheim “who made consequential discoveries...[however] it would be Freud and not Breuer, who assiduously cultivated them until they yielded a rich and unsuspected harvest.”⁸² The interpretation of language is here understood as a verbal action (speech and “talking out”) which cathects or abreacts manifest neurotic symptoms. Later, language and interpretive techniques are established through writing, in Freud’s self-analysis and textual methods detailed in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, though here the process-based method of the talking cure indicates its emphasis on durational, qualitative forms of analysis.

A provisional summary of the Pappenheim case is worthwhile, especially to demonstrate how “the case of Anna O. [Pappenheim] did more to divide Freud and Breuer than to bring them together,” to acknowledge the unique direction towards sexuality that Freud would take after *Studies on Hysteria* was published.⁸³ Most importantly, however, it demonstrates the development of the role of speech as a means to interpret the language of neurotic symptoms. Breuer had begun treating Pappenheim, an “interesting hysteric in December 1880,” and he continued to work “with the case for a year and a half.”⁸⁴ According to Breuer’s report on her, Pappenheim came from an Orthodox Jewish family, though she preferred the study of art to religion. In 1880 her father became terminally ill, and she developed unique physical symptoms while she nursed him: “spasms, deafness, absences, paralyses. She could no longer speak in her mother tongue, but communicated fluently in English.”⁸⁵ When her father died in April 1881 her symptoms grew worse—she became suicidal and would only eat when Breuer fed her. In the course of being treated by Breuer she developed a strong attachment to

⁸¹ *SE II*, 185. “A Preliminary Communication,” the introductory section of *Studies on Hysteria* jointly written by Breuer and Freud, first appeared in 1893. It was reprinted in 1895 as the first section of *Studies on Hysteria*. See Gay, *A Life*, 63.

⁸² Gay, *A Life*, 63. There is extensive scholarship specific to the Anna O. case, her impact on psychoanalysis, and her remarkable life that followed after treatment. For a commended monograph dedicated to the topic see Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen, *Remembering Anna O.: A Century of Mystification*, trans. Kirby Olson (New York: Routledge, 1996).

⁸³ Gay, *A Life*, 67. Breuer had also been against Freud’s use and proposition of cocaine many years prior, which is discussed in Crews, *Freud*, 164.

⁸⁴ Gay, *A Life*, 64.

⁸⁵ Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 95.

him, eventually experiencing a phantom pregnancy where she became convinced that she would give birth to his child, a topic returned to briefly below in relation to transference.⁸⁶ Breuer tried to hypnotise her, but “one of the many interesting things about Bertha was that she didn’t need to be hypnotized, but rather seemed to already be, intermittently, in a kind of hypnotic trance.”⁸⁷ She informed him that she preferred talking to hypnosis, and “the verbal utterance of her hallucinations calmed her.” She “aptly described this procedure, speaking seriously, as a ‘talking cure,’ while she referred to it jokingly as ‘chimney sweeping.’”⁸⁸

After a year of analysis with Breuer, who was able to communicate with her in English, Pappenheim “reproduced a hallucination that she had while caring for her father, which had been at the root of her symptoms.”⁸⁹ This hallucination involved a snake. When she had sat by her father’s sickbed in July 1880 “she [had] fell into a waking dream and saw a black snake coming towards the sick man from the wall to bite him.”⁹⁰ After a period of analysis with Breuer, she carefully rearranged her room to replicate her father’s room at the time of his death. She then relived the night when, “literally paralyzed and struck mute by fright, she saw a black snake slithering towards him [her father] with the intention of biting him.”⁹¹ After recounting “the reproduction of the original scene” to Breuer in one of their sessions “she was able to [once again] speak in her native German.”⁹² Due to describing her hallucination to Breuer, Pappenheim was seemingly cured from the disturbances that she had previously exhibited and the case was, for the time being, deemed a success.⁹³ Despite Crews’ critical review of Pappenheim’s case, he acknowledges that Breuer “did in fact restore his hysterical patient—that is, free her from her symptoms; he found a technique for bringing to her consciousness the unconscious processes which [sic] contained the sense of the symptoms, and the

⁸⁶ Gay, *A Life*, 67; Crews, *Freud*, 597–598.

⁸⁷ Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 95.

⁸⁸ *SE II*, 30.

⁸⁹ Borch-Jacobsen, *Remembering Anna O.*, 19.

⁹⁰ *SE II*, 38.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 19–20. The episode is recounted in *SE II*, 40. See also Crews, *Freud*, 601–602.

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ The myth of her having been cured has been extensively exposed as a hoax. For Crews, one particular detail that has been overlooked is Pappenheim’s addiction to both morphine and chloral hydrate, both of which Breuer continued to administer to her despite being aware of her need to successfully withdraw from the dependency. Crews demonstrates that Breuer’s observations of her behaviour such as hallucinations, double-vision, and hearing voices could have been caused by effects of the drugs or symptoms of withdrawal when they had not been administered in doses corresponding to her level of addiction. See *Freud*, 623–627.

symptoms disappeared.”⁹⁴ Crews refers to the talking cure, and the cathartic method associated with it, to be specifically credited to Breuer’s work with Pappenheim. However, Freud had come to similar conclusions.

To consider Pappenheim’s case before deliberating both authors’ understanding of speech and the cathartic method at this time, we might first explore Breuer’s theoretical contributions to *Studies on Hysteria*. Breuer investigates how Pappenheim’s disposition resembles a hypnotic state, and reasons that if

...hypnoid states...are already present before the onset of the manifest illness, they provide the soil in which the affect plants the pathogenic memory with its consequent somatic phenomena. This corresponds to dispositional hysteria.⁹⁵

In referring to “dispositional hysteria,” Breuer, like Freud, distinguishes the difference between this and hereditary conditions (such as Graves’ disease referenced above) in Charcot’s neuropathic model. Breuer’s foray into a theory of “hypnoid states” was derived from studies conducted by contemporary psychologist Pierre Janet, who also worked with Charcot at the Salpêtrière, and had recently coined the terms “disassociation” and the “subconscious” while working on a trauma and memory-based theory of hysteria.⁹⁶ Developing from Janet’s work, Breuer asserted that hypnoid states represent a “psychical splitting” that develops through the repetition of the effect of trauma upon an individual.⁹⁷ Both Breuer and Freud deduced that the traumatic associations of memories or reminiscences caused them to become “inadmissible to consciousness,” and therefore “unconscious” as opposed to Janet’s term “subconscious,” though Bruce Fink asserts Breuer’s descriptions of hypnoid states equivocate the term “disassociation” as it is understood today.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ Ibid., 591–592.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ See Henri F. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry* (London: Fontana Press, 1994), 374–377 for a detailed description of Janet’s understanding of the “subconscious.” For how Breuer was influenced by Janet in relation to “hypnoid states,” see Crews, *Freud*, 583. For Strachey however, the term “hypnoid states” is Breuer’s; see Strachey, “Editor’s Introduction,” *SE II*, xxii. Bruce Fink notes how a contemporary term for “hypnoid states” can be understood as disassociation; see *A Clinical Introduction to Freud: Techniques for Everyday Practice* (London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2017), 99. Applebooks Edition.

⁹⁷ *SE II*, 222.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 225. Strachey notes that the phrase “inadmissible to consciousness” is not unambiguous and for that reason “leaves much to be desired.” *Bewusstseinsunfähig* is constructed on the analogy of ‘*Hoffällig*

In relation to hypnoid states, Breuer writes that “we cannot...speak of a splitting of consciousness, though we can speak of a splitting of the mind.”⁹⁹ Breuer asserts that hysterical phenomena are not to be thought of as strictly “determined by ideas,”¹⁰⁰ as Paul Moebius had asserted in 1888, but rather a confluence between the “ideogenic” and the energetic force of affect which “presupposes a quantitative theory of cathexis.”¹⁰¹ Breuer had discovered, in relation to the ideational component of relieving hysteria (due to Pappenheim’s ability to “cathect” her symptoms verbally), how “if he just let her [Pappenheim] *speak* her fantasies through what she called ‘the talking cure,’ it began to alleviate her symptoms,” as exemplified in her ability to once again speak German by repeating yet abreacting the snake hallucination that plagued her, as referenced above.¹⁰²

Accordingly, in *Studies on Hysteria*, Breuer, along with Freud, presents readers with the theory that mental disturbances can be “released” through a therapy based on the process of a *verbal* catharsis, and relatedly, abreaction, wherein “language serves as a substitute for action; by its help, an affect can be ‘abreacted’ almost as effectively.”¹⁰³ These concepts represent an early theory of the unconscious and a topography of the mind that links physical symptoms with uttered language tied to a mental “split.” It establishes that speech, as utterance, can be essential in abreacting physical neurotic symptoms, pointing to a dynamic connection between the mind and body, as well as a multi-faceted concept of the psyche. Laplanche and Pontalis describe that an “exclusive emphasis on abreaction [*Abreagieren*] is above all typical of the period in Freud’s work which is known as the period of the cathartic method.”¹⁰⁴ As is explored below, employing language as a methodology for cathecting neurotic symptoms was fundamental in Freud’s own method of self-analysis. However, the idea of cathexis is reconfigured through the forms of “writing out” that Freud depended upon in his dream interpretation almost a decade later.

[‘admissible to the court’] and the word translated as “*inadmissible* to consciousness” from this analogy could be equally translated as “*incapable* of consciousness.” See *SE II*, 225 n1, author’s emphasis.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, author’s emphasis.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 186.

¹⁰¹ See Laplanche and Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, 14.

¹⁰² Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 96, emphasis mine.

¹⁰³ *SE II*, 8.

¹⁰⁴ Laplanche and Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, 2.

The cathartic method depends on a process of abreaction, which denotes a specific use of language in releasing the emotional repressions of personal memory. The “emotional discharge whereby the subject liberates himself from the affect attached to the memory of a traumatic event in such a way that this affect is not able to become (or to remain) pathogenic.”¹⁰⁵ That is, as in the related process of cathexis, the abreaction of any affective symptom signifies an active and cathartic release of “a certain amount of psychical energy...attached to an idea or to a group of ideas, to a part of the body, to an object, etc” such that it cannot reconstitute itself (remain pathogenic).¹⁰⁶ Laplanche and Pontalis write that any notion of the term abreaction can only be understood by reference to Freud’s earlier work, such as in the 1893 paper “On the Psychological Mechanism of Hysterical Phenomena,” but that from *Studies on Hysteria* onward “we find Freud speaking on occasion of the actual effort of recollection and mental working out as a process of abreaction in which the same affect is revived at the memory of each of the different events which have given rise to it.”¹⁰⁷ In other words, in *Studies on Hysteria*, cathexis indicates the reliving and re-narration of a traumatic memory through speech in order to trigger a psychical release, which eases the manifest, physical symptoms of neurosis. Traumatic memory is *not* the event “in-itself.” Memory is, by definition, narrated. Forms of “talking out,” “ventilating,” and “narrating” described in *Studies on Hysteria* indicate the method of interpreting the verbal narration of memories that mimic and relive what the mind has archived yet the body continues to process.

A focus on the textual grows in Freud’s independent work following *Studies on Hysteria*. However, for now we will consider some similarities between Breuer’s and Freud’s approaches to language and speech in this text before turning to their differences at this crucial stage in the development of psychoanalysis.¹⁰⁸ In *Studies on Hysteria* both Freud and Breuer claim that an idea or memory can have “free rein” over a person’s body, but that a reassociation of the symptom through *talking* can displace it. They jointly argue that traumatic memories, which produce “an energetic reaction to the event that provokes an affect,” can be “talked away,” re-configuring the significance of

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 1.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 62.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 1.

¹⁰⁸ *SE II*, 29, 30, 35, 34, 101.

traumatic memory through narration facilitated by an interpreter: the analyst.¹⁰⁹ As both Breuer and Freud considered hysteria to be caused by traumatic memories, they argue for a “‘symbolic’ relation between the precipitating cause and the pathological phenomenon,” and as such effectively agree on a non-literal approach to examining the links between language, mind, and body.¹¹⁰

Though not directly focusing on the role of dreams as of yet, Freud now viewed hypnosis as a redundant tool. He came to believe that it was too superficial, and should be replaced with the talking cure and the free-association technique, which allow for “methods of investigation of the unconscious mind...[that rely] on suggestion and on the patient’s concentrating his mind on a given idea.”¹¹¹ Freud, perhaps more ambitiously than Breuer, wanted to demonstrate that the splitting off of associations from consciousness is caused by the mind working against itself, forming a defensive tension between consciousness and the unconscious. This was not a question of degenerative, hereditary predisposition, but rather hidden traumatic memories that are sexual in origin and are repressed from consciousness. These views indicate a theory of repression increasingly developed in Freud’s work, and the role of the analyst who guides a patient in concentrating on “a given idea” through methods of verbal free-association to access repressed content deemed inadmissible to conscious life.

In Freud’s case study on Miss Lucy R., he describes his method of analysis in accordance with, yet slightly differing from, Breuer’s work on the theory of the talking cure as a means to facilitate the catharsis of hysterical symptoms. His described method also incorporates Bernheim’s pressure technique. By placing his hand on a patient’s forehead and instructing them to relax their “critical faculties” Freud writes of encouraging his patient to grasp any idea that came into their mind. In doing so, Freud determines that he has found an ability to locate the source of a patient’s symptoms through an associative technique he would later apply to recording and working through his own dream analysis whenever he reached points of resistance.¹¹² In *Studies on Hysteria* he writes how the latent, repressed source of a patient’s hysteria became clear when, after being prodded to free-associate, “the patient would reply: ‘As a matter of

¹⁰⁹ *SE II*, 8, author’s emphasis; 35.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹¹¹ Laplanche and Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, 169.

¹¹² *SE II*, 110.

fact I knew that the first time, but it was just what I didn't want to say.”¹¹³ This process led Freud to infer that “forgetting is often intentional and desired,” and that a repressive force bars the uncovering of an unconscious (and ultimately sexual), memory through forms of resistance he dedicated himself to defining as part of a larger theory of the mind.¹¹⁴

In this way, and as Laplanche and Pontalis describe, while Freud had defined three types of hysteria, “hypnoid hysteria, retention hysteria and defence hysteria,” it was “immediately after the publication of the *Studies on Hysteria* that Freud abandoned the first two of these three types.”¹¹⁵ He would focus most exclusively on defence or repression: a “patient’s ‘not knowing’ was in fact a ‘not wanting to know,’” and the concept of defence would become a focus in part of his study of primary neurological processes in “Project for a Scientific Psychology.”¹¹⁶ Importantly, Freud had discovered a method that allows an “idea to emerge which is an intermediate link in the chain of associations between the idea from which we start and the pathogenic idea which we are in search of,” as having the greatest interpretive value in exploring what is hidden from consciousness. There is a barrier between the unconscious mind and the body that works in tandem with defence or repression, but such resistance can be overcome through using associative language (and the interpretation of symbolic forms of association) as a means of access to the repressed, latent content of one’s unconscious.¹¹⁷

Freud’s final chapter in *Studies on Hysteria* contains a preliminary blueprint of his theory that hysteria results from the “repressed memory of a sexual trauma,”¹¹⁸ as well as his insistence on “abandon[ing] hypnotism.”¹¹⁹ According to Crews, Freud was “ready to tell the world that he had devised an efficacious new therapy, based on Breuer’s ‘cathartic method’ but improving on it—for Breuer hadn’t grasped that every psychoneurosis is traceable to the repressed memory of a sexual trauma.”¹²⁰ Indeed,

¹¹³ Ibid., 111.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Laplanche and Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, 2.

¹¹⁶ *SE I*, 270.

¹¹⁷ *SE II*, 271.

¹¹⁸ Crews, *Freud*, 627.

¹¹⁹ Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, 29. The process of abandoning hypnotism is also discussed in *SE I*, 268–269.

¹²⁰ Crews, *Freud*, 898.

Freud's final contribution stands in contrast to Breuer's theoretical summary that precedes it. Freud writes that in the course of the development of *Studies on Hysteria* he had begun to uncover insights independent of Breuer's research and conclusions, and that "it would be unfair if I were to try to lay too much of the responsibility for this development upon my honoured friend, Dr Josef Breuer."¹²¹ Freud's proposition is that in looking for the "determining causes which lead to the acquisition of neuroses, their aetiology is to be looked for in sexual factors."¹²² Here Freud's tendency, as might now be evident, bears resemblance to his annotations to his early translation of Bernheim, and his translation of Charcot's *Leçons* that shortly followed. That is, in the conclusion to *Studies on Hysteria* he effectively informs readers of new developments that go against the work of his mentor or colleague while incorporating their theoretical advancements into his own work. In this text, however, he announces working towards an independent theory for the first time.

Freud's deviation from Breuer, his belief in sexual trauma, and his interpreting case material to deduce "sexual factors" are evident in his retroactive analysis of Breuer's work with Pappenheim. In *Studies on Hysteria* Freud first describes that while he deems sexuality to be the true cause of traumatic memories, he was unable to find such a source in Breuer's analysis of Anna O.: "it is quite useless for this purpose [of deducing sexual trauma as the cause of hysteria]."¹²³ However, Freud later revises this opinion in *An Autobiographical Study*, where he explains that a sexual scenario was present in the *transference* of Pappenheim's attachment to his colleague, which the physician had failed to discern: "the girl had developed a transference love that Breuer had not connected with her illness."¹²⁴ Although Breuer was able to communicatively engage with Pappenheim and develop the method of the "talking cure," the sexual components that Freud would increasingly focus on were what Breuer refused to acknowledge, and such factors, according to Freud, are precisely what determined the unsuccessful outcome of the case. Freud interprets that it was Breuer's lack of attention to Pappenheim's sexual attraction to him—transference—that caused him to fail in his analysis of her; he was unable and unwilling to join Freud in his conclusions concerning the theory that "sexual factors" are invaluable for studying hysteria. For

¹²¹ *SE II*, 256.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 257, author's emphasis.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 258.

¹²⁴ Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, 46.

Breuer, “to admit that the ultimate origins of hysteria, and some of its florid manifestations, were sexual in nature [...] is not to my taste.”¹²⁵

That sexually traumatic memories (later, latent desires) are the source of hysteria, as well as how they manifest and reveal their “nature” through transference with an analyst, is explained in *Studies on Hysteria*. Freud recounts a case wherein a patient attempted to give him a kiss at the end of a session, based on her belief that “the man she was talking to at the time might boldly take the initiative and give her a kiss.”¹²⁶ As such, the patient’s transferred desire or “wish” was “linked to my person” as an ultimately “false connection” but nevertheless an important one.¹²⁷ Though Freud wholly admits that he understood the patient did not want to kiss *him* but rather the man she had been seeing at the time, her repressed, “forbidden wish” to be kissed by that man provoked a “transference” intimately related to resistance (the forbiddingness of the wish or desire for a kiss) that was nevertheless projected onto his person.¹²⁸ In such instances, Freud “underscored the tendency of certain patients to ‘act out’ the instinctual impulses aroused during the analytic session outside the consulting room.”¹²⁹ A crucial part of cathecting symptoms is to “relive” the memories being actively narrated—in the analytic scenario these are projected onto the analyst and are thusly given the scenario to be intervened upon and ascribed with new significance. In Freud’s process of analysing his own dreams, he acknowledges the significance of his dreams through textual self-analysis as a form of re-transcription.

In *Studies on Hysteria*, Freud had developed, with Breuer, the theory that neurosis is the result of traumatic memories. It was meant to replace Charcot’s hereditary thesis by providing an account of dispositional, acquired hysteria equipped with an analytic methodology involving interpreting spoken language. From his work with Breuer, Freud incorporated Pappenheim’s insistence that it was talking, rather than hypnosis, that provided the best therapeutic effect as well as unique insight into the processes of the mind and its connection to the body. As much as Charcot’s use of hypnosis was meant to provide resource to the empirical study of hysteric degeneracy, the talking cure was an equivalent for studying the way the mind processes trauma durationally,

¹²⁵ Gay, *A Life*, 66–67.

¹²⁶ *SE II*, 303.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹ Laplanche and Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, 5.

accessed through interpreting hysterics' personal narratives as opposed to observing their external symptoms. A link between the interpretation of speech and how neurosis manifests or is inscribed in the body through seemingly disconnected symptoms is established as a narrative that an analyst can decode. Therefore, Freud deemed the practice of hypnotism to be redundant; it was replaced with the psychoanalytic method of a "talking cure," a methodological process for analysing the "psychical" through language. This could relieve or "cathect" the physical symptoms of neurosis, while giving those such as Freud the opportunity to examine how the process of the mind hides traumatic memories and desires.

However, at the end of *Studies on Hysteria*, Freud determines that the cathartic method still "cannot affect the underlying causes of hysteria: it thus cannot prevent fresh symptoms from taking the place of the ones which had been got rid of."¹³⁰ Although his studies with Breuer deviated from the hereditary thesis advocated by Charcot, its methods lacked a working theory to support future investigations. Freud wanted to understand how hysteria worked on a neurological, systemic level rather than on only a case-by-case scenario. In seeking to do so, he turned his attention to carving out a scientific theory of the mind in accordance with what he had been working on with Breuer. He began working on what is now called "Project for a Scientific Psychology," a series of notebooks that he began immediately after *Studies on Hysteria* was completed. This draft-stage work represents Freud's attempts at creating a neurophysiological language for the invisible aspects of the mind and its capacity for repression, defence, and archiving memories. The text is an intermediary effort that contains sketches of what would become re-transcribed during his self-analysis and is an important paratextual resource to understanding *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

1.3 "Project for a Scientific Psychology" as Paratextual Workbook

After *Studies on Hysteria* was published, Freud immediately began to work on an independent "Project for a Scientific Psychology." The text, which was never established in one volume during his lifetime, was developed in several notebooks. It appears to be a diversion from his prior conclusions, and, although Freud would abandon the work and go so far as to describe it as "a kind of aberration," argued here is

¹³⁰ Ibid., 261.

that it can be seen as a paratextual, companion text to *The Interpretation of Dreams*, one that signifies an overlapping tension between scientific positivism and applied aesthetics woven into psychoanalytic theory so often seen as at odds with each other.¹³¹ Crews designates it as “the most obscure work in the Freud canon,” however, the draft-stage work articulates Freud’s independent efforts to create a neurological language of the mind outside of a hereditary model and outside of the focus on speech developed in the theory of the talking cure.¹³²

A focus on the “scientific” project is also contextually important, due to how it came to a standstill just before the death of Freud’s father, Jacob, in 1896. Many of the ideas presented in this text were reworked in the aftermath of Jacob’s death, a period distinguished by Freud’s self-determined belief that he himself had become neurotic. His consequent writerly approach to self-analyse was an attempt to understand and “cure” himself. A focus on “Project” therefore signifies a turn towards both a neurological premise for language outside of speech (a remainder from his work with Charcot) that was swiftly followed by a rethinking of language through the writing out of his dreams as therapeutic practice spurred by the death of his father. These conceptual and biographical intersections are important antecedents to how Freud configured the textual methods of self-analysis so fundamental to the interpretive methods described in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, which is distinguished from empirical science by its literary qualities.

The history and format of “Project for a Scientific Psychology” make it an interesting document to study from a textual perspective. It is made up of letters that provide commentary on drafts from notebooks that Freud sent to Wilhelm Fliess, with whom he had developed a close friendship by that time.¹³³ Louis Breger writes that drafts of Freud’s notebooks on “Project” were “sent to Fliess but never published.”¹³⁴ Frank Sulloway explains that the “two surviving notebooks [source texts] were published only posthumously” and that after having been “discovered among Freud’s letters to Fliess [they] were given the German editor’s title *Entwurf einer Psychologie* [Sketch of a

¹³¹ Crews translates *Wahnwitz* to “madness” as opposed to the milder “aberration” employed in Strachey’s translation; see *Freud*, 751.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 749.

¹³³ See Jones, “The Fliess Period (1887–1902),” in *The Life and Work*, 249–275.

¹³⁴ Breger, *Freud: Darkness in the Midst of Vision*, 54.

Psychology].”¹³⁵ The numerous letters and series of drafts that Freud sent to Fliess became available only after the Second World War, and were so lengthy that Freud’s authoritative translator, James Strachey, grew to view them as an independent document. He consolidated the drafts and notebooks and chose to translate the provisional German title *Entwurf einer Psychologie* [Sketch of a Psychology] to “Project for a Scientific Psychology,” a posthumous title that has since been adopted by scholars and used here.¹³⁶ It was in early spring of 1895 and just a month after completing his final chapter for *Studies on Hysteria* that Freud wrote to Fliess of his ambitious undertaking that he first titled “Psychology for Neurologists.” A comparison between excerpts of the text and the letters to Fliess contributes to our ability to situate Freud’s ambitious yet abandoned vision within the context of his early thinking around both empirical science and aesthetic modes of interpretation.¹³⁷

Freud wanted to create a new understanding of normal psychology outside of Charcot’s model. His work in “Project for a Scientific Psychology” attempts to provide a mechanical and positivist model reminiscent of his earlier studies with Charcot, and an organic project that exceeds positivism’s reductionist, hereditary framework. The draft-like quality or “sketch” of psychology in these notebooks are why they are designated as paratextual, and a number of lines from the “Project” are reiterated in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. The reasons why Freud abandoned this project also mark an important transition between Freud “the neurologist” to Freud “the psychoanalyst.” We can see this process in action by briefly studying the consolidated version of this text. Concepts arising from *Studies on Hysteria* such as cathexis and repression are included in “Project;” the work recapitulates, revises and re-presents much of what he had learnt within the work-in-progress format. However, it ultimately shows that because a neurological language of the mind lacks the features of symbolic language, invisible to neurological study, it was impossible for it to accord with the aesthetic language of the self. Freud struggled to reconcile a scientifically reductive theory of the mind with the language of dynamically experienced symptoms that cannot, in effect, be neurologically located nor, consequentially, plotted. He would have to abandon the pursuit of

¹³⁵ Frank Sulloway, *Freud, Biologist of the Mind: Beyond the Psychoanalytic Legend* (London: Fontana Press, 1980), 114.

¹³⁶ Strachey, “Editor’s Note,” 175–176.

¹³⁷ See Strachey, “Editor’s Note,” in *SE I*, 175.

establishing an inclusive, scientific neurological system for explaining the effects of trauma, and his revised approach is what we see in *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

The liberating exchange of ideas that Freud felt to be available in his relationship with Fliess gave him the chance to “entertain a more wildly speculative self; the respectable scientific doctor becoming also something akin to a visionary artist.”¹³⁸ Breger writes that drafts of the work and his letters to Fliess show how Freud began “to frame his emerging psychoanalytic ideas” through a freedom of expression encouraged by an open-minded and receptive Fliess.¹³⁹ In a letter to his friend, Freud defined two central objectives concerning this work. Firstly, he wanted to establish a project that would “investigate what form the theory of mental functioning assumes if one introduces the quantitative point of view, a sort of economics of nerve forces; and secondly, he wished to distil from psychopathology a gain for normal psychology.”¹⁴⁰ A passionate excerpt from this letter is worth quoting in full:

I have found my tyrant, and in his service I know no limits. My tyrant is psychology; it has always been my distant, beckoning goal and now, since I have hit on the neuroses, it has come so much the nearer. I am plagued with two ambitions: to see how the theory of mental functioning takes shape if quantitative considerations, a sort of economics of nerve-force, are introduced into it; and secondly, to extract from psychopathology what might be of benefit to normal psychology. Actually a satisfactory general theory of neuropsychotic disturbances is impossible if it cannot be brought into association with clear assumptions about normal mental processes.¹⁴¹

Freud’s described twin ambitions—developing an economy of nerve forces (an extrapolation on cathexis as an “economical concept” that would influence his theory of drives and libido) and creating a gain for normal psychology—are reflected in the structure of “Project,” and the excerpt describes how psychology had become Freud’s “tyrannical” or single-minded preoccupation.¹⁴² It is evident that he wanted to create a “quantitative” theory of neurology reflecting normal mental processes in order to develop a better, categorical theory upon which to rest an account of its disturbances.

¹³⁸ Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 100.

¹³⁹ Breger, *Freud: Darkness in the Midst of Vision*, 54.

¹⁴⁰ Gay, *A Life*, 78.

¹⁴¹ Bonaparte, Freud, and Kris, *The Origins of Psychoanalysis*, 119–20.

¹⁴² Cathexis denotes “the fact that a certain amount of psychical energy is attached to an idea or group of ideas, to a part of the body, to an object, etc.” Laplanche and Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*, 62.

His ambition was to construct a new system, and the aborted efforts of this particular articulation are contained in the surviving portion of the work, which tackles his proposed endeavour in three parts.

The text begins with a lengthy “General Scheme” that sets forth the various premises of his undertaking, followed by a comparably short section, “Psychopathology,” and closes with a section titled “Attempt to Represent Normal Psychical Processes.” In the General portion of the study, Freud’s fundamentally positivist orientation in the text is evident in the first sentence: “The intention is to furnish a psychology that shall be a natural science: That is, to represent psychical processes as quantitatively determinate states of specific material particles, thus making those processes perspicuous and free from contradiction.”¹⁴³ Freud wanted to partake in a study of psychology according to natural laws of the mind, similar to the positivist tradition: material particles could quantitatively determine the nature of psychical processes and especially their “normal” states according to determinants of natural science. However, given that Freud wanted to do so outside of a hereditary model, his task was an attempt to rewire Charcot’s positivist methodology based on the degeneracy thesis with a new, though equally scientific, methodological replacement.

Perhaps in an effort to distance himself from language, Freud implements several sigla, such as in his representation of permeable and impermeable neurons: Φ is meant to indicate *permeable* neurons that are met with no resistance, that retain nothing, and that are essential to perception; Ψ indicates *impermeable* neurons that are “loaded with resistance” and are the “vehicles of memory.”¹⁴⁴ He was “convinced that psychology must have a physical basis, and he logically hoped that psychological laws might turn out to exhibit many of the same fundamental principles as the neurophysiological events upon which they are causally dependent.”¹⁴⁵ Rather than focusing on the metaphoric unknowns “hidden” from consciousness, not yet available in language, Freud attempted to connect symbols and concepts to neurological processes in the brain, particularly to determine primary processes and to form a working foundation for “normal psychology.” If he could do this, he could create an antecedent foundation for

¹⁴³ *SE I*, 295.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 299–300.

¹⁴⁵ See Richard Wollheim, *Sigmund Freud* (New York: Viking Press, 1971), 34.

what was “hidden from consciousness” that creates the pathogenic conditions for hysteria.

Although he insists, for the most part, on implementing a scientific language, several passages in the General Scheme concerning dreams and sleeping anticipate content in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Freud explains that “in dreams the *compulsion to associate* prevails” because of the paralytic effect of sleeping.¹⁴⁶ In a phrase that echoes *The Interpretation of Dreams*, he describes that in every association “dreams are *wish-fulfilments*,” which are defined in this text as “primary processes following upon experiences of satisfaction” separated from pain (which he associates with affect).¹⁴⁷ Freud deduces that if, “when the memory of a dream is retained, we inquire into its content, we find that the meaning of dreams as wish-fulfilments is concealed by a number of Ψ processes: all of which are met with once more in neuroses and characterize the latter’s nature.”¹⁴⁸ That is, he contends that the process of association occurs more freely in dreams, that dreams are wish-fulfilments associated with satisfaction, and that the *meaning* of that satisfaction is concealed by virtue of impermeable *neurons* at the level of primary processes, represented by Ψ .

However, as Freud tried to map neurological mechanisms onto the language of impermeable concepts, he ultimately concludes it is impossible to do so. In part two, “Psychopathology,” Freud switches to a more narrative approach, recounting his experience with a patient called Emma. An account of the case serves, in the text, as an example of how displacement works as a mechanism of defence distinguished from Ψ as a primary neurological response denoting impermeability and resistance.¹⁴⁹ In his description of the case study Freud appears more confident, fluently articulating how his patient, Emma, had told him that when she was eight she was sexually groped by a shopkeeper when she went to purchase candy. While no symptom formed following this event, when she was around the age of “twelve (shortly after puberty)...she went into a shop to buy something, saw the two shop-assistants (one of whom she can remember) laughing together, and ran away in some kind of *affect of fright*.”¹⁵⁰ Their

¹⁴⁶ *SE I*, 390, author’s emphasis.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 340, author’s emphasis. Freud distinguishes between affect (pain) and wishful states (satisfaction) from 321–322.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 341.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 351–352.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 353, author’s emphasis in both italics and parenthesis.

laughter reminded her of the grin of the shopkeeper when he had grabbed her years prior, establishing a link between the two events that “allowed her to reread the first event in light of her *recently acquired knowledge of sexuality*.”¹⁵¹

Freud refers to this “deferred action” as *Nachträglichkeit*, a secondary process of repression that Bruce Fink translates as “ex post facto action.”¹⁵² Freud determines, in relation to this case, that we “invariably find that a memory is repressed which has only become trauma by *deferred* action” that encounters its impact through a circuit, one that displaces repression into an “afterness,” which tied into his sexuality hypothesis.¹⁵³ The case of Emma demonstrates deferred action in tandem with repression, while also demonstrating that the onset of puberty (sexual awakening) can live an incubating, psychical dormancy, resulting in what would become hysterical symptoms. In this text Freud’s analysis of deferred action resembles qualities of *displacement* that later function in a dream schema that Freud provides as a method of interpretation, and this “deferred action” becomes traceable by plotting the symbolic networks of language developed over time.¹⁵⁴ In this way, his methods for interpreting case studies *do* develop a language of interpretation, although not through a purely scientific, neurological understanding. Instead, we find the seeds of the analytic method in concepts such as displacement, condensation, and deferral, each of which depends upon the dynamic analysis of language.

Freud increasingly recognised that his ambitions in the early “Project for a Scientific Psychology” were difficult, if not impossible, to realise. Though components in this work find their way into *The Interpretation of Dreams*, in “Project for a Scientific Psychology” Freud’s efforts to develop an innovative yet neurologically based theory of the mind grew steadily frustrated. In a letter dated 26 April 1895, Freud wrote to Fliess:

I am so deep in the “Psychology for Neurologists” that it quite consumes me, until I have to break off out of sheer exhaustion. I have never been so intensely preoccupied by anything. And will anything come of it? I hope so, but the going is hard and slow.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹ Fink, *A Clinical Introduction to Freud*, 105, author’s emphasis.

¹⁵² *SE I*, 106.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 356.

¹⁵⁴ Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, 60.

¹⁵⁵ Bonaparte, Freud, and Kris, *The Origins of Psychoanalysis*, 118.

The laborious process is evident in the section called “Attempt to Represent Normal Psychological Processes,” where Freud determines that neuronal processes, when considered to be unconscious, should simply be “inferred like other natural things.”¹⁵⁶ This final section of “Project for a Scientific Psychology” shifts from Comte’s positivist and reductive approach to science, realising that mechanical explanations are insufficient, and then rapidly progresses towards a more dynamic approach he associates with evolutionary biology. Freud writes of trying to discern “the mechanism of psychical attention,” but he finds it “hard to give a mechanical (automatic) explanation” and therefore concludes it is “biologically determined” without explaining precisely what this means.¹⁵⁷ Psychological attention (along with craving, ideas, and satisfaction) become “biologically justified; it is only a question of guiding the ego as to *which* expectant cathexis is to establish and this purpose is served by the indications of quality.”¹⁵⁸ That is, natural and sexual selection become understood as vague but permeable principals inherent in the dynamic qualities of life, and so the question then becomes how to assign its significance to psychical processes. Freud’s text suddenly veers into iterating a preliminary theory of dreams that deviates from biological language, especially in relation to his proposed understanding of primary and secondary systems of defence.

This confusion represents how Freud realised that he lacked a feasible mechanism to adequately connect symptoms of defence with the origin of psychical attention and wish-fulfilment as an idea with desire. Therefore, Freud decided to abandon the work altogether and it drew to a standstill; he came to regard it, as stated above, as “a kind of aberration.” While his progress may represent an early formation of a new theory of evolutionary psychology as some have argued, here we might view how the very limitations of this text contain the problems facing interpretation when subjected to the validity criteria of the scientific method.¹⁵⁹ In attempting to impose reductive concepts on a theory of the self, Freud struggled with this reconciliation and rightly so. Fertile traces of concepts that would become filtered and defined in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, such as interpretive process, are neurologically invisible. The process of

¹⁵⁶ *SE I*, 356.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 360–361.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 361.

¹⁵⁹ A summary can be found in Geoffrey Marcaggi and Fabian Guénolé, “Freudarwin: Evolutionary Thinking as a Root of Psychoanalysis,” *Frontiers in Psychology* 9 (2018): 892.

interpretation, as argued here, is marked by Freud's personal experiences that immediately followed his abandonment of this text, and that impacted his understanding of not only the project he had deserted, but the one he would create through a more writerly focus on language and dreams, more specifically his foundational theory of psychical processes that stands in stark contrast to scientific empiricism.

Shortly after Freud decided to forgo working on "Project," which contains his most direct, and frustrated, efforts to carve a neurological study of psychology after his break from Charcot, he experienced "the most important event, the most poignant loss, of a man's life"—the death of his father.¹⁶⁰ The event instigated his self-analysis, and his interpretive work on himself incorporates and crucially changes several of the half-formed concepts written in "Project for a Scientific Psychology." He purposefully removed himself from a neurophysiological approach in favour of more interpretive methods that increasingly can be seen as literary. Personal trauma re-transcribed and re-informed much of Freud's understanding of psychology to create methods—applications—for the interpretation of the unconscious. It might seem heavy-handed to assert that it was personal trauma, or what Henri Ellenberger and Didier Anzieu alternatively call "creative crisis," that drew together the threads discussed up to this point to create the groundwork of Freudian psychoanalysis as a creative project.¹⁶¹ However, Ellenberger, who views this period as a point of "creative illness," encourages such a reading, and the period when Freud was writing "Project" and the death of his father occurred was undoubtedly a catalysing time in his life.¹⁶² Adam Phillips provides a useful, condensed summary:

...between 1887, the year after he married, when he met Wilhelm Fliess, and the publication of *Interpretation of Dreams* in 1900 were the most tumultuous years of Freud's life, a protracted crisis in which he had his family, and effectively

¹⁶⁰ *SE IV*, xxvi.

¹⁶¹ Didier Anzieu, *Freud's Self-Analysis*, trans. Peter Graham (London: Chatto & Windus, 1986), 3.

¹⁶² Henri Ellenberger cited in Jean-Michel Obaid, "The Incidence of Freudian Self-Analysis in the Construction of the Psychoanalytic Theory of Anxiety," *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 95, vol. 1 (2014): 19 fn 1.

invented psychoanalysis by inventing a new kind of patient, and a new kind of doctor to treat this patient.¹⁶³

Acknowledging these events can contribute to understanding the fact that “Freud broke through to the more literary, the more psychological account of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, in which the so-called psychic apparatus began to sound more like a poet than a machine” as concurrent with the death of his father.¹⁶⁴

Freud’s work, specifically in advance of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, had maintained an appeal to scientific methods while increasingly stretching the bounds of reductive and materialist positivism and its applications to psychology. He remained self-conscious of the adage that he “never tired of repeating: *La théorie, c’est bon, mais ça n’empêche pas d’exister* [Theory is good, but it doesn’t prevent facts from existing].”¹⁶⁵ However, his work with Breuer on trauma, memory, and the talking cure progress into the revised approach to language brought about in his self-analysis. To extrapolate from Phillips, it was in becoming his own patient following the death of his father that Freud in fact “invented a new kind of patient,” and in so doing was able to reciprocally “invent a new doctor.”¹⁶⁶ A dynamic approach to symptomology through language was a means for deciphering the unquantifiable and invisible unconscious. Freud’s methodological approach would strive to, as Phillips puts it, “release the language of literature into the language of science, to make the hybrid language of psychoanalysis.”¹⁶⁷

We can now turn to the role that Freud’s self-analysis played as a form of writerly process in informing the content and creative legacy of *The Interpretation of Dreams*. We will regard the psychoanalytic frameworks that Freud developed in this text with a focus on process, one rooted in studying consciousness through language and writing. Doing so will better allow us to see how the literary is built into this foundational psychoanalytic text, which literary modernists would participate in and repurpose according to their independent understandings of the importance of writing, its representations of inner and outer worlds, and the significance of dreams. Although this

¹⁶³ Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 102.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 110.

¹⁶⁵ Gay, *A Life*, 51.

¹⁶⁶ Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 102.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 110.

study far from suggests that Freud abandoned his commitments to psychoanalysis being taken as a form of empirical science, and will return to them in this chapter's conclusion, for now we approach his self-analysis that informed *The Interpretation of Dreams* through a process-based, self-administered "writing cure."

1.4 Self-Analysis Through Dreamdrafts: *The Interpretation of Dreams*

In 1907, Freud prefaced the second edition of *The Interpretation of Dreams* by informing readers that the text was created from "my own self-analysis, my reaction to my father's death—that is to say, to the most important event, the most poignant loss, of a man's life."¹⁶⁸ He therefore forthrightly states that his father Jacob's death on 23 October 1896 was what prompted his self-analysis that established the foundations of *The Interpretation of Dreams* and its crucial discoveries that "it has been my good fortune to make."¹⁶⁹ Roughly a week after his father's funeral he wrote to Fliess: "in [my] inner self the whole past has been awakened by this event. I now feel quite uprooted," and he began to suspect that he himself had a case of neurosis.¹⁷⁰ Makari describes what followed as a process predicated on grief; Freud began his self-analysis to work through his symptoms as a method for coping with the loss of his parent.¹⁷¹ For Ernest Jones, Freud's self-analysis represents his "most heroic feat—a psycho-analysis of his own unconscious [...] the uniqueness of the feat remains. Once done it is done forever. For no one again can be the first to explore those depths."¹⁷²

In considering Freud's self-analysis as a response to his own experience of dispositional neurosis, we can examine Freud's venture while acknowledging how (despite Jones's enthusiasm regarding his mentor's heroism) he would deem the process of self-analysis to be an impossible endeavour: "true self-analysis is impossible; otherwise there would be no [neurotic] illness."¹⁷³ However, the "depths" to which Freud plunged through self-analysis, and which contributed to the essential insights in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, are valuable in their own right, precisely because they developed the compositional foundation for this text. Further, his process is, as we shall see in the chapters that follow, not dissimilar to literary modernists who sought to explore their

¹⁶⁸ *SE IV*, xxvi.

¹⁶⁹ Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 104.

¹⁷⁰ Masson, *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess*, 202.

¹⁷¹ Makari, *Revolution in Mind*, 74.

¹⁷² Jones, *The Life and Work*, 276.

¹⁷³ Masson, *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess*, 281.

own process-based and representative understandings of the mind through unconventional and creative uses of language. The process, progress, and ambiguity reflected in language as it is used are immanent to literary composition, often mimicking the inner workings of psychological perception, which thus provides potential for investigations of the mind. In Freud's self-analysis he established and profited from a focus on how language is essential to analysing experience, by fixating on the symbolic interpretation of his own dreams directly after his father's death.

Freud's self-analysis paved his pivotal and most intimate foray into the role of language by writing out, and then interpreting, his dreams in order to intervene and remedy his self-diagnosed case of neurosis. In *Studies on Hysteria*, as we've explored, trauma and an account of it is not an event in itself — its accessibility is delayed. A memory reappears through traces that, by definition, can only be understood through narrative formulated retroactively. This is the qualitative difference emphasised between talking and writing, one which is markedly different from the empirical approach pursued in the sciences. The function of the talking cure achieves something that empirical analysis cannot: deciphering how a traumatic, dynamic narrative can trace the symptoms of neurosis (ultimately, the self). Unlike scientific empiricism or neurological psychology, a primary focus on language itself can plot out how memory represses, condenses, and archives trauma through a non-linear and non-static *aesthetic* interpretation of how the mind uses language. Methods, such as condensation and displacement, are paramount in *The Interpretation of Dreams*; the concepts therein are meant to be tools for interpretive work on revealing the language of the unconscious that provides consciousness's subtext. By comparing how Freud's adopted methods of self-analysis (as both essential *and* "impossible") contributed to the interpretive methods he defines as an essential methodology for the analyst and thus the clinic, we can extrapolate upon Patrick Mahony's view that Freud enacted a "writing cure" while composing *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

Several months after his father's death and shortly after he wrote to Fliess that his entire life had been uprooted by that event, Freud wrote a letter describing "memory-traces," which he believed are subject to a "re-arrangement in accordance with fresh circumstances—to re-transcription."¹⁷⁴ While "a biography, like a symptom, fixes a

¹⁷⁴ Cited in Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 16.

person in a story about themselves,” psychoanalytic intervention allows the opportunity to re-transcribe memory through alternative forms of signification.¹⁷⁵ Phillips and others have noted how Freud “had a lifelong aversion to biography and to biographers,”¹⁷⁶ and Gay records how, when recounting his earliest years when his family moved from Leipzig to Vienna in 1859, Freud wrote, “I think nothing about them was worth remembering.”¹⁷⁷ In a letter to Bernays in 1885 Freud informed her that he had “destroyed all my notes of the past fourteen years, as well as letters, scientific excerpts and the manuscripts of my papers...I couldn’t have matured or died without worry about who would get hold of those papers.”¹⁷⁸ That year was not the only occasion on which Freud destroyed his papers. Frank Sulloway recalls how “again in 1907, [Freud] completely destroyed all his manuscripts, private diaries, notes and correspondence” and that in doing so “actively sought to cultivate the unknown about himself.”¹⁷⁹ Freud himself did not want to be interpreted on the basis of biography nor did he want to have analytic readings applied to him.

If it were exclusively the case that Freud wanted to sabotage all possible biographical readings of himself, it appears curious that *The Interpretation of Dreams* reads as such an autobiographical work, disclosing intimate aspects of his life for public scrutiny. It therefore seems likely that the process of self-analysis imparted a meaningful and creative distance for Freud (between author and biography), one that allowed space for intervention and independent, creative interpretation: a re-transcription of his “memory-traces” into a new, coherent narrative. A concentration on forms of narrative process is one that this dissertation emphasises. That is: work-in-progress resources that demonstrate the inscriptive revision and creative re-transcription of the narrative self. Like a palimpsestic text, the mind is dynamically constructed through revision, erasure, style, and accumulation. For Freud, one can explore the psyche’s multi-dimensional aspects through the symbolic interpretation of dreams and language.

It is evident that Freud’s self-analysis was dictated by uncovering what was unknown and alien in himself following the death of his father, yet he also wanted to scour such discoveries for objective value, a representational formulation that could form the basis

¹⁷⁵ Phillips, *Becoming Freud*, 16.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 22.

¹⁷⁷ Cited in Gay, *A Life*, 8.

¹⁷⁸ Ernst Freud, ed., *Letters of Sigmund Freud* (London: Hogarth Press, 1961), 152.

¹⁷⁹ Sulloway, *Freud: Biologist of the Mind*, 7.

of a “normal psychology.”¹⁸⁰ While Freud created, abandoned and revised many convictions throughout his expansive career, the focus here should be fundamentally understood as limiting itself to the fecund period just before *The Interpretation of Dreams* was published—this chapter, and this section, does not claim to encompass the vast breadth of “Freudian theory.” Instead, it focuses on the process of Freud’s interpretation, which was decidedly not scientific, but rather literary in method.

The beginning of Freud’s self-analysis is expressed in a letter to Fliess on 2 November 1896, where he writes of a dream concerning his father’s funeral, one that is presented differently in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Though it is generally agreed that the height of Freud’s self-analysis occurred during the summer of 1897 and continued to November 1899, he had begun a rudimentary process of interpreting his dreams, starting in connection with his father, much earlier.¹⁸¹ To Fliess, Freud writes that he dreamt of his father’s funeral the night after it occurred, though in *The Interpretation of Dreams* the dream is described as having occurred the night before. To Fliess, Freud describes the first iteration of the dream, where he read on a sign located in a barbershop he frequented daily: “you are requested to close the eyes.”¹⁸² Freud writes to Fliess that at the actual funeral he was late, and that his family was offended by both his lack of punctuality and his frugal approach to the ceremony: the funeral was simply furnished and few were invited. Freud concludes, in his letter to Fliess, that the dream “thus stems from the inclination to self-reproach that regularly sets in among the survivors.”¹⁸³

Didier Anzieu compares such a description to the characteristics of mourning that Freud would later describe in “Mourning and Melancholia.” That is,

...the survivor can, through a process of revival, master both the conflict of ambivalence towards the image of his father and the dependence or counter-dependence that goes with authority, and thereby, if he has the makings of a

¹⁸⁰ Masson, *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess*, 202.

¹⁸¹ Patrick Mahony provides the dates: the summer of 1897 to November 1899 “more or less” mark the duration of Freud’s systematic self-analysis; “Writing Cure,” 15. As he acknowledges, the dating of Freud’s self-analysis is difficult to place, and he provides a detailed appendix concerning this topic; see 33–35.

¹⁸² Ernest Freud, *Letters of Sigmund Freud*, 202.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*

creator, cease to consider himself solely as someone's child and assert himself as the father of his works.¹⁸⁴

Anzieu's reading postulates that the melancholic significance of the death of Freud's father represented a *possibility* offered by trauma; Freud had the opportunity to overcome or re-think *meaning* and the principals of self-identity.

The self-analysis to which Freud became fundamentally dedicated (particularly through the summer and autumn of 1897) constitutes, as Mahony writes, a writing cure that allowed him to rethink the principals of self-identity. This was done through the creation of his "dream book" that began in May 1897: "I have felt impelled to start working on the dream, where I feel so very certain."¹⁸⁵ Freud's self-analysis was primarily effective by virtue of a writerly process: he wrote his dreams down and reviewed them for abstract links, while sending drafts to Fliess. A textual engagement, one detailed through an exchange of letters with Fliess and through reviewing drafts of his own dreams, became an applied, aesthetic method of interpretation, for deducing the symbolic meaning behind his dreams and thus analysing them. This process is crucial in elaborating how the development of psychoanalysis as a "talking cure" progressed into, essentially, a "writing cure." Freud's process of recording and reviewing his dreams denotes a textual and narrative progress, one that evokes how he formed an increasingly independent theory of interpretation that would lace his positivist leanings with aesthetic methods.

In adequately considering Freud's activities with the "dream work," Mahony notes it is important to refer to the translation of Freud's letters and the complete works in the original German. In the German text of his correspondence with Fliess, for example, Freud repeatedly describes his writing project as the "dream" [*Traum*]. However, Strachey adds the word "book" in brackets within the English translation, and thus detracts "from the force of Freud's condensation of dream book into 'dream.'"¹⁸⁶ Strachey's editorial addition is of significance given English readers would interpret the force of the dream perfunctorily—the English rendition affects the manner with which, in the English translation, scholars can read and "interpret" the impact of Freud's

¹⁸⁴ Anzieu, *Freud's Self Analysis*, 3–4.

¹⁸⁵ Mahony, "Writing Cure," 24; Freud cited in Mahony, "Writing Cure," 25.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 25.

condensation concerning the importance of the “dream” as a narrative and likewise its immediate focus. For example, Mahony translates from the German how, at the end of 1897, Freud writes: “I shall force myself to write the *dream* in order to come out of it” and that “The *dream* is suddenly taking shape...the *dream* will be” and again later: “[I am] entirely the *dream*.”¹⁸⁷ When read in the German, it seems of clear value that Freud viewed himself as an extension of the dream *within* which he might interpret: he saw the dream as an extension of himself. The lack of Freud’s separation between “dream” and “book” and indeed his condensation is lost in reading the English translation wherein “book” is added parenthetically.

Furthermore, and as Mahony again points out, in the *Gesammelte Werke* [*Collected Works*] Freud “renders the dreams and its associations in present tense. The immediacy conveyed within the original German text contrasts with the effect of distance brought about by Strachey’s recourse to the past tense.”¹⁸⁸ In the original German, as opposed to Strachey’s translation in the *Standard Edition*, “dream” is not only *not* associated with “book”—the process of dreaming or the dream itself is not viewed from a temporal and retrospective distance—but rather as a *state* within which Freud was navigating, imparting a sense of immediacy that removes forms of authorial distance. The present tense enforces the activity of process, and indeed its creativity as an open, rather than established, project. In reading Strachey’s authoritative translation in English, the imperative and force of Freud’s immediacy conveyed in German is lost. Mahony does not see the absence of the word “book” as a detraction from reading Freud’s self-analysis of being *in* the “dream” as a writerly project. He in fact postulates that it is precisely by placing emphasis on the immediate *presence* and *present* of the dream that we are better able to understand how it “presently” signified Freud’s self-analysis as a work-in-progress. Freud’s interpretive work on himself was an urgent and focused creative process—the writer in action within the dream as most direct.

During the spring of 1897, Freud worked on his theory of dreams with greater intensity and this was, in part, based on his minor interpretation of the dream after his father’s death. Nearly eight months after the dream that he believed reflected his guilt concerning the austerity of his father’s funeral, he wrote another important letter to

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, emphasis mine.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 18. Mahony has also written a helpful and compelling article on Freud and translation; see Patrick Mahony, “Freud and Translation,” *American Imago* 58, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 837–840.

Fliess, on 7 June 1897. In this letter, Freud describes the experience of writer's block like a symptom of neurotic defence. His difficulty in coming to any conclusions concerning his theory of neurosis is the result of a "writing-paralysis."

...I still do not know what has been happening in me. Something from the deepest depths of my own neurosis has ranged itself against any advance in an understanding of the neuroses and you have somehow been involved in it. For my writing-paralysis seems to me designed to hinder our communications [...] the most assured thing seems to me to be the explanation of dreams, but it is surrounded by a vast number of obstinate riddles.¹⁸⁹

The contents of the letter demonstrate how Freud was paying close attention to the process of not only his dream analysis, but also fluctuations in his literal ability to write. Analysing his dream life remained the most enigmatic riddle, and he believed there was an internal tension around what was *hidden* from his own consciousness. Freud's frustrations, and his described solutions, resemble something similar to how, in reference to the "talking cure," Freud writes of having to probe patients to reveal what they involuntarily withhold.

To that effect, Freud combated points of resistance (writer's block) by applying methods of free-association in the form of associative writing. In the section on Method in *The Interpretation of Dreams* Freud writes that even if the dream appears to be unintelligible at first, "I am following the fundamental rule of rendering the dream in those words which occur to me in *writing it down*."¹⁹⁰ In this way, the task of "writing down" and "writing out" is similar to the applications used to analyse points of resistance when analysing a patient's dream narrative.

As we can recall, Freud's theory of free-association developed from the pressure technique he had learnt from Bernheim. That technique was used to "massage" an idea or possible repression into legible, conscious meaning, and it is refined in *The Interpretation of Dreams*:

If I ask someone to tell me what occurs to him in response to a particular element of a dream, I am asking him to surrender himself to free association *while keeping an idea in mind as a starting point*. This calls for a special

¹⁸⁹ *SE I*, 257–278.

¹⁹⁰ Cited in Mahony, "Writing Cure," 18, author's emphasis.

attitude of the attention which is quite different from reflection and which excludes reflection.¹⁹¹

The process of beginning with an idea as a “starting point” from where one might begin to free-associate, reminiscent of his work in *Studies on Hysteria*, particularly in the case study of Lucy R., reflects his issued imperative to relax her “critical faculties” while grasping any idea that might come into her mind.¹⁹²

When describing methods of interpreting dreams in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud writes that the patient must “concentrate his attention on his self-observation [...] it is necessary to insist explicitly on his renouncing all criticism of the thoughts that he perceives.”¹⁹³ He expounds that it is by virtue of the relaxation of critical faculties that “involuntary ideas,” such as those we experience in sleep, are allowed to emerge and can be harnessed through “the adoption of the required attitude of mind.”¹⁹⁴ This process of analysis forms metaphorical associations. Interpreting seemingly illogical raw material of free-association into a cohesive narrative indicates the creative process at work in psychoanalysis’s applied methods of interpreting dream *narratives*.

Freud appeals to the German philosopher, poet and playwright Friedrich Schiller in describing the relaxation of critical faculties that allow one to free-associate. Freud connects such techniques with the process of “writing down” in conjunction with the neo-Kantian philosopher’s descriptions of resistance:

...what Schiller describes as a realisation of the watch upon the gates of Reason, the adoption of an attitude of uncritical self-observation, is by no means difficult. Most of my patients achieve it after their first instructions. I myself can do so very completely, by the help of *writing down* my ideas as they occur to me. The amount of psychical activity by which it is possible to reduce critical activity and increase the intensity of self-observation varies considerably according to the subject on which one is trying to fix one’s attention.¹⁹⁵

Freud’s reference to Schiller suggests an evocation of aesthetics that connects his own process of “writing down” with the requirement of his patients to follow his

¹⁹¹ *SE XV*, 105.

¹⁹² *SE II*, 110.

¹⁹³ *SE IV*, 101.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 102.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 103, emphasis mine.

“instructions” or applications, to similar effect. Schiller, who emphasised the importance of aesthetics in his treatise against the violence of the French Revolution and endorsed the morality of beauty and art (what Herbert Marcuse calls “aesthetic function”), evokes a reconciliation between the dehumanising “sensuous drive” [Sinntrieb] and the “formal drive” [Formtrieb].¹⁹⁶ Freud attempted to apply aesthetic principals to a scientific understanding of human psychology based on independent analysis; he tried to exceed the “gates of Reason” to increase the function of self-observation.

To Fliess, Freud writes that “the mechanism of poetry [essentially creative writing] is the same as that of hysterical phantasies.”¹⁹⁷ In this instance, and in others, we can see how his self-analysis and what is portrayed in *The Interpretation of Dreams* overlap in relation to the task and interpretive practice of writing and decoding as aesthetic process. Freud’s investigations into the aesthetic and dynamic potential of navigating interpretive possibilities based on his self-analysis inhibited or relaxed connections formed between “ideas as they occurred to me.”¹⁹⁸ The writerly and immediate methods of his self-analysis stand in stark contrast to the scientific language he attempted to use in “Project for a Scientific Psychology.” Instead of a reductive, neurological or materialist psychology, Freud was forming creative, symbolic associations as the groundwork for psychoanalytic dream interpretation.

It is worth noting here that while composing *The Interpretation of Dreams*, and during his process of self-analysis, Freud did not effectively conclude a single case. Freud considered his “self-analysis to be the most essential thing” that he had during the composition of *The Interpretation of Dreams*.¹⁹⁹ Yet, as Mahony writes, “throughout his writing cure, he did not achieve any talking cure with his patients.”²⁰⁰ Though he viewed the interpretation of a dream narrative as a “decoding method,” one wherein the dream can be understood as a “conglomerate of psychological formations,” (most notably to

¹⁹⁶ See Patricia Cotti, “Hunger and love: Schiller and the origin of drive dualism in Freud’s work,” *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 88, no. 1 (2007): 167–182 for a recent examination of how Freud was inspired by Schiller, particularly in relation to his self-analysis of his dreams from April to December 1898 and in connection with the father figure. Though it is not pursued here, the theme of “play” notably figures into Derrida’s pluralistic concept of *différance*.

¹⁹⁷ *SE I*, 256.

¹⁹⁸ *SE IV*, 100, 103.

¹⁹⁹ *SE I*, 263.

²⁰⁰ Mahony, “Writing Cure,” 20.

reveal an underlying “wish” as discussed above in relation to “Project for a Scientific Psychology”), this process and its aim were divined from his own analytic work on himself.²⁰¹ In this way, and as many scholars have discussed, it is evident that Freud himself was actually his most successful patient. Freud often fruitfully analysed phenomena he had uncovered in himself before then attempting to apply these insights into his practice immediately after, with typically negative results. *The Interpretation of Dreams* represents an alternative construction for analysing psychological phenomena based on Freud’s own prodigious self-analysis dependent upon writerly practice that *he* self-authored.

Throughout Freud’s letters to Fliess during his period of self-analysis, one can see a chronological record of his lack of progress with patients he was working with at that time. In March of 1897 he wrote to Fliess, “I have not yet finished a single case,” and later that month, “I am still having the same difficulties and have not finished a single case.”²⁰² In May of that year, he wrote: “I shall wait still longer for a treatment to be completed. It must be possible,” and in September 1897, “[I have] continual disappointment in my efforts to bring a single analysis to a real conclusion,” and finally, in February 1898: “I shall not finish a single one [case] this year either.”²⁰³ Mahony notes that in the same letter in 1898, where Freud resigned himself to not finishing a case that year either, he announced that he had finished composing “Sexual Aetiology of the Neuroses,” an essay that contained the claim: “I have in recent years almost worked out a therapeutic procedure which I propose to describe as *psychoanalytic*. I owe a great number of successes to it.”²⁰⁴ Freud’s rendition in fact indicates his own progress, the productive course of the “impossible” analysis he had conducted on himself.

The foundations of Freud’s psychoanalytic method were paved by his independent work that stemmed from analysing his dreams. Namely, concepts concerning wish-fulfilment, repression, and infantile sexuality, the latter of which he reports in “Sexual Aetiology.” That text issues, as Jones puts it, a strong plea for the “justification of investigating the sexual life of neurotic patients and the vast importance of doing so

²⁰¹ *SE IV*, 100.

²⁰² Masson, *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess*, 232; 233.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 244; 264; 299.

²⁰⁴ Cited in Mahony, “Writing Cure,” 21, emphasis in original.

[...] the former is the first pronouncement on the theme of infantile sexuality.”²⁰⁵

However, Freud’s self-analysis, rather than studies with his patients, helped to refine his belief that the root cause of dispositional hysteria is to be found in sexuality. Work on himself led him to abandon the belief that neurosis was caused by being “sexually seduced by a grown up person,” to instead develop his theories of the Oedipal complex and repression.²⁰⁶

When Freud began writing *The Interpretation of Dreams* “he hadn’t forsaken the quasi-mythical conception of dreaming that allowed him, in his self-analysis, to ‘reconstruct’ events of his early childhood through dreaming about them.”²⁰⁷ Dreams, he explained, “have at their disposal the earliest impressions of our childhood, and even bringing up details from that period of our life which, once again, strike us as trivial and which in our waking state we believe to have been long since forgotten.”²⁰⁸ On 21 September 1897 he wrote to Fliess that he had further grown to be convinced that the origin of repression occurs in childhood, although he lamented that he had not succeeded in gleaning how “a theoretical understanding of repression and its interplay of forces” actually works.²⁰⁹ What he did believe, however, was that fantasies “hark back to childhood,” despite the fact he still he could not bring “a single analysis to conclusion.”²¹⁰ He wrote to Fliess:

...I will confide in you at once the great secret that has been slowly dawning on me in the last few months. I no longer believe in my *neurotica* [theory of neurosis]. This is probably not intelligible without an explanation; after all, you yourself found what I could tell you credible [...] Then came the surprise at the fact that in every case the father, not excluding my own, has to be blamed as a pervert, though such a widespread extent of perversity towards children is, after all, not very profitable. [There is] the certain discovery that there are no indications of reality in the unconscious, so that one cannot distinguish between truth and fiction that is cathectic with affect.²¹¹

This letter indicates how Freud had ceased to believe that, in conceiving sexuality as the root cause of hysteria, sexual *trauma* had been inflicted on a child. If that were

²⁰⁵ Jones, *The Life and Work*, 232–233.

²⁰⁶ Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, 60.

²⁰⁷ Crews, *Freud*, 950.

²⁰⁸ *SE IV*, 163–164.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 265.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 265–266.

²¹¹ *SE I*, 259–260.

singularly the case, it would follow that his own father “has to be blamed as a pervert,” and in his process of self-analysis it was clear that that was not the case.²¹² However, Freud still sought an origin centred around the role of the father and sexuality: in his letters to Fliess he writes of seeking “the fulfilment of my wish to catch a father as the originator of neurosis, and so put an end to all my doubts about this which still persist.”²¹³

Freud seems to have been, intentionally or otherwise, searching for a sexual cause (much as he did in his attempts to apply his theory of sexuality to Breuer’s case with Pappenheim) to confirm his sexuality hypothesis in analysing himself. That breakthrough is recorded in another letter to Fliess, dated October 1897, where he excitedly wrote that he had uncovered a primal wish: “being in love with my mother and jealous of my father...I now consider it a universal event in early childhood...if this is so, we can understand the gripping power of Oedipus Rex. Everyone in the audience was once a budding Oedipus in fantasy, and each recoils in horror from the dream fulfilment here transplanted into reality.”²¹⁴ As such, rather than a traumatic memory based on molestation, or a theory predicated on qualitative neurology, the role of the father—dependent on literary mythology but sourced from his own methods of self-analysis—became conciliatory, identified source for psychological repression. The father represents a universal memory that begins in childhood sexuality and thus the formation of the psyche, and its determination, indicate forms of mental resistance. The theory of the Oedipal complex transformed the notion of physiological mechanisms and repression to a psychological event rooted in childhood, dramatically progressing content discussed above in relation to “Project for a Scientific Psychology.” It would confirm the theory of the “father as the originator of neurosis,” and provide a theoretical foundation upon which many of his theories following *The Interpretation of Dreams* build.²¹⁵

The theory of the Oedipus complex is only briefly mentioned in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, and it is of only minor consideration here, but it is clear from Freud’s letter to Fliess, and the direction of what followed in Freud’s work, that this “universal insight”

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ “Letters to Fliess,” *SE I*, 254.

²¹⁴ Ibid., 271–272.

²¹⁵ “Letters to Fliess,” *SE I*, 254.

was a conceptual apex for Freud. The breakthrough would totalise many of his theories following the dream text, though at this stage it had not become his central focus. Crews notes that although “it is true that the basic idea [of the Oedipal complex] was disclosed to Fliess on October 15, 1897...he did not attempt to propagate the new concept. The several papers he published between 1898 and 1900 are devoid of references to it.”²¹⁶ Crews writes that the notion that repressed Oedipal wishes “constitute the nuclear complex of every neurosis” was launched only in a lecture that he delivered in 1909 and published in the following year.²¹⁷ He adds that in Freud’s dramatic proposition he looked most like a literary modernist:

Coolly attaching his cultural allusiveness to the triviality and occasional sordidness of dream imagery, he would defy existing genres with a boldness that bears comparison to James Joyce in his astounding *Ulysses* of 1922. Like that work, the *Interpretation* would constitute a studied insult to the graybeards, prudes, and hypocrites who had tried in vain to keep the author down.²¹⁸

While it is a stretch to compare *The Interpretation of Dreams* with Joyce’s *Ulysses*, both texts do challenge forms of interpretation, language, and mythology. Freud cultivated new ground in portraying a contingent and dynamic construction of the psyche in ways dependent on his narrative interpretation of *his* psyche, investigating the minutiae of past memories in analytic detail.

Mahony explains how after Freud finished the initial draft in 1898, he began another, second draft in May 1899. His letters to Fliess show how the “second draft underwent revisions and the entirely new seventh chapter was added.”²¹⁹ It was around this time that Freud grew to see the process of self-analysis as “impossible,” and was aware that when set for publication *The Interpretation of Dreams* contained numerous errors: “it will contain 2467 mistakes — which I shall leave in it.”²²⁰ It seems that the productive utility of inspired self-analysis had run its course and now had fully transferred into the independent project. His ambivalent remark on the inclusion of thousands of errors does

²¹⁶ Crews, *Freud*, 877.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 873.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 941.

²¹⁹ Mahony, “Writing Cure,” 30.

²²⁰ Cited in Crews, *Freud*, 878.

resemble Joyce's own eclectic approach to error, referenced in *Ulysses*: "A man of genius makes no mistakes. His errors are volitional and are the portals of discovery."²²¹

Operative throughout *The Interpretation of Dreams* is the idea that psychological activity is determined by the pursuit of an unconscious purpose, which psychoanalysis can decipher through dream interpretation, and where results are inconclusive works-in-progress. Freud writes that a "dream can give evidence of knowledge and memories which the waking subject is unaware of possessing," inviting us to both "read the plot" and acknowledge or question errors of any given subject's narration.²²² The importance of *The Interpretation of Dreams* to Freud's thinking is clearly indicated in the 1932 preface to the third English edition, where he writes that it "contains, even according to my present-day judgement, the most valuable of all the discoveries it has been my good fortune to make. Insight such as this falls to one's lot but once in a lifetime."²²³

In the first portion of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud evaluates how the scientific literature on dreams has determined them to be of little epistemological value.²²⁴ In this way, he sets up a rhetorical foil that interestingly marks a development from his own cursory remarks on dreams scribbled in the unpublished workbooks for "Project for a Scientific Psychology." There, Freud had written that dreams are "partly *nonsensical*, partly *feeble-minded*, or even meaningless or strangely crazy."²²⁵ In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, however, he offers an extensive refutation of that position, one that substantially builds from his comments in "Project." He develops the proposition that the nonsensical qualities in dreams can be "explained by the fact that in dreams the *compulsion to associate prevails*," and that free-association indicates connections to memory and the unconscious.²²⁶ In developing draft-stage concepts from "Project for a

²²¹ James Joyce, *Ulysses*, eds. Hans Walter Gabler et al. (New York: Viking Press, 1993), 9.228–29, 156. 4.415. Reference gives episode, line, and page number. Joyce's depiction of error within the narrative of *Ulysses* is not unlike his approach to textual error that extends to *Finnegans Wake*. Akin to Freud's acknowledgement that *The Interpretation of Dreams* contained thousands of errors, Joyce largely accepted errors and mistakes during the course of various drafts, transcriptions and auto-dictation during the composition of his final text, almost conceding to the fact that a "complete" publication, much like a "complete" analysis, is impossible: it's left to the interpreters. For a volume dedicated to the subject of Joyce and error, see *Errors and Erroriboose: Joyce and Error*, ed. Matthew Creasy (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

²²² *SE IV*, 14.

²²³ *SE IV*, xxiii.

²²⁴ *SE IV*, 1–6.

²²⁵ *SE I*, 338, author's emphasis. In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud dedicates a number of pages to critiquing the premise that dreams reflect "madness," notably by John Locke in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (New York: Dover Press, 1959), 528.

²²⁶ *SE I*, 338. See *SE IV*, 11–21 for Freud's preliminary discussion on the role of memory in dreams.

Scientific Psychology” Freud’s *The Interpretation of Dreams* provides methods for deciphering associations creatively. Interpreting a dream’s latent “madness” or raw associations into manifest content can facilitate conscious results, and this process can only be achieved with a psychoanalyst.

The Interpretation of Dreams puts forth the proposition that an analysis of dreams reveals a repressed unconscious, which not only exists but can be interpreted. He offers general techniques that clearly resemble his work on himself. Two primary ways “for solving the problem of dreams” are through *condensation* and *displacement*, “the two foremen in charge of the dream-work.”²²⁷ With regard to the role of condensation, within a dream it stands for several associations and is “only accessible by way of that chain.”²²⁸ A process of intermediate associations connects the process of linguistic free-association with what Freud had tried to formulate in his attempts to connect an “intermediate link in the chain of associations between the idea from which we start and the pathogenic idea which we are in search of” in *Studies on Hysteria*.²²⁹ In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, such associations within a dream are determined many times over, with varying and linguistically connected complexity, as Freud demonstrates in his analysis of the dream of the botanical monograph.

What Freud demonstrates in his analysis of this dream and others a theory of the dream that is not dissimilar to features of narrative composition. A dream is not “constructed by each individual dream-thought” but rather “associative paths” that are constructed “of the whole mass of dream-thoughts,” which manipulate and determine dream content.²³⁰ He later extrapolates how, in displacement, the dream logic shifts by virtue of “a *transference and displacement of psychical intensities* [that] occurs in the process of dream formation, and it is the result of these that the difference between the *text* of the dream-content and that of the dream-thoughts comes about.”²³¹ By virtue of these two processes (condensation and displacement), Freud argues, it becomes essential to consider the role of “representation” and therefore the symbolic value of dreams understood through interpretation within the narrative of experience. As Freud acknowledges, this task is a difficult one: the dream “has a very striking way of dealing

²²⁷ *SE IV*, 211; 276.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, 212.

²²⁹ *SE II*, 271.

²³⁰ *SE IV*, 286.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, 307–308, author’s emphasis.

with *opposites and contradictions*” and thus a cohesive unity is rarely found.²³²

Therefore the role of the analyst is to remain both deductive and flexible in approaching the content of a dream wherein “‘No’ doesn’t seem to exist” and yet, in the context of analysis with a patient, Freud would formulate associative patterns in them much like he did in himself.²³³

Freud’s hermeneutic approach to the narrative of a dream as a means to decipher unconscious content transfers his methods of the writing cure into analytic tools familiar to literary theory. Freud’s often philological approach to dream analysis links etymological connections with memory-concepts; his method therefore connotes metaphorical and metonymic forms of interpretation. Language was an essential aspect of Freud’s method of self-analysis, and a focus on its structure, which guided his interpretation of his own dreams into a general schema, created a map for navigating the alternative construct of the psyche that he created: “it has been my experience, and one to which I have found no exception, that every dream deals with the dreamer himself. Dreams are completely egoistic.”²³⁴

Freud writes that “all the material making up the content of a dream is in some way derived from experience” that is reproduced in the dream.²³⁵ He derives from his own methods the idea that experiential content is recapitulated within a dream “so much so that we may regard it as an undisputed fact.”²³⁶ *The Interpretation of Dreams* makes temporality its subject, and shows how the past affects the present dynamically, transfiguring hidden events that suture one’s daily activities within the scope of personal history. Such writings distinctly deviate from Freud’s previous intentions to form a “natural science” as a gain for “normal psychology” founded on the study of neurophysiological “particles” while engaging themes of repression, resistance and deference.²³⁷ In this way, Stephen Richmond’s thesis that psychoanalysis constitutes an “applied aesthetics” that “helps point the way back to the lived moment,” is relevant.

²³² Ibid., 318, author’s emphasis.

²³³ Ibid. The lack of a “no” in dreams is reiterated at *SE IV*, 326, though is amended on 337 to instead represent “conflicts of will.”

²³⁴ *SE IV*, 322.

²³⁵ Ibid., 11.

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Gay, *A Life*, 78.

Psychoanalytic systems “should be evaluated in the way that we evaluate aesthetic systems.”²³⁸

In his own process of self-analysis along with methods of dream interpretation presented in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud offers a conceptual over-determinacy, one that makes univocal results impossible. In this way, the positivist influence of his early mentor Charcot stands in stark contrast to the path of an ultimately literary journey. But it also represents something essential to the experience of every dream. As we have discussed, in the original German, Freud continued to place “dream” in the present tense and did not include the word “book.” He was entirely consumed by the process of *interpretation*, particularly of his own neurosis, but also his “dream” to establish an application for “reading” normal psychology. While *The Interpretation of Dreams* represents an achievement of that goal, it does so through means that largely rely on the ambiguity of the self. Freud’s approach indicates a method of both writing and reading (interpretation) that is rife with potential errors. A dream cannot be dreamt the same way twice.

The approach in which Freud was most successful was based on his inconclusive process of writing down his dreams, before then interpreting his own work. A focus on the dynamic process by which the mind archives experience alludes to the symbolic subtext of the unconscious and its repressions; it requires a literary method of interpretation that exceeds the scientific study of the brain. The pursuit of understanding human phenomena requires a focus on memory, trauma, and process in ways that positivism cannot account for. In this way, and as this chapter has sought to argue, Freud’s psychoanalysis cannot be subjected to the validity criteria of science. Rather, inherent in its model is an applied aesthetics that bears resemblance to literary process, concerned with the impermeable and temporal experience of consciousness that can only ever be studied durationally. By turning to the process of modernist writers influenced by Freudian theory, we will expand upon literary process influenced by Freud’s work. In doing so, we will acknowledge how Freudian theory encroached on the literary while still attempting to claim it as a science, which was met with resistance by a number of modernist literary writers who wrote in Freud’s wake.

²³⁸ Stephen Richmond, “Psychoanalysis as Applied Aesthetics,” *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 85, no. 3 (July 2016): 614.

Conclusion

In considering the history of the development of psychoanalysis, Freud reminisced about its earliest days:

I soon saw the necessity of carrying out a self-analysis, and this I did with the help of a series of my own dreams which led me back through all the events of my childhood: and I am still of the opinion today that this kind of analysis may suffice for one who is a good dreamer and not too abnormal.²³⁹

Freud's self-analysis was essential to his composition of *The Interpretation of Dreams*. In that text he produced a powerfully influential model for thinking about what it is to be human through a new way of using language. This chapter has focused on his earliest work leading up to *The Interpretation of Dreams* in order to highlight the engagements with science that he had before his self-analysis began, and that contributed to his formation of concepts related to language in that text. In considering how Freud deemed his process of self-analysis to be an "impossible" venture, this chapter has considered it to nevertheless represent what Mahony refers to as a "writing cure." Building upon Mahony's work, it has also been asserted that Freud's writerly process indicates a process-based approach to the mind through language. This operates outside of the scientific domain and anticipates the developmental progression of chapters to follow.

Freud mined the experience of his father's death by observing in himself how trauma, which he had first defined with Breuer as the cause of neurosis, could be charted. Through close inward attention to the process not only of his symptoms, but also his life in relation to the symbols of his own symptoms reflected in his dreams, Freud worked at traversing or overcoming the death of his father. Freud's methodological approach to recording his dreams after his father's death developed techniques akin to literary analysis that deduces plot structure through inference. By writing his dreams down upon waking, rewriting them and analysing draft differences, Freud approached childhood memories much like a philologist might do in collating pre-publication drafts, or a literary geneticist might do in mapping the evolution of texts.

²³⁹ Freud cited in Mahony, "Writing Cure," 15.

However, Freud believed that associative work between memory and dreams could point to areas of conflict or defence and thus lead to illuminative, interpretive insight determined by *his* view of the psyche. Though he abandoned the notion of successful self-analysis, he presented a model that interpreted the discoveries he made onto nearly every case. His later emphasis on a theory of Oedipus became a totalising theory, one that subsumed his discoveries under one, conciliatory rubric he hoped could pass muster as an empirical science. As we turn to the chapter to follow, on D.H. Lawrence, we find both an example and a rejection of that tendency, and this in turn will provide a useful example of the complexity of Freud's influence on the writers who came after him. Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers* was reviewed by psychoanalysts as evidence of the "scientific" truth of Freud's insights. In response, Lawrence created his own alternative approach to the unconscious in two texts published in 1921 and 1922, which can be seen as paratextual resources that draft the goals of his late fiction.

Finally, it should be once again emphasised that rather than reading modernist writers *through* Freud's works, we will be considering how Lawrence, Nin, and Joyce wrote in light of Freud, as it were. In examining how Freud's work elicited a confrontation with what constructs of the "psyche" might mean in relation to language, and the process of self-examination that analysis resoundingly entails, we can trace both his impact and its diversions through a focus on aesthetic process as it is applied in literary writing. In beginning with Lawrence, in particular, we will see a particularly forceful encounter between psychoanalysis and literature that begins with his vehement rejection of Freudian readings of his work, and ends up moving into a defence of the literary as a means for understanding the psyche that is, paradoxically, akin to the Freud who had his own anguished relationship to the scientific validity of his work.

Chapter Two

D.H. Lawrence: The Pristine Unconscious, Blood Wisdom, and Literary Purpose

We must discover, if we can, the true unconscious, where our life bubbles up in us, prior to any mentality.

—D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*¹

¹ D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious; and, Fantasia of the Unconscious*, ed. Bruce Steele (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 15.

After D.H. Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers* was published in 1913, British analysts lauded the book as "the most penetrating exploration of the Oedipal scenario ever described in literature."² The analyst and critic Alfred Kuttner, in his 1916 review "*Sons and Lovers: A Freudian Appreciation*," emphasises the novel's value as psychoanalytic evidence: *Sons and Lovers* is able to:

...attest the truth of what is the most far-reaching psychological theory ever propounded...Professor Sigmund Freud's theory of psychological evolution of the emotion of love as finally expressed by a man or a woman towards a member of the other sex.³

Kuttner's Oedipal appraisal of Lawrence's text commends "the novel's 'freshness' and 'amazing style'" but nevertheless "insists that *Sons and Lovers* would be unremarkable were it not for added significance acquired by virtue of the support it gives to the scientific study of human motives."⁴ Though Jennifer Spitzer recounts that Kuttner's review was in many respects positive and that psychoanalytic readings of *Sons and Lovers* popularised Lawrence's text, Lawrence himself rebelled against the reduction of his novel to a psychoanalytic narrative. It is likely that Lawrence's intensely negative reaction against Kuttner's review and other psychoanalytic readings of *Sons and Lovers*, a self-described "more or less autobiographical" text, was what provoked him to eventually write two heavily criticised and now largely forgotten non-fiction works on psychoanalysis and the unconscious in the early 1920s.⁵

In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* (1921) and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (1922) Lawrence attempts to create a counter-discourse to Freudian theory, and he offers alternative theories to oppose what he saw as the detrimental, hermeneutic practices of psychoanalysis. Several key points are at stake for Lawrence: that psychoanalysts—as Spitzer writes—read literature to "uncover allegories that affirm their own speculations," that they turn sex into a form of discourse, or what Lawrence frequently refers to as "sex in the head," and that psychoanalysis, to paraphrase Anne Fernihough,

² Jennifer Spitzer, "On Not Reading Freud: Amateurism, Expertise, and the 'Pristine Unconscious' in D.H. Lawrence," *Modernism/modernity* 21, no. 1 (January 2014): 91.

³ Alfred Kuttner, "*Sons and Lovers: A Freudian Appreciation*," *Psychoanalytic Review* 3, no. 3 (July 1916): 316.

⁴ Kuttner cited in Spitzer, "On Not Reading Freud," 93.

⁵ James T. Boulton and Andrew Robertson, eds., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume III: 1916–1921* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 526.

creates what it purports to ameliorate.⁶ The over-intellectualisation of psychological experience, according to Lawrence, manipulates natural instinct and invents the neuroses it then proceeds to diagnose. His attack on Freudian theory, as Mark Kinkead-Weekes puts it, is “that it starts as a therapy but ends by seeing disease as the norm...Lawrence wanted the opposite: to conceive a psychology of natural growth and creativity.”⁷ Lawrence’s work on psychoanalysis ventures to restore natural impulse and vitality to the inner dynamics of the self. His critique of Freud represents a literary effort to creatively salvage human experience from psychoanalysis’s pathologising depiction of sexual repression. At the heart of his attempts at analytic literature is a critique of what he disparagingly refers to as the “diseased” intellectualising tendencies of his era and its susceptibility to psychoanalytic propositions in the first place.⁸

Secondary scholarship concerning Lawrence’s esoteric texts on psychoanalysis describes “the power psychoanalysis exerts over him,” and the concepts presented in these slim texts have been largely criticised.⁹ However, little scholarship focuses on a style Lawrence uses in attacking Freud that is at the same time highly didactic and self-consciously aesthetic; nor have these non-fictional texts been considered as paratextual *materials* that inform his literary fiction. The most obvious thing that confronts the reader approaching *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* is that Lawrence’s method for critiquing psychoanalysis is highly literary: he uses satire, metaphor and allegory to respond to what he sees as the reductionist language of science. He ridicules Freud as a “quack” and satires both the analyst and the language of experts more broadly. Rather than attacking psychoanalysis in its own terms as scientific literature, Lawrence shifts the ground, writing in literary style that suspends the formation of truth-claims by deploying a metaphorical language for sensory and non-rational life.¹⁰ Moreover, the allegorical language that Lawrence uses to express his concepts of the “pristine unconscious,” “blood-wisdom,” and sexuality

⁶ Spitzer, “On Not Reading Freud,” 94; Anne Fernihough, *D.H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 68.

⁷ Mark Kinkead-Weekes, “The Genesis of Lawrence’s Psychology Books: An Overview,” *D.H. Lawrence Review* 27, nos. 2–3 (1997–1998): 162.

⁸ See Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 118: “We are so overloaded and diseased with ideas that we can’t get well in a minute.”

⁹ Spitzer, “On Not Reading Freud,” 91.

¹⁰ Lawrence was naïvely convinced that scientists would accept his instinctual version of the psyche as grounds for a new form of analysis; see Mark Kinkead-Weekes, *The Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2 (1912–1922) Triumph to Exile* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 553.

had a clear impact on fiction that he was drafting simultaneously to writing these texts. In studying his psychoanalytic works as both literary and paratextual, we can better understand how the concepts Lawrence put forward therein apply to the aesthetics of his later literature, and thus better grasp his vision of the psyche, sexuality, and his belief that the literary author can instigate cultural regeneration.

Fiona Becket has examined how Lawrence's work concerns the "non-deliberate aspects of human feeling," and the intimate proximity between self and experience foregrounds his proposed theory of the "pristine unconscious," based on that which is aesthetic and inherently moral, known through the body by way of his theory of "blood-wisdom" or "blood-consciousness" that is intuitive, sensuous, and perceptive.¹¹ Fernihough describes how Lawrence's views were bound into his belief that his generation had succumbed to harmful, theoretical inversions of what it means to be human, stressing instead that "art connects us with the world."¹² His psychoanalytic texts are meant to undermine the theory that the unconscious, repression, and sexuality indicate the source of neurosis; he thought that these so-called scientific concepts reductively account for human experience. For Lawrence, the abstract theories and forms of deductive reasoning used in Freudian psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic writing are the true propagators of repression and neurosis. Conversely, Lawrence wanted not just to say, but to show that literature and literary language provide the best medium through which to understand what he meant by the pristine unconscious and blood-wisdom, which represent the individualist, non-rational, and sacred qualities inherent in the self of pure experience. Lawrence's thoughts on these matters was highly distinctive (one might even say idiosyncratic). However, to read him purely in terms of his own account of himself, rather than as being in dialogue with the putatively scientific language of psychoanalysis, is to miss one side of the conversation.

This chapter begins by surveying early biographical scholarship on Lawrence and on the early development of his theories of the self, such as his concept of the blood as a source of wisdom and non-mental consciousness, and his religious views on art as an act of creation. It then examines the content and style of Lawrence's analytic works in detail, before comparing how concepts therein are reworked in the narratives of his late

¹¹ Fiona Becket, "Lawrence and Psychoanalysis," in *The Cambridge Companion to D.H. Lawrence*, ed. Anne Fernihough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 217.

¹² Fernihough, *D.H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*, 81, author's emphasis.

fiction, namely, the incomplete short novel *Mr. Noon* and one of his major works, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Unlike previous scholarship that alternately considers Lawrence's efforts to revise psychoanalytic theory as a futile attempt to participate in scientific discourse, a testament to "the agonizing self-contradictions in his work," or a praiseworthy post-Freudian position, this chapter explores the ways in which Lawrence approaches psychoanalysis and theories of the self by considering these texts in the frame of process.¹³ Even though *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* are both published texts, rather than drafts or works in progress, it is possible to read them as trial pieces, preliminary approaches to the questions raised by psychoanalysis, and hence akin to an elaborated form of the notes or prose excursions that an author would typically create while working through the language, images and ideas that would take shape in a major work. It is in this way that they are considered to be paratextual resources: they sketch preliminary concepts later enacted in his fictional works.

In this particular instance, in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, we see Lawrence confronting, head on, as it were, the ways in which literature allows for the suspension of truth-claims, and thereby permits new ways—and indeed a new language—for conceptualising conscious and unconscious experience. From the outset, what is noteworthy is that Lawrence is appropriating the language of psychoanalysis, in particular the word (and concept) of the "unconscious," but using it to claim that fictional creativity and the "truth of art-speech" can be a generative mechanism for freeing repression and conveying the "soul-truth of unconscious impulse," which elsewhere he calls the "IT," distancing himself from the word "unconscious."¹⁴ Art, he argues, is "a sort of subterfuge," allowing for an engagement with the unknowability of the self that can become "a mine of practical truth" leading to

¹³ Spitzer, "On Not Reading Freud," 91. For a range of approaches, see Frederick J. Hoffman, *Freudianism and the Literary Mind* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1957); Daniel A. Weiss, *Oedipus in Nottingham: D.H. Lawrence* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962); Murray M. Schwartz, "D.H. Lawrence and Psychoanalysis: An Introduction," *D.H. Lawrence Review* 10, no. 3 (Fall 1977): 215–222; R.A. Gekoski, "Freud and English Literature 1900–1930," in *The Context of English Literature 1900–1930*, ed. Michael Bell (London: Methuen & Co., 1980), 186–217; Elizabeth Wright, *Psychoanalytic Criticism: Theory in Practice* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989); Anne Fernihough, "The Tyranny of the Text: Lawrence, Freud and the Modernist Aesthetic," in *Modernism and the European Unconscious*, ed. Peter Collier and Judy Davies (Cambridge: Polity Press; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 47–63; Linda Ruth Williams, *Sex in the Head: Visions of Femininity and Film in D.H. Lawrence* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993).

¹⁴ D.H. Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature*, ed. Ezra Greenspan et al. (New York: Viking Press, 1961), 18.

cultural regeneration.¹⁵ In short, as we see Lawrence's ideas of blood-wisdom and the pristine unconscious outlined in his psychoanalytic works take shape, we see an exemplary case of a literary modernist being forced to confront the challenge presented by psychoanalysis to the understanding of what it is to be human; these works can then be understood as preparing the ground for Lawrence to stake a distinctively literary claim to the same territory, using a completely different vocabulary and language.

2.1 D.H. Lawrence's Psychoanalytic Beginnings

Lawrence did not start off with an antipathy to psychoanalysis; in fact, before the psychoanalytic interpretations of *Sons and Lovers* were published, Lawrence acknowledged Freud's work with some interest. Lawrence's wife Frieda describes in her autobiographical book *Not I, but the Wind* that they discussed the "Oedipal complex within twenty minutes" of their first meeting in 1912.¹⁶ Five years earlier, in 1907 and while married to her first husband Ernest Weekley, Frieda had a brief affair with the Austrian psychoanalyst Otto Gross, an early disciple of Freud who was a believer in the therapeutic properties of cocaine, polyamory, and nudism, activities that were practised in the commune established in Monte Verità in Ascona in the early 20th century.¹⁷ Frieda met Gross at the Stephanie—also known as Café Grössenwahn—close to Monte Verità. There Gross frequently expounded psycho-philosophic theories on sexual liberation as a means to cure ailments that he considered to be imposed by social repressions.¹⁸ When Frieda and Gross began a relationship he was simultaneously involved with her sister Else, and conceived an illegitimate child with her.¹⁹ That Frieda sympathised with and maintained Gross's opinion that sexual freedom can relieve neurotic illness is evident not only from the letters exchanged between them, but also in her actions.²⁰ Frieda took part in a romantic relationship with Gross despite his sexual involvement with her sister, and she had multiple extramarital affairs during her first marriage to Weekley and while married to Lawrence. What is more, she held to such

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 14.

¹⁶ Frieda Lawrence, *Not I, but the Wind* (Granada, 1983), 2; James T. Boulton, ed., *The Selected Letters of D.H. Lawrence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 80.

¹⁷ See Janet Byrne, *A Genius for Living: A Biography of Frieda Lawrence* (London: Bloomsbury, 1995), 64–84.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 69.

¹⁹ Kinkead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 9.

²⁰ See "The Otto Gross–Frieda Weekley Correspondence," transcribed, translated, and annotated by John Turner with Cornelia Rumpf-Worthen and Ruth Jenkins, special issue of the *D.H. Lawrence Review* 22, no. 2 (Summer 1990): 137–227.

beliefs throughout her life; when her daughter was ill after Lawrence's death, Frieda hired a local stonemason to have sex with her—a clear indication of her unconventional belief in the powers of sexual recuperation.²¹

Frieda's understanding of psychoanalysis as it was interpreted by Gross is an important factor concerning Lawrence's introduction to the theory more generally. As Fiona Becket notes, Frieda "is most often credited with introducing him [Lawrence] to the basics of Freudian psychoanalysis," a version that was undoubtedly biased towards Gross's liberal teachings.²² Frieda's biographer Janet Byrne explains that Frieda not only embraced Gross's unconventional perspective on polyamorous sexuality as a psychical and spiritual panacea to restrictive, socially induced neurosis, but that Frieda's approach to sexual freedom was continuously present over the course of her marital life with Lawrence and deeply influenced him.²³ Frieda's sexual independence, especially given her aristocratic background, challenged bourgeois versions of morality, and this fascinated Lawrence and contributed to his developing views on female sexuality and class distinction. Their passionate co-dependency is thus an important context for Lawrence's concepts of the blood, sexuality, and unconscious impulse that feature in his analytic works.²⁴

Examining several instances of Frieda's early impact on Lawrence's attitude towards psychoanalysis is worthwhile due to her progressive influence on his thinking. Lawrence met her before the publication of *Sons and Lovers*, a book he described as semi-autobiographical.²⁵ Frieda, after reading the early "Paul Morel" version of the text after they first met, wrote in a letter that "he really loved his mother more than anybody, even with his other women—a real love, a sort of Oedipus."²⁶ Her relatively detached and brief summary of Lawrence's fictional depiction of his recently deceased mother would change in tone. Just after leaving her husband to marry Lawrence, Frieda found a notebook with a poem he had written about his mother in 1910, shortly before

²¹ David Holbrook, *Where D.H. Lawrence Was Wrong About Women* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1992), 28.

²² Fiona Becket, "Lawrence and Psychoanalysis," 218.

²³ Frieda's aristocratic background is described at length in the first chapter of Byrne's biography. See in particular Byrne, *A Genius for Living*, 5–35.

²⁴ Their tempestuous relationship is described throughout biographical scholarship. See in particular: Byrne, *A Genius for Living*, 203–205; Holbrook, *Where D.H. Lawrence Was Wrong*, 31; Kinkead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 154–158.

²⁵ Boulton and Robertson, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume III*, 526.

²⁶ Cited in Byrne, *A Genius for Living*, 103.

her death. The poem, as Kinkead-Weekes describes in his contribution to Lawrence's multi-authored biography, seemed "evidence to her that mother-fixation had made him incapable of real love for another woman, to Frieda's outrage and contempt."²⁷ The two stanzas that conclude Lawrence's poem are as follows:

You sweet love, my mother
Twice you have blooded me,
Once with your blood at birth-time
Once with your misery.
And twice you have washed me clean.
Twice-wonderful things to see.

And so, my love, Oh mother
I shall always be true to thee.
Twice I am born, my mother
As Christ said it should be,
And who can bear me a third time?
—None love—I am true to thee.²⁸

The intimate, and what Frieda read as Oedipal, devotion expressed in the unpublished poem disturbed and angered her. Unlike her earlier, more sympathetic reading of "Paul Morel," Kinkead-Weekes recounts that Frieda "scribbled words of hate against each stanza" of the poem, and wrote as a conclusion:

...Now I will leave you for some days, and I will see if being alone will help you to see me as I am...you are a sad thing, I know your secret and despair, I have seen you are ashamed—I have made you better—that is my reward.²⁹

Frieda's strong reaction against Lawrence's pledge to his mother, "true to thee," in the poem and her amateur familiarity with Freudian theory evidently incited her to provoke Lawrence into a more conscious confrontation with the psychological dimensions of his maternal fixation. She demanded, as far as her notes on the poem and opinion of "Paul Morel" can determine, that he examine the "secret" and "despair" of his dedication to his mother. She also enforced a brief separation so that he would "become free" of its obsessive quality—and, as Kinkead-Weekes describes—especially so that he might be

²⁷ Kinkead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 21.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *Ibid.*

free to love her unreservedly.³⁰ In short, Frieda was strongly of the view that Lawrence's devotion to his mother was a complex to be overcome.

Lawrence's works incorporate events from his life, and in particular his powerful tie to his mother, and this aspect of the relationship between his life and work has often dominated Lawrence scholarship.³¹ Nonetheless, we might briefly consider the effect that Frieda's Oedipal interpretations of Lawrence's poem and of "Paul Morel" were to have for his subsequent work, as the basis for understanding the way in which Lawrence's attitude to psychoanalysis evolved. Ingersoll writes that while "Lawrence was almost immediately resistant to Frieda's *Freudian* reading of his text ["Paul Morel"]," her interpretation and influence seem to have motivated him to develop a sense of self-understanding outside of a maternal fixation.³² Towards the end of *Sons and Lovers* Lawrence describes what Paul Morel desires most in terms of a life lived "somewhere in a pretty house near London with my mother," yet this statement is embedded in the text through a series of "I don't know" that structurally and associatively approximate the uncertain objectives of the protagonist's maternal commitment.³³ As her notes to the early poem show, Frieda demanded that Lawrence rigorously self-analyse his motives and affections, not only for the certainty of their own union (i.e., a primary dedication to her) as Kinkead-Weekes describes, but to develop himself independently, towards a "certainty" she calls her "reward."

Frieda's influence disrupted Lawrence's focus on his mother, and it appears that her early interrogations had an effect on the development of his theories of "blood." In the early 1910 poem Frieda discovered, the first cited stanza describes how Lawrence was "twice-blooded" by his mother, first through childbirth and second through her "misery."³⁴ In the poem, Lawrence places emphasis on the wonders of shared blood,

³⁰ Jessie Chambers (Lawrence's early girlfriend and the inspiration for the character Miriam in *Sons and Lovers*) writes in *D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Record* that after his mother's death Lawrence said: "I've always loved my mother...I've loved her, like a lover. That's why I could never love you." (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 184. It is clear that Frieda did not want to meet the same fate.

³¹ See Keith Segar, *The Art of D.H. Lawrence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966): 19–30; and Brian Edward, "The Inhibited Temperament in *Sons and Lovers*," *Style* 44, nos. 1 & 2 (Spring/Summer 2010): 62–78. *D.H. Lawrence's Sons and Lovers: A Casebook*, ed. John Worthen and Andrew Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) is a particularly helpful collection, focusing on psychoanalytic and gendered readings of *Sons and Lovers* since 1913.

³² Earl Ingersoll, "Gender and Language in *Sons and Lovers*," *Midwest Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (1996): 434–47, emphasis mine. Ingersoll strongly suggests that Frieda's reading was influenced by her relative familiarity with Freudian literature.

³³ D.H. Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers* (London: Penguin Classics, 1994), 428–429.

³⁴ Kinkead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 21.

“twice wonderful to see,” alluding to gestation and birth that quite literally delivers a conscious connection between mother and child. While the poem closes with a pledge of fidelity to his mother, “true to thee,” we can see that, after several years of marriage to Frieda, Lawrence’s theory of “blood” has developed well beyond the blood ties of family love. In an exultant letter written to Ernest Collings in 1913, Lawrence proclaims:

My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds. But what our blood feels and believes and says, is always true. The intellect is only a bit and bridle. What do I care about knowledge?³⁵

This letter to Collings describes Lawrence’s belief in a non-rational wisdom imparted by blood and attributes religious connotations to “blood” which, as Bruce Steele notes, probably derives at least in part from Genesis ix. 4: “flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof.”³⁶ From a deeply felt devotion to his mother and their “twice shared blood,” here Lawrence expresses a religious devotion to “blood” that metaphorically develops to represent the sacred flesh or the body of every person. What this shows is how Lawrence’s concepts were progressing in allegorical terms on the nature of the living body, blood, and the mind’s intuitive susceptibilities to life that can exceed or transcend the “bit and bridle” of intellectual knowledge.

Within Lawrence’s theory of the blood as a religion and practice, the natural rhythms of the life become specific to the individuality of the body and hence an indication of an individual’s soul, which he sees as a form of embodied spirituality that overcomes forms of scientific knowledge. Lawrence connects these religious terms to the dimensions of his art in a “Foreword” to *Sons and Lovers*, which he drafted and sent to his editor and mentor Edward Garnett shortly after the novel was completed.³⁷

Although Lawrence was embarrassed at the prospect of the “Foreword” being published

³⁵ James T. Boulton, ed., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume I: 1901–1913* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 503.

³⁶ Bruce Steele, “Introduction,” *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, xxi.

³⁷ A recent account of this exchange is provided by Robert Caserio, “Beyond Oedipal Psychology in *Sons and Lovers*: Lawrence’s ‘Forward’ to Being and History” *D.H. Lawrence Review* 39, no 2 (Fall 2014): 97–115.

(indeed, it was never published in his lifetime), a notable feature is how it parodies Scripture.³⁸ He asks, for instance, “What was Christ?” and provides the response:

He was Word, or he became Word. What remains of him? Word! [...] He is Word. And the Father was Flesh. For even if it were by the Holy Ghost his spirit were begotten, yet flesh cometh only out of flesh. So the Holy Ghost must have been, or have borne from the Father, at least one grain of flesh.³⁹

The unpublished “Foreword” puzzles out the doctrine of the Trinity in Lawrence’s own terms, and he comes to the idiosyncratic conclusion that “the Holy Ghost is the expression of the joy of the individual man in finding himself in creation,” connecting flesh, blood and creation to a sacred principle.⁴⁰ In short, in Lawrence’s working through of the idea, art and a metaphorical understanding of the blood of the body give life; this he sets against what he understands to be reductive forms of rational knowledge that dissect and threaten to destroy it.

Lawrence’s approach to his concept “blood” is complex in that it contains numerous subsets of meaning, each with additional metaphorical connotations. There is a wisdom inherent in “blood” that bestows intuitive and religious understanding in life, flesh, experience, and one’s capacity for creation. The term also encompasses organic sexuality and consciousness, art, and mind. In a letter to Bertrand Russell in 1915 Lawrence addresses some of these additional components, describing what he calls “blood-consciousness,” a non-rational form of consciousness or instinct that connects to the body through the “eye” and “the sexual connection.” He uses the eye as a metaphor for the mind’s capacity to perceive, absorb, and create relational experiences without rational knowledge:

Now I am convinced of what I believed when I was about twenty—that there is another seat of consciousness than the brain and the nervous system: there is a blood-consciousness which exists in us independently of the ordinary mental consciousness, which depends on the eye as its source or connector. There is the blood-consciousness, with the sexual connection, holding the same relation

³⁸ “I would die of shame if that Foreword were printed,” Boulton, *The Letters of D.H Lawrence, Volume I*, 510.

³⁹ Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers*, 467.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 472.

as the eye, in seeing, holds to the mental consciousness. One lives, knows, and has one's being in the blood, without any reference to nerves and brain.⁴¹

In his psychoanalytic texts Lawrence dedicates quite a number of pages to a theory of the nerves and the nervous system more broadly, to the extent that the reader begins to wonder at points if this has moved beyond metaphor to become a physiological theory in which Lawrence fully believes. In the letter to Russell, however, he notably characterises instinct and intuition as forms of consciousness outside mentality or as functions of the nerves and the “brain.” He understands the body on the basis of symbolic attributes. In this case, the privileged part of the body is the “eye,” a source of non-intellectual perception that engages connections between the body and the world (blood consciousness). Lawrence enforces the “eye” as the act of sight and perception that can transfigure and create, and that connects the body of experience to the world. Many of these concepts will be returned to when we explore Lawrence's psychoanalytic texts, where he associates numerous parts of the body with abstract concepts. But what we can see for now is that Lawrence was creating drafts for a grand, constellatory theory of the self—body, artist, the sacred—based on imaginative and highly metaphorical associations grounded in the body.

Drawing attention to Lawrence's preoccupations at this time helps to contextualise his immensely negative reaction to Kuttner's 1916 psychoanalytic review of *Sons and Lovers*. For Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers* was in many respects a dedication to his mother; it portrayed his relationship with her, and also his emergence from that relationship. It ultimately represented, as described in the unpublished “Foreword” sent to Garnett, “the joy of the individual man finding himself in creation.”⁴² In stark contrast, Kuttner, though praising Lawrence's book, writes that it would be “unremarkable” if not for its “added significance” acquired “by virtue of the support it gives to the scientific study of human motives”—reducing the text to evidence that supports the “scientific” legitimacy of Freudian theory, and not much else.⁴³ The review completely dismisses the novel's aesthetic value in favour of claiming that it supports psychoanalytic theory. Furthermore, while it was bad enough that Kuttner reduced *Sons*

⁴¹ James T. Boulton and George J. Zytaruk, eds., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume II: 1913–1916* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 470.

⁴² Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers*, 472.

⁴³ Kuttner, “A Freudian Appreciation,” 316.

and Lovers to a psychoanalytic narrative, it was perhaps of even greater insult that he included Lawrence's relationship with his mother as part of the review, writing "there can be no doubt as to the authenticity of the author's inspiration."⁴⁴ Lawrence's text becomes little more than an autobiographical example of the "truth" of what Kuttner characterised as Freud's "scientific" theories.

Freud himself would have rejected such a level of interpretive intimacy, having destroyed his own biographical information several times over. But his disciples, who indiscriminately read psychoanalytic significance into literary texts and their authors, used methods of diagnostic reduction that contributed to Lawrence's negative belief that, as Spitzer puts it, "psychoanalysts read literature to uncover allegories that affirm their own speculations."⁴⁵ After reading the review, Lawrence wrote a strongly worded letter to his friend, British psychoanalyst Barbara Low, dismissing it from having any legitimate value and criticising its psychoanalytic interpretation:

I hated the Psychoanalysis Review of *Sons and Lovers* [Kuttner's]. You know I think 'complexes' are vicious half-statements of the Freudians: sort of can't see the wood for the trees. When you've said Mutter-complex, you've said nothing—no more than if you called hysteria a nervous disease. Hysteria isn't nerves, a complex is not simply a sex relation: far from it. My poor book: it was, as art, a fairly complete truth: so they carve a half-lie out of it, and say 'Voila!' Swine! Your little brochure—how soul-wearied you are by society and social experiments.⁴⁶

For Lawrence, Kuttner's appraisal of *Sons and Lovers* "cannot see the wood for the trees," meaning that its focus—interpreting the text as psychoanalytic evidence—entirely misses the book's artistic vision, the "fairly complete truth" that he intended to convey.⁴⁷ Although Lawrence was not particularly well-versed in Freudian theory, Kuttner's review set him against everything analysts and psychoanalysis stood for. While Fiona Becket correctly describes how the psychoanalytic texts that Lawrence would write "form part of his long-running preoccupation with unconscious, or non-

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Spitzer, "On Not Reading Freud," 94.

⁴⁶ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, xxviii.

⁴⁷ He returns specifically to this point in Chapter IV of *Fantasia of the Unconscious* in a digression on "tree worship" to incite his reader to consider both trees and the wood simultaneously, *Fantasia*, 85–88. An interesting contrast can be made by drawing attention to one of Freud's letters to Fliess, where he writes of authors "who do not see the trees, hopelessly lost on the wrong track," cited in Frederick Crews, *Freud: The Making of an Illusion* (New York: Macmillan, 2017), 943. Applebooks Edition.

deliberate, aspects of human feeling which, crucially, pre-dated his introduction to ‘Freudianism,’” these texts likewise concern how he calibrated those concepts in a defence against unwelcome analytic interpretations of both himself and his fiction, the individual and the artist.⁴⁸ Nearly a hundred years later, psychoanalytic interpretations of Lawrence’s work, particularly *Sons and Lovers*, continue. In 2016, a special issue on Lawrence and psychoanalytic theory in the *D.H. Lawrence Review* includes a piece on *Sons and Lovers*. Seolji Han recapitulates the biographical relevance of reading this text, particularly with regards to psychoanalytic interpretation.⁴⁹

Lawrence did not write his psychoanalytic essays for a number of years. After Kuttner’s review was published, however, it is evident that he was undertaking some independent psychoanalytic study that he took quite seriously. He wrote a letter to Katherine Mansfield in 1918 after reading the English translation of Jung’s *Psychology of the Unconscious*, a title that he drew upon in naming his first work on psychoanalysis, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*. He writes to Mansfield:

...this Mother-incest idea can become a bit of an obsession. But it seems to me there is this much truth in it: that at certain periods the man has a desire and a tendency to return unto the woman, make her his goal and end, find his justification in her. In this way he casts himself as it were into her womb, and she, the Magna Mater, receives him with gratification. This is a kind of incest...I have done it, and now struggle all my might to get out. In a way, Frieda is the devouring mother. It is awfully hard, once the sex relation has gone this way, to recover. If we don’t recover, we die.⁵⁰

Some of the problems surrounding Lawrence’s characterisation of “man” and “woman,” and indeed the intensely negative criticism he received from feminist scholars will be engaged below. For now, however, what content in the letter to Mansfield shows is a critical progression. In reading psychoanalytic literature further, Lawrence engaged with how it applied to his own life, finding some truth in it, while

⁴⁸ Becket, “Lawrence and Psychoanalysis,” 218.

⁴⁹ Han remarks on the longstanding problem of reading *Sons and Lovers* as a pathology, rather than a literary text, before proceeding to study the text in relation to Freud’s theories of melancholia. See Seolji Han, “The Ethics of Melancholic Subjectivity in *Sons and Lovers*” *D.H. Lawrence Review* 41, no 2 (Fall 2016): 7–25. As stated in the introduction to this dissertation, it seems problematic to continue to read psychoanalytic significance in the works of modernist writers, such as Lawrence, who spent a significant amount of energy opposing such readings.

⁵⁰ Kinkead-Weekes, “The Genesis of Lawrence’s Psychology Books,” 153 n1; Boulton and Robertson, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume III*, 301–302.

seeking out its various blind spots and untried assumptions with the intention to dismantle or “get out” of it.

Kinthead-Weekes writes that “...it was no accident that his title [*Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*] echoes that of the book by Jung...the one in which Freud’s most powerful disciple broke with his master in a way that Lawrence must have approved.”⁵¹ Jung’s break from Freud can be provisionally defined by how, rather than focusing on the repressed sexuality of specific individuals, he believed in a theory of the collective unconscious where “archetypal inheritance informs the experience of...the human race.”⁵² However, Lawrence, as Kinthead-Weekes continues, “thought Jung was as culpable as Freud in seeing the incest motive as virtually constitutional,” given Jung thought that the incest motive was “part of a broader collective.”⁵³ Therefore, for Lawrence, Jung founded his psychology, too, on “the analysis of disease and disorder,” namely the incest motive.⁵⁴ For Lawrence, psychoanalysis’s emphasis on “incest-craving” creates an analytic and diseased cul-de-sac, one that manipulates the inner dynamics of the self by continuously finding evidence for the Oedipal complex it then proceeds to diagnose. His letter to Mansfield describes actively trying to “recover” himself from the trap of reducing psychical experience to the framework of an incest motive. He takes issue with its obsessive, self-justifying way of “thinking” that amounts to a form of death— “if we don’t recover, we die.”⁵⁵

For Lawrence, it is impossible to mentally extricate oneself from what he perceived of as psychoanalytic reductionism, its circular reasoning and constant intellectual pathologising of sexuality, repression, and family love. He viewed psychoanalysis under terms similar to his condemnation of rational knowledge described in his 1913 letter to Collings: another form of the intellect’s “bit and bridle.”⁵⁶ As such, Lawrence was motivated to create a new psychology for the public, one that was generative and that liberated organic will, primary impulse, and sexuality from what he viewed to be false mental consciousness susceptible to the ideologies of its day. *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* present his theories on knowledge,

⁵¹ Kinthead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 554.

⁵² See Carl Jung, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, trans. Beatrice M. Hinkle (New York: Dover, 2003).

⁵³ Kinthead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 554.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ Boulton and Robertson, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume III*, 302.

⁵⁶ Boulton, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume I*, 503.

the self, blood, sexuality, and what he calls the “pristine unconscious” to override all forms of inescapable, diagnostic reductions of the psyche.⁵⁷ These works ambitiously encompass his retaliation against categorical forms of knowledge, and he genuinely believed that the texts would be taken as serious contributions to scientific literature.⁵⁸

While that would be far from the case, the highly rhetorical manner in which he wrote them, along with the complex and puzzling metaphorical concepts that he puts forth therein, can allow these texts to be read not simply as literary works, but as ideas in process, and akin to the kinds of preliminary paratexts that writers characteristically produce as they build towards a major work. By focusing on the style in which Lawrence mocks Freud, the metaphoric and allegoric way he portrays his own views, and the didacticism with which he wishes to enforce social change, we can also better grasp the significance of these texts as paratextual. Lawrence approached psychoanalysis as a writer, which is to say that he wanted to defend and portray an aesthetic understanding of a self, liberated from rational entrapment. Therefore, his writings on psychoanalysis, albeit problematic, show how he was imaginatively illustrating the possibility of a cultural awakening that could come from a renewed belief in the psychical forces centred on the experiencing and sacred body. In reading the concepts in these texts with a focus on their literary language, we can engage Lawrence’s vision of non-rational forms of knowledge and a life in the body, before considering their impactful reworking in his fictional literature that determines them as paratextual to his later fiction.

2.2 D.H. Lawrence’s Psychoanalytic Works: A Literary Defence

At the beginning of *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* Lawrence provides a dramatic rendition of Freud’s theory of the unconscious:

With dilated hearts we watched Freud disappearing into the cavern of darkness, which is sleep and unconsciousness to us, darkness which issues in the foam of all consciousness. He was making for the origins. We watched his ideal candle flutter and go small....

⁵⁷ For a valuable exploration of Lawrence’s cultural objectives see Jae-Kyung Koh, “D.H. Lawrence’s World Vision of Cultural Regeneration in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*,” *Midwest Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (Winter 2002): 189–206.

⁵⁸ Lawrence was convinced his instinctual version of the psyche would create new forms of analysis; see Kinkead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 553.

But sweet heaven, what merchandise! What dreams, dear heart! What was there in the cave? Alas that we ever looked! Nothing but a huge slimy serpent of sex, and heaps of excrement and a myriad of repulsive little horrors spawned between sex and excrement.⁵⁹

Lawrence's theatrical and macabre description reads as intentionally grotesque and makes his rejection of Freud, the "psychoanalytic gentleman...on the stage," abundantly clear.⁶⁰ He considers Freud to be an imposter, one who has done little more than propose a theory of the unconscious surmised as a "huge slimy serpent of sex, and heaps of excrement."⁶¹

Lawrence's use of language sets the tone for what would be his largely ridiculed contributions to psychoanalytic theory.⁶² Freud, a "psychiatric quack," is caricatured through the deliberately parodic language Lawrence employs: "dear heart" provides a mocking substitute for Freud's frequent use of "dear reader" in his writings.⁶³ While Lawrence's vision contains merits to be explored, the more positive attributes of his work are often immersed in rhetoric that mimics and exaggeratingly renounces the discursive attributes of psychoanalytic writing. However, navigating its style tells us much more about Lawrence's particular ambitions. For example, his vividly staged portrait of Freud and the "serpent" provided in the introduction suggests that his understanding of the Freudian unconscious is embroiled in his preoccupation with Genesis as it relates to his concept of "blood." Having associated Freud with the "serpent of sex coiled round the root of all our actions," we can anticipate that

⁵⁹ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 9.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* Lawrence extends the motif of the serpent in relation to Genesis and original sin in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*; see 11–12, and later in relation to "being driven out of paradise" in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, see 117–118.

⁶² As described in far greater detail below, Lawrence's theoretical contributions to psychoanalytic theory would be largely rejected by not only psychoanalysts but also the literary community. See Spitzer, "On Not Reading Freud," 96–97.

⁶³ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 5. Freud appeals to the 'reader,' though this tradition can be traced to Laurence Sterne's satire of the 18th century cliché. In the Introduction to *The Penguin Freud Reader*, Adam Phillips enumerates that in the *Standard Edition* of Freud's works, "the word 'reader' is used one hundred and twenty-two times...he often addressed [the reader] directly in his writing." See Adam Phillips, ed., *The Penguin Freud Reader* (London: Penguin, 2006), vii. Though Lawrence arguably did not have much familiarity with Freud and could have simply been playing on 18th century rhetorical tropes, it is equally possible that he absorbed Freud's form of appeal to the "reader" to parody it.

Lawrence is trying to find a way of claiming the unconscious, sexuality, knowledge, and culture for a language in which he can work with them.⁶⁴

Spitzer points out that in the introduction to *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, Lawrence alludes to Plato's allegory of the cave and offers the image of Freud's "ideal candle," implying that Freud's theory of the unconscious can be taken as an attempt to enlighten humanity's self-imposed ignorance.⁶⁵ Though Lawrence essentially endeavours to accomplish this same thing—that is, to liberate the public from their own ignorance—he puts forward his concepts as a true liberation against what are considered to be Freud's false ones. For Lawrence, the ideas that Freud proposes are problematic in their own right, but he also seeks to emphasise how Freud's methodology reveals the pervasive problem of how "ideas that are mentally derived" contribute to the proliferation of an intellectual sickness, or what he calls "ideation."⁶⁶ Spitzer explains that Lawrence's repeated characterisation of Freudian "ideation" (and indeed his continual use of this word) specifically stands as "rhetorical shorthand for the epistemological methods that Lawrence sees and opposes in Freud."⁶⁷ Ideation, or the perpetuation of abstract concepts, is understood as the imposition of external ideas onto lived experience that repressively prescribe form onto consciousness. Kinkead-Weekes describes how, in this way, "Lawrence reverses the old Platonic myth of the cave: what is needed now is to get away from ideas and ideals" that he considers to be undermining to organic life.⁶⁸ Unlike the lowly position allocated to the artist in Plato's *Republic*, Lawrence will have it, Fernihough writes, that "the artist becomes not the copier but the creator, and the Platonic *eidos* [form, essence] is dismissed as inadequate to deal with the *thingness* of the thing."⁶⁹ Lawrence wanted to creatively engage (and portray) the material reality of experienced life as it is *lived*, as opposed to what he views as a Freudian reduction that relegates the psyche and individual into a series of formulaic types and therefore ideological categories akin to scientific empiricism.

A rejection of Platonic idealism that Lawrence connects to Freudian "doctrine" is linked to his belief in the detrimental, hermeneutical qualities of psychoanalytic

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Spitzer, "On Not Reading Freud," 90.

⁶⁶ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 14.

⁶⁷ Spitzer, "On Not Reading Freud," 90.

⁶⁸ Kinkead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 591.

⁶⁹ Fernihough, *D.H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*, 166, author's emphasis.

theory.⁷⁰ For Lawrence, Freudian theory “reads” a pre-determined, topographical unconscious onto the individual in order to inform a self-copying theory of repression, and doing so *forms* a totalising and negative claim on the psyche’s unconscious as irrevocably sick. To expose these problems, Lawrence asks a number of rhetorical questions in *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious*: if the psychoanalytic premise is that psychological inhibitions cause neurosis and insanity, yet the incest motive is a *necessary* inhibition that is the “cause of practically all modern neurosis and insanity,” how can it be rectified aside from accepting incest-craving “as part of the normal sex manifestation?”⁷¹ If it must be accepted that incest-craving is a fundamental part of sexuality that one *must* repress, is not it the case that the “mind acts as incubus and procreator of its own horrors,” and psychoanalysis perpetuates the notion of a “repressed motive” of incest that cannot truly be remedied?⁷² It is for this reason that, as Kinkead-Weekes puts it, Lawrence finds in psychoanalysis that it “starts as a therapy but ends by seeing disease as the norm.”⁷³ A concept of mind that dictates that all individuals perversely harbour incestuous desires normalises an ultimately sick account of the human mind while subjugating sexuality to those premises. For Lawrence, if we want to be freed from perverse ideas of the mind and body, then we must consider alternatives such as those he wishes to offer.

The doctrine of a prurient unconscious hinged on necessary repression, Lawrence explains, should not be taken as an infallible truth about the nature of human psychology. After all, “when the analyst discovers the incest motive in the unconscious, surely he is only discovering a term of humanity’s repressed *idea* of sex,” that is, a theory of the incest motive is an *idea* and not necessarily a “truth” about sexual motivation.⁷⁴ Psychoanalytic ideas are dangerous when believed, because they undermine our intuitive sense of self by “inoculating” us with a theory of our own incurable sickness.⁷⁵ Psychoanalysis “is not only an epistemology of the unknowable, but it is, in medical terms, a ‘symptom’ of the sickness it claims to cure.”⁷⁶ In his focus on the problem of accepting intellectual doctrine as truth, Lawrence conveys a fairly

⁷⁰ Lawrence, “This new doctrine—it will be called no less—has been subtly and insidiously suggested to us, gradually inoculated into us,” *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 7.

⁷¹ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 11, 10.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 12.

⁷³ Kinkead-Weekes, “The Genesis of Lawrence’s Psychology Books,” 162.

⁷⁴ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 25, emphasis mine.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁷⁶ Fernihough, *D.H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*, 68.

simple psychological point that continues to run throughout both of his works on psychoanalysis. Psychoanalytic ideas, when accepted as true, create the repressions that they describe. To rid oneself of belief in ideational truth means to get rid of the proliferating disease it causes. As he puts it in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, ideas which are “merely introduced into the brain” have “started spinning there like some outrageous insect” and are “the cause of all our misery today.”⁷⁷ When formal concepts become a hegemonic topography for defining the unconscious mind, little has been done but cause the misery that psychoanalysts, “the medicine men of our decadent society,” *claim* to remedy through analytic treatment, but ultimately enforce.⁷⁸

In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, Lawrence provides several comic narrations of the state of affairs of decadent society under the sway of psychoanalytic theory, such as in this example:

Amateur analyses became the vogue. ‘Wait till you’ve been analysed,’ said one man to another, with varying intonation. A sinister look came into the eyes of the initiates—the famous, or infamous, Freud look. You could recognise it everywhere, wherever you went.⁷⁹

Psychoanalysis had, as far as Lawrence could see, become ubiquitous and had captured popular opinion; it was now the topic of “tea-table chat.”⁸⁰ His use of the past tense in the above excerpt suggests that he wanted to portray life *after* the popularity of psychoanalytic theory, conveying it as a passing trend with the tone of a broadcaster. Opposing his generation’s fixation on psychological theories as “in vogue,” Lawrence wanted to instead facilitate a “true” and vigorous liberation, one that shakes people from “ideational” dependencies to the so-called truths of the day. Life, as he writes, “is only bearable when the mind and body are in harmony,” and to him Freud’s theories of repression and the unconscious, quite rightly, make such equilibrium impossible.⁸¹

Therefore, Lawrence’s analytic texts work towards his non-abstract concept of the “pristine” or “true” unconscious “in which all our genuine impulse arises,” and his

⁷⁷ Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 115.

⁷⁸ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 7.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ See Lawrence, “Apropos of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*,” *Sex, Literature and Censorship*, ed. Harry T. Moore (London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1955), 231.

notion of “blood-consciousness” to articulate a compelling and new way out of intellectual forms of self-understanding.⁸² But first, Lawrence takes his time in an extensive rejection of general doctrinal thinking, and he hammers out indictments to every conceivable culprit of what he sees as intellectual entrapment. Between *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, Lawrence voluntarily swings his attention from psychoanalytic theory to ideas more generally. His heated opinions against forms of knowledge or “truth claims” go so far as to suggest that all formal education should be banned—“let all schools be closed, at once” because “ideas are the most dangerous germs mankind has ever been injected with.”⁸³ While some individuals might have an inclination towards intellectual thinking, for the vast majority “mental consciousness is simply a catastrophe, a blight. It just stops their living.”⁸⁴

Within this particular argument—that all formal education should be banned—is Lawrence’s inclination to form associations between knowledge and class. While Freud’s approach to formulating a theory of the psyche far from represents a static or linear mental fixity, as the previous chapter has shown, his emphasis on repression and theory of the incest motive as a universal truism indicates, for Lawrence, how psychoanalysis intellectually claims authority over the inner dynamics of self. That we do not know ourselves but are rather victims of our not knowing, which psychoanalysts alone can uniquely determine, represents a battle concerning the hegemonic status of knowledge and taught education. It places specialised knowledge into the hands of the elect few. To that effect, Lawrence rallies for a more democratic—or as Spitzer puts it—“populist view,” where self-knowledge is a matter of personal prerogative that requires sensuous encounters with the world that proceed by “sure intuition” and without adherence to the dictations of formal education, and least of all psychoanalysis.⁸⁵

Lawrence’s solution to this situation is poised on the edge of metaphor: blood flows through every individual body, bestowing it with the capacity for the wisdom of experience, for sexual possibility, for creative potential. Any externally imposed

⁸² Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 12.

⁸³ Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 106; 116.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 105.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

diagnoses of the self, much like forms of education that tell one who one is or what to think, produce a homogeneous and slavish culture. Lawrence wants to provide an alternative that goes against the grain of hierarchical structures of analytic thinking to restore a belief in and capacity for individual action. Intellectual forms of knowledge with which the modern public are indoctrinated stifle individual possibility that, as Lawrence iterates, have created “the incipient man, the man of today.”⁸⁶

Although Lawrence advocates the capacity for intuition and will, present in all living things as a collective, he also seeks to repudiate sources of knowledge that impose sanctions on what can only be internally perceptible truths, such as those known through the body, through intuition, and direct experience, that represent the creative possibilities of the *individual*. In *Fantasia of the Unconscious* Lawrence flaunts his lack of knowledge of Freud as a mark of individualistic, creative liberation and implies that a lack of academic knowledge allows him greater access to the truth of human experience and that bestows him with the ability to describe its qualities with accuracy: “I am not a scientist. I am an amateur of amateurs...I am not a scholar of any sort...I proceed by intuition.”⁸⁷ His reckless and perhaps even courageous statements that admit his lack of knowledge are self-referential: they plainly draw attention the fact that the style and form in which the text itself is written is not scholarly or scientific. He approaches the topic of human psychology and its relation to the organic spontaneity of experienced life through “intuition” and the non-intellectual mind, which allows him to take the position of the writer freed from psychoanalytic discourse. Not only does this represent a form of personal freedom unhinged from formal education, it reminds us of his religious beliefs expressed in the unpublished Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*, where he determines “the Holy Ghost is the expression of the joy of the individual man in finding himself in creation.”⁸⁸ Spontaneous creativity, borne from sensitivity to one’s “spontaneous centres” allows the intuitive expression of flesh or blood to be written (or, as Lawrence would have put it, “made Word”) that the individual, especially the individual writer, can affect.

⁸⁶ D.H. Lawrence, “Enslaved by Civilization,” *Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works by D.H. Lawrence*, ed. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore (London: Heinemann, 1968), 578.

⁸⁷ Lawrence. *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 62.

⁸⁸ Lawrence, *Sons and Lovers*, 472.

However, one of Lawrence's many contradictions is here apparent, where his argumentative traction begins to sputter. While for him "analysis is evil," and this point is meant to apply not only to psychoanalysis's claim to a "pure psychology," but also more broadly to established schools of thought that misguide the blighted and ignorant public from their greater capacities for living, he nevertheless expounds his own prescribed equivalent, which he tries to avoid presenting as another doctrine.⁸⁹ Readers are compelled to interpret Lawrence's proposed alternatives to Freudian theory, and nearly any theory, as somehow superior to all that other analytic concepts have to offer. He provides his ideas while simultaneously denouncing intellectual truth-claims, and in so doing attempts to convince his audience (often appealing to them directly, such as in his now adopted and repeated "dear reader") that there is an organic equivalent to the source of human knowledge that can be achieved and communicated without any form of systematic or generalising thought.⁹⁰

This is an exceptionally difficult task and as a result Lawrence continuously contradicts himself by attempting to replace ideas he so opposes with his own ideas that are meant to be deprived of the qualities of abstract thought. In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, while Lawrence successfully evades falling into another form of dogmatic thinking (precisely what he is criticising), it is the particular aesthetic quality of his claims that problematically inhibit them from being scientifically valid, and thus steers the entire project toward incoherence. Therefore, while Lawrence does succeed in not creating an alternative *ideology*, he fails because he refuses to speak the language of psychoanalysis's "scientific" discourse. Instead, he uses aesthetic descriptions to convey an imaginative set of pseudo-scientific theories, which end up looking like less coherent versions of what they are intended to critique.

This incoherence manifests itself in the ways in which metaphors in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* contradict one another, so that any attempt to unravel a logical position from the works finds itself caught in loops of illogic. For instance, one of the first alternatives to Freudian theory that Lawrence proposes is based on what he refers to as a true version of the unconscious, one that is not a shadowed mystery hiding a repugnant secret about human sexuality (a giant

⁸⁹ Boulton and Robertson, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume III*, 42.

⁹⁰ Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 72.

serpent of sex whose coils are surrounded by excrement), but one in which we can know the unconscious “as we know the sun.”⁹¹ Not only does he wish to assert that the damaging intellectual tendencies of his generation have removed the ability to live and experience sexuality naturally, Lawrence argues, he wants to introduce consciousness (and the unconscious along with it) to the “light.” This set of images of “the sun” and “light” brings his metaphoric language back to the image of Plato and the cave, which he associates with Freud and the serpent in the introduction to *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*.

To enlighten false notions of the unconscious, and any fixed truth-claims about being (so that individuals can reclaim their capacity for living), he proclaims:

We have actually to go back to our own unconscious. But not to the unconscious which is the inverted reflection of our ideal consciousness. We must discover, if we can, the true unconscious, where our life bubbles up in us, prior to any mentality. The first bubbling life in us, which is innocent of any mental alteration, this is the unconscious. It is pristine, not in any way ideal, it is the spontaneous origin from which it behoves us to live. What then is the true unconscious? It is not a shadow cast from the mind. It is the spontaneous life-motive in every organism. Where does it begin? It begins where life begins.⁹²

Lawrence compels readers to sense the organic and intuitive properties of life that “bubbles up in us,” explaining that *this* is where we can find the “true unconscious.” His appeal is rife with noble ambitions comparable to Nietzschean philosophy, focusing on the will or “life-motive” inherent in every organism.⁹³ For Lawrence, we must turn away from the resentment that creates psychological sickness, embracing instead the pristine sources of life within each of us, that exist prior to any “mental alteration.” The unconscious is not a source of our repressed incest-cravings, a “shadow cast from the mind” in the hopes of reflecting our preferred conscious life. It is rather the life force,

⁹¹ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 17.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 15.

⁹³ In “Study of Thomas Hardy,” as Fernihough notes, Lawrence “expresses the merging and separateness in art in terms of the Will-to-motion and the Will-to-Inertia,” demonstrating his intentional use of Nietzschean terms; however, she describes him as “guilty of distorting the meaning of ‘will-to-power’” by conflating it with “willpower—which is as far as could be from Nietzsche’s definition.” See Fernihough, *D. H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*, n92; 80; 147. For a further and extensive resource on Lawrence and Nietzsche, see in particular Colin Milton’s book dedicated to the topic, *Lawrence and Nietzsche: A Study in Influence* (Edinburgh: Mercat Press, 1987).

the “sun” within us, that we “idiotically” ignore in favour of following the dominant ideologies of the day.

Instead of logic, even the logic of metaphor, then, there is the assertion of the sermon. Lawrence’s imploring efforts to convince his readers that they must try to eradicate concepts that mentally distort intuitive, natural, and intrinsic value are delivered with passionate immediacy.⁹⁴ Yet in trying to develop the principals of his proposition, the “pristine unconscious,” he struggles with his own conceptual limitations. He cannot locate *where* life bubbles up in one, he has no topography, he cannot piece together a formulaic *idea* or a doctrine that people can take seriously—and he knows it. For example, he acknowledges, anticipating his critics, that his perspective on the unconscious is “...too vague. It is no use talking about life and the unconscious in bulk.”⁹⁵

Still, the pages that follow in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* show truly remarkable efforts at creating a methodological framework for propositions such as the pristine unconscious. It is here that Lawrence begins to expound a number of metaphorical and symbolic concepts that frequently become cross-wired. He attempts to pinpoint the source of will and the origin of the individual soul prior to ideological forms of morality or dogmatic thinking. What he offers, as numerous critics have discussed and ridiculed, is an argument that perches in a liminal zone between metaphor and an intuited biological fact, based around the ganglia or nerve centres within the body, which he divides into ganglia and plexuses.⁹⁶ Unlike in his 1915 letter to Russell where he rejected the idea of both nerves and brain, he now attempts a theory of the nerves, largely influenced by his reading of Trigant Burrow, and a mapping of the body for psychological significance.⁹⁷ First, he asserts that the origin of consciousness is located in the solar plexus:

⁹⁴ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 28.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁹⁶ Lawrence was inspired in particular by James Morgan Pryse’s *The Apocalypse Unsealed* (1910), where he explains how in ancient Indian neurology, cosmic energy “can be generated from the ganglion or web of nerves (in the lower back, loins and thighs), whose centre is the base of the spine; and how, in its full circuit through all other ganglia or *chakras* and the brain (a nervous system both sensual and spiritual), the whole being can be flooded with illumination.” Kinkead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 395.

⁹⁷ Lawrence approvingly references Burrow, the founder of the concept of “neurodynamics,” in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 11.

In the solar plexus is the first great fountain and issue of infantile consciousness. There, beneath the navel, lies the active human first-mind, the prime unconscious. From the moment of conception, when the first nucleus is formed, to the moment of death, when this same nucleus breaks again, the first great active centre of human consciousness lies in the solar plexus.⁹⁸

To this he adds further centres such as the lower spinal ganglia that, through “frictional electricity,” essentially constitute a developing child’s backbone: “the forces of anger and retraction into independence and power.”⁹⁹ Similar metaphorical associations guide his description of other ganglion and plexuses, such as with the thoracic, “a sun in the breast” that “fills the shoulders with strength,” the cardiac, “that strange effluence of the self which seeks and dwells upon the beloved, lovingly roving like the fingers of an infant or a blind man over the face of the treasured object,” and the breasts and nipples, which serve as “two eyes...as fountains leaping into the universe, or as little lamps irradiating the contiguous world, to the soul in quest.”¹⁰⁰

The allegorical creativity of Lawrence’s descriptions of the body’s spontaneous centres both discredit the possibility of treating the work as a legitimate contribution to psychoanalysis, while representing his remarkably creative map of the human body. At such moments, these works cannot be taken as a physiological or scientific argument to be understood literally, but rather a highly allegorical rendition of his concepts of blood, wisdom, and life portrayed by a writer. Lawrence conveys his concepts through associations he has formed, much like he associated the “eye” with its ability to transfigure perception in the earlier letters. In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, it is clear that Lawrence knew his highly metaphorical mapping of the body and psyche would be criticised as having little to no legitimate scientific or theoretical value. At the same time, however, he attempts to deflect a reading that would treat such passages as his map of the body as “merely a metaphor”:

...a mere incoherent stammering, broken first-words. To return to the direct path of our progress. It is not merely a metaphor, to call the cardiac plexus the sun, the Light. It is a metaphor in the first place, because the conscious effluence which proceeds from his first upper centre in the breast goes forth

⁹⁸ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 25.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 27; 29; 30.

and plays upon its external object, as phosphorescent waves might break upon a ship and reveal its form.¹⁰¹

While excusing his explanations as “broken first-words,” he suggests that metaphorical language does not “merely” present a metaphor. The text opens itself up to ridicule in the suggestion that the argument is to be taken literally. However, there is another way in which to read this: Lawrence’s argument is not “merely metaphorical” because consciousness is *already* metaphorical. To perceive the world, to “play upon [the] external object,” means to form associations creatively that exceed any stable understanding of language and the mind. Just as waves might break upon a ship “and reveal its form,” so too can a certain kind of language relationally expose the way conscious beings perceive the world. Literary language allows for fluidity of explanation that mimics the intuitive and non-intellectual forms of understanding that Lawrence is trying to convey. While his poetic associations, such as of “cardiac plexus” and the “sun” are problematic in the realm of scientific discourse, they demonstrate his belief in the powers of applied, aesthetic representation in not only portraying, but also transforming, conscious awareness.¹⁰² If we believe in psychoanalysis, Lawrence seems to ask, then *why not* a metaphorical understanding of the sacred body that each of us knows intuitively, and that can be representatively portrayed?

Along with the theory of the vital centres, ganglia, and plexuses, Lawrence insists on the importance of sexuality, and he considers shame to be propagated by modern psychoanalytic discourse, not, significantly, by the proscriptions of religion, where the blame is often placed. This allows Lawrence, when approaching the subject of sexuality, to use language that is explicitly religious in tone. Moreover, despite having advocated liberation from ideological thinking and sexual repression, Lawrence rather contradictorily seeks to repress “thinking” about sex. In *not* analysing human sexuality, but rather only in intuitively exploring it through a preordained and natural morality derived from the organic body, it could be argued that there is an underlying religious impulse, which sees the unconscious as something to be preserved as “pristine,” natural, “impulsive,” and “intuition based” by remaining fluid, unexamined, consecrated. This often leads Lawrence to arguments that sound curiously conservative, almost prudish.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 33.

¹⁰² Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 115.

So, for instance, he argues that we should substitute societal strictures (forms of puritanism), contemporary promiscuity (the modern “jazzy” generation’s more relaxed attitude towards sex), and the psychoanalytic theory of sexuality and the unconscious for a kind of hallowed, spiritual approach to sex. Rather than stepping past morality, Lawrence is thus positing a creative version of morality that still maintains organic sexuality in order to liberate “sex in the head.”¹⁰³

In other words, Lawrence criticises Freud because of his methods that diagnose human sexual experience into reductive categories posed as unequivocal truths (forming a negative, ideological discourse of repressed human sexuality). However, Lawrence himself in fact risks advocating repression by promoting methods of preserving the sacred body and sex act to protect it from the violations of contemporary thinking; he argues “the supreme lesson of consciousness is learning how to not know.”¹⁰⁴ Lawrence equates examining and analysing sex with what is unnatural and even devilish, whereas whatever is spontaneous or intuitively felt and left intellectually unexamined is understood as natural and morally pure, a belief that runs contrary to central concepts in psychoanalytic theory. What is most indecent to Lawrence is what he calls “sex in the head,” which has multiple resonances for him: “a turning inward of man upon himself, an intensification of the mental at the expense of the physical, and any kind of intellectually distanced view of the sexual act.”¹⁰⁵ Lawrence finds “sex in the head” so repugnant because it exemplifies how ideas have warped organic human impulse and capacity for intuitive enjoyment into a pathology.

The excerpts from *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* cited above, concerning how Lawrence relied on metaphorical terms to explain his belief in the body’s vital centres and the origins of the pristine unconscious, continue in his depictions of sexual instinct and connection.¹⁰⁶ Relying on religious examples, and in particular the fall of man described in Genesis, Lawrence combines aesthetic technique with religious motifs to again and more explicitly confront the “serpent” in psychoanalytic theory and its approach to sex. Lawrence’s view of the pristine unconscious becomes interspersed

¹⁰³ Ibid., 148.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 75.

¹⁰⁵ Spitzer, “On Not Reading Freud,” 98.

¹⁰⁶ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 28.

with depictions of Genesis in order to appeal to a return to the origins of not only sexuality but of knowledge:

...the nature of the true, pristine unconscious, in which all our genuine impulse arises—a very different affair from that sack of horrors which psychoanalysts would have us believe is the source of motivity. The Freudian unconscious is the cellar in which the mind keeps its own bastard spawn. The true unconscious is the well-head, the fountain of real motivity. The sex of which Adam and Eve became conscious derived from the very God who bade them be not conscious of it—it was not spawn produced by secondary propagation from the mental consciousness itself.¹⁰⁷

What this passage suggests is that the pristine unconscious that Lawrence has referred to as “from where life begins” is created from an intuitive and holy union that relies on the motif of the creation story between an original man and woman.¹⁰⁸ Unlike the language that describes a “bastard spawn” associated with the Freudian unconscious that illegitimizes impulse, the pristine unconscious, though contrarily produced from “the very God who bade them be not conscious of it” is not “secondary,” but rather springs forth from genuine instinct.¹⁰⁹ Lawrence connects procreation and sexuality with intuitive impulse to purify the spontaneity and creativity of desire and therefore to render it legitimate.

In his appeal to biblical references, Lawrence does not see Adam and Eve’s union as a sin. It is rather their subsequent knowledge and self-consciousness of the sex act, informed by the serpent, that created the true original sin. His explanations surrounding Adam and Eve in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* are helpfully expanded in *Studies in Classic American Literature*:

Adam knew Eve as a wild animal knows its mate, momentarily, but vitally, in blood knowledge. Blood-knowledge, not mind knowledge. Blood knowledge that seems utterly to forget, but doesn’t. Blood knowledge, instinct, intuition, all the vast vital flux of knowing that goes on in the dark, antecedent to the mind. Then came that beastly apple, and the other sort of knowledge started...and that was the birth of sin. Not *doing* it, but **KNOWING** about it...No wonder the Lord kicked them out of the Garden. Dirty hypocrites. The

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 26.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 15.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 26.

sin was the self-watching self-consciousness. The sin, and the doom. Dirty UNDERSTANDING.¹¹⁰

This important comparison—between Lawrence’s early theories of blood-wisdom or blood-consciousness (here referred to as blood-knowledge) and Adam and Eve in his work on American literature—illustrates his highly specific regard of sex as a moral, natural, and essential feature to the nature of life that became *unnatural* because of knowledge. It is not Adam and Eve’s having sex, but rather their subsequent knowledge of it that formed “the sin and the doom”—ultimately it is “dirty understanding” that is the true sin, turning what is sanctimonious into a “dirty” lesson.¹¹¹

In describing sex, Lawrence writes:

But what is the experience? Untellable. Only we know something. We know that in the act of coition the *blood* of the individual man, acutely surcharged with intense vital electricity—we know no word, so say “electricity,” by analogy—rises to a culmination, in a tremendous magnetic urge towards the magnetic blood of the female. The whole of the living blood in the two individuals forms a field of intense, polarised magnetic attraction.¹¹²

This passage not only valorises the qualities of sexual union as emblematic of a blood connection and a universal relation, Lawrence advocates; it also insists on the universal individuality he so endorsed, and the impossibility of language to approximate pure experience other than through analogy.

Lawrence’s insistence on the importance of sex is meant with a religious level of sacred, and notably literary, magnitude. He conservatively viewed promiscuous behaviour as anti-progressive, seeing uninhibited modern sexuality as unauthentic and a testament to his emotionally dead “counterfeit” generation.¹¹³ Margaret Beede Howe describes that “to be whole, according to Lawrence, we need to be in touch with our unconscious, and to be in touch with our unconscious, we need—quite literally—sex.”¹¹⁴ However, Howe’s remark might be too hastily worded. Lawrence’s concept of “needing sex” is of a very specific kind, one that is meant to affirm instinct that

¹¹⁰ Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature*, 82, author’s emphasis.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹¹² Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 134, author’s emphasis.

¹¹³ See D.H. Lawrence, *Sex, Literature and Censorship*, 120–127; 195–222.

¹¹⁴ Margaret Beede Howe cited in Holbrook, *Where D.H. Lawrence Was Wrong*, 24.

precedes self-conscious knowledge. In his reading of Freud, Lawrence disparages psychoanalysis's theoretical discourse of sex given he thought that it paradoxically continues the worn association between sex and impurity by describing what is unconsciously hidden as devilish and repugnant. Therefore, psychoanalysis does not actually advance the social repressions it claims to unveil. It does not encourage what is sacred and profound in sexuality but, like the puritanical Victorianism from which it was born, demoralises sexuality through emphasis on a prurient, serpentine unconscious. Similarly, a contemporary, relatively promiscuous culture operates on similarly artificial terms by not acknowledging the importance of the body and of sex as a profound and sacred expression of human experience.

It is perhaps because of his belief that words are only ever a creative approximation of experience that Lawrence chose to apply them so freely in his psychoanalytic texts, without a truly deep engagement with the theories he dedicated himself to rejecting. He writes, "there is no logical or rational co-relation in the dynamic unconscious," a phrase that resembles the spontaneous way he connected theories of the unconscious to the experience of life in his own imaginative terms.¹¹⁵ With regard to the reception of Lawrence's analytic works, Henry Miller is one of few who defend the author's approach to analysis, arguing that these texts sought to recapitulate:

the long struggle for human freedom which the Greeks, in their hey-day, apotheosized. He realized that man's struggle was to live as god, and that only when he had attained this goal, he could become truly human.¹¹⁶

Miller thought that Lawrence's motive was to transcend formal strictures that ideologically limit consciousness and sexual experience, which was what made him most human, and most effective as a writer describing humanity. Anaïs Nin, whose own experiences of psychoanalysis and her short work of criticism on Lawrence are explored in the next chapter, similarly championed Lawrence's theories. However, the majority of his modernist contemporaries did not follow suit.¹¹⁷ T.S. Eliot wrote that Lawrence had a lack of "social and intellectual training...an incapacity for what we

¹¹⁵ Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 125.

¹¹⁶ Henry Miller, *The World of Lawrence: A Passionate Appreciation*, ed. Evelyn J. Hinz and John J. Teunissen (London: John Calder, 1985), 200.

¹¹⁷ See Lawrence, "Forward: An Answer to Some Critics," *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 51–65.

ordinarily call thinking.”¹¹⁸ Lawrence’s digressions are “worthy of less fantastic and better-balanced thought,” Eliot believed, going on to argue that they are distracted and frenzied, and his content exhaustively weaves between sporadic propositions and discursive conjecture.¹¹⁹ Spitzer writes that Lawrence’s views stand in direct opposition to many literary modernists’ preoccupations with education and intellectualising self-reflexivity: “Lawrence’s decentred position in relation to high modernism, [...] as Eliot’s critique reveals, was very much concerned with traditional forms of education and training.”¹²⁰

Fernihough dedicates a substantial portion of her monograph, *D.H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*, to the differences (and some similarities) between Lawrence and members of the Bloomsbury group, especially his opposition to Bloomsbury art critics Clive Bell and Roger Fry.¹²¹ John Worthen’s biography focuses on how Lawrence was an outsider to literary and working class communities.¹²² Lawrence accused Bell’s *Art* of exemplifying the pretensions he most detested, and in *Studies in Classic American Literature* he takes considerable time to criticise qualities of his literary contemporaries.¹²³ His rejection of intellectual, analytic activity was compounded after a visit to Cambridge with Bertrand Russell that made him “very black and down. I cannot bear its smell of rottenness, marsh-stagnancy...How can so sick people rise up? They must die first.”¹²⁴ Lawrence bitterly writes in “The Novel and the Feelings” of the “farcical” belief “men” have in being “so civilized, so highly educated and civilized.”¹²⁵ Lawrence’s perspective, expounded in his writings and in his life, opposed high modernism’s preoccupations with intellectualism that he associated with the self-conscious bourgeoisie class. These opinions are embodied in Lawrence’s literary characters such as *Lady Chatterley’s* impotent author Sir Clifford,

¹¹⁸ T.S. Eliot, *After Strange Gods*, quoted in David J. Gordon, *Lawrence as a Literary Critic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 24; 27; quoted in Spitzer, “On Not Reading Freud,” 97. For a lengthy account, see also “Reception” in Steele’s Introduction to *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious*, xlvii-li.

¹¹⁹ See Introduction to *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious*, xlviii.

¹²⁰ Spitzer, “On Not Reading Freud,” 97.

¹²¹ See in particular Anne Fernihough, *D.H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*, 83–99.

¹²² See John Worthen, *D.H. Lawrence: The Life of an Outsider* (London: Penguin, 2006).

¹²³ For a full account of Lawrence’s visit to Cambridge, see Kinkead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 208–212.

¹²⁴ Kinkead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 309.

¹²⁵ Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature*, 201.

whose weakness requires earthy gamekeeper Oliver Mellors to push him out of a muddy trench.

A consideration of knowledge and its impact on understanding the mind of experience—so imperative to the writer of literature—indicates one of many arenas in which psychoanalysis and modernist literary representation diverge. The concept of the author as one who documents “truth” about the human condition, right down to theories of the “soul” and the “unconscious,” is bound into contextual theories that spark debates on the status of knowledge itself taken up by psychoanalyst and literary authors alike. However, literature uniquely allows for the suspension of truth claims, which permit alternative ways for interpreting and portraying the self. This chapter has thus far demonstrated Lawrence’s approach to psychoanalysis to draw attention to its inherent contradictions as well as examine how Lawrence approached psychoanalysis as a writer, focusing on its creative and literary merits. While many of his propositions are best represented in his fictional works, where he was able to demonstrate his ideas rather than attempt to prove them scientifically, the analytic texts are paratextual to the fictional works. Lawrence intended to convey a doctrine on the psyche, and when that was not taken seriously within the psychoanalytic academy, he embedded the same ideas in his fiction. It would be his literary texts that grasped public opinion and heated discussion, rather than these analytic works. However, in considering the non-fictional works as part of the processual paratextual apparatus of the novels, we can begin to read the novels differently.

In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* Lawrence writes, “The unconscious is the *creative* element, like the soul it is beyond all law of cause and effect in its totality.”¹²⁶ *Studies in Classic American Literature*, published shortly after *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, discusses his ambitious regard of what literary creativity (as an unconscious element) can accomplish.¹²⁷ He claims the “truth of art-speech” functions as a liberation from repressive ideation:

¹²⁶ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 18.

¹²⁷ *Studies in Classic American Literature* was published in 1923; however, many of its essays were composed throughout the 1910s though emendations continued up until December 1922. For a detailed genetic history including revisions of the essays that would have occurred while Lawrence was writing his psychoanalytic texts, see Bruce Steele’s introduction to *Fantasia and Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious*, xxxix–xlii.

Art-speech is the only truth. An artist is usually a damned liar, but his art, if it be art, will tell you the truth of its day. And that is all that matters. Away with eternal truth. Truth lives from day to day, and the marvellous Plato of yesterday is chiefly bosh today.¹²⁸

Art is true and artists are liars, yet art “has two great functions. First, it provides an emotional experience. And then, if we have the courage of our own feelings, it becomes a mine of practical truth.”¹²⁹ Lawrence’s belief in the “truth of art-speech” and the possible practical truth of the analytic propositions he sought to propose are creatively incorporated in *Mr. Noon* but especially *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* and are themes that will be addressed in the subsequent chapters on Nin and Joyce. For present purposes, it is clear that despite the negative reception of his analytic texts Lawrence did not abandon any of his concepts, but rather integrated them in his fiction, to which we now turn. He remained resolved in an ongoing belief that artistic motivity can operate as a psychical force that can contribute to cultural regeneration.

2.3 The Psychoanalytic Texts as Paratextual Trial Pieces

In “Lawrence and Psychoanalysis” Fiona Becket directs attention to a scene in Lawrence’s *Aaron’s Rod*. Lawrence began writing the book in 1918 and finished it in 1921, when *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* was first published. Becket posits that protagonist Rawdon Lilly, the Lawrence-figure in *Aaron’s Rod*, signifies Lawrence’s “view of the disintegrative processes of modernity in the context of a world that has been at war.”¹³⁰ The passage she refers to bears a striking resemblance to Lawrence’s gothic depiction of Freud’s theory of the unconscious in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*:

Damn all masses and groups, anyhow. All I want is to get myself out of their horrible heap: to get out of the swarm. The swarm to me is nightmare and nullity—horrible helpless writhing in a dream. I want to get myself awake, out of it all—all that mass-consciousness, all that mass-activity—it’s the most horrible nightmare to me. No man is awake and himself.¹³¹

¹²⁸ Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature*, 13–14.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 14.

¹³⁰ Becket, “Lawrence and Psychoanalysis,” 221. Her description alludes to the impact the First World War had on Lawrence’s understanding of the “mob” and is returned to in the detailed analysis of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* below.

¹³¹ D.H. Lawrence, *Aaron’s Rod* (London: Penguin, 1996), 119.

Though Becket does not specifically associate this quote with the introduction of *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, which describes a “writhing” and “swarming” serpentine Freudian unconscious, she does explain Lawrence’s view that modern mental-conscious is “felt physically in the sick, and sickened, body of the man.”¹³² Becket explains that in *Aaron’s Rod* what Lilly desires most in the above-cited speech “is the birth, or re-birth, of the individual, independent self that Lawrence describes in the metaphoric language of *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*.”¹³³

A comparison between the language used in *Aaron’s Rod* and *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* indicates Lawrence’s pervasive use of content from his psychoanalytic texts in his literature around this time. *Aaron’s Rod* presents a disparaging view of a swarming and collective nightmarish dream-state as a ubiquitous psychological condition plaguing the protagonist’s generation. One of Lawrence’s central ambitions in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*—much like Lilly’s wish in *Aaron’s Rod*—is to awaken from a bad dream exemplified by the abstractions of Freudian theory and the homogenising tendencies of the mob. For Lawrence, his analytic texts were not only meant as a contentious replacement to Freudian theory, but also to refute dominant and ideological ideations more broadly, and this endeavour is developed in his literary works that followed. He wanted to shed light on false beliefs that continuously motivate the “masses and groups” into misdirected frenzy that, at its furthest, results in war.¹³⁴ Lawrence believed those who subscribe to or generate authoritative forms of thinking create the “horrible nightmare”—a blind, collective and diseased predicament.¹³⁵ The masses are for Lawrence, as Miller puts it, “biology—organic life, not *creative* life,” and a creative response facilitated by the independent and self-actualised artist, who has the capacity to transform lies into truths, contributes to Lawrence’s latter-stage beliefs in “art-speech” as an active contribution to cultural regeneration.¹³⁶ Lawrence’s theories of the pristine unconscious, blood-consciousness, and cultural regeneration are

¹³² Becket, “Lawrence and Psychoanalysis,” 221.

¹³³ *Ibid.*

¹³⁴ Lawrence, *Aaron’s Rod*, 119.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁶ Miller, *A Passionate Appreciation*, 242, emphasis mine. We might also note here how Lawrence’s original view of regeneration had been far more genetic. His concept of blood-wisdom had derived from a maternal fixation that believed in connectivity based on a form of biological relatedness. As stated in the first section of this chapter, this progressed into an increasingly abstract and independent theory—one that we can see at its height in the current section of this chapter.

ambitiously engrained in his literature, valuably affirming many of his propositions that were ineffectively portrayed in the analytic texts.

Max Saunders considers Lawrence's criticisms of early 20th century modernity with Freud's late text *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur* [*Civilization and its Discontents*], published in 1930, the year Lawrence died.¹³⁷ As Saunders notes, in the Standard Edition the word *Unbehagen* is translated as "malaise," rather than the more commonly used term "discontent," and malaise in particular is a constant preoccupation in both men's works.¹³⁸ The qualitative difference that Saunders alludes to is the more precise definition of malaise as an illness, as opposed to discontent as an unhappiness. According to Saunders, what we find in Freud is that the subject is the cause of their own unhappiness as a self-perpetuating illness, one that is cyclically propelled: societally imposed, repressed guilt follows with compulsive, transgressive action against socially enforced restrictions, leading to guilt over the transgression, therefore reinstating guilt once more. The perpetual parry between subject and culture is "the price we pay for our advance in civilization...a loss of happiness through the heightening of the sense of guilt."¹³⁹ Saunders continues that what Freud suggests is

...a deeply depressing verdict for any civilized regulation, since the very attempt to impose regulations will itself produce the desire to transgress them; and if we repress that desire, we will feel guilty...social regulations do not just protect and benefit everyone, as claimed; but might actually produce suffering.¹⁴⁰

Lawrence's works and letters similarly prescribe the human psyche and culture as fundamentally ill, approximating some of Freud's more dismal conclusions on civilisation in *Civilization and its Discontents* referenced in Saunder's quote. However, Lawrence offers a distinctly alternative articulation: the author's texts on psychoanalysis posit that guilt is externally motivated by abstract and imposed truths,

¹³⁷ For another, recent study of Lawrence and Freud's *Civilization and its Discontents*, see Michael Bell, "Myths of Civilization in Freud and Lawrence" *Études Lawrenciennes* 45 (2014): 9–26.

¹³⁸ Max Saunders, "Lawrence, Freud and Civilization's Discontents," *D.H. Lawrence Review*, 27, nos. 2–3 (1997–1998): 270. Adam Phillips, however, draws attention to how Freud originally wanted the English title to be "Man's Discomfort in Civilisation," bringing to bear another means to interpret the notion of discontent and malaise. See Adam Phillips, *Becoming Freud: The Making of a Psychoanalyst* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 40.

¹³⁹ Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents*, ed. Albert Dickson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985), 327.

¹⁴⁰ Saunders, "Lawrence, Freud and Civilization's Discontents," 271.

and that the *industry* of mentality creates guilt, which (like the theory of incest craving) has sickened the inherent, dynamic capacities of the individual's aptitude towards life. Though, like Freud, Lawrence saw individuals as the perpetrators of their own ills in relation to societal repressions, unlike Freud he believed the problem was dictated by ideation and *not* the individual, whom he regarded as capable of transcendental, sensuous freedom, the "light." Lawrence's objective is to do away with the theoretical *cause* of guilt, and therefore he advocates a distinctly different approach to Freud's views on the subject. Such topics are nascently threaded in the incomplete *Mr. Noon* but are most clearly detailed in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Lawrence worked on *Mr. Noon* between 1920 and 1921, but eventually abandoned it while composing both *Fantasia of the Unconscious* and *Aaron's Rod*. This text marks a developmental bridge between his concepts in the analytic works into increasingly fictional representation, and he was working on them simultaneously.

In *Mr. Noon*, a young schoolteacher Gilbert Noon is "famous as a spooner," and the object of his attentions is Emmie, "famous as a sport."¹⁴¹ The two of them represent modern youth, and they meet in order to "spoon" each other in the darkened entry of the local Co-op until Emmie must return home to meet her curfew. Throughout this early episode in *Mr. Noon* Lawrence continuously addresses the reader with various provocations similar to the rhetorical style employed in both *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*: "It does not matter what you do—only how you do it," "I hope you're not feeling horribly superior," "Dear reader, have we not all left off believing in positive evil?"¹⁴² The didactic and confrontational appeals in this intentionally comedic text employ the language used in the analytic works.

When Emmie returns home to meet her curfew, Noon waits for her in the forest outside of her house until her father leaves for a late work shift, so that they might resume their sexual activities. As he waits in the trees, Noon suddenly falls into an unexpected, rapturous experience. He contemplates the "*metaphorical* structure of the tree, right from the root-tip through the sound trunk, right out to a leaf tip...incalculable."¹⁴³ This spontaneous encounter with the unknown and the depth of unquantifiable feeling bears

¹⁴¹ D. H. Lawrence, "Mr. Noon," *Phoenix II*, 124.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 124; 129.

¹⁴³ Lawrence, *Mr. Noon*, 138, emphasis mine.

significant resemblance to Lawrence's discursive, criticised meditation on tree worship in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*:

The looming trees, so straight. And I listen for their silence. Big, tall-bodied trees, with a certain magnificent cruelty about them... Their magnificent, strong round bodies! It seems I can hear the slow, powerful sap drumming in their trunks. Great full-blooded trees, with strange tree-blood in them, soundlessly drumming... A vast individual life, and an overshadowing will. The will of a tree.¹⁴⁴

In *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, this moment is meant as an allegorical example, one that indicates the interconnectedness of the "will" in being, as paralleled in the natural world. A similar experience is portrayed in *Mr. Noon* as the protagonist momentarily experiences an expansion of consciousness in the forest. Noon suddenly feels a sense of dislike towards Emmie—he begins to see their jaunts as foolish, and superfluous next to nature's towering and authentic magnanimity.¹⁴⁵

The brief, unforeseen turn in the text might indicate that Lawrence was simultaneously working on *Mr. Noon* while composing the tree excerpt in *Fantasia of the Unconscious* quoted above.¹⁴⁶ The general spirit of this vision, as we shall see, is resumed later on in the text. At this point in the story, however, Noon's syncopated revelation is interrupted when Emmie signals to him that her father has left. His private spell is broken, and Noon sneaks into the family's greenhouse with Emmie in order to continue the intimacies they had begun in the darkened entry of the Co-op. However, Emmie's suspicious father returns because of a hunch based on what Lawrence highlights as a common hypocrisy (Emmie's father, we are told, engaged in numerous previous trysts himself) and he angrily barges in on them in the greenhouse. Noon takes off running, narrowly escaping a violent fight.¹⁴⁷

The incident with Emmie causes Noon to lose his job as a teacher; he is brought in front of a committee from his school composed of "mostly fat fossils and important persons of complete insignificance," and rather than endure their insufferable moral judgement

¹⁴⁴ Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 85–86.

¹⁴⁵ Lawrence, *Mr. Noon*, 135.

¹⁴⁶ It seems highly plausible that Lawrence was working on both excerpts at the same time; however, without access to Lawrence's extant drafts it is impossible to determine a precise chronological congruence. However, given he *was* working on both texts at the same time, the possibility is justifiable.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 136–137.

he forthrightly offers his resignation and leaves.¹⁴⁸ The scene pokes fun at Noon's philandering, while similarly mocking the pettiness of moral convention. The "spoony" and "counterfeit" generation Emmie and Gilbert represent are as foolish as the committee which passes pre-determined, glib judgements on his actions.¹⁴⁹ In lieu of what Lawrence accentuates as the programmed, artificial display of convention obliged by the scene's participants to significant comic effect, he follows with a side story that connects with Noon's epiphany in the forest. This deviation concerns Noon's encounter with a married woman, Patty, "a woman of about forty, stoutish, with very dark glossy brown hair coiled on her head," that parallels Noon's later love interest Joanne whom Brenda Maddox has controversially identified as Lawrence's wife, Frieda.¹⁵⁰

The married woman's husband, Noon's former teacher, is away when Noon visits their house to seek counsel the day after resigning from his job. Patty and Noon decide to take a walk together, and they discuss marriage and relations between the sexes. Mid-conversation Patty interrupts Noon to chide him. She remarks how young he is and therefore how little he knows: "What difference there is between what you think now and what you'll think afterwards!"¹⁵¹ As sudden as his earlier revelation in the trees, an epiphanic experience begins to pass over Gilbert Noon, one that both characters perceive. Lawrence's description at this point in the text is worth quoting in full:

Other women, such as Patty, had always been to him dresses with faces. And now, to his terror, something else seemed to be emerging from her face, a new Aphrodite from the stiff dark sea of middle-aged matronliness, an Aphrodite drenched with knowledge, rising in a full ivory-soft nudity, infinitely more alluring than flapperdom could offer [...] through the foam of the fight for freedom, the sea of ideal right and wrong, and now was emerging, slowly, mysteriously, ivory-white and soft, woman still, leaving the sea of all her past, nay, the sea of all the extant human world behind her...unfathomed,

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 157.

¹⁴⁹ Lawrence refers to the modern generation as "counterfeit" in many of his essays, such as "Is England Still a Man's Country?" and "Sex versus Loveliness," *Phoenix II*, 556–559; 527–532.

¹⁵⁰ Brenda Maddox's *D.H. Lawrence: The Story of a Marriage*, as the title suggests, discusses Lawrence's marriage to Frieda at length. She uses the incomplete *Mr. Noon* in particular as a "barely fictionalised account" of Lawrence and Frieda's early relations, 11. Because of the negative criticism Maddox's text has received from numerous reviewers, I have chosen not to include her study in this chapter. For a critical review of the work, see Kinkead-Weekes, *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. 2*, 762.

¹⁵¹ Lawrence, *Mr. Noon*, 141.

unexplored, belonging nowhere and to no one, only to the unknown distance, the untrodden shore of all the sea of all the unknown knowledge.¹⁵²

Although Noon's revelation during this intimate moment becomes defused by an encounter with an unruly heifer that frightens Patty, thus breaking the spell and returning the story to its comedic style, the poignancy and unexpected incongruence of this interlude in the text suggests it was Lawrence's central focus. The drama with Emmie and the school committee is superfluous to the greater meaning in this revelatory area of the text that might have been elaborated had *Mr. Noon* been completed as a novel.¹⁵³ Gilbert Noon's proximity to a shift in consciousness signals an awakening that he involuntarily experiences through Patty's effect over him. An introspective turn inward fuses spontaneous transcendence with psychical awakening that imparts a prescient sense of meaning now available to him. It had begun with Noon's meditation on the trees around him outside of Emmie's house, yet is brought far closer through what Patty's presence arouses in him.

This instance articulates content allegorically presented in both of his analytic works: the instinctive vitality of the self and the power of nature to compel a psychical awareness that erases moral ideation. Here the implication of direct experience as *not* being quantifiable but rather spontaneous is realised with brief, yet far greater representational accuracy. In this experience shared between Noon and Patty—perhaps autobiographically derivative of Lawrence's first encounter with Frieda, as Maddox suggests—he invites the reader to partake in a narrative that is experienced rather than logically defined.¹⁵⁴ Lawrence transmits the intuitive, sensuous revelations uncovered by the narrator through sensory-emotive writing, and in doing so finds better words for what knowledge of an unintelligible, pristine unconscious might feel like, reminiscent

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 141–142; 143–144. The repetitive and receptive stylistic quality of this passage could be compared to Molly Bloom's reflections that lead towards "Yes" at the end of *Ulysses*.

¹⁵³ The first segment of *Mr. Noon* was completed and published within fifty years of its composition; it was first published with a selection of Lawrence's writing in *Phoenix II* in 1968.

¹⁵⁴ The possibility of an autobiographical connection is not explored here as there is not enough evidence to support it, and thus any argument in this direction would be pure conjecture. Suffice to say, however, that Frieda's influence on Lawrence was a substantial psychological awakening for him and that there are many resemblances to their first meeting in what is described in *Mr. Noon*, as Maddox has discussed.

of an Emersonian “all-seeing” transcendental dissolution of self, to such effect that it intimately mutes the rest of the story’s plot.¹⁵⁵

In *Mr. Noon*, Lawrence illustrates, albeit briefly, that it is precisely the quality of a transcendent experience in tandem with the physical body that sparks the source of a recuperative possibility for the self. Noon’s encounter with Patty leads him towards an unresolved and thinly grasped, yet prophetic awareness of life, growth, and therefore regeneration: “the untrodden shore of all the sea of all the unknown knowledge.”¹⁵⁶ This is an extension of the very themes that run through Lawrence’s earlier, quasi-religious *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* concerning the “pristine unconscious” and his view that one should embrace what unconsciously “bubbles up within us” as a revelation.¹⁵⁷ Noon is overcome by an epiphany that resembles the *content* that Lawrence tried to articulate in both of his psychoanalytic works; it is as though Noon’s revelation narrates the impact Lawrence hoped his analytic texts would have on readers. In this way, and increasingly so, we can see the paratextual connections between the essays and Lawrence’s fiction. Far from being inconsequential, they allow us subterranean insight into the process, and conceptual through-lines, operating within Lawrence’s later fiction.

Saunders puts it that Lawrence believed “thinking has got separated from feeling; and this turns men into reasoning-machines” detached from their own transcendental powers.¹⁵⁸ Intuitive and sexual life are an antidote to guilt and confusion, and do away with the ideational moralising of talking heads such as those represented by Noon’s school committee. Although knowledge remains “unknown” in the *Mr. Noon* passage, the epiphanic moment expressed in this short text advocates how dynamic experience can offer a portal into new methods of knowledge beyond cerebral, “ideational” thinking, presenting instead a malleable and dynamic awareness equated with the soul and the body.

Lawrence’s fiction transfers feeling into language in ways that convey his theories of the pristine unconscious and blood wisdom. His narrative in *Mr. Noon* is an anecdote

¹⁵⁵ The connection between Emerson’s “all-seeing eyeball” is apt here, given Lawrence was extensively reading American authors that feature in *Studies in Classic American Literature*.

¹⁵⁶ Lawrence, *Mr. Noon*, 144.

¹⁵⁷ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 15.

¹⁵⁸ Saunders, “Lawrence, Freud and Civilization’s Discontents,” 269.

on the modern world, as one filled with either “grey puritans” or “smart jazzy persons” that have “no respect for anything,” and undervalue sex and its harmonising capacity of psychological and physical importance.¹⁵⁹ Whether it be modern views of promiscuous ambivalence, outdated puritanical moralising, or psychoanalytic ideation, Lawrence believed that a disoriented understanding of the body and sex had led to the mentalising sickness of guilt and moral repressions that permeated his era. As such, his literature does not straightforwardly suggest, as Howe writes, that “to be in touch with our unconscious, we need—quite literally—sex,” it rather serves to validate and discern the role of sexuality outside of its modern appropriations such as those expressed by Emmie and Noon’s activities and those who reprimand them.¹⁶⁰

The artist’s task provides an essential cultural function. Lawrence believed it can amend the puritanical and repressive malaise plaguing his era. A literary portrayal of genuine sensuous experience as revelatory and curative can and should be able to change culture. Lawrence sets this goal for himself, and in doing so most strongly offers his conceptual alternatives to Freudian psychoanalysis in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. The story itself *enacts* a number of his concepts from the psychoanalytic texts. In many ways, it is Lawrence’s sharpest narrative argument against Freudian theory and all that he believed it entailed. Lawrence’s statements in the short essay “Apropos of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*,” his defence of the book published shortly before he died, prefaces this reading.

In the essay Lawrence makes clear “the real point of this book...I want men and women to be able to *think* sex, fully, completely, honestly, and cleanly.”¹⁶¹ Though the quote emphasises the verb to “think” (quite contrary to his disparaging remarks on sex in the head in the analytic texts), it shows that the motivational aim of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is that it be educational, to serve a psychological and social purpose. He goes on:

The mind has to catch up, in sex: indeed, in all the physical acts [...] The mind has an old, grovelling fear of the body and the body’s potencies. It is the *mind*

¹⁵⁹ Lawrence, *Sex, Literature and Censorship*, 231.

¹⁶⁰ Margaret Beede Howe cited in Holbrook, *Where D.H. Lawrence Was Wrong*, 24.

¹⁶¹ Lawrence, “Apropos of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*,” in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* (London: Penguin, 2006), 308, author’s emphasis.

we have to liberate, to civilise on these points. The mind's terror of the body has probably driven more men mad than ever could be counted.¹⁶²

Lawrence's intentions for *Lady Chatterley's Lover* are similar to his ambitions in *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. The analytic works can, as stated above, be read as paratextual resources, insofar as they are essential paratextual material as trial pieces that influenced the conceptual development of the novel. The analytic texts and fiction are not just comparable to each other; focus on the psychoanalytic essays allows us to interpret how the concepts therein are re-presented and reworked in Lawrence's writing as a textual continuum.

In this way, his appropriation of (and deviation from) Freudian theory resembles what Dirk Van Hulle refers to as "exogenetic," a tier of genetic inquiry that refers to outside, external source texts that effect a text's composition.¹⁶³ In studying the literary text from a compositional, genetic perspective, the value of demonstrating how external texts enhanced or shaped the objectives of a particular writer is important. What we see in Lawrence is the appropriation of psychoanalytic terminology as exogenetic, external source material that contributed to the formation of his own concepts, which in turn developed his fiction. Lawrence's work demonstrates how literary modernism processed psychoanalysis through literary process, and in so doing developed its own textual interpretations of the self and language over time.

Lawrence depicts experiential awareness as a catalyst, the crucial impetus and antidote to the cultural problems he believed were rife in his era. A sense of cultural sickness is addressed, and his theories of the pristine unconscious and blood wisdom appear and are rendered with greater sophistication in the story of Constance (Connie) and Clifford Chatterley and gamekeeper Oliver Mellors. In this respect, *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* are paratextual to *Lady Chatterley's Lover*; many of the concepts in those essays are mimetically demonstrated through the characters in the novel.

¹⁶² Ibid., 308, 309.

¹⁶³ Dirk Van Hulle, "Editing the *Wake's* Genesis," in *James Joyce and Genetic Criticism*, ed. Genevieve Sartor (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 44. Van Hulle's definition of endogenetic, exogenetic and epigenetic are originally derived from Raymond Genette's work, though he modifies the terms in relation to more recent developments in genetic criticism, and the more updated versions of these terms are reflected here.

2.4 A Paratextual Reading of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*

At the very beginning of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, we learn Sir Clifford Chatterley married central protagonist Connie while on a month-long leave from his position as a chief officer in the First World War. After being sent back to Flanders, he was severely wounded within six months, so much so that “the lower half of his body, from the hips down, [was] paralyzed for ever.”¹⁶⁴ Clifford returned to Wragby Hall, the Chatterley “family seat...more or less in bits,” and we are told his condition required two years of intensive medical care.¹⁶⁵ It becomes clear that there would be no possibility for an heir to the Chatterley estate: “crippled forever...he could never have any children.”¹⁶⁶

Beyond providing a contextual introduction to the drama of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Clifford's condition corresponds with many of Lawrence's descriptions in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, specifically concerning civilisation's malaise as a fundamental imbalance between the upper and lower body: “an insistence upon the one life-mode only...a suppression of the great lower centres, and a living sort of half-life, almost entirely and exhaustively from the upper centres.”¹⁶⁷ The sickness Lawrence believed to be plaguing his generation is embodied in his portrayal of the “upper-centred” Clifford who has returned to Wragby effectively sterilised from the waist down by the detriments of what Lawrence would call “ideation” at its maximum: war.

Following his father's death, Clifford is now the master of Wragby Hall and owns the coal mines in Tevershall, the nearby industrial village situated in the smoky English midlands. While Connie and Clifford enjoy a privileged life at Wragby, one sheltered from the mounting dissent of the colliers “talking again of a strike” in Tevershall, the intellectual relationship that initially brought them together wanes: “the mental excitement had worn itself out and collapsed, and she was aware only of the physical aversion.”¹⁶⁸ Clifford focuses on intellectual and technological advancements to offset his physical disability. A motorised chair supplements his inability to walk, and the electronically powered wheelchair is a tool he uses to “ride upon the achievements of the mind of man.”¹⁶⁹ Meanwhile, Connie is dissatisfied with the limitations of their

¹⁶⁴ D.H. Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 5.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 52.

¹⁶⁸ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 50; 97.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 179.

circumstance, and her lack of sexual fulfilment begins with a description of corresponding physical atrophy. She negatively assesses her naked body in the mirror: “instead of ripening its firm, down-running curves, her body was flattening and going a little harsh. It was as if it had not enough sun and warmth [...] her body was going meaningless.”¹⁷⁰

The emotional and physical gulf between Connie and Clifford widens and complex psychological consequence follows. Their inability to be physically intimate and the impossibility of their conceiving a child—creating life—causes Clifford to become “queer.” He listens to the radio for hours alone (“Was he really listening?”) while Connie becomes increasingly fearful: “A kind of terror filled her sometimes: a terror of the incipient insanity of the whole civilized species.”¹⁷¹ Connie’s voice conflates with the narrator’s in a further description of the condition:

...it was not a manifestation of energy, it was the bruise of war, that had been in abeyance, slowly rising to the surface and creating the great ache of unrest, the stupor of discontent. The bruise was deep, deep, deep—the bruise of the false and inhuman war. It would take many years for the living blood of the generations to dissolve the vast black clot of bruised blood, deep inside their souls and bodies. And it would need a new hope.¹⁷²

The quote demonstrates Paul Dawson’s observation that the sense we get throughout *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* “is of never quite knowing which sentiments are more or less Connie’s and which are more or less the narrator’s as it shuttles between long sections of free indirect discourse and overtly didactic anti-industrial statements.”¹⁷³ Similar to the interjections of the narrator in *Mr. Noon*, a stylistic equivalent is embedded in the prose of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. Connie’s thoughts throughout the body of the text are indicative of Lawrence’s own inspired views. The formation of a regenerative “new hope” and “living blood” to heal the “deep bruise” of a “false and inhuman” cultural predicament is, much like the ambitions in Lawrence’s analytic works, the book’s main prerogative.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 70.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 110.

¹⁷² Ibid., 50.

¹⁷³ Paul Dawson, “Fictional Minds and Female Sexuality: The Consciousness Scene from *Pamela to Lady Chatterley’s Lover*,” *ELH* 86, no.1 (Spring 2019): 182.

¹⁷⁴ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 50.

The narrator's voice that approximates Lawrence's opinions is increasingly apparent in how Connie grows to steadily dislike Clifford, who "was almost an idiot when left alone with his emotional life."¹⁷⁵ Clifford starts to write and publish short stories as a hobby, and we find that unlike the criticisms Lawrence endured from his literary contemporaries, Clifford's thinly disguised Bloomsbury-like stories are positively received by the literary community. Lawrence's response is described in how Clifford's capacity for "brilliant" talk does not embody "the leafy words of an effective life, young with energy and belonging to the tree. They were the hosts of fallen leaves of a life that is ineffectual."¹⁷⁶ Gilbert Noon's communion with the forest in *Mr. Noon* and Lawrence's own sustained meditation on tree worship in *Fantasia of the Unconscious* are subtly woven into the narrator's opposition to Clifford's ill-attuned capacity for organic revelation. His character reflects a literary ineptitude at harnessing the truth of art-speech that would make his attempts as a writer truly effective. Connie proclaims that Clifford's stories are "all nothing, a wonderful display of nothingness. At the same time a display. A display, a display, a display!" echoing Lawrence's bitter experience of the Cambridge academic elite and the negative reviews of his analytic works.¹⁷⁷ Clifford's character, as Fernihough puts it, is "bound in by method and intentionality;" his efforts as a writer "can only be derivative, not genuinely creative."¹⁷⁸ Clifford is an opposing example for the greater message percolating in the text, one concerning the potential power of artistic creativity against Platonic ideation, which Lawrence had previously connected with Freudian psychoanalysis in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*.

Clifford is sterile in both fictional creativity and the physical capacity for creation. His neutered position signifies a mental inversion preoccupied with external, intellectual progress that develops an expanding sexless, mechanical industry. Connie, echoing Lawrence's personal misgivings, is "tired of self-important mentalities" such as those displayed in Clifford's stories, his theories of industrial advancement, and his entitled attitude towards the people who work at the colliery he owns—"no wonder they hate you."¹⁷⁹ She articulates Lawrence's disparaging and deeply bitter views on the modern

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 111.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 50.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Fernihough, *D.H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*, 167.

¹⁷⁹ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 202.

condition. Clifford's psychic barrenness, as Jae-Kyung Koh puts it, "and his devotion to the mechanical principle, rather than his physical impotence...frustrates the deepest desires in his wife Connie."¹⁸⁰ Much like Lilly in *Aaron's Rod* and Lawrence's vitriolic diatribe against psychoanalytic theory, Connie's resentments reflect the author's negative views concerning "displays" of modern progress. It is instead the capacity for regenerative life that should be the real site of progress, one that brings out intuitive vitality, "new hope," change.

Questions as to how potency is acquired and how it might be cultivated are represented in the contrast Lawrence sets up between Clifford and the organic passions of Connie activated by her masculine counterpart—gamekeeper Oliver Mellors. Virile and earthy Mellors is anecdotally associated with an old-fashioned, thick-blooded, working-class sensuality. When the Chatterleys first stumble upon Mellors during a stroll on Wragby grounds they find him wearing outdated clothes, "dark velveteens and gaiters," a stark contrast to the modern, "mechanised" world Clifford represents.¹⁸¹ Mellors speaks "broad Derbyshire," and Connie observes him as unnervingly self-possessed; he has "a perfectly fearless, impersonal look."¹⁸² Though Clifford dismissively refers to him as a "collier's son," Connie perceives Mellors to be a "curious, quick, separate fellow, alone but sure of himself."¹⁸³ In setting up a juxtaposition between differing versions of masculinity in his text, Lawrence suggests a form of psychical rejuvenation born from an invigorated and individualist masculine virility. His description of Mellors's individualism echoes his belief in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, "there is only one Law: I am I," that here becomes increasingly precise and earthy.¹⁸⁴

In 1928, Lawrence wrote to Earl Brewster about *Lady Chatterley's Lover* to describe that it "is a novel of the phallic consciousness: or the phallic conscious *versus* the mental spiritual consciousness: and of course you know which side I take."¹⁸⁵ For Lawrence, the phallic represents a life-giving, powerful, and intuitive sensibility, and the letter to Brewster indicates how he wanted it to be a central theme in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. This objective is certainly exemplified in how Mellors and Clifford

¹⁸⁰ Koh, "D.H. Lawrence's World Vision," 190.

¹⁸¹ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 46.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 47.

¹⁸⁴ Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 72.

¹⁸⁵ Harry T. Moore, ed., *The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence* (New York: Viking, 1962), 182.

offer Connie polarising versions of male self-expression and capacity for power. Attention to Lawrence’s articulation here—of the phallic and its importance in the text—conjures reminders of feminist criticisms of his work, most powerfully issued by Kate Millet.¹⁸⁶

Since Millet’s work appeared in 1970, there has been a lively debate as to whether Lawrence’s work can (or, indeed, should) be recovered from the vigorous critiques to which it was subjected by second wave feminism. For instance, we find Milne has described the ways in which some feminist critics have portrayed Lawrence as a “patriarchal bigot and pornographer,”¹⁸⁷ the latter argument harkening back to an even earlier phase of Lawrence’s critical reputation. Cornelia Schulze asked in 2002 “how can you be a feminist and a Lawrentian?,” while Santan Bhowal has more recently argued that Lawrence’s work actually endorses many principals by which third wave feminism is defined.¹⁸⁸ And, indeed, as we shall see in the chapter to follow, Anaïs Nin far from believed that Lawrence’s work as, Beynon writes, “celebrates the phallic at the expense of woman’s reality and being.”¹⁸⁹

On the one hand, it can be strongly argued that Lawrence viewed sex and gender in essentialist terms, in terms that leave little scope for contemporary debates on gender fluidity:

A child is born sexed. A child is male or female; in the whole of its psyche and physique it is either male or female and will remain either male or female as long as life lasts.¹⁹⁰

On the other hand, this formulation neither subjugates nor idealises the female based on that essentialism; “that magic and dynamism rests on otherness.”¹⁹¹ Lawrence writes, “the true female will eternally hold herself superior to any idea, will hold full life in the

¹⁸⁶ Kate Millet, *Sexual Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970).

¹⁸⁷ Drew Milne, “Lawrence and the Politics of Sexual Politics” in *The Cambridge Companion to D.H. Lawrence*, 202.

¹⁸⁸ Cornelia Schulze, *The Battle of the Sexes in D.H. Lawrence’s Prose, Poetry and Paintings* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 2002), 4. Bhowal’s study defines third wave feminism as “sceptical about universal truth claims, doubtful about the idea of a stable, pre-social self and questions the pretensions of a disembodied rationality.” See Bhowal, “Lawrence and Feminism” *Études Lawrenceiennes* 49 (2019): 16.

¹⁸⁹ Richard Beynon, *Icon Critical Circles: The Rainbow, Women in Love* (Cambridge: Icon Books, 1997), 114.

¹⁹⁰ Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 96.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 103.

body to be the real happiness.”¹⁹² This characterisation of the female precisely defines the very qualities that Lawrence upheld the most: non-abstract knowledge, supremacy of experience over ideas, rootedness in the body. These are attributes that he portrays in character Connie in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*; but, equally, they are what he equates with Mellors, which suggests that, in fact, what Lawrence means by the “female,” or, indeed, the “phallic” may well be an attribute either of men or of women. At the very least, we can say that when Lawrence uses a term like the “phallic,” he is doing something more complex than simply propagating a misogynistic idea, any more than it made him a pornographer.

A closer reading of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* makes this clearer. Connie is initially and actively attracted to Mellors as an antidote to her life with Clifford: “the sense of deep physical injustice burned through her very soul.”¹⁹³ She is described as “tender, tender with the tenderness of the growing hyacinths unlike the celluloid women of today.”¹⁹⁴ Connie is closer to the character of Patty in *Mr. Noon*, rather than the character of modern girl Emmie, who represents Lawrence’s conservative views on a “jazzy” and “counterfeit” generation. The text significantly differs from *Mr. Noon* in that rather than a female character, Patty, who roused sacred knowledge in that text’s protagonist, in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* it is rather Mellors who primarily leads Connie towards a process of internal and consummated transformation. Connie and Mellors’s physical and spiritual union indicate a fusion between blood-consciousness and the pristine unconscious and, notably, neither of these concepts are associated with sex or gender. *Together*, and quite fluidly, they embody and demonstratively enact concepts contained in *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. The scenes between them provide equal definition for the concepts that Lawrence had such difficulty in portraying effectively in his analytic works.

Lady Chatterley’s Lover articulates masculine incentive as connected to natural life connected to its female protagonist and demonstrates how sexuality possesses the great capacity for personal regrowth, specifically as it might exist apart from intellectual abstractions, “dirty understanding,” or shame. In the scene where Connie and Mellors

¹⁹² Lawrence, *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*, edited by E.D. McDonald (New York: Viking Press, 1936), 481.

¹⁹³ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 71.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 119.

first consummate their relationship she finds him attending to pheasant chicks in the clearing in front of his gamekeeper's cottage. Because she wants to touch one, Mellors reaches into the coop to draw a chick out.

She took the drab little thing between her hands, and there it stood, on its impossible little stalks of legs, its atom of balancing life trembling through its almost weightless feet into Connie's hands....

The keeper, squatting beside her, was also watching with an amused face the bold little bird in her hands. Suddenly he saw a tear fall on her wrist. And he stood up, and stood away, moving to the other coop. For suddenly he was aware of the old flame shooting and leaping in his loins that he had hoped was quiescent for ever.¹⁹⁵

Saunders interprets that the scene is as much about sexuality as it is about "something that gives new life, both actually in the shape of progeny, but also symbolically, in their own rebirths through it."¹⁹⁶ The vision that Lawrence cultivates in this scene is one of sympathetic awareness, mapped between the natural, the innocent, and the sexual. The connective and affective quality of the experience impacts and receives the material world in a dizzying circuit of non-intellectual knowledge. The compelling revelation that brings both of these characters into new forms of self-discovery is instinctual. The arousal is depicted as a spontaneous transfusion, an inexorable and natural occurrence as much a part of life as the pheasant chick's stalk legs. Mellors's own response to Connie's unexpected expression of feeling, her shed tear, brings the sympathetic into the body that moves him towards action. Lawrence carefully portrays Mellors's intentions—he is not crude nor violent—and Lawrence is not gratuitous in his depictions of the characters' sex. The literary effort is rather focused on providing an account that uses words to thread connectivity through experience, the sensual body, and the scene that can bring about a climactic revelation tuned towards life; as Mellors tells her, "I thought I'd done with it all. Now I've begun again...life."¹⁹⁷ Their encounter is mutually transformative, an invigorating remedy against the "evil electric

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 115.

¹⁹⁶ Saunders, "Lawrence, Freud and Civilization's Discontents," 276.

¹⁹⁷ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 118.

lights and diabolical rattling of engines,” and the idea that sex is shameful or to be forgotten.¹⁹⁸

Connie grows through her encounters with Mellors, portraying the message that Lawrence wished to convey in his rally against “sex in the head” in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*.¹⁹⁹ In one of their later-described sex scenes, Lawrence’s depiction of their passionate union incorporates the qualities of the oceanic, and notably transfigures illusions to the “mass” frequently referenced in both the introduction to *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious* and *Aaron’s Rod* to reparative effect.

It seemed she [Connie] was like the sea, nothing but dark waves rising and heaving, heaving with a great swell, so that slowly her whole darkness was in motion, and she was ocean rolling its dark, dumb mass. Oh, and far down inside her the deeps parted and rolled asunder, in long, far-reaching billows, and ever, at the quick of her, the depths parted and rolled asunder, from the centre of soft plunging, as the plunger went deeper and deeper, touching lower, and she was deeper and deeper and deeper disclosed, and heavier the billows of her rolling away to some shore, uncovering her, and closer and closer plunging the palpable unknown, and further and further rolled the waves of herself away from herself, leaving her, till suddenly, in a soft, shuddering convulsion, the quick of all her plasm was touched, she knew herself touched, the consummation was upon her, and she was gone. She was gone, she was not, and she was born a woman.²⁰⁰

Lawrence’s passage alludes to an oceanic experience of pristine awareness—“she was like the sea”—and his rhetorical use of repetitive language and stream-of-consciousness style draws the reader into a sense of origin. The prose used in the text creates its own stylistic whirlpool to accommodate the transformation being described; Lawrence’s prose, as David Lodge has put it, advances “by continuity, each clause or phrase typically taking its impetus from an item in the preceding clause or phrase,” to generate an edged sense of ecstatic harmony.²⁰¹ It also, seemingly, attempts to mimic a sense of blood running through the body, connecting the vital centres. Lawrence’s phrase “the quick of her plasm was touched” alludes to a companion passage in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* that describes Lawrence’s vision of the origin of life: “In the

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 119.

¹⁹⁹ Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, 148.

²⁰⁰ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 174.

²⁰¹ David Lodge, “The Language of Modernist Fiction,” in *Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890–1930*, ed. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane (London: Penguin, 1991), 492.

beginning was a living creature, its plasm quivering and its life-pulse throbbing.”²⁰² The “dumb mass” of the “ocean” which Connie *becomes* is equated with a sense of the first living creature, as though she had journeyed through the ancestral bloodstream from which all knowledge truly springs forth: “her whole self quivered unconscious and alive, like plasm.”²⁰³ She has, effectively, experienced the pristine unconscious that “bubbles up in us,” and that contains the true reparation from ideational sickness associated with Clifford and rallied against in the analytic texts.²⁰⁴ Through the instinctual blood union experienced with Mellors, awakening her to life, she is “born a woman.”²⁰⁵

As we can recall, similar oceanic language is applied to Noon’s revelations as he sees “the sea of all the extant world” in Patty.²⁰⁶ Charles Burack elaborates on how the numerous scenes between Connie and Mellors are described with such dynamic and elemental uses of allegorical language (flames, waves, sap, lava, whirlpools). Doing so, Burack contends, prevents the text from appearing pornographic, a medium Lawrence abhorred and wrote strongly against.²⁰⁷ Instead, Lawrence “thought that his representations of erotic surrender, arousal, rhythm, friction, intensification, and climax would have comparable energizing effects for both men and women” and that readers would not grow to be *fixated* on the sex act purely.²⁰⁸ The scenes are meant to “cleanse” sex of puritanical shame and modern-day vulgarity, thereby replacing his interpretation of Freud’s discourse on sex and the unconscious as well as vestigial Victorian repressions. In the introduction to *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious* Lawrence criticised Freud’s attempts to “make for the origins” of sex in the unconscious, writing that he found nothing but “a huge slimy serpent of sex, and heaps of excrement and a myriad of repulsive little horrors spawned between sex and excrement.”²⁰⁹ Lawrence’s alternative, inadequately described in that text through his inability to navigate scientific or psychoanalytic concepts, is here depicted by a different vision of the

²⁰² Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 69.

²⁰³ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 175.

²⁰⁴ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 18.

²⁰⁵ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 174.

²⁰⁶ Lawrence, *Mr. Noon*, 121.

²⁰⁷ See Lawrence, “Pornography and Obscenity,” *Sex, Literature and Censorship*, 195–222, for his extended argument against both pornography and masturbation.

²⁰⁸ Charles Burack, “Revitalizing the Reader: Literary Technique and the Language of Sacred Experience in D.H. Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*,” *Style* 32, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 103.

²⁰⁹ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious*, 5.

“origins” of the self, one that is in tandem with nature, that precedes “dirty understanding,” and that allows for a transformation of the concept of sex, collapsing the idea of it within a depiction of instinct and profound bodily experience.

Saunders writes that *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* offers a representation of “the unconscious at moments when realism and symbolism merge: when actions gesture towards something larger than themselves, something larger than the characters are aware of.”²¹⁰ Certainly the text presents Connie’s “dynamic, sentient body as the primary focalization through which the reader’s consciousness will vicariously undergo a conversion,” and her transformation is meant to provide insight for readers.²¹¹ That is, and as Lawrence forthrightly explains in “Apropos of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*,” he wanted to facilitate a conversion wherein people could begin “to think sex, fully, completely, honestly and cleanly.”²¹² Saunders writes that “as Connie’s and the reader’s bodily consciousness are slowly awakened, there is less need for extensive and abrasive mental mortification.”²¹³ In other words, shame or guilt become forgotten (much like in *Mr. Noon* during Noon’s epiphany with Patty) and the organic possibilities associated with the sexual act becomes cleansed—revealing Lawrence’s intents, his concepts, and their meaning in the analytic essays through a modernist, literary depiction.

In this way, as Dawson writes,

The book’s notoriety and significance results from it being the first work of serious literature to include graphic depictions of sex, but the sex scenes are structured as a progression towards Connie’s awakening to the passion of life and the self-knowledge that comes with this awakening, and hence can be read equally as consciousness scenes. Each sex scene involves her thinking during the act of copulation and each scene brings her closer to a knowledge of herself, one that requires her in fact to transcend consciousness.²¹⁴

The form of consciousness that Connie transcends is a more developed equivalent of what was briefly experienced by Noon with Patty, explored above. Dawson’s description in the above quote explains that the structure of Connie’s awakening is one that brings “knowledge” closer to that of transmutation—a unifying and shared depth

²¹⁰ Saunders, “Lawrence, Freud and Civilization’s Discontents,” 276.

²¹¹ Burack, “Revitalizing the Reader,” 206.

²¹² Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 227.

²¹³ Saunders, “Lawrence, Freud and Civilization’s Discontents,” 276.

²¹⁴ Dawson, “Fictional Minds and Female Sexuality,” 182.

recalling Lawrence's concept of blood-consciousness. Deeper than conscious awareness, it represents what Lawrence wrote of in the texts on psychoanalysis. That is, his theory of blood-consciousness described at length plumbs the notion of consciousness itself, seamlessly connecting a metaphorical, indeed, mythological sense of sexual experience—like that of Adam and Eve prior to understanding—with an enlightenment that dynamically provokes an expansive awareness and participation in life, traversing rational consciousness while meeting the pristine unconscious. It is precisely this quality of awakening, one that aesthetically portrays the unconscious and conscious self, that indicates the “non-deliberate aspects of human feeling” described by Fiona Becket.²¹⁵

Conversely, Clifford's character indicates Lawrence's various criticisms of the “incipient man of today” in relation to the masses, and a final consideration of this character brings us closer to Lawrence's view of cultural regeneration nascent in the text. On an occasion when Connie and Clifford go walking in Wragby grounds, he discusses the men at the mines he presides over, lecturing Connie on the “masses.”

The masses were always the same, and will always be the same. Nero's slaves were little different from our colliers or the Ford motor-car workmen. I mean Nero's mine slaves and his field slaves. It is the masses: they are unchangeable. An individual may emerge from the masses. But the emergence doesn't alter the mass. The masses are unalterable. It is one of the momentous facts of social science...and what we need to take up now is whips, not swords. The masses have been ruled since time began, and till time ends, ruled they have to be. It is sheer hypocrisy and farce to say they can rule themselves.²¹⁶

Clifford's statements, notably issued after Connie had experienced her self-transformation—the “ocean rolling its dark, dumb mass” with Mellors—are comparable to Lawrence's previous descriptions of the “masses” in *Aaron's Rod* as a collective, dream-like nightmare.²¹⁷ Clifford's opinions would have it that the masses are not capable of change or self-rulership and, resultingly, they will be continuously informed by the ruling class—hegemonic purveyors of ideational representation and educational knowledge. As described above, change is for “Lawrence a sign of life, and what is

²¹⁵ Becket, “Lawrence and Psychoanalysis,” 217.

²¹⁶ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 189–190.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 174.

static, dies.”²¹⁸ Earlier, this reference was made in relation to his belief that one would die if not for fighting to get out of the “obsession” of a fixed incestuous or Oedipal narrative, and we can recall his unsympathetic dismissal of formal education more broadly. Those themes appear here to depict a fight against the static fixity which landowner Clifford ascribes to the “unchangeable” masses in order to conclude and reinstate the power of selfhood and its capacity for dynamic flux and thus psychological freedom wherein the Law of the self, the “I,” can truly reign.

The point is developed in this scene, where Clifford’s speech on fixed human types is abruptly interrupted, with notable irony, when his motor-chair suddenly gets stuck in the muddy terrain. Mellors is called to push the chair so that it might become freed. The nuance in the scene contributes to its climactic rendition; Connie is furious at her husband’s impervious belief in his superiority, how he commands his mastery over Mellors, and the rigidity of his views concerning class structure. Though crippled by war he continues to maintain that the masses must be led by force and uses both military and classist language when describing them as “slaves.”²¹⁹ The pathos in this scene, rather than demonstrating a simple binary between the brute physical strength the gamekeeper embodies and Clifford’s unfortunate disability, illustrates a careful juxtaposition we can understand through reference to his analytic work. Lawrence portrays Clifford’s literal view of the unchangeable hegemonically ruled and thus slavish masses, needing to be led by a “whip,” before metaphorically intervening. Clifford is assisted from his literal fixity by the self-ruled, individualist Mellors who releases him from a vulnerable yet stubborn predicament. Connie admonishes Clifford for his self-entitlement that has no sense in *life*: “why are you so abominably inconsiderate... your nasty, sterile want of common sympathy is in the worst taste imaginable.”²²⁰ It is not only that Clifford thinks himself a master; it is rather the foolish sickness of this dangerous fantasy that she, and presumably Lawrence, so abhors. Reminiscent of the comparison between Freud’s view of malaise in *Civilization and its Discontents*, and Lawrence’s beliefs in a homogenous slavishness rife in the

²¹⁸ Kinkead-Weekes, “The Genesis of Lawrence’s Psychology Books,” 163.

²¹⁹ Although Lawrence rejects ideology or ideation in the psychoanalytic works, he does not mention war within them. This comes later, particularly in *Aaron’s Rod* but also in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. The extent to which Lawrence was against the war as a totalising ideology is not the focus of this chapter but suffice to say it strongly impacted his view of how ideation can lead to a castration of masculinity which is reflected in the text through Sir Clifford.

²²⁰ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 200–201.

modern public described above, he portrays that class and the purveyors of ideation are the source of contemporary ills. Conversely, Mellors and Connie are meant to represent a new beginning that might, ultimately, possess a greater strength that can, indeed, come “unstuck,” instigating independent activity into the masses by offering them an alternative. Lawrence’s literature provides a narrative landscape to consider such possibilities through language that invites a sympathetic reading. His style evokes a response that facilitates a better understanding of his vision that he struggled to convey in the analytic works.

On the one hand, Lawrence considered objective intellectualisation as a form of spiritual death, but on the other he perceived the masses as requiring a dominant and guiding authority. Despite his ongoing sympathetic portrayal of a robust working class in his fiction, Lawrence believed that people require an influencer. His opinions were inflammatory enough to cause Bertrand Russell to remark that Lawrence’s views “led straight to Auschwitz.”²²¹ However, while Lawrence genuinely believed that the masses required governance, his project was to emancipate them from the perils of ideational thinking predominant of his era through the task of the writer. An author can depict versions of reality that the reader can be transformed by. Anne Fernihough defensively writes that

Lawrence, accused by Russell of carving the way to Auschwitz, never ceased to warn against the dangers of an unbridled idealism. Auschwitz, the apotheosis of an idealism in which the body had become utterly dispensable, would, I believe, have utterly horrified Lawrence. His output as a writer places the neat link between organicism and idealism under violent strain.²²²

Fernihough’s remarks are perhaps best defended by noting how the hero of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, Mellors, offers his own view of what the masses need towards the end of the book.

In the famous “red trousers” passage, Mellors is at his most talkative, telling Connie as they warm themselves by the fire that people need to live for something other than the false machinations of so-called progress. She “felt the curious quiver of changing

²²¹ Bertrand Russell, “Portraits from Memory, III: D.H. Lawrence,” *Harper’s Magazine* ccvi/1233 (Feb. 1953): 95.

²²² Fernihough, *D.H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*, 7.

consciousness and relaxation going through his body” as he describes going back to something before industry. If he was in command, he would instruct men:

Take yer clothes off an’ look at yourselves. Yer ought ter be alive an’ beautiful, an’ yer ugly an’ half dead. So I’d tell ’em. An’ I’d get my men to wear different clothes: appen close red trousers, bright red, an’ little short white jackets. Why, if men had red, fine legs, that alone would change them in a month. They’d begin to be men again, to be men! An’ the women could dress as they liked. Because if once the men walked with legs close bright scarlet, and buttocks nice and showing scarlet under a little white jacket: then the women ’ud begin to be women. It’s because of th’ men aren’t men, that th’ women have to be.²²³

It might be idealistic to imagine that a change of clothes could prompt such a psychological shift that it would rejuvenate civilisation—indeed, Mellors’s vision *is* idealistic. Much like Lawrence’s self-contradictory rejection of ideation in favour of a far more idealistic vision (in the conventional sense), Mellors’s claim to origin is a near-utopian vision of self-actualisation.

However, Lawrence’s central ideas in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, much the same as those portrayed in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, are rendered with far greater effectiveness in the novel: that sexual regeneration as a cultural rejuvenation does not so much have to do with simply freeing taboos around the topic of sex—that is not what the concepts of blood-consciousness and the pristine unconscious are strictly about. It rather has to do with a reclaiming of what is most valiant, vibrant, and organic in one, with “sex” even exceeds calling a man to be a man and a woman a woman. It is rather about claiming the “I” of oneself, one’s *identity*, that psychoanalysis largely puts into question.²²⁴ Lawrence’s theory of blood-consciousness, which represents the intuitive life of lived experience, melds with the pristine unconscious as a revelatory dimension through the invigorated, experiencing body. It is not static, nor does it try to formulate emotional life into sets of information, nor does it contain a fundamentally sick unconscious, but rather *creates* powerfully and emotively.

²²³ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 230–231.

²²⁴ A similar digression on what constitutes man and woman can be found in the short essay “Cocksure Women and Hensure Men,” *Phoenix II*, 553–556. It describes that men have become increasingly emasculated, forcing women to adopt masculine characteristics.

Lawrence's alternative vision, which *processed* an elaboration of psychoanalysis in Freud's wake, is represented in Mellor's red-trouser theory set to narrative language.

At the very end of the novel Connie receives a letter from Mellors which is written in notably unaccented English. She is pregnant with his child, and although they are separated, they will be reunited soon. He tells her that, "although I am frightened, I believe in your being with me. A man has to fend and fettle for the best, and then trust in something beyond himself. You can't insure against the future, except by really believing in the best bit of you, and in the power beyond it."²²⁵ Though Mellors is uncertain what the world will bring, he has faith in what they have experienced, and trusts in remaining steadfastly true to the belief that things might improve. The last sentence of the text ends with Mellors's letter, signed inconclusively, "with a hopeful heart—"²²⁶

Lawrence's point is quite emphatically that the enlivened vital centres, when awakened, can shamelessly source sexuality and a capacity for living as a creative and moral power. These are the reasons why he depicts what he perceived to be the ideation inherent in Freudian theory so negatively: it does not give life to a sickened people, but rather allows them to better define what ails them. What is even more damaging, according to Lawrence, is that if we take the Freudian unconscious and the Oedipal complex seriously, we have to believe that each of us possess a sick and repressed unconscious that never be remedied. To read Lawrence's literature through psychoanalytic theories is thus the antithesis of everything the author worked towards. It is evident, particularly by reading Lawrence's retaliation against psychoanalytic theory as paratextual to the development of his later fiction, that he firmly believed in cultural rejuvenation, and that the artist could help to incite it.

Lawrence's literature, such as *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, contain examples of his own *concepts* that were essentially trial pieces in *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. It was through fiction that he was able to portray an aesthetic view of the self, and a representation of the truth of the experiencing body most fully. Literature offered the ability to articulate his theoretical beliefs without intellectual theorising, leaving us with a hopeful conclusion concerning the modern

²²⁵ *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 300.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, 302.

public and an elevated role of the literary artist. Lawrence, like other modernists we will turn to, processed psychoanalytic theory in the development of his texts, while likewise cultivating a broader representation of consciousness that challenges many of psychoanalysis's concepts. It is only by viewing text as process that we can perceive these otherwise imperceptible links.

Conclusion

For Lawrence, as for Freud, culture hinges on repressions that are ideologically informed and perpetuated. If an ideology, or abstract form of knowledge, lays claims to truth, and perverts or stultifies one's capacity towards life, then it creates the sickness that Lawrence so passionately criticised. In his retaliation against psychoanalytic theory he sought to awaken new theories of the self, sourced from the body as a force for cultural rejuvenation. Far from the criticised, conflated ranting in his texts against psychoanalysis that lead Spitzer to conclude that "polemics are dependent on the discursivity and abstraction that they condemn," the aesthetic presentation of Lawrence's concepts demonstrate his attempts to redeem the role of the artist in influencing the public.²²⁷ While his non-fiction texts on analysis did not succeed in creating a scientific replacement to Freudian theory (something that he did not want in any case), his literary approach does successfully point towards where he believed the stream of psychological progress should be flowing due to the effect that literary representation can cause.²²⁸ In his later works, key components of Lawrence's engagement with psychoanalysis are embedded in his fiction, and an understanding of his texts on psychoanalysis illuminate the didactic undercurrents of his literary work. He wrote the text of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, for example, for it to be exemplary but not dogmatic and we can see from the text that it is capable of portraying his concepts without having to define them.

Lawrence describes a "shifting over from the old psyche to something new, a displacement. And displacements hurts."²²⁹ He believed that the truth of art-speech, and the experience it might deliver, would be a painful yet necessary displacement. This was preferable to the discursive tendency to place experience under a microscope—a

²²⁷ Spitzer, "On Not Reading Freud," 103.

²²⁸ D.H. Lawrence, "Men Must Work and Women as Well," *Phoenix II*, 582.

²²⁹ Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature*, 13–14.

trend found in literary modernism's hyper-intellectualism exemplified in Joyce's *Ulysses*, T.S. Eliot's poetry, and to some extent in Woolf's novels. The analytic tendency is a route Lawrence refused to take. He believed that progress is not to be found in formal types of mechanised industry, nor the examination of the minutiae of consciousness, but rather in returning to the body and the spontaneous spirituality of organic experience that can be uniquely conveyed through literary language and narrative form.

Lawrence's psychoanalytic texts represent his own journey in tension with Freudian theory, beginning with Oedipal readings of *Sons and Lovers*. His unique beliefs in cultural rejuvenation based on the moral soul, individual creativity, and a revised experience of sexuality are expressed in his fiction that followed from his analytic works, reworking some of the key arguments that he had rehearsed in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* in the form of fiction. While these texts contain many contradictions and inaccurate accounts of Freudian theory, the concepts therein underpin the didactic dimensions of his later fiction, such as in *Aaron's Rod*, *Mr. Noon*, and in particular *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. As such, we can read Lawrence's analytic works as both literary works in their own right, as well as paratextual material to his later fiction, and this in turn can assist us in understanding how he sought to contribute to public opinion on psychology and sexual discourse popular in the early 20th century. His work would impact fellow modernist Anaïs Nin, to whom we now turn, who defended and deeply identified with the concepts explored in Lawrence's writings. After publishing on Lawrence shortly after his death, Nin immersed herself in psychoanalytic theory in the 1930s and eventually focused on how to aesthetically represent the "female unconscious" through literature. Nin identified with Lawrence's "white heat" approach to living, while embarking on her own analytic journey that merged writerly process with psychoanalytic theory through using her diaries as a form of intertextual self-development.

Chapter Three

Anaïs Nin: Editorial Diarist of the Female Unconscious

I inhabit the unconscious. I will always write from there, flow from there, more deeply until I reach the collective unconscious of woman.

—Anaïs Nin, *Mirages*¹

In 1932, a young Anaïs Nin published her first text, a slim work of criticism called *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*. The text praises Lawrence’s experience-based approach to living as a “*transcending of ordinary values*.”² Nin identified herself with the women in Lawrence’s work (“in his descriptions of women I find myself”) and, in reading his literature, became preoccupied with the belief that life experience was passing her by.³ That same year she began maintaining two journals—a green, edited one and another red unadulterated one—to keep her first instances of adultery a secret from her husband, Hugo Guiler. Throughout maintaining this private duplicity, Nin did not believe that the diaries would be published: they were thought of as secondary to the books she intended to write. It wasn’t until 1966, over thirty years after separating her journals into a green version for Guiler and a red version that accounted for her true activities, that she would publish a self-edited volume derived from a number of her “red” journals, titled simply *The Diary of Anaïs Nin*. The text was so popular she began publishing other self-edited volumes of her red journals during the 1970s, which fall under the heading *The Journals of Anaïs Nin*, and the publication of these versions of her journals quickly achieved mainstream success.⁴

This complex publishing history has had an impact on the shape of Nin’s critical reputation. The first generation of feminist scholars who critiqued Nin’s published, edited journals were unaware of the more troubling aspects of her life, which are now available in the unexpurgated versions of her diaries that Nin’s second husband, Rupert Pole, began publishing in 1986, seven years after her death.⁵ Attention to the version of

¹ Anaïs Nin, *Mirages: The Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin (1939–1947)*, ed. Paul Herron (Ohio: Swallow Press, 2013), 305.

² Anaïs Nin, *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study* (London: Black Spring Press, 1996), 17, author’s emphasis.

³ Nin, *Henry and June, From the Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin*, ed. Rupert Pole (London: Penguin, 2017), 12.

⁴ The first hardback printing of the *Diary* sold out its 3000 volumes within a week; paperback sales in the United States of the first four volumes reached almost 125,000 by 1973. See Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 495.

⁵ At her request, Nin’s second husband, Rupert Pole, whom she married while still married to Hugo Guiler, began publishing her unedited diaries.

the red diaries that Nin self-published against the recent, unexpurgated versions shows how she carefully omitted excerpts from her original journals. The recent publication of unexpurgated versions of the journals offer new, candid accounts of Nin's life that were excluded from her self-edited diaries whose publication she oversaw.⁶ For example, the second unexpurgated diary *Incest* describes Nin's sexual relationship with her father, additional material on her termination of a third-trimester pregnancy, and her psychoanalytic therapy with Otto Rank.⁷ A comparison between the various iterations of her diaries, the self-edited publications, and the unexpurgated posthumous volumes, allow for an intertextual analysis of her highly curated and self-reflexive process. Of particular relevance to this dissertation is how an examination of Nin's process is rooted to her unique understanding of psychoanalysis: she adapted techniques learnt from her time in analysis with Otto Rank to her literary methods of self-editing and creative practice.

When Nin first separated her journals into two volumes in 1932, she had begun a heated affair with Henry Miller and his wife June Mansfield. The dynamic between them, and her infidelity to her husband Guiler, instigated her first experience with psychoanalysis: a short analytic relationship and sexual affair with analyst René Allendy, described in the first unexpurgated diary, *Henry and June*. However, Nin's second unexpurgated diary, *Incest*, provides an account of how she began analysis and psychoanalytic training with Freud's early disciple Otto Rank in late 1933. She actively sought him out shortly after her incestuous reunion with her father whom she had not seen for twenty years. The relatively recent publication of *Incest* in 1992 is perhaps why there is little scholarship that discusses her breach of the incest taboo, her neurotic symptoms that followed, and her efforts in psychoanalytic therapy with Otto Rank to mitigate them.⁸

⁶ The most recent unexpurgated diary, *Mirages*, was rather unceremoniously published by Swallow Press in 2013.

⁷ For details on the complicated publication history of Nin's journals see Philip K. Jason, *Anaïs and Her Critics* (Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1993). For how this history corresponds to first- and second wave feminism given the expurgated and then unexpurgated versions of the diaries, see Tookey, "I am the Other," 314–319.

⁸ See Angie Kehagia, "Anaïs Nin: A Case Study of Personality Disorder and Creativity," *Personality and Individual Difference* 46, no. 8 (Summer 2009): 800–808, where Nin is diagnosed as a creative histrionic who neurotically sought the desirability she wished others to perceive in her, perceptible by comparing her fiction with her actions in life. Paul Grimley Kuntz describes a continuity between *House of Incest* and its sequel *Winter of Artifice* in his chapter "Art as Public Dream: The Practice and Theory of Anaïs Nin," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32, no. 4 (Summer 1974): 525–537. See also Diane Richard-Allerdyce, *Anaïs Nin and the Remaking of Self: Gender, Modernism and Narrative Identity* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1998) that uses Lacanian theory to read Nin's place in literary modernism.

Nin edited out content concerning the sexual dimension of her reunion with her father in the first diary she published in 1966. The unexpurgated *Incest*, however, includes this information. Conversely, her first published diary contains much more material about her understanding of Rank's work in relation to her own creative practice. By comparing these texts with each other, we can examine how and where Nin's material operates in conjunction with her therapy with Rank and her affair with her father, and how it influenced her literary process. By examining these texts, we can see how deeply Nin was inspired by Rank's theories of the subject that describe the "neurotic as a failed artist" and neurosis as "*a malfunction of the imagination.*"⁹ Nin believed that by focusing on her writing she could overcome her neurosis associated with her father and her adopted editorial methods mark a developmental appropriation of Rank's psychoanalytic concepts of the artist.

Rank facilitated Nin's belief in a psychoanalytic connection between the alleviation of neurotic illness and the task of writerly practice, and, at his insistence, in 1934 she briefly stopped keeping a diary in order to develop her first work of fiction, *House of Incest*. Nin considered the slim and surrealist volume, which was not published until 1936, to be "the seed of all my work." A process-based approach to the text will show that elements of her journals and her work on Lawrence are incorporated into the text's narrative.¹⁰ What close textual analysis shows is that Nin began to draw from her writing as a paratextual resource for creating her first work of fiction, and that this process is imbricated in her belief that the diary allowed her to "inhabit the unconscious" while attempting to overcome the neurosis she associated with her father through writing.¹¹ By creating what she wanted to be "the vilest book on incest—stark, real," Nin viewed the prose-poem *House of Incest* as the beginning of a rehabilitative and intentional process.¹² For her, this first "fictional" text signified the termination of her relationship with her father and the origin of her life as a process-based writer who

⁹ Ibid., 290, author's emphasis. These descriptions of Rank's theories are given by Nin but are discussed in detail below with reference to Rank's texts.

¹⁰ Cited in Helen Tookey, "I am the Other Face of You': Anaïs Nin, Fantasies and Femininity," *Women: A Cultural Review* 12, no. 3 (Fall 2001), 306; Anaïs Nin's concept of the "double" was largely articulated by Rank's theory of this concept, and she describes it often in relation to her first book of fiction. See Anaïs Nin, *Incest: From 'A Journal of Love,' The Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin*, ed. Rupert Pole (London: Penguin, 1994), 358. As Deirdre Bair describes in her biography, "this novel [*House of Incest*] is the primary source of everything fictional that followed." *Anaïs Nin: A Biography* (London: Bloomsbury, 1993), 157.

¹¹ Nin, *Mirages*, 305.

¹² Nin, *Incest*, 308.

drew from her journals as an act of independent self-creation. Nin's unique understanding of psychoanalysis through self-editing and Rank's theory of "creative will" contributes to how she understood the dimensions of writing as a therapeutic activity, and her approach is perceptible by comparatively studying her expansive textual repository.

This chapter first explores Nin's book on D.H. Lawrence, and how reading his fiction precipitated her approach to literature and the beginning of her affairs outside of her marriage. It then turns to an overview of scholarship on Nin's diaries to contextualise how research used in this chapter differs from present scholarship: the chapter focuses on how intertextual and psychoanalytic methods converge in her diaries between 1932–1936. It shows how Nin's influential relationship with Henry Miller and his wife June Mansfield led to her first experience of psychoanalysis with René Allendy in April 1932. It then examines *Incest* to show that Nin reciprocated her father's sexual advances during their reunion in 1933 and how she confronted the fact that her diary, up to that point, was maintained as a "record for him."¹³ Her relationship with her father and psychoanalytic therapy with Otto Rank changed the way she viewed the diary, which can be seen through comparing the unexpurgated *Incest* and her self-edited *Journal*. In 1934 Nin attempted to liberate the hold that her father had on her by briefly abandoning her diary to focus on writing her first work of fiction, *House of Incest*. This chapter's concluding section shows that, after Nin resumed writing her diary, she ended her romantic affair with Rank (recorded in the third unexpurgated volume, *Fire*) and began to definitively create her own, notably literary, understanding of the unconscious and the artist through viewing the diary as a resourceful and productive form of dreamwork. Nin used her diaries as a paratextual resource for creating her works of fiction before they were published as separate volumes, and her process demonstrates how she adapted intertextual forms of literary process as a complement to psychoanalytic work she had learnt from Rank. By studying Nin's diaries through manuscript-based criticism, we can dive deeper into how literary process and aspects of psychoanalytic theory overlap. In doing so, we will examine how Nin's extensive

¹³ Nin, *The Journals of Anaïs Nin, Volume I*, ed. Gunther Stuhlmann (London: Quartet Books, 1975), 211.

autobiographical record contributes to literary modernism's challenging encounters with psychoanalysis.

3.1 Early Edits: Nin's Green and Red Notebooks, *Henry and June*

Anaïs Nin was twenty-nine and living in considerable comfort as a housewife in Louveciennes with her husband, the banker and lithographer Hugo Guiler, when she published her first text, *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study* in 1932. The study praises D.H. Lawrence's works and was published a year after his death at a time when he was largely considered to be unpopular.¹⁴ Nin's text is a slim, impressionistic, yet careful work, and it is divided into themes as well as brief analyses of his various books, which are arranged in no discernible order. The study celebrates what Nin independently defines as a "white heat" living rooted at the centre of Lawrence's "electromagnetic" literary axis:

Lawrence's chief preoccupation is precisely the choice between life and death, or rather: between *complete life and death*. *Livingness* is the axis of his world, the light, the gravitation, and electromagnetism of his world.¹⁵

Nin writes that "the most characteristic attitude of the true Lawrence is a state of high seriousness and lyrical intensity [...] a *transcending of ordinary values*."¹⁶ Her descriptions likewise contain a seriousness and lyrical intensity; the text is highly stylised and the account of Lawrence's work that she provides is more descriptive than critical. In a meditation on the importance of approaching his works through "intuitional reasoning" rather than "intellectual lucidity," it is apparent that she wanted to convey her understanding of his texts with adherence to the former.¹⁷

For Nin, her appropriation of Lawrence's work recalls Van Hulle's definition of the exogenetic, which refers to source materials that influence the composition of a writer's work. Attention to how Nin interpreted Lawrence's use of language contributes to an understanding of how she later appropriated qualities of his writing. For her, Lawrence is able to transcend the ordinary: he writes like a "sculptor" or a "painter" to express "the texture of different skins, the chameleonesque qualities of the eyes, the sensations

¹⁴ Harry Moore, "Introduction," *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*, 8.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 13, author's emphasis.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 17, author's emphasis.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 18.

given by the feel of sea water and rain on the body, the changes in the colors of the day.”¹⁸ These words are worked into the first sentences of the 1936 *House of Incest*, and Nin’s later writing connects with her early text on Lawrence. In 1932, Nin’s efforts show how she thought Lawrence’s writing demonstrates that language can be an “instrument of unlimited possibilities,” by evoking metaphorical connections that portray “sound, musicality, cadence: thus words sometimes used less for their sense than their sound.”¹⁹ Lawrence’s prose not only liberates value from formulaic ideologies, it also pushes language beyond prescribed units of meaning. Nin emphasises Lawrence’s ability to convey the *sense* of life, its *livingness*, and use of language as an instrument for expressing life rather than as a functional vehicle for mental generalisations or ordinary purpose.

Nin explains the importance of the body for Lawrence and its relatedness to the necessity of experience, especially for the artist. She writes about the body as something which can experience its own dreams, thereby transitioning from a focus on the importance of dreams in the head, as Lawrence believed we find in Freud’s theory of the unconscious, to how dreams can be sensed and mapped onto an invigorated notion of the body:

Imprisoned in our flesh lives the body’s own genie, which Lawrence set out to liberate. He found that the body has its own dreams, and that by listening attentively to these dreams, by surrendering to them, the genie can be evoked and made apparent and potent.²⁰

In this passage Nin develops some of Lawrence’s work from his psychoanalytic texts. In conveying her understanding of his instinctual reasoning, especially one that is devoid of abstract “mentality,” she curates a portrait of the unconscious, and instincts, as inherent to the *body* that dreams, and that can and should be “made potent” through artistic evocation. The material body contains a capacity for dreaming that becomes, through her articulation, a creative method that signifies and portrays the vital motivity of desire. In this way, transcending ordinary values becomes related to desire. For Nin, desire is not inherently good or bad, and in her reading, Lawrence’s works *transcend* the values placed upon it. The task of channelling the dreaming body so that desire

¹⁸ Ibid., 63.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid., 19.

might be transcribed into text represents how Nin would reflectively view her work in the diaries—as a capacity for “proceed [ing] from the dream outward”—by drawing nascent possibilities forth from the activated, desiring body into language.²¹

The liberating activity of becoming potent through experiential life is reiterated in her pages dedicated to Lawrence’s *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. There she describes how Lawrence was concerned that science was:

...in danger of raising consciousness to a mob-meaning. Which would make the unconscious another mass production on sale anywhere, and which anyone could memorise...*instead of there being individuals who would create each one his own living formulas—each for himself.*²²

We can recall how, in Lawrence’s emphasis on the individual, he sought to usurp homogenising structures that he perceived in psychoanalysis’s theory of the unconscious and incest craving. Nin follows Lawrence in championing individual variances of meaning, particularly in positioning him as the attuned artist: the antithesis of the scientific or psychoanalytic pedagogue. The primary means of developing an artistic sensibility towards life is a process of unapologetically tracking the source of one’s desires, the body’s “dreams,” regardless of imposed, conceptual limitations that configure the meaning of dreams, such as psychoanalysis, into diagnostic theories that qualify the motivation of desire. Nin writes that in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* “Lawrence’s work reaches its climax...it is at once his fleshiest and his most mystical work.”²³ In this work, as in others by Lawrence, it “does not matter that the woman...now desires a peasant. It matters that the woman now *desires*. Lawrence raises us to a plane of vital, impersonal creation and recreation.”²⁴ In this way, desire, and its “fleshiness,” becomes a crucial philosophy of the *pure* and mystical impulses of the body. Rather than evaluating desire, desire itself becomes a sign of *livingness*, and the literary artist’s method is to fruitfully nurture and transcend the latent, desirous potential of the dreaming body to its most genuine capacity through the process of writing.

²¹ Nin, *The Novel of the Future* (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 5. Deirdre Bair refers to Jung’s maxim as the “controlling metaphor for how she wrote about her life as well as lived it.” *Anais Nin*, 157.

²² *Ibid.*, 87, author’s emphasis.

²³ *Ibid.*, 107.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 19, author’s emphasis.

For Nin, Lawrence's work encourages personal transformation through a focus on the body and desire that is individual rather than generalised. It advocates creative will without adherence to ordinary or preordained values established by scientific doctrine, psychoanalytic or otherwise. Lawrence's texts represent life's expression through a dedicated engagement between world and body, symbolising the unique task of the literary artist: to draw the truth of the flesh into the written word as an embodiment of life's capacity for expression. This can only be done if one embraces "life as a process of *becoming*, a combination of states we have to go through. Where people fail is that they wish to elect a state and remain in it. This is a kind of death."²⁵ Later, Nin's therapy with Rank and her understanding of his theories of the artist incorporate what she had adopted as Lawrence's philosophy of living; she conflates the two in developing her own theory of diary writing and the value of psychoanalysis. While this will be addressed when we turn to Nin's therapy with Rank in 1934, what can be seen is that in 1932 Nin identified herself with what she thought Lawrence's literature conveys. Her work on Lawrence is unique not only because Lawrence was then unpopular, and that Nin was an unknown in literary circles; it was also unheard of for a woman (at least publicly) to praise Lawrence's works, much less identify with them.²⁶

However, Nin *did* strongly identify with Lawrence's work, conceptually and with regards to the female characters in his books. She records in her journal "in his descriptions of women I find myself," and while working on the Lawrence text she became fixated on the belief that she needed to experience more of life to become an artist.²⁷ In the first unexpurgated diary *Henry and June* Nin emphasises wanting to experience the "intensity one finds in lovers and mistresses:" energetic transgression motivated by desire she viewed as essential fodder for becoming the artist she longed to be.²⁸ In late 1931, while she was working on the Lawrence text, Nin describes finding her life with her husband to be a suffocating compromise, similar to an "elect state that is a kind of death."²⁹ She writes in her journal: "When I go home I go back to the banker [Guiler]...I abhor it."³⁰ An entry from October 1931 describes a joint decision that was, in all likelihood, instigated by her: she and Guiler had "the need of orgies, of

²⁵ Ibid., 20, author's emphasis.

²⁶ Harry Moore, "Introduction," *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*, 8.

²⁷ Nin, *Henry and June*, 12.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Nin, *D.H. Lawrence*, 20.

³⁰ Nin, *Henry and June*, 12.

fulfilment in other directions,” although they struggled to come to terms with how this might be executed.³¹ Nin was afraid of losing Guiler, upon whom she financially depended, and her “face [was frequently] ravaged by tears.”³² But Nin felt more compelled still by an experience-driven and instinctual approach to living she so praised in her study of Lawrence. She wanted to become an artist and felt as though her potential was being stifled in her kept life with Guiler.

Nin had substantial flirtations (most notably with John Erskine and cousin Eduardo Sanchez), but had not consummated a relationship with anyone apart from Guiler when they agreed to open their relationship in the winter of 1931. However, when Henry Miller visited Louveciennes in the spring of 1932, everything changed for her. Miller arrived in the company of Nin’s lawyer, Richard Osborn, whom she was consulting on the contract of her Lawrence book. In the course of their meeting Nin was immediately and entirely smitten by Miller: she recorded in her diary later that night that Miller was “the truest genius I have ever known.”³³ Miller was familiar with Lawrence’s work, and would eventually write his own book on the author with Nin’s help; he was impressed by Nin’s unconventional appraisal of Lawrence’s texts.³⁴ They connected with each other through an ebullient appreciation of Lawrence’s literature, praising the author’s retaliation against forms of diagnostic rigidity in favour of the immediacy of sensual experience.³⁵ Nin had read some of Miller’s work before they met³⁶ and concluded “he is a man whom life makes drunk...he is like me.”³⁷ After she was introduced to Miller’s wife, June Mansfield, Nin characterised her as “the most beautiful woman on earth.”³⁸ Nin frequently portrays Mansfield with an intoxicated use of language: as “perfidious,

³¹ Ibid., 4.

³² Ibid., 6. See Tookey, *Anaïs Nin*, 124–125 for a discussion of how Nin was inspired by Lawrence, and a brief synopsis of the publication history behind *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*.

³³ Nin, *Henry and June*, 10.

³⁴ See Henry Miller, *The World of Lawrence: A Passionate Appreciation*, ed. Evelyn J. Hinz and John J. Teunissen (London: John Calder, 1985).

³⁵ Their ongoing discussion on Lawrence continued; see Gunther Stuhlmann, ed., *A Literate Passion: Letters of Anaïs Nin and Henry Miller 1932–1953* (London: Harcourt Brace, 1987), 11; 92–93; 164; 168. It seems Nin thought of herself as a kind of Lady Chatterley in her position at Louveciennes, a fantasy she transferred onto Miller as a pseudo-Mellors. Shortly after meeting Miller and June, she wrote in her diary: “I think of D.H. Lawrence [...] My friendship with Henry is not just a personal one; it also symbolizes one between France and America, between the aristocrat and the common man, the civilized and the primitive.” Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 129–130. She describes her familiarity with his behaviour—especially his crass, primitive use of language—as similarly used by her father, with whom, a year later, she would have an incestuous affair. Ibid., 130.

³⁶ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 6.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid., 13.

infinitely desirable, drawing me to her as towards death,” and records how her “beauty drowned me.”³⁹ This quote, like segments of her text on Lawrence, and many other lines from her journals written at this time, are replicated in *House of Incest*, published four years later.

Nin decided to keep her affairs, instigated with Miller, a secret from her husband Guiler. Although they agreed to be candid with one another, and in the diaries Nin frequently describes not wanting to hurt Guiler, convincing herself that “by giving myself I learn to love Hugo more,” she also wrote about her marital dissatisfaction,⁴⁰ calling Guiler “‘a bore,’ and inept in intimate matters.”⁴¹ After commencing an affair with Miller, and because Guiler regularly read her diaries, she began maintaining two diaries simultaneously: a green copy functioned as a decoy to the secrets contained within the genuine, red one. Nin persuaded Guiler that the red diary, which would detail her various infidelities with Miller, her analysts, and numerous other men, was an “imaginary” journal of a “possessed woman,” and he believed her.⁴² Nin’s biographer Deirdre Bair portrays Nin writing “at double speed and in deep secrecy to write enough entries to bring the green journal up to date with the red” so that she would have an edited version for Guiler to read.⁴³ The task of maintaining two journals is indicative of Nin’s private need for secrecy, and it also signals her early, inventive process through editorial omission, emendation, and self-fictionalising. Dividing her journals marks the beginning of how she turned the diaries into a curated and convincing work that she would eventually rework for public readership, in *The Journals of Anaïs Nin*. Nin’s methods, which she viewed as a task of “only [conveying] mensonges vital [vital or essential lies], the lies which give life,” demonstrate her belief in telling “beautiful lies always, necessary creative, the fairy tales!” as she cultivated multiple versions of herself, first with Guiler and then later in the process of editing her journals for publication.⁴⁴

Nin’s tendency towards self-fictionalisation has been criticised in the scholarship on her; her approach to documenting her life has been viewed as artificial and

³⁹ Nin, *Henry and June*, 14.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 49.

⁴¹ Kehagia, “Anaïs Nin,” 802.

⁴² Deirdre Bair, *Anaïs Nin: A Biography* (London: Bloomsbury, 1993), 132.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 133.

⁴⁴ Nin cited in Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 133; Nin, *Incest*, 109.

performative. Joan Bobbitt, writing in advance of the first unexpurgated publication *Henry and June*, argues that Nin wilfully fictionalised her experiences through self-conscious forms of self-representation. Nin's journals, Bobbitt argues, "reveal a determined self-consciousness of design and content, a calculated artistry which is in direct opposition to Nin's espoused idea of naturalness and spontaneity."⁴⁵ For Bobbitt, Nin's method of heavily editing her journals shows how "she exists in her own imagination, a woman of many dimensions which fuse to form a completeness of character rarely achieved in reality."⁴⁶ Estelle Jelinek accuses the enthusiasm of Nin's largely female readership as representative of a form of false consciousness, at odds with the tenets of first wave feminism: "these women seem incapable of discerning the inherent contradictions between their sexual and/or radical politics and her views. [...] I think it is time women began to look at Anaïs Nin with some objectivity."⁴⁷

It is notable that Nin's work has received so much negative attention from first and second wave feminist scholars, because these remarks are similar to how Lawrence's work came under substantial criticism for its so-called phallic agenda. In the first-person preface to her 2019 study of Nin, Clara Oropeza observes:

As I read through some critics responses to her [Nin's] posthumously published work, I am reminded of how often we hold women to higher, and often double, standards than we do men. We are more forgiving of male writers than of female writers...⁴⁸

While Nin's work was largely embraced by female readers when she began publishing her journals in 1966, Oropeza points out that for a period in the 1970s and 1980s, Nin's work was seen as problematic for feminism. Recent scholarship, she suggests, however, represented by third wave feminism, now turns towards a more nuanced approach to determining the value of the texts of these writers and their representations of gender and sexuality, in part by moving past what was for some readers the shock of sexual

⁴⁵ Joan Bobbitt, "Truth and Artistry in the *Diary of Anaïs Nin*," *Journal of Modern Literature* 9, no. 2 (Spring 1982): 267.

⁴⁶ Bobbitt, "Truth and Artistry," 269.

⁴⁷ Estelle Jelinek, "Anaïs Nin: A Critical Evaluation," in *Feminist Criticism*, eds. Cheryl L. Brown and Karen Olson (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1978), 318; 323.

⁴⁸ Clare Oropeza, *Anaïs Nin: A Myth of Her Own* (New York: Routledge, 2019), xiv.

explicitness on which so much of Nin's popular reputation rests (as, indeed, was the case with Lawrence).

What we can see in studying Nin's process of creative self-development is precisely a method of self-fictionalising as a form of applied aesthetics that would become her most memorable contribution to literature. This is especially discernible when focusing on the complex publication history surrounding Nin's diaries, her process of writing, and her time in psychoanalytic therapy. Tookey's monograph *Anaïs Nin, Fictionality and Femininity*, published in 2001, provides a valuable overview of the publication history and reception Nin's diaries have received over time. Tookey's study explains that academic response to Nin's edited journals, and the unexpurgated diaries, can be overarchingly traced to how they convey the author's "function as a mobiliser of fantasies" that has been interpreted parallel to the developments of feminism and feminist critique.⁴⁹ Tookey explains that, because of the intermittent publication of her journals and diaries, Nin's autobiographical methods have been studied within the context of both first and second wave feminism.⁵⁰ Tookey writes that Jelinek's earlier work from the 1980s shows how, "almost despite herself, [Jelinek] acknowledges many women's *investment* in femininity," and writes that Jelinek's account suggests, in spite of itself, that "the concept of femininity is more slippery than we would like" as a precursor to further feminist articulations of what "femininity" represents.⁵¹ This supports Tookey's view that the topic of femininity, female sexuality, and its creative portrayal maintains Nin's position as a critical resource within the feminist canon.

Given that this chapter focuses on the intersection between an intertextual analysis of Nin's writerly process and her relationship with psychoanalysis, it differs from the trajectory that Tookey plots in relation to Nin's place in ongoing feminist dialogues. Although Tookey's study includes Nin's engagement with psychoanalysis, and accounts for how she was influenced by Rank's concept of creative will, she avoids addressing how Nin sought therapy with Rank shortly after her incestuous reunion with her father. As this chapter argues, studying the confessional and imaginative self-representation Nin practised in her self-edited journals published in her lifetime,

⁴⁹ Helen Tookey, *Anaïs Nin, Fictionality and Femininity: Playing a Thousand Roles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 189.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Tookey, "I am the Other," 314, author's emphasis.

compared with the uncensored material of the unexpurgated diaries such as *Incest*, offers a manuscript-based analysis of her approach to writing that intersects with her understanding of psychoanalysis. There is significantly less scholarship on Nin than on Lawrence or, especially, Joyce. Most of that scholarship focuses on feminism or on Nin's sexual explicitness. However, of greatest interest here is precisely what is particularly unique to Nin: her fastidious editorial process, her intertextual use of her own literary resources, and her application of psychoanalytic therapy and concepts to her process of writing. This draws attention to, and expands, what Van Hulle refers to as endogenetic; the draft-stage, interior process of works-in-progress.⁵² This definition uniquely applies to what Nin did within the diaries as she cultivated and modified their content, like drafts, for her fictional works.

Nin started keeping a diary when she was eleven, as a letter to her musician father Joaquin Nin asking him to return to the family he had abandoned.⁵³ Nancy Scholar rightly argues that Nin began her diary as a juvenile attempt to seduce her father—in Nin's words, "to entice him to come back" to the family he had abandoned for another woman.⁵⁴ Scholar goes on to suggest that the narrative qualities critically highlighted by Bobbitt and Jelinek are likely the product of Nin's original efforts to be desirable, and appealing, to her father. That is, Nin's self-aggrandisement, non-conformism, and compulsive lying within her journals can be understood by focusing on *why* she first wrote her diaries: to entice the invisible readership of her absent father. The charmed and seductive manner that Nin conveys in the diaries she published, which Bobbitt and others have criticised, demonstrates how, for her, "every act related to my writing was an act of charm, seduction of my father."⁵⁵

However, there is a significant difference between how Nin understood her diaries as written for her father and then for Guiler in 1932, versus how she came to understand her writing by 1936, the year *House of Incest* was published. In this way, Tookey's

⁵² Dirk Van Hulle, "Editing the *Wake's* Genesis," in *James Joyce and Genetic Criticism*, ed. Genevieve Sartor (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 44.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, xi. Nin's description that her diary began with a letter to her father is cited in numerous sources, though the first mention of it and her subsequent epiphany appears to be in an analytic session with Rank, described in *Journals: Volume I*, 281–283. She also recounts the association between her father and the diary in "The Labyrinth," *Under a Glass Bell* (London: Penguin, 1978), 66.

⁵⁴ Anaïs Nin, *A Woman Speaks*, ed. Evelyn J. Hinz (London: Penguin, 1992), 140. See Nancy Scholar, *Anaïs Nin* (Boston: Twayne, 1984), 38.

⁵⁵ Cited in Tookey, *Anaïs Nin*, 117.

focus on the complex publication history of Nin's work is helpful, though in this chapter it is not used within the context of feminist discourse. In examining the fairly recent publication of *Incest* against her self-edited *Journal*, we can see that Nin's relationship to the diaries dramatically changed between 1932–1934. During these years she reunited with her father and consummated an incestuous relationship with him, the details of which she edited out of her published journals. Though her self-edited first journal details her analytic therapy with Rank, there is no discernible connection as to how she sought that therapy to mitigate her neurotic symptoms following her affair with her father. By focusing on the textual significance of Nin's editorial process, we can trace how her engagement with psychoanalysis conflates with her own understanding of writing the diary for her father and her engagement with him, and that her first work of literature, *House of Incest*, signifies creative effort to disentangle this association. Sharon Spencer has argued in her early, 1977 monograph *Collage of Dreams: The Writings of Anaïs Nin*, and more recently in her article "Anaïs Nin and Otto Rank," how Rank's efforts to persuade Nin to distance herself from the diary in order to focus on writing fiction "was intended to reduce the intensity of her obsession...to facilitate her success and recognition as a creative author."⁵⁶ In developing some of Spencer's assertions, this chapter focuses on how Nin would analyse the relationship between her diaries and her father during her time in analytic therapy with Otto Rank, and would grow to use psychoanalytic insights as a process-based method for writing *House of Incest*.

In 1932 Nin had amateur familiarity with psychoanalysis. However, she first aligned her position with Lawrence's views: intellect only suffices when "imagination" is coupled with "physical feeling." The doctrine of psychoanalysis, according to her, missed this process entirely.⁵⁷ After writing her book on Lawrence, Nin was all but opposed to psychoanalytic theory and therapy. She describes Alfred Alder as boring, "like a goody-goody idealist old maid," and Freud, whom she does praise in other passages in the diaries, as not paying enough attention to the "transposition, sublimation [and] transfiguration of our physical and mental elements."⁵⁸ Nin's chief interests at the time were, as biographer Bair summarises, "how the artist ultimately makes use of real

⁵⁶ Sharon Spencer, "Anaïs Nin and Otto Rank," in *Anaïs Nin Literary Perspectives*, ed. Suzanne Nalbantian (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1997), 99.

⁵⁷ Nin, *Early Diaries*, cited in Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 99.

⁵⁸ Cited in Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 110.

life;”⁵⁹ indeed Nin approvingly states “Jung magnifies as should be magnified.”⁶⁰ This earlier view of the artistic and the psychological is similar to how she understood Lawrence’s “protest against automatic conclusions” in favour of “the still living mystery,” that “strikes at a vital truth.”⁶¹ Her diaries allowed creative licence to demonstrate an inspired equivalent of Lawrence’s theories of the “truth of art-speech”—namely, his account of art and lies that permits a “sort of subterfuge.”⁶² After an unconsummated rendezvous with Mansfield in February 1932, Nin wrote to Miller that her encounters with his wife required “...the consciousness of the poet...not the consciousness the dead formula-making psychoanalysts would like to put their clinical fingers on—oh, not that, no, a consciousness of acute *senses*,” conveying her understanding in terms that had been used in her reading of Lawrence’s works.⁶³

Given her resistance to psychoanalytic theory, it took a number of circumstances to lead her to book an appointment with René Allendy, one of the founding members of the Société Psychanalytique de Paris, in April 1932. June had returned to New York, and Nin’s romantic and sexual involvement with Miller had dramatically escalated.⁶⁴ She often kept Miller in the house at Louveciennes when Guiler was away, and the family housekeeper threatened to expose her adultery. When her Lawrence book was published, it received little attention, aside from a review by Waverley Root who patronisingly described it as “heady stuff for a mere woman to have written.”⁶⁵ After this critical review, Nin fell into a depression and she began to remember “Father’s cruelty towards Mother and his sadistic punishment of my brothers and me” and writes how she “want[ed] to confide in someone.”⁶⁶ Her cousin Eduardo advised psychoanalytic therapy with his analyst at the time: “he said Dr Allendy would be like a father for me (Eduardo loves to tempt me with a father!).”⁶⁷

⁵⁹ Ibid., 110–111.

⁶⁰ Nin, *Early Diary IV*, 372. In Susan Nalbantian’s *Aesthetic Autobiography: From Life to Art in Marcel Proust, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, and Anaïs Nin*, she focuses on the role of aesthetic biography to include references to Jung while largely bypassing any compelling study of Freud’s impact on modernist fiction and, indeed, the historical development of psychoanalysis.

⁶¹ Nin, *D.H. Lawrence*, 87.

⁶² D.H. Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature*, eds. Ezra Greenspan et al. (New York: Viking Press, 1961), 18.

⁶³ Stuhlmann, *A Literate Passion*, 9, author’s emphasis.

⁶⁴ Their relationship during this period is evident from letters between them. See Stuhlmann, *A Literate Passion*, especially pages 31–137, which span the heights of their affair during 1932.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 134.

⁶⁶ Nin, *Henry and June*, 83–84.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

Unlike Lawrence, Nin directly engaged with the potential merits that psychoanalytic therapy might offer. However, she expected analysis to be banal and formulaic. It therefore surprised Nin that, during her first meeting with Allendy, he was able to rapidly touch on a crucial truth that she went to great lengths to conceal: “my lack of confidence” and her history with her father.⁶⁸ These sessions mark the beginning of her revised understanding of psychoanalytic therapy and her relationship with her father. Nin records that she explained to Allendy, with a confessional vulnerability that is rare in her self-edited diary entries:

My father⁶⁹ did not want a girl. He said I was ugly. When I wrote or drew something, he did not believe it was my work. I never remember a caress or a compliment from him, except when I nearly died at the age of nine. There were always scenes, beatings, his hard-blue eyes on me. I remember the unnatural joy I felt when Father wrote me a note here in Paris which began: ‘Ma jolie.’ I got no love from him.⁷⁰

Nin’s analysis with Allendy facilitated some introspection concerning her relationship with her father, especially how it affected her confidence. However, Nin would soon seduce the analyst; several months into their sessions Nin began to actively side-step his insights: “with Allendy it is coquetry, a pleasant game I am learning to play.”⁷¹ Nin admits to projecting a paternal identification onto Allendy and would grow to enjoy her seduction that would eventually lead to the end of their analytic sessions. A description of her above-quoted session with Allendy demonstrates how she associated her father’s “hard-blue eyes” with Allendy: “I look into Allendy’s face with a new-born power, I see his *intensely blue, fanatic eyes* melt, and I hear the eagerness in his voice when he asks me to return soon.”⁷²

A year later, Nin would write of her time in analysis with Allendy: “I only wanted to win my father and destroy him, assert my power,” and in the case of her therapy with him, she considered herself victorious in that ambition.⁷³ Nin provided Miller with a more nuanced account: that she revolted against Allendy and analysis because “he

⁶⁸ Ibid., 92.

⁶⁹ Depending on the edition, both “father” and “mother” are capitalised, and each citation referenced in this chapter corresponds with the edition it came from.

⁷⁰ Nin, *Henry and June*, 92.

⁷¹ Ibid., 195.

⁷² Ibid., 192, emphasis mine.

⁷³ Nin, *Incest*, 144.

made me reach a point, where, by great effort of logic on his part, he had resolved my chaos, established a pattern. I was furious to think I could be made to fit within one of those ‘fundamental patterns.’”⁷⁴ She did not want to be included in the “mob-formation of consciousness” and the objectives of “scientific” psychoanalytic theory that she had so railed against in aligning herself with Lawrence’s radical position, yet she furthermore projected, by her own admission, a number of her associations with her father onto Allendy.⁷⁵

Nin’s non-conformist rebellion against fitting a “type” and refusal to directly examine the patterns in her behaviour influenced by events in her childhood caused her to “play at his [Allendy’s] own feelings, every bit of power I had I used, to create a drama, to elude his theory, to complicate and throw veils. I lied and lied more carefully, more calculatingly than June, with all the strength of my mind.”⁷⁶ Nin closes her journal entry near the end of *Henry and June* by affixing an unsettling, private comment at the end of a copied letter to Miller: “My letter to Henry reveals my lies to him, necessary lies, mostly lies meant to heighten my confidence.”⁷⁷ In effect, Nin creatively used her lies both as armour against the vulnerability of being exposed to the “logic” of Allendy’s “patterns,” to maintain Miller’s view of her as a confident, self-possessed woman who had not submitted to psychoanalysis and its doctrines, and to begin applying literary techniques within the journals themselves.

The letter and its epitaph in the journal show that despite its confessional intensity, her letter to Miller was still rife with “necessary lies,” demonstrating how Nin evaded confrontational, introspective objectivity in favour of a more imaginative portrayal of events. She was effectively combining fiction with autobiography in maintaining the diary. This was largely derived from an association between the diaries and her father, though her understanding of the impact her father had on her approach to writing the

⁷⁴ Nin, *Henry and June*, 201.

⁷⁵ The topic of transference discussed in chapter one in relation to Freud’s analysis of Breuer’s treatment of Anna O. (Bertha Pappenheim) in *Studies on Hysteria* and Freud’s own failures with Dora in “A Case of Hysteria” come to mind here. Though Nin might have seen herself as overcoming Allendy’s desire to interpret her into “fundamental patterns” that she did not want to be reduced to, it is evident that she projected her most fundamental pattern—desire for the father—onto her seduction of him that was inadequately handled. As such, reviewing Nin’s journals provides a compelling study of the subject of analysis in her own words, while remaining in the tradition of viewing the aetiology of hysteria as sexual in origin, i.e., principally sourced from her relationship with her father that she would go on to consummate.

⁷⁶ Nin, *Henry and June*, 201.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 202.

diaries would alter after she was reunited with him. Her description of their affair has been only made available in the publication of *Incest*. In studying the details of their relationship in this way, we can perceive how she sought out therapy with Rank after the incest, and the fact that this changed her approach to the diaries.

3.2 Psychoanalysis, and the Unexpurgated *Incest*

Nin justified her frequent adultery—with Henry Miller, both of her analysts, numerous homosexual young men, her husband’s associates, and her eventual bigamous marriage to second and final husband Rupert Pole—as largely a consequence of her need to gain experience, to be an artist “courting the world.”⁷⁸ Nin writes: “I really believe that if I were not a writer, nor a creator, nor an experimenter, I might have been a faithful wife.”⁷⁹ Nin’s numerous fictions can lead us to a better understanding of the performative quality of her red journals, her process of self-editing, and her unique relationship with psychoanalysis and analytic therapy.⁸⁰ In *Incest*, Nin confesses: “I realise the diary is a struggle to seize on the most unseizable person on earth. I elude my own detection. I do not tell all my lies—it would take too much time.”⁸¹ While Nin’s practice of maintaining a diary signifies her preferred form of self-expression through maintaining a personal record, she consistently modified the truth within them. Despite the autobiographical nature of her most prolific writing, Nin herself admits to self-fictionalising her written accounts despite using the diary as a site of intimate, “spontaneous” confession.

Angie Kehagia has written on how Nin’s compulsive lying, extramarital affairs, depressions, and narcissism are indistinguishably threaded into the creativity expressed in her expansive journals. She draws close, crucial attention to events that Nin experienced in her early childhood in Cuba, most notoriously with her father, in ways that Nin only generalises in describing her early session with Allendy included in *Henry and June*. Kehagia recounts:

⁷⁸ Cited in Kehagia, “Anaïs Nin,” 802.

⁷⁹ Nin, *Henry and June*, 11.

⁸⁰ After learning that Guiler “also at some point had a mistress, long after their marriage: she called him ‘even more a father, as he deserted me for a mistress,’” showing the double standard in their terms of agreement. See Kehagia, “Anaïs Nin,” 804.

⁸¹ Nin, *Incest*, 141.

Nin's early years were scarred by physical abuse and had a profound impact on her growing personality. At 17 she wrote "I would do anything to keep him [her father] from lifting my dress and beating me."

Although these beatings stopped when Nin was ten years old, the abuse from then on took the form of camera stalking. Nin and her brothers were made to stand naked in front of their father's lenses, while he repeated "What an ugly little girl."⁸²

This passage provides one example of the accounts of how Nin's father was a household tyrant, and that his dominion over her childhood home made her fear, at times, that he might beat her mother to death.⁸³ For her and her brothers, frequent physical abuse was common. However, when Joaquin left the family when Nin was a child, she was inconsolably devastated: "I adored my Father, body and soul... When I was ten years old my Father left us, abandoned my Mother and made her suffer. But for me—it was I he had abandoned."⁸⁴ Nin's mother Rosa, realising her husband Joaquin had permanently left them, decided to relocate the family to America before eventually settling in France. Nin's fear of never seeing her father again caused her to begin her diary entries; she describes it in the narrative of "The Labyrinth," a section in her book *A Woman Speaks*—"I was eleven when I walked into the labyrinth of my diary [...] I walked with the desire to see all things twice so as to find my way back into them again..."⁸⁵ The diary represents their journey to America and then on to France, which opens the first pages of *House of Incest*, signifying, as examined below, the first of her efforts to therapeutically transform this traumatic moment into writerly expression.

Noël Riley Fitch's biography of Nin, which came out the year after *Incest* was published, is structured around the "plausible but unverifiable hypothesis that Nin was abused as a child by her father."⁸⁶ Fitch argues that many of Nin's behavioural patterns characteristically "fit the patterns typical of victims of childhood incest."⁸⁷ Bair's biography two years later was able to confirm that incestuous relations between them had occurred, though it could not assert, much like this present study, the extent of Nin's father's treatment of her as a child. As such, this chapter avoids speculations

⁸² Kehagia, "Anaïs Nin," 805.

⁸³ For a detailed account of Nin's childhood and her experience of her father's abuse, see Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 12–39.

⁸⁴ Nin, *Incest*, 198.

⁸⁵ Nin, "The Labyrinth," in *A Woman Speaks*, 66.

⁸⁶ Tookey, *Anaïs Nin*, 116 f73.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

concerning Nin's childhood and her treatment by her father; it instead pursues what can be known in Nin's own words as recorded in *Incest*.

Nin's nine-day holiday and incestuous affair with her father in 1933 represents a significant turning point in her life. The unexpurgated diary demonstrates how the diaries are not simply a contribution to the literary modernist canon but are also a candid and unsettling account of a woman's experience of incest and the symptoms she experienced following it. The text documents her decision to end their liaisons, which significantly corresponds with when she began analysis with Otto Rank. Although it is clear in the censored *Journals* that her father had an obsessive hold on her, and that Rank's analysis was important to her, interpreting Nin's analytic therapy with Rank *without* knowing about the sexual dimensions of her reunion with her father would remove and therefore weaken an interpretation of just how essential that therapy was, and the impact it would have on her literature and writerly process.

Considering the deeply felt impact of his abandonment and the way Nin's diaries began as an expression of her devotion to him, the impact of a letter from her father in 1933, the first instance of communication between them in twenty years, is evident.⁸⁸ Nin was at a dance recital in Paris in March of that year when she met composer Gustavo Durán who had recently seen her musician father Joaquin. He was in the city, and Durán told Nin how much she resembled him; Joaquin was "very sad about losing his children...he asks especially about you."⁸⁹ Nin asked Durán to tell her father to visit her, and some days later she received a letter, the first from him: "a beautiful, tender letter—which made me weep."⁹⁰ After an exchange of additional letters between them, "rife with sexual undertones on his part and hers," a personal meeting took place at the beginning of May.⁹¹ Recording the occasion on 5 May 1933, Nin victoriously proclaimed: "I have found my father, my God, only to discover that I do not need him."⁹² Nin describes the liberation to be the result of therapy with Allendy and her relationship with Miller.

A description of their reunion is present in the first volume of her edited journals and her second piece of fiction *Winter of Artifice* (1939), which largely copies entries from

⁸⁸ See Bair, *Anais Nin*, 12–27.

⁸⁹ Bair, *Anais Nin*, 167.

⁹⁰ Nin, *Incest*, 131.

⁹¹ Kehagia, "Anais Nin," 804.

⁹² Nin, *Incest*, 152.

the first volume of the edited *Journal*. However, their private holiday, where they engaged in an incestuous relationship, is censored in the edited journal. The 1992 uncensored version is composed of Rupert Pole's amalgamation of journals thirty-seven through forty-six that Nin kept between 1933 and 1934. Nin had begun to use psychoanalytic language following analysis with Allendy, and among the volumes of her journals that Pole selected from are journals titled "Schizoidie and Paranoia," "Flagellation," "Incest," and a doubly underlined journal labelled "Father."⁹³ Pole consolidated content from these unpublished journals into the unexpurgated *Incest*, and a comparison between this unexpurgated diary and the first volume of her self-edited journals, *The Journals of Anaïs Nin: Volume One* (hereafter referred to as *Journal*), allows us to examine her reunion with her father and the form and content of her diaries in relation to her psychoanalytic therapy with Otto Rank that began later that year.

Nin had ended her relations with Allendy several months prior, in March of that year. Though analytic therapy between them has been virtually non-existent for months, "sessions"—essentially sexual trysts in his office—had continued.⁹⁴ During a particularly intense rendezvous, the last of Nin's intimate meetings with Allendy, he flogged her with a whip under the pretence of mutual sexual enjoyment. Nin writes that it was also meant to make her "pay for everything, to pay for enslaving me and then abandoning me!"⁹⁵ Nin records the experience in her diary with little emotion; she coolly archives the occasion in the unpublished volume of the diary labelled "Flagellation."⁹⁶ At the same time, she began to feverishly write "obsessive prose for the first time since her childhood"⁹⁷ about her father, repeatedly writing "I love him...I love him...I want nobody else."⁹⁸ The repetitive, manic tone of her diary entries during this brief period is notably childish and obsessive. But further, the entries increasingly meld into an encounter with the content and subject of the diaries themselves, the text itself as decidedly not written for Nin herself.

⁹³ Cited in Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 161.

⁹⁴ See Valerie Harms, "Anaïs and Her Analysts, Rank and Allendy: The Creative and Destructive Aspects," in *Anaïs Nin Literary Perspectives*, 112–119.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 146.

⁹⁶ Cited in Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 161.

⁹⁷ Kehagia, "Anaïs Nin," 804.

⁹⁸ Cited in Kehagia, "Anaïs Nin," 804.

A confrontation between the intentionality, form, and content of her diaries begins to emerge as Nin explicitly defines her father as the true subject, and invisible audience, of the diaries:

The diary began as a diary of a journey, *to record everything for my father. It was written for him*, and I had intended to send it to him. *It was really a letter*, so he could follow us into a strange land, know about us...I find my father again when I am a woman. When he comes to me, he who marked my childhood so deeply, I am a full-blown woman.⁹⁹

This passage, which she *did* choose to include in the self-edited *Journal*, demonstrates a personal epiphany for Nin that she evidently decided to share publicly some thirty years later. In doing so, she chose to invite her readership into how she began to confront the fact her diary was effectively a longstanding letter written to and for her father. She also includes how she gravitated, with unsettling levels of neurotic delusion, towards her father in the reunion that followed their initial epistolary exchange. Joaquin asked Nin to join him in the south of France in June, wanting, as he describes in a letter Nin transcribed in her journal and chose to maintain in the self-edited volume but that is not included in *Incest*, “to have you alone for a few days. We deserve this after such a long separation. We must spend hours to know each other intimately.”¹⁰⁰ Nin writes in *Journal*: “I meet him again when I know there is no possibility of fusion between father and daughter, only between man and woman.”¹⁰¹

However, in *Journal* Nin suddenly breaks off, and keeps details of their reunion short; she writes that she did meet her father at Valescure, “but I left ahead of time to have a few days of quiet and meditation,” and says nothing of their sexual liaisons.¹⁰² The unexpurgated *Incest* supplies the missing information of the nine days they spent in Valescure, north of Montpellier, from 23 June to 1 July 1933. Despite Nin’s habitual tendency to lie, the fact that these entries in the diary remained, at her request, unpublished until after her death suggests that the content is legitimate, and sparse scholarship on this topic does not contest its validity. In *Incest*, Nin writes: “My evil

⁹⁹ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 211, emphasis mine.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 226.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 245–249

will be posthumous—the ruthless truths!”¹⁰³ Her exclamatory remark suggests that she was aware that the diaries might be published after her death, and the “ruthless truth” of her relationship with her father known. Nin’s biographer Bair writes that “it seems more than likely that she recorded what had happened between her and her father either exactly as it occurred or in the way she chose to commit it to memory.”¹⁰⁴ The following is all taken from *Incest*.

On the first day of their holiday Nin records examining her father’s face, the “mask [that] had terrorized me,” at the bar of the hotel where they were staying.¹⁰⁵ She wonders “what this sense of my Father’s exactingness contributed to my haunting pursuit of perfection.”¹⁰⁶ Her introspection may have been the result of productive analytic sessions with Allendy, who had pinpointed her lack of confidence in association with her childhood memories of her father’s abuse. However, this encounter demonstrates a unique, albeit perverse, exchange unmitigated by any analytic context, which soon headed into murky territory, particularly after her father began enumerating his dissatisfactions with her mother in a “terrible list of crude details.”¹⁰⁷ Her mother’s sexual frigidity, poor personal hygiene, “strong odours,” and her ineptitude at thinking like an artist, “without coquetry and taste,” were itemised on a long list of cited reasons why “the king, the solitary and obstinate visionary” *had* to leave the family when Nin was a child.¹⁰⁸ Nin immediately sided in favour of her father’s rendition of events: it wasn’t something that she had done that caused her father to leave, but rather the fault of her mother: “Mother *understood nothing*, could not be reasoned with, was primitive in her jealousies, irritable, tyrannical.”¹⁰⁹ Nin eagerly justified her father’s violent behaviour towards her mother while Nin was a child by ridiculing the negative attributes her father identified—especially her mother’s frigidity, “for he was capable of taking Mother several times a day, and every day [...] and she did not know how to take him.”¹¹⁰ We might see attributes of the diaries in relation to Joaquin’s critical

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 203. In the edited *Journals: Volume I*, she writes that she did meet her father at Valescure, “but I left ahead of time to have a few days of quiet and meditation,” and says nothing of their sexual liaisons. See *Journals: Volume I*, 245–249.

¹⁰⁴ Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 174.

¹⁰⁵ Nin, *Incest*, 205.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 207.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, emphasis mine.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 206–207.

description of Nin's mother. That is, the precise qualities Nin was exceedingly concerned with possessing—jealousy, undesirability, ugliness, and frigidity—represent qualities she fastidiously omitted in her diaries in order to create “fairy tales” instead.

Conversely, her father did not withhold describing to her the traits he saw as most admirable in a woman: sexual adventurousness, beauty, refinement, generosity, and creativity. These attributes are ones Nin actively projects in the process of self-editing she implemented in the diaries, and in view of this, we might better contextualise Bobbitt's critical appraisal of the *Journals* previously described. Bobbitt's claim that the diaries show how Nin's existing “in her own imagination, a woman of many dimensions which fuse to form a completeness of character rarely achieved in reality,” might in fact be derived from her attempts to artistically portray and cultivate what her father desired most, while concealing, by either editing or omitting, what might have displeased him.¹¹¹ On this first evening she told him repeatedly, “my work is for you...my journal is for you. For you I want to make, and shall make, renewed efforts—whatever may give you joy.”¹¹² In this regard, Jelinek's view that “we should start viewing Nin with some objectivity” is perhaps too quickly defined.¹¹³ In fact, regarding Nin within the context of her dependency on her father's approval, and her keen awareness of the violence of his displeasure, likely contributes to the quality of her writing in the texts. That is, her heavy editing, liberal use of “vital lies,” as well as her actions to follow signify the internalised dynamics of her complex relationship with her father, and its entanglement in her composition of the diaries.

Bair describes Nin and her father's first night at Valescure, and writes that:

Anaïs was well aware that she was sitting with *her father* and listening to stories of his sex life with *her mother*. There was never any doubt that she was his daughter and he was her parent, at least not in her written account. How or why she lost sight of it is known only to her, but it may have happened when they shared tales of their mutual “diabolicalness.”¹¹⁴

Although Nin was aware that she was in the company of her parent, it was one whom she had spent her life wanting to please, and whose abandonment had marked her so

¹¹¹ Bobbitt, “Truth and Artistry,” 269.

¹¹² Ibid., 245.

¹¹³ Jelinek, “Anaïs Nin: A Critical Evaluation,” 323.

¹¹⁴ Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 172, author's emphasis.

strongly. That evening, Nin reassured her father that he was the parent she most identified with and distanced herself from any associations with her mother. She cites her liberal, sexual promiscuity as proof, which signifies the “diabolicalness” Bair refers to in the quote above. Nin began recounting her sexual trysts to him: “I told Father about my liking to go with both Henry and Eduardo [her homosexual cousin who had encouraged her therapy with Allendy] to the same hotel room (not at the same time!)” and she congratulates herself by noting “this simple statement revealed a world to him. He smiled: I have done that too.”¹¹⁵ Nin was aware that describing her sexual encounters pleased her father, and she continued to recount stories of her exploits to his increasingly inappropriate zeal: “I told him the secret of my flagellation [with Allendy]. When I described how I stood off and observed the commonness of the scene, Father was amazed. This fact seemed again to touch some secret spring of his own nature.”¹¹⁶ In effect, Nin began to vocalise the contents of the diary to her father directly, content which she had, in many respects, created or engaged in with him in mind.

Nin’s renditions of her sexual deviances were not only met with her father’s approval; in her diary she provides a careful account of how they aroused him. Though she describes reciprocated affection, the intricate psychological context of this encounter can only be speculated at. The second night of their holiday, she consented to have intercourse with him. Perhaps her father’s capacity for violence and his ability to abandon her again—the primary source of her immense fear of abandonment and rejection in the first place—was the reason why. Perhaps she viewed transgressing the incest taboo as the ultimate way to transgress ordinary values. In any case, Nin writes that in his hotel room he admonished her initial hesitancy at their intimacy, and proselytised that she was “a liberated woman, an *affranchie* [freed]” while coercing her “to masturbate him.”¹¹⁷ Nin writes that she was “timid and unwilling” but that he told her to enjoy it: “‘I want you to enjoy, to enjoy’, he said. ‘Enjoy.’”¹¹⁸ She “violently” lifted her negligee in response, and after they consummated the act he proclaimed “*Toi: Anaïs! Je n’ai pas de Dieu!*” [You: Anaïs! I have lost God].¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ Nin, *Incest*, 207.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 208.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 209.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

Nin records that after they had sex she wanted to run away—“I wanted to leave him”—but stayed because she did not “want to hurt him.”¹²⁰ It was not until several hours later that “I went to my room, poisoned.”¹²¹ Nevertheless, she continued and encouraged what Bair describes as a “non-stop orgiastic frenzy” during the remaining seven days of their holiday.¹²² Nin writes that she derived pleasure from the experience, though without achieving orgasm, especially in seeing her father revived by their alliance—he appeared more healthy than when they had first met.¹²³ Though she identifies herself as a transgressive co-conspirator in these diary entries, a close analysis of her writing suggests that her overwhelming compulsion to please him, perhaps derived from incestuous abuse when she was a child, was a strong factor in her decision to participate in their sexual encounters: “I feared disappointing him.”¹²⁴ In this instance her vulnerabilities seem to have contributed to the decision to maintain what she called her “poisonous” relationship with her father (the word appears frequently in passages associated with him). In these scenes in *Incest* she writes “the sperm was a poison; the love was a poison...” which would be reworked in *House of Incest*.¹²⁵

Nin had arranged to meet Henry Miller in Avignon after she left her father, and the extensive letters between them show that she remained out of communication with him until appearing at Avignon train station on 2 July 1933, the day after her holiday at Valescure.¹²⁶ She had not answered Miller’s calls because of her father’s jealousy.¹²⁷ Nin lied to her father about Miller, and she also lied to Miller about what had happened with her father. More lies were told to her husband Guiler, who remained ignorant of her sexual activities outside of marriage. She also edited the account from her diary when, nearly two decades later, she was preparing it as an edited volume of the *Journals*. Nin describes how when she reunited with Miller in Avignon on 2 July she was “more ill than ever, more neurotic,” though she struggled to hide it from him, and when she saw him at the station platform she felt they “were strangers.”¹²⁸ She had a

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Ibid., 210.

¹²² Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 174.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Nin, *Incest*, 161.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 210.

¹²⁶ See Stuhlmann, *A Literate Passion*, 171–177.

¹²⁷ See Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 181. It seems rather interesting to note that although Joaquin expressed no jealousy in Nin’s accounts of her sexual trysts, he was jealous of Miller’s position in her life.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 215; 217.

sudden “bilious attack” (Nin’s shorthand for vomiting) and was feverish, but “did not want Henry to see me ill!” because she was afraid that he might “be disillusioned, annoyed, disappointed” and so kept “my mood, my despair *poisoning* me, undetectable.”¹²⁹ In effect, she struggled with symptoms undoubtedly precipitated by her actions, but when such occurrences are read only in the edited diaries (which do not include the incestuous reunion with her father), they might be read as simply a brief illness.

The fits of neurosis Nin records in her diary following her experience with her father are unsurprising when placed in context. Her actions can be interpreted differently when read in light of the uncensored material and cannot be understood when reading only the edited *Journal*—it is through examining *Incest* that we are able to see these symptoms causally. Nin maintained a performative veneer and ensured she was “powdered, perfumed...the effort of will to poetize illness for him [Miller]...I succeed.”¹³⁰ Miller did not suspect that anything untoward had happened during her holiday, though he remarked that her father was “courting” her “with a vengeance.”¹³¹ Several days after returning to Paris she documents that the secrecy was too overwhelming to bear and writes: “I want to go to [Otto] Rank and get absolution for my passion for my Father.”¹³² However, she would not contact the analyst for another four months. Nin proceeded to return to her life with Guiler at Louveciennes and pretended that nothing had happened. However, she relied heavily on her diary—“my journal keeps me from insanity”—while she kept her affair with her father hidden.¹³³

Nin did not specify any negative consequences of her affair with her father in her diaries. In late 1933, she instead itemises financial stress, pressure from Miller to leave Guiler, and preoccupation with her need to write a book as the reasons for her frequent insomnia, spontaneous vomiting, self-starvation, and other illnesses. The cause of these disturbances seems fairly obvious: her ongoing sexual relationship with her father, who she continued to maintain letters with, was triggering substantial levels of anxiety.¹³⁴ Therefore, there is a reasonable argument, as the above information strongly suggests,

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 216, emphasis mine.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*

¹³¹ Stuhlmann, *A Literate Passion*, 175.

¹³² Nin, *Incest*, 221.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 217.

¹³⁴ Kehagia describes these symptoms at length without directly connecting them to her incestuous reunion with her father. See “Anaïs Nin,” 802–804.

for forming a direct correlation between such symptoms and what had occurred in Valescure and later at Louveciennes, which clarifies aspects of the edited *Journal* that are unspoken. Scholars such as Tookey, Kehagia, Bobbitt and others do not explore such associations, which will be developed here in relation to how she sought out Otto Rank in an effort to overcome her relationship with her father. These connections are only perceptible by comparing the recent volume *Incest* with her self-edited *Journal* and later, her first volume *House of Incest*.

3.3 Otto Rank, Creative Will, Diary as Intertextual Resource

When Nin met Rank on 7 November 1933, she proclaimed, “I am one of the artists you are writing about, Dr Rank.”¹³⁵ She was familiar with two of his books and both had been translated in 1932: *Kunst und Künstler* [*Art and Artist*] had been translated into English and *Der Doppelgänger: Eine Psychoanalytische Studie* [*Don Juan: Une étude sur le double*] had appeared in French. Miller was the first between them to read the English translation of *Art and Artist*, and after reading it Nin wrote in her diary: “it was the book I wanted to write!”¹³⁶ She held Rank’s work in high esteem and identified with his concepts, factors that influenced her decision to single him out as her analyst; she wanted to write, and believed that he could help her do so. In order to understand how he helped her to write *House of Incest*, and to come to an understanding of the diaries as paratextual material in relation to her time in analysis with him, we will first consider their analytic sessions and Rank’s theories of the artist, as well as how Nin connected many of his concepts to her understanding of Lawrence.

In July 1933 Nin recorded that she wanted to undergo analysis with Rank to “get resolution for my passion for my father.”¹³⁷ Four months later she described that it was a “courageous mood” that caused her to finally and “impulsively ring Rank’s doorbell” without advance notice.¹³⁸ A previously censored entry in *Incest* shows that her actions were not as spontaneous as she makes them out to be—her father had paid what would be his last intimate visit to Louveciennes a week prior. Before he arrived Nin wrote that she had resolved to “yield to my father when he comes, out of loneliness.”¹³⁹ She

¹³⁵ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 280.

¹³⁶ Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 187; Nin, *Incest*, 73.

¹³⁷ Nin, *Incest*, 221.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 291.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 284; 287.

describes facilitating the “light and swift” intercourse that took place while her husband Guiler was within earshot, and would reflect that she “yields only for his [her father’s] pleasure.”¹⁴⁰ In the diary entry Nin considers that she “should tell my Father I do not love him,” but writes that she “will lie to him and I am sick with my lies.”¹⁴¹ Her letters to him, copied into the unexpurgated diary, profess an ongoing devotion: “I feel your gaze penetrate my whole life. Look: Everywhere there is only your image.”¹⁴² Nin had begun to think of her father as her twin, an indispensable part of her, “my Father is me.”¹⁴³ However, an awareness of the cyclical and perverse continuation of their affair, along with an evidently confining “poisoned” identification with him, is likely what caused her to finally contact Otto Rank.

Rank had been in Paris since 1926, having been, as Nin would write, “excommunicated” from Freud’s inner circle after the publication of *The Trauma of Birth* in 1924.¹⁴⁴ The break was unprecedented—when Rank presented Freud with his manuscript of *Der Künstler [The Artist]* in 1905, Freud was so impressed that he arranged Rank’s funding through university, and then appointed him secretary of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society in 1906.¹⁴⁵ Nearly twenty years on, in 1923, Rank had become “virtually indispensable” to Freud. He had been promoted to vice-president of the Psychoanalytic Society and was the director of Freud’s *Verlag* [publishing company].¹⁴⁶ Freud wrote to Sandor Ferenczi in March 1924 that Rank was “the person nearest to me in so many respects. His work has been invaluable, his person would be irreplaceable.”¹⁴⁷ However, Rank’s *The Trauma of Birth*, which was dedicated to Freud and that he believed supported Freudian theory, was considered “a blatant denial of the Oedipal complex” by members of the Society, particularly Karl Abraham and Ernest Jones.¹⁴⁸ They urged Freud “to reconsider his positive attitude towards Rank.”¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 284.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 287.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 247.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 217.

¹⁴⁴ Anaïs Nin, “Foreword,” in Otto Rank, *Art and Artist: Creative Urge and Personality Development*, trans. Charles Francis Atkinson (London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1989), vii.

¹⁴⁵ See James Lieberman and Robert Kramer, *The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Otto Rank: Inside Psychoanalysis* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012).

¹⁴⁶ Robert Kramer, “Introduction: Insights and Blindness: Visions of Rank,” in *Otto Rank, A Psychology of Difference, The American Lectures*, ed. Robert Kramer (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 12.

¹⁴⁷ Letter dated 20 March 1924, cited in James Lieberman, *Acts of Will: The Life and Work of Otto Rank* (New York: Free Press, 1985), 218.

¹⁴⁸ Kramer, “Visions of Rank,” 25.

¹⁴⁹ Tookey, *Anaïs Nin*, 61.

Despite an exchange of letters in which Freud appealed to Rank to “leave open a way back,”¹⁵⁰ in April 1926 Rank resigned his posts in Vienna and, as Tookey puts it, “effectively severed his connections with Freud and the Freudians.”¹⁵¹

After relocating to Paris Rank worked on material that would develop into one of his crucial works, *Art and Artist: Creative Urge and Personality Development*. His affirmative view of artistic development described therein, and, in Nin’s words, that he conveyed the opinion “genius is invention,” was sympathetically received by the literary and artistic community in Paris.¹⁵² Wadlington describes in “Otto Rank’s Art” how in *Art and Artist* Rank developed a theory “of art and creativity; a personality typology based on the artist as an exemplar of healthy development and an innovative approach to the analytic relationship.”¹⁵³ Wadlington continues, “Rank regarded his patient’s symptoms—alienation, suffering, inhibition—as signs of creative failure” and he had developed a “‘constructive’ therapy, a ‘Will therapy,’ addressed to the artist within.”¹⁵⁴ This approach can be seen in his analytic sessions with Nin, as described in her detailed entries in *Incest*, but especially her first published *Journal*. Attention to these sessions shows how, in light of material in *Incest*, Rank would greatly assist her in severing her relationship with her father while developing her process of writing.

Rank answered the door on that day in November 1933, and he agreed to meet Nin later that afternoon. As she prepared for their meeting, she wrote in her diary that she began “to invent what I will tell Rank instead of coordinating truths [...] What should I say to create such and such an effect. I mediate lies as others mediate confessions.”¹⁵⁵ Nin wanted to impress Rank so that he would find her worthy as a patient; she had heard he was interested in artists and so wanted to make “a selection of what might interest him.”¹⁵⁶ During their first session, he asked her for an outline of her life and work. After she provided an account, he helped her come to a rapid, but nevertheless powerful conclusion, which she summarised in the diary shortly afterwards:

¹⁵⁰ Kramer, “Visions of Rank,” 31.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 62.

¹⁵² Nin, *Incest*, 301.

¹⁵³ Will Wadlington, “Otto Rank’s Art,” *The Humanist Psychologist* 29, nos. 1–3 (2001): 281.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 289.

¹⁵⁵ Nin, *Incest*, 293.

¹⁵⁶ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 279.

There is *more* in my relation to my Father than the desire of victory over my Mother. There is more in my relation to Henry [Miller] than masochistic sacrifices or a need of victory over the other woman. There is—beyond sexuality, beyond lesbianism, beyond narcissism—creation, *creation* [...] I wanted to create myself.¹⁵⁷

Nin's realisation, guided by Rank's interpretative work, indicates a crucial, preliminary redirection of her focus from her father to the individual task of self-creation and writerly activity. Nin's summary of Rank's initial assessment during their first session shows that he immediately helped her towards the view that her neurotic patterns stemmed *not* solely from her father, but from a deeper desire to "create" herself.

Rank would work extensively with Nin to shift her attention away from a centralised and traumatic relationship with her father and the diaries towards a greater imperative: to forge herself through new and creative writerly development. Sharon Spencer writes how, at this time,

Nin's most overwhelming problems were two: her difficulty establishing physical and emotional independence from her father, an obsession that came close to crippling her entire life, and her frustrated efforts to become an artist. Needless to say, these problems were deeply and tightly intertwined.¹⁵⁸

In order to disentangle these interconnected problems, in their second analytic session Rank rapidly and decisively asked her to cut herself off from the diaries— "he asked me to give up my journal and I left it in his hands. He delivered me of my opium."¹⁵⁹ Nin was startled but also elated by Rank's request: "Dr Rank was clever enough to realize the diary was the key."¹⁶⁰ Although Allendy had made Nin aware of the effects of her father's abandonment on her lack of confidence, he ignored her journals that had begun as a result of that abandonment: "he [Allendy] never expressed curiosity about them."¹⁶¹ Spencer endorses Rank's efforts to distance Nin from the diary and his encouragement that she take a break to pursue more formal literary genres.¹⁶² She rightly notes that Rank's effort was intended to reduce the intensity of her obsession

¹⁵⁷ Nin, *Incest*, 292, author's emphasis.

¹⁵⁸ Sharon Spencer, "Anais Nin and Otto Rank," in *Anais Nin Literary Perspectives*, 99.

¹⁵⁹ Nin, *Incest*, 294.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² Spencer, "Anais Nin and Otto Rank," 99.

with the diary, and it is clear from entries that Nin wanted, now more than ever, to abandon her dependency on diary writing.

Nin had begun referring to the diaries at this time as “my drug and my vice” and describes them as “covering all things with the mist of smoke, deforming and transforming as the night does.”¹⁶³ Rather than providing clarity, or support, the journal was now considered to be an obscuring narcotic—it clouded her ability to self-orientate, especially in relation to her father—convoluting her sense of self and creative independence. Nin’s characterisation of her diaries as a “drug” and “vice” was likely caused by her confrontation with the fact that the diary signified a relationship with her father that bore the qualities of an addiction. She wanted to achieve distance from her diary much like she wanted to impart distance from him. By asking her to temporarily give them up, Rank enforced a symbolic, rehabilitative separation.

Rank told her: “If you carry it [the diary] around and bring it here it is because you want to give it, you want someone to read it. And it isn’t only your wish to have it read. It is your last defence against analysis.”¹⁶⁴ Though at this time Nin did not see the diaries as literary works, to have them read by him was both intimate and powerful for her. For Nin, Rank’s statement meant he *understood* that she used her diaries as armour against being fully understood and yet created herself in them:

...the role of refuge played by the diary, the role of a personage with whom a dialogue could help me resist invasion of the self. He has understood what a shell the diary is around me, what a weapon of defence. But he has understood, too, that it contains the truth.¹⁶⁵

In effect, Rank was approaching the diaries not only as a defence against analysis—Nin saw too that he was reading them with a sensitivity towards the artist, navigating between seeming contradictions.

The unexpurgated *Incest* does not make it clear whether Nin told Rank of her incestuous encounters with her father, though Bair states she finally told him about them in March the following year.¹⁶⁶ It is evident that during their early sessions, begun

¹⁶³ Nin, *Incest*, 366.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 294.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 297.

¹⁶⁶ See Bair, *Anais Nin*, 62. In the unexpurgated third diary, *Fire*, the entries from March of 1934 to which Bair refers describe a fight and reconciliation that had occurred with Rank concerning her “bad

in November 1933, Rank was able to “immediately touch on the vital points. The diary and my Father—the connection between them” without having known, so far as can be ascertained, that they had consummated an incestuous relationship.¹⁶⁷ We are similarly censored in an excerpt from the *Journal* that is not included in *Incest*, where Nin describes telling Rank that, after reuniting with her father, she felt that she had to abandon him. Rank’s response was:

You had to fulfil the obsession to be reunited with him, but you also had to liberate yourself from the fatalistic determinism of your whole life, of being the abandoned one. When you lost him as a child, you lost him in the personification of your ideal self. He was the artist, musician, writer, builder, socially fascinating personage. When you found him, you were a young woman in search of your real self. This your father could not give you, because the relationship was only a reflection of the past, of child and father love. This had to be broken so that you might find a man independently of this image. Your father, as far as I can make out, is still trying to create you in his image.¹⁶⁸

This passage, which is included in her self-edited *Journal*, again shows how Nin wanted to place specific attention on the important points of her father’s involvement in the diary and her analysis with Rank following it. However, *Incest* allows us to fill in the gaps; fulfilling the “obsession” of being reunited with her father involved a great deal more than is detailed in this passage from the *Journal*. Rank might have also, like readers of the *Journal*, been only able to guess at the connotations of her obsessional reunion. But the important point to make of this segment is that Rank encouraged her to become her own woman in search of her “real self,” and to break from a father that tried to create her in his image.

A key example of Rank’s approach concerning this particular theme of the image is in Nin’s documentation of a session where Rank offers insight into his concept of “the double.” Here we can see an instance of where Rank’s theoretical work was

habits”—see Nin, *Fire*, 34–59. However, it is not evident that Nin told Rank about her sexual relations with her father—Bair might be referring to archival material and not the unexpurgated, published text.

¹⁶⁷ Nin, *Incest*, 297.

¹⁶⁸ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 278.

incorporated into his analysis of Nin, such as in the way she found an image of herself in her father, and her father created an image of himself in her. Rank, Nin writes,

...began to talk very subtly about the Double theme, saying more than he said in his book, *Don Juan: Une étude sur le double*, expanding, extending, touching on the subject from a great diversity of aspects. Said first of all that I had written the diary in order to replace my Father, unconsciously imitating my Father, too, and identifying myself with him...Diary then originates in the need to cover a loss, to fill a vacancy. I call the diary, little by little, a personage; then I confuse it with the shadow, *mon ombre* [my shadow] (my Double!) whom I am going to marry...¹⁶⁹

The book to which Nin is referring in this passage is an expanded version of an early essay Rank wrote, called *Der Doppelgänger* ["The Double"]. The paper was originally published in the German magazine *Imago*, edited by Freud in 1914. Rank's original essay was expanded in 1925 to *Der Doppelgänger: Eine Psychoanalytische Studie*, also published by Freud's *Verlag*.¹⁷⁰ This edition was translated into French in 1932 as *Don Juan: Une étude sur le double*, the volume Nin refers to in the diary passage quoted above. In that text Rank characterises the "double" as a form of "double-consciousness" that can become an "individual being," much like "a shadow, reflection or portrait," a depiction reminiscent of Nin's characterisation of her father's impact on the diary and herself.¹⁷¹

Rank's account of a theory of the double indicates Freud's work on the topic of the uncanny, but it also corresponds to attributes that Nin describes when recording her father's impact on her and her understanding of the diary as a replacement that could "cover a loss, fill a vacancy" that had become its own independent, ghost-like "personage."¹⁷² Rank explains that the death of a main character can arise from "the wounding of his reflection, portrait or double" as a desperate act meant to get rid its presence.¹⁷³ Rank isolates that the double theme represents a self-created split within the self that has the capacity to be the harbinger of destruction, which can annihilate

¹⁶⁹ Nin, *Incest*, 297–298.

¹⁷⁰ For the original 1914 German chapter, see "Der Doppelgänger," in *Imago: Zeitschrift für Anwendung der Psychoanalyse auf die Geisteswissenschaften*, ed. Sigmund Freud (Leipzig, Vienna, and Zürich: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1914, Vol. III), 97–164.

¹⁷¹ Otto Rank, *Double: A Psychoanalytic Study*, trans. Harry Tucker Jr. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971), 20.

¹⁷² Nin, *Incest*, 298.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 52.

rather than fortify the ego. This explanation aligns with Nin's internalised conception of herself, in this case one derived from her father who had a totalising and uncannily spectral impact on her. Her belief that his omnipresent gaze "penetrate[s] my whole life," and that he was her "Double! My evil Double!" show that she had internalised his attributes as a ghostlike yet internal component to her psychical reality.¹⁷⁴ The way in which Nin would have to become liberated from her father's hold on her is inseparable from how she would have to become *psychically* independent—as a diarist, literary author, and woman—yet without annihilating herself in the process. Rank urged her to "abandon him as he abandoned you. Revenge is necessary. To re-establish equilibrium in the emotional life."¹⁷⁵

Studying *Incest* shows that during therapy with Rank Nin had to undergo extensive self-work in order to re-approach her method of writing within and, more importantly, to establish her sense of self outside of keeping a diary. In asking her to temporarily forgo maintaining a journal, Rank enforced her personal growth *beyond* the framework of her father towards independent self-development. Rank understood the symptomatic dimensions of the diary and its key association with her father as an ominous double-presence with whom she strongly identified, a combination of psychological fiction and biographical reality. It was a creative documentation of her source of neurosis that she depended upon that Rank wanted her to relinquish. The diary, "this self," had to undergo a transformation to "preserve, to reintegrate, and to return to me whole" and Nin, quite uncharacteristically, "trusted him" to read the truth when she gave the diaries to him.¹⁷⁶ After giving up the diaries Nin records that stopping them and her therapy with Rank signified "the end of a cycle. My life, which began with my passion for Father, now ends with the same passion. And *ends*."¹⁷⁷ Such a transformation—the termination of her affair with her father and a new approach to the diaries—was undoubtedly the result of her therapy with Rank.

Tookey rightfully cautions in *Anaïs Nin, Fictionality and Femininity* that Nin's account of her analysis with Rank "cannot be considered a verbatim report, or even an accurate reconstruction, of her analytic sessions."¹⁷⁸ Rather, she argues that Nin's accounts

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 247; 155.

¹⁷⁵ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 291.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 238, author's emphasis.

¹⁷⁸ Tookey, *Anaïs Nin*, 63.

should be “read like an essay on Rank’s thought designed to introduce his ideas to a wider public and, perhaps, to defend him against a culture hostile to psychoanalysis by emphasising his difference.”¹⁷⁹ Spencer similarly describes how, in life, “Rank never knew how valiantly and articulately Nin struggled in her writings and her public talks to create an audience for his many brilliant books.”¹⁸⁰ Several years after his early death in 1938, Nin gave a lecture to the Otto Rank Association, wherein she described her indebtedness to the analyst, stating that she had “found that my whole life as a woman had been influenced by it [*Truth and Reality*]” and that her life had “proved its wisdom.”¹⁸¹ She also provided the Foreword to the 1966 edition of *Art and Artist*, where she praises Rank as a “literary man...when he examined the creative personality it was not only as a psychologist, but [also] as an artist.”¹⁸²

However, though neither Tookey nor Spencer put forth the suggestion, Nin’s defence of Rank’s theories are not dissimilar to her vindication of Lawrence’s writing in *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*. Many of Nin’s summaries of Rank’s theories and her time in analysis with him in *Journal* and *Incest* bear resemblance to how she praised Lawrence’s views in her study of the author. Both men clearly contributed to her increasingly independent theories of psychoanalysis and its relationship to writing. An initial example is provided in an excerpt from the *Journal*, where Nin writes of one of her early sessions with Rank. She records that Rank told her:

I believe analysis has become the worst enemy of the soul. It killed what it analysed. I saw too much psychoanalysis with Freud and his disciplines which became pontifical, dogmatic. That was why I was ostracized from the original group.¹⁸³

Nin’s depiction of Rank’s belief that analysis had “become the worst enemy of the soul” echoes a number of lines in Lawrence’s texts on psychoanalysis discussed in the previous chapter. Similar to Lawrence’s eccentric critique of psychoanalysis, Nin paraphrases Rank’s views that Freudian theory is reductive and a danger to the “soul,” an accusation comparable to Lawrence’s belief that Freud’s strict topography of the

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

¹⁸⁰ Spencer, “Anaïs Nin and Otto Rank,” 98.

¹⁸¹ Anaïs Nin, “On Truth and Reality,” in Nin, *In Favour of the Sensitive Man* (London: Penguin, 1992), 47.

¹⁸² Nin, “Foreword,” in Rank, *Art and Artist*, vii.

¹⁸³ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 287.

unconscious is antithetic to the true, “pristine unconscious,” the creative, quasi-religious “soul-truth of unconscious impulse” that signifies life.¹⁸⁴ Likewise, Nin believed that an adherence to experiential life that follows the desires of the body signifies a mystic self that dreams, becoming “the evolution of the universe reduced to the terms of our own souls.”¹⁸⁵

In Nin’s interpretation of Rank’s method of analysis, we might consider how she initially praised Lawrence as an author whose works represented the “*transcending of ordinary values*,” discussed at the beginning of this chapter.¹⁸⁶ Nin wrote then that what mattered above all was the tracing of one’s desires, the body’s dreams, regardless of moral or psychoanalytic dictums that relegate desire into unconscious formulas of motivation, namely incest craving. For her, creative enterprise, impulse, and will indicate that experience is the essential element to life, and particularly that the contents of life experience that foster artistic productivity almost need to be beyond moral convention. She saw the task of creativity as a necessary process of transcending ordinary values in order to express “white heat” forms of living in her literature. In Rank’s focus on the creative *over* the father-daughter relation, he helped her to transcend her own relationship with her father into fiction rather than taking a more typically psychoanalytic route by focusing on the Oedipal. In this way, Nin approvingly saw Rank as someone who was already going beyond the Oedipal restrictions of psychoanalysis, redirecting and creatively engaging pathways of desire that go beyond normal or traditionally psychoanalytic values.

Rank’s *Art and Artist*—the controlled and highly competent work of Freud’s once most favoured disciple—differs from Lawrence’s emotive analytic treatises discussed previously. However, there are several notable conceptual similarities between his works and Lawrence’s texts which point towards how Nin would have understood a connection between them. In *Art and Artist* Rank writes:

Creativeness lies equally at the root of artistic production and of life experience. That is to say, lived experience can only be understood as the expression of volitional creative impulse, and in this the two spheres of artistic production and actual experience meet and overlap. Then, too, the creative

¹⁸⁴ See Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature*, 18.

¹⁸⁵ Nin, *D.H. Lawrence*, 38; 86, author’s emphasis.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 13, author’s emphasis.

impulse is manifested first and chiefly in the personality, which, being thus perpetually made over, produces artwork and experience in the same way.¹⁸⁷

The project of self-construction or reconstruction that Rank refers to in this quote, “the artist’s lifelong work on his own productive personality,” bears some resemblance to the conclusion of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, which we have examined in detail in relation to his psychoanalytic texts.¹⁸⁸

Lady Chatterley’s Lover closes with Mellors’s contention that all one can do is better the most productive and creatively affirming aspect of oneself: “You can’t insure against the future, except by really believing in the best bit of you, and in the power beyond it.”¹⁸⁹ The character’s sentiments align with Lawrence’s belief in the truth of *living* as a dynamic intervention in an otherwise rigid and insipid modern world represented in the impotent Sir Clifford. In Rank’s above-quoted passage, the expression of “volitional creative impulse,” such as in the life of the artist, is connected to “actual experience” much like Lawrence’s emphatic association between experiential blood-consciousness and the transcendental pristine unconscious it connotes. Nin’s assisted realisation during her first session with Rank, “I wanted to create myself,” became the focus of her individual process towards self-evolution through creative outlet, and its conclusion bears traits of both Lawrence’s and Rank’s concepts of the self.¹⁹⁰ An affirmation of creative enterprise coupled with lived experience is a part of Rank’s theory of the artist, one he rigorously endorsed and imparted upon Nin during their sessions, representing what she originally longed for when she was working on her study of Lawrence several years prior.

Rank’s work possesses a theoretical sophistication that is lacking in Lawrence’s attempts to articulate his individualist view “there is only one Law: I am I,” and his concepts of blood-consciousness and the pristine unconscious.¹⁹¹ Rank carefully posits that life experience and creative impulse overlap into the broad imperative of self-production and therefore self-administered psychological transformation, and his view particularly emphasises the task of the *individual* in fulfilling the creative work of

¹⁸⁷ Rank, *Art and Artist*, 38.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 41.

¹⁸⁹ D.H. Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* (London: Penguin, 2006), 300.

¹⁹⁰ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 292, author’s emphasis.

¹⁹¹ D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious; and, Fantasia of the Unconscious*, ed. Bruce Steele (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 72.

productive self-development. The task is one Nin summarises from a talk that Rank gave in 1935, “Neurosis as a Failure of Creativity.”¹⁹² Therein he emphasises that “the neurotic is a failed artist” and that “neuroses are a *malfunction of the imagination*,” a sentiment Nin took seriously.¹⁹³ The rousing message was derived from his work in *Art and Artist*, where he attempted, as Wadlington describes, to “counter Freud’s well-known ambivalence towards artists (a mix of envy and admiration), with an existential appreciation for the personality development of what he called the ‘artistic type.’”¹⁹⁴

Beyond an “artistic type” however, it seems Rank designated neurotics in general to be failed artists. By this he does not mean every neurotic must become a literal artist, but rather that neurotics lack the creativity and imagination necessary for overcoming, self-producing and creating personality beyond their own neurosis. Rank reinvigorates the process of artistic endeavour by suggesting individual creativity can actively ameliorate neurotic symptoms, and in doing so he significantly differs from Freud in his unique approach to psychoanalysis. This view is not unlike Lawrence’s attempts to reclaim the artist from psychoanalysis’s more formative strictures, which he equated, by a certain stretch of philosophical logic, with Platonic idealism. Lawrence thought that Freudian psychoanalysis detracts from the invigorating and enlivening task of artistic productivity and conceals the dynamic freedom inherent in being, to which he assigns the true quality of the unconscious. In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, he writes “the unconscious is the *creative* element, like the soul it is beyond all law of cause and effect in its totality” to argue that at the root of all individuals lies a fundamental creativity.¹⁹⁵ Likewise, Rank’s work indicates that he presupposes a self that contains inherent and creative capacity that, in its ability for self-invention, can overthrow, or at the very least, productively navigate the ideational concept of neurosis. Rank, however, does not define creative impulse as a principal feature that *defines* the unconscious; it rather is sourced from the attributive notion of “will.”

Rank provides a set of propositions centred on the concept of “creative will” born from the artist types’ “own process of self-formation.”¹⁹⁶ Rank describes that the artist

¹⁹² See Otto Rank, *A Psychology of Difference: The American Lectures*, ed. Robert Kramer (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 251–260.

¹⁹³ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 290.

¹⁹⁴ Wadlington, “Otto Rank,” 285.

¹⁹⁵ Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, 18.

¹⁹⁶ Rank, *Art and Artist*, 377.

absorbs the world “on account of his emotional needs,” which allows the urge to throw this self “off in creation and save himself again as an individual.”¹⁹⁷ The gesture of an “overthrowing” and “will” are emphatically described at the end of *Art and Artist* and are expanded in *Truth and Reality* through a greater focus on the theme of creative will. Esther Menaker defines this concept as “an original, uniquely human ‘given’...which is representative of the life force” and states that “it is the creative urge, expressed through the individual will, that at one and the same time produces the conflict and attempts its resolution through all the manifestations of creativity.”¹⁹⁸ Rank, following Freud, maintains belief in an inclusive and therefore universal neuroticism, yet he intervenes on this theory by articulating a unique concept of the artist, one Tookey focuses on as an essential factor in Nin’s period of analysis with Rank and what she drew from his work. The “principle of creative will is...fundamentally bound up with Rank’s view of the human subject as essentially in conflict with itself, conflict that can be ameliorated but never completely resolved, since it is inherent in the human condition.”¹⁹⁹ Rank’s theory of the artist doesn’t imply a conclusion or cure, but it does describe a process dictated by creative self-production.

Nin translated Rank’s view of creative will as “a possibility, a potential to change ourselves” that engenders “the transformation of life, the transcending, the metamorphosis of everything.”²⁰⁰ Nin derived the hope that “there is always a way out, there is always a way out through the creative will.”²⁰¹ It was evidently this form of finding a “way out” through creativity that Nin took from her analytic sessions with Rank. The manner in which she distanced herself from her diaries and reconsidered them while contemplating the development of her career and potential as a writer, suggests a nuanced amalgamation of both Rank and Lawrence’s theories of the creative. Nin formed intellectual connections between these two men who had significant impact on her: her understanding of themes in Lawrence’s literature are conflated with Rank’s

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ Esther Menaker, *Otto Rank: A Rediscovered Legacy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 39; 34.

¹⁹⁹ Tookey, *Anais Nin*, 74.

²⁰⁰ Nin, *A Woman Speaks*, 2; 128.

²⁰¹ Nin, *Incest*, 212.

psychoanalytic concepts when summarised and worked out into her own personal views in her diaries.²⁰²

Nin used the recuperative qualities of Rank's psychoanalytic contributions to her own benefit. Rank went from not only being her analyst, but also her teacher and lover from 1934 to 1936. Nin trained at the Sorbonne under him in 1934, and privately received her own patients when she moved with him to New York in 1935.²⁰³ Rank would provide a preface for *House of Incest*, to which we will now turn. A focus on the relation between literary writers and psychoanalysts provides key examples of connections between modernists who reciprocally developed theories of the psyche in relation to psychoanalysis's burgeoning concepts. Lawrence's work, which independently critiqued psychoanalysis outside of analysis, does not expand on such correlations and he did not undergo psychoanalytic therapy. These factors support a study of Nin's therapy with Rank as a crucial component to analysing how she comprehended her literal breach of the incest taboo and ultimately worked towards successfully redirecting her focus by completing *House of Incest*. However, and as will be argued in this chapter's concluding section, Nin's work with Rank also helped her to come to an independent view of her journals as paratextual material in creating her first work of fiction, and her eventual belief that they allowed her to partake in a form of creative dreamwork.

3.4 Revising Drafts of the Self in *House of Incest*

In 1935 Rank embarked on an American lecture tour, and Nin agreed to join him in New York. She brought with her the "much revised manuscript" of *House of Incest* that, at that point, did not have a definitive title.²⁰⁴ After arriving in the city Nin established herself in an adjacent room in his hotel at the Barbizon Plaza and from there she worked as his private secretary while taking on her own patients.²⁰⁵ Despite their initially positive reunion, a pervasive separation began to grow between them. In an

²⁰² Though beyond the scope of this present study, a rigorous exploration of the connections between Rank, Nin, and Lawrence would be fruitful given Lawrence's treatise on psychoanalysis, Nin's adoption of his works, and her analysis with Rank, who dedicated his life to studying the artist in relation to psychoanalysis.

²⁰³ Nin's references to the beginning of her training in analysis begin in *Incest*, 334; Nin's sessions with patients are detailed in Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 203–212.

²⁰⁴ Gunther Stuhlmann, "Foreword," *House of Incest* (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1994), xiii.

²⁰⁵ See Anaïs Nin, *Fire: From 'A Journal of Love,' The Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin (1934–1937)*, eds. Rupert Pole and Gunther Stuhlmann (London: Harcourt Brace, 1995), 49.

effort to mend the division they exchanged rings. Rank had long since resigned from Freud's inner circle, but he still wore the carnelian ring that Freud had given him indicating membership of that circle.²⁰⁶ After Nin arrived in New York, Rank presented the ring in exchange for one her father had given her bearing his coat of arms.²⁰⁷ The symbolic trade is described at the beginning of the third unexpurgated diary, *Fire*. Nin writes: "I cast off the tie with my Father. He [Rank] wanted to give me the ring Freud had given him. He wanted to cast off his father."²⁰⁸

Notwithstanding wanting to cast off her relationship with her father and her willingness to commit to a new stage in her life with Rank, Nin's own process of emollition grew to be steadfastly independent. Nin had resumed maintaining a diary and was coming to the conclusion that it could allow her to sculpt, through revision, a newly developed sense of self. It became an important creative outlet and resource, a form of personal, essentially paratextual material that she could draw from. Noting this, Rank invigorated his efforts in preserving their relationship by trying to insert himself into her new diary. He suggested that they write a "twin diary," with him writing on one page and her on another.²⁰⁹ For a short time, they were "both using twin diaries, exchanging them every week," where he wrote in hers, and she wrote in his.²¹⁰ This collaboration quickly dwindled as Nin grew impatient with Rank ("he is ordinary, vulgar, ugly, impossible")²¹¹ and she considered his "insistence on our twinship" as proof of his faulty, idealised view of her.²¹² She concluded that his method of "analysis is only another form of idealization" and, as she records, told him, "You analysed me—or created me—and then you wanted me exactly according to your ideal image—the potential me, *your* creation."²¹³

The issue, as Nin records it, was that Rank's ambitions in documenting the life of the creative had become inextricably fused to his now cloying attachment to her. In a particularly relevant passage, she writes:

²⁰⁶ See Phyllis Grosskurth, *The Secret Ring: Freud's Inner Circle and the Politics of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Addison Wesley, 1991).

²⁰⁷ Nin, *Fire*, 41.

²⁰⁸ Nin, *Incest*, 394.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 51.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 62.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, 51.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 37.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 37; 81–85.

Rank wants to live. I am joy, the body, expansion, and danger, movement, color. He craves a kind of suicide after having seen the ultimate error of all philosophies and systems of ideas. He is afraid of the truths he has discovered. They do not help to live. He has met me and he has lost his head...since I cannot have God, says Eduardo, I will have the analysts, whom the world considers as godlike men. As victories. As I took my father. But I don't give myself to them. I keep myself. How far can I be June to Rank?²¹⁴

Nin had begun to analyse herself separately from the insights that Rank had given her, and the last sentence in this passage shows that she returned to an identification with Miller's wife June Mansfield. Nin had previously admired June's ability to outwit and overpower through forms of self-invention, which had allowed her to remain indecipherable to the analysts by being "mostly unconscious."²¹⁵ Nin identified with Mansfield in her own ability to "cast veils" (ultimately creative lies) to outwit Allendy through methods more "clever than June's" as an artist.²¹⁶

The passage cited above also alludes to Nin's father's impulsive cry that he had "lost God" after they first had intercourse in Valescure a year prior.²¹⁷ Here her words suggest that she transferred (and therefore "doubled") encounters associated with her father into a revised articulation. She had "defeated" her analysts much like she had "taken" her father whom, characterised as close to God, she could now—presumably like June—outwit, beguile, and grow beyond. Her journal entries included in *Fire* suggest that she had come to a personal realisation that Rank, much like Allendy and her father, depended on *her* to act out their joint theories and fantasies, which in turn led her to home in on a belief that she could now emerge as a triumphant and true artist, the creator (rather than the creation) of every scenario. She writes: "all along I had been the one who had acted out and lived Rank's philosophy. I had tried all the roles (also, added Rank, the poetic expression of them in writing). I had been the actress."²¹⁸ In *Fire* she appears resolute in independently harnessing the numerous roles she had grown familiar with playing. When Rank confronted her concerning her sudden abandonment, "I could only say, 'And didn't I give you something in return?'"²¹⁹ In

²¹⁴ Ibid., 357.

²¹⁵ Nin, *Henry and June*, 13.

²¹⁶ Nin, *Incest*, 357.

²¹⁷ Ibid., 209; 384.

²¹⁸ Nin, *Fire*, 62.

²¹⁹ Ibid., 81.

determining she no longer needed Rank's direct guidance, she focused on becoming the subject he had dedicated his life to studying: a true artist.

Nin's method of writing and her awareness of herself undoubtedly changed as a result of Rank's influence, "the man who took away the diary from me as neurosis" also gave "it back to me as a unique work by his enthusiasm for it. He incites and inspires me to work."²²⁰ Despite ending her relationship with him she was aware of the work he had inspired in her, and she began to focus on completing the "much revised manuscript" that would become *House of Incest*. What is most notable, and what this chapter has explicitly focused on, is plotting how her methods as a writer evolved from a private diarist into someone who became intentionally aware of self-editing as a form of self-creation, and who grew to approach the methods of diary-keeping as a paratextual resource in conjunction with psychoanalytic insights. While she may have played the part of an actress with the analysts who had succumbed to her seductions and had literally lived the Oedipal scenario by experiencing its consummate ramifications directly, she now wanted to reorient her own focus. She wanted to turn her attention to more definitively honing concepts of experience, desire, and a dream language by directly writing from herself:

I don't want to spend a year of my life rewriting Rank's book on incest. I want to do my own writing. I am the writer and the artist for Rank—just as Henry was the writer for me and instead of me. But now I want to be all things myself. I want to be a world all to myself, because—well, I feel like it. I feel like playing all the roles.²²¹

Nin's efforts to become "all things herself," stands in contrast to her previous sense of self, enmeshed with the spectral presence of her father who had originally guided the narrative of her journals as an "act of charm."²²² Now, revisiting diary writing after her brief hiatus instigated by Rank, Nin was ready to re-approach the utility of diary writing as an important process in *writing* herself.

Nin's newly proclaimed sovereignty in "playing all the roles" indicates a defined sense of independence that threads together the roles she played in the diaries into the dream-

²²⁰ Ibid., 51.

²²¹ Ibid., 48.

²²² Cited in Tookey, *Anais Nin*, 117.

like narrative of *House of Incest*. Her alternative approach can be seen in the style of this markedly slim work of “fiction” that can as easily be called a prose-poem and a form of autobiographical dreaming. *House of Incest* was published in 1936 by Obelisk Press, a year before the same publisher would issue a deluxe edition of James Joyce’s final pre-publication fragments to the “dream text” *Finnegans Wake, Storiella as she is Syung*, which features his daughter Lucia’s last illustrations. An excerpt of *House of Incest* was also published in the modernist journal *transition* in May 1938 alongside Joyce’s last contribution of a pre-publication fragment of *Finnegans Wake*, which became chapter II.3 in the final published text in 1939. The sense of a nocturnal approach to language is one of the only things *House of Incest* and *Finnegans Wake* have in common. Joyce’s attitude towards psychoanalysis, as we will see in the next chapter, was largely avoidant despite numerous associations between his last work and psychoanalytic theory as well as concepts of dreaming and dream language. Conversely, Nin found an important and transgressive outlet in transfiguring aspects of her previous writings (from the journals, and from her book on Lawrence) into a narrative “dream-scape” where various textual impressions can be re-composed into alternative forms of language that mimic the process of the mind while asleep, in states of reminiscence or revelry. The task of “proceeding from the dream outward” became an adage for textual composition.

Like a number of scholars, Bair writes that *House of Incest* is the “primary source for everything fictional that followed in Nin’s literary career.”²²³ Nin called it “the seed of all my work” and her “double book.”²²⁴ Even though, at approximately fifty-one pages, it is quite short, the process of its completion was long and arduous. Its first iteration began in 1932. After meeting June, Nin was inspired to begin work on a manuscript she tentatively titled “Alraune,” taken from a nickname she had given June at that time.²²⁵ She called it her “June story,” though it came to a creative standstill around the same time she reunited with her father, began therapy with Rank, and briefly gave up her diaries while in analysis.²²⁶ The title of Rank’s work *Don Juan: Une étude sur le double* was at the forefront of Nin’s mind when she returned to the “Alraune” manuscript shortly after their first sessions. Nin was aware and noted that the first holiday with her

²²³ See Bair, *Anais Nin*, 157.

²²⁴ Cited in Tookey, “I am the Other Face of You,” 306. See Nin, *Incest*, 358.

²²⁵ Nin, *Incest*, 31.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, 277.

father in Valescure occurred during the feast of San Juan, and a second working title of *House of Incest* was “*Don Juan and His Daughter*.”²²⁷ This provisional title alludes to how the holiday with her father took place in the month of June, her father as a “Don Juan” character, and is a pun on Juan that connects to her ongoing preoccupation with June Mansfield. Reading an early, preliminary draft of “Alraune” in 1932, Miller critiqued the work as stylistically reproducing “the clotted, spangled phantasmagoria of neurosis,” though it seems by 1935 Nin had become more fluent in transforming that “spangled phantasmagoria” into prose by relying on a revised approach to her diaries to finish the manuscript.²²⁸ Nin writes that it was Rank “who made me finish the ‘Alraune’ manuscript,” which strongly suggests that his influence helped her to complete what became *House of Incest*.²²⁹

The material from the earliest drafts of the “Alraune” story, as well as lines from a number of her journal entries from 1932 when she first met June are incorporated into *House of Incest*, so it is clear that Mansfield features heavily in this text. For this reason, numerous scholars such as Tookey have focused on Nin’s identification with June as tantamount to understanding the content of the text. In Tookey’s analysis of *House of Incest*, she isolates narrative connections to Nin’s relationship with Mansfield, but in doing so does not analyse between the novella, the experiences Nin had with her father, and her analysis with Rank in completing it. Therefore, her study focuses on the role of June as the embodiment of a “double” for Nin: “I am the other face of you.”²³⁰

However, Nin’s father was also “the other face” of her “doubled” psychical reality, as described in relation to her work with Rank, which is detailed above. It seems clear that *House of Incest*, though incorporating June in the text, perhaps more definitively absorbs Nin’s attempt to sublimate her father’s grip as her “dark double,” while questioning the murky boundaries of identification, love, and desire.²³¹ Nin was processing her affair with her father while revising and adding to “Alraune,” and her preoccupation with June is “doubly” absorbed into a narrative indicative of Nin’s intent

²²⁷ Bair, *Anaïs Nin*, 318.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, 141.

²²⁹ Nin, *Fire*, 68.

²³⁰ “I am the Other Face of You” is a chapter in Tookey’s monograph on Nin, but also the title of a chapter she published in advance of the monograph. It is taken from an early statement in *Henry and June* with regard to some of Nin’s first meetings with Miller’s wife, yet, as argued here, no longer had the immediate relevance of this encounter as much as her affair with her father did.

²³¹ Nin, *Incest*, 365, author’s emphasis.

to “liberate myself of my subjugation to my father”: indeed, the text enacts such liberation.²³² Nin’s various developments and reiterations of the text, notably her augmentations during and shortly after her therapy with Rank, are perceptible additions. The volume gathers together the threads of Nin’s life experience while transforming them into her own voice, consolidating her encounters with June, her relationship with her father, and her desire for absolution and creative freedom in this short text that took her nearly three years to write.

The novella begins by importantly re-articulating some of her lines on Lawrence’s use of language in *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*. As discussed in beginning of this chapter, in that early text Nin first describes Lawrence’s ability to transcend ordinary values by pushing language beyond prescribed units of generalised meaning. We can recall how she writes that Lawrence uses language like a “sculptor” or “painter” to illustrate the “chameleonesque qualities of the eyes...sea water and rain on the body...colours of the day.”²³³ Similar lines appear in the opening sentences of *House of Incest*: “My first vision of earth was water veiled [...] my eyes are the color of water. I looked with chameleon eyes upon the changing face of the world, looked with anonymous vision upon my uncompleted self.”²³⁴ From the very beginning of the text, Nin establishes an engagement with her previous works, and the result signifies her “doubled” appropriation of an understanding of Lawrence’s works, coupled with the result of her analysis with Rank: impetus to reframe the “father story” into a work of fiction. It also suggests that transfiguring and transgression through a dream-like language can perhaps better represent an articulation of desire that ordinary language cannot accomplish.

Following the initial passages that re-appropriate sentences from her Lawrence book, the beginning of *House of Incest* alludes to Nin’s early years as a child. The text focuses on primary memories that most concern her father. In recalling that Nin did not anticipate her journals to be published, these words signify how she cultivates a hidden starting point of how the diaries began. The narrative zeroes in on the ship journey from Cuba to France via New York, when she first began the “letter” of her diaries for her father: “I sway and I float, stand on boneless toes listening for distant sounds, sounds

²³² Ibid., 304.

²³³ Nin, *D.H. Lawrence*, 63.

²³⁴ Nin, *House of Incest*, 3

beyond the reach of human ears, see things beyond the reach of human eyes. Born full of memories of the bells of the Atlantide.”²³⁵ Eventually, a “steel” necklaced protagonist arrives in New York as a woman (as Nin did in following Otto Rank to New York), who blends with the child who views the “steel of New York’s skeleton buried in granite, buried standing up.”²³⁶ The statuesque figure oversees a broad, personal, and temporal landscape: Nin’s first journey to the city as a child, her first instances of authoring the diary as a letter to her father, her return there as a woman, and the fact that New York was June’s native city. These blended allusions are guided by the author who is now their creator. In this way, Nin’s text goes back to the beginning of her diaries and collages the content of them up to that point to reclaim her memories. By turning the story into one that has now become her creative rendition of events, she uses a form of language that does not follow any semblance of a linear plot line. She guides the reader through shifts and turns that proceed as though in a multi-layered dream that transgresses formal structures of storytelling. However, familiarity with Nin’s biography shows just how much it represents an artistic depiction that is a crucial rewriting of the journaled “father story” pervasive in her diaries as a form of individuality and creative enterprise.

Nin’s use of dream-like prose harnesses a creative style that reverberates the features of her autobiography, her perceptions, and the people who defined her. This narrative approach also allows her to “play all the roles” in a multi-tiered story that indiscriminately blends timelines, impressions, and sensations.²³⁷ As the text progresses, a number of incidences recorded in her journals up to that point, which have been flagged in this chapter, appear within the text like objects floating to the surface of a sea that she wishes her writerly approach to convey. For example, when it bifurcates into a second section it recounts episodes of Nin’s time with June in early 1932. This section revolves around the narrator and a woman named Sabina who functions as “a masked personage, who is her shadow self.”²³⁸ This portion revisits a phrase quoted above that Nin had written after first meeting June in 1932, “her beauty drowned me,” by presenting it in this text towards character Sabina: “Your beauty drowns me, drowns

²³⁵ Ibid., 5.

²³⁶ Ibid., 8.

²³⁷ Nin, *Fire*, 48.

²³⁸ Nancy Scholar, “Anaïs Nin’s *House of Incest* and Ingmar Bergman’s *Persona*: Two Variations on a Theme,” *Literature/Film Quarterly*, 7. 1 (1979): 47–59.

the core of me.”²³⁹ In relation to June and her capacity to lie, discussed above, the text continues: “The truth would be death-dealing and I prefer fairy tales,” a quote familiar to what has been cited concerning Nin’s approach to lying as a creative and desirable approximation and alternative to the truth that she believed she had in common with Mansfield.²⁴⁰ While Mansfield’s influence, which deepened Nin’s idea of an all-powerful *femme fatale* as “amoral, unfettered, dramatically mysterious,” was the inspirational origin of the “Alraune” version of the text, it is evident where that segment of her life is left and another period of her life is picked up.²⁴¹

As the text continues, we leave a more positive aspect of the dream that describes the love between the narrator and Sabina and find ourselves in “a room with a ceiling threatening me like a pair of open scissors.”²⁴² Nin’s lines descend into echoes of her time with her father in the south of France. The room was “not even registered in the hotel book”—in other words, it was not publicly known.²⁴³ From here the prose grows darker, as the narrator describes “I jump out of bed and run out of this room growing around me like a *poisoned* web, seizing my imagination, gnawing into my memory so that in seven moments I will forget who I am.”²⁴⁴ The matter here, and its “poisonous” association, becomes further affiliated with desire run havoc—“desire which had stretched the nerve broke” that causes the narrator to “writhe within my own life.”²⁴⁵ In pursuing what might only be considered as the “*transgression of ordinary values*,” the text goes on:

In the House of Incest there was a room which could not be found, a room without a window, the fortress of their love...their love like the ink of squids, a banquet of *poisons*.²⁴⁶

These associations, much like Nin’s descriptions in *Incest* articulating her relationship with her father—“the love was a poison”—appear in passages in *House of Incest* through concentrated repetitions of the word “poison” in conjunction with a theme of

²³⁹ Nin, *House of Incest*, 12.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 24.

²⁴¹ Tookey, “I am the Other Face of You,” 307.

²⁴² Nin, *House of Incest*, 17.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 18.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 31, emphasis mine.

desire now stretched to its limit.²⁴⁷ Transgression beyond the break is depicted like squid ink, defensively cloaking and therefore veiling the self, much as she had perceived her diaries to have done. Similar to her journal entry concerning her desire to undergo analysis with Rank to seek absolution from her father, the text iterates: “I am enmeshed in my lies, and I want absolution.”²⁴⁸

Stuart Gilbert, friend and translator of Joyce’s work into French, wrote of *House of Incest* that the text implies how “each lover creates the being he loves, the loved one is a creation or a projection of the lover...he identifies with the loved one, and therefore this love of an unreal image is an act of incest.”²⁴⁹ In the text, another character, Jeanne, who appears separate from Sabina, professes “I love my brother” repeatedly, before the narrative changes to the first person “our love of each other is like one long shadow kissing, without hope of reality.”²⁵⁰ The narrator is then “led into the house of incest,” which is described as full of rooms chained together by deeply worn steps, and “no room was on a level with another.”²⁵¹ In this way, as Gilbert surmised, Nin transcribes in *House of Incest* a view of love and desire as a perpetual form of self-created identification with another, which in itself is a kind of incest. What this means on a textual level is that Nin transformed her literal encounters with her father, and with others whom she identified with and desired, into a broad metaphor for the experience of love as a form of doubling, splitting and conjoining that can be uniquely captured by dream-like language such as she evokes throughout the text. Emphasis on the dream is called out directly in its pages: “The dream! The dream! The dream rings through me like a giant copper bell.”²⁵² As we can recall from her text on Lawrence, Nin equated the body with a capacity for dreaming that signifies its innate and permeable forms of desire. Transcribing the dreams of the body into textual formulations was Nin’s equivalent of Lawrence’s allegorical writings on turning flesh into word.

This representation exceeds both ordinary value and reductive, psychoanalytic qualifications of a topographical unconscious with discernible and even reductive motivations. In creating the text as an alternative to the diary entries, Nin translated

²⁴⁷ Ibid., 210.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 24.

²⁴⁹ Ibid., xiv.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 30–31.

²⁵¹ Ibid.

²⁵² Ibid., 21.

instances of her reality into prose that, when not consulting the later unexpurgated diaries, appears as original and detached from the experiences she had. However, close attention to the various iterations of the diaries and her first work on D.H Lawrence shows that Nin used her previous writings as paratextual material in completing *House of Incest* with writerly intent.

This method began after her psychotherapy with Rank, and the text itself shows how her process of incorporating aspects of her previous writing allowed her to replace and reiterate her memories into alternative formulations. She could distinctly revise, as a process of personal self-editing, the origins of her father's impact on her into independent creativity that transmutes her previous material into important resources for *personal* revision. That is, paratextual self-editing is imbricated in the themes of ameliorating neurosis through imagination by revising the self in alternative forms of language. The use of language transgresses the ordinary much like its content, allowing her depth of voice in this first work. Indeed, in *House of Incest* the writer-narrator walks "into my own book, seeking peace" to merge various forms of splitting that mark diverse articulations of desire.²⁵³ Two disparate female characters within the text reach a unified resolution, and a sense of conclusive expulsion permeates the end of the novella that corresponds with how Nin has described the book: a reconstruction of her past, sowing the seeds of her work to follow. Its dissociative and disparate montage of events in her life represents an overcoming, as well as a preliminary beginning for her life as a writer: "she opened them [her hands] in a gesture of abandon and giving; she relinquished and forgave; opening her arms and her hands, permitting all things to flow away and beyond her."²⁵⁴

The dream-like structure of the text resembles how Nin would come to see her diary as a tool to examine the unconscious unfettered by traditional, psychoanalytic designations of this term. The theme of a double is absorbed in the unknown attributes of desire through a writerly transmutation, one that usurps and engages the double as a textual outlet for portraying desire through a self-directed story voiced from deep within the dream. Nin uniquely adopted psychoanalytic theory while engaging a number of its principals most strongly influenced by Rank's work on the artist with her own

²⁵³ Ibid., 36.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 51.

understanding of the artist developed in her work on Lawrence. In her later writings she continuously referenced the role of psychoanalytic themes in articulating her approach to the diaries. In 1942 she writes that the “diary must be unconscious and emotional, so I can get lost in it and can only regain my vision through the objective eye of another. Psychoanalysis is our only way of gaining wisdom because we do not have religion.”²⁵⁵ Her edited journals present a carefully edited, self-conscious portrayal of herself, offering a deceptively simple “masquerade” of a woman’s engagement with psychoanalysis at the height of its influence on literary modernism. The woman behind the words will undoubtedly become more exposed, and cross-textual significance become re-examined, as additional unexpurgated volumes of her diaries are published. While Nin’s diaries have been criticised at length for their performativity, this chapter has sought to show how a consideration of the unexpurgated volumes present a more nuanced, paratextual account of her use of literary process in relation to psychoanalysis. Her diaries are not spontaneous. Instead, they provide the complex record of artistic process of an author deeply influenced by imagination and creative will, who believed both could assist her in transforming neurosis stemming from her childhood into creative practice, in order to articulate alternative theories of desire and the body that dreams beyond the bounds of ordinary language.

Conclusion

After years in analysis, Nin described her diaries as that which “makes my life bearable,”²⁵⁶ and as a continuous affirmation that “the topsoil of our personalities is nothing.”²⁵⁷ The connection between Nin’s relationship with her father “from the point of view of a girl” that instigated the diaries, her analysis and intimate relationships with psychoanalysts René Allendy and most notably Otto Rank, and her ongoing dedication to incorporating psychoanalytic theory into creative, writerly practice shows how her works provide a unique contribution to the literary modernist canon and its engagements with the challenges of psychoanalysis.²⁵⁸

As much as her work as a diarist began as a letter to her father, Nin eventually saw the task of maintaining a diary as synonymous with creative will that deviated from Rank’s

²⁵⁵ Ibid., 130.

²⁵⁶ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 234.

²⁵⁷ Nin, *Mirages*, 307.

²⁵⁸ Nin, *Journals: Volume I*, 284.

understanding.²⁵⁹ As Harriet Zinnes writes, “Nin’s fiction is built upon dialectic, a tension between the outer and inner worlds.”²⁶⁰ It is only by reading the unexpurgated versions of her diaries, most notably *Incest*, that we can interpret and untangle the significance that psychoanalysis had on her in relation to her intertextual, writerly process and her ambition to connect such “inner and outer worlds.”²⁶¹ It is clear that for Nin psychoanalysis helped her to extricate herself from the “father” pattern through Rank’s concepts of “creative will” and his work on the artist, assisting her completion of *House of Incest* and a new approach to maintaining the diary. Yet the coordinates of psychoanalytic theory nevertheless confined her. She wanted to play “all the roles,” and even though she would continue to circulate around the story of her father, her process of “writing out” from within her own dreams became artistically self-defined as a process of artistry.²⁶² The method of textual editing, emendation, re-articulation, and collage coalesce is her contribution to literary modernism.

Nin’s writing represents a detailed textual journey of her attempts to depict and engage the relations between writing and the precarious revisions of the self through creative practice that could permeate regular consciousness. Beyond Lawrence’s concepts of blood consciousness and the pristine unconscious that she endorsed, as well as Rank’s theories of the artist and creative will, Nin carved her own understanding of the mind’s relationship to language in relation to her process-based approach to writing. Her use of language in *House of Incest* mimics a dream to engage the desires of the body beyond all units of ordinary value as a therapeutic and redemptive effort. Her writing oscillates between fiction and biography, signifying her ongoing imperative to transcribe her multi-tiered stories on the path of perpetually *becoming* an artist. Her focus on the dream, a categorisation that scholars have applied to James Joyce’s final text *Finnegans Wake*, uses style to navigate regions of the mind that are invisible to science. Her fertile methods centre on a re-transcription of the “father” narrative that defined her writing by recapitulating the value of language as a possibility for self-understanding and individualistic definition. As we turn to the next and final chapter of this dissertation, the focus on literary process becomes more rigorous and complex, and the focus shifts

²⁵⁹ Bruce Fink, *A Clinical Introduction to Freud: Techniques for Everyday Practice* (London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2017), 106. Applebooks Edition.

²⁶⁰ Harriet Zinnes, “Art, The Dream, The Self,” in *Anaïs Nin: Literary Perspectives*, ed. Suzanne Nalbantian (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1997), 52.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*

²⁶² Nin, *Fire*, 48.

from a daughter's attempts to understand her relationship to her father, to how Joyce sought to understand his mentally ill daughter, Lucia, within the pages of *Finnegans Wake*.

Chapter Four

James and Lucia Joyce: Recuperative Aesthetics and Literary Genetics

Everyday, precious, while m'm'ry's leaves are falling deeply on my Jungfraud's
Messongebook I will dream telepath posts dulcets on this isinglass stream...

—James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*¹

¹James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, eds. Finn Fordham, Erik Bindervoet, and Robbert-Jan Henkes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 460.19–23. References give page and line number.

Shortly before the publication of *Ulysses*, James Joyce's patron Edith Rockefeller McCormack encouraged him to undergo psychoanalysis with Carl Jung because of what she and others perceived to be his increasing mental instability.² Joyce describes declining McCormack's offer in a letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver, where he flippantly refers to Jung as "the Swiss tweedledum who is not to be confused with the Viennese Tweedledee, Dr. Freud."³ However, while Joyce may have been quick to disregard psychoanalytic therapy in relation to himself, his daughter, Lucia, spent approximately thirty-five years in institutional care, which included brief psychoanalysis with Jung in 1934. Lucia's first mental breakdown in February 1932 and her extensive treatments that followed dramatically altered the life of the Joyces and significantly influenced Joyce's fiction and, as this chapter argues, his attempts to both understand and facilitate the possibility of her mental recuperation. Joyce grew to see the task of completing *Finnegans Wake* as synonymous with helping to cure Lucia, and therefore proposed literature as an alternative to psychoanalysis.⁴

Unlike the headlong engagements with psychoanalysis in which both D.H. Lawrence and Anaïs Nin partook, this chapter examines how Joyce side-stepped psychoanalytic evaluations of his daughter. Instead, Joyce tried to understand and independently resolve some of the questions that psychoanalysis poses by focusing on the manifestations of Lucia's mental ill health through forms of literary engagement. Lucia was most commonly diagnosed as schizophrenic, and beyond financing her numerous medical and psychiatric treatments, Joyce believed he could uniquely understand her, and he took it upon himself to incorporate her artistic talents in several publications between 1932 and 1937. Using her illustrations in his work was central to his most direct efforts to stabilise her, and these intentions are marked by three collaborative publications. Lucia provided illustrations to the limited-edition re-publication of *Pomes Penyeach* (1932), and two of *Finnegans Wake*'s pre-book publications—*The Mime of*

² See Stuart Gilbert, ed., *Letters of James Joyce, Volume I* (New York: Viking Press, 1966), 166.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Jacques Mercanton recounts how Joyce equated the task of completing *Finnegans Wake* with curing Lucia during one of their conversations, in "The Hours of James Joyce," in *Portrait of the Artist in Exile*, ed. Willard Potts (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), 214; Paul Léon to Weaver cited in Finn Fordham, "James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* and Lucia Joyce's Breakdown" (PhD diss., Birkbeck, University of London, 1996), 58.

Mick, Nick and the Maggies (1934) and *Storiella as She is Syung* (1937) while she was under psychiatric care.

Attention to the aesthetic presentation of the pre-publication *Finnegans Wake* volumes provide ways to critically engage how Joyce's composition of the text, Lucia's psychiatric treatments, and his complex efforts to solve her condition through literary activity chronologically overlap. A draft-by-draft genetic analysis of *Finnegans Wake*, cross-referenced with biographical material, allows for an examination of how Joyce rejected psychoanalytic theory in order to understand his daughter's deteriorating mental health through the work of literary representation. Lucia's aesthetic contributions to the pre-publication fragments of *Finnegans Wake*, imperceptible when reading the final published text, are creatively woven into the book's compositional development over time. Her illustrative work not only signifies Joyce's attempts at facilitating artistic projects as a form of therapy; the illustrations also meaningfully engage textual content of segments of *Finnegans Wake*. When it became evident that her condition would most likely not improve, this chapter argues that Joyce eulogised Lucia at the end of the book in the epilogue commonly interpreted by scholars as Anna Livia's monologue. This chapter claims that the end of *Finnegans Wake* portrays an unresolved yet hopeful and recuperative conclusion to Lucia's condition through a memorialising depiction of the freedom of the text's daughter, Issy—"keys to. Given!"⁵ Considered in this way, what is considered to be literary modernism's most impenetrable work of fiction contains a biographical history wrought with psychological and aesthetic significance, contributing to a study of the meta-textual engagements between modernist literature and the prominence of psychoanalytic theory and practice in the early 20th century.

The chapter begins with a summary of Lucia's early life, an overview of scholarship on her, and her brief but intensely lived dance career that preceded her first major breakdown in 1932. It considers Joyce's early correspondence with Carl Jung concerning the analyst's preface to the third edition of *Ulysses* that same year, psychoanalytic readings of the text as a "dream book," and how Joyce deviated from clinical, psychoanalytic interpretations of his daughter. It examines Joyce's response to

⁵ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 628.6–9.

her first breakdown to demonstrate that her psychiatric and medical treatments that followed impacted Joyce's writing, visible through the collaborations between them. It considers Joyce's efforts in producing a deluxe re-publication of his poetry collection *Pomes Penyeach* featuring her illustrations, which were followed by the pre-publication volume *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies* for which Lucia designed the cover, first illuminated letters (letrines), and colophon. Lastly, it focuses on the final pre-book publication, *Storiella as She is Syung* that contains a single illuminated letter, signifying the end of Lucia's ability to contribute to Joyce's work. This volume was published in 1937 and its contents were heavily revised during one of Lucia's long-term hospitalisations at a sanatorium, Ivry-sur-Seine. The final section in this chapter argues that the narrative of *Storiella*, which was incorporated in chapter II.2 of *Finnegans Wake*, influenced how Joyce wrote the conclusion to the book. Genetic scholarship can show how the finale of *Finnegans Wake* represents Joyce's final, curative hopes for Lucia. What emerges from this reading is a recognition that, rather than directly engaging psychoanalytic theory, Joyce side-stepped its clinical principals, and in his strategy of avoidance he looked to tools most readily available to him (language and literary aesthetics), to try to understand, and potentially solve, his daughter's condition. Even though he could not cure her in writing his last contribution to literature, Joyce's complex efforts to try to comprehend and mitigate her condition are memorialised in the pages of *Finnegans Wake*.

4.1 Lucia Joyce: Literary Biography

Lucia was born in Trieste in Ospedale Maggiore on 26 July 1907.⁶ Finn Fordham describes that Santa Lucia, the patron saint of light or of the blind, is what Joyce had in mind when choosing "Lucia" as a name for his daughter.⁷ Joyce frequently associated her with Saint Lucia's day, 13 December. Appended to Lucia's name was Anna: the name of her maternal grandmother, the mother of Mary, and the saint whose day, like Lucia's birthday, is 26 July. Brenda Maddox's *Nora* points out that Lucia's names were first registered as "Anna Lucia, an inversion of the intended order that persisted for many years," recalling the name of Anna Livia, the maternal protagonist of *Finnegans*

⁶ Frequent biographical confusion surrounds Lucia's birth. For clarification see John McCourt, *The Years of Bloom: James Joyce in Trieste, 1904–1920* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 2000), 123.

⁷ Fordham, "Lucia Joyce's Breakdown," 6.

Wake returned to at the end of this chapter.⁸ When Lucia was born, Joyce's brother, Stanislaus, recorded in his diary that the Joyces were disappointed that their second child was a girl: "they had wanted a boy."⁹ However, Joyce's attitude that girls "are generally impudent little pieces" softened with Lucia.¹⁰ Richard Ellmann explains that she quickly won her father's affections; "he was especially fond of Lucia."¹¹

During the years the Joyces spent in Trieste, Joyce wrote two poems about her.¹² The first, "A Flower Given to My Daughter," was written in 1913. The poem is included in Joyce's collection of poetry *Pomes Penyeach*, which was first published by Shakespeare and Company in 1927, though *Pomes* would be reproduced in a deluxe edition featuring Lucia's artwork as a response to her first outburst in

1932.

A Flower Given to My Daughter

Frail the white rose and *frail*
Are the hands that gave
Whose soul is sere and paler
Than time's wan wave
Rosefrail and fair – yet *frailest*
A wonder wild
In gentle eyes thou veilest
My blueveined child.¹

The poem's content corresponds with a passage in Joyce's yet-undated prose-poem *Giacomo Joyce*.² A two-line paragraph in *Giacomo Joyce* reads: "A flower given by her to my daughter. Frail gift, frail giver, frail blue-veined child."³ Attention to these two lines shows how the passage expands in the poem: the two sentences from the prose-poem bracket the poem, in title and closing line. As indicated in the added emphasis,

⁸ Brenda Maddox, *Nora: The Real Life of Molly Bloom* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1988), 112.

⁹ Stanislaus Joyce, unpublished, *Triestine Book of Days*. Richard Ellmann Collection, McFarlin Library, University of Tulsa.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 447.

¹² For resources detailing Lucia's earlier years see Carol Loeb Shloss, *Lucia Joyce: To Dance in the Wake* (London: Bloomsbury, 2003), 37–63, and Fordham, "Lucia Joyce's Breakdown," 6–12.

¹ James Joyce, *Pomes Penyeach* (London: Faber & Faber, 1970), 10, emphasis mine.

² Categorising what *Giacomo Joyce* actually is as a text within the genetic dossier of Joyce's work is the subject of Shinjini Chattopadhyay's "Giacomonian Oxen: *Avant-texte* or Intertext?" in *James Joyce and Genetic Criticism: Genesis Fields*, ed. Genevieve Sartor (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 82–95.

³ James Joyce, *Giacomo Joyce*, ed. Richard Ellmann (Viking Press, 1968), 3.

the poem evokes an implicit reflection not unlike what a structural image reflected in a body of water does; the two stanzas are linked through the four “frails” that erect a “frail” and mirrored architecture within the poem. In contrast to *Giacomo Joyce*, the poem consciously pans our gaze towards the daughter; the second stanza draws our attention to its “veiled” and refracted close, making her its focus. These evocative and poetic details are mimicked in Lucia’s aesthetic presentation of the 1932 deluxe edition of the collection and will be discussed below.

The earliest stages of Lucia’s appearance in Joyce’s writing continue in the ways in which Joyce incorporated her in his works leading up to his composition of *Finnegans Wake*. Indeed, the 2006 discovery of the 1923 *Finnegans Wake* vignettes has shown that the book’s composition during 1922 and 1923 differs from what was previously thought, in ways that correspond with details concerning Lucia’s early biography. Sam Slote writes in “An Imperfect Wake” that the vignettes show how “Joyce went through a number of different versions of ‘Tristan and Isolde,’ including a vignette solely dedicated to an account of young Isolde.”⁴ What this means is that while many Joycean scholars had originally thought that the initial stages of *Finnegans Wake*’s composition focused on the character of paternal protagonist Humphrey Chimpden Earwicker (HCE) through figures such as Saint Patrick and King Roderick, the recent discovery of the National Library of Ireland vignettes have revealed that the figure of Isolde, related to the text’s daughter Issy, is equally valuable for studying *Finnegans Wake*’s genesis.

The preadolescent “wonder wild” in the second stanza of “A Flower Given to My Daughter,” anaphorically grows into the “*wonderwide*” character of Milly Bloom in *Ulysses*, and the poem’s depiction of her as a “blue-veined child” appears again in *Finnegans Wake* with reference to Issy, “Novarsome, my creature, blievent bleives.”⁵ Numerous intertextual examples plot how Lucia’s earliest appearances within Joyce’s fiction “grew-up” over time through an associative wordplay that developmentally evolves in his works. While much Joycean scholarship examines how Joyce was a “scissors and paste man” who made use of immediately available biographical content in his literature, approaching the question of just how much Lucia and her mental illness impacted his writing is embroiled in a contentious history, largely due to heavy

⁴ Sam Slote, “An Imperfect Wake,” in *Errears and Erroriboose: Joyce and Error*, ed. Matthew Creasy (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 140.

⁵ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 156.6.

copyright restrictions implemented by the Joyce Estate, and Stephen James Joyce in particular.⁶ Brenda Maddox's 1988 biography of Nora Barnacle, for example—which explores how Joyce's wife Nora influenced the character of Molly Bloom in *Ulysses* and Anna Livia Plurabelle in *Finnegans Wake*—was allowed to be published on the condition that Maddox remove her epilogue on Lucia, "Her Mother's Daughter."⁷ The draconian restrictions exercised by Stephen Joyce are infamous within the world of Joyce scholarship, and his resistance to biographical investigations of his aunt Lucia was made abundantly clear. At the annual Joyce Symposium in 1988, the year Maddox's biography on Nora was published, Joyce announced he had destroyed a trunk containing "a thousand" of Lucia's letters and some of her belongings, and he threatened legal action to deter any inclination to pursue research on her.⁸

Despite this loss of material and Stephen Joyce's threats, prominent Joyce scholar Finn Fordham completed a doctoral thesis on Lucia, "James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* and Lucia Joyce's Breakdown," at Birkbeck in 1998. While Fordham did not publish his thesis due to threatened legal action, its contents demonstrate the extensive connections between Lucia's biography, her mental illness, and the text of *Finnegans Wake*. Fordham's research provides biographical context that bolsters some scholarship that was, at that time, investigating Lucia's significance on *Finnegans Wake*. In the 1980s and 1990s, Joyceans such as Adaline Glasheen, Shari Benstock, Robert Polhemus, David Hayman, and Margaret McBride explored possibilities for how Lucia's diagnosed schizophrenia may have inspired the character of Issy in *Finnegans Wake*. Some of the first connections were made by Glasheen. In *The Third Census of Finnegans Wake* she tersely asserts her belief, under her entry on Lucia, that "Joyce observed his daughter's madness with care and interest and wrote about it with great power and bad taste."⁹ In her article "Girls from Boston, Mass." Glasheen elaborates that Morton Prince's study of Sally Beauchamp's multiple personality disorder in *The*

⁶ Joyce described himself as a "scissors and paste man" in a 1931 letter to George Antheil; see Gilbert, *Letters, Volume I*, 297. On the topic of biographical influence in Joyce's work, see in particular Morris Beja, *Joyce: A Literary Life* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1992) and Finn Fordham, "Biography," in *Joyce in Context*, ed. John McCourt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 17–26.

⁷ See Gordon Bowker, "An end to bad heir days: The posthumous power of the literary estate," *The Independent* (January 2012).

⁸ See Caryn James "Privacy a Burning Issue for Joyce's Grandson," *The Chicago Tribune* (August 1988), and D.T. Max's article on Stephen James Joyce's censorship of material on Lucia Joyce, "The Injustice Collector," *The New Yorker* (June 2006).

⁹ Adaline Glasheen, *The Third Census of Finnegans Wake: An Index of the Characters and their Roles* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 149.

Dissociation of a Personality provides “a model for Issy” who in particular “was meant to be a multiple personality.”¹⁰

Margaret McBride’s later article echoes Glasheen, particularly where she claims that “Joyce was usurping his child’s tragic situation as the inspiration for an insane (and oddly subordinate) creation [of Issy], who often seems merely to hover around the perimeters of the story.”¹¹ However, McBride additionally argues that in *Finnegans Wake* the character of Issy, and by proxy Lucia, is “the major player” in the book: “Issy may be narrating [the text].”¹² Though Fordham’s thesis on Lucia was not published, his emphasis on character Issy’s importance to the text in his 1998 dissertation strongly supports suggestions such as McBride’s and others that Lucia’s alleged schizophrenia, and her fictional representation in Issy, play an essential role in the dream-like and unconscious narrative quality of *Finnegans Wake*. Though the true scope of Lucia’s influence on the text still remains unclear, in Fordham’s 2012 introduction to the Oxford edition of *Finnegans Wake*, he reiterates his belief in her essential significance to the text, highlighting that the four old men in the text muse that Issy may be the key to the entire book, “the character around which everything in the book rotates.”¹³

While interest in Lucia and her influence on the stylistic dimensions of *Finnegans Wake* remained the subject of marginal yet significant scholarly debate in Joyce circles, the publication of Carol Shloss’s biography of Lucia in 2003 created public engagement and curiosity about Lucia. Shloss’s success at publication was the product of a drawn-out court battle with the Joyce Estate that culminated in her victory, one that received fairly substantial media coverage.¹⁴ In Shloss’s biography, *Lucia Joyce: To Dance in*

¹⁰ Adaline Glasheen, “*Finnegans Wake* and the Girls from Boston, Mass.,” *The Hudson Review* 7, no.1 (1953): 90. See also Robert Polhemus, “Dantellising Peaches and Miching Daddy, the Gushy Old Goof: The Browning Case and *Finnegans Wake*,” *Joyce Studies Annual* (Texas: University of Austen Press, 1994), 75–03, where Polhemus compares the sensationalised scandal of marriage between Peaches Browning (née Frances Belle Heenan) to Edward West “Daddy” Browning, thirty-five years her senior, to the character of Issy and Lucia.

¹¹ Margaret McBride, “*Finnegans Wake*: The Issue of Issy’s Schizophrenia,” *Joyce Studies Annual* 7 (1996): 149.

¹² *Ibid.*, 146.

¹³ Finn Fordham, “Introduction,” in Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, xix. See also Finn Fordham, “When Lightning Becomes Electra,” *James Joyce Quarterly* 39, no. 4 (Winter 2002): 655–678. In this article Fordham focuses on Lucia’s name, particularly by examining the connection between lightning, lux, and themes of eyesight and vision throughout *Finnegans Wake*.

¹⁴ See John Naughton, “Joyce and copyright: a nightmare from which publishers are now trying to awake,” *The Guardian* (June 2006) for a discussion of Shloss’s early engagements with Stephen concerning her intentions to publish a biography of Lucia, and Cynthia Haven’s “Stanford researcher gets

the Wake, she suggests that Lucia was Joyce’s muse and had a resounding impact on every aspect of Joyce’s literature. The biography also poses a number of speculative inferences, particularly that Lucia was incestuously abused, and that she was not actually schizophrenic—rather, she was artistically repressed by her mother Nora. Shloss’s tenuous hypotheses, along with the informal narrative tone used in the biography, has received negative criticism from Joyce scholars while, at the same time, generating public interest in Lucia.¹⁵ Instead of instigating renewed *scholarly* interest in Lucia and her impact on *Finnegans Wake*, Shloss’s depiction, combined with the expiration of copyright on Joyce’s works at the end of 2011, has catalysed an influx of fictional interpretations of Lucia’s life and influence on her father.¹⁶ Annabel Abbs’s fictional *The Joyce Girl* in 2016 makes much of incestuous possibilities between Lucia and her brother Giorgio and was one of the most widely read works of fiction in Ireland that year; Alex Pheby’s violent rendition of incestuous and medical abuse is offered in the award-winning *Lucia* (2018); Anne Vaught has recently published *Saving Lucia* (2020).¹⁷ These novels largely build upon the mysterious, elliptical speculations offered in Shloss’s biography, while taking creative license in broadly “imagining” the causes for Lucia’s mental illness and her treatment under psychiatric care. Shloss’s biography, as well as these novels, however imaginative, have also brought Lucia’s story into the domain of public dialogue on the history of psychiatric and psychoanalytic treatment of women, the repression of female artists, and the hidden dimensions of family abuse.

Given that this chapter aims to examine where psychoanalysis and modernist literature converge in the context of Lucia and James Joyce, it does touch on how themes of mental illness, psychoanalytic practice, and artistic process are incorporated in

six-figure settlement from James Joyce Estate,” *Stanford News* (September 2009) that details Shloss’s court battle and victory against Stephen Joyce.

¹⁵ Shloss’s portrayal of Lucia has been critiqued by many including myself; see for example John McCourt, “‘To Dance in the Wake’, Review of *Lucia Joyce: To Dance in the Wake* by Carol Shloss,” *James Joyce Quarterly* 41 (2003–2004): 249–254; Genevieve Sartor, “Genetic Connections in *Finnegans Wake*: Lucia Joyce and Issy Earwicker,” *Journal of Modern Literature* 41, no. 4 (Fall 2018): 18–30. That said, this chapter does include Shloss’s work because there are a number of areas in her research that are commendable, regardless of the narrative speculation that seems to have gotten away with itself. Her assertions that Lucia was molested by Giorgio, for instance, cannot be verified, yet her portrayal of sensitive topics such as this one frequently appears alongside other scandalous possibilities that cannot be confirmed.

¹⁶ Gordon Bowker’s article “An end to bad heir days: The posthumous power of the literary estate,” *The Independent* (January 2012) discusses the significance of Joyce’s work passing out of copyright.

¹⁷ I have reviewed both Pheby and Abbs’s texts. See Genevieve Sartor, “Flawed Fictions Don’t Write Her Back into History [Review]” 31 August 2016, www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/lucia-joyce-flawed-fictions-don-t-write-her-back-into-history-but-hide-her-truth-1.2774355; Genevieve Sartor, “In the Absence of Facts [Review]” <http://review31.co.uk/article/view/564/in-the-absence-of-facts>.

Finnegans Wake. However, while it refers to existing scholarship on Lucia by Fordham, Shloss, and others where appropriate, it seeks to circumnavigate speculative conjecture concerning what can only ever be hypothetical: namely, the ultimate cause of Lucia's breakdown, whether she was in fact schizophrenic, the possibilities of incestuous abuse in the Joyce household, and if the unconventional linguistic style of *Finnegans Wake* emulates the linguistic characteristics of her diagnosed schizophrenia.¹⁸ Instead, the focus here follows the same approach as in the previous chapters, in examining how Joyce's attitude towards psychoanalysis was challenged, in this case as a result of Lucia's ill mental health, and how this in turn is perceptible in the development of his writing. At the core of this argument is the idea that Joyce's representational, literary engagement with, and depiction of, mental illness side-stepped psychoanalytic concepts and Lucia's various psychiatric evaluations. Joyce largely avoided direct engagements with psychoanalytic theory and practice, but his daughter's erratic outbursts and need for institutional care caused him to independently engage questions of how to understand and solve her tragically untenable condition. His concern, puzzlement, and attempts to provide a solution to his daughter's erratic mental health are absorbed in the narrative seams of *Finnegans Wake*'s complex literary genetic history. In this way, he used the literary element that was latent within psychoanalysis from its Freudian origins as an alternative to psychoanalysis itself, as, in their own ways, did Lawrence and Nin: in the case of Lawrence, this involved considering his early texts, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*; in the case of Nin, her unpublished diaries; and in the case of Joyce, we have the archival repository of *Finnegans Wake*. Each of these, in their own way, constitute the psychoanalytic paratext of major literary works in their respective authors' *oeuvres*.

4.2. Lucia's Dance Career, First Breakdown, and Illuminated Letters

By examining the progression of Lucia's mental illness in relation to Joyce's writing process, we can see a fundamental connection between modernist fiction, aesthetic recuperation, and pervasive psychoanalytic treatments of the time. That Joyce avoided

¹⁸ Scholarship has engaged questions of whether or not incestuous abuse occurred between Joyce and Lucia, or Lucia and her brother Giorgio. For example, see Philip Kuberski, "The Joycean Gaze: Lucia in the I of the Father," *SubStance* 14, no. 1 (1985). Kuberski argues that Joyce channelled his incestuous desire for Lucia into his writing. See also Jen Shelton, *James Joyce and the Narrative Structure of Incest* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006). Shelton's monograph represents her belief that Joyce's writing functions incestuously through forms of wordplay, and she advocates the term "textual incest" to refer to the stylistic qualities of literary modernism more generally.

psychoanalytic theory as clinical practice is indicative of his choice to use the skill he knew best, language and literary aesthetics, in an attempt to understand the enigma of his daughter's behaviour. Archival research from the *James Joyce Archive*, cross-referenced with biographical material, can critically navigate how Lucia's condition and institutionalisations durationally impacted the narrative development of *Finnegans Wake*. The first of his efforts to help Lucia was to remove her from her first stay at a *maison de santé* and enlist her assistance in providing illustrations to the 1932 deluxe edition of *Pomes Penyeach*, a project rapidly devised with her rehabilitation in mind.

Several years after *Ulysses* was published, the Joyces were living in a *maison de famille* on the rue de l'Université. Lucia had begun a short but intense dancing career. Her foray into dance has been described in the scholarship, and in particular detail in Shloss's biography.¹⁹ A popular conception as to what instigated Lucia's first breakdown is thought to be the suppression of her artistic talent as a dancer, and therefore a cursory account is needed for considering events leading up to that breakdown. Contextualising it, while addressing Joyce's immediate response, will prepare for an analysis of Joyce's avoidant response to psychoanalytic theory and how Issy, herself a forlorn dancer in episodes of *Finnegans Wake*, was drafted into the text several years after Lucia abandoned her dance career.

Richard Ellmann writes that between 1926 and 1929 Lucia worked six hours a day, taking dance courses that lasted anywhere from three months to a year.²⁰ Rigorous training allowed her to be accepted for study at the Dalcroze Institute in Paris run by Dalcroze himself, followed by Margaret Morris in her school of modern dance, and later with Raymond Duncan at his school near Salzburg.²¹ These names indicate some of the leading avant-garde choreographers and dancers working in Europe at the time. That Lucia studied with them can be taken as indication of her focused dedication and the likelihood of talent. Lucia's skill at dance was consistently praised by those such as Dominique Maroger in "Lucia et la danse," and by Hélène Vanel, with whom Lucia studied. Vanel writes of Lucia in "Souvenirs de Lucia Joyce" with considerable enthusiasm: "elle était bien la fille spirituelle de James Joyce; elle était son prolongement. Elle était le seul élément sur terre qui soit son prolongement en dehors et

¹⁹ See Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 99–141.

²⁰ See Ellmann, *James Joyce*, 612.

²¹ See Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 99–107; 123–127.

en dedans de son oeuvre” [she was the spiritual daughter of James Joyce; she was his extension. She was the single element on earth that prolonged his existence, both inside and outside of his work].²² As Lucia’s acclaim grew she was interviewed by the *Paris Times*, and the article begins by stating “Lucia Joyce is her father’s daughter, she has James Joyce’s enthusiasm, energy, and a not-yet-determined amount of his genius.”²³ Around this time, and increasingly so, there is more information on Lucia that can allow us to cast a greater comparative examination of her life’s traumatic proportions in relation to developments in Joyce’s fiction.

In 1928 Lucia joined “Les Six de rythme et couleur,” a group of six female dancers who performed together at various events in Western Europe. Beyond working with a troupe, Lucia performed individually on a handful of occasions and gained special recognition for having choreographed and created costumes for each performance herself.²⁴ Her dancing career culminated in what would be her final solo performance, a competition at the Bal Bullier that her father and Samuel Beckett attended in 1929. Dancing to Schubert, Lucia presented herself in a costume that she had designed so that, as Joyce’s niece Bozena Delimata describes, “one leg was covered to the heel and the other came right through the costume, so that when she put one behind the other she created the illusion of a fish tail.”²⁵ Though Lucia did not win the competition, when the results were announced, the crowd flew into an uproar. A letter Joyce wrote to Weaver describes the event with pride: “a good half of the audience (not friends of ours) called out repeatedly “Nous reclamons l’irlandaise! Un peu de justice, messieurs!” [We choose the Irish girl! A little justice, gentlemen!].²⁶

Attention to the end of Lucia’s dance career is associated with retroactively comprehending what might have triggered the tragic turn in her mental health. Shloss argues that Lucia ended her career as a professional dancer because her mother Nora prompted her to give it up, catalysing an impending psychological unravelling.²⁷ In referencing ongoing family tensions between Nora and Lucia, she states Nora was

²² Hélène Vanel, “Souvenirs de Lucia Joyce,” in *James Joyce*, eds. Jacques Aubert and Fritz Senn (Paris: L’Herne, 1985), 85.

²³ Cited in Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 151.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 153.

²⁵ Bozena Delimata, “Reminiscences of a Joyce Niece,” *James Joyce Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (Spring 1981): 50.

²⁶ Gilbert, *Letters, Volume I*, 280.

²⁷ See Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 175–185.

jealous of her daughter and posits that Nora actively facilitated Lucia's decision to stop dancing. In support of this view, Shloss cites the unpublished autobiography of Helen Fleischman, Giorgio's first wife: "Nora was jealous of the attention Lucia was getting" and she "bullied until she got Lucia to give it up."²⁸ Conversely, Louis Gillet's daughter Dominique Maroger states that it was Joyce, and not Nora, who pressured Lucia to quit dancing. She recalls an exchange with Lucia: "'Mon père désapprouvait ma danse' devait nous confier avec une grande tristesse Lucia, comme on constate et comme on excuse un parti pris injuste" [My father disapproved of my dance, Lucia confided in us with great sadness, as one states and excuses an unjust position].²⁹ Fordham supports this possibility, describing how Lucia told her friend Stella Steyn that "her father had told her to give it up [dancing] and take up art instead."³⁰

However, on 19 October 1929, Joyce dictated a letter to Lucia addressed to Weaver, partly about Lucia, that suggests that the decision to quit dance could have simply been her own: "Lucia has turned down the Darmstadt offer [likely an offer for more dancing]... Lucia seems to have to come to the conclusion that she has not the physique for a strenuous dancing career."³¹ Joyce continued to Weaver, again through dictation to Lucia: "the result of which has been a month of tears and she thinks that she has thrown away 3 or 4 years of hard work and is sacrificing a talent."³² In interpreting the contents of this letter, Shloss writes: "On *exactly the same day*, Joyce had marked as ready for press a proof for *Tales Told of Shem and Shaun*."³³ Though Shloss's reading seeks to prove that Lucia having quit dance directly corresponds to the textual genesis of this section in *Finnegans Wake*, the information she provides is incorrect. *Tales Told*, one of four pre-book fragments of *Finnegans Wake* published in advance of the full text, had already been published by Black Sun Press on 9 August 1929, roughly two months prior to the Weaver letter.³⁴ That is, it is impossible that the volume *Tales Told of Shem and Shaun* could have aligned with the contents of the Harriet Shaw Weaver letter, and therefore the argument that Shloss puts forth is not possible.

²⁸ Fleischman cited in Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 180–181.

²⁹ Dominique Maroger, "Dernière Rencontre avec Lucia," in Aubert and Senn, *James Joyce*, 73.

³⁰ Fordham, "Lucia Joyce's Breakdown," 21.

³¹ Gilbert, *Letters, Volume I*, 285.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 428, author's emphasis.

³⁴ John J. Slocum and Herbert Cahoon, *A Bibliography of James Joyce* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1971), 48–49.

Shloss cites as her source the contents of the Weaver letter itself: it describes Joyce marking for press a proof for *Tales Told*, yet her information here is likewise impossible. In the letter the only material Joyce mentions finishing is a fragment for *transition*. Presumably Joyce meant the upcoming November 1929 piece for the eighteenth issue of *transition*, as there was no fragment published in the following issue (1930–31). As such, what we can see is that Shloss mistook proofs for the pre-publication volume of *Tales* (I.6 in *Finnegans Wake*) for a fragment that was prepared for *transition* from an altogether different section, III.4. It took Joyce nearly two decades to compose *Finnegans Wake*, and we can track the drafts of the text, which includes the various stages of the book’s pre-publication materials. Before *Finnegans Wake* was published in its entirety, four segments were published as separate volumes and seventeen segments were serialised in *transition*, allowing for fairly precise, accurate dating that can be cross-referenced to a reading of Lucia’s biography.³⁵ This permits a process-driven examination of how and where she featured in his work, thus making more convincing the argument for whether her breakdown and psychoanalytic treatment influenced his literature.

Although Shloss’s reading is inaccurate, it is understandable why she wanted to make the connection. Content in “The Mookse and Gripes” section of the pre-book publication *Tales Told of Shem and Shaun*, as it appears in the final published text of *Finnegans Wake*, is similar to the content of the Weaver letter. Like Joyce’s account of Lucia, the relevant section in *Finnegans Wake*—I.6—describes Novoletta or Nuvoluccia, one of Issy’s avatars, who has “cancelled all her engauzements” and feels “a thousand tears had gone eon her and come to her” as she was “stout and struck on dancing” and felt “as though her heart was brook.”³⁶ Still, it is more convincing to analyse how the end of Lucia’s dance career is represented in another section of the book, one where Lucia provided illustrations: *The Mime of Mick, Nick, and the Maggies*, which is turned to below.

For now, the reasons why Lucia abandoned her dancing career remain uncertain. However, it continues to be a focus in the scholarship on her because it is thought to

³⁵ For a detailed account of the pre-publication fragments of *Finnegans Wake*, see Dirk Van Hulle, *James Joyce’s ‘Work in Progress’: Pre-book Publications of Finnegans Wake Fragments* (New York and London: Routledge, 2016).

³⁶ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 159.8–17.

have been a significant contributing factor for her first major breakdown in February of 1932, particularly for Carol Shloss. Similarly, dance historian Deirdre Mulrooney has recently suggested that had Lucia been allowed to continue her dance career, she might not have had a breakdown, which she explores in relation to the topic of feminism and the institutionalisation of “eccentric” female artists more broadly.³⁷ However, given that Lucia had given up dancing two and a half years prior to her first recorded breakdown, several other factors are worth considering. Between October 1929 and February 1932, Nora had been diagnosed with cancer, and, during her treatment, Joyce stayed in hospital with her. Thus, Lucia had to live with Giorgio and his new wife Helen Fleischman. News of her brother’s affair and subsequent marriage was swiftly followed by Lucia’s recognition (prompted by her parents’ belated marriage in 1931) that she was technically illegitimate.³⁸ The news caused a public scandal and is caricatured in *Finnegans Wake*: “the old sniggering publicking press and its nation of sheepcopers about the whole plight troth between them.”³⁹

Biographical literature on Lucia uniformly describes her first major outburst: on 2 February 1932, she threw a chair at her mother during her father’s 50th birthday party.⁴⁰ Lucia’s tantrum not only took place on the night meant to mark Joyce having turned a half-century old; what has received less attention is that the evening was also a celebration commemorating the ten-year publication anniversary of *Ulysses*. In volume 21 of *transition* an entire section, “Homage to James Joyce,” is dedicated to the occasion. Focus on such details allows us to envision just how large and indeed monumental the night would have been, and a consideration of it provides a fuller imaginative context for understanding how the impact of Lucia’s behaviour that evening brought the party to, at the very least, a temporary halt. Of immediate consequence was that her brother, Giorgio, probably in front of a large number of guests, including those involved in *transition* and her romantic interest Samuel Beckett, took her to a *maison de santé*.

³⁷ Deirdre Mulrooney, “The Lost Story of James Joyce’s Daughter as a Parisian Dancer,” *The Irish Times*, June 21, 2018, <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/stage/the-lost-story-of-james-joyce-s-daughter-as-a-parisian-dancer-1.3534604>.

³⁸ Maddox, *Nora*, 265.

³⁹ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 229. 8–10.

⁴⁰ Ellmann, *James Joyce*, 646.

Fordham describes that Joyce's distress at this event can only be signalled from a long letter written to Harriet Shaw Weaver on 6 February 1932, though "she destroyed this as it was too personal."⁴¹ Therefore, although stipulating that what prompted Lucia's first breakdown remains a focus in the scholarship and recent published fiction inspired by her story, it is impossible, because of the lack of available information, to provide a firm answer of what caused it. Fordham points out that Lucia had not displayed any unusual symptoms indicating that she was schizophrenic or bi-polar prior to this breakdown, and later records describe that she "pretended" to be insane.⁴² Though, and again, arguing for whether Lucia's outburst represented an indication of schizophrenia, or simply the frustrated tantrum of a young woman, is quite futile. What can definitively be known is that the event marks a significant turning point in the Joycean biography, and, as argued here, the composition of sections in *Finnegans Wake*. Lucia's behaviour drastically altered the future of her life and her relationship with her father both personally and in his writing. As Ellmann describes, "the next seven years of Joyce's life were pervaded by a frantic and unhappily futile effort to cure her...it seemed to him that her mind was like his own, and he tried to find evidence in her writing and her drawing of unrecognised talent."⁴³

Joyce quickly had Lucia removed from the *maison de santé* to return to live in the Paris flat, and promptly engaged her in work on illuminated letters that between them they called "lettrines." Joyce evidently viewed artistic production as a therapeutic activity, and it is clear that his efforts were not only an attempt to stabilise Lucia, but to also give her a vocation through her illustrative talents. He put considerable energy into producing and promoting a deluxe edition of *Pomes Penyeach* so that her illustrations would be published. At this time Joyce was also engaged in correspondence with Carl Jung. The analyst sent Joyce a final draft of the preface he had written to the third German edition of *Ulysses*. In the preface Jung relays his opinion that *Ulysses* provides "an example of the schizophrenic mind" and that it could be "read as easily backwards as forwards."⁴⁴ Joyce took enough offence to Jung's description that it was revised, and Jung sent a new version to Joyce along with a personal letter. Though apologetic, this

⁴¹ Fordham, "Lucia Joyce's Breakdown," 26.

⁴² Extensive study of Lucia's diagnosis as bipolar and schizophrenic appears in Fordham, "Lucia Joyce's Breakdown," 119–135.

⁴³ Ellmann cited in Hayman, "Shadow of His Mind," 66.

⁴⁴ Ellmann, *James Joyce*, 642.

letter retains Jung's view that *Ulysses* "presents the world with an upsetting psychological problem" that he could not understand.⁴⁵

That Jung made it clear that he could not fully comprehend Joyce's work, and associated it with schizophrenia, is perhaps why Joyce would reject later diagnoses of Lucia as schizophrenic. The issue appears to be one of understanding: if analyst Carl Jung could not understand Joyce's literature, and qualified it as the product of a schizophrenic mind, how could psychoanalysis accurately understand Lucia, who would be diagnosed as schizophrenic? Joyce believed that he was uniquely able to understand Lucia because, as Ellmann states, he thought "her mind was like his own," and he defended her on the basis of that belief.⁴⁶ Joyce's efforts to understand Lucia demonstrate that he believed he could comprehend what analysts could not, and instead he independently used literature and aesthetics as an alternative to psychoanalysis.

Due to an increasingly tragic set of circumstances, two years later Lucia would be under the care of Jung at Küsnacht. But at this time, Joyce centred his attentions on promoting and encouraging Lucia's work on the *Pomes* collection; he believed her creative work would be therapeutic, perhaps supplement the disappointing end of her dance career, and avoid the need for psychiatric care. Hayman qualifies that Joyce's efforts to find "analogues for Lucia's personality and to normalise her deteriorating condition" were meant to constitute "a sort of self-therapy."⁴⁷ That Joyce believed this to be the case is evident in his significant efforts on promoting and paying for the deluxe volume. He first secured publishers in Jack Kahane and Desmond Harmsworth at the Obelisk Press and was required to underwrite the production costs and find subscribers for the expensive edition: 1000 French francs or £12 apiece.⁴⁸ Joyce paid out of his own pocket for the collection and was persistent in gathering subscriptions throughout the summer of 1932. He showed Lucia's designs to Edmund Brauchbar, a silk merchant, in the hope that they might be used for fabric design. He sent some of her lettrines to Daniel Brody, an editor at Rheinverlag, as well as the German publisher of *Ulysses*, who in turn

⁴⁵ Ellmann, *Letters, Volume III*, 253.

⁴⁶ Ellmann cited in Hayman, "Shadow of His Mind," 66.

⁴⁷ Hayman, "Suspect Dreams," 148.

⁴⁸ See Van Hulle, *Work in Progress*, 189–190.

forwarded them to a German wallpaper company.⁴⁹ He then arranged to send a copy of the completed book to H  l  ne Vogt, the daughter of his Z  rich eye surgeon.⁵⁰

The collection came out in September 1932, though the original aim was for it to be ready by Lucia’s twenty-fifth birthday at the end of July. What the volume explicitly conveys can be uniquely understood when it is viewed in material form. Joyce’s collection of poems transformed from the small brown chapbook of its original publication into a luxurious volume; in the large deluxe edition his poetry is typed on translucent tissue that, when lifted, exposes an illuminated letter—lettrine—and a facsimile of the corresponding handwritten poem. These are printed on nine loose folio sheets of thick Japanese paper (called nacre or iridescent Japanese vellum), folded in on each other. The interlaid translucent tissue and its typed text required a stencil process called *pochoir*. Joyce explained to Frank Morley on 10 November 1932 that the process could “be done only in Paris and even here only by two or three firms.”⁵¹ Joyce signed the editions, and they are held in a sage-green silk casting with the title written in gilt on its front cover.

The collection is visually stunning, and it is quite clearly a labour of love. But beyond the aesthetics that emphasise Joyce’s efforts and expense on the volume, its format shows an additional, subtle dedication to her work; the volume’s compositional model imaginatively connects with the lettrines. Lucia’s thirteen “illuminated” letters are tacitly accentuated by the process of “illumination” that the reader experiences when turning over a translucent sheet to bring them into clear view. This is likely why Joyce enlisted the stencil work he had explained to Morley as difficult to obtain: he wanted the translucent tissue to veil Lucia’s lettrines before revealing or “reflecting” the facsimile. The number of poems and lettrines—13 in total—are further engaged in a subtle form of mirroring by the reversal of the number of copies produced: twenty-five copies and six *hors commerce* were issued, totalling 31.⁵² All this work was ostensibly done in service for a deluxe edition of one of Joyce’s lesser works; however, it was at

⁴⁹ Catherine Fahy, ed., *The James Joyce–Paul L  on Papers in the National Library of Ireland: A Catalogue* (Dublin: Library, 1992), 1–7.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Ellmann, *Letters, Volume III*, 266.

⁵² Van Hulle, *Work in Progress*, 189.

the very least a round-about way of accomplishing such an end, which suggests that the effort was primarily directed to Lucia in the aftermath of her breakdown.

Much like examining how D.H. Lawrence's psychoanalytic essays allows for a renewed analysis of the way psychoanalytic theory impacted his fictional texts and how Anais Nin's editorial process on her own diaries show her complex, therapeutic process, we can analyse Joyce's aesthetic engagement with his daughter by referring to peripheral, written material. In focusing on the paratextual repository surrounding Joyce's work on *Finnegans Wake* and biographic material concerning Lucia's ill mental health, her impact on his work elucidates alternative meanings. In the case of the *Pomes Penyeach* volume, it is apparent that this text was a direct response to her first mental outburst and Joyce's first efforts to use aesthetic activity as an antidote to her unstable behaviour. But—and perhaps more importantly—we can also see, by focusing on the genetic activity that precedes the final publication of *Finnegans Wake*, how her aesthetic contributions to the text imaginatively tie into his work. The reflective attention focuses on Lucia through a parlay between the volume's material qualities and its poetic, literary content.

In the *Pomes Penyeach* volume, the thirteenth poem “Tilly” evokes the phrase “twelve and a tilly,” which indicates a bonus or an extra to a total count. The feature of an “extra,” much like reflection and mirroring present in the duality that Issy's figure represents in *Finnegans Wake*, marks this persistent theme in relation to Lucia. The connective nuance dates back to “A Flower Given to My Daughter,” given that the poem is included in this collection whose composition presents the qualities of mirroring or reflection. Such correlations gain in complexity: the numbers, the material volume, and the collaboration between Lucia and Joyce begin to provide an inferential logic that continues in work to follow. Forms of “linking,” particular to Lucia and to her appearances in *Finnegans Wake* that are understood retroactively through attention to her art and presented in several of the pre-book volumes, provide tools for navigating the final text within its pre-publication repository.

On September 28, shortly after the collection had come out, Joyce wrote to his brother Stanislaus: “Lucia's book is out and is exquisite.”⁵³ Of the letrines, Louis Gillet would

⁵³ Ellmann, *Letters, Volume III*, 260.

write in the preface for *Chaucer ABC*—an alphabetical collection for which Joyce had again commissioned Lucia to provide illustrations—“they were like insects, weird flowers, butterflies of unknown species thrown onto the page and about to fly away.”⁵⁴ Yet the *Pomes Penyeach* collection did not sell well, despite Joyce’s significant labours. A prospectus issued by Harmsworth in the autumn of 1932 notes that five copies remained unsubscribed, and Kahane was still advertising the book for sale in Paris as late as 1936.⁵⁵ Joyce hid news of *Pomes*’ lack of commercial success from Lucia; he sent her 1000 francs through Kahane as “royalties” that, in actuality, never accrued. Joyce pressed on; he sent copies to T.S. Eliot, to Frank Morley at Faber and Faber, one to Hubert Foss at Oxford University Press, and still another to his own agent, Ralph Piner, while giving one to the Bibliothèque Nationale.⁵⁶ Joyce wrote to Frank Budgen in October 1932, referring to the book, as he had to Stanislaus several months before, as Lucia’s: “I wish you and Sargent could see Lucia’s book of lettrines at Harmsworth’s shop [...] if you like them as I know you will a line would please her greatly.”⁵⁷

Joyce’s efforts to gain some popularity for Lucia, commercially as well as through artistic recognition, makes his dedication to his daughter clear. But it also shows his attempts to find a way to help her through forms of aesthetic self-creation; he believed creative process could mitigate signs of her psychological ailments that he sought to understand. However, Lucia’s behaviour steadily grew more violent and uncontrollable. During the summer of 1932, Lucia was taken to a clinic in L’Hayë-les-Roses where she was put under the care of Dr. Maillard. Here she composed seven lettrines for *Chaucer ABC*, the series of illuminated letters spanning the alphabet meant to be a present for her 29th birthday. It was also at L’Hayë that she first began to be evaluated as schizophrenic.⁵⁸ In response to the possible diagnosis, Joyce “smuggled Lucia and her nurse out of the clinic” to “thwart the doctors,” and she was moved to Feldkirch to stay with the Jolases.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ *Chaucer ABC* has no page numbers. It seems worthy of note that in commissioning Lucia’s work for providing illuminated letters to the alphabet is that he could hide his name and thus his involvement.

⁵⁵ See Neil Pearson, *Obelisk: A History of Jack Kahane and the Obelisk Press* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007), 419.

⁵⁶ Fahy, *James Joyce—Paul Léon Papers*, 26.

⁵⁷ Ellmann, *Letters, Volume III*, 261.

⁵⁸ Gilbert, *Letters, Volume I*, 321.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*; Fordham, “Lucia Joyce’s Breakdown,” 28.

Joyce's resistance to psychoanalytic theory or other forms of psychological assessments practiced at the time demonstrate an interesting bifurcation. On the one hand, he rejected psychoanalytic evaluations of both himself (such as in his rejection of analysis with Jung offered by Edith Rockefeller McCormack in 1921) and of his daughter, whom he would place and remove from psychiatric care dozens of times. Yet, as he moved Lucia from sanatoriums to various *maisons de santé*, to household friends and back again, he had to engage in psychoanalysis's theoretical relevance at analysing literary texts, including his own serialised excerpts of *Finnegans Wake*, then called "Work in Progress," in *transition*.

4.3 Psychoanalysis, Literary Genetics, *The Mime*

Interpretations of *Finnegans Wake* in relation to psychoanalytic theory dates back to William Carlos Williams's 1929 contribution to *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination*. The multi-authored, collaborative volume defends the unconventional style of the serialised segments of "Work in Progress" that had appeared in *transition*. In his article for *Our Exagmination*, Williams refers to Rebecca West's 1928 Freudian reading of *Ulysses*, and denounces what he calls West's "descent to Freudian expedients of classification;" he labels her psychoanalytic interpretation of *Ulysses* as "a mark of defeat" to caution against similar readings of "Work in Progress."⁶⁰ Jean Kimball's *Joyce and the Early Freudians* recounts that "as late as the 1973 Joyce Symposium in Dublin, when Maria Jolas was asked about Joyce's attitude towards Freud and Jung, Jolas responded that "it was a remarkable sign of his intelligence that he didn't fall for psychoanalysis when it was so current. He started beyond it."⁶¹ Similarly, Joyce's friend and fellow author Italo Svevo remarked that Joyce "knew nothing of psycho-analysis ... [which] thus cannot boast for having fathered Joyce's work."⁶²

Richard Ellmann conversely states that the effect of psychoanalytic literature on Joyce "can hardly be overstressed," and surmises that Joyce must have recognised "at once

⁶⁰ William Carlos Williams, "A Point for American Criticism," in *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination* (London: Faber and Faber, 1929), 179.

⁶¹ Maria Jolas cited in Jean Kimball, *Joyce and the Early Freudians* (Florida: University Press of Florida, 2003), 10.

⁶² Italo Svevo cited in Rose Maria Bosinelli, "The Importance of Trieste in Joyce's Work, with Reference to His Knowledge of Psycho-Analysis," *James Joyce Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (Spring 1970): 181.

that he had here a new continent.”⁶³ This view has been particularly adopted in critical literature on the subject of *Finnegans Wake* and dreams. The idea that *Finnegans Wake* is a night text or represents a dream narrative largely began, as Derek Attridge writes in *Joyce Effects*, with Edmund Wilson.⁶⁴ In December 1929, Wilson provided an essay for *The New Republic* which described “Work in Progress” as

...a sort of complement to *Ulysses*; Joyce has said of it that, as *Ulysses* deals with the day and with the conscious mind, so his new work is to deal with the night and with the subconscious. The whole of this new production is apparently to occupy itself with the single night’s sleep of a single character.⁶⁵

Despite Wilson’s implied authority—that Joyce had conveyed to him that sleep and the “subconscious” are at the heart of the text’s meaning—Attridge points out that there is “no evidence that Joyce had communicated any clues to Wilson about *Work in Progress*.”⁶⁶ Still, Wilson maintained the qualification in 1931: in *Axel’s Castle* he writes that the book immerses its reader into “the consciousness of the dreamer itself.”⁶⁷

Wilson’s contemporaneous view of “Work in Progress” as representative of a dream persisted while gathering additional allusions to Freudian theory, such as in Harry Levin’s early review:

The dream convention is Joyce’s license for a free association of ideas and a systematic distortion of language. Psychoanalysis insinuates its special significances into his calculated slips of the tongue. Under cover of a drowsy indistinctness and a series of subconscious lapses, he has devoted a diction that is actually alert and pointed, that bristles with virtuosity and will stoop to any kind of slapstick. His neologism is the joint product of three types of verbal wit that Freud has discriminated—condensation, displacement, allusion.⁶⁸

⁶³ Richard Ellmann, *The Consciousness of Joyce* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 54.

⁶⁴ For a succinct study of how Wilson influenced the trend of reading *Finnegans Wake* as a dream text, see Derek Attridge, *Joyce Effects: On Language, Theory, and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 144–146.

⁶⁵ Edmund Wilson, “James Joyce,” *The New Republic* 61 (18 December 1929), 91.

⁶⁶ Attridge, *Joyce Effects*, 145.

⁶⁷ Edmund Wilson, *Axel’s Castle* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1969), 234–235.

⁶⁸ Harry Levin, *James Joyce* (London: New Directions, 1960), 185. The chapters on *Finnegans Wake* in Levin’s book (originally published in 1941 and revised in 1960) are based on the review that was published in 1939 in *New Directions in Prose and Poetry*, but the review is much shorter. An abridged version of the review is in *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage, Volume 2: 1928–1941*, ed. Robert H. Deming (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970), 693–702.

What is interesting to note is that Joyce approved of Levin's review and later thanked him for it, suggesting that he endorsed, at least to a point, interpreting Freudian concepts such as condensation, displacement, and allusion in his work.⁶⁹ Indeed, in David Hayman's *The Wake in Transit* he describes that Joyce was not averse to implementing a study of his own dreams within the text: "Joyce was not above participating in the general enthusiasm for dreams as keys to unlock the psyche."⁷⁰

However, when it comes to Lucia, Joyce seems to have been adamant that psychoanalytic assessments of *her* were off limits. When Joyce found out that she was diagnosed as schizophrenic at L'Hayë, he may have associated it with Jung's claims that *Ulysses* was the product of a schizophrenic mind. It certainly appears that, although Joyce was open to psychoanalytic readings of "Work in Progress," he was against interpretations of himself and his daughter. Therefore, scholarly debates concerning whether or not there is evidence Joyce took psychoanalysis seriously in the construction of his final text are ultimately separate to how Lucia's direct involvement in psychoanalytic *practice* fed into his work. In Joyce's efforts to help Lucia is an ongoing attempt to understand her independently (without recourse to psychoanalytic doctrine) and to provide solutions to her ailments on the basis of that understanding. In evading the potential relevance of psychoanalytic theory and practice in relation to Lucia's manifest illness, Joyce turned to language to attempt to understand and solve what ailed her. While we examined the aesthetic project of *Pomes Penyeach*, the pre-book publication *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*, where Lucia once again provided illustrations, shows where his composition of content in *Finnegans Wake* corresponds with problems she was having at this time. A comparative study of biographical material and contents in the *James Joyce Archive* and *transition* can document how draft stages, revisions, and pre-publication fragments of *Finnegans Wake* correspond with Joyce's numerous attempts to "cure," solve, or at the very least mitigate Lucia's increasingly erratic behaviour.

In this instance, and increasingly so, paratextual analysis and literary genetics helps to examine how Joyce used writing as an alternative to psychoanalytic theory in his understanding of his daughter. Genetic criticism allows for a process-based

⁶⁹ See Ellmann, *James Joyce*, 723.

⁷⁰ David Hayman, *The Wake in Transit* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 140.

methodology that is useful in comprehending Lucia's significance in relation to *Finnegans Wake*. Joyce scholars in particular have used genetic scholarship to derive and highlight connective meaning in Joyce's complex textual repository. The publication of the *James Joyce Archive* in 1978 marks the introduction of genetic criticism to Joyce studies. The paratextual resources that it provides has generated a wave of genetic scholars specialising in Joyce, such as Vincent Deane, Daniel Ferrer, Geert Lernout, Laurent Milesi, and Jean-Michel Rabaté. These names indicate pioneering figures who have demonstrated how a focus on the developmental complexity of Joyce's works are of consequential importance for Joyce criticism. However, and although all of these scholars have pursued the impact of Joyce's process as essential to reading the final "product" of his texts, little genetic work has been done on Joyce and Lucia—a point that will be focused on in the final section of this chapter. As we shall increasingly see, genetic scholarship on Joyce has poorly conveyed how Lucia bears importance on Joyce's work. It is argued here that not only does Lucia bear significant genetic import on *Finnegans Wake*, a study of his efforts surrounding the publication of this text through a literary, genetic methodology allows us to better understand his personal approach to psychoanalysis and use of literature as a supplemental form of curative practice.

Focusing on the first pre-book publication of *Finnegans Wake* for which Lucia provided artwork, *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*, shows how Joyce's anxieties concerning Lucia increased between 1932 and 1933 and are reflected both in her aesthetic contribution to the volume and its thematic content, bolstering our ability to understand her significance in *Finnegans Wake*. When Dominique Maroger wrote a positive review of Lucia's lettrines for *Pomes Penyeach* in *Revue des deux mondes*, interest was generated for the pre-book publication of *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies* that would feature her illustrations. The text first appeared in serialised form in *transition* 22 (February 1933), before being published as its own separate publication by Servire Press around May 1934. The publishing history is somewhat convoluted. Shloss dates *The Mime* to have come out in 1933 and she "corrects" Ellmann's reference that it was published in 1934 in a footnote to her biography on Lucia.⁷¹ Shloss is incorrect here: though the volume does date *The Mime*'s publication as 1933 on its

⁷¹ Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 501 n120.

book jacket, on the title page it gives 1934 as its publication date.⁷² This section in question first came out as a fragment in *transition* 22 in 1933, and *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies* was published as a pre-book fragment in May 1934.⁷³ Specifying the year of publication is important because the composition of this section of the text in *Finnegans Wake* (II.1) shows a fairly exact chronological congruence with central issues concerning Lucia, and therefore an increasingly apparent connection between content and the material presentation of Joyce's work. During the spring and summer of 1932, Lucia insisted she would be well again if she was married by the age of twenty-five.⁷⁴

The task of finding Lucia a groom before she turned twenty-five was a tall order considering it was the age that she would turn that summer. However, her request instigated a rapid, short-lived series of events that unfolded right up to when Joyce began revisions for *The Mime* segment, which he prepared for serialisation in the 1933 issue of *transition*. In order to comply with Lucia's wishes, Joyce put pressure on Paul Léon's brother-in-law, Alex Ponisovsky, to propose to Lucia. He did, and she accepted, though she broke off the engagement twice before he officially ended communication between them.⁷⁵ Early summer of 1932 marked the end of the "Ponisovsky affair," which would have occurred shortly before Joyce's additions to the typescript were penned, and the influence is apparent in the text.⁷⁶

The *James Joyce Archive* shows that Isa—Issy's—drama of having her "beauman gone of a cool" along with other, thematically similar additions were added to the typescript⁷⁷ whose date is not guaranteed; we are told it was "probably" written between November 1930 and January 1931.⁷⁸ Judging from the draft progression of the section, it could just as easily have been developed, and was in fact more likely to have been, as late as the summer of 1932. An observation made by Finn Fordham suggests this possibility. He notes that "in the *Archive* there is a curious mistake about the date of

⁷² The description on the book jacket and the title page are contradictory; however, this is because that fragment had come out in *transition* in 1933. The Paul Léon papers, the *James Joyce Archive*, Richard Ellmann, and letters in April and June of 1934 confirm 1934 as its true publication date. See Ellmann, *James Joyce*, 659; Gilbert, *Letters, Volume I*, 340–341.

⁷³ See Fahy, *James Joyce-Paul Léon Papers*, 213–214.

⁷⁴ Cited in Fordham, "Lucia Joyce's Breakdown," 26.

⁷⁵ Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 217–220.

⁷⁶ Fordham, "Lucia Joyce's Breakdown," 26–27.

⁷⁷ Groden, Gabler et al., *James Joyce Archive*, 51: 47.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 51: 13.

transition in which this chapter appeared: putting it as February 1932 is one year earlier than the date *transition* did appear—which was 1933.”⁷⁹ This means that in David Hayman’s and Danis Rose’s accounts the drafting of the chapter would have to have been squeezed into the first half of 1931, rather than gradually composed over the whole of 1931 and more particularly from the middle of 1932 until the publication of the *transition* volume in February of 1933.⁸⁰ Such dating connects the groomless bride drama in the contents of the chapter with Lucia’s demand to be married, thereby mirroring what Joyce was preoccupied with during this time.⁸¹

In *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*, a note on the first page of the book as well as the colophon at the back emphasises that “the initial letter, the tailpiece and the cover were specially designed for these editions by Miss Lucia Joyce.”⁸² The volume opens with one of Lucia’s lettrines, and as in this section of *Finnegans Wake*, the narrative of the episode proceeds like a play. After an introductory description of the main characters, which includes Issy as Izod, and her “guards” The Floras, the play begins “in pressant time.”⁸³ We find the drama of Izod, one of Issy’s avatars, as a fairy-tale Cinderella (“cindernelly angled her slipper”) who has not found a groom (“cho chiny yet braught her a groom”).⁸⁴ This problem is elaborated; it is not that an infantile hybrid between destiny and what could be a play on *ciuccio*, the Italian for a child’s soother—“cho chiny”—has not found Izod a groom, but rather that her “beauman’s gone of a cool.”⁸⁵ Rejected, “Isa [now] sits a glooming so gleaming in the gloaming” and is “fading out so you can’t see her now.”⁸⁶ The ongoing theme of marriage, the tragic story of Tristan and Isolde, and the associative connection with Isolde’s chapel, Chapelizod, located in Phoenix Park, is engaged in a narrative trajectory that incorporates Lucia’s demand to be married by twenty-five, Alex Ponisovsky’s rejection of her, and the persistent problem of remedying character Issy’s malaise.

⁷⁹ Fordham, “Lucia Joyce’s Breakdown”, 142.

⁸⁰ Groden, Gabler et al., *James Joyce Archive*, 51: viii.

⁸¹ James Joyce, *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies* (Paris: Servire Press, 1934), 14; Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 226.4–7.

⁸² No page numbers.

⁸³ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 220.3; 221.17.

⁸⁴ Joyce, *The Mime*, 11; Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 224.30–31.

⁸⁵ See Joyce, *The Mime*, 14; Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 226.4–7.

⁸⁶ Joyce, *The Mime*, 14; Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 226.11–12.

Beyond the themes of unrequited love, abandoned marriage vows, and an Issy-like Cinderella with no prince, *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies* also puts forth a riddle issued by the text's dancing group of girls: the Maggies or leapyear girls. Also called the "Rainbow Girls," the Maggies are associated with riddles, dancing, and flowers, and they—usually twenty-nine and sometimes seven—indicate the colours of the rainbow, notes on a scale, the letters of the alphabet, and the number twenty-nine signalling a leap year. Fordham describes an occasion when Beckett asked Joyce if *Finnegans Wake*'s dancing Rainbow Girls were in any way modelled on Lucia and her work with the dance troupe Les Six de rythme et couleur. He replied, "yes, a certain amount."⁸⁷ The representation of the dancing, Rainbow Girls, and Issy's tragic relationship with them signify one of the riddles in this section of the text that character Shaun tries to solve.

The riddle that the Rainbow Girls issue, as Slote describes in "Blanks for When Words Gone," is a "polemic between Shaun (Chuff) and Shem (Glugg) within the roles prescribed by the game Angels and Devils."⁸⁸ In this area of the text, the solution to the riddle is rhythmically executed—the dancing girls appeal to Shem and Shaun to guess the name of a colour. Much like in a game of charades, they dance and tease to provide clues to the answer of the riddle, and, in doing so, they assert from the outset that the answer to an abstract question requires a process-based, and here a notably artistic, understanding. Slote's analysis shows that the Rainbow Girls dance out the riddle's answer. The answer to the colour riddle that the Rainbow Girls taunt Shem with is *heliotrope*, a pinkish-purple colour, just like the so-named flower that grows in Ireland. In a letter to Frank Budgen, Joyce informed him that the colour *heliotrope* is "the colour of Isolde," pinpointing her character at the centre of the dilemma.⁸⁹ In Slote's reading of the chapter he shows that it is in their actual dancing that the Rainbow Girls "*perform heliotrope: they turn (tropein) towards Shaun or Cuff, the heavenly angel, their sun-god (helios)*" and therefore *perform* the answer.⁹⁰ Shem, or Glugg, who cannot guess it, has the problem of differentiating the unity of the Rainbow Girls' sequence while maintaining an ability to distinguish them as seven distinct apparitions; he

⁸⁷ Fordham, "Lucia Joyce's Breakdown," 22.

⁸⁸ Slote, "Blanks for When Words," 188.

⁸⁹ Gilbert, *Letters, Volume I*, 406.

⁹⁰ Slote, "Blank for When Words," 190, author's emphasis.

struggles to *see*, “he was off colour.”⁹¹ It is likely that this evocative passage in *Finnegans Wake*, serialised in *transition* in 1933, skirts the notion that dancing could be a solution to the riddle. Shem’s difficulty at being able to discern the dance of the Rainbow Girls references his inability to actually see the dancing girls and thus his difficulty at forming an answer to their question, and in “his subnsciousness he could scares of all knotknow.”⁹²

Joyce’s severe glaucoma and cataracts would have made him, like Shem, unable to actually “see” Lucia perform. John Gordon goes to great length to connect Lucia, the character of Issy, and the Rainbow Girls with Joyce’s glaucoma—“rainbow girl equals glaucoma’s rainbow; the girl...is implicated in light’s fragmentation into a spectrum of colours.”⁹³ However, it is reasonable to postulate that given Joyce’s ongoing eye condition he, like Shem’s predicament with the Rainbow Girls, was literally not able to see Lucia perform—“have you nonbreamstone? No. Or Hellfeuersetyn? No.”⁹⁴ Her quitting dance, the cause of a “month’s worth of tears,” left something to be solved that character Shaun tries to answer by engaging in a form of literary problem solving.⁹⁵

In connecting the dancing apparitions of the Rainbow Girls with the name of Lucia’s dance troupe—in English “The Six of Rhythm and Colour”—Joyce may have used language as a substitute for this lack of visual understanding. In the text, it is through words that Shem eventually grasps the answer to the enigma of the Rainbow Girls’ riddle. To compensate for Shaun’s inability to understand it visually, the word of the colour heliotrope allows him to deduce the movements of the dancing girls turning towards the sun, itself performing a kind of fictional analysis that corresponds to a biographical problem. It is evident that within the text finding out how to solve the issue of Issy’s unhappiness is of concern, and the sources of her unhappiness—marriage and dance—resemble preoccupations that were Lucia’s throughout the sections’ respective genesis: dance during 1929 and marriage between 1932 and 1933.

As described, Joyce enlisted Lucia to work on the lettrines for *Pomes Penyeach*, and he was trying to forge a career for her from her illustrations while beginning to rework *The*

⁹¹ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 230.1.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 224.17–18.

⁹³ John Gordon, *Finnegans Wake: A Plot Summary* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986), 80–81.

⁹⁴ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 225.22–25.

⁹⁵ Gilbert, *Letters, Volume I*, 285.

Mime fragment for *transition* during the summer of 1932. A reference to them is made in the area of *Finnegans Wake* that absorbed the *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*: “we’ll have our private *palypeachum* pillarposterns for lovesick *lettrines*.”⁹⁶ Joyce wanted Lucia to partake in a task he could engage in and help her through following her first breakdown, and the sentiment is reflected in a late edition to the “Mookse” section where Isa is finally “married to reading and writing which pleasebusiness now.”⁹⁷ In this way, through the text Joyce seeks to understand and solve problems that were central to Lucia’s unhappiness at the time. Character Issy, like Lucia, might not find a groom, nor dance any longer, but in the text Issy’s new solution is to engage in “reading and writing” and “lovesick *lettrines*,” using literature as an alternative to psychoanalysis. Similarly, Joyce had Lucia incorporate the colours of the rainbow, like the dancing Rainbow Girls, in the material volume of *The Mime* where she provided the illustrations.

Of *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*, Servire issued a total of 1000 copies, along with twenty-nine limited-edition volumes that were bound in parchment and signed by both Lucia and Joyce. The number of the limited-edition volumes meaningfully connects to the content in this section. The leaping “dance troupe” of the 29 Rainbow Girls represents the “hymnumber *twenty nine*,” a number which not only represents the theme of a leap year present throughout the book, but also relates to Lucia’s artistic contribution. On the fragment’s front jacket, we are told that the tailpiece has “seven colours” that intentionally reflect the Rainbow Girls.⁹⁸ The seven colours and the twenty-nine volumes, much like the thirteen poems contained in the volume *Pomes Penyeach*, indicates the persistent theme of an odd-numbered “extra” and symbolises a connection between Lucia’s artistic contributions and areas of the text.

The dancing girls appear in other parts of the text, and the theme of the rainbow and reflections of light recall Louis Gillet’s remark that Joyce had told him, in writing the book, that he wanted to “give vocabulary to the elasticity of sleep, multiplying the meaning of words, playing with glisterings and iridescences, making of the sentence a

⁹⁶ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 235.21–22, emphasis mine.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 146.22.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 234.43, emphasis mine.

rainbow where each drop is a prism assuming a thousand colours.”⁹⁹ The connections between the Rainbow Girls and the language of *Finnegans Wake* are so extensive that drawing on them would be a daunting task, one not suitable to the confines of this chapter. However, what can be said is that it is clear that Joyce’s work corresponds with his efforts to understand Lucia and to help solve what ailed her. This instance demonstrates her durational impact on the narrative of *Finnegans Wake*.

When Lucia had her first breakdown, Joyce tried to create a career which might “pleasebusiness now,” using her illustrations to provide the answer to the “riddle” of her increasingly splintered psychology and depression. Her illustrations for the 1934 volume of *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies* are a material representation of such ambitions. Joyce had absorbed her difficulties within its narrative, analysing the riddles of what then seemed to afflict her: the termination of her dance career and, more persistently, remaining unmarried. However, as her condition escalated, Lucia became unable to provide illustrations at all; she mustered one illuminated letter for the final pre-publication volume, *Storiella as she is Syung*. The less that Lucia could provide the more it seems Joyce compensated, and, as we will see, his efforts grew to such proportions that the very end of *Finnegans Wake* imagines a cure for her.

4.4 Lucia’s Treatments 1934–1936, transition 23, and *Storiella*

While Joyce’s attitude towards psychoanalysis has remained the subject of scholarly debate, Lucia’s increasing psychological deterioration evidently caused him to reconsider the possible value of psychiatric and psychoanalytic treatment as he sought to provide any measure of help possible for Lucia. While he may have thought that illustrative work, marriage, or the possibility of a future career could help Lucia, it became apparent that was not to be the case. Despite his previous antagonisms to the ideas of the analyst Carl Jung, Joyce grew desperate enough to place her under psychoanalysis with him in 1934.

In considering some of the treatments that she underwent, as well as Joyce’s work on what would become II.2 of *Finnegans Wake*, we can see how the dynamics of psychoanalytic therapy and his literary work converge as Lucia’s condition escalated to unmanageable proportions. Genetic work can allow us to pinpoint ties between archival

⁹⁹ Potts, *Portrait of the Artist*, 178.

scholarship and the events unfolding within the Joyce household. However, these events would accrue to unprecedented proportions. Unlike D.H. Lawrence and Anaïs Nin, Lucia not only experienced psychoanalytic therapy, but ultimately endured a number of clinical trials and tribulations based on what was both medically and psychiatrically offered at that time. In this way, although Joyce is the lesser of these authors in approaching psychoanalysis directly, he was most personally impacted by it. In so far as Lawrence fought against the diagnostic reduction of psychoanalytic principals in relation to his literature, and Nin immersed herself in the story that psychoanalysis tells about women, Joyce found himself navigating the reality of how psychoanalytic theory could truly diagnosis a person. Lucia's long-term internment at various sanatoriums and the treatments she received sheds sobering light on the difference between psychoanalytic postulations in reading texts, versus the flesh-and-blood consequences it had for individuals, and women, such as Lucia.

We can better grasp this meaning by briefly considering the conditions under which Lucia lived following another one of her outbursts in February 1934. Lucia attacked her mother again; she slapped Nora in yet another outburst. Similar to what had occurred in 1932, Lucia was taken away by Giorgio but this time to Prangins, a Swiss sanatorium in Nyon run by Oscar Forel, for a seven-month stay.¹⁰⁰ There she was forbidden from receiving visitors, including family, and she was often placed in solitary confinement and under surveillance. In protest she set fire to her room and tried to escape by swimming across Lake Geneva.¹⁰¹ Workers at the hospital thought that she was attempting to commit suicide given the lake was far too wide to swim across, and “when she was picked up by a rowing boat, she made them promise that they would not put her back under surveillance.”¹⁰²

That promise was not to be kept. Forel published a handbook that contains instructions for dealing with unruly inmates, a category Lucia fell under because of her violent outbursts, attempts to escape, and frequent pyromania. She described the latter impulse to be because “her father's complexion was very red,” though in all likelihood she set fire to her room in order to be let out of long-term solitary confinement.¹⁰³ Shloss

¹⁰⁰ See Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 267.

¹⁰¹ Fordham, “Lucia Joyce's Breakdown,” 38.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ Chester Anderson, *James Joyce and His World* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1967), 120. Áine Stapleton's recent work-in-progress film based on Lucia, “Horrible Creature,” was filmed in 2019 on

summarises content in the handbook pertaining to disruptive patient behaviour: “Restraint took the form of physical intervention. Two or three men would hold and carry them, force them to wear leather mittens, put them in strait-jackets, make them bathe for five to six hours at a time, and keep them in solitary confinement.”¹⁰⁴

Medically sanctioned conditions were harshly administered for mental patients at Prangins, and the long-term stay detrimentally affected Lucia to the point that Joyce found her significantly changed.

When Joyce came to see her, he found she was under restraint, her windows were barred, and she was continuously under surveillance.¹⁰⁵ He was deeply disturbed by the condition he found her in and she wept upon seeing her parents. Joyce wrote that she was “on the verge of collapse,” and he immediately had her transferred to a small and sordid asylum called Burgholzi, the only available option at short notice.¹⁰⁶ A distressed Joyce wrote to Weaver on 22 September 1934:

Lucia is at present an inmate of Burgholzi (the Zürich equivalent of Bedlam). I had arranged for her transfer...but that very morning she set fire to her bedroom in 4 different places...Perhaps he can cure her physically. She is not at all anaemic...Burgholzi sounds awful but the poor child is not a raving lunatic, just a poor girl who tried to do too much, to understand too much. Her dependence on me is now absolute and all the affection she repressed for years pours itself out on both of us.¹⁰⁷

This letter to Weaver articulates the increasingly drastic and untenable nature of the situation while referring to how much Lucia “understood,” Joyce’s insistence that she was not a “raving lunatic,” and that her dependence on him was absolute. In effect, Joyce believed that he was solely responsible for her, though he still maintained she was not insane. Trying to find a solution or remedy for Lucia occupied Joyce’s thoughts so heavily that it brought his work on *Finnegans Wake* to a standstill. He was slated to provide a fragment of “Work in Progress” for *transition* 23—what is now the “Night Lessons” chapter—II.2 of *Finnegans Wake*.

location at Prangins and features depictions of her pyromania. Likewise, Alex Pheby’s fictional account in *Lucia* heavily features her setting fire to things.

¹⁰⁴ Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 270.

¹⁰⁵ See Ellmann, *Letters, Volume III*, 323.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ Gilbert, *Letters, Volume I*, 346.

When the fragment did appear in print in *transition* 23 (1934–1935) it was titled the “Opening and Closing Pages of Part II Section II.” David Hayman writes that “of the 266 words in the completed first draft, approximately 132 can be directly traced to the notes [of Scribbledehobbles].”¹⁰⁸ What this means is that the *transition* fragment essentially repurposed material that Joyce had already written in one of his notebooks, providing little original content. Hayman contends that Joyce’s dependence on VI.A to complete the *transition* fragment from 1934 to 1935 shows he “was not interested in this passage, though he felt obligated to complete the lessons chapter.”¹⁰⁹ However, events pertaining to Lucia are most likely what caused Joyce to recycle previous material in an effort to provide that fragment for *transition*. It was not that he wasn’t “interested” in this section—rather, he was too focused on Lucia to come up with original material.

In Luca Crispi’s review of the *transition* fragment he remarks that in Ellmann’s biography a focus on Lucia’s worsening condition does not provide much information on Joyce’s process leading up to the *transition* publication.¹¹⁰ However, Ellmann’s attention to Lucia’s increasing psychological deterioration was probably similar to the reason that composing content for this area of the text received little attention from Joyce. Joyce borrowed heavily from Scribbledehobbles because he was occupied with Lucia’s care, and thus did not have the time or presumably the energy to compose new material for the fragment. A letter Paul Léon wrote to Harriet Shaw Weaver while Lucia was at Nyon in 1934 demonstrates that probability:

[As] far as he [Joyce] is concerned primarily the important event in his private life is the departure of Miss Joyce to the Sanatorium in Nyon [...] This departure has first of all created the feeling of emptiness in the house and this is quite understandable after having been for the last three years in the center of all his worries and daily if not hourly thought and reflection. Miss Joyce even while absent causes enervation which is perhaps the more tantalizing as she is not there and communication with her or even with the doctors are both scarce and merely medical in nature....the last three years of unceasing worry about Miss Joyce, have caused him to almost abandon his work. It is

¹⁰⁸ David Hayman, “‘Scribbledehobbles’ and How They Grew,” in *Twelve and a Tilly*, eds. Jack P. Dalton and Clive Hart (London: Faber & Faber, 1966), 110. Notes for Scribbledehobbles are in a section of VI.A, which at one time, when it wasn’t properly understood, was called the ur-workbook. See Luca Crispi, “*Storiella* as She Was Wryt: Chapter II.2,” in Slotte and Crispi, *How Joyce Wrote*.

¹⁰⁹ Hayman, “‘Scribbledehobbles,’” 112.

¹¹⁰ Crispi, “*Storiella*,” 234–235.

remarkable that he was even able to accomplish what he did...But what is obvious is that owing to whatever influences it may have been he has neglected that part of his work...¹¹¹

The contents of this letter show the extent of Joyce's substantial concern for Lucia for "the better part of three years."¹¹² Her worsening condition was presumably why, after finally producing the piece for *transition* 23, Joyce did not contribute anything to its following two volumes.

Joyce transferred Lucia to Küsnacht to undergo psychoanalysis with Jung in 1934. During the stay Lucia's interactions with Jung were limited; she was predominantly in the care of Cary F. Baynes, a psychiatric nurse and friend of Eugene Jolas's wife.¹¹³ However, the stay at Küsnacht proved unproductive, and in a passage often cited in the scholarship, Jung deduced what he perceived to be the problem.¹¹⁴ Jung relayed to Patricia Hutchison that psychological similarity and an unhealthy mutual identification between Joyce and Lucia made effective analysis impossible:

If you know anything about my Anima theory, Joyce and his daughter are a classical example of it. She was definitely his *femme inspiratrice*, which explains his obstinate reluctance to have her certified. His own Anima, i.e. unconscious psyche, was so solidly identified with her, that to have her certified would have been as much as an admission that he himself had a latent psychosis.¹¹⁵

That Joyce identified with Lucia is strongly supported in the scholarship. Chester Anderson writes in *James Joyce and His World* that Joyce defended Lucia "as if it were himself who was being threatened, as in a sense, of course it was. Their psyches were strangely alike."¹¹⁶ Joyce's uniquely determined ability to interpret Lucia's "wild words" and presumably the meaning behind them continued to enforce his belief in and defence of her sanity. Joyce, in writing of Lucia's language in a letter, claims "I can understand it or most of it."¹¹⁷ In a letter Paul Léon wrote to Weaver: "Mr Joyce trusts

¹¹¹ Paul Léon to Harriet Shaw Weaver (11 March 1934) cited in Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 271–272.

¹¹² *Ibid.*

¹¹³ Fordham, "Lucia Joyce's Breakdown," 41.

¹¹⁴ Unfortunately, there are no records available at Küsnacht detailing Lucia's brief period in analysis with Jung.

¹¹⁵ Patricia Hutchison, *James Joyce's World* (London: Methuen, 1957), 184–85.

¹¹⁶ Anderson, *James Joyce and His World*, 121.

¹¹⁷ Richard Ellmann, ed., *Selected Letters* (New York: Viking Press, 1975), 376.

one person alone, and this person is Lucia.”¹¹⁸ To Weaver, Joyce wrote passionately of his allegiance to Lucia: that if she was to be mentioned as mad “then it is I who am mad.”¹¹⁹ In effect, Joyce believed that he was the only person who could understand Lucia, and viewed himself as best equipped to therefore help her; “Joyce was convinced he was the only one capable of curing her.”¹²⁰ Rather shrewdly, Jung surmised that Joyce “was her slave.”¹²¹

When treatment with Jung proved unsuccessful, Lucia briefly stayed with Harriet Shaw Weaver in England before travelling to Ireland for what would be a troublesome independent visit. She swam naked each morning under Bray Head and “remarked that the contour resembled her father,” and frequently disappeared.¹²² Her baffled Irish cousins Bozena Berta and Nora Schaurek observed that she believed that the parts of “Work in Progress” that involved “eyes, dancing, men, and madness were written about her.”¹²³ She carried these segments around with her, and when “she read passages about eyes or about insanity or about being fond of various men, she cried.”¹²⁴ It might be noted that the allowance Joyce was sending to Lucia during the stay was a stipend for prescription barbiturates, the inconsistent and/or frequent use of which may have contributed to her erratic and dissociative behaviour.¹²⁵

After Ireland, Lucia travelled to England to live with Weaver in 1935, and there she underwent a series of bovine injections (derived from cow foetuses) as well as hydrotherapy—prolonged submersion in ice baths while restrained.¹²⁶ These treatments were to conquer what was briefly considered to be a glandular condition. Joyce continued to be protective of Lucia and rejected any diagnosis that she was schizophrenic or indeed “mad” in any capacity. Leon wrote to Weaver: “every time I meet him [Joyce] some new origin of her condition has been discovered—the only

¹¹⁸ Cited in Anderson, *James Joyce and His World*, 120.

¹¹⁹ Ellmann, *Selected Letters*, 377.

¹²⁰ Fordham, “Lucia Joyce’s Breakdown,” 56.

¹²¹ Carl Jung, from interview notes with Ellmann, Tulsa: 152, cited in Fordham, “Lucia Joyce’s Breakdown,” 175.

¹²² Delimata, “Reminiscences of a Joyce Niece,” 55.

¹²³ Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 437.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 345.

¹²⁵ Lucia’s medication is discussed by Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 340–344.

¹²⁶ Dr W.G. MacDonald administered seven or eight weeks of injections every other day. Bovine serum was thought to stimulate the thyroid and remedy glandular conditions. See Fordham, “Lucia Joyce’s Breakdown,” 58–59. Lucia’s treatments were so numerous that they have been condensed here to maintain the focus of the chapter; however, detailed information can be found in both Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 259–301, and Fordham, “Lucia Joyce’s Breakdown,” 37–72.

thing that does not vary is that he is the culprit.”¹²⁷ Brief psychoanalysis, solitary confinement, open-air therapy in Ireland, hydrotherapy, and bovine injections had done little to cure a now dramatically altered Lucia. It became increasingly apparent that she would require long-term care, and in 1936 she was transferred to Le Vésinet, west of Paris. Her violent “ugly assaults on the nurses” there meant she had to be transferred again, now to Ivry-sur-Seine, where her symptoms and diagnosis were pronounced: “moral disequilibrium with episodic schizoid signs and recurrent cyclic impulsiveness.”¹²⁸ Joyce remained “in a minority of one” in his belief that Lucia could be cured. Despite a litany of failures, he continued to stand by the possibility she could be well again, and he was keen to develop a final pre-publication volume that would once again feature her illustrations.¹²⁹

In an exchange with Jacques Mercanton, after laying his hand on the *Work in Progress* manuscript, he had said, “Sometimes I tell myself that when I leave this dark night, she too will be cured.”¹³⁰ Here Joyce’s statement offers an alternative reading: that by imaginatively immersing himself in a non-rational world, he might understand his daughter. It also offers something more, in that it portrays how Joyce considered his daughter’s mental health as parallel to a writerly finality: a cure, an ending, a perceptible impasse that could be surmounted by completing his work. Joyce having been approached by Convinus to work on *Storilla* contextualises the background that frames what Crispi describes as “a two and a half year process of getting *Storiella*, the last integral fragment of work in progress to emerge before *Finnegans Wake* was published, ready for Corvinus,” and indicates the final focus of this chapter.¹³¹ What we can see here is a massive reinvigoration on the part of Joyce to tie Lucia into the text and finally finish the book that he had been working on for several decades.

The late-stage pre-publication volume of *Storiella as she is Syung* was developed using content from the 1934–35 *transition* 23 fragment discussed above. It was advertised in *transition* 26 (1937), explaining that it “will include reproductions in color of two illuminated lettrines by Lucia Joyce.”¹³² Sadly, the ambitions of the advertisement

¹²⁷ Cited in Fordham, “Lucia Joyce’s Breakdown,” 63.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 58–59.

¹²⁹ Ellmann, *Selected Letters*, 376.

¹³⁰ Mercanton, “The Hours of James Joyce,” 214.

¹³¹ Crispi, “*Storiella*,” 237.

¹³² No page number.

would not be fully met. Lucia was so unwell that she only contributed one illuminated letter to *Storiella*, the most visually arresting pre-book publication of *Finnegans Wake*. However, that Joyce chose to rework a highly derivative fragment from *transition* 23 to create this final, pre-publication volume is important. What first appeared in *transition* 23 as “Opening and Closing Chapters of Part II Section II” during her worst episodes was transformed into the illustrious *Storiella as She is Syung* when it was published in October 1937. The volume, like the deluxe edition of *Pomes Penyeach*, shows a remarkable transformation. The chapbook of the *Pomes* volume became the illustrious deluxe edition—five years later, Joyce’s recycled contribution to *transition* grew into the most aesthetically stunning volume of the pre-book fragments. Like the twenty-nine limited-edition copies of *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*, an evaluation of the aesthetic quality of *Storiella* also provides an informative entry into understanding its contents.

The volume immediately suggests that its contents will relay a myth, a folk tale or a fairy tale. A blue-grey slipcase hides the thin, largely formatted folio (30.2 x 26cm) that, when exposed, reveals its bright, full orange vellum and the title lettered in gilt. Lucia’s illuminated letter and the black and red text that colour the marginalia are printed on untrimmed, handmade paper that has a gilt top edge. One-hundred-and-fifty volumes were advertised, but an additional twenty-five volumes with Joyce’s signature were printed on Japanese mulberry; the total number of volumes issued was 175.¹³³ It is the most spectacular of the pre-book fragments, and what the deliberate artistic presentation of this fragment shows is how Joyce wanted to represent the “spirit” of *Storiella as She is Syung*. The aesthetic choices Joyce made run along an imaginative line that differs from one commonly used to characterise the chapter.

The area of *Finnegans Wake* that *Storiella* corresponds with—II.2—is most commonly understood as a used schoolbook complete with the scribbled marginalia of young pupils. This is because the chapter is distinguished from the rest of the book in how it uses footnotes, associated with the daughter, Issy, and marginalia, associated with her brothers Shem and Shuan, to comment on the body of the text, differentiating this chapter from the rest of the book. However, a material consideration of the *Storiella*

¹³³ Carol Shloss writes that 176 were produced; she is again wrong here. See Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 501 f.133.

volume evocatively suggests that the footnotes and marginalia illuminate the body of the text much like a medieval manuscript.¹³⁴ The folio's luxurious quality and its coloured marginalia draw attention to this section's annotated features that seem to mimic the convention of antiquated religious texts that are informatively annotated by scribes. That Joyce wanted the first footnote to begin with one of Lucia's illuminated letters suggests that the footnotes are of equal or corresponding "illuminative" importance to the text. Given that Joyce intended for there to be an illuminated letter on the first footnote illustrated by Lucia, a connection between her and Issy's voice in the footnotes is also forthrightly implied. These effects are reduced or even eliminated when reading II.2 in the published Faber/Viking text of 1939.

A revised version of the contents of the *Storiella* volume are incorporated in II.2, and its title is called out early on in the chapter: "Singalingalying. Storiella as she is Syung."¹³⁵ The chapter is an area of the text most engaged with the character of Issy, associated with the footnotes, and Lucia has also been connected with the chapter. An initial tie can be found in the Buffalo notebook Joyce used when drafting this section, where "Lucia Joyce" is atypically written in pen: Joyce's notes are mostly written in pencil.¹³⁶ The main text of chapter II.2 lets us know that the children, among other things, are being schooled on "gramma's grammar."¹³⁷ This has been interpreted as a way into the "geometer" diagram illustrated in the chapter, understood in accordance with the theme of learning, which the chapter more broadly represents. The diagram provided in the chapter touches on Euclidean geometry, but is commonly understood conceptually, as the coordinates of mother ALP's vagina. That has been viewed as a lesson on what Hayman calls the chapter's "female force," which he suggests operates as an informative aside to the central theme of learning.¹³⁸ The diagram signifies not only geometry, but is also revealed as a maternal diagram of ALP as a source of knowledge rooted in the body; the boys learn they have traced her genitalia "...heaving alljawbreakical expressions...A is for Anna like L is for liv. Aha hahah, Ante Anne

¹³⁴ Joyce may have been drawing on the Book of Kells, which he called "the most purely Irish thing we have," and some of the big initial letters which swing right across a page have the same essential quality of a chapter of *Ulysses*; see Ellmann, *James Joyce*, 545.

¹³⁵ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 267.7.

¹³⁶ Vincent Deane, et al, *The Finnegans Wake Notebooks at Buffalo* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001–), VI.B.36, 210. Lucia's name is the only entry in this notebook in ink.

¹³⁷ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 268.17.

¹³⁸ Hayman, "'Scribbledehobbles,'" 117.

you're apt to ape aunty annalive! Dawn gives rise. Lo, lo, lives love! Eve takes fall...Tis perfect."¹³⁹

Issy, who is the provocative voice behind the chapter's footnotes, is thought of as indicative of a mischievous burgeoning of the knowledge represented by ALP, converse to her brothers' more scholarly contributions in the text's margins. Her introjections from the footnotes evoke her notably young, female sexuality as counterpart to the male-dominated study of geometry, history, and arithmetic framed in this way.¹⁴⁰ In the first footnote she quickly calls "Rawmeash," or romantic nonsense, to the chapter's tasks in her "girlic teangue," her girlish and Irish tongue or speech.¹⁴¹ In studying the chapter, critical readings have interpreted the role of Issy as only juvenile; she is "training herself to write the letters of ALP" by partaking in knowledge acquisition through a matrilineal narrative, and her pithy, sexual interjections from the footnotes serve a disruptive foil to the brothers' schoolbook studies in the margins.¹⁴²

Hayman describes his opinion in a discussion of the footnotes: "Joyce sets Issy's behaviour up as a foil for the boys' struggles with Euclid's first theorem and the mysteries of mature sexuality...[Issy's] footnotes contribute throughout to impose her personality upon the male world of studies, to introduce, that is, the irrational as a force in that world."¹⁴³ Luca Crispi qualifies Issy's irrationality: "this composition [II.2] is centred on Issy, specifically what little she knows about life, sex and her studies [...] her thwarted attempts to pass herself off as intelligent."¹⁴⁴ What these critics imply is that Issy is not so much learning as inheriting. These analyses portray the brothers as the section's true pupils and characterise the acquisition of feminine knowledge as an irrational but necessary "force" that enhances this objective.

However, the body of the chapter contains frequent allusions to Issy. Her role as one of the Rainbow Girls is touched upon in the enumeration of the colours of the rainbow in

¹³⁹ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 293.16–23.

¹⁴⁰ See Gordon, *Finnegans Wake: A Plot Summary*, 183–186; Philip Kitcher, *Joyce's Kaleidoscope: An Invitation to Finnegans Wake* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 146–147; Laurent Milesi, "Towards a Female Grammar of Sexuality," *Modern Fiction Studies* 35, no. 3 (Fall 1989): 569–586. In Milesi's text he uniquely places emphasis on the idea of 'gamma' as a letter as opposed to it as *grandmother*; Milesi focuses on this in terms of grammar and sexuality.

¹⁴¹ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 260.F1.

¹⁴² Hayman, "Scribbledehobbles," 116.

¹⁴³ Hayman, "Scribbledehobbles," 116.

¹⁴⁴ Crispi, "Storiella," 232.

the body of the text: “That grene ray of eorong it waves us to yonder as the red, blue and yellow flogs time on the domisole.”¹⁴⁵ Locating her is flagged early on in a series of questions that have been perceived as concerning HCE: “But, to speak broken heaventalk, is he? Who is he? Whose is he? When is he? Where is he? How is he?”¹⁴⁶ In reading the passage aloud, “is he” announces “Issy,” suggesting that locating the how and why of her presence is an important contribution to the theme of learning in this area of the text. It appears that a split between the body of the text and the footnotes works, like the voice of two girls chattering in tandem, which “makes us a daintical pair of accomplases!”¹⁴⁷

But where is Issy, how might this correspond with Lucia within the “split in the infinitive from to have to have been to will be?”¹⁴⁸ The most common scholarly reading claims that although Issy is a central focus in the chapter, her footnotes and character have no relevance to an understanding of the text beyond the capricious development of irrational female sexual awareness requiring masculine articulation, the analytic “law of the jungeral.”¹⁴⁹ There has been very little scholarly work on the footnotes, precisely because they have been dismissed as irrelevant or unintelligible. The footnotes are a demonstration, as Crispi writes, of Issy’s “thwarted attempts to pass herself off as intelligent,” an assertion that recapitulates Hayman’s earlier argument that the footnotes represent little more than Issy’s juvenile, parenthetical attempts to emulate or develop ALP’s “female force” represented in the chapter.

However, this is a significant and misguided oversight, one that speaks to two very different poles of “reading” Lucia, or the Issy character in the text. While, as articulated earlier in this chapter, fictional interpretations derived from Carol Shloss’s biography develop a conflated reading of Lucia’s significance on Joyce’s fiction, genetic scholarship has all but ignored the visibly apparent connections between her and the character of Issy in *Finnegans Wake*. By looking at these associations from a genetic perspective, we can see how, at the latest stages of Joyce’s redrafting of the text, he significantly revised sections pertaining to her. It will be argued that these genetic

¹⁴⁵ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 267.13–15.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 261.27–31.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 295.26–27.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 271.21–22.

¹⁴⁹ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 268.F3.

connections contribute to how she influenced the end of *Finnegans Wake* as an alternative cure to psychoanalytic and medical therapies.

A most interesting insight is derived from comparing the 1937 *Storiella as she is Syung* volume and its integration into *Finnegans Wake*. Joyce added over a hundred footnotes in 1938 as he prepared for the *Wake*'s publication, an observation that Joycean geneticists, working on the chapter, have all but ignored. After working on the aesthetic composition of *Storiella* with Lucia in 1937, Joyce integrated the text into the book, and his work at doing so is evident in a proof from 1938. This proof makes visible that a major change occurred in how he expanded the footnotes that signify Issy's voice. The augmentation is one of the only major changes that he made, and what makes it more intriguing for the conclusion of this chapter is that while he modified the footnotes, he composed the conclusion to the book. What this means is that Joyce's last alterations to the text were to add significant content to the area of the book commonly associated with Lucia at the same time as he was writing the conclusion of the text. What scholars such as Crispi and Hayman have dismissed as of little importance beyond Issy poorly mimicking ALP (in Issy's footnotes) actually show significant genetic activity that connects two very different areas of the text together in ways that reference Lucia, and can allow us to read the end of what can be seen as literary modernism's most obscure texts differently.

4.5 "Lisp!": Genetic Connections Between II.2 and IV of *Finnegans Wake*

As stated, the publication of the *James Joyce Archive* ushered in a plethora of genetic readings of Joyce's works. The process of Joyce's literary texts was seen as essential value to understanding the final, composed work. But when it comes to considering how Lucia and the character Issy developed in the text, we find a number of discrepancies. For example, in the preface to the drafts, typescripts, and proofs of volumes 52 and 53 of the *James Joyce Archive*, David Hayman states only a few changes were made between *Storiella as she is Syung* and chapter II.2 in the final published text of *Finnegans Wake*.

In the *James Joyce Archive* that prefaces the archival material associated with *Storiella* and its integration into *Finnegans Wake* Hayman writes:

After *Storiella* the draft history of II.2 is refreshingly simple. In February 1938, Joyce received a set of galleys with the italicized marginalia boxed in the text. It is on these galleys that he made his revisions [...] the additions to these galleys were not overly numerous, but the textbook layout complicated the process, requiring among other things what Joyce called reshuffling the footnotes. Joyce seems not to have proofread the typescript of his additions. These last stages of the manuscript's development contain relatively few changes aside from the adjustments of the layout.¹⁵⁰

Hayman's summary of Joyce's latter-stage editorial attention to this section has evidentially established the way scholars would comprehend a genetic understanding of the late developments of II.2. Hayman's account is echoed in Luca Crispi's appraisal of the genetic development of this chapter:

A commonplace in the exegesis of this chapter has it that the footnotes are the place where Issy finally gets her say about the children's homework tasks. Based as it is on the published versions of the text, such an interpretation is convincing. But, as was the case with the development of the distinct voices of the marginalia, here too the textual evidence suggests that this was an afterthought, a voice or personality imposed on the footnotes after many of the footnotes, which are not Issy-specific, were already in place [...] the final page proofs of the chapter were printed in late 1937 and thus the way an understanding of II.2 was then established.¹⁵¹

This particular trail of scholarship continues to Dirk Van Hulle. His recent 2016 study dedicated to the pre-book publications follows in the tradition of Hayman and Crispi. In the third appendix of *James Joyce's Work in Progress*, meant to provide scholars with genetic information on the changes between the pre-book fragments and the final published text, Van Hulle describes the addition of 13 footnotes between *Storiella* and the final published text of *Finnegans Wake*.¹⁵²

Such analyses have significant limitations, because, by the final set of galley proofs, dated March 1938, Joyce had added 117—not 13 as Van Hulle shows—footnotes to the 84 contained in the *Storiella* volume, and he changed their arrangement. Therefore, significant activity occurred in the footnotes of II.2 during Joyce's late to final revisions in 1938. The correspondence with Paul Léon shows that Joyce was immersed in

¹⁵⁰ Groden, Gabler et al., *James Joyce Archive*, 52: xvii–xviii.

¹⁵¹ Crispi, "Storiella," 237.

¹⁵² Van Hulle, *Work in Progress*, 266–269.

revising the footnotes as late as 12 January 1939.¹⁵³ Late activity concerning II.2 has been understood as a matter of coordinating the chapter's awkward layout with the printers; Hayman writes that Joyce needed to "reshuffle" them because of the marginalia. Hayman's word "reshuffling" refers to Joyce's emphatic note on the March 1938 galley proof that contains the additional 117 footnotes: "the footnotes will have to be reshuffled and renumbered as some of the new additions are to be *intercalated*!!"¹⁵⁴ Far from being an afterthought as Hayman suggests, Joyce's emphatic note makes us see that his work on the chapter II.2's footnotes do more than a "reshuffling." Joyce's issue with typesetters attempting to format the chapter was due to his insistence that each page contain the *number* of footnotes (and the positioning of the marginalia) he wanted, and these emendations occurred while he was composing the end of the book. It is evident that Joyce wanted to do quite a deal more with the footnotes in the chapter pertaining to *Storiella*. Attention to this activity that has been ignored or deemed irrelevant by Joycean geneticists can allow us to understand why and how it is of significance. What is argued here is that by focusing on Lucia, the character of Issy, and these late stage changes we can perceive a compositional overlap between the aesthetic volume Joyce created—*Storiella as she as Syung*—and his final work on the epilogue.

Joyce's note shows that the footnotes were not only to be rearranged; they were to be "intercalated." Therefore, in adding so many additional footnotes it seems likely that Joyce wanted to do something more. Among its many meanings, "to intercalate" means to insert an additional month into a year. Between the March 1938 proof, which is the last one provided in the *James Joyce Archive* for the *Finnegans Wake* chapter II.2, and the final text of *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce added another eight footnotes (most of them followed by exclamation marks). This brings the total number of footnotes to 229, which is the number of footnotes the final published text of *Finnegans Wake* contains. Given that Joyce added the 8 footnotes so that their total would equal 229, we could interpret the number as an additional, subtle reference to the extra day in a leap year (otherwise called an intercalary year), the Rainbow Girls, an association with Issy, and the dancing girls that *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies* so often reference. Given Joyce's propensity for numerological significance, it could also plausibly date

¹⁵³ Fahy, *James Joyce—Paul Léon Papers*, 183–184.

¹⁵⁴ Groden, Gabler et al., *James Joyce Archive*, 53: 338, author's emphasis.

when Lucia’s first breakdown occurred. Joyce’s 50th birthday, 2 February 1932 (2/2 of a 29-day month), was a leap year.

These connections do hint at a logic that approximates Lucia’s presence in relation to Joyce’s final modifications to *Finnegans Wake*. But why did Joyce rearrange nearly all the footnotes between the 1937 *Storiella* volume, the March 1938 proof, and the *Wake*’s final publication in 1939? Joyce could have simply added an additional eight to suggest a leap year rather than, as we can see from a comparison of the 1938 proof with the final text, completely change the position of the footnotes in his final emendations to the book prior to publication. Likewise, the fact that they total 229 is not apparent—the footnotes are not continuous throughout the chapter, and therefore one can only discern that they amount to 229 by counting them page by page. Something else is going on, which shows how this middle section of *Finnegans Wake* corresponds with the final passage in IV (the end of *Finnegans Wake*) and thus provides a new reading for how the book ends, particularly, as argued here, in relation to Lucia, and Joyce’s fixation on her that was very much present at this time.

Joyce was working intensively on “intercalating” the footnotes throughout 1938. In the appendix to *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake*, the compositional process of Book IV (the end of *Finnegans Wake*) is provided.¹⁵⁵

593.01–604.26		1937
604.27–607.22	“St. Kevin”	Summer 1923
607.23–614.18	“St Patrick and the Druid”	7/1923
614.19–619.19	“The Revered Letter”	12/1923
619.20–628	“Soft Morning City”	1938

What this dating shows is that the final section of Book IV of the *Wake* was developed during 1938, and as Daniel Ferrer further specifies in his preface to VI.B.47, its

¹⁵⁵ See Slote and Crispi, *How Joyce Wrote*, 488.

composition occurred as late as October–December of that year. As early as December 1937, shortly after *Storiella as she is Syung* was published, Joyce had begun planning this final passage, which he refers to as an “epilogue,” often called “soft morning city” in the scholarship. The very end of the book operates as its own passage, running from pages 619 to 628. The passage begins:

Soft morning, city! Lsp! *I am leafy speafing*. Lpf! Foly and folty all the nights have falled on to long my hair. Not a sound, falling. Lispn. No wind no word. Only a *leaf*, just a *leaf* and then *leaves*...*I am leafy, your goolden*, so you called me, may me life, yea your *goolden, silve me solve, exsogerraid*!¹⁵⁶

The fairy-tale tone of the closing passage of *Finnegans Wake* begins by letting us know that its primary speaker, “leafy,” is both named and *is* leafy and “goolden.” Throughout the narrative of the *Wake*, Issy is referred to or associated with both attributes resembling the fairy-tale quality of *Storiella as she is Syung*’s material presentation. The speaker is “golden lasslike,” “like some losthappy leaf,” “tickled with goldies,” who writes with her “gold pen and ink” while her “m’m’ry’s leaves are falling deeply on [her] Jungfraud’s Messongebook.”¹⁵⁷

Her golden qualities not only reference the colour of choice for the pre-book publication of the *Storiella* volume: in this final passage, “Jungfraud” evidently indicates a young girl, a young *frau*, the analysis Lucia took with Jung, *Syung*, and dismisses the validity of psychoanalysis and indeed Freud as a “fraud.” The passage dismisses psychoanalytic discourse while presenting something different, an alternative *understanding* between father and daughter. The “leafy” speaker addresses a parental figure, using Lucia’s nickname for her father, “exaggerator,” and the passage’s “silve me solve” recalls an occasion when Lucia told her care worker while staying at Küsnacht, Cary Baynes, to tell Joyce “that she was a crossword puzzle” he was to solve, which she associated with her personality as evidentially splintered.¹⁵⁸ We can perceive, within this metatextual analysis, plausible connections between Joyce’s concern for Lucia and the closing epilogue to *Finnegans Wake*.

¹⁵⁶ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 619.20–24; 31, emphasis mine.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 562.5; 556.19; 384.11; 460.19–20.

¹⁵⁸ Shloss, *To Dance in the Wake*, 288.

This assertion differs from what is commonly understood in the scholarship on *Finnegans Wake*. The final passage is typically thought of as a monologue delivered by ALP, the mother in the text who represents the river Liffey now returning to her father the sea.¹⁵⁹ However, although the majority of scholars insist on the epilogue as being ALP's monologue, the arguments for this interpretation are not sufficiently convincing. The notion that *Finnegans Wake* ends with a monologue from the text's central, maternal figure seems derived from a comparative reading with how *Ulysses* ends with Molly Bloom's soliloquy in the "Penelope" chapter that closes the novel. Daniel Ferrer writes in the preface to VI.B.47 that one of the only significant revisions made to the uncharacteristically fluid composition of this final section is an increasing emphasis on a father–daughter narrative.¹⁶⁰ Ferrer, like others, characterises this change as indicative of ALP's return to her father the sea. However, it is at least as likely that the daughter in the section is the text's actual daughter. As Hayman notes, "Is/Isolde existed long before Joyce thought to invent ALP as an avatar of Nora Barnacle."¹⁶¹

While it is undeniable that the final section at the end of *Finnegans Wake*, like the rest of *Finnegans Wake*, is a confluence of voices, the maternal character of ALP's voice interacts with Issy's at points in the closing of the text. The present reading argues that Issy is the epilogue's dominant speaker, and that ALP's voice significantly fades following her postscript that precedes the epilogue. A number of references to the Rainbow Girls lead up to the epilogue: Issy and Lucia's dance troupe the "Rhythm and Colour," "heptachromatic sevenhued," stretch and prepare for the epilogue's opening lines as though ushering her moment in, diminishing ALP as the final subject closing the text.¹⁶² When considering how Joyce used literary activity to supplement for psychiatric care, and how he continued to parlay Lucia's story into its conclusion, the finale to his text can be read differently. The emendations Joyce made to his work concerning Lucia reach a resounding conclusion by noting that he integrated his work with her on *Storiella* into the end of the text simultaneously. Proving this to be the case requires paratextual attention that not only demonstrates the evidence of an overlap

¹⁵⁹ See Dirk Van Hulle, "The Lost Word: *Book IV*," in Slotte and Crispi, *How Joyce Wrote*, 453.

¹⁶⁰ Deane et al, *Notebooks at Buffalo*, VI.B.47, 7.

¹⁶¹ Hayman, "Suspect Dreams," 148.

¹⁶² Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 610.33; 611.6.

between sections compositionally, but it must also show how we can understand the significance.

Considering the overlap between work on the epilogue and Issy's footnotes in II.2, the footnotes themselves show the genetic link to the IV passage. A comparative reading between the final published text, *Storiella*, and draft changes to both II.2 and IV in the *James Joyce Archive* indicates that there is a logic to the disposition of the footnotes and revisions in IV that reveals how the two sections are connected, an association that has not been pursued in genetic readings of the text. The intentionality behind Joyce's placement of the footnotes is distinct: the highly deliberate arrangement of the footnotes against the traditional interpretations of this chapter's genesis. The letter footnote, wherein the speaker contemplates "putting an end to myself and my malody," for example, is the 100th footnote in the sequence.¹⁶³ In the *James Joyce Archive*, the typescript upon which Joyce indicates that the footnote is to be thought of as a "letter" is catalogued as having been written in 1934. This seems odd, as it does not appear in either the *transition* volume from 1934, nor in *Storiella* from 1937. There is no convincing justification for why it should be thought of as having been written in 1934. Given that this version of the "letter" does not appear anywhere in the text—not as a footnote in drafts for II.2 nor elsewhere in the text prior to the 1938 proof—makes this dating questionable. It is possible to suggest it could have been composed during 1937 or as late as 1938, in conjunction with these late draft changes. With 500 words, the "halt for hearsake," the 100th footnote is the longest in the chapter.¹⁶⁴

This footnote is followed by a silence on the next page, which has no footnotes, the only page in the chapter to have none.¹⁶⁵ There seems to be an implicit, evocative play: while the page succeeding the largest footnote has no footnote, the body of the text on the page that contains no footnotes describes a second "letter," one from a "second" Issy "Auburn chenlemagne," a likely indication that the characteristic bifurcation that Issy's figure frequently represents functions in tandem between the footnotes and the body of the text.¹⁶⁶ It includes reference to the Cinderella "who angled her slipper" in *The Mime* and previous hopes of a literary career: II.2 signs its letter with "best from

¹⁶³ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 279.F1.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 279.9.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 242.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 242.27–28.

cinder Christinette if prints chumming can be desires soldi.”¹⁶⁷ It’s not only Christine but also another, “dunloop into eath the ocher,” that indicates it is Lucy, Lucia, or Issy here: “Lucihere!”¹⁶⁸

Attention to the footnotes, to the 100th, and its reflection as a letter provided in the body of the text on the page succeeding it reveals this as an important point in the section concerned with the mysterious “letter” of *Finnegans Wake*. The reflective play that Joyce is setting up should, at this stage, be familiar. The processes of mirroring, veiling, reflecting, and dispersing have operated in conjunction with instances of Lucia’s influence on how Joyce reflected her into his writing, thus indicating a source of internal tension within the text, arguably much like a symptom refers to itself through inference or, to recall Levin’s review, “calculated slips of the tongue” and “lapses.”¹⁶⁹ The transmission/reflection of the letter from the footnote to the body of the text typographically and repeatedly suggests such difference through a shrinking and expanding between the respective size of its typescript, numerical play, and exceptions. A difference in size is nuanced in how the sum of the *Wake*’s dancers, totalling twenty-nine, “shrinks” into eleven or *II* when their digital sum (two plus nine) is calculated—a subtle reference to this section of the text that Joyce had called II.II in his advertisement for it in *transition* 26.

Paying attention to the footnotes shows something else that allows for a connection between the developments in the footnotes and the end of *Finnegans Wake* and that elaborates on psychoanalytic nuance. The 199th footnote of the final, published *Wake* reads: “lifp year fend you all and moe, fouveniers foft as fummer fnow, fweet willings and forget-uf-knots.”¹⁷⁰ There is only one other place that has Joyce’s neologism “lifp”—the first draft of the *Wake*’s final passage, which begins its epilogue. This presents an initial narrative connection between the final compositional states of IV and text in the footnotes of II.2. In David Hayman’s *First Version Draft*, underlined for further emphasis (though the bold text indicates the author’s emphasis) the word “lifp” appears in the epilogue:

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 224.30–31; 280.21–22.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 295.33.

¹⁶⁹ Levin, *James Joyce*, 185.

¹⁷⁰ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 302.F2.

Soft morning, city! I am leafy-leafy speafing. *Lifp!* Foltly and foltly ~~they~~ all **the nights** have ~~falled~~ being falling on to long my hair. Not a sound, falling. The woods are so fond always. It is for ~~our~~ my golden wending. ~~Come~~ **Rise up, Rise up, man of the hooths**, you have slept so long! I am leafy, your golden, so you called me, exaggerator!¹⁷¹

Joyce's draft changes to the end of Book IV show a notable amount of attention to this tiny narrative connection, one that fundamentally links his footnote in chapter II.2 (placed during 1938) with the epilogue at the end of *Finnegans Wake*. The "Lifp" footnote from II.2 is not in the *transition* volume, nor is it in *Storiella*; it does not appear until the galley proof in March 1938. Instead, we find it in the 175th footnote, which could intentionally reflect the number of volumes of *Storiella* that were published: 175. It is not until the final published text that this footnote becomes number 199, and when exactly it was "intercalated" cannot be determined. What is clear is that its repositioning could have occurred as late as the composition of the first draft of *Finnegans Wake*'s final passage, where the word "lifp" was written into the opening lines. However, we can be sure that this footnote was rearranged somewhere between March 1938 and April 1939. The chronology and connective use of "lifp" indicate a link between the two passages that suggests a compositional overlap in 1938.

The drafts and proofs for the epilogue show that Joyce's neologism "lifp" received particular attention during the draft changes. In the second draft, he obscures the connection between the footnote and the first lines of the epilogue by removing the "I," a letter that connotes Issy, a lisp, a Milly differentiated from her mother Molly, the "I" of a subject, and a "letter" in general.¹⁷² While the typescript following the first draft of the final passage shows that Joyce removed it almost immediately, in the draft to follow, he replaces it in the word "lisp," which he writes for inclusion in the sixth note next to the galley.¹⁷³ This "i" would also be removed before the text was published, and the final, 1939 published version reads: "Soft morning, city! Lsp! I am leafy speafing. Lpf! Foltly and foltly all the nights have falled on to long my hair. Not a sound, falling. Lispn!"¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ David Hayman, *A First Draft Version of Finnegans Wake* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963), 284, author's emphasis.

¹⁷² Groden, Gabler et al., *James Joyce Archive*, 53: 143.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 53: 184.

¹⁷⁴ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 619.20–21.

This connection genetically posits a compositional overlap between II.2 and the end of IV, but what does it mean? Returning to the “lifp” footnote in II.2, it reads “lifp year fendu you all and moe, fouveniers foft as fummer fnow, fweet willings and forget-uf-knots.”¹⁷⁵ “Decoding” this footnote is not difficult; it involves an exchange of an “f” for an “s,” mimicking a typographical convention prior to the 18th and 19th centuries. The long s, f, looks like an f without the crossbar and was formally used at the start or within a word, whereas the character s was only used at the end of a word: thus “lifp” looks very much like “lisp.” Implementing this convention suggests two things: 1) it appropriates one childish and commonly used way of coding “dirty” messages amongst studying children; and 2) it associates printing conventions before the 19th century with the aesthetic qualities of the *Storiella* volume as an antiquated text. Translating the footnote by substituting an “s” for an “f” increases the readability of the footnote into “lisp year sends you all and moe, souvenirs soft as summer snow, sweet willings and forget-us-knots.”

Beyond increasing the footnote’s legibility, applying a similar exchange of letters in the first line of the epilogue—the final section of the text—is even more interesting. If we substitute an “s” for an “f” while further adding the “i” that preoccupied the draft changes in the final passage, we can translate “Lsp! I am leafy speafing. Lpf!” using the same logic from the footnote in II.2. A correlative reading between the footnote in II.2 and the opening of the epilogue reads the opening of *Finnegans Wake*’s epilogue as: “Lisp! I am leasy speasing. Lips!” That is, a *lapsus linguae* here names a lisped Issy–Lucia hybrid, “leasy,” as spoken through lispings “speasing” lips and opens the final passage in Book IV, clearly announced as the speaker to close the book.

The connection between lips and lisp in both the footnote and the epilogue is hidden yet was very likely intentional. Genetic work is the only way these sections could be understood as fundamentally connected; after Joyce deleted the “i” from the “lifp” in the epilogue in October–November 1938, the textual interdependence between the two footnotes and the end of the *Wake* is imperceptible without examining the drafts. The rearrangement of the “i,” “f,” and “s” indicated by the footnote in chapter II.2 functions for several other seemingly nonsensical words in the final passage of Book IV. In many of its three-letter words, an addition of an “i” or a change from an “f” to an “s”

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 303.F2.

increases legibility; for example, “snf?” becomes “sins?” and “lff” becomes “liss,” and so on.¹⁷⁶ The changes to the footnotes, which continued until *Finnegans Wake*’s final publication, would indicate that they can be used to decipher other changes in the text in 1938, and in other areas of the final passage beyond its opening lines. Joyce’s modifications of the marginalia and footnotes of II.2 could help to interpret other parts of the text.

In considering the lapse of the letter as a way into suggesting that the *Storiella* volume links with the eulogising passage written at the end of the *Wake* as being to and for Lucia, there are a number of factors to consider. First, Joyce maintained his belief that Lucia would be well again as late as 1937. However, by the time he was implementing the final changes to *Finnegans Wake* during 1938, it was clear that it was unlikely that she would recover.¹⁷⁷ Lucia was still held in the sanatorium at Ivry, and as Helen Fleischman recalls, Joyce would visit her every Sunday. Sometimes she was not well enough to receive him “and then he would return to Paris very discouraged.”¹⁷⁸ Other times “they would dance with wild abandon together,” an experience echoed in the final passage of the *Wake*: “for all our wild dances in all the wild din.”¹⁷⁹ According to Fleischman, Joyce would often weep on his return to Paris. It seems likely, as the last changes were being added to *Finnegans Wake* after seventeen years of work, that Joyce would have reflected on his daughter’s six years of institutionalisation and treatments, which had begun on his birthday in 1932.

In a letter Joyce wrote to Paul Ruggiero in September 1938, a date that corresponds with when Joyce began work on “soft morning city,” he wrote:

How do you begin and end a fairy tale or little story for children in Greek? To explain the matter to you: in English you begin:
Once upon a time and a very good time it was; and you end like this:
So they put on the kettle and they made tea and they lived happily ever after
[...] Of course I don’t want the Greek translation of these sentences but something typically Greek (with the Italian translation underneath). Each

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 625.17; 628.7.

¹⁷⁷ See Ellmann, *Letters, Volume III*, 405.

¹⁷⁸ Fleischman cited in Fordham, “Lucia Joyce’s Breakdown,” 246.

¹⁷⁹ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 627.25–26.

country has its own expressions for this purpose. I have finished my long book.¹⁸⁰

This letter shows that Joyce was preparing to compose his epilogue as the end of a fairy tale, much like the one that *Storiella as she is Syung* represents when the aesthetics of its pre-book publication form is considered. The example that Joyce provides for how a fairy tale is written in English is the first line from *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. This connection suggests that Joyce wanted to associate the beginning of *A Portrait*, with a child being read a story, and the end of *Finnegans Wake*. What we can now see is that there is a significant conceptual correlation between the chapter of *Finnegans Wake* associated with Lucia and the character of Issy in the footnotes to the very final passage of the text itself that implies a parent telling a story to their child who wonders, “is there one who understands me?”¹⁸¹

In the epilogue a small girl and her father walk hand in hand towards the sea, bringing the text to a close:

My leaves have drifted from me. All. But one clings still. I'll bear it on me. To remind me of. Lff! So soft this morning, ours. Yes. Carry me along, taddy, like you done through the toy fair. ... Whish! A gull. Gulls. Far calls. Coming, far! End here. Us then. Finn, again! Take. Bussoftlhee, mememormee! Till thousandsthee. Lps. The keys to. Given! A way a lone a last a loved a long the¹⁸²

This bittersweet ending accrues significance when, as this chapter has argued, it is taken as a final ode to Lucia, the best Joyce had left to give. The daughter is carried along by her father and utters a girlish call to be remembered, “mememormee,” while also suggesting a liberating freedom— “The keys to. Given!”—at the summit to which they are heading together. The river Liffey (Irish: *An Life*) represents the “life” that flows through Dublin and to the Delta, the letter that follows Gamma in the Greek alphabet. As this chapter has argued, the final passage in *Finnegans Wake* eulogises Lucia in a recuperative and open-ended conclusion.

¹⁸⁰ Gilbert, *Letters, Volume I*, 400.

¹⁸¹ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 627.15.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 628.6–9; 13–16.

Fordham has noted that small and subtle revisions to the first chapter in the book have responses in Leafy's monologue: "the Overture and Epilogue look forward to and back over each other."¹⁸³ The famous first sentence of *Finnegans Wake* corresponds with the conclusion of the book.¹⁸⁴ That is, there is an inherent regeneration in the way that the book ends to lead to its beginning. If we consider the end of the book as evoking Joyce's hopes for Lucia, then this vision accrues in significance. In attempting to understand her through forms of literary engagement, Joyce eulogised Lucia at the end of a text that feeds into its beginning, symbolising regenerative freedom that he still hoped was possible for her even though the odds looked grim. We can also note that the signed first Faber editions of *Finnegans Wake* amounted to a total of "four hundred and twenty-five numbered copies of which one hundred and twenty-five copies are for sale in Great Britain and three hundred copies in the United States of America." That is, 29 (twenty-five plus four) copies were issued in Great Britain and 29 (one plus twenty-five plus three) copies were issued in the United States, respectively. The repetition of the "hymnnumber twenty nine" of the dancing leap year girls, the total limited-edition pre-publication volumes of *The Mime*, and an allusion to the 229 footnotes of II.2 continues.¹⁸⁵ The two digital sums of 29 would make the double set of this number into 11:11, thereby mirroring the II.II/II.2 chapter, the double instance of the letter, and the ongoing theme of mirroring throughout Joyce's appropriations of Lucia within his work.

In *Finnegans Wake*, one of the old wise men wonders if she is the "clou historique," a clue to the riddle of the whole story, the character—as Fordham wonders—around which everything in the book rotates.¹⁸⁶ Certainly, as this chapter has sought to show, Joyce's preoccupation with his daughter is of resounding impact on *Finnegans Wake*. Her influence on his work is still uncharted, though this chapter has sought to contribute to that scholarship. But what a study of her relations to the text also shows is his attempts at her psychological recuperation. Joyce tried to rehabilitate Lucia through artistic projects that corresponded with a number of areas in *Finnegans Wake*. When she was no longer capable of providing illustrations to contribute to his work, Joyce metastasised her experience, and his hopes for her, within his pages. While Joyce could

¹⁸³ Finn Fordham, "'The End;' 'Zee End;' Chapter I.1," in Slote and Crispi, *How Joyce Wrote*, 479.

¹⁸⁴ Geert Lernout, "The Beginning," in Slote and Crispi, *How Joyce Wrote*, 49–50.

¹⁸⁵ Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 234.34.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 528.14; xix.

not succeed at curing her, he immortalised Lucia in his fiction through a restorative conclusion.

Conclusion

When Joyce was to receive his first copy of the published *Finnegans Wake*, he wrote to Carlow on 28 January 1939:

My book is to be sent over on Wednesday by air express but unfortunately [...] It might arrive at the very last moment after a day of exhaustive waiting and even that would be too late to allow of my showing it to my daughter (who lives outside Paris) in the early afternoon. Or it might just arrive the morning after the 2nd in which case I should feel inclined to throw it out the window. In sum, I should like to be sure of having it on that morning.¹⁸⁷

Joyce was preoccupied not simply with the fact his book, after nearly two decades of work, had finally been published in its entirety; of other concern was whether it would arrive in time so that he could show it to Lucia. Perhaps he would have shown her the connections in the text that have been described above: that the footnotes in the section most involving her character connect to the beginning of the epilogue to the ending of the book, integrating its final resolution as about her. Given that Joyce tried to promote her work following her breakdown and that much of it proved unsuccessful, incorporating her into his final text was a way to overcome this problem. To put it simply, Joyce wanted to make her well again, to let her believe that she would be remembered and immortalised, and he tried to do what he believed psychoanalysis could not: provide recuperative resolution.

In the attempt to foster her rehabilitation, Joyce's private yet extensive efforts refute contemporary understandings of Lucia that have become popular in recent years. This chapter has shown the subtle way in which she is incorporated in his text over time through a paratextual and genetic reading, to show how this methodology both complicates and enhances our understanding of the relation between *Finnegans Wake* and psychoanalysis. This chapter has particularly sought to demonstrate how literary genetics can cultivate an archive of psychological experience that can be traced over time to view Joyce's literary activities as an alternative to psychoanalysis. It has also shown

¹⁸⁷ Cited in Fordham, "Lucia's Breakdown, 394.

that genetic scholarship has neglected the developmental impact of character Issy, and the way that Lucia may have augmented Joyce's writing due to her various medical treatments and institutionalisations.

While it is evident that Lucia had a significant impact on Joyce's writing, particularly in *Finnegans Wake* in relation to his attempts to understand, and potentially cure her over time, this chapter has tried to offer something more. To study the intersections between modernist fiction and psychoanalytic theory cannot be wholly theoretical, especially in Joyce's case. The author's ambivalent attitude towards psychoanalysis in terms of how it can interpret his fiction, is circumspect to his engagements with Lucia's serious prognoses. We can read Joyce differently by examining these parallels, and in doing so come to a greater understanding of not only his final work, but how it meaningfully imbricates his daughter within its pages.

Demonstrating the first appearances of Lucia in Joyce's fiction, and how understanding the impact of her schizophrenia has been the subject of extensive, speculative scholarly debate that has migrated into public dialogue and fictional representation. However, examining how after Lucia's outburst in 1932 her involvement in Joyce's work dramatically changed, both at the level of narrative content and in her artistic involvement with his work, provides new ways to understand his final text. This chapter has argued that Joyce tried to understand her through aesthetic engagement, and suggested that a literary, genetic reading of *Storiella as she is Syung* in relation to *transition*, the *James Joyce Archive*, and the final published text of *Finnegans Wake* shows that the intentional positioning and value of the footnotes in II.II connect to the conclusion of the text. Reading *Finnegans Wake*'s final passage in this way provides a new way of interpreting the end of the book as a recuperative, imaginative vision for Lucia. As such, it becomes possible to read this section of *Finnegans Wake* as one of modernist literature's most complex responses to the challenge posed by psychoanalysis.

Conclusion: Redefining the Territory of the Literary

I avow myself that in writing (this work) I have learned many things which I did not know.

—Saint Augustine¹

This dissertation has sought to examine how an awareness of the challenges posed by psychoanalysis can change the way we read the modernist text. For many of the most prominent figures in literary modernism, psychoanalysis was seen both as a source of possibility, and as something of an interloper, encroaching on the territory of the literary. It has been argued here that D.H. Lawrence, Anaïs Nin, and James Joyce each uniquely rejected what they saw as the more reductive aspects of psychoanalytic theory, such as Freud's attempts to diagnostically categorise human behaviour. This thesis has explored the ways that these modernist authors challenge and extend the more aesthetic possibilities of the analytic method by examining the paratextual literary process of their texts. Doing so has allowed us to explore how modernist literature examines the relations between language, mind, sexuality, and the self.

Psychoanalysis not only makes us think about the importance language has for understanding the self; it focuses on the process of how the significance of language is specific, personal, and created over time. It reveals something about forms of knowledge that are invisible to science. In particular, the modernist literary process demonstrates durational aspects of consciousness through the use of unconventional narratives, formed through an extensive confluence between memory, editorial deletion, self-understanding, and re-transcription. We can navigate the writing of the self with literary process in ways that are dynamic precisely because of how literary language reflects the development of ideas, concepts, and memories over time. Examining the processes behind the text is similar to the way the mind experiences the world: without a final narration. In order to take literary studies seriously as a way of revisiting and challenging the questions psychoanalysis poses (of consciousness, of the relationship between language and the unconscious, of being in the world), we open up the possibilities for reading literature as a process rather than a final, published work.

¹ From Book Three of the Latin treatise *De Trinitate*, *Omnia Opera*, 2: 690, translated by Patrick Mahony in "Psychoanalysis—Writing Cure," in *Writing in Psychoanalysis*, eds. Emma Piccioli, Pier Luigi Rossi, and Antonio Alberto Semi (London: Karnac Books, 1996), 13.

Underpinning the relationship between psychoanalysis and literature in the early 20th century is a contrast between what we might think of as two cultures of knowledge. In this respect, it is worth recalling how Jürgen Habermas has written on how science and technology have progressively “colonized the lifeworld” to the extent that the value of other modes of thinking *outside* of science, such as literary aesthetics, often find themselves in a state of defence against the knowledge produced by scientific inquiry, which is seen as reductive.² In C.P. Snow’s *Two Cultures*, he summarises this view (which, it could be argued, is reductive in its own right):

Scientists have their own culture...which contains a great deal of argument, usually much more rigorous, and almost always at a much higher conceptual level than a literary person’s argument.³

Freud’s oversight, as Stephen Richmond puts it, is that he continued to fall into the self-conscious trap of thinking like Snow.⁴ Despite all evidence demonstrating that the aesthetic is an inherent and useful aspect for studying psychology, Freud continued to plot, catalogue and defend psychoanalysis as a “rigorous” science, all the while absorbing contradictory elements of the aesthetic into his framework. His disciples, many of whom analysed literary texts for little else than evidential proof of the scientific legitimacy of psychoanalysis (as we have seen in Lawrence), tried to relegate literary works to the position of objects of analysis, rather than as modes of knowledge in their own right.

This is not to say that psychoanalysis should not be thought of as interdisciplinary, in that both science and the aesthetic coalesce in a dynamic theory of the mind. The central problem is that Freud (or, at least, some Freudians) were seen to encroach on the literary to *claim* it for science. What is more, this continues to be the case, and some

² Jürgen Habermas, *Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 2, Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason* (Beacon Press, 2003), 153–160. This quote is elaborated into a discussion of the effect science and technology has had on understanding consciousness by integral philosopher Ken Wilber in *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality: The Spirit of Evolution* (New York: Shambala, 1995), 652.

³ C.P. Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 11.

⁴ See Stephen Richmond, “Psychoanalysis as Applied Aesthetics,” *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 85, no. 3 (July 2016): 614. Although Richmond does not reference Snow, he spends a significant portion of his text highlighting the importance of revisiting psychoanalysis as an applied, aesthetic system. He discusses how Freud’s oversight was to continue to try to define psychoanalysis as a science.

intersections of psychoanalysis and literature, such as in Thomas Carmagno's analysis of Virginia Woolf's manic depression and her literature, continue to attempt to deploy the language of literature as the object of scientific study. In such cases, the literary text is treated as symptom.⁵ Other literary studies, which employ aspects of psychoanalytic theory, often present highly impressionistic and representational readings of literary texts that seem ill-equipped to take further the possibilities of what the literary can develop *beyond* psychoanalysis. Shoshauna Felman equates such an application of the psychoanalytic method to literature as "acquired science," and cautions against it. But if the analytic method is divested of attempts to be a science, and is used to explore the fluid and relational language of the self by concentrating on the possibilities of studying literary process itself, then the literary text-as-process may provide ways of knowing that are inaccessible to the scientific study of the mind.

This perspective gains an added methodological importance within literary studies when we acknowledge that within the relatively small, scholarly world of genetic criticism, debates continue to exist concerning its place as a "science of literature." Such claims could be seen as a self-conscious attempt to position textual studies in relation to the "true work" of a scientific discipline. Because the genetic scholar is concerned with uncovering relational meaning through text-based resources—draft dates, publication numbers, personal letters, tangible revisions to a typescript, and so on—it has been considered up for debate that this method might have a claim to fall within the realm of "science." However, the methods of genetic criticism ultimately represent tracing the connective plot of a writer's durational *process* over time, and this, it could be argued, is closer to an aesthetic method, rather than relegating the aesthetic process to the role of an object capable of rendering scientific knowledge.

For this reason, in this dissertation, it has been important to go back to the origins of Freudian psychoanalysis. When Freud broke from Charcot, he strongly stood against empirical neurological premises that cannot wholly account for human experience. He declared that a different method is required, one of equal value to scientific study. In his early work, those efforts are most plainly depicted in the abandoned "Project for a

⁵ Thomas Carmagno, *Virginia Woolf's Art and Manic-Depressive Illness* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

Scientific Psychology.” Yet, as it was argued in the first chapter, Freud had to abandon that project quite simply because there was no scientific language for what he was uncovering. His patients were experiencing symptoms that could not be attributed to physiological or neurological conditions, and yet they found relief in narrating traumatic memories. Even though many of his case studies were unsuccessful, the fundamental premise of the process of using language could be used to understand the working of the mind, particularly in relation to memory and the logic of associative language, which offered new possibilities for understanding what it means to be human.

If we abandon the vestiges of Freud’s dependence on *proving* the legitimacy of psychoanalysis as a science, and rather focus on the aesthetic process inherent in his methods for exploring the associative self as being fundamentally literary, we can better see how it lays the groundwork for a methodology that takes seriously how the process of writing can open up the immanent psychoanalytic impetus in key modernist texts. By using varying modes of genetic analysis—from the paratextual trial pieces of Lawrence’s essays, to the intertextual use of the diaries in *Nin*, to a rigorous genetic reading of Joyce’s relationship to Lucia visible in the pre-publication genetic dossier of *Finnegans Wake*—this thesis has sought to examine how a process-based literary study can pursue some of the same goals as psychoanalysis (understanding the mind at work) by using the literary method implicit within Freudian psychoanalysis.

Indeed, it may be that this will be one of the most enduring aspects of Freud’s legacy, given that much of what he introduced to clinical practice has long since been overtaken by other developments in psychology and cognitive neuroscience. In some respects, this leaves the field open for new literary readings of his work. Moreover, it allows us to move past the well-rehearsed specifics of his theory—the Oedipus complex, repression, etc.—to concentrate on the ways in which his method impacted the generation of literary writers who came after him. Accordingly, it is argued here that Lawrence’s attempts to create a new, alternative theory of the unconscious in *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, discussed in chapter two, are best approached at the level of style. By conducting a reading of the analytic essays as paratextual to his later fiction, it becomes possible to see the Lawrence’s later fiction as an attempt reclaim a means of understanding the processes of the mind from psychoanalysis through literary style. The terms in which Lawrence

did so provide a perspective from which it is possible to see why Anaïs Nin would have been inspired by Lawrence's work, largely because Lawrence's work showed her how lived experience and writerly craft can be fused into a narrative of the self and body that dreams. By comparing the unexpurgated diaries to her edited ones, and examining what Nin withheld, developed, and ultimately used to write her first fictional text, in chapter three it became clear that writing-as-process for Nin was a means of exploring the female unconscious and female desire. Although comparatively little scholarship on Nin exists (at least in contrast to Lawrence or Joyce), and that which does exist often focuses on her sexual explicitness, it has been shown here that by focusing on her writing as process, her work gains a new importance, and with it her significance for understanding modernism more generally.

The final chapter sought to expand the scope of reading text-as-process by deploying a genetic analysis of Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* to recalibrate our understanding of his daughter Lucia's absorption in the text. Out of all of the authors examined in this dissertation, Joyce was the most directly impacted by the realities of mental illness as Lucia underwent countless procedures, institutional stays, and a variety of treatments ranging from analytic therapy to dubious medical "cures." It is almost ironic, yet justifiable, that he had so little to say about psychoanalysis; he chose to ignore it, while rigorously incorporating so many instances of Lucia's increasing mental instability and experience into the text. Beyond the specific elements that she contributed to pre-publication fragments of *Finnegans Wake* (imperceptible in the final published text), chapter four demonstrated that Joyce worked Lucia into the body of the text through numerous revisions that correspond to her worsening condition. As argued, the text's epilogue closes with a memorialising dedication to Lucia as a way to ensure her memory. Genetic criticism can allow for a fuller picture of the durational aspects of literary process over time that perhaps best exemplifies the approach to the literary text as process, which, it can be argued, was implicit within Freudian psychoanalysis.

The approach to the concept of the paratext here has been informed by recent developments in genetic criticism, which argue for a practice that is investigative, combining theory and practice in ways that focus on textual evolution as a source of interpretive value. While the enigmatic quality of what constitutes authorship or the interpretive possibilities of a final published work invariably persists, a genetic

approach grapples with the enigma from within the developmental process. In chapter I.5 of *Finnegans Wake* Belinda the hen uncovers the infamous letter concerning HCE's crime from a midden heap—a process that echoes Freud's self-proclaimed description of *The Interpretation of Dreams* as a “dung heap, seedling, and a new species.”⁶ In *Finnegans Wake*, the letter, befitting of the scratchings of a hen, is mostly illegible; we are presented with different versions or “drafts” throughout its subsequent appearances in the *Wake* that are never wholly decipherable. This example is in many ways analogous to the genetic approach where genetic scholars read versions, revisions, emendations, and errors in what can be broadly construed as behind-the-scenes “heaps” of letters, and they do so in order to facilitate an ever-evolving interpretation of the text's lettered meaning that can be interpretively traced, but never wholly concluded.

The possibility for plotting out a topographical understanding of literary texts directly relates to some of the most recent work done by Dirk Van Hulle. In particular, Van Hulle has defined the ways in which what he calls the “endogenetic” and “exogenetic” refer to the inside and outside of the genesis of a text respectively; “the drafts of a new work and the external source text consulted by the author.”⁷ Additionally, epigenesis refers to post-publication modifications “that continued even after publication,” and could inform readers of material pertaining to the interpretation of the text after it had been published.⁸ The contingent and self-referential manner in which text can be creatively interpreted through multiple changes over time, such as in the model offered by Van Hulle, can demonstrate how seemingly unrelated sections of a final published work are indeed connected, and the manner in which they grew to be incorporated into its final presentation.⁹ In the considering the engagement with psychoanalysis of the three writers studied here, all of these elements come into play: we see both the impact of the “source text” in all three, the re-drafting of works in process in Nin and Joyce, and, in Lawrence, a very particular case of a published text being re-contextualised by

⁶ Freud to Fliess, 28 May 1899, cited in Mahony, “Writing Cure,” 31.

⁷ Dirk Van Hulle, “Editing the *Wake*'s Genesis,” in *James Joyce and Genetic Criticism*, ed. Genevieve Sartor (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 44. For a thorough description of endogenetic and exogenetic, refer to pages 44–46.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁹ Recently, there has been extensive funding awarded towards projects that investigate similar possibilities. For example, the collaborative “Beckett and Brain Science” was an AHRC-funded project between Warwick, Reading, and Birkbeck on Beckett's writing and neuroscience. This project has gone on to accrue additional AHRC funding for the project “Modernism, Medicine, and the Embodied Mind” at the universities of Bristol, Exeter, and Warwick in partnership with the New York Psychoanalytic Institute.

later published texts. It is the contention here, then, that by extending this method to include other works not usually considered by genetic criticism, such as Nin's diaries or Lawrence's early attacks on psychoanalysis, we see more clearly some of the ways in which certain key modernist texts responded to the challenges that psychoanalysis posed by absorbing one of Freud's most abiding findings: the possibility of using language as process to understand the processes of the mind. In this repositioning of method, in which the literary text is read as process rather than as final published artefact, we find literature reclaiming the ground of knowledge.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Bair, Deirdre. *Anais Nin: A Biography*. London: Bloomsbury, 1993.
- Boulton, James T., ed. *The Selected Letters of D.H. Lawrence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . ed. *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume I: 1901–1913*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- . ed., with George J. Zytaruk. *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume II: 1913–1916*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- . ed., with Andrew Robertson. *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume III: 1916–1921*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Charcot, Jean-Martin. *The Tuesday Lessons: Excerpts from Nine Case Presentations on General Neurology Delivered at the Salpêtrière Hospital in 1887–88*. Translated by Christopher G. Goetz. New York: Raven Press, 1987.
- . *Clinical Lectures on Diseases of the Nervous System*. Vol. III. Translated by Thomas Savill. London: The New Sydenham Society, 1889; reprinted and intro. Ruth Harris. London: Routledge, 1991.

- , and Pierre Marie. “Hysteria mainly Hysteroepilepsy.” In *A Dictionary of Psychological Medicine*, edited by D. Hack Tuke, 627–641. London: J. & A. Churchill, 1892.
- Byrne, Janet. *A Genius for Living: A Biography of Frieda Lawrence*. London: Bloomsbury, 1995.
- Comte, Auguste. *Introduction to Positive Philosophy*. Translated by Frederick Ferre. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1998.
- Crews, Frederick. *Freud: The Making of an Illusion*. New York: Macmillan, 2017. Applebooks Edition.
- Crispi, Luca and Sam Slote, eds. *How Joyce Wrote “Finnegans Wake”: A Chapter-by-Chapter Guide*. Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 2007.
- Deane, Vincent, Daniel Ferrer, and Geert Lernout, eds. *The “Finnegans Wake” Notebooks at Buffalo*. Projected at 55 volumes. Turnhout: Brepols, 2001–.
- Deppman, Jed, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, eds. *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-textes*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Derrida, Jacques. “Freud and the Scene of Writing.” Translated by Jeffrey Mehlman. *Yale French Studies* 48 (1972): 74–117.
- Ellenberger, Henri. *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. London: Fontana Press, 1994.
- Ellmann, Richard, ed. *The Letters of James Joyce, Volume III*. New York: Viking Press, 1966.
- . *James Joyce*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1959] 1982.
- . ed. *Selected Letters of James Joyce*. New York: Viking Press, 1979.
- Fahy, Catherine, ed. *The James Joyce-Paul Léon Papers in the National Library of Ireland: A Catalogue*. Dublin: Library, 1992.
- Fink, Bruce. *A Clinical Introduction to Freud: Techniques for Everyday Practice*. London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2017. Applebooks Edition.
- Freud, Ernst, ed. *Letters of Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth Press, 1961.
- Freud, Sigmund. *An Autobiographical Study*. Translated by James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 1950.
- . *Civilization and its Discontents*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
- . *General Psychological Theory: Papers on Metapsychology*. Edited by Philip Rieff. New York: Touchstone, 2008.

- . *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. 24 vols. Edited and Translated by James Strachey. London: Vintage, 2001.
- . *The Origins of Psychoanalysis: Letters to Wilhelm Fliess, Drafts and Notes: 1887–1902*. Edited by Marie Bonaparte, Anna Freud, and Ernst Kris. New York: Basic Books, 1954.
- . *Writings on Art and Literature*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Gay, Peter. *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988.
- Gilbert, Stuart, ed. *The Letters of James Joyce: Volume I*. New York: Viking Press, 1966.
- Groden, Michael, gen. ed. *The James Joyce Archive*. 66 vols. New York: Garland Publishing, 1978–79.
- Hutchison, Patricia. *James Joyce's World*. London: Methuen, 1957.
- Jolas, Eugene, gen. ed. *transition*. 27 vols. Paris: Shakespeare and Company, 1927–1938.
- Jones, Ernest. *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*. Edited by Lionel Trilling and Steven Marcus. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. Edited by Robbert-Jan Henkes, Erik Bindervoet and Finn Fordham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . *Giacomo Joyce*. Edited by Richard Ellmann. New York: Viking Press, 1968.
- . *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*. Paris: Servire Press, 1934.
- . *Pomes Penyeach*. London: Faber & Faber, 1970.
- . *Pomes Penyeach*. Paris: Obelisk Press, 1932.
- . *Storiella as She is Syung*. Paris: Obelisk Press, 1937.
- . *Tales Told of Shem and Shaun*. Preface by C.K. Ogden. Paris: Black Sun Press, 1929.
- . *Ulysses*. Edited by Hans Walter Gabler, Wolfhard Steppe, and Claus Melchior. New York: Viking Press, 1993.
- Hayman, David. *A First Draft Version of "Finnegans Wake."* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963.
- Kinkead-Weekes, Mark. *Cambridge Biography of D.H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile (1912–1922)*. 3 vols. *Cambridge Bibliography of D.H. Lawrence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Knowlson, James. *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett*. London: Bloomsbury, 1997. Applebooks Edition.

- Lacan, Jacques. "The Instance of the Letter in the Unconscious, or Reason Since Freud." In *Écrits*. Translated by Bruce Fink in collaboration with Héloïse Fink and Russell Grigg, 412–441. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006.
- Laplanche, Jean and J.-B Pontalis, *The Language of Psychoanalysis*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. London: Karnac Books, 1988.
- Lawrence, D.H. *Aaron's Rod*. Edited by Mara Kalnins. London: Penguin, 1996.
- . *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Edited by Michael Squires. London: Penguin Classics, 2006.
- . "Mr. Noon." In *Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works*. Edited by Warren Roberts and Henry T. Moore. London: Heinemann, 1968.
- . *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*. Edited by E.D. McDonald. New York: Viking Press, 1936.
- . *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious; and, Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Edited by Bruce Steele. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . *Sex, Literature, Censorship*. Edited by Harry T. Moore. London: William Heinemann, 1955.
- . *Sons and Lovers*. Edited by Helen Baron and Carl Baron. London: Penguin Classics, 1994.
- . *Studies in Classic American Literature*. Edited by Ezra Greenspan, Lindeth Vasey, and John Worthen. New York: Viking Press, 1961.
- . *The Symbolic Meaning: The Uncollected Versions of Studies in Classic American Literature*. Edited by Armin Arnold. Fondwell: Arundel, 1962.
- Lawrence, Frieda. *Not I, But the Wind*. London: Granada, 1983.
- Lieberman, James. *Acts of Will: The Life and Work of Otto Rank*. New York: Free Press, 1985.
- , and Robert Kramer, eds. *The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Otto Rank: Inside Psychoanalysis*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.
- Maddox, Brenda. "Her Mother's Daughter." Omitted Epilogue to *Nora*. James Joyce Foundation, Zürich. Nora and Lucia Box, 394–406.
- . *D.H. Lawrence: The Story of a Marriage*. London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1996.
- . *Nora: The Real Life of Molly Bloom*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1988.
- Masson, Jeffrey, ed. *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887–1904*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

- Molnar, Michael, ed., trans. *The Diary of Sigmund Freud 1929–1939: A Chronicle of Events in the Last Decade*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1992.
- Nin, Anaïs. *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study*. London: Black Spring Press, 1996.
- . *The Early Diary of Anaïs Nin, Volume IV: 1944–47*. London: Quartet, 1976.
- . *Fire: From ‘A Journal of Love,’ The Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin (1934–1937)*. Edited by Rupert Pole and Gunther Stuhlmann. London: Harcourt Brace, 1995.
- . *Henry and June: From the Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin*. Edited by Rupert Pole. London: Penguin, 2017.
- . *Winter of Artifice & House of Incest*. Denver: Swallow Press, 1961.
- . *Incest: From ‘A Journal of Love,’ The Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin*. Edited by Rupert Pole. London: Penguin, 1994.
- . *In Favour of the Sensitive Man*. London: Penguin, 1992.
- . *The Journals of Anaïs Nin: Volume I*. Edited by Gunther Stuhlmann. London: Quartet Books, 1979.
- . *Mirages: The Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin (1939–1947)*. Edited by Paul Herron. Ohio: Swallow Press, 2013.
- . *The Novel of the Future*. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- . *Under a Glass Bell and Other Stories*. London: Penguin, 1978.
- . *A Woman Speaks*. Edited by Evelyn J. Hinz. London: Penguin, 1992.
- Phillips, Adam. *Becoming Freud: The Making of a Psychoanalyst*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.
- . ed. *The Penguin Freud Reader*. London: Penguin, 2006.
- Rank, Otto. *Art and Artist: Creative Urge and Personality Development*. Translated by Charles Francis Atkinson. London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1989.
- . “Der Doppelgänger.” In *Imago: Zeitschrift für Anwendung der Psychoanalyse auf die Geisteswissenschaften*, edited by Sigmund Freud, 97–164. Leipzig, Vienna, and Zürich: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1914.
- . *Double: A Psychoanalytic Study*. Translated and Edited by Harry Tucker Jr. Capehill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971.
- Shloss, Carol Loeb. *Lucia Joyce: To Dance in the Wake*. London: Bloomsbury, 2003.
- Stuhlmann, Gunther, ed. *A Literate Passion: Letters of Anaïs Nin and Henry Miller, 1932–1953*. London: Harcourt Brace, 1987.

Wollheim, Richard. *Sigmund Freud*. New York: Viking Press, 1971.

Secondary Sources

Augustine, Saint. *Against the Academics: St. Augustine's Cassiciacum Dialogues*.

Translated by Michael P. Foley. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019.

Abel, Elizabeth. *Virginia Woolf and the Fictions of Psychoanalysis*. Chicago:

University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Ackerley, Chris. "Lassata Sed: Samuel Beckett's Portraits of his Fair to Middling

Women." *Samuel Beckett Today/Aujourd'hui* 12 (2002): 62–63.

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal*. Stanford: Stanford University Press,

2004.

Anderson, Chester. *James Joyce and His World*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1967.

Anzieu, Didier. *Freud's Self-Analysis*. Translated by Peter Graham. London: Chatto &

Windus, 1986.

Attridge, Derek. "Finnegans Awake: The Dream of Interpretation." *James Joyce*

Quarterly 27, no. 1 (Fall 1989), reprinted in *JJQ 50 Years: 1963–2013* 50, no.

1–2 (Fall 2012–Winter 2013): 185–202.

———. *Joyce Effects: On Language, Theory, and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 2003.

Becket, Fiona. "Lawrence and Psychoanalysis." In *The Cambridge Companion to D.H.*

Lawrence, edited by Anne Fernihough, 217–234. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 2001.

Beede, Margaret. *The Art of the Self in D.H. Lawrence*. Ohio: Ohio University Press,

1977.

Beja, Morris. *Joyce: A Literary Life*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992.

Bell, Michael. "Myths of Civilization in Freud and Lawrence." *Études Lawrenciennes*

45 (2014): 9–26.

Benstock, Shari. "The Genuine Christine: Psychodynamics of Issy." In *Women in*

Joyce, edited by Suzette Henke and Elaine Unkeless, 169–196. Chicago:

University of Illinois Press, 1982.

Berger, Louis. *Freud: Darkness in the Midst of Vision*. New York: Wiley, 2000.

Bersani, Leo. *The Freudian Body*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

- Bhowal, Sanatan. "Lawrence and Feminism." *Etudes Lawrenciennes* 49 (2019): no page numbers.
- Bishop, John. *Joyce's Book of the Dark: "Finnegans Wake."* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.
- Bobbitt, Joan. "Truth and Artistry in the *Diary of Anaïs Nin.*" *Journal of Modern Literature* 9, no. 2 (Spring 1982): 267–276.
- Bornstein, Robert F. "Reconnecting Psychoanalysis to Mainstream Psychology: Challenges and Opportunities." *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 22, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 323–340.
- Borch-Jacobsen, Mikkel. *Remembering Anna O.: A Century of Mystification.* Translated by Kirby Olson. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Bosinelli, Rose Maria. "The Importance of Trieste in Joyce's Work, with Reference to His Knowledge of Psycho-Analysis." *James Joyce Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (Spring 1970): 177–185.
- Bradbury, Malcom, and John Fletcher. "The Inverted Novel." In *Modernism: A Guide to European Literature (1890–1930)*. Edited by Malcom Bradbury and James McFarlane, 394–415. London: Penguin, 1991.
- Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Burack, Charles. "Revitalizing the Reader: Literary Technique and the Language of Sacred Experience in D.H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover.*" *Style* 32, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 102–126.
- Burrell, Harry. *Narrative Design in "Finnegans Wake": The Lock Unpicked.* Florida: Florida University Press, 1996.
- Cahoon, Herbert, and John J. Slocum. *A Bibliography of James Joyce.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1971.
- Chambers, Jessie. *D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Record.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Chattopadhyay, Shinjini. "Giacomonic Oxen: *Avant-texte* or Intertext?" In *James Joyce and Genetic Criticism: Genesis Fields*, edited by Genevieve Sartor, 82–95. Linden: Brill, 2018.
- Cixous, Hélène. *The Exile of James Joyce.* Translated by Sally Purcell and David Lewis. London: John Calder Publishers, 1976.
- Cohen, David. *Freud on Coke.* London: Cutting Edge Press, 2011.

- Colum, Mary and Padraic. *Our Friend James Joyce*. London: Doubleday, 1958.
- Cotti, Patricia. "Hunger and Love: Schiller and the Origin of Drive Dualism in Freud's Work." *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 88, no. 1 (2007): 167–182.
- Crews, Frederick, ed. *Unauthorized Freud: Doubters Confront a Legend*. New York: Viking Press, 1998.
- Crispi, Luca. "Storiella as She Was Wryt: Chapter II.2." In *How Joyce Wrote "Finnegans Wake": A Chapter-by-Chapter Guide*, edited by Luca Crispi and Sam Slote, 214–249. Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 2007.
- Dawson, Paul. "Fictional Minds and Female Sexuality: The Consciousness Scene from *Pamela* to *Lady Chatterley's Lover*." *ELH* 86, no. 1 (Spring 2019): 161–188.
- David, Oliver. "The Author at Work in Genetic Criticism." *Paragraph* 25, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 92–106.
- Delimata, Bezena Berta. "Reminiscences of a Joyce Niece." *James Joyce Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (Spring 1981): 45–62.
- Didi-Huberman, Georges. *Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpêtrière*. Translated by Alisa Hartz. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2004.
- Doran, Christine. "Rage and Anxiety in the Split between Freud and Jung." *Humanities* 6, no. 3 (Fall 2017): 53–63.
- Ellmann, Richard. *The Consciousness of Joyce*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Ellmann, Maud. *The Nets of Modernism: Henry James, Virginia Woolf, James Joyce and Sigmund Freud*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Edmundson, Mark. *The Death of Sigmund Freud: Fascism, Psychoanalysis and the Rise of Fundamentalism*. London: Bloomsbury, 2008.
- Edward, Brian. "The Inhabited Temperament in *Sons and Lovers*." *Style* 44, no. 1–2 (Spring–Summer 2010): 62–78.
- Eggers, Tilly. "Darling Milly Bloom." *James Joyce Quarterly* 12, no. 4 (Winter 1975): 386–395.
- Ffytche, Matt. *The Foundation of the Unconscious: Shelling, Freud and the Birth of the Modern Psyche*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Felman, Shoshana. "To Open the Question." In *Literature and Psychoanalysis, The Question of Reading: Otherwise*. Edited by Shoshana Felman, 5–10. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

- . “Turning the Screw of Interpretation.” *Literature and Psychoanalysis, The Question of Reading: Otherwise*. Edited by Shoshana Felman, 94–207. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.
- Fernihough, Anne. *D.H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Ferraz, Marcia. “Science and History of Science: Between Comte and Canguilhem.” *Traversal: International Journal for the Histography of Science* 4 (2018): 108–117.
- Ferrer, Daniel. “Wonderous Devices in the Dark: Chapter III.4.” In *How Joyce Wrote “Finnegans Wake”: A Chapter-by-Chapter Guide*, edited by Luca Crispi and Sam Slote, 410–436. Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 2007.
- Fish, Stanley. *Is there a Text in this Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Fletcher, John. *Freud and the Scene of Trauma*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2013.
- Forbes, Shannon. “Joyce’s Saucebox: Milly Bloom’s Portrait in *Ulysses*.” *Irish Studies Review* 14, no. 1 (February 2006): 39–55.
- Fordham, Finn. “Biography.” In *Joyce in Context*, edited by John McCourt, 17–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- . “The End;” ‘Zee End.’ Chapter I.1.” In *How Joyce Wrote “Finnegans Wake”: A Chapter-by-Chapter Guide*, edited by Luca Crispi and Sam Slote, 462–481. Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 2007.
- . “James Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake* and Lucia Joyce’s Breakdown.” PhD diss, Birkbeck, University of London, 1996.
- . “When Lightening Becomes Electra: Violence, Inspiration, and Lucia Joyce in *Finnegans Wake*.” *James Joyce Quarterly* 39, no. 4 (Winter 2002): 655–678.
- Gay, Peter. *Freud for Historians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Gekoski, R.A. “Freud and English Literature 1900–30.” In *The Context of English Literature 1900–1930*, edited by Michael Bell, 186–217. London: Methuen & Co, 1980.
- Gelfand, Toby. “Charcot’s Response to Freud’s Rebellion.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50, no. 1 (1989): 293–307.

- Gillet, Louis. "Farewell to Joyce." In *Portraits of the Artist in Exile: Recollections of Joyce by Europeans*, edited by William Potts, 165–169. Portmarnock: Wolfhound Press, 1979.
- Gilman, Sander. *Freud, Race, and Gender*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Glasheen, Adaline. "Finnegans Wake and the Girls from Boston, Mass." *Hudson Review* 8 (Spring 1954): 88–96.
- . *The Third Census of "Finnegans Wake": An Index of the Characters and their Roles*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Gordon, John. *"Finnegans Wake": A Plot Summary*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. *The Nick of Time: Politics, Evolution and the Untimely*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.
- . *Volatile Bodies: Towards a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Guénolé, Fabian and Geoffrey Marcaggi. "Freudarwin: Evolutionary Thinking as a Root of Psychoanalysis." *Frontiers in Psychology* 9 (2018): 892–900.
- Grosskurth, Phyllis. *The Secret Ring: Freud's Inner Circle and the Politics of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Addison Wesley, 1991.
- Harmes, Valerie. "Anaïs and Her Analysts, Rank and Allendy: The Creative and Destructive Aspects." In *Anaïs Nin Literary Perspectives*, edited by Suzanne Nalbantian, 112–135. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.
- Hart, Clive. *Structure and Motif in "Finnegans Wake"*. London: Faber & Faber, 1962.
- Hay, Louis. "Genetic Criticism: Origins and Perspectives." In *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-textes*, edited by Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, 17–27. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Hayman, David. "'Scribbledehobbles' and How They Grew." In *Twelve and a Tilly*, edited by J.P. Dalton and Clive Hart, 107–119. London: Faber & Faber, 1966.
- . "Shadow of His Mind: The Papers of Lucia Joyce." In *Joyce at Texas: Essays on the James Joyce Materials at the Humanities Research Center*, edited by David Oliphant and Thomas Zigal, 65–79. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983.
- . *The "Wake" in Transit*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Holbrook, David. *Where D.H. Lawrence Was Wrong About Women*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1992.

- Ingersoll, Earl. "Gender and Language in *Sons and Lovers*." *Midwest Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (Winter 1996): 434–47.
- Isenburg, Philip and Stanley Rothman. "Sigmund Freud and the Politics of Marginality." *Central European History* 7 (1974): 58–73.
- Jelinek, Estelle. "Anaïs Nin: A Critical Evaluation." In *Feminist Criticism*, edited by Cheryl L. Brown and Karen Olson, 312–323. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1978.
- Jolas, Eugene. "Manifesto: The Revolution of the Word." In *transition workshop*, edited by Eugene Jolas, 173–174. New York: Vanguard Press, 1942.
- Jung, Carl. *Psychology of the Unconscious*. Translated by Beatrice M. Hinkle. New York: Dover, 2003.
- Kaplan, E. Ann. "From Plato's Cave to Freud's Screen." In *Psychoanalysis and Cinema*, edited by E. Ann Kaplan, 1–23. Los Angeles: The American Film Institute, 1990.
- Kehagia, Angie. "Anaïs Nin: A Case Study of Personality Disorder and Creativity." *Personality and Individual Difference* 46, no. 8 (Summer 2009): 800–808.
- Kimball, Jean. *Joyce and the Early Freudians*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003.
- Kinhead-Weekes, Mark. "The Genesis of Lawrence's Psychology Books: An Overview." *D.H. Lawrence Review* 27, no. 2–3 (1997–1998): 153–170.
- Kleinbard, David. "D.H. Lawrence and Ontological Insecurity." *PLMA* 89, no. 1 (1974): 154–163.
- Koh, Jae-Kyung. "D.H. Lawrence's World Vision of Cultural Regeneration in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*." *Midwest Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (Winter 2002): 189–206.
- Kramer, Robert. "Insights and Blindness: Visions of Rank." In *Otto Rank: A Psychology of Difference, The American Lectures*, edited by Robert Kramer. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Kuberski, Philip. "The Joycean Gaze: Lucia in the I of the Father." *SubStance* 14, no. 1 (1985): 49–66.
- Kuntz, Paul. "Art as Public Dream: The Practice and Theory of Anaïs Nin." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32, no. 4 (Summer 1974): 525–537.
- Kuttner, Alfred. "*Sons and Lovers*: A Freudian Appreciation." *Psychoanalytic Review* iii, no. 3 (July 1916): 295–317.

- Leitgeb, Christoph. "Narrating the Uncanny – Uncanny Narration: Freud's Essay and Theories of Fiction" in *Narrated Communities—Narrated Realities*, edited by Hermann Blume, 115–126. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Lernout, Geert. "The Beginning." In *How Joyce Wrote "Finnegans Wake": A Chapter-by-Chapter Guide*, edited by Luca Crispi and Sam Slote, 49–65. Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 2007.
- . *The French Joyce*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1992.
- Levin, Harry. *James Joyce*. London: New Directions, 1960.
- Lodge, David. "The Language of Modernist Fiction." In *Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890–1930*, edited by Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, 481–496. London: Penguin, 1991.
- . *Consciousness and the Novel: Collected Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Lover, Samuel. *Legends and Stories of Ireland*. London: H.G. Bohn, 1853.
- Macleod, Shelia. *Lawrence's Men and Women*. London: Paladia, 1985.
- Mahony, Patrick. *Freud's Dora: A Psychoanalytic, Historical, and Textual Study*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- . "Freud and Translation." *American Imago* 58, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 837–840.
- . "Psychoanalysis—Writing Cure." In *Writing in Psychoanalysis*, edited by Emma Piccioli, Pier Luigi Rossi, and Antonio Alberto Semi, 13–37. London: Karnac Books, 1996.
- Makari, Roberto. *Revolution in Mind: The Creation of Psychoanalysis*. London: HarperCollins, 2009.
- Marcus, Steven. "Freud and Dora: Story, History, Case History." In *Freud: A Collection of Essays*, edited by Perry Meisel, 183–210. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1981.
- Maroger, Dominique. "Dernière rencontre avec Lucia." In *James Joyce*, edited by Jacques Aubert and Fritz Senn, 76–82. Paris: L'Herne, 1985.
- Marshall, Jonathan. *Performing Neurology: The Dramaturgy of Dr. Jean-Martin Charcot*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Masson, Jeffrey, ed. *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887–1904*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1986.
- Max, D.T. "The Injustice Collector." *New Yorker*, June 11, 2006.

- Mayer, Ernst. "Lamarck Revisited." *Journal of the History of Biology* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1972): 55–94.
- McBride, Margaret. "Finnegans Wake: The Issue of Issy's Schizophrenia." *Joyce Studies Annual* 7 (1996): 145–147.
- McCourt, John. "To Dance in the Wake." Review of *Lucia Joyce: To Dance in the Wake*, by Carol Shloss. *James Joyce Quarterly* 41, no. i/ii (2003–2004): 249–254.
- . *The Years of Bloom: James Joyce in Trieste, 1904–1920*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 2000.
- McKenna, Maxime. "In the Wake of Fair Use: Incest, Citation, and the Legacy of *Finnegans Wake*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 35, no. 4 (Summer 2012): 56–72.
- Menaker, Esther. *Otto Rank: A Rediscovered Legacy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Mercanton, Jacques. "The Hours of James Joyce." In *Portraits of the Artist in Exile: Recollections of Joyce by Europeans*, edited by William Potts, 205–252. Portmarnock: Wolfhound Press, 1979.
- Milesi, Laurent. "Towards a Female Grammar of Sexuality: The De/Recomposition of 'Storiella as she is Syung.'" *Modern Fiction Studies* 35, no. 3 (Fall 1989): 569–586.
- Miller, Henry. *The World of Lawrence: A Passionate Appreciation*. Edited by Evelyn J. Hinz and John J. Teunissen. London: London Calder, 1985.
- Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
- Milne, Drew. "Lawrence and the Politics of Sexual Politics." In *The Cambridge Companion to D.H. Lawrence* edited by Anne Fernihough, 197–215. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Milton, Colin. *Lawrence and Nietzsche: A Study in Influence*. Edinburgh: Mercat Press, 1987.
- Min-ha, Trinh. "Write Your Body." In *Feminist Theory and the Body: A Reader*, edited by Janet Price and Margrit Shildrich, 258–266. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Mulrooney, Deirdre. "The lost story of James Joyce's daughter as a Parisian dancer." *The Irish Times*, June 21, 2018.

- Nalbantian, Suzanne. *Aesthetic Autobiography: From Life to Art in Marcel Proust, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf and Anaïs Nin*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1994.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Translated and Edited by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Random House, 1995.
- Norris, Margot. "The Consequence of Deconstruction: A Technical Perspective of Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *EHL* 41 (1974): 130–148.
- . *The Decentered Universe of "Finnegans Wake"*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- Obaid, Francisco. "The Incidence of Freudian Self-Analysis in the Construction of the Psychoanalytic Theory of Anxiety." *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 95, no. 1 (2014): 15–41.
- Olney, James. *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2014.
- . *Memory and Narrative: The Weave of Life Writing*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1998.
- Oropeza, Clare. *Anaïs Nin: A Myth of Her Own*. New York: Routledge, 2019.
- Park, Sowan. "The Dilemma of Cognitive Literary Studies." In *English Studies: The State of the Discipline, Past, Present, and Future*, edited by Helena Goodwyn, Niall Gildea, Megan Kitching, Helen Tyson, 67–81. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Pearson, Neil. *Obelisk: A History of Jack Kahane and the Obelisk Press*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007.
- Polhemus, Robert. "Dantellising Peaches and Miching Daddy, the Gushy Old Goof: The Browning Case and *Finnegans Wake*." *Joyce Studies Annual* 5 (1994): 75–103.
- Potts, Willard, ed. *Portraits of the Artist in Exile: Recollections of James Joyce by Europeans*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1979.
- Rabaté, Jean-Michel. *The Cambridge Introduction to Literature and Psychoanalysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Richard-Allerdyce, Diane. *Anaïs Nin and the Remaking of Self: Gender, Modernism and Narrative Identity*. Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1998.
- Richmond, Stephen. "Psychoanalysis as Applied Aesthetics." *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 85, no. 3 (July 2016): 589–631.

- Rose, Danis, and John O'Hanlon. *Understanding "Finnegans Wake."* London: Garland, 1983.
- Royle, Nicholas. *The Uncanny.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
- Ruderman, Judith. *D.H. Lawrence and the Devouring Mother.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1984.
- Sailer, Susan. "Conjunctions: Commentary and Text in *Finnegans Wake* II.2." *James Joyce Quarterly* 27, no. 4 (Summer 1990): 793–802.
- Saunders, Max. "Lawrence, Freud, and Civilization's Discontents." *D.H. Lawrence Review* 27, no. 2–3 (1997–1998): 269–288.
- Safranski, Rüdiger. *Goethe: Life as a Work of Art.* Translated by David Dollenmayer. New York: Liveright, 2017.
- Sartor, Genevieve. "In the Absence of Facts." Review of *Lucia*, by Alex Pheby. *Review* 31. July 3, 2018.
- . "Genetic Connections in *Finnegans Wake*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 41, no. 4 (Fall 2018): 18–30.
- . "James Joyce and Genetic Criticism: Genesis Fields." In *James Joyce and Genetic Criticism*, edited by Genevieve Sartor, 1–10. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- . "Lucia Joyce: flawed fictions don't write her back into history but hide her truth." Review of *The Joyce Girl*, by Annabel Abbs. *The Irish Times*, August 31, 2016.
- . "What Genetics Can Do: Linking II.2 and IV of *Finnegans Wake*." In *James Joyce and Genetic Criticism*, edited by Genevieve Sartor, 69–81. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Segar, Keith. *The Art of D.H. Lawrence.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Schneider, Duane. "Anaïs Nin in the Diary: The Creation and Development of a Persona." *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal* 11, no. 2 (Winter 1978): 9–19.
- . "The Fiction of Anaïs Nin." In *A Casebook on Anaïs Nin*, edited by Robert Zaller. New York: New American Library, 1974.
- Scholar, Nancy. *Anaïs Nin.* Boston: Twayne, 1984.
- . "Anaïs Nin's *House of Incest* and Ingmar Bergman's *Persona*: Two Variations on a Theme." *Literature/Film Quarterly* 7, no. 1 (1979): 47–59.

- Schulze, Cornelia. *The Battle of the Sexes in D.H. Lawrence's Prose, Poetry, and Paintings*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 2002.
- Shelton, Jen. *James Joyce and the Narrative Structure of Incest*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006.
- Slote, Sam. "Blanks for When Words Gone: Chapter II.1." In *How Joyce Wrote "Finnegans Wake": A Chapter-by-Chapter Guide*, edited by Luca Crispi and Sam Slote, 181–214. Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 2007.
- . "An Imperfect Wake." In *Errears and Erroriboose: Joyce and Error*, edited by Matthew Creasy, 135–149. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Snow, C.P. *The Two Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Sotirova, Violeta. *Consciousness in Modernist Fiction: A Stylistic Study*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Spencer, Sharon. "Beyond Therapy: The Enduring Love of Anaïs Nin for Otto Rank." In *Anaïs Nin Literary Perspectives*, edited by Suzanne Nalbantian, 97–111. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.
- Spitzer, Jennifer. "On Not Reading Freud: Amateurism, Expertise, and the 'Pristine Unconscious.'" *Modernism/modernity* 21, no. 1 (January 2014): 89–105.
- Sulloway, Frank. *Freud, Biologist of the Mind: Beyond the Psychoanalytic Legend*. London: Fontana Press, 1980.
- Thurston, Luke. "Joyce and the Narrative Structure of Incest." Review of *James Joyce and the Narrative Structure of Incest*, by Jean Kimball. *James Joyce Broadsheet* 27 (February 2007).
- . "Ourselves: Beckett, Bion and Beyond." *Journal of Modern Literature* 32, no. 3 (Spring 2009): 121–143.
- Tookey, Helen. *Anaïs Nin, Fictionality and Femininity: Playing a Thousand Roles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- . "'I Am the Other Face of You:' Anaïs Nin, Fantasies and Femininity." *Women: A Cultural Review* 12, no. 3 (Fall 2001): 306–324.
- Vanel, Hélène. "Souvenirs de Lucia Joyce." In *James Joyce*, edited by Jacques Aubert and Fritz Senn, 83–85. Paris: L'Herne, 1985.
- Van Hulle, Dirk. "Editing the *Wake's* Genesis." In *James Joyce and Genetic Criticism: Genesisic Fields*, edited by Genevieve Sartor, 37–54. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

- . “The Lost Word: *Book IV*.” In *How Joyce Wrote “Finnegans Wake”*: A Chapter-by-Chapter Guide, edited by Luca Crispi and Sam Slote, 463–471. Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 2007.
- . *James Joyce’s ‘Work in Progress’: Pre-book Publications of “Finnegans Wake” Fragments*. New York and London: Routledge, 2016.
- . *Modern Manuscripts: The Extended Mind and Creative Undoing*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Van Zyl, Susan. “Psychoanalysis and Literature: An Introduction.” *Journal of Literary Studies* 6 (1990): 1–12.
- Wadlington, Will. “Otto Rank’s Art.” *The Humanist Psychologist* 29, no. 1–3 (2001): 281.
- Weitzenhoffer, André. “What Did He (Bernheim) Say?” In *Hypnosis at its Bicentennial*, edited by Fred Frankel and Harold S. Zamasky, 47–56. New York: Springer, 1978.
- West, Rebecca. “The Strange Case of James Joyce.” *The Bookman* 68.1 (September 1928): 9–23.
- Whyte, Lancelot Law. *The Unconscious Before Freud*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1979.
- Williams, Carlos Williams. “A Point for American Criticism.” In *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination*, 80–87. London: Faber & Faber, 1929.
- Wilson, Edmund. *Axel’s Castle: A Study in the Imaginative Literature of 1870–1930*. Glasgow: Collins Fontana, 1961.
- . “The Dream of H.C. Earwicker.” *The New Republic* 91 (12 July 1939): 203–206.
- Wolff, Janet. “Reinstating Corporeality; Feminism and Body Politics.” In *The Feminism and Visual Culture Reader*, edited by Amelia Jones, 414–425. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Zinnes, Harriet. “Art, The Dream, The Self.” In *Anais Nin Literary Perspectives*, edited by Suzanne Nalbantian, 52–62. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.