

Jung, Psychoanalysis, and the Great Divide

Overall view of Jungian Theory

As mentioned in the previous section, in addition to a subject's personal unconscious, Jung believes in the collective unconscious, a common, impersonal unconscious, which has agency across different historical epochs and cultural boundaries. The collective unconscious mainly consists of a collection of what Jung calls 'archetypes', nameless until they become symbols of representation. Archetypes are a priori possibilities, phylogenetically inherited predispositions to 'apperceive a universal, emotional core human experience, myth, or thought-image-fantasy. [An archetype] can never be exactly pinpointed or apprehended because it exists in such a primitive formal state'.¹ Archetypes, however, become known when they are manifested as images. Jung differentiates between the *archetype-as-such*, which is the psychic energy or possibility, and the *archetypal image*, which is the manifestation of the archetype through an image or symbol (for example, images in art are regarded as reflections or representations of archetypes, or 'archetypal images'): 'The archetype as such is a psychoid factor that belongs, as it were, to the invisible, ultraviolet end of the psychic spectrum... We must... constantly bear in mind that what we mean by "archetype" is in itself irrepresentable, but it has effects which make visualizations of it possible, namely, the archetypal images'.² It is of great importance, I will argue, to be able to spot

¹ Renaldo J. Maduro and Joseph B. Wheelwright, 'Archetype and Archetypal Image', in *Jungian Literary Criticism*, ed. by Richard P. Sugg (Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1992), p. 182.

² C.G. Jung, 'On the Nature of the Psyche,' in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Volume 8: The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, ed. and trans. by Gerhard Adler and Richard Francis Carrington Hull (Princeton: Princeton 2014) p. 69.

major archetypes in a work of literature, as this helps to identify certain logical connections that give a work its structure: ‘The detection of governing archetypes serves principally to show hidden connections that universalize what might seem highly idiosyncratic [...]’.³

Unlike the archetypes-as-such, their representations, or symbols, are not inherited, ‘... the material of the collective unconscious is a collection of archetypes. But it must be understood that the archetype cannot be named until it is represented by a symbol’.⁴ Both symbols of dreams and conscious symbols are archetypal images, but the latter can be open to observation since they can be expressed by the senses: ‘The raw symbols of dream must be considered apart from the symbols formed by the conscious mind, which are beyond the nonsensical and open to rational inspection. Both groups are reflections of archetypes, but there could be no conscious artistry if the symbol were simply automatic’.⁵ As already indicated, Jung’s construal of symbols and symbolization is not restricted to reactive formations as in the staple Freudian view, but seem to have their own integrity.

Jung’s impact on modern literature (to be addressed below) is mostly apparent in the significance given to myth and the emphasis on certain facets of his psychological theory, like the concepts of the archetype and individuation. The first benchmark for Jung’s impact is his interpretation of myth as universal and as a projection of mental activity. Jung’s perspective on myth as having psychological origins and creating a correspondence between interior and exterior,

³ F.L. Radford and R.R. Wilson, ‘Some Phases of the Jungian Moon: Jung’s Influence on Modern Literature’, in *Jungian Literary Criticism*, ed. by Richard P. Sugg (Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1992), p. 320. Personal style, therefore, whether it is Yeats or H.D., can be viewed thus as an artefact of a universal repository. Joyce, by turns, may be construed as being more directly mapped, if speculatively, on Jung himself insofar as his personal style was intentionally and emphatically a meta-style.

⁴ Rowland, Susan, *C.G. Jung and Literary Theory: The Challenge from Fiction* (London: Palgrave, 2001), p. 44.

⁵ James Baird, “‘Preface’ to *Ishmael*, Jungian Psychology in Criticism: Some Theoretical Problems’, in *Jungian Literary Criticism*, ed. by Richard P. Sugg (Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1992), p. 46.

the individual and the universal, has had a great influence on literature and on other aspects of modern culture. According to Radford and Wilson:

In modern literature, Jung's influence shows most emphatically in the significance that has been attributed to myth and in the stressing of certain aspects of this psychological theory, such as the concept of the archetype and the problem of individuation, which have only a tangential significance within the generalized psychoanalytic system. Jung's interpretation of myth as both a universal (and interconnected) body of concepts and also a projection of inherent mental activities, themselves also universal, provides the first touchstone of his influence. His view of myth as possessing psychological roots—and thus projecting correspondence between the interior and the exterior, the individual and the universal—has affected many aspects of modern culture, including literature.⁶

Mental activity, such as unconscious fantasies and the images that appear in dreams, renders the human mind as mythological, in the following particular sense: the archetypes of the universal unconscious are a set of universally-signifying patterns or mythoi, which change their empirical expression (as personal symbols) from life-world to life-world as much as from one individual (writer) or another. Jung makes the correlation between myths and the way the human mind works, since he regards mythological narratives as reflections of psychological structuring, for, as

⁶ Radford and Wilson., p. 318.

Rowland puts it, 'What is intrinsic to Jung's use of mythology is the use of mythical narratives as stories of being, of psychological structuring, that value the unconscious as superior'.⁷

Mythology is of special interest to Jungian critics since it is a vivid representation of the collective unconscious, more like a 'group dream', which renders itself a good area of investigation for that realm of the psyche: 'Mythology as a raw representation of this group dream can be an area of investigation for the Jungian critic'.⁸ However, critics rarely limit themselves to mythology; when Jung looks at poetry, he speaks of the symbol as a unifying bridge between the conscious and unconscious. 'The critic is scarcely the critic of art if he limits himself to the raw materials of mythology. When Jung deals with problems inherent in an assessment of the art of poetry, he speaks of "the saving factor...the symbol, which is able to reconcile the conscious with the unconscious and embrace them both"'.⁹

The importance, here, of Jung's theory on the relationship between alchemy and individuation, thus, lies in its ability to enhance our understanding of the mythological foundations in the works of H.D, Joyce, and Yeats. Not only that, but Jung echoes the mythic method's¹⁰ style of identifying antiquity with contemporaneity, as he finds in the ancient Hermetic texts of alchemy metaphors of a modern person's need to develop the 'Self' through the fusion of 'anima' and 'animus'. The modern human, as it seems, has lost (along with the war casualties and social and cultural degeneration) a sense of self that can be regained, Jung suggests, through myth and ritual, and can help one be in touch with his or her collective unconscious for regeneration. The idea of

⁷ Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, p. 28.

⁸ Baird, p. 46.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

¹⁰ T.S. Eliot speaks about this method in his essay 'Ulysses, Order and Myth.' The mythical method consists of a way of utilizing myth and narrative for the purpose of creating order when an author is writing a novel or composing a poem.

the collective unconscious had already established for itself a link with mythology, for it is also referred to as the ‘universality of mythopoeic mental condition’, since ‘...Jung’s theory of the communicability of archetypes through a “collective unconscious” had been essentially established 50 years earlier in the work of Tylor and Lang, who discovered ‘the universality of the mythopoeic mental condition’.¹¹ According to Jung, it is deep within this collective unconscious that archetypal images carry the memory of ancestral experience; hence, the symbols and images that arise from it ‘can also draw out our potential for transcendence in the future’;¹² or as H.D. puts it in *Trilogy*, ‘...let us search the old highways/ for the true-rune, the right-spell,/ recover old values’.¹³

Consequently, by attempting to access or to get in touch with the collective unconscious, it is suggested, individuals discover the thread that combines the past with the present and the ancient with the new, that ‘...rare intangible thread/ that binds all humanity’.¹⁴ Eliot’s mythic method seems to enact and make present this ‘thread’. The mythic method, crudely understood, juxtaposes antiquity with contemporaneity, bringing out the commonalities between two disparate times and locations, and transcending the temporal narrative by utilizing a kind of comparative mythology. In other words, the mythic method is a revelatory collage combining fragments of both the past and the present in literature.¹⁵

¹¹ Martha Celeste Carpentier, *Ritual, Myth, and the Modernist Text: The Influence of Jane Ellen Harrison on Joyce, Eliot, and Woolf* (Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach, 1998), p. 26.

¹² Duane Elgin, ‘Collective Consciousness and Cultural Healing’, *Emergent Mind* (October 1997) <http://www.emergentmind.org/new_page_204.htm> [accessed 3 September 2010] (p. 5).

¹³ Hilda Doolittle [H.D.] and Alik Barnstone, *Trilogy* (New York: New Directions, 1998), p. 5.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7-8.

¹⁵ This is very different from Freud’s notion of myth, which appears in his essay ‘Creative Writers and Day-dreaming’: ‘The study of constructions of folk psychology such as these is far from being complete, but it is extremely probable that myths, for instance, are distorted vestiges of the wishful fantasies of whole nations, the secular dreams of youthful humanity.’ [David Lodge, *20th Century Literary Criticism: A Reader* (London: Longman, 1972), p. 41] It may seem to a superficial observer that Freud talking of ‘whole nations’ is something like a

According to Jung, an artist's free will is nonexistent, for the artist becomes a channel through which art is allowed to realize its purposes. Jung believes that artistic material transcends one's personal unconscious or even one's individual ability to create. Rather, the collective unconscious is what leads consciousness toward the formation of certain symbols representative of its contents. Jung sees the artist as a shaper of man's psychic life, and the work of the poet is more important than the poet's personal experience; therefore, the poet does not have to interpret her/his own work since s/he is essentially an instrument for it: 'The artist is not a person endowed with free will who seeks his own ends, but one who allows art to realize its purposes through him...he is 'collective man'—one who carries and shapes the unconscious, psychic life of mankind'.¹⁶ Jung continues: '...The work of the poet comes to meet the spiritual need of the society in which he lives, and for this reason his work means more to him than his personal fate, whether he is aware of this or not. Being essentially the instrument for his work, he is subordinate to it, and we have no reason for expecting him to interpret it for us' (*MM*, p. 171). Jung, from a literary perspective, is expressing a notion similar to that of T.S. Eliot's theory of impersonality. In 'Tradition and the Individual Talent,' T.S. Eliot claims that an artist constantly surrenders himself in a form of 'continual extinction of personality' for the sake of art, which is more valuable than his own self. Eliot familiarly explains this notion of depersonalization in an analogy referring to a chemical reaction that needs a catalyst, platinum, in order to form sulphurous acid. As a result, a new compound (that does not contain platinum) is formed, leaving the platinum unaffected, just like the poet's mind, understood as an impersonal agent that produces artistic emotions separate from its own emotions, where 'the mind of the poet is the

collective conscious; however, Freud seems to mean here, empirical developments of particular cultures, not the Jungian structural or transcendental collectivity.

¹⁶ Carl Gustav Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1933), p. 169.

shred of platinum...The poet's mind is in fact a receptacle for seizing and storing up numberless feelings, phrases, images, which remain there until all the particles which can unite to form a new compound are present together'.¹⁷ The poet, therefore, according to Eliot, expresses a medium, not a personality, since art is an escape from both personality and emotion: 'The emotion of art is impersonal. And the poet cannot reach this impersonality without surrendering himself wholly to the work to be done'.¹⁸ Jung, therefore, makes a psychological echoing of Eliot's notion but in terms of the collective unconscious, rendering a sense of aesthetics in psychoanalysis. A poet is not really one who discovers, but rather one who is sensitive to certain truths that all know but not all are aware of. This is because of the poet's ability to express the collective unconscious, and to understand it, for poets 'voice rather more clearly and resoundingly what all know...The mass does not understand it although unconsciously living what it expresses; not because the poet proclaims it, but because its life issues from the collective unconscious into which he has peered'.¹⁹

This notion of impersonality leads to another Jungian concept, the 'visionary' in art. Jung believes that 'It is essential that we give serious consideration to the basic experience that underlies it—namely, to the vision'.²⁰ An artist is regarded as a visionary since the numerous contents of the unconscious mind cannot be defined, but rather, can only be known through the work of art regarded as a symbol. Jung 'reads' a work of art in light of the 'vision', which is the basic experience responsible for its creation. Because of this notion of the visionary, a sense of a Jungian poetics is different from a psychoanalytical interpretation of a text. For Jung, art (in this case,

¹⁷ T.S. Eliot, 'Traditional and the Individual Talent' in *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot*, ed. by Frank Kermode (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988), p. 41.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹⁹ Carl Gustav Jung, 'The Problem of Types in Poetry', in *Psychological Types*, p. 191.

²⁰ Qtd. In Raman Seldon, *The Theory of Criticism from Plato to the Present: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2014), p. 228.

poetry) is too powerful to be analyzed psychologically, believing that ‘the work of art exists in its own right and cannot be got rid of by changing it into a personal complex’ (*CW15*, p. 93). Jung sees symbols as the expression of humanity’s inherited collective unconscious. This collective unconscious, transcending biographical individual psychology, is, to repeat, one of the main hallmarks differentiating Jung from Freud. This notion, as shall be seen next, is among the direct causes separating of Jung from Freud.

Jung and Freud:

The relationship between Freud and Jung, which lasted about six years (from 1906-1912) started with a (legendary) conversation of about thirteen hours, for ‘they talked, [Jung] remembered, for thirteen hours, virtually without stopping’.²¹ Their friendship was a complementary one, where Freud found a ‘son’ in Jung, who in turn found a father figure. In a letter to Freud, Jung asks the older master to let him enjoy their friendship ‘not as that of equals but as that of father and son’.²² However, their intimacy has been cast as homoerotic, an assertion supported by Jung’s declaration in one of his letters to Freud:

[M]y veneration for you has something of the character of a ‘religious’ crush. Though it does not really bother me, I still feel it is disgusting and ridiculous because of its undeniable erotic undertone. This abominable feeling comes from the fact that as a boy I was the victim of a sexual assault by a man I once worshipped. (p. 95)

²¹ Peter Gay, *Freud* (New York: Norton, 1998), p. 204.

²² Freud, Sigmund, William McGuire, and C. G Jung, *The Freud/Jung Letters*, trans. by Ralph Manheim and R. F. C. Hall (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. 60.

Freud assured Jung that this was a form of ‘religious transference,’ which can only end in apostasy.²³ Jung’s important confession, however, shed a new light on the intense affinity between him and Freud, and at the same time illustrates a potential reason—among other reasons— for their future break with one another.

At the beginning of their acquaintance, Jung was an important and well-respected member of the psychiatric establishment at the Burgholzi hospital, but Freud was regarded as a suspicious man of ‘highly speculative theories’.²⁴ A decade later, however, after the break with Freud (who by then had become a leading figure in the fairly new field of psychoanalysis), Jung became regarded as a philosopher—albeit a speculative one—and was regularly ignored because of the perception that his direction was disloyal to the psychoanalytic establishment. For the most part he was criticized for lacking ‘scientific objectivity’.²⁵ While Jung acknowledges the importance of sexuality in psychic life,²⁶ he seeks to set boundaries for the term and wishes ‘to put sexuality itself in its proper place’ (*MM*, p. 120). The exclusive emphasis on sexuality even if, more strictly-speaking, psycho-sexuality, as the main driving force was the main reason behind the separation, as Jung willingly acknowledges himself that his collaboration with Freud ‘was qualified by an objection in principle to the sexual theory in which and it lasted up to the time when Freud identified in principle his sexual theory with his method’.²⁷ Jung objected in the main to reducing all psychological life, conscious or unconscious, to instinctual drives which were purely based in psycho-sexual motives. As a pertinent example, myths for Jung can be part of a spiritual drive inherent in man, not reducible to a more ultimate psycho-sexual motive. In

²³ Gay, p. 204.

²⁴ June Singer, *Boundaries of The Soul* (New York: Anchor Books, 1994), p. 94.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

²⁶ In the *Freud/Jung Letters*, pp. 4-5, Jung states the following: ‘...it seems to me that though the genesis of hysteria is predominantly, it is not exclusively sexual. I take the same view of your sexual theory.’

²⁷ Qtd in: E.A. Bennet, *What Jung Really Said* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), p. 34.

this sense, Jung's theory is more differentiated; Freud's more univocally reductionist. Finding and acknowledging 'spirit', or the spiritual, religious aspect of the person, is a necessity of the modern age according to Jung, since experiencing and rediscovering the life of the spirit is 'the only way in which we can break the spell that binds us to the cycle of the biological events'. However, despite Jung being wrongfully labeled as a mystic by his opponents (such as Abraham, Ferenczi, Rank, Sachs, and Ernest Jones), he claims that experiencing the spirit is something that cannot be attained through theology, which demands faith, something that cannot be made. He focuses on the notion that every individual everywhere and at every time has developed some religious forms of expression, with the psyche defined by religious notions and sentiments, and 'Whoever cannot see this aspect of the psyche is blind, and whoever chooses to explain it away, or to "enlighten" it away, has no sense of reality' (*MM*, p. 122). Even though Jung claimed mystic experience during psychosis, his theories do not have to be understood purely as personal experiences writ large. Jung questioned Freud's attitude toward spirituality,²⁸ for the latter would always suspect any personal or artistic expression of spirituality (even the intellectual, not spiritual expression) and dismiss it as a manifestation of sexual repression. In his *Memories, Dreams, and Reflections*, Jung writes about his protest against Freud's hypothesis, which 'would lead to an annihilating judgment upon culture. Culture would then appear as a mere farce, the morbid consequence of repressed sexuality' (*MDR*, p. 150).

²⁸ C. G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, and Reflections* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989), p. 150: In his April 6, 1925 lecture (3), Jung says the following about Freud: 'He invariably sneered at *spirituality* as being nothing but repressed sexuality, and so I said if one were committed fully to the logic of that position, then one must say that our whole civilization is farcical, nothing but a morbid creation due to repressed sexuality. He said, "Yes, so it is, and its being so is just a curse of fate we cannot help." My mind was quite unwilling to settle there, but still I could not argue it out with him.' In a letter on November 29 1912, Freud mockingly praised Jung for having 'solved the puzzle of all mysticism [*Freud-Jung*, pp. 581-82 (524)]. All this said, Jung breaking with Freud might be construed to be a great historical irony, insofar as his breaking with Freud could be seen as the most Freudian move, which is to say, Jung was allowing himself to be castrated to traverse his imago, and become, as in the most pressing Freudian desideratum, a more independent, autonomous person.

Sexuality, at least before the late period (1920's until his death), was a central principle for Freud. However, Jung's approach (accused by Freud of being vague) helped him establish an arguably more comprehensive view of man's psychology than Freud's. Jung's focus of interest was in the direction of symbolism, unbound by clinical data as Freud, for the former relied more on more abstract, intangible factors in his research. According to Jung, whatever Freud had said about sexuality is no more than 'the truest expression of his own psychic make-up' (*MM*, p. 117), for 'He has given adequate form to what he has noted in himself' (*MM*, p. 117). Jung further clarifies this claim by explaining that Freud's great achievements in discovering human 'truths' lie in his own findings about himself, and with that, Jung qualifies the emerging reputation of him being an opponent of Freud, an image that was created by the latter's 'own shortsightedness and that of his pupils' (*MM*, p. 117). Jung had attempted to be 'fair' to Freud from the very beginning of their friendship, for in his forward to *The Psychology of the Dogma Praecox*, Jung writes that:

Fairness to Freud, however, does not imply, as many fear, unqualified submission to a dogma; one can very well maintain an independent judgment. If I, for instance, acknowledge the complex mechanisms of dream and hysteria, this does not mean that I attribute to the infantile sexual trauma the exclusive importance that Freud apparently does.²⁹

²⁹ C. G. Jung, *Collected Works Of C.G. Jung, Volume 3: Psychogenesis of Mental Disease* (Princeton University Press, 2014), p. 3.

Moreover, although Jung was well-immersed in science and medicine, his sciences were permeated by his interests in religion and spirituality, for his religious upbringing (his father was a parson) had shaped certain habits of thought in him. According to June Singer, 'His [Jung's] world was full of unseen forces, which could only be known through their manifestations'.³⁰ Hence, not altogether impressed by Freud's pansexualism, Jung's main questions were directed toward the 'spirit,' which refers to man's higher, striving aspirations that are expressed 'in works of art, in service to one's nature and her order'. While Jung acknowledges spirit, which conflicts with instinct, he finds that Freud, in favor of defining 'instinct', seems to dismiss 'spirit,' both being equally mysterious terms that Jung claims to be beyond his understanding, '...terms that we allow to stand for powerful forces whose nature we do not know' (*MM*, p. 119). Jung is the proponent of the notion of opposites, which gives birth to his idea of psychic energy. Freud, on the other hand, was occupied with sexuality as the single unconscious driving power, believing that repressed sexuality is where spirituality stems from, and it was not until his break with Jung that he paid attention to other psychic activities.³¹ However, Jung categorizes psychic drives under the concept of energy 'in order to avoid the arbitrariness of a psychology that deals with drives or impulses alone'.³² Freud is a neo-Darwinian in the sense that whether his metaphors are hydraulic or not, he believes libido to be a function of differential energies seeking stasis always.

³⁰ Singer, p. 94.

³¹ Worth mentioning is Freud's 1895 'Project for a Scientific Psychology', an essential neurological model of the mind that major concepts in psychoanalytic theory (such as libido, consciousness, and repression) can be traced back to. The importance of Freud's 'Project' also lies in the fact that it marks the shift in his thinking from a neurological to a psychological method, aiming to give psychology a scientific basis; As Paul Ricoeur asserts in *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*, it 'stands as the greatest effort Freud ever made to force a mass of psychical facts within the framework of a quantitative theory (p. 73).' The scientific model Freud uses shows how quantity is governed by the principle of constancy, which he develops from the principle of inertia. The principle of inertia states that the (neuronic) system tends to reduce its level of tension to zero by means of discharging or getting rid of them; the principle of constancy, however, states that the system has to keep the level of tension as low as possible—which is how Freud found the mind to operate, analogously.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 120.

Jung by turns thought of psychological energy as not wholly reducible to a search for stasis and resolution of tension. Individuation and the union of opposites is not an automatic or physicalist process, rather, it is a process with a stronger normative drive. One of the biggest disagreements between Freud and Jung lies in the latter's attempt to develop this idea, claiming an inability to define *libido*, which was a clear message to Freud that he has not (nor is willing to) completely accept the Freudian definition of the term, and shows that 'Jung steadily attempted to widen the meaning of Freud's term, to make it stand not just for the sexual drives, but for a general mental energy'.³³ Thus, Jung's break with Freud is not a mere question of language or of definitions, but indicates a more substantial break.

Despite their divergence on the nature of spirituality, though, the patient's sexuality is important in order to approach the main source of neurosis.³⁴ Jung was in total accordance with the basic principles Freud sketched out—in spite of his questioning of Freud's emphasis on his sexual theories. However, Jung strongly felt that there was an area of psychic functioning that Freud failed to accommodate in his psychological theory—although he recognized this field.³⁵ Jung gave expression to the essential role that sexuality plays in expressing psychic wholeness, but he did not reduce the psyche to sexuality. Jung wanted to go beyond sexuality and explore a perceived spiritual aspect to human subjectivity, in order to explain 'what Freud was so fascinated by but unable to grasp'.³⁶ In his *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, and with Freud in mind, of course, Jung interprets the idea of the father complex as 'a cloak for religiosity misunderstood; it is mysticism expressed in terms of biology and the family relation' (*MM*, p. 122). Jung asserts that it is important that the spiritual nature of the human psyche does not

³³ Gay, p. 226.

³⁴ Singer, pp. 94-95.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

³⁶ Singer, 'Are Archetypes Necessary?', p. 108.

become cancelled out while science is taking its course and developing hypotheses, and the psychotherapist must not allow the ideas of pathology to blindfold him. In fact, Jung asserts, it is vital that the psychotherapist notices that the illness of the ego is because of its separation from the whole, in turn losing its connection with mankind and the spirit. For Jung, whose sympathies for religion motivated his studies in psychology, Freud, in comparison, seemed to preach atheism with his apparent disregard of the spiritual aspect of man, 'plainly committed to the kind of scientific convictions that rejected any claims for religious thinking in the pursuit of truth'.³⁷ Jung found Freud rather unfit to explain a spiritual aspect of humanity, since the latter himself was not religious, and as he asserts in his essay, 'In Memory of Sigmund Freud', 'Freud's inadequate training in philosophy and in the history of religion makes itself painfully conspicuous, quite apart from the fact that he had no understanding of what religion was about' (*CW15*, p. 45).

Jung's related interests in archaeology and anthropology led him to argue for the power of the primitive instincts, and to acknowledge their collective nature, where they become 'shared aspects of the human condition'. Therefore, he theorized childhood neuroses and psychoses as universal phenomena—which is quite different from Freud's position.³⁸ To Jung, primordial images, which are sometimes manifested as 'mythologems', are proof of the inherited nature of the human imagination. Because of this 'psychic' legacy, there are repetitions and recurrences of certain motifs (almost identically) across different cultures. This argument provided for Jung an explanation as to why many disparate patients reproduced images in analysis identical to those discovered in ancient texts.³⁹ For Jung, therefore, archetypes were the moving forces that formed

³⁷ Gay, p. 212.

³⁸ Singer, 'From Associations to Archetypes', p. 97.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 100-101.

the structures of both children's fantasies and cultural mythologies. This is contrary to Freud's belief in personal experience, infantile sexuality, and areas of conflict between instinct and parental negation that form a child's fantasies. Jung believed that a child's experiences fell into preformed impersonal patterns or archetypes. Mythic forms, as theorized by Freud, reflect children's experiences and fantasies that had somehow shifted to a whole collective. Freud believes in a symbolic function of dreams, especially daydreams, which are the roots of folklore and mythology—a notion completely different from that of the Jungian collective unconscious. According to Jung, just as fantasy is a work of an individual's archetypal expression, so is myth a 'collective version of the emergence of the archetypal expression into a society'.⁴⁰ The collective unconscious is transpersonal in nature, an extension of the personal unconscious; in Jolande Jacobi's *Complex, Archetype, and Symbol*, she states that '...The archetype ...expresses itself first and foremost in metaphors; there is some part of its meaning that always remains unknown and defies formulation'.⁴¹ Freud's distrust of Jung's theory of mythic forms and archetypes was another major cause for divergence between them, especially after Freud's statement to Jung when thinking about the possible means of applying psychoanalysis to the cultural sciences. Instead of approaching Jung, who held an enthusiastic interest in the subject, Freud expressed a longing to seek help from 'students of mythology, linguists, and historians of religion...Otherwise we will have to do it all ourselves',⁴² a statement that Jung took as a clear dismissal of his own views.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 101.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 105.

⁴² Gay, p. 227.

Jung's concept of alchemy as a metaphor for the individuated psyche, then, is important in an understanding of a Jungian sense of poetics; however, the term 'psyche' in particular conceals complexity in the way it is perceived and used by Jung:

There are, as we know, certain views which would restrict everything psychic to consciousness, as being identical with it. I do not believe this is sufficient. If we assume that there is anything at all beyond our sense-perception, then we are entitled to speak of psychic elements whose existence is only indirectly accessible to us. (CW8, p. 27)

Like Freud, Jung's model of the psyche was the sum of different interacting systems; however, instead of ego, superego, and id, the components of the psyche according to Jung are the ego, the personal unconscious, and the collective unconscious. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Jung's notion of the psyche contains the unconscious as well as conscious functioning, which is 'not directly accessible to observation—otherwise it would not be unconscious...the unconscious, then, is part of the psyche' (CW8, p. 28). The ideas of the ego (as cognition) and the personal unconscious (as the repository of both the repressed and as the agency of the repressing process itself)⁴³ are more or less the same as Freud's, but, as is familiar, the entirely Jungian concept was that of the *collective unconscious*, a transpersonal level of the unconscious that is communal, containing, so Jung argues, ancient ancestral memories (from an evolutionary past), that is 'the form of the world into which [a person] is born [which] is already inborn in him, as a virtual

⁴³ See: Slavoj Žižek, *Sublime Object of Ideology* (New York: Verso, 2009) and Alasdair MacIntyre, *The Unconscious* (New York: Routledge, 2004).

image'.⁴⁴ Jung calls the 'energies' of the psyche's ancestral memories and images 'archetypes', and because they seem common to the human race, these archetypes generate similar symbols across different cultures:

The collective unconscious—so far as we can say anything about it at all—appears to consist of mythological motifs or primordial images, for which reason the myths of all nations are its real exponents. In fact, the whole of mythology could be taken as a sort of projection of the collective unconscious. (CW8, p. 39)

Jung's hesitation in being able to 'say anything at all' when explaining the collective unconscious lies in its very nature, which cannot reveal itself empirically. Given the rising dependence on empirical facts in an age of science, explaining and proving the existence of the unseen, unmeasurable psyche and collective unconscious was a challenge. The basis of the psyche is an ancestral past, which steers and affects man's (present) actions. According to Jung, 'the psyche is the greatest of all cosmic wonders and the *sine qua non* of the world as an object,' and by the term 'psyche', as mentioned earlier,⁴⁵ Jung refers to 'the totality of all psychic processes, conscious as well as unconscious' (CW6, p. 463). The term 'psyche' is not interchangeable with the concept of 'mind,' for the latter is limited to the boundaries of the conscious brain, unlike the psyche, which combines the conscious with the unconscious. The psyche seeks to maintain 'balance' by reconciling opposing forces, as it constantly strives for growth (or individuation, which is like the transformative inclination of the poem or, a novel). The Self (or the total sum of the psyche) is

⁴⁴ Jung, *Two Essays in Analytical Psychology*, p. 190.

⁴⁵ See the definition in footnote 1.

what drives the individual forward to reach a stage of full potential through the process of individuation. This is in contrast to Freud's thought which claims that the ego is what forms the axis on which a person's individual psychology turns—whereas Jung sees the ego as one small part of the complex 'Self' archetype. Since Jung sees the process of individuation as sought-after by the psyche, which also contains the 'energies' that generate archetypal symbols from the collective unconscious, then this is an especially interesting notion in Jungian poetics. The transformative power of language, as will be seen in H.D., Yeats, and Joyce, requires a medium like the psyche in order to engage the reader. The mobility of language becomes a representation of the psyche's ability to generate images and thus, transform by undergoing individuation. Two particularly interesting archetypes for the individuation process and the creation of poetry, if we accept Jung's model, are the anima and animus, the 'alchemical' union of which makes possible a new creation through the tension of opposing forces. This thesis will argue that the anima and animus, both thematically and at a textual level, contribute to a productive reading of the works of H.D., Yeats, and Joyce.

In his *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, Jung argues that Freud's portrayal of man is one-sided, generalizing from specific incidences of neurosis. Jung, in his 'In Memory of Freud,' sees that:

Anyone who has this picture before him always sees the flaw in everything, and however much he may struggle against it, he must always point out what this daemonically obsessive picture compels him to see: the weak spot, the unadmitted wish, the hidden resentment, the secret, illegitimate fulfillment of a wish distorted by the 'sensor'. (*MM*, p. 45)

According to Jung, Freud overemphasizes the pathological, ‘interpreting man too exclusively in the light of his defects’ (*MM*, p. 45). By this means, according to Jung, Freud pathologizes the unconscious, erasing all possibility of any positive functioning: ‘Nowhere does he break through to a vision of the helpful, healing powers which would let the unconscious be of some benefit to the patient’ (*CW15*, p. 46). Jung, on the other hand, prefers to emphasize positive health, ‘and to free the sick man from that point of view which colors every page Freud has written’ (*MM*, p. 117). Jung further criticizes Freud for considerably narrowing the field of human experience by basing his psychology upon a world view that excluded integral takes on spiritual or numinous experience, and for never criticizing the bases that underlie his psychology. While Jung himself had personally accepted and taken criticism (albeit with caution), he accuses Freud of never critically examining his assumptions—a necessary procedure for creative people. Jung further argues that Freud had not read much philosophy in general, which he considered ‘a great mistake on Freud’s part to turn his back on philosophy’ (*MM*, p. 118), whereas Jung himself had used philosophical criticism to come to the conclusion that every psychology is similar to a subjective confession. In other words, one way of understanding the different approaches of Jung and Freud is that Freud considered the new science of psychoanalysis discursively separate from the personalities discovering and fine-tuning it, whereas Jung saw subjective experience as integral to his discourse of analytical psychology.⁴⁶ This questioning of whether or not ‘the work of one

⁴⁶ Jung here, as per above in the main text, is integrating his insight on Freud himself for his own separate use. Which is to say, believing that Freud’s discoveries were based in self-induced insight, something Freud might have played down, Jung took his cue from this aspect of Freud’s original discoveries. While we know, Freud was greatly influenced by Schopenhauer early in his intellectual career, the known Nietzschean influence on Jung may be a way of understanding why Jung saw his philosophical work as subjective confession. Nietzsche was one of the first philosophers to discount philosophy as an objective, discursive realm, seeing all reflection as rhetoric and as reactive or active facets of the biographical thinker. Which is to say, the realm of value was reduced to the realm of fact;

man is subjectively colored' is where Jung mostly finds the intellectual barrier between him and Freud. Jung believed that Freud caused his own repression—the repression of the 'spirit' archetype because of his predominant focus on the sexual theory. However, where there has been a large body of Freudian literary criticism, the Jungian approach to literature has not been given its rightful space, especially in modernist works. It is my contention to show the possibility of some 'literary space' for Carl Jung in modernist literature, specifically in the works of H.D., Yeats, and James Joyce.

philosophy was no more transcending discipline, rather restricted to the plane of immanence. In other words, Nietzsche turned psychology into a branch of philosophy.