3

Literary Jung

Jung in the literary field

My study approaches the literary value of the text by developing a Jungian poetics in modernist literature, one that accommodates the mythic method and considers alchemy as having metaphorical significance for both poetry and individuation simultaneously. Critics such as Paul Bishop and Neil Wollman have rejected the notion that Jungian readers might approach the text from a psychological point of view; readers must not reduce the text to a group of archetypes and should not disregard a literary work's aesthetic, cultural, and literary value, but it is this aspect of unconscious psychic creativity in literature that should be explored. The definitive point to make here is that Jung's approach to literature may be viewed as valid insofar as for him, literature and artistic creativity more generally are not reducible to analytical psychology, but are in their totality analogous repositories of the same. In other words, unlike Freudian symptomaticity, art for Jung is a psychological agent in itself. The psychological aspect that interests me in Jungian poetics is the formation of such art in the creative self, in what is to Jung a transformative 'psyche', for which mythological and alchemical symbols contribute to expressions of the individuation process: 'From the living fountain of instinct flows everything that is creative; hence the unconscious is not merely conditioned by history, but is the very source of the creative impulse'.[1] Although Jung called for logos in his theories, he stressed the importance of mythos, which is as important as, if not more than, logos. Logos alone was not enough for understanding the psyche, and in turn, humanity; however, mythos, which can manifest as narrative or poetry

[1] C.G. Jung, *Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche* CW 8 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), p. 157.

with its language of symbolism and imagery, is necessary to reveal the hidden aspects of the collective unconscious in the work of individuals. For Jung, myths were narratives that both expressed and shaped the psyche, which is where poetry and psychology meet.[2] This stance might be seen as a form of philosophical idealism; however, not of the out and out Platonic kind, but more so the attenuated form found in transcendental idealism. Archetypes are not wholly discrete essences separate from empirical experience. Rather, they exist in the empirical world like transcendental truths as the constructors of individual experience.

Jung did not claim to be a literary critic, for his invocation of literature was primarily to 'prove' the presence of a collective unconscious. In other words, Jung is not self-classified as a critic, but he found in literature and art a means to demonstrate human experience. As James Baird asserts in 1956, 'Jung is not the critic. He wishes to be the expositor of the basic experience through art. By this act he becomes a presence in criticism rather amorphous than distinct. He did not found a school of criticism. He created an attribute of the climate in which criticism of the last fifty years has flourished'.[3] Jung's recourse to literature was to demonstrate how, as a field of art, literature is able to speak the language of a collective unconscious through the vision of the poet (or artist).

---

[2] This tension between the individual and the text brings in the agency of the collective in the development of the individual, if we combine Jung's notion of the collective unconscious in mythos with Paul Ricoeur's ideas on mimesis in *Time and Narrative*. Ricoeur acknowledges the three stages of mimesis: prefiguration, configuration, and refiguration—with a special interest in refiguration. Prefiguration, which is both mimetic and expressive, shows how human acting is already prefigured with certain abilities such as the structural and symbolic skills necessary for composing poetry. The second stage of mimesis is the configuration of experience, which imitates reality in a way that liberates the reader through narrative emplotment, or what Ricoeur calls 'the kingdom of the as if,' bringing elements of a situation in an imaginative order. The third stage of mimesis, refiguration, whether narrative or historical, mediates both the world of the text and the world of the reader. It includes the fictive into live experience, as 'the intersection of the world projected by the text and the life-world of the reader.' 'the intersection of the world of text and that of the listener or reader.' (44) This is where mythos comes into play, for when narrative or poetry is read, they are experienced by the reader, taken as one's own, and integrate the hypothetical to the real.

[3] Baird, James, '"Preface" to *Ishmael*: Jungian Psychology in Criticism: Some Theoretical Problems' in *Jungian Literary Criticism,* ed. by Richard P. Sugg (Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1992), p. 42.

One major problem that can be revised now is that during his time, Jung had not been thoroughly and properly read, as many offered distorted interpretations of his ideas. Many, like Freud and his fellows Abraham, Ferenczi, Rank, Sachs, and Ernest Jones, have created a cloud of taboo hovering over his status as a theoretician—so 'Jung not only is not read, but he is misread while being unread'.[4] Freud's 'History of the Psychoanalytic Movement' contributed greatly to the misrepresentation of Jung's ideas; the work is considered 'Freud's declaration of war. As he wrote it, furiously, he sent drafts to his intimates, and he came to call it affectionately the "bomb"'.[5]

So, we can legitimately question this degree of professional hostility. When attempting to define the psyche, Jung prioritized its creative nature first. In her book, *Jung as a Writer*, Susan Rowland posits that the innate property of the human mind to be mysterious comes first in Jung's thought, and then comes the ability to produce a comprehensive science of the psyche, or the ability to describe the psychic process verbally, for 'It is an attempt to evoke in writing what cannot be entirely grasped: the fleeting momentary presence of something that forever mutates and reaches beyond the ego's inadequate understanding'.[6] Such a mode of expression cannot but have literary qualities, or so it could be argued. As in poetry, when a concept is not fully grasped or comprehended by the intellect, it is felt and understood through the expressive, creative nature of the intellect. And these aspects are vital for the performative nature of the Jungian approach, in light of its aesthetic significance. By performative, the point to be made here recoups a previous one, namely that Jung saw personal biographical experience as integrally a part of the

[4] Susan Rowland, *Jung as a Writer* (Hove: Routledge, 2005), p. x.
[5] Gay, p. 241.
[6] Rowland, *Jung as a Writer*, p. 3.

development of his discourse, which discourse was not as it were considered a science in the hard sense.

In his essay, 'On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry,' Jung explains how his psychological approach to poetry differs from that of Freud. One of Freud's common criticisms of Jung is directed toward his writing style, for his essays tend to work around topics (such as the archetypes, the collective unconscious, libido, and myth and alchemy) rather than the keen, focused abstractions of modern science—when explaining the human psyche, the struggle to define 'scientific writing' is a common criticism of Jung. Contrary to Freud's belief, Jung does not agree that art or religion can or should be explained through psychology/science, for that would be a denaturization: 'when we speak of the relation of psychology to art, we shall treat only of that aspect of art which can be submitted to psychological scrutiny without violating its nature'.[7] For psychology to account for art, and in particular literature, therefore, would be seen as a subordination of art to science, a type of colonialization which Jung resists, as he sees no 'unifying principles' among these disciplines:

> Indeed, art and science would not exist as separate entities at all if the fundamental difference between them had not long since forced itself on the mind. The fact that artistic, scientific, and religious propensities still slumber peacefully together in the small child, or that with primitives the beginnings of art, science, and religion coalesce in the undifferentiated chaos of the magical mentality, […] all this does nothing to prove the existence of a unifying principle which alone would justify a reduction of the one to the other. (*CW 15*, p. 66)

[7] Carl Gustav Jung, *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature* trans. by R.F.C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978), p.66.

Another area of disagreement with Freud concerning art is the reduction of the infant psyche into one model that would later express itself religiously or artistically. In other words, Jung is against what is perceived as highlighting infantile psychology as the reason or main cause of art and other cultural expressions. Art, argues Jung in 'On the Relation between Analytical Psychology and Poetry,' cannot be reduced to infantile neuroses, Oedipal complexes, or sexual repression, in which case 'interest is insidiously deflected from the work of art and gets lost in the labyrinth of psychic determinants, the poet becomes a clinical case and, very likely, yet another addition to the curiosa of *psychopathia sexualis*' (*CW 15*, p. 68). In Freud's reductionist viewpoint, Jung finds that psychology is given a false authority to explain something it actually has nothing to do with in essence or nature: 'Art by its very nature is not science, and science by its very nature is not art; both these spheres of the mind have something in reserve that is peculiar to them and can be explained only in their own terms' (*CW 15*, p. 66).

Jung's counterargument to Freud's reductive approach (as Jung perceives it) is to propose the concept of the symbol as 'an expression of an intuitive idea that cannot yet be formulated in any other or better way […] that is, attempts to express something for which no verbal concept yet exists' (*CW 15*, p. 70), where the symbol's significance is detached from the artist's ego. This is redolent of T.S. Eliot's theory of impersonality. In other words, the root of such symbolic art is from the collective (as opposed to Freud's personal) unconscious, a theory which highlights a purely impersonal nature.[8] Despite Jung's belief that many works of art do reveal the conscious intentions of the author, he concedes that symbols 'are the best possible expressions for

[8] As previously noted on page 18, this is similar to T.S. Eliot's theory of impersonality, which appears in 'Tradition and the Individual Talent.'

something unknown' (*CW 15*, p. 76) and therefore reading a symbolic, or as he terms it, 'visionary,' work is in itself is an experience of 'bridges thrown out towards an unseen shore' (*CW 15*, p. 76). That is because it is a suprapersonal experience, going beyond comprehension, a process that Jung likens to the author's dormant consciousness during the process of creation (*CW 15*, p. 75). In 'The Analytical Psychology of C.G. Jung and the Problem of Literary Evaluation', Mario Jacoby examines how Jung views symbols as images that carry meaning beyond what they depict. According to Jung, 'a symbol becomes the most sophisticated form of representation of a relatively unknown fact' (*CW 6*, p. 474). However, for an image to become a symbol, it depends entirely on the way it is approached through consciousness (*CW 6*, p. 475). A symbol is only 'alive' when it becomes the finest revelation of something that is sensed, but that is not quite known to the observer (*CW 6*, p. 476). In a Jungian poetics, therefore, it is necessary for consciousness to be receptive to symbols, for it is through the recognition of the symbol that one may 'strike a chord of meaningful experience'.[9] Mario Jacoby mentions that 'Jung's particular endeavour is to make consciousness receptive to symbols in order to strike a possible chord of meaningful experience'.[10] By interpreting symbolic images, Jung believes that consciousness becomes open to unconscious experiences. The collective memory is the root source of models taken from myths and religions, and what makes the irrational picture-language of the unconscious extremely valuable is the creative/synthetic nature of the latter: 'The unconscious is creative, and this makes its irrational picture-language extremely valuable'.[11] The importance of the unconscious resides in its archetypes, its main regulators responsible for imagination. Hence, the archetypes become the roots of consciousness as well: 'The unconscious

[9]Mario Jacoby, 'The Analytical Psychology of C.G. Jung and the Problem of Literary Evaluation' in *Jungian Literary Criticism*, ed. by Richard P. Sugg (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1992), p. 63.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Ibid., p. 64.

regulators, the archetypes, make the human imagination possible. They are the seeds from which the conscious mind unfolds'.[12]

Jung also makes a distinction between the psychological and the aesthetic approaches to literature. A psychologist can never answer questions on what art is in itself, but rather, such questions must be approached from an aesthetic perspective. Jung states that a work of art contains psychological structures, but they are not derived from the artist's psychological condition. He argues that 'The investigation of the psyche should therefore be able on the one hand to explain the psychological structure of a work of art, and on the other to reveal the factors that made a person artistically creative' (*CW 15*, p. 86). He asserts that the exploration of the psyche must be able to both explain the psychological structure of a work of art, and illustrate the factors that led to a person's artistic creativity. Jung's view on art is based on his belief in the creativity rooted in the collective unconscious. In this sense, the work of art is more revelatory than the actual artist himself. In fact, the latter is an artefact in a strangely counter-intuitive way of the former, according to a Jungian stance. Because ideological stances change with time, so do the values of each historic period. From a psychological perspective, this would mean that 'changing archetypal ideas attain validity and develop into the cultural canon of an era'.[13] Most importantly, Jung's researches result in the insight that man's soul strives toward its totality, its realization of all its potential. 'Soul', a key term for Jung may sound uncritical, however, that is precisely the point. Jung's conflation of psyche and shadow as part of the individuation process is thus, in a strictly analytical sense, beyond clear and distinct articulation. 'Soul' in Jung captures both the connotation of the inarticulable aspect of experience and of its performativity,

[12] Ibid.
[13] Jacoby, p. 66.

rather than being denotatively grasped. Insofar as selfhood strives toward totality, selfhood strives toward something always and ever beyond itself; hence, the signification of terms such as 'soul', which may seem uncritical. Hence, Jung views the poet as a product of a collective creative repository of archetypes, whose work gives shape to the unformed ideas in the collective psyche. In other words, the individual artist gives form to the vivid fantasies rising from the unconscious. Although psychology can explain a literary work through the writer's personal life experiences, Jung disapproves of such a reductive approach to literature which reduces the work to a display of symptoms: 'Though the material he works with and its individual treatment can easily be traced back to the poet's personal relations with his parents, this does not enable us to understand his poetry […] If a work of art is explained in the same way as a neurosis, then either the work of art is a neurosis or a neurosis is a work of art' (*CW 15*, p. 67). Jung holds visionary literature in high regard, for the writer who speaks in primal images both overpowers the reader and elevates the particular into the eternal.

In fact, Jung views as problematic the language of psychology for this above reason. Since it requires some cognitive analysis, science, understood broadly, requires a rational language, which is problematic, or so Jung would argue, because it discards the work of the unconscious. Jung adverts to an experiential, less cognitive approach to the creative process in his essay 'On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry,' saying that 'indeed we ought not to understand, for nothing is more injurious to immediate experience than cognition. But for the purposes of cognitive understanding we must detach ourselves from the creative process and look at it from the outside…In this way we meet the demands of science' (*CW 15*, p. 78). Much later, however, in his *Liber Secundus* of his *Red Book*, Jung applies a non-cognitive approach again, but this time paradoxically, aligning reason with 'unreason': 'We recognized that the

world comprises reason and unreason; and we also understood that our way needs not only reason but also unreason'.[14] Jung focused on this a-rational aspect of 'unreason' that Freud, in his scientism, had almost completely dismissed, one that Jung reads as 'the greater part of the world [that] eludes our understanding…part of the incomprehensible, however, is only presently incomprehensible and might already concur with reason tomorrow' (*RB*, p. 404). Jung dubs this type of knowledge as 'magic,' as it involves thinking, the mediation of whose processes are not fully fleshed out. Thinking, in other words, involving, as it were 'elective affinities', or as it were, truths leapt towards and seen rather than worked through stage by stage. He sees this as a necessary method for understanding the creative side. To a certain extent, the alchemical aspect of poetry itself is articulated in Jungian terms, as a meaningful process that 'consists in making what is not understood understandable and in an incomprehensible manner' (*RB*, p. 404).

This method of argument is described as 'magic' in the *Red Book*. This can be viewed in one instance when Jung described myth as a type of (irrational) science. In his essay, 'Psychology and Literature,' Jung expresses a concern over a weakness of modernity perceived as a result of an over-reliance on reason, and discusses how the healing power of art, like myth, lies in its ability to bring into the collective consciousness the compensatory function of dreams, where the 'manifestations of the collective unconscious are compensatory to the conscious attitude' (*CW 15*, p. 97). He returns to myth in his essay, believing that it yields a new mode of 'science' to suitably express experience, in a way that is far from modernity's science of rationality. The new mode of science, myth, can indeed be dubbed a science (if soft, not hard) while it enacts a very different form of comprehending and making sense of human experience

[14] C.G. Jung, *The Red Book: Liber Novus*, ed. by Sonu Shamdasani, 1st edn (London: Norton and Company, 2009), p. 404.

preserves the impersonal quality of the collective unconscious without reducing it to the artist's personality.[15] This 'science' views visionary art as a newborn child separated from the realm of the mother (*RB*, p. 362). Because the primordial experience, which is the source of creativity, is too 'amorphous' to understand, Jung argues that 'it requires the related mythological imagery to give it form' since it is 'wordless and imageless…nothing but a tremendous intuition striving for expression' (*CW 15*, pp. 96-97). In Freud's *Moses and Monotheism*, published almost a decade after Jung's 'Psychology and Literature,' Freud views magic as the predecessor of science that served in the development of language:

> All magic of words belongs here, as does the conviction of the power connected with the knowledge and the pronouncing of a name. We surmise that 'omnipotence of thoughts' was the expression of the pride mankind took in the development of language, which had brought in its train such an extraordinary increase in the intellectual faculties.[16]

Freud, however, saw this form of 'magic' not as a form of science as Jung viewed it, but as a precursor to science, one moreover that contributed to the development of language, and later on, spirituality.[17] This new realm of spirituality, according to Freud, was where 'conceptions,

---

[15] See Adorno and Horkheimer's *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. This text from the 1940's is very pertinent here insofar as it argues that modern rationality has become occluded and thus mythological in the pejorative sense, whereas Homeric myth can be construed to have been a primordial form of reasoning about the human condition.
[16] Sigmund Freud, *Moses and Monotheism* trans. by James Strachey (Hogarth Press: Letchworth, 1939), p. 179.
[17] This form of magic-as-science versus the modernist focus on reason is discussed in the same light in Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno's *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, where it is argued that the enlightenment's emphasis on rationality intended to separate man from nature. This movement away from nature has led to an increase in violence, and a tendency in man to overcome and destroy nature and denounce all the pre-rational forms of 'science' such as myth, which was common among people who are closer to nature and further from the enlightenment rationality. In overcoming nature, 'the concordance between the mind of man and the nature of things that he had in

memories, and deductions became of decisive importance'[18] and is contrasted with basic sensual perceptions. Hence, Freud views 'magic' as an important element in humanity's development, but does not regard it as form of 'science' the way Jung does.

The importance of Jung's works lies in the fact that his innovative ideas bridge the gap between art and science. Excluding this bridge, according to Terry Eagleton, has led to an emaciated cultural theory today, one that is lacking in some essential political and ethical challenges.[19] While Jung may not always be right (and I do not argue that he is) his work definitely strives to find answers for global crises, addressing issues such as morality and religion, for 'he analyzed a world built on structures of exclusion and knew it was sick for that reason'.[20]

An examination of the reasons behind the separation between Jung and Freud would highlight the aspects of Jung's psychology that have been undermined or altogether dismissed in contemporary cultural theory. This thesis offers a fresh perspective on how Jungian thought can be re-incorporated into literary critique without repeating errors of the past. So where do Jungian psychoanalysis and a Jungian sense of alchemy become useful, critically when reading poetry? Will a Jungian poetics teach us to read modernism differently? Whether alchemy, or 'magic' as it is sometimes referred to by Freud and Jung, is a predecessor or another form of science, its poetic power lies in metaphor. As Donna Orange notes, 'Metaphor is everywhere in science—in the processes of discovery and of framing models for testing'.[21]And if we were to replace the

---

mind is patriarchal: the human mind, which overcomes superstition, is to hold sway over a disenchanted nature' (p. 4).

[18] Freud, *Moses and Monotheism*, p. 179.

[19] Qtd. In Rowland, Jung as a Writer, p. x [from Terry Eagleton, *After Theory* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003), pp. 101-102].

[20] Rowland, *Jung as a Writer*, p. x.

[21] Adolf Grunbaum, *The Foundations of Psychoanalysis: A Philosophical Critique* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

word ‘science’ with the term ‘alchemy’ (in the Jungian sense of the word), then we would come to realize that just as in poetry, metaphor underpins a Jungian notion of alchemy.

However, while it is my contention to show how H.D., Yeats, and Joyce can incorporate a ‘literary Jung,’ and while many authors and poets showed an awareness of Jungian concepts, not all modernist writers that were Jung’s contemporaries could incorporate a Jungian style or poetics. There are other writers, like D.H. Lawrence for example, who have a different relationship to language than Jung. Lawrence’s language, of course, works very differently than that of H.D., Yeats, and Joyce. Firstly, Lawrence had clearly expressed his distrust (and perhaps dislike) of psychoanalysis:

> Psychoanalysts know what the end will be. They have crept in among us as healers and physicians; growing bolder, they have asserted their authority as scientists; two more minutes and they will appear as apostles. Have we not seen and heard the *ex cathedra* Jung? And does it need a prophet to discern that Freud is on the brink of a Weltanschauung—or at least a Menshenschauung, which is a much more risky affair?[22]

Obviously, Lawrence’s attitude toward psychoanalysis shows how he discredits what he sees as scientifically pretentious, claiming, in a way, that psychoanalysts descended from a line of charlatanry, and he mentions Jung and Freud in particular. Moreover, in his *Fantasia of the*

[22] Ibid., p.3.

Unconscious, Lawrence presents a kind of disclaiming attitude towards scholarship in its classical sense:

> I am no 'scholar' of any sort. But I am very grateful to scholars for their sound work. I have found hints, suggestions for what I say here in all kinds of scholarly books, from the Yoga and Plato and St. John the Evangel and the early Greek philosophers like Herakleitos down to Frazer and his Golden Bough, and even Freud and Frobenius. Even then I only remember hints—and proceed by intuition.[23]

Lawrence here claims that his language is intuitive, and although he does pay attention to Jungian approaches and interests (ancient texts such as the Yoga, Plato, Heraclitus, Frazer, and Freud), he does not consider himself a scholar. While Jung studies ancient texts on magic and alchemy and lays foundations of his theory of individuation on them; Lawrence refers to ancient texts on magic as scientific texts:

> I honestly think that the great pagan world of which Egypt and Greece were the last living terms, the great pagan world which preceded our own era, once had a vast and perhaps perfect science of its own, a science in terms of life. In our era this science crumbled into magic and charlatanry. But even wisdom crumbles.[24]

[23] D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious* (New York: Dover, 2005), p. 54.
[24] Ibid.

Here, Lawrence again makes references to psychoanalysis as a science in light of charlantry, although later, he continues to hint at an awareness to certain Jungian concepts like the collective unconscious in his forward to *Fantasia and the Unconscious*, where he mentions the power of symbols and myths. Instead of the exact Jungian collective unconscious, Lawrence claims that in myth and ritual lie the foundations of old wisdom, and in it is where the artist makes his knowledge available:

> …the intense potency of symbols is part at least memory. And so it is that all the great symbols and myths which dominate the world when our history first begins, are very much the same in every country and every people, the great myths all relate to one another. And so it is that these myths now begin to hypnotize us again, our own impulse towards our own scientific way of understanding being almost spent.[25]

Here, Lawrence acknowledges a cultural paradigm similar to Jung's, as well as in his revival of the Heraclitan principle of opposites, which is found in *Birds, Beasts, and Flowers*, where he describes in a passage on reptiles how the tension of all things is being: 'for in the *tension* of opposites *all things* have their *being'*.[26] What is interesting is that in his discursive writing, Lawrence appears to be paying attention to what I would call a Jungian poetics. However, although a Jungian consciousness might be found lurking somewhere in his work, Lawrence's

[25] Ibid., p. 55.
[26] D.H. Lawrence, *Birds, Beasts, and Reptiles* (Jaffrey, NH: Black Sparrow, 2008), p. 93.

work is in a different mode of expression, and this difference is important. Lawrence's writing seems to change from text to text, but if two of his novels were observed, two particularly broad styles are perceived: in *The Rainbow,* there is a wave of language that reduces dialogue to almost nothing, whereas in *Women in Love,* there is a frictional mode of language and it is entirely dialogic and argumentative.[27] In *Women in Love,* Fiona Becket argues that Lawrence displays the 'tension of opposites' at the level of language through oxymoron and other means. According to Becket in *D.H. Lawrence: The Thinker as Poet*:

> The tension between two unrelated terms brought suddenly into proximity […] is in Lawrence, "frictional", a word which, in his lexicon, has sexual overtones but which more properly refers to language and questions of style. In oxymoron, friction is generated (and meaning created) by the semantic or more properly, the logical, disparity between the two terms brought together. (p. 146)

Moreover, while the text of *Women in Love* talks about love, it is expressed as hatred—something none of H.D., Yeats, or Joyce do. 'Tension', therefore, for Lawrence, is used to convey a creative frictionality, while in the sense of a Jungian poetics, tension must be *resolved* through union of opposites in order for creativity to occur. Lawrence's different modes of language, therefore, cannot be seen to sit with a sense of a Jungian poetics, For Jung is interested in the *union* of opposites; he can invoke the Heraclitan model, but in terms of Heraclitan tension at the level of the page. Usually, however, with writers like H.D., Yeats, and Jung, there is a

[27] Fiona Becket, *D.H. Lawrence: The Thinker as Poet* (London: Macmillan, 1997).

palpable coherence within the Jungian model of alchemy, which strives towards individuation through the unity of opposites instead of a focus on and striving towards the tension between them.

In Lawrence's Heraclitan observation, therefore, he finds that being and creation lies in the *tension* between opposites, while Jung (along with H.D., Yeats, and Joyce) focuses on the *union* of opposites as a source of creative power. Jung's opposites do not work at the same level as they do in Lawrence's work, destructing and dismantling ideas that are received (as shown in Becket's example of the expression of romantic love as hatred in *Women in Love*). Lawrence's Heraclitan model, then, works its way into his poetics with a special focus on this tension at the level of language. However, in works like those of H.D., Jung, and Joyce, there is usually a very local kind of coherence with what is invoked (for example: the sun, the moon, and the feminine). Still, however, Lawrence would be useful to invoke because in a discursive context, he actually adopts some very useful philosophies and metaphysic as we have seen in some of his passages from *Psychology and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Yet, at the level of his very own style, he produces a very different type of writing, which is why it is unlikely that he be read through a Jungian perspective. With Lawrence, there is so much going on at the level of language, whereas H.D., Yeats, and Joyce seem to be more easily understood in the context of the Jungian model.

A Jungian Poetics

While a 'Freudian poetics' has been argued for as a basis for reading, not least, H.D., critics have been reluctant to analyze the validity of a Jungian poetics, in part as a countervoice to the

alignment of Freudian psychoanalysis and cultural theory.[28] Jung's preoccupation with psychiatry, psychology, and theories of art, myth, alchemy, symbols and archetypes, and the collective unconscious, are what comprise his psychoanalytical approach, and his approaching literature is not in the familiar traditional psychoanalytical sense. A Jungian reading stems from a synthesis of his theories, mainly those on art, alchemy, the symbol, and the 'coniunctio' archetype, which is the union of both anima and animus necessary for individuation (since the *coniunctio* is able to support and portray the poetic notion of artistic tension and creativity).

Jung's clinical experience had helped him develop his theories on the unconscious, for his medical training and experiences in psychiatry aided in refining some thoughts on the nature of the 'unconscious personalities,' the discovery of the 'complex', and the validation of the presence of a collective unconscious. Some major experiences that led to the refinement of his psychological notions were his studies on occult phenomena, performance of the word-association tests, and clinical observations of the delusions of schizophrenic patients. Jung's dissertation for his medical degree, entitled 'On the Psychology and Pathology of So-called Occult Phenomena', was based on a case study he performed by observing the behavior of his fifteen-year-old cousin, Helene Preiswerk, during her role as a medium during seances. Observing Helene, who claimed to be controlled by a variety of spirits, led Jung to interpret these spirits as 'unconscious personalities,' where 'the patient is obviously seeking a middle way between two extremes; she endeavors to repress them and strives for a more ideal state',[29] bringing to mind Freud's 'dream investigations, which disclose the independent growth of repressed thoughts' (*CW 1*, p. 78). His study was used in a clinical setting to confirm the idea

[28] See Dianne Chisolm, *H.D's Freudian Poetics: Psychoanalysis in Translation* Cornell University Press, 1992)
[29] C.G. Jung, *Psychiatric Studies CW1*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), p. 77.

that personality was not actually a unity, as it might contain in itself other secondary, minor personalities. At the start of Jung's psychiatric practice at the Burgholzli mental hospital, he worked with 'word-association tests' which were used in order to study the way mental contents (verbal concepts produced by products in response to stimuli) were connected (by similarity, contrast, or spatial/temporal proximity). Jung used these word association tests as research tools for exploring and studying emotional preoccupations—which resulted in his formulation of the concept of the 'complex,' defined as 'a conglomeration of psychic contents characterized by a peculiar or perhaps painful feeling-tone, something that is usually hidden from sight'.[30] Furthermore, in developing the ideas of the collective unconscious and archetypes, Jung's clinical experience with schizophrenic patients, along with his deep involvement in trying to understand their psychology led him to reach the conclusion that their delusions and fantasies could not have possibly arisen from personal experiences nor could they be explained in terms of their biographical backgrounds: 'psychotic contents show peculiarities that defy reduction to individual determinants, just as there are dreams where the symbols cannot be properly explained with the aid of personal data'.[31] Jung found dream-like, numinous motifs analogous to those that appear in mythology in the delusions of schizophrenic patients who were completely unaware of mythical traditions and folklore of other civilizations. One important observation Jung made was in 1906, in the case of a schizophrenic patient who claimed that he could see the sun's phallus, from which the wind originates. This patient had no previous knowledge of any myths that described similar concepts; however, in the course of Jung's studies in mythology in 1910, Jung came across a book by Dieterich on ancient Mithraic cults, which mentioned an identical image

[30] C.G. Jung, 'Tavistock Lecture II,' in *The Symbolic Life: Miscellaneous Writings CW 18*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), p. 49.
[31] Jung, 'Recent Thoughts on Schizophrenia' in *The Psychogenesis of Mental Disease*, p. 254.

as the one seen by the schizophrenic patient four years before. Such clinical experiences where Jung believed he had found established mythological symbols in his patient's fantasies helped him to develop his theory on the collective unconscious, for he was able to offer evidence for the archetypal manifestations that he claimed were common to all, whether they appeared in dreams of clinically sane people or in the delusions of the schizophrenic patients.

With the rise of a popular interest in mysticism alongside rationalist modes of reading, notions such as alchemy not only caught Jung's attention, but in poetry, a sense of an 'occult' world was, for some, extremely productive, even vital, while simultaneously a sense of irony could be maintained. Insofar as it is constructivist, modernist art not only names an unhoused modern reality, but its very method of constructing meaning from the interstices may be viewed as a form of unhousedness.

Attributing occultism as a form of spiritual compensation for the post world wars' loss of values that society suffered from, Freud considered it an alternative to people's dull existence, and an attempt to return to 'superseded convictions of primitive peoples'.[32] Occultism's appeal, according to Freud, was also partly due to being an approach to the revolution the world was heading toward.[33] Jung, however, saw it as a reaction against rationality, associated with the physical mass destruction of the time from the first World War onwards, and a return to the sacred unconscious from which the modern psyche was split in favor of a notion of science which was exclusively empiricist. Yet, whether the interest in mysticism was a compensatory act or not, Jung found in it a mine of symbolism, which can productively inflect and influence the ways we read H.D., Yeats, and Joyce. From a system of thought to an artistic style, the metaphors which express

[32] Sigmund Freud, 'Psychoanalysis and Telepathy' (1941) in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. 18, ed. James Strachey, (London: Hogarth, 1955), p.177-178.
[33] Umberto Eco, *Foucault's Pendulum*, trans. by William Weaver (New York: Ballantine Books, 1990), p. 467.

Yeats and Joyce's metaphysical (Theosophic or occultist) beliefs provide their works with a unique sense of both language and meaning. In their case, the parallels between art and 'magic' is well-established (through the systemic explanation of the universe by Yeats, the verbal creation—or alchemy—of new ideas by H.D., and the mythical/archetypal juxtapositions by Joyce). Freud in *Totem and Taboo*, while comparing magic to art, offers an interesting distinction with which Jung might agree: in 'the field of art…people speak with justice of the "magic of art" and compare artists to magicians',[34] with the artist (poet) drawing on 'primitive' ideas and emotions in a manner similar to how a magician or alchemist might draw on them to demonstrate (super-natural) power over the elements and the natural world. Moreover, the association of ideas found in poetry (especially in H.D.'s *Trilogy* as we will see), also displays a connection which is quite self-conscious between alchemy and poetics.

Jung's critical work on literature is usually confined to one work—that of James Joyce's *Ulysses*. In his essay, 'Ulysses', Jung complains that even exerting a huge effort, he barely made his way through the first half of the 'monotonous' novel, claiming that it had made him ill and sent him to sleep. Jung's extensive critical analysis of *Ulysses* comprises one of Joyce's most severe reviews, as he likens the novel viscerally to a 'tapeworm' feasting on his energy, nourishment, and life force as it endlessly proliferates chapters: 'From this stony underworld there rises up the vision of the tapeworm, rippling, peristaltic, monotonous because of its endless proglottic proliferation' (*CW 15*, p. 114). Jung claimed that the only way out of the novel's terrible assault on his body and mind—it caused him to converse with his own intestines (*CW 15*, p. 113)– was to stop reading it and start treating the reader's own distress, so he 'laid it aside

[34] Sigmund Freud, *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*, trans. by James Strachey (New York: Norton, 1950), p. 90.

disappointed and vexed' (*CW 15*, p. 115). While Jung's response risks obtuseness or banality, it actually turned out as an interpretive opportunity. Jung's initial resistance to *Ulysses*, then, suggests in this case that the experience that the reader needs in order to understand the novel's meaning, the experience of befuddlement, is necessary. Jung ended up neither pathologizing nor diagnosing *Ulysses* or its reader, as the process of moving it from the category of art to that of pathology does not 'solve' the complexity of the novel. It was more important to Jung to investigate why the novel had exerted such a great cultural and literary influence 'and not whether its author is a high-grade or low-grade schizophrenic' (*CW 15*, p. 117). Continuing his reading of the novel, Jung did not see *Ulysses* as a result of an illness, but rather as a cultural response he renders analogous to the schizophrenic model—while not diagnosing the author as a schizophrenic. Cultural responses to the 1914-1918 war were not uncommon, of course, and many artistic movements (such as Surrealism, Cubism, and Vorticism) mirrored traumatic responses toward the war. In writing, as has been expressed by David Trotter, 'techniques of representation were changing, nowhere more radically than in the work of James Joyce'.[35] Jung argues that, in the manner of the modern artist, Joyce transforms the novel; it is 'a mere eye, ear, nose, and mouth, a sensory nerve exposed with choice or check to the roaring chaotic, lunatic cataract of psychic and physical happenings, and registering all this with almost photographic accuracy' (*CW 15*, p. 109). These details could have been read by Jung as symptomatic of schizophrenia. According to Jung, estrangement from reality is created by mental disease in schizophrenic patients, but it is not the result of schizophrenia in the modern artist's work. Rather, fragmentation and grotesque manipulation of reality is a collective manifestation of the artist's cultural moment, since the artist follows the 'current of collective life' (*CW 15*, p. 117)

[35] David Trotter, *English Novel in History: 1895-1920* (London: Routledge, 2003), p. 93.

stemming out of the collective unconscious rather than individual consciousness. While grotesque distortions of beauty, for instance, in schizophrenic individuals is a result of personality destruction, it is not so in the modern artist, who creates such distortions for creative purposes. Instead of being a sign of insanity in the modern artist, destructiveness is where the writer finds 'unity of his artistic personality' (*CW 15*, p. 118). Hence, 'the modern artist finds his psychological truth in making art about the destruction of conventions and values'.[36] In a chaotic modern world, therefore, Jung notes that art finds no room for mimetic traditions, conventions and values, as the artist can find a constructive aspect in such destructiveness, so 'far from his work being an expression of the destruction of his personality, the modern artist finds the unity of his artistic personality in destructiveness' (*CW 15*, p. 118).

Consequently, Jung comes to realize that modernism has an investment in shattering traditions that no longer seem to function culturally. *Ulysses* turns Jung's ideas on art as transcendent and visionary into an expression of bodily vileness and degradation, which drove Jung to comment on such a response to modernity as 'the transformation of escatology into scatology' (*CW 15*, p. 128). This is what Jung sees as a 'reversing' of art, which is seen in the visceral nature of *Ulysses*:

> But it is only modern man who has succeeded in creating an art in reverse, a backside of art that makes no attempt to be ingratiating, that tells us just where we get off, speaking with the same rebellious contrariness that had made itself disturbingly felt in those

[36] Susan Rowland, *Jung and the Humanities* (New Orleans: Spring Journal, 2012), Amazon Kindle e-book (chapter 3, location 1026).

> precursors of the moderns[37] who had already started to topple the old ideals. (*CW 15*, p. 119)

In her book, *C.G. Jung in the Humanities,* Susan Rowland makes an interesting observation that a significant, often overlooked aspect of Jung's response (as a reader) arises from the conclusion Jung makes out of his experience of *Ulysses*: from his perception of the novel's resistance to interpretation.[38] Which is to say, Jung's biographical take on the novel opens an avenue onto a more broadly considered Jungian interpretation. Even if a Jungian reading refuses the work's susceptibility to direct interpretation and decoding, it would still be misreading to simplistically draw out the 'symbols' in a text such as *Ulysses* as instantly recognizable archetypal images. A text cannot be interpreted by locating archetypal correspondences (such as anima, animus, and shadow); Jung wanted to interpret language the way he would interpret archetypes, but he did not want to interpret the novel as 'archetypal' In *Ulysses,* the only symbol Jung was actually interested in was the novel itself, which he saw as 'a living symbol that creates a new consciousness for a new age'.[39] According to Jung, the 'symbol' that is formed by the novel is that of Joyce's new Self, as a result of the author's dissolving ego, which is dispersed into the numerous figures and events in the book: 'In the whole book no Ulysses appears; the book itself is Ulysses, a microcosm of James Joyce, the world of the self and the self of the world in one' (*CW 15*, p. 127). This is the symbolic perspective through which Jung reads *Ulysses*—in contrast to a 'vulgar' theory of archetypes, which attempts to oversimplify the novel and reduce its complexity. From Jung's perspective, there is a chaos in *Ulysses*, a *massa confusa* where

[37] By 'precursors of the moderns' Jung is making references to Friedrich Nietzsche and Friedrich *Hölderlin.*
[38] Rowland, *C.G. Jung in the Humanities*, location 1055.
[39] Ibid., location 1049.

'destructiveness seems to have become an end in itself,' (*CW 15*, p. 116) and this, he opines, is what causes a change in the (unindividuated) reader's perspective, which lies in the resulting, 'alchemical' function of the novel in the sense that it transforms the readers after a tedious struggle (for Jung): the reader re-finds new consciousness, or rather, a new 'home' with Ulysses, who 'has freed himself from attachment, entanglement, and delusion, and can therefore turn homeward' (*CW 15*, p. 128). In contrast to Jung's first impression of *Ulysses*, his final comments struck a more positive note, for the novel was no longer a 'tapeworm'. Jung's reading attempts to show how the 'alchemy' of literary texts lies in the text's ability to develop creativity in both reader and writer. Throughout the process of reading the novel, Jung as a reader undergoes an act of individuation, starting with the entanglement in bodily details and materialism, moving on to the suffering in search of meaning, and finally ending with a sense of detachment from the novel's details. Jung's journey as a reader was one away from total immersion in sensation; the initial merging of the reader's psyche with the world of the novel acts as a kind of refiguration integrating both worlds of the text and reader,[40] at the same time leading to Jung's 'alchemical' sense of individuation and freedom from the entanglements of materialism. This causes him to find a 'spiritual' purpose for *Ulysses*:

> O Ulysses, you are truly a devotional book for the object-besotted, object-ridden white man![41] You are a spiritual exercise, an ascetic discipline, an agonizing ritual, an arcane procedure, eighteen alchemical alembics piled on top of one another, where amid acids,

[40] See footnote 93 on p. 55 for more details.
[41] Perhaps Jung here aims to debunk modern instrumental rationality via the same of modern 'western' man. In this sense, Jung evinces a modernist inflection in the same way, say, an early modernist like Conrad debunks western imperialism.

> poisonous fumes, and fire and ice, the homunculus of a new, universal consciousness is distilled! (*CW 15*, pp. 131-2)

Here, Jung finds symbols of personality development in alchemical concepts (such as 'alchemical alembics', 'poisonous fumes', and 'distilled'), and he sees the alchemical process as a metaphor for the individuation process, or the process of 'becoming an in-dividual…becoming one's own self…"coming to selfhood" or "self-realization"',[42] which is actually based on the idea of opposition and wholeness. Jung's expression here regarding *Ulysses's* polymorphous contents seems, apart from Jungian alchemical interests, directly suited to the kind of uncanny science that psychoanalysis was becoming. The Hermeneutic circle may be seen to typify a psychoanalytic science, insofar as there is no absolute or total solution, rather every revelation or disclosure must result in a new obscuring of a different facet of the reality under interpretation. Alchemy—perhaps precociously—had prefigured this relativistic notion, seeing the alchemist as affecting the results of his magical science.

In 'Psychology of the Child Archetype,' Jung states that 'Identity does not make consciousness possible; it is only separation, detachment and agonizing confrontation through opposition that produce consciousness and insight'.[43]Jung did not see in the medieval preoccupation to turn lead into gold the literal, physical transformation of base metals, but in it he found a metaphorical system for understanding the transformation of consciousness. The transformation from lead to gold is that of the dense to the subtle, or from the un-individuated to

[42] C. G Jung, *Two Essays in Analytical Psychology*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), p. 173.
[43] C.G. Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), p. 169.

the enlightened and/or the illuminated individual. 'Mercury', the god of insight in alchemy is also thought to ultimately lead the alchemist in to a relationship with Sophia, or wisdom. The effect of alchemy with its 'language' of images, metaphors, and symbols, is, then, akin to poetry. Alchemy, therefore, becomes in Jung a 'technique for relating to the unconscious'.[44] For Jung, alchemy is not a 'primitive' attempt at an early form of psychology in an early modern moment, but rather, he regarded it as an erudite symbolic system that was suitable to stimulate modernist thought. What further draws Jung's psychology to poetics is the metaphoric nature of his approach. Since Jung seeks to find ways that express otherwise inexpressible concepts, he claims in his *Mysterium Coniunctionis* that his psychology is a metaphor. Furthermore, Jung likens himself to an artist, which might align him with the poets, especially in my view, H.D., Yeats, and Joyce, whose work at points constructs the artist as an alchemical magus; co-creators of reality through words and, in particular, the power of metaphor. Most important is Jung's quest metaphor which informs the notion of individuation; in this quest, his approach becomes transformational and creative, 'reconceiving or rebirthing the world and the psyche as dynamically co-creative'.[45] With the focus on the quest metaphor and the birth of the new, Jung presents the *psyche* as co-creative with the world, which allows poetry to become a good medium for Jungian psychological expression—hence a Jungian poetics where psyche and language are co-creators of new meaning and, by extension, a new reality.

Within Jung's dialectical psyche, there is a relationship of self-balancing between the conscious and the unconscious, where both constantly attempt to regulate the tensions between them. This is similar to the creative tension in a poet's mind, like Yeats's concept of creative

[44] Rowland, *Jung as a Writer*, p. 87.
[45] Rowland, *Jung and the Humanities*, location 477.

tension between the self and anti-self and H.D.'s attempts to unite the male and female in the androgyne. In order to clarify the complex term, 'psyche,' Jung makes the following differentiation between the latter and the concept of the 'soul': 'I have been compelled, in my investigations into the structure of the unconscious, to make a conceptual distinction between soul and psyche. By "psyche,"I understand the totality of all psychic processes, conscious as well as unconscious. By soul, on the other hand, I understand a clearly demarcated functional complex that can best be described by "personality"'.[46] The psyche, therefore, is the location of both the conscious and the unconscious (personal and collective, along with the archetypes). The soul, on the other hand, is not synonymous with the psyche, as it is closer in similarity to one's personality.

Part of the complexity of the psyche lies in the problem of 'knowing it'. It lies beyond empirical experience and comprehension. In other words, Jung strives to prove the existence of an unknown and empirically unknowable 'mind'. Because the psyche is an unobservable entity, Jung resorts to indirect proof through images and symbols to track down the unknowable 'dark impulse' that works by guiding the artist *and* psychologist.[47] Poetry is, in this sense, the translation of the creative impulse from archetype to image to word. Poetic language helps the artist to 'come to terms with the pain of the inferior part of the personality or shadow'.[48] For Jung, in order to perform this inner healing from the damage left by the shadow archetype, there must be within the psyche some dialogical process. This idea, as shall be presented in the following chapters, recurs in the works of H.D., Joyce, and Yeats.

Poetry and Alchemy

[46] Jung, *Psychological Types*, p. 463.
[47] Rowland, *Jung as Writer*, p. 90.
[48] Ibid.

In the works of H.D., Yeats, and Joyce, it can be argued that there is a special affinity between alchemy and poetry. For them, poetry appears to be a useful alchemical crucible that reaffirms the Hermeticists' (alchemists') belief in '…the Egyptian god Thoth, identical with the thrice renowned Hermes of Hellenism; who was honored [by the ancient Greeks] as the inventor of writing, protector of libraries, and inciter to all literary efforts'.[49] Since Hermes-Thoth is believed to be the inciter of both 'literary efforts' and alchemy, it is possible, therefore, for the theme of alchemy to grasp the attention of literary figures and permeate their styles in the same manner that it made its way into Carl Jung's psychoanalysis.

In the following chapters I shall show how alchemy as a metaphor stylistically pervades the works of H.D., Joyce, and Yeats in the manner of a verbal alchemy. For example, in Joyce's *Ulysses* we find such sentences as: 'His lips lipped and mouthed fleshless lips of air: mouth to her womb. Oomb, allwombing tomb. His mouth moulded issuing breath, unspeeched'.[50] A comparative style appears in H.D.'s work, particularly in *Trilogy*, a further attempt at a kind of verbal alchemy or individuation, for 'H.D. believed that alchemy would help her to "find new words as the Professor [Freud] found or coined new words to explain certain yet unrecorded states of mind or being"'.[51] In section 21 of *The Walls do not Fall*, H.D. uses puns to create new words

[49] William York Tindall, 'James Joyce and the Hermetic Tradition', *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 15.1 (1954) <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2707648 > [accessed 27 March 2010] (p. 30).
[50]James Joyce, *Ulysses* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. 60.
[51] Timothy Materer, *Modernist Alchemy: Poetry and the Occult* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996), p. 100. Indeed, Materer's just-cited work is perhaps the most apposite influence on this thesis. Four pertinent points Materer develops are: the historical contexts of occultist, mystical and alchemical notions, and their biographical influence on modernist writers like H.D., Yeats and Joyce; the relevance more globally of poetry being read under an alchemical lens, due to parallels of mode and conception; and how, as another instance, Jung held in common with such modernist authors a rebellion against repression of the spiritual or numinous side of human experience, which may be seen as a rebellion of a strictly Freudian view. Materer also highlights the commonality between Jung in particular and these authors, in so far as they all rebelled against a rigorously-instrumental rationality inherited from the Enlightenment; opting for more irrational, or perhaps better, a-rational modes of making sense of human experience; one obvious way being the deployment mythoi, both in contents and as methodological tools.

and to transform the divinity Amen-Ra into a mother-cocoon and then again into a newborn son: 'here am I, Amen-Ra whispers,/ Amen, Aries, the Ram,/ be cocoon, smothered in wool,/ be Lamb, mothered again' (*Trilogy*, p. 30). H.D. puts her word alchemy into action within the 'crucible' of her poetry in section 8 of *Tribute to the Angels*: 'Now polish the crucible/ and set the jet of flame/ under, till *marah-mar*/ are melted, fuse and join/ and change and alter,/ mer, mère, mere, mater, Maia, Mary,/ Star of the Sea,/ Mother' (*Trilogy*, p. 14). This is a version of Arthur Rimbaud's notion of the *alchimie du verbe*, or 'Alchemy of the Word': 'Then I'd justify my magic sophistries with the hallucination of words!'[52] This type of verbal alchemy in poetry celebrated by Rimbaud introduces new words, ideas, and images to the text, giving it a hallucinatory quality that implies a change in the text's consciousness: 'I got used to elementary hallucination: I could very precisely see a mosque where there was a mere factory, a corps of drummer-boys made up of angels, ponycoaches on the highways of heavens, a living-room at the bottom of a lake—monsters, mysteries—the title of a vaudeville show set up real horrors before me' (p. 37). An example of Rimbaud's idea of the 'hallucination of words' in *Ulysses* would be when all of a sudden, 'God becomes man becomes fish becomes barnacle goose becomes featherbed mountain' (*Ulysses*, p. 63). Transformation of words and letters in Yeats's poetry emphasizes the transformation of modern man into an unstable and insane creature. Yeats uses a kind of 'shuffling' of words rather than letters for that purpose: '…only an aching heart/ conceives a changeless work of art' (*VP*, p. 421, ll. 13-14). Although Yeats, H.D., and Joyce differ in mode and aesthetics, this thesis argues that the modernist commonality between them (in technique and chronological tallying—which is to say experimental methods and historical contexts of alchemical and occultist interest) is appropriately construed by its own commonality with Jungian theory. Not only can they all be

[52] Arthur Rimbaud, *A Season in Hell and Illuminations: Poems*, trans. by Bertrand Mathieu (Brockport: BOA Editions, 1991), p. 37.

seen to have written in the same modernist period, but, as in what follows, their writings are analogized in a more emphatic way when illuminated by an equally modernist theoretical itinerary like Jung's.

Poetic language uses images, of course, for the language of poetry is '…a language pregnant with meanings, and images that are true symbols because they are the best possible expressions for something unknown—bridges thrown out towards an unseen shore' (*CW15*, p. 75). Just as imagery is used metonymically for the mystical realm of alchemy, so imagery is used to make the realm of the psyche more vivid to the readers in Jung. Imagery, then, becomes central to a language of both poets and alchemists. As put by Timothy Materer, 'The language of images is universal, but it is no more fixed for H.D. than the identity of Thoth/ Hermes/ Mercury. The universal language was preserved not only by poets but also by alchemists and astrologers'.[53] Jung, however, finds it a great loss to the individual who has not experienced the relation of sacred imagery to one's own psychic structure, so 'To help remedy this loss, H.D. renews the occult arts and writes poetry in which her readers may experience its sacred images'.[54] Yeats uses geometric images to express his metaphysical/ spiritual beliefs in poetry, or in other words, uses the visual as a means toward the visionary; as he says in 'Ego Dominus Tuus,': 'By the help of an image/ I call to my own opposite (*VP*, p. 367, ll. 7-8)'.

Jung marshals conceptions and techniques of alchemists which are also adopted, but very differently, as shown in this thesis, by H.D., Yeats, and Joyce. Jung asserts that two necessary factors must be present within the alchemist in order to alter matter: meditation and imagination: '"Meditation' (i.e., an internal dialogue with one's own unconscious self) and 'imagination' (i.e.,

[53] Materer, p. 100.
[54] Ibid.

the action of the 'celestial' in man, his 'astrum') will, in the alchemist's opinion, set free the forces which enable him to alter matter'.[55] A poet, therefore, like an alchemist, can alter material reality into whatever he or she desires it to be transformed into through the use of both meditation and imagination. Like the alchemist, the poet needs to have an internal dialogue with the self in order to reveal unconscious desires, thoughts, or feelings through poetry; similarly, the poet needs to use imagination in order to create new images, analogies, and symbols. Therefore, with the use of both meditation and imagination, the poet, like the alchemist, will be able to 'alter matter', transforming worlds, objects, people, emotions, and ideas, a method I shall shed more light on in the forthcoming chapters discussing the works of H.D., Yeats, and Joyce.

Interestingly, the similarity between alchemist and poet was evident to early Hermeticists (such as Boehme , Paracelsus, Flamel, and Aquinas) who regarded Hermes as patron of poetry, the god of writing and the artist with a palette; this idea, however, has been revived by the modernist poets, for as H.D. states in her *Trilogy*, 'so what good are your scribblings?/ This—we take them with us/ beyond death; Mercury, Hermes, Thoth/ invented the script, letters, palette' (p. 17). Joyce also refers to Thoth many times in *Finnegans Wake*, especially when characterizing the principal creative figure as 'thauthor,' and in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* when Stephen Daedalus addresses 'Thoth, the god of writers, writing with a reed upon a tablet'.[56] Yeats, believing that art is a means for expressing spiritual ideas, perceived 'art and religious sensibility as one, and the artist was a priest,' whose poetic art would offer redemption to a degraded mankind. Yeats also makes a reference to Hermes in Book V of 'Anima Hominis': 'He only can create the greatest imaginable beauty who has endured all imaginable pangs, for only when we have seen and foreseen

[55] Walter Pagel, 'Jung's Views on Alchemy', *Isis*, 39.1 (1948) <http://www.jstor.org/stable/226767> [accessed 16 May 2010], p. 45.
[56] James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (New York: Penguin Group, 2013), p. 225.

what we dread shall we be rewarded by that dazzling, unforeseen, wing-footed wanderer'.[57] In the end, poetry represents an alchemical method of expressing a collective unconscious: 'the work of art we propose to analyse, as well as being symbolic, has its source not in the *personal unconscious* of the poet, but in a sphere of unconscious mythology whose primordial images are the common heritage of mankind' (*CW15*, p. 80).

H.D., Yeats, and Joyce

H.D.'s poetic style, despite the fact that her words have been viewed in light of Freud's poetics, also demonstrates a radical conjunction with Jung. H.D.'s Hermetic tendencies work their way into her poetry, making 'alchemy' both a theme and metaphor for her artistic creativity, where she renders words as procreators of revolutionary ideas. Such notions include the Hermetic motifs such as the divine feminine (anima), the androgyne, and transformation, which happen to be major Jungian themes. Hence, I argue, H.D.'s metaphysical inclinations, especially those dealing with the feminine, draw her philosophy closer to Jung's than to Freud's; and with these notions working their way into her poetic style, she in fact gives shape to a Jungian poetics, which, ironically, emerged from her relationship with Freud, whom she calls the 'alchemiste si remarkable'.[58] I shall argue that H.D. adopts the Jungian notions that the mind is a womb for creation, along with the belief in a similar collective unconscious, which hides a set of primordial images (like Jung's archetypes, more or less). What is striking about H.D.'s work is her use of these (Jungian) notions for revisionist purposes through her poetry, where, as poet-priestess she seeks to call for a 're-visionary' perception of patriarchy.

[57]William Butler Yeats, *Per Amica Silentia Lunae*, (New York: The Macmillan Company) https://read.amazon.com/ [accessed 26 October 2014], location 168.
[58] John Walsch, 'H.D., C.G. Jung and Kusnacht: Fantasia on a Theme', in *H.D.: Woman and Poet*, ed. by Michael King (Orono: The National Poetry Foundation, 1986), p. 61.

Yeats, radically dissimilar to H.D., expresses his spiritual beliefs through his works such as *Rosa Alchemica, A Vision, Anima Hominis*, 'Ego Dominus Tuus' and 'A Dialogue Between Self and Soul, and he sees himself as a priest-like figure, where the gift of creation (poetry) gives him visionary power. The uniqueness in Yeats's alchemical poetics, however, is his striving toward knowledge and meaning beyond what is found in the intellect using his own symbolic system in which he attributes universal meaning to geometric symbols. Yeats also focuses on the poet-priest's trance-like state of mind for poetic inspiration through accessing the *anima mundi*, or world spirit, a notion I find reminiscent of Jung's idea of the collective unconscious. The term *Anima Mundi*, used by Yeats, means 'world spirit'. Yeats describes the Anima Mundi as an impersonal memory which is not related to the memories of individuals,[59] and claims that it is 'a general storehouse of images which have ceased to be a property of any personality or spirit'.[60] Similarly, Jung perceives the collective unconscious as a universal soul, referring to a shared, impersonal, inherited memory containing 'deposits of the constantly repeated experiences of humanity' (*CW7*, p. 69). The contents of the collective unconscious, according to Jung, are similar to individuals everywhere, just like the contents of the Anima Mundi. Most importantly in Yeats's 'alchemical poetics', however, is his focus on symbols of polarity and the tension between them from which creation results. Given a Jungian emphasis on certain ideas, it becomes productive to think of a Jungian model of reading Yeats. This could establish a Jungian poetics through the alchemical notion of the 'coniunctio,' the union of opposites, an idea that is developed and exploited in a poetic style that Yeats manifests throughout his works.

[59] William Butler Yeats, *The Autobiography* (New York: Scribner, 1986), p. 175.
[60] Peter Allt and Russell K. Allspach, *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of W.B. Yeats* (New York: Macmillan, 1987), p. 822.

Joyce's novels, on the other hand, demonstrate a similar undertaking of verbal alchemy and mythical parallels to Jung's models of alchemy, individuation, and the collective unconscious. Joycean themes include heroic or epic journeys seen in Stephen Daedalus and Leopod Bloom, who ultimately reach a new level of personal transformation. What is unique about Joyce's tracing of the process, however, is the redeployment of letters and sounds that develop into a new language and new perspectives. While Jung claims that the self strives toward its totality, Joyce portrays how this individuation is done through writing, not only through the characters, but also through linguistic changes and symbols, which can be read from a Jungian perspective: Joyce's use of symbols is archetypal, since certain ideas are expressed in images containing meaning beyond what they depict, often referring to universal ideas such as the anima. Archetypal images, like symbols, express universal ideas that are present in the collective unconscious. Jung's anima, for example, finds ample room in Joyce's portrayal of the hero, where it manifests itself through many symbols (dove-girl, uroboros, dung, ink) the hero encounters on his individuation journey and influences the language of Joyce's works, showing how the protagonist's psychic development through the anima affects its style.

Whether on the thematic level, or the stylistic presentation, alchemy as an idea permeates the works of H.D., Yeats, and Joyce in a way that suggests a powerful Jungian poetics. This study will show how key Jungian ideas have exerted an influence on the works of these three modernist writers at a time when there was not much consideration given to Jungian thought in the arts; while Jung struggled to be accepted and establish a name among the major modernists, his notions found expression in some works of modernist literature. The first chapter will show how H.D's *Trilogy* can be read as a form of linguistic alchemy. This opening reading will then lead on to alternate Jungian readings of the two other modernist writers in the remit of this thesis.