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Abstract

The connection between Sigmund Freud and modernism is firmly established and there is an increasing (though still limited) body of scholarship that adopts methods of literary analysis in approaching Freud’s texts. This thesis adds depth and specificity to a broad claim to literariness by arguing that Freud can be considered a practitioner of modern literary impressionism. The claim is substantiated through close textual analysis of key texts from James Strachey’s *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, alongside theory and fiction by significant impressionist authors Ford Madox Ford, Henry James, Virginia Woolf and Dorothy Richardson. The authors’ respective approaches to various aspects of literary impressionism are considered, such as the methods of textual development, the instability of genre, and the stylised techniques utilised to convey the impression. This research illustrates that whilst each of the chosen novelists engages with literary impressionism differently, Freud’s texts share common practice with each, facilitating the reassessment of the analyst as a specifically ‘impressionist’ author.
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IMPRESSIONS OF AN ANALYST: REASSESSING SIGMUND FREUD’S LITERARY STYLE THROUGH A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE PRINCIPLES AND FICTION OF FORD MADOX FORD, HENRY JAMES, VIRGINIA WOOLF & DOROTHY RICHARDSON

‘All genuinely creative writings are the product of more than a single motive and more than a single impulse in the poet’s mind and are open to more than a single interpretation’.1

INTRODUCTION

Aims, Scope & Structure

This thesis argues that Sigmund Freud may be considered not simply a theorist within the context of modernism, as he has often been described, but an impressionist author producing literary works. As such, its chapters explore the similarities between Freud’s texts and those of established impressionist authors Ford Madox Ford, Henry James, Virginia Woolf and Dorothy Richardson. While the origins of literary impressionism predate Freud, and have been fruitfully explored across various geographical contexts (French, Russian, American and British, for instance) in the works of authors such as Walter Pater, Gustave Flaubert, Guy de Maupassant and Ivan Turgenev, this thesis limits itself to impressionists of the modernist period who pushed the boundaries of impressionism and whose works formed the apposite site of impressionist experimentation.2 As science and psychoanalysis were leading to new

2 Rebecca Bowler provides a useful overview of critical discourse on the impact of modernist cultural developments upon (the particularly visual aspects of) literary impressionism, to which she adds her own appreciation of the impact of modernist ‘cinema, photography, painting and theatre’ (p. 4). Rebecca Bowler, Literary Impressionism: Vision and Memory in
understandings of the mind, these authors recognised that the novel and various forms of life-writing also had to change in order to engage with these emerging insights. There is no evidence to suggest that Freud read or was directly influenced by any of the impressionist fiction or theory discussed at length in this thesis. Rather, as Lionel Trilling explains in his study ‘Freud and Literature’, ‘we must see that particular influences cannot be in question here but that what we must deal with is nothing less than a whole Zeitgeist, a direction of thought’.

A core component in each of the respective chapters is the subject matter shared between psychoanalysis and impressionism – of exploring individual consciousness – but the thesis does not employ psychoanalysis as a theoretical influence on the production of modernist literature in the more traditional approach to the disciplines discussed below. Instead, following Maud Ellmann’s model described below, it remains firmly rooted in literary criticism, declining to engage in the debate surrounding the validity of psychoanalytic theory, which has already received much attention and which would inhibit the appreciation of Freud’s style that I wish to prioritise. In each chapter I consider both the particular impressionistic fictional outputs and literary theory propounded by the authors, and how this corresponds with the aesthetics of Freud’s texts. I do not claim to offer here an exhaustive reading of the impressionism of each of the focal authors; work has already been done in this area by scholars who fruitfully explored this in more depth than a single comparative study such as this thesis can aspire to. But as Max Saunders suggests, ‘[w]e should talk of impressionisms, as we now do of modernisms’, in the sense that literary impressionism varies

---


between authors and amongst the *oeuvres* of specific authors; my own study adds to the existing scholarship by considering Freud’s relation to a wide range of impressionist tropes and characteristics. For example, I consider Freud’s formal and generic conventions, highlighting not only his overtly impressionistic tendencies but how these both develop and rebel against other forms, such as the realist novel and nineteenth-century biography. Freud’s impressionism is shown to extend beyond his innovative psychoanalytic thinking to the way in which he represents these thoughts. This method reflects the indeterminate nature of the concept of impressionism discussed below, identifying impressionism by acknowledging deviance from the conventions of other movements, and identification with other authors readily conceived of as impressionist, hence the selection of canonical impressionists for comparison; since their impressionism has already been critically established it facilitates the tracing of similar impressionistic tendencies in Freud’s work.

I begin by examining Ford Madox Ford’s influential manifestos of literary impressionism and their correspondences with one of the most famous, and strikingly impressionistic, of Freud’s texts, *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900). From this general claim to impressionism permeating content and form, I focus in the second chapter on the way in which an impressionistic central consciousness is created into which lasting impressions are scored, guided by Henry James’s notion of the germ and culminating in a comparison of Freud’s case history of Little Hans with the child consciousness of James’s Maisie character. This focus on the central consciousness is maintained throughout the thesis and explored in the third chapter through a study of the instability of generic boundaries between biography, autobiography and fiction, drawing upon Virginia Woolf’s seminal

---

essays on these subjects to produce a reading of the impressionism within Freud’s Dora case history. Finally, I draw together the themes of the preceding chapters with reference to Dorothy Richardson’s theoretical comments on literary style and her practical application of these principles in her *Pilgrimage* series. In contrast to previous chapters, which predominantly take singular Freudian texts as their focus, the fourth chapter draws upon a wider breadth of Freud’s writing to demonstrate the extent to which impressionism characterised his literary output across his career, but also to trace further manifestations of his impressionism apparent within the broader narrative of psychoanalysis comprised by a cumulative reading of his individual publications. Finally, the chapter and the thesis conclude by addressing the issue of endings (or lack thereof) within psychoanalytic and impressionistic endeavours, arguing that both are characterised by an innate unfinishability.

### A Note on Translations

Over the course of this thesis I base my analyses on The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, edited by James Strachey, his wife Alix Strachey, and others. Published by the Woolfs’ Hogarth Press, the Standard Edition became in the early twentieth century the dominant medium through which readers encountered Freud’s theories. James Strachey, like Freud, was immersed in literature from an early age: his mother ‘often organised small literary salons for her children [James was the youngest of thirteen] and their friends’, and James ‘rapidly developed a love for literature and the arts’. Later, at Trinity College, Cambridge, Strachey became a member of the undergraduate Conversazione Society, known as the Apostles, which also counted amongst its members James’s brother.

---

Lytton Strachey, Leonard Woolf and John Maynard Keynes. Strachey recalled his somewhat underqualified entrance to the British Psychoanalytical Society, in 1922 as an associate member, and in 1923 as a full member, with ‘no experience of anything except third-rate journalism’ and ‘some two years of analysis with Freud’. Strachey’s first comment here refers to his position as assistant editor of The Spectator journal, which was edited by his cousin John St Loe Strachey. Alix Sargent Florence entered Newnham College, Cambridge in 1911 to read modern languages. In 1915 she began attending the weekly meetings of the Bloomsbury group, where James was also present. They married in June 1920, moved to Vienna six months later and first James, then Alix, began analysis with Freud, in which they remained until 1922, at which point the pair moved to London and joined the British Psychoanalytic Society. Freud’s request that the Stracheys translate some of his texts into English was made early in their analysis, and ultimately led James to translate 26 of Freud’s essays between 1927 and 1950, ‘in close collaboration with Alix’.

It may be argued that by not working with the original German of Freud’s texts, the analyst’s impressionism cannot be fully appreciated due to differences in the English and German versions, a point of particular concern when working at the detailed level of close reading that I intend. For instance, Bruno Bettelheim’s impassioned diatribe against Strachey’s refusal to translate the frequently used ‘Seele’, as its English counterpart ‘soul’ is, in Bettelheim’s view, an example of Strachey’s transformation of psychoanalysis from a

---

6 Nobus, para. 3 of 9.
8 Nobus, para. 5 of 9.
9 Nobus, para. 6 of 9.
10 Nobus, para. 7 of 9.
humanist to a scientific discourse. Similarly, Darius Gray Ornston Junior argues that Freud’s ambiguous wordplay, for instance in his use of metaphor or pun, ‘often leaves his reader to finish a point’. Strachey’s translations, by contrast, may misinterpret or misconstrue Freud’s intended meaning or, as Ornston argues, engage in a tendency to fill ‘in the gaps that I believe Freud carefully crafted for his reader’; ‘[Strachey] rarely tried to convey Freud’s bemused wit and dry humour; nor did he try to explain Freud’s mesmerizing ambiguity’, eliding it instead.

As Paul Roazen observes, ‘Strachey’s translation was also an act of interpretation and it has not been hard to find spots where he went astray’, yet nevertheless even ‘the German editions have relied on Strachey’s editorial apparatus’. According to Michael Holroyd, a German publishing house even considered retranslating the Standard Edition back into German for its merits. As Ornston points out in his preface to Translating Freud, Strachey’s translations ‘have become essential to anyone who studies Freud in any language’, because many foreign translators have consulted Strachey’s editorial machinery, for which he was awarded the Schlegel Tieck prize for translation in 1966. Moreover, Freud gave his support for the Stracheys’ translations, describing the pair as ‘my excellent English translators’ in a footnote added in 1923 to his ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’ (1905

---

13 Ornston, pp. 2, 3.
16 Ornston, p. ix
17 Nobus, para. 8 of 9.
This is one of the key reasons that the Stracheys’ Standard Edition is utilised in the present study, in favour of the new Penguin editions produced under the editorship of Adam Philips, which lack Freud’s sanction. In addition, the earlier Standard Edition was immersed in the temporal, geographical and literary culture with which the present thesis is concerned, so while some editorial decisions may arguably reduce the radicalism of the texts, Strachey’s Freud is one imbued with the experimental ethos of both author and editor.

Rebecca Beasley discerns the concept of translation as embedded within ‘the dominant epistemological structures of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’. Building upon Sanford Schwartz’s description of the ‘strong predilection for surface/depth oppositions that distinguish conceptual abstraction from concrete sensation’ in the period, which manifest across psychoanalytic, anthropologic, poetic, and philosophic cultural facets, Beasley argues that ‘the conversion of sensation to concept, experience to knowledge, is frequently conceived by these thinkers as an act of translation’. For instance, Beasley identifies

Freud’s characterization of the unconscious as region of [...] ‘ruins, with remains of walls, fragments and columns, and tablets with half-effaced and unreadable inscriptions’ [...] , which reveal to the analyst [...] ‘an alphabet and a language, and, when they have been deciphered and translated, yield undreamed-of information about the events of the remote past, to commemorate which the monuments were built’.

---

21 Beasley, p. 551.
Strachey’s acts of translation then mimic Freud’s own interpretive task, adding another layer of meaning which, on the one hand, makes readable Freud’s work which would, to many, be otherwise ‘unreadable’; but on the other hand creates a record that possesses its own archaeological depths, open to excavation and interpretation.

As Walter Benjamin argues, ‘translation’ may be conceived of as occupying a position ‘midway between poetry and doctrine,’ an ambiguous standing which the discipline of psychoanalysis also navigates, as explored below.  

Jacques Derrida, in his ‘Letter to a Japanese Friend’, goes further still in arguing for the inherent value of the translation and its proximity to poetry, attesting: ‘I do not believe that translation is a secondary and derived event in relation to an original language or text’, and ‘I clearly understand translation as involving the same risk and chance as the poem.’

Strachey’s translations are, according to this view, new primary works in their own right, of no less value than Freud’s originals. Although Strachey’s vocabulary may affect the tone (and sometimes the meaning) of Freud’s texts, his translations are therefore nonetheless approachable from a literary-critical standpoint according to the theoretical perspectives of Derrida and Benjamin. Moreover, much of the analysis that is to follow in reading Freud as an impressionist author can justifiably be made in a translated version of the text, since the central consciousness, the unit of the impression, the interplay of literature, science and reality, and the lack of endings all endure across languages.

Psychoanalysis and/as Literature

As abundant scholarship has demonstrated, Sigmund Freud was acutely aware of the intimate connection between psychoanalysis and literature: as he wrote in an oft-quoted passage, ‘[t]he poets and philosophers before me discovered the unconscious. What I discovered was the scientific method by which the unconscious can be studied’.24 His library at 20 Maresfield Gardens boasts a complete edition of the works of Goethe, as well as editions of Shakespeare, Gogol, Balzac and Anatole France.25 While he was unable to bring all of his books from Vienna upon his exile to England in 1938 in the face of the increasing threat of Nazism, the collection in London ‘includes a wide range of subjects: art, literature, archaeology, philosophy and history as well as psychology, medicine and psychoanalysis’.26 Ernest Jones dedicates a chapter of his important biography of Freud to the topic of literature. He begins by noting the abundance of published material already (by 1957) devoted to the subject of Freud’s impact upon literature, and limits his own discussion to the following themes: ‘Freud’s own contributions to our understanding of creative activity and the study of certain literary productions; some account of his interest in literature; and a note on his contact with literary personages’.27

Freud penned essays devoted to literature, for example ‘Creative Writers and Daydreaming’ (1908 [1907]) on the process of creative composition, or studies dedicated to

literary criticism, such as ‘Delusion and Dream in Jensen’s *Gradiva*’ (1907), but as we will see Freud’s attitudes towards literature and his personal preferences also creep into studies dedicated to other subjects, appearing as passing comments, interruptions and parataxis, demonstrating the extent to which literature permeates his psychoanalytic texts. Despite this interest, critics such as Sarah Kofman and Graham Frankland have noted that Freud’s relationship with creative writers was not that of simple admiration and identification, but was, rather, complex and ambivalent. For instance, many of his remarks betray a sense of competition and perceived inferiority in the analyst when presented with the intuitive understanding of the human mind demonstrated by creative writers, while conversely critiques of literature as the product of fantasy diminish the authority of these writers. Whereas Freud’s contention in ‘An Outline of Psychoanalysis’ (1940 [1938]) that psychoanalysis goes beyond ‘cool scientific interest’ suggests an empowering distance from restrictive science, enabled by and manifested in his literariness, he argues elsewhere (in ‘The Future of an Illusion’ [1927]) that ‘scientific work is the only road which can lead us to a knowledge of reality outside ourselves’. Furthermore, in lecture XXXV of his *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (1933 [1932]), ‘The Question of a Weltanshauung’, Freud explains that psychoanalysis, as a ‘specialist science’, adheres to the scientific

---


weltanshauung, or ‘view of the Universe’,\textsuperscript{31} which ‘asserts that there are no sources of knowledge of the universe other than the intellectual working-over of carefully scrutinized observations—in other words, what we call research—and alongside of it no knowledge derived from revelation, intuition or divination’\textsuperscript{32}. Freud posits art as one of three ‘powers which may dispute the basic position of science’ as the means of understanding the universe (the other two oppositional powers being philosophy and religion; religion being the only one of the three ‘to be taken seriously as an enemy’ of psychoanalysis and science). ‘Art’, according to Freud, ‘is almost always harmless and beneficent; it does not seek to be anything but an illusion’, rarely making any ‘attempt at invading the realm of reality’\textsuperscript{33}. For his psychoanalytic texts to be considered art would therefore threaten to undermine Freud’s scientific attempt to elucidate the human condition.

The advent of psychoanalytic literary criticism lies with Freud himself. As Céline Surprenant observes from a twenty-first-century perspective, ‘[p]sychoanalytic literary criticism does not constitute a unified field. […] However, all variants endorse, at least to a certain degree, the idea that literature […] is fundamentally entwined with the psyche’\textsuperscript{34}. Schools of psychoanalytic literary criticism have developed, involving the process of psychoanalysing either the author or key character(s) within a text, as Freud often did

\textsuperscript{32} Freud, ‘New Introductory Lectures’, xxii, p. 159.
\textsuperscript{33} Freud, ‘New Introductory Lectures’, xxii, p. 160.
himself, which Surprenant terms “‘applied’ psychoanalysis’;\textsuperscript{35} the exploration of psychoanalytic concepts in relation to form and structure, such as the application of concepts relating the Lacanian unconscious to language systems, or Carl Gustav Jung’s identification of recurring images of archetypes and the collective unconscious across literary and cultural sources; and finally, the analysis of psychoanalytic texts themselves, in which theoretical material is re-read in light of its formal and stylistic qualities. As Surprenant suggests, these critical approaches demonstrate a ‘shift of emphasis from “content” to the fabric of artistic and literary works’, and ‘from the “content” of Freudian psychoanalytic theory to its formal aspects’.”\textsuperscript{36} The present thesis predominantly adopts the latter approach and focuses on these characteristics within the psychoanalytic texts themselves, however there are times when exploring possible psychoanalytic readings of the texts under consideration further elucidates elements of Freud’s impressionism due to the fundamental entwinement of literature and the psyche identified by Surprenant. In these instances such readings are not applied reductively or arbitrarily, but rather reveal new connections between the texts’ contents, styles, and underlying theoretical assumptions, which enrich our understanding of Freud’s impressionism.

\textsuperscript{35} Surprenant, p. 201. Important early book-length examples of this process in practice can be found in Ernest Jones’s \textit{Hamlet and Oedipus} (1949) and Marie Bonaparte’s \textit{Life and Works of Edgar Allan Poe} (1933).

\textsuperscript{36} Surprenant, p. 203. This development should not be oversimplified, however: a recent (2016) independent study course designed by Dianne M. Hunter, Emeritus Professor of English at Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut, USA and published in the University of Edinburgh’s Language & Mind Research Network blog bears resemblance to early trends in psychoanalytic literary criticism as it similarly attempts to foster an approach to literature stemming from a kind of Freudian dream-interpretation process, though it does not encourage the kind of reductive readings denounced by critics of the early mechanisms of ‘applied psychoanalysis’. Laura Cariola, ‘Psychoanalytic Study of Literature’, \textit{Language and the Mind}, 25 May 2016 <http://www.blogs.hss.ed.ac.uk/language-mind/2016/05/25/psychoanalytic-study-literature/> [accessed 1 August 2017].
Freud’s own literariness did not go unnoticed by his contemporaries: he received the Goethe prize for literature in 1930 (‘evidence that some of his essays were masterpieces of writing’\(^{37}\)), and there are numerous acknowledgements of his literary talents, including praise from Eugen Bleuler, Havelock Ellis, and Albert Einstein.\(^{38}\) Ernest Jones describes him as ‘a distinguished master of prose style’ and recalls that ‘[h]e is said to have told someone that as a young man he had thought of becoming a novelist’.\(^{39}\) Over the years an increasingly sophisticated body of scholarship has developed which considers this literariness in greater depth. For instance, Trilling’s essay ‘Freud and Literature’, originally published in 1940, revised and reprinted in 1947 and 1950, considers amongst other facets of the titular relationship, the analyst’s place within literary tradition, including his Romantic heritage: Trilling argues that ‘psychoanalysis is one of the culminations of the Romanticist literature of the nineteenth century’, given the disciplines’ common concern with ‘the perception of the hidden element of human nature and of the opposition between the hidden and the visible. We have too the bold perception of just what lies hidden’.\(^{40}\) He also explores Freud’s impact upon the development of literary biography and his ideological affinity with the modernist Zeitgeist, identifiable in the literature of Marcel Proust, T.S. Eliot, Thomas Mann, Franz Kafka and James Joyce (though one should note the resistances of modern authors such as Joyce and Woolf to what they perceived to be Freud’s formulaic, artificial discourse upon the


\(^{38}\) Patrick Mahony, *Freud as a Writer*, Expanded ed (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), pp. 9, 18. Though note Ernest Jones’s interpretation that ‘When Havelock Ellis and other critics assert that Freud was an artist rather than a scientist the statement is plainly intended not so much as praise of his artistry, though this was evident enough, as a means of discounting his scientific work.’ Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, III, p. 417.


\(^{40}\) Trilling, ‘Freud and Literature’, pp. 95, 96.
— and the inescapable role of poetry within Freud’s ‘shaping of his own science’: we ‘feel and think in figurative formations,’ and thus poetry is necessary for the creation of psychoanalysis, ‘a science of tropes, of metaphor and its variants, synecdoche and metonymy’. Nevertheless, Trilling’s focus remains predominantly on ‘the poetic qualities of Freud’s own principles’, rather than his texts. Several decades later psychoanalyst and literature professor Patrick Mahony undertook a more direct and sustained examination in *Freud as a Writer* (first published in 1981), exploring the stylistics of ‘Freud the skillful storyteller’ across the analyst’s multiple and ambiguous generic compositions, including consideration of Freud’s performative style and his conception of audience, degrees of certainty and utilisation of figurative language. Notably, Mahony argues for the coherence between the content of Freud’s psychoanalytic theory and the style in which he presents this, a congruence that will be framed in terms of impressionism in the current thesis.

Graham Frankland’s *Freud’s Literary Culture* is of particular note for its exploration of the multiple ways in which Freud’s works manifest his deeply significant experience of literature, his ‘literary culture’ underlying his ‘new “science”’. Shoshana Felman’s assertion, not specific to Freud, that literature is the unconscious of psychoanalysis, is drawn

---


44 Frankland, p. xi.
upon by Frankland as he argues that literature permeates Freud’s career, both at a textual and practical level, in the psychoanalytic technique of retelling patients’ stories. In his preface, Frankland declares, ‘I shall concentrate on analysing Freud’s texts as texts – their rhetoric and imagery, their inner tensions and subtexts, their sources, their cultural background’ (p. xi). He does this by positing Freud as reader, literary critic, and, most interestingly, writer or ‘frustrated dichter’ as his final chapter phrases it. Over the course of this final chapter Frankland analyses Freud’s complex use of allusion and imagery; his ambivalent attitude towards creative writers in which his conservative preference for classics such as Goethe and Shakespeare is complicated by his envy of their ready comprehension of primary psychological drives and the debt owed to them by psychoanalysis; and his role as creator of ‘“fictional” narratives,’ including his use of conventions of the nineteenth-century novel in his own writings (p. 162). Regarding the last of these points, Joyce Crick highlights certain ‘aspects of the case histories which do not entirely fit the Novelle model: the absence of closure in the Dora case history, for example, or its radical shifts of register from social narrative to technical analysis’. This observation lends itself to alternate readings of Freud’s style, which at the same time does not undermine those produced by Frankland: as his preface states, the objective of his study is to ‘leave the reader with […] a fresh sensitivity towards Freud’s writing, an alertness to its rich contexts and fraught subtexts, which in the best literary-critical tradition, should ambiguate rather than definitively categorize the work’ (p. xi).

My aim in this thesis is to build upon studies such as those above, which appreciate and explore Freud’s literariness, by considering him predominantly within his own

45 Shoshana Felman, Literature and Psychoanalysis: The Question of Reading, Otherwise (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982).

contemporary context. Freud’s cultural context is often broadly defined as that of modernism; in particular I focus on the impressionist characteristics of his texts. Critical introductions to modernism traditionally present psychoanalysis as a theme or context for the development of literary modernism, or as an embodiment of shared modernist sensibilities, but rarely as the subject of literary criticism itself. For example, *The Modernism Handbook*, edited by Philip Tew and Alex Murray, presents Freud as a ‘major figure’ under the heading ‘Literary and Cultural Contexts’, in which Emmett Stinson describes Freud’s influence upon ‘writers who employed the stream-of-conscious technique’, upon the Surrealist movement, and upon specific modernist authors such as D. H. Lawrence.47 Stephen Frosh’s chapter in David Bradshaw’s *Concise Companion to Modernism* is more exploratory, acknowledging that ‘[o]ne of the claims one might make about the relationship between psychoanalysis and modernism is that each is a beast of the other’; ‘psychoanalysis […] is an emblematic modernist discipline; conversely, modernist perceptions of subjectivity, individuality, memory and sociality are all deeply entwined with a psychoanalytic sensitivity’.48 Frosh concludes that psychoanalysis in the modernist period ‘took off both as a mode of therapy and as a cultural form’, but he stops short of analysing the modernist aspects of psychoanalysis (p. 134). In her study of Virginia Woolf’s psychoanalytic narratives, Elizabeth Abel ‘is less concerned with influence [between Woolf and Freud] than

The current thesis shares this approach, but seeks to shift the focus onto literary style rather than psychoanalytic content.

In line with Surprenant’s observation of increasing concern with the formal and stylistic composition of texts, several studies have emerged which consider Freud as an author within a modernist context. One such example is Abigail Gillman’s *Viennese Jewish Modernism*, which explores Freud’s cultural background in greater breadth than Frankland’s focus on a singularly literary culture. Setting aside the factual errors identified by Andrew Barker (‘it is Bertold Löffler, not Berthole; Alexander Bain was not an English philosopher, and it is not the case that “Schnitzler and Hofmannsthal both died in their fifties” (p. 5): Schnitzler was sixty-nine’), Gillman’s study offers a valuable way of viewing Freud as a literary author, alongside Arthur Schnitzel, Richard Beer-Hoffmann, and Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Gillman identifies the affinities between these figures ‘as a shared concern with memory, as a shared wrestling with Jewish identification and Jewish sources, and as a shared practice of writers seeking to create new genres of cultural memory’ (p. 8). This perspective adds entirely new material to the literary appreciation afforded by Frankland’s study. The works of these figures, she argues, ‘render a fin de siècle modernism, backward-looking yet highly experimental’ (p. 9), a paradox, or hologram to use Gillman’s recurring trope, embodied in the conclusion that ‘tradition [is] the prototype of Freud’s modernism’, an observation particular to his form of Viennese Jewish modernism (p. 52). Like Frankland, Gillman selects Freudian texts that focus on cultural heroes such as Leonardo da Vinci and

Moses, culminating in Freud’s ‘Moses and Monotheism’ (1939 [1934-38]), which, she argues, displays

the awkward consolidation of a new genre of Jewish discourse out of extant scholarly modes and artistic forms; the compulsion to resist tendentious interpretations and to frustrate or undermine the expectations of readers; the problematization of Jewish heroism; and, [as] in the cases of Schnitzler and Beer-Hoffmann, the eschewal of a Jewish nationalist ethos in the name of liberal humanism. (p. 53)

These characteristics of Freud’s style foreshadow elements embodied in the texts of the other writers considered in Gillman’s study, locating him firmly within a circle of Viennese Jewish modernists.

In an alternative reading of Freud’s style that bears the closest resemblance to my own research, Maud Ellmann’s *The Nets of Modernism* places Freud as a modernist literary author under consideration alongside Henry James, Virginia Woolf and James Joyce, investigating how each ‘confront the entangled nature of the self, caught in the nets of intersubjectivity and intertextuality’. Ellmann argues that Freudian psychoanalysis ‘could be seen as a serial fiction – part autobiography, part epistolary novel, part Viennese soap opera’, resembling Marcel Proust’s *In Search of Lost Time* (1871-1922), ‘another serial fiction delving into dreams, erotic obsessions, and the psychopathology of everyday life’ (p. 10). She traces the interconnectivity of psychoanalysis and the writings of her other focal authors, such as the general notion that ‘Freudian ideas were “in the air” at the same time that Joyce, Woolf, and James were composing their novels, yet none of these novelists set out to write psychoanalytic fictions’ (p. 10). Such relations contribute to the overall theme of entanglement in the study; moreover, the dissolution of boundaries between the psychoanalytic and literary disciplines works towards Ellmann’s aim ‘to sharpen our sense of

---

what has been called the “dissolution of the self” in modernist fiction, particularly by exploring the significance of images of bodily violation and exchange – scar, bite, wound, and their psychic equivalents – to the modernist imagination.’ (p. 13). As Ellmann observes, her

focus on canonical literary texts may seem old-fashioned at a time when modernist literary studies is becoming more inclusive […]. The present book, without making any claims to exhaustiveness, justifies its choice of literary texts by their fertile correspondences to psychoanalysis; other literary works, many of them less canonical, might have stimulated similar investigations. The most a critic can hope for is to invigorate debate, including debate about well-known works, and it is my hope that at least some of my analyses fulfil that purpose. (p. 13)

Ellmann’s above defence of her canonical, Anglophone scope is a justification that can likewise be applied to my own study, which considers Freud alongside similar literary figures, though the present thesis arguably extends this scope by introducing Ford, and increases its inclusivity by exchanging the canonical figure of Joyce for the comparatively overlooked Dorothy Richardson. Importantly, all of Ellmann’s focal authors could be considered not merely modernists, but impressionists, and reframing them in this light draws out interesting new characteristics of and connections between their writing.53 Similarly, Ellmann reasons that her approach, involving the implication rather than the application of psychoanalytic theory, is served by her decision to draw her

critical vocabulary from the literary texts, […] rather than imposing psychoanalytic terms upon these works. The aim is not to seize the psychoanalytic truth disguised within the literary work, for such an enterprise can only prove reductive, but to set up a frictional interplay between these discourses. (p. 11)

Reminiscent of Frankland’s desire to stimulate revisionary approaches to Freud’s work, my own approach likewise follows Ellmann’s objective and methodology as expressed here.

53 See how Matz’s treatment of such authors positions them not only as modernists, but also as impressionists. Jesse Matz, Literary Impressionism and Modernist Aesthetics (Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
The Nets of Modernism presents a balanced analysis of the dissolution of self as expressed by Ellmann’s chosen writers, and it is in Chapter 4, ‘The Woolf Woman’, that Freud comes to the fore (pp. 62-92). In this section, Ellmann argues that the resurgence of the primal scene in Virginia Woolf’s To the Lighthouse and Freud’s Wolf Man case history of patient Sergei Pankejeff was manifested in Lily Briscoe’s painting and Pankejeff’s paintings and dreams, which leave ‘a gap that generates the impulse to make further scenes, whose frozen images disrupt the continuity of narrative’ (p. 12). In conducting literary analyses, Ellmann employs the same use of biographical information in both To the Lighthouse and the composite Wolf Man texts, such as the childhood sexual traumas of both Woolf and Pankejeff (p. 62), the recurring theme of ‘animality’ in reference to the reversion to the prehistoric childhood state (p. 64), and other literary works as sources contributing to the created scenes, such as the fairy tale ‘The Tailor and the Wolf’ (p. 76). She notes the textual history of the Wolf Man case, its composition from various Freudian analyses, Brunswick’s deferential ‘A Supplement to Freud’s History of an Infantile Neurosis’, and accounts by Pankejeff himself: ‘These multiple treatments and analytic conversations produced the numerous texts that constitute the “Wolf Man” for posterity – a highly contradictory array of documents’ (p. 73). Ultimately, Ellmann concludes that

The Wolf Man’s dream-scenes, like Lily’s elegiac painting, summon up this placeless, timeless non-event, this rupture in the flow of history. Their visions suggest that trauma, rather than the impulse to restore a lost original event, represents the drive to make a scene of nothing. […] By making scenes, the writer and the dreamer strive to frame this nothing, to stage the unoccurred and the unoccurrable. (p. 92)

Ellmann’s literary analysis of elements of Freud’s texts such as themes, imagery, textual history and narration, in direct comparison with Woolf’s, offers a radical new contribution to the fields of both Freud and modernist studies. The focus on the challenge to capture a central consciousness in the face of fragmenting distortions such as trauma and memory, and the idea
of creating scenes, are not merely modernist, but also impressionist concerns. Ellmann’s book thus provides both relevant content and a methodological approach to be assessed and incorporated into my own research.

Impressionism

While the above studies approach Freud’s texts from literary, even modernist literary perspectives, none read Freud from the perspective of literary impressionism, despite the fact that impressionism is increasingly seen as more than just ‘a transitional phase as realism turns into modernism’; Pericles Lewis acknowledges that impressionism is now regarded as a facet of modernism, and critics such as Jesse Matz and Max Saunders have traced the complexity of impressionism’s integral role in modernist fiction and life-writing respectively.\(^{54}\) The term ‘impressionism’ was coined by Louis Leroy in his 1872 satirical review of Monet’s Impression: Soleil Levant, and its meaning and significance to aesthetic theory have subsequently developed over time. A consequence of such evolution is that the term resists concise definition, and is often criticised for its vagueness (though as we will see below this fittingly corresponds with its core stylistic characteristics). See, for instance, how Dictionaries of Literary Terms highlight impressionism’s vagueness and even suggest that consequently ‘we might well dispense with’ such terminology in literary criticism.\(^{55}\)


Thankfully, however, literary critics have not given up on impressionism: rather than applying reductive definitions, scholars have instead continued to explore the nuances of impressionistic techniques and effects. There are inevitably not only differences in the scholarly perspectives on impressionism, but also individual differences between the ways in which authors of the modernist period approached and practiced literary impressionism, and even within the body of work of individual authors. Therefore, each of the chapters that follow seeks out explicit statements of stylistic intent from the authors under consideration, in conjunction with their literary outputs. Nevertheless it is useful at this early stage to outline some of the characteristics of literary impressionism that are drawn upon throughout the study, and to trace its origins and influencers to the modernist period with which we are here concerned.

In seeking to understand impressionism in the modernist period, we must cast back to prior artistic/literary traditions. On the one hand, a number of parallels can be drawn between impressionism and romanticism: both seemingly reject ‘the precepts of order, calm, harmony, balance, idealization, and rationality that typified’ Classicism, Neoclassism and rationalism, in favour of the subjective impression of experience.\(^\text{56}\) This description, like Trilling’s identification of psychoanalysis with Romanticism noted above, emphasises the role of perception. As Richard M. Berrong suggests of impressionism in its original painterly context, ‘the subject was of little or no importance to Impressionists like Monet’; rather, the

\(^{56}\) ‘Romanticism’, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 2016
act of perception and means of representing this were afforded greater priority. Thus we observe, as Lewis points out, that ‘[t]he attempt to register the uncertainty and even haziness of the subjective experience of events remained a central concern of modernist [and impressionist] fiction, influential throughout the history of modernism’. He highlights the illustrative example of Woolf’s oft-cited statement in ‘Modern Fiction’ that ‘[l]ife is not a series of gig lamps symmetrically arranged; life is a luminous halo, a semi-transparent envelope surrounding us from the beginning of consciousness to the end’. According to Lewis, ‘[t]he images of light, translucence, and haze’ in this declaration ‘indicate [Woolf’s] impressionist heritage’. On the other hand, Lewis also identifies impressionism as ‘[i]nspired in part by realism; impressionism sought to convey the impression of reality at a given moment, free from academic restrictions’. As Tamar Katz notes, modernist literary impressionism construes the subject as both the vehicle of subjective perception, and ‘thoroughly permeated by [external] sensation […]; it is wholly constructed from without’. The detailed authenticity of realist description corresponds with faithful scientific

---

58 Lewis, p. 61.
60 Lewis, p. 39.
observation, and the aim of literary impressionism was, as Max Saunders observes, precisely to render the ‘realm of reality’, being characterised by ‘[t]he appeal to the real’. 62

Berrong identifies a number of critics that define literary impressionism ‘in terms of its painterly namesake’ but notes a growing critical trend in the twenty-first century towards the prioritisation of literary impressionism’s ‘philosophical grounding,’ rather than its connections with the visual arts. 63 Such approaches appreciate the differences between impressionism across these media. For instance, while both stress the significance of the immediate first impression, John G. Peters demonstrates that literature is able to extend beyond this initial moment of perception to ‘the way human beings obtain knowledge’ through ‘epistemological processes’, 64 for instance by presenting things in ‘the order in which we perceive them, rather than first explaining them in terms of their causes’. 65 Nevertheless, Berrong’s study advocates that the importance of impressionist painting should not be dismissed, and rather illustrates how a number of features of impressionist painting apply to both the stylistic characteristics of literary impressionism, and its ‘conceptual underpinning’. 66 These include an emphasis on sensory—often visual—perception through the use of colour (pp. 207-09) and light (pp. 209-11) to convey what Pericles Lewis terms

64 Peters, p. 2.
65 Berrong, p. 205.
66 Berrong, p. 204.
‘fidelity to visual experience’,\textsuperscript{67} vagueness and indefinite forms (pp. 211-15); incompleteness and the viewer/reader’s subsequent temptation to complete it, in contrast to the artist/author’s authentically limited perspectives in their creations (pp. 216-223); and of course, the subjectivity of the individual consciousness through which the perceptions are filtered and impressions formed (p. 218). These common characteristics of literary impressionism outlined by Berrong are of the kind that are identified in the texts of the chosen authors over the course of this thesis.

At the root of impressionism is of course the impression itself, as per Walter Pater’s call in the Preface to The Renaissance, ‘to know one’s own impression as it really is’.\textsuperscript{68} According to Jesse Matz, the impressionist tendency to convey ‘intense momentary perceptions’ has frequently led to the view that literary impressionism is concerned merely with the transient perceptual impression at the expense of ideological, reflective, critical depth, affecting sceptical responses to the style.\textsuperscript{69} Matz’s extensive research across numerous publications is invaluable for understanding how impressionism was developed and received as an aesthetic enterprise, acknowledging the complexities and contradictions, but refusing to accept that this might result in meaninglessness.\textsuperscript{70} As Matz reviews the usage of the term

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{67} Lewis, p. 51.
\item \textsuperscript{69} Matz, Literary Impressionism, pp. 3, 12.
‘impression’ by late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century writers, it becomes clear that these authors had far more than just surface-level perception in mind:

the impression is by no means any merely sensuous, superficial, or insubstantial perception. As these writers invoke it, the impression is nothing less than a name for the aesthetic moment itself, a new sign for the old bridge between art and life. Like aesthetic experience, it pitches consciousness between sense and reason. Hardly a threat to literature’s intelligence, it gives the literary mind new links to life.71

Matz’s review in Literary Impressionism and Modernist Aesthetics of the usage and understanding of the impression by the writers with which we are concerned in this thesis (amongst many others) stresses how rendering the impression was viewed as a particular strategy for authentically representing the multifaceted experience of life.

Defining the impression beyond the record of perception is not, however, a straightforward task. Rather, its various and complex array of meanings have spurred criticism of impressionism as a vague and unhelpful concept (see above). Matz, however, argues that the variety encompassed by the critical term impressionism is indicative of the various opportunities it presented to modernist authors and their ‘creative irresolution […]'. For our current definitional chaos is but the latest result of the uncertainty that created some of the monuments of early Modernism’.72 Matz lists the variety of meaning with which the impression presents its users:

---

71 Matz, Literary Impressionism, p. 13.
72 Matz, Literary Impressionism, p. 18.
In everyday parlance, it is a feeling, an inchoate sense of things, an untested belief at once tentative and convincing. When we speak of ‘having an impression’ we refer to a hunch, an intuition, or a belief that is partial but comprehensive, a product at once of caprice and discretion; ‘taking impressions,’ as people used to do when traveling or looking at art, similarly means making incomplete or passive observations that nevertheless convince. Such impressions are superficial but have their own kind of depth, so that we trust first impressions more than many of the estimations that follow before judgment comes; we wait for an impression’s correction, but expect its vindication. An impression is personal, but universal—subjective, but not therefore wholly idiosyncratic—and falls somewhere between analytic scrutiny and imaginative invention. This in-betweenness is essential. An impression is never simply a feeling, a thought, or a sensation. It partakes, rather, of a mode of experience that is neither sensuous nor rational, neither felt nor thought, but somewhere in between. Belonging to none of these categories, an impression similarly belongs to no one theoretical way of thinking. […] Impressions are empirical, imaginative, and painterly; they are everything from visual to emotional to rational; and even within such categories and discourses, they connote both the imprint that lasts and the feeling that passes, error and insight, authenticity and irresponsibility. […] The impression’s variation confuses, but the confusion, blurring disciplinary distinctions, forms of judgment, and perceptual moments, has productive results. Lumping together empirical psychology and aestheticism, confusing the difference between thoughts and feelings, erasing the line between superficial appearances and deep knowledge, the impression brings art richer connections. It promises mediation, and thereby to release art into places it could not otherwise go.73

Matz’s description encapsulates the tendency of the impression to mediate between various definitions and categories of knowledge and experience. As we will see over the course of this thesis, these characteristics of the impression described by Matz permeate the psychoanalytic writing of Sigmund Freud, as well as the fiction and aesthetic treatises of a number of other key writers of the modernist period, so it is useful to work through them at this stage and to highlight the striking affinity between Matz’s description of the impression and Freud’s psychoanalysis. One of the most significant criticisms of Freudian psychoanalysis as a scientific enterprise is its lack of empiricism or falsifiable data;74 to read

73 Matz, Literary Impressionism, pp. 15-17.
Freud’s theories or case histories is essentially to read his impressions, his ‘untested beliefs at once tentative and [to varying extents depending on the theory and the reader] convincing’. These are based upon observations which, much to Freud’s frustration, are often incomplete, yet retain a powerful hold over the analyst and, as time has told, also over his audience; despite its widespread criticism it is impossible to dismiss the cultural impact of psychoanalysis, its ‘longevity’ and its service as a ‘catalyst’ for future insights into the mind. Whether seeking ‘correction’ or ‘vindication’, the preoccupation with psychoanalysis endures. Arguably this is due to the ‘personal but universal’ appeal of psychoanalysis, its focus upon the inner workings of the individual mind that recur time and time again across patients, colleagues, family members, friends and oneself—all sources of Freud’s ‘analytic scrutiny’, to which he lends the ‘imaginative intervention’ necessary to make conscious the contents of the unconscious. Psychoanalysis thus embodies the ‘essential’ ‘in-betweenness’ of the impression, and Freud’s stylised articulation of it variously and at times contradictorily embodies the ‘empirical, imaginative, and painterly’, the visual, emotional and rational characteristics of impressionism. We witness how the seemingly transient feelings that often pass into the unconscious, or are symptomatic manifestations of psychological disturbance, only later prove themselves to have constituted, or have been initiated by ‘the imprint that lasts’. As we read his texts we are guided by Freud through his analytic process, replete with errors and insights—wrong turns and revelations in his narratives of interpretation and theoretical configuration. We also witness his determined commitment to the authenticity of his patients’ accounts, as well as irresponsibility, for instance in his handling of transference/counter-transference. The contents of his dreams, the accounts of his patients, and even the theories intended to elucidate them may all be

75 Kristen M. Beystehner, ‘Psychoanalysis: Freud’s Revolutionary Approach to Human Personality’, Great Ideas in Personality, 1998
characterised by confusion, as the mysterious nature of the subject matter makes itself felt throughout Freud’s corpus. Yet, as Matz argues, this confusion is valuable. Blurring disciplinary boundaries, as psychoanalysis does between science and the humanities, ‘has productive results’. This thesis similarly set about ‘lumping together’ psychology and aestheticism, psychoanalysis and impressionism, formulating an impression of Freud’s texts as impressionistic that will, it is hoped, bring ‘art richer connections’.

According to Freud’s approach, the mind itself is the source of the impression, receiving and processing perceptions subjectively, especially since the ego, which ‘is in direct contact with the external world (reality)’, is only one component, and must mediate, for instance, ‘[t]he id, [which,] cut off from the external world, has a world of perception of its own’.

The subjectivity of the individual experience is therefore at once heightened and subjected to a universal theory. Matz’s postulation of impressionism’s release of ‘art into places it could not otherwise go’ thus extends to and encapsulates these realms of the mind. Dislocation from objective reality and the abstract nature of theories relating to the subjective experience are both inherent to and fundamentally problematic for Freudian psychoanalysis as a scientific discipline. Freud argues that his conception of consciousness is the ‘[r]eality’ of our human condition, but that this will ultimately remain ‘unknowable’ because the unconscious cannot be subjected to direct sensory perception, the method we impose to translate our inferences regarding it (XXIII, p. 196). Nevertheless, he argues,

\[
[t]he yield brought to light by scientific work from our primary sense perceptions will consist in an insight into connections and dependent relations which are present in the external world, which can somehow be reliably reproduced or reflected in the internal world of our thought and a knowledge of which enables us to ‘understand’ something in the external world, to foresee it and possibly to alter it. (XXIII, p. 196)
\]

The vagueness of the process by which understanding is arrived at (this occurs ‘somehow’) is characteristically impressionistic. We know that our impressions are created out of more than just sensory perception, but we struggle to pin down, and certainly to prove, the exact processes. Freud attempts to mediate the undermining impact of this question of verifiability upon his subject by aligning psychoanalysis with disciplines whose scientific status is more secure:

In our science as in the others [particularly physics] the problem is the same: behind the attributes (qualities) of the object under examination which are presented directly to our perception, we have to discover something else which is more independent of the particular receptive capacity of our sense organs and which approximates more closely to what may be supposed to be the real state of affairs. (XXIII, p. 196)

On the other hand, he goes on to acknowledge that ‘inferences and interpolations’ are necessary to get closer to ‘the real state of affairs’ (XXIII, p. 196):

the degree of certainty attaching to them of course remain open to criticism in each individual instance; and it cannot be denied that it is often extremely difficult to arrive at a decision—a fact which finds expression in the lack of agreement amongst analysts. […] in psychology, unlike physics, we are not always concerned with things that can only arouse a cool scientific interest. (XXIII, p. 197)

Both impressionism and psychology are thus concerned with how we process the unit of the impression. Whilst the lack of verifiability resulting from the theoretical and subjective may be problematic to hard sciences, psychoanalysis accepts reality’s ‘in-betweeness’ and subsequently is not limited to dealing ‘with things that can only arouse a cool scientific interest’. In the chapters that follow we accordingly pass beyond scientific interest to apply a literary gaze to Freud’s texts, beginning with the Fordian approach to impressionism.
ON IMPRESSIONISM IN THE INTERPRETATION OF DREAMS:
FREUD & FORD

It is fitting that this thesis should begin by considering the stylistic inclination towards literary impressionism in what is arguably Freud’s most famous text, *The Interpretation of Dreams*. In addition to the prolonged examination of this publication in the present chapter, its significance manifests as it recurs over the course of this thesis, for instance as an example of Freud’s self-impressionistic autobiography in the Woolfian scheme, or in the impressionistic elaboration of dream records through interpretations that create new narratives in their own right, akin to James’s growth of novel from germ. Initially published in 1900 and undergoing a series of subsequent editions during Freud’s lifetime, the seminal text is often cited in discussions of the role of psychoanalysis in the development of early modernism, due to the shared interest in the ‘epistemological quest for self-knowledge’ and focus on ‘individual subjective consciousness’ held by these disciplines. Though, as will be discussed below, readership of and engagement with *The Interpretation of Dreams* was not immediately forthcoming, Freud came to distinguish the text amongst his oeuvre: in his preface to the third revised English edition, published in 1932, he claims that ‘[i]t contains, even according to my present-day judgement, the most valuable of all the discoveries it has been my good fortune to make. Insight such as this falls to one’s lot but once in a lifetime’. The discovery referred to is that dreams *mean*, and that they ‘are capable of being interpreted’ by the scientific method presented in the text (IV, p. 96). As Freud cherishes the psychoanalytic ‘insight’ heralded by the book, so too it offers unsurpassed insight into the analyst-author’s impressionism, from the inherently impressionistic subject matter of the

---

dream and its connected processes of memory and trauma, to the techniques used to convey the experiences of dreaming, interpretation and, ultimately, of writing.

The Introduction to this thesis discussed the summaries of the impression and impressionism put forth by leading critic in this field, Jesse Matz, in *Literary Impressionism and Modernist Aesthetics*, including the vast array of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century writers that engaged with the subject (p. 13); the association of impressionism with ‘intense momentary perceptions’ and its visual emphasis (p. 3); its vagueness and complexity; and its essential ‘in-betweenness’ (pp. 15-17). Over the course of the present chapter, I utilise *The Interpretation of Dreams* to demonstrate Freud’s participation in all of these areas. Some elements of impressionism may seem hard to connect with a dream-orientated subject, such as the difficulty of discussing ‘perception’ in relation to dreams when the former is, by definition, associated with awareness and consciousness, while the latter is concerned with unconscious processes and distinctly removed from the perception of external stimuli since the ego’s ‘institution of reality-testing, […] is allowed to fall into abeyance in dreams’.\(^3\) However, Freud identifies sensory excitations as among the contributing sources of dreams, even if only to a ‘modest’ extent.\(^4\) More importantly, whilst dreaming, the hallucinatory power of the dream is such that the dreamer confuses the dream with reality: ‘we appear not to *think* but to *experience*; that is to say, we attach complete belief to the hallucinations’ (iv, p. 50). Freud highlights the connection between waking consciousness and the dream when he argues that ‘[t]he way in which the memory behaves in dreams is undoubtedly of the greatest importance for any theory of memory in general’ (iv, p. 20). Similarly, in a note added in 1909, he argues that the frequent appearance in dreams of innocuous events from the previous day serves as a method by which the dreamer can

---


convince himself of the reality of his dream experience: ‘What the dreamer is himself stressing in dreams of this kind is not [...] the content of the memory but the fact of its being “real”’ (IV, p. 21). Contemporary dream theory similarly takes up the significance of the waking experiences of the prior day in formulating the dream, under the guise of the continuity hypothesis, which ‘states that dreams reflect waking life concerns (Hall & Nordby, 1972), waking thought (Strauch & Meier, 1996) or waking life experiences (Schredl & Hofmann, 2003)’. Michael Schredl’s application of the continuity hypothesis to Freud’s own dreams highlights how waking experience is an integral component of The Interpretation of Dreams. Ultimately, dreams, like Matz’s description of impressionism, are characterised by in-betweenness: they occupy a state between conscious thought and the unconscious; and they are the height of universal subjectivity, in that the particular dream is only experienced by the dreamer, but the experience of dreaming is common: ‘Dreams occur in healthy people—perhaps in everyone, perhaps every night’.

The present chapter focuses on the particular correlation between Freudian impressionism in The Interpretation of Dreams and that discussed and practiced by Ford Madox Ford. Ford receives comparatively little attention in Matz’s study of impressionism, despite being the only one of the authors in this thesis to self-identify as an impressionist; despite Ezra Pound’s recognition of him as ‘the father or at least the shepherd of English

---


6 Freud, The Interpretation of Dreams, iv, p. 35.
Impressionist writers’; and despite the surge in Ford studies associating the author and impressionism since the New Critical zenith of the 1960s and 1970s. Max Saunders explains that even this increased attention neglects Ford’s theoretical position: ‘what these books miss, is that Ford isn’t only a practitioner of Literary Impressionism. He is also its major critical exponent, certainly in English’. Saunders, in his numerous publications on the subject from the perspectives of biography, cultural history and literary criticism, seeks to address and counter this comparative neglect, making it possible to extend commentary upon impressionism by authors such as Matz to both Ford’s fictional and non-fictional work. This chapter likewise recognises the significance of Ford’s pioneering contribution to the complex movement of impressionism and pairs it with Freud’s pioneering excursion into the unconscious in *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

Though differentiating Ford’s particular impressionism according to the evidence of his own theories and practice, it is important to acknowledge his relation to his fellow impressionists. For instance, his affiliation with authors such as Henry James and Joseph Conrad was of the utmost significance to his literary career. Though frequently upbraided by

---

8 Saunders, ‘Ford and Impressionism’, p. 159.
critics for exaggerating the degree of intimacy he shared with both James and Conrad,\(^\text{10}\) and despite feelings of inadequacy experienced by Ford at the thought that these men may not take him seriously as a writer,\(^\text{11}\) there is evidence of both personal friendships and professional respect between them.\(^\text{12}\) Ford came to idolise James as one of his literary ‘masters’, and his influence can, for instance, be perceived in the representation of Dowell’s consciousness in *The Good Soldier* (1915), which Saunders identifies as modelled upon James’s *What Maisie Knew* (1897).\(^\text{13}\) Conrad’s influence is even more overt: he and Ford collaborated to produce three co-authored texts: *The Inheritors* (1901); *Romance* (1903); and *The Nature of a Crime* (1909), which satisfied Ford’s ‘driving need, to ally himself with the chief literary forces of the day’\(^\text{14}\). Not only are texts such as Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (1899) and his preface to *The Nigger of the ‘Narcissus’* (1897), considered fundamental impressionist works, the close collaboration between the two authors led to the development of a shared literary theory concerning impressionism, given voice by Ford in his novel/biography, *Joseph Conrad: A Personal Remembrance* (1924).

Though self-deprecatingly referred to as ‘merely some notes towards a working guide to Impressionism as a literary method,’ Ford’s 1914 essay ‘On Impressionism’ is arguably the most important piece of literary theory in this area.\(^\text{15}\) In it, he claims to have been labelled as


\(^{13}\) Saunders, *Ford Madox Ford*, I, p. 426. Saunders also points out that *What Maisie Knew* offers a thematic suggestion for the dubious relationship between Edward Ashburnham and Nancy Rufford in *The Good Soldier*, the germ for which Saunders suggests may possibly be found in ‘Sir Claude’s flirtatious chivalry towards his stepdaughter’ in James’s text.


an impressionist by others, and so proceeds to explain the characteristics of the style attributed to him: ‘if I am in truth an Impressionist, it must follow that a conscientious and exact account of how I myself work will be an account, from the inside, of how Impressionism is reached, produced, or gets its effects’.16 The fictions in which Ford’s impressionism is most striking, and which offer sources to illustrate his technique over the course of this chapter, are *The Good Solider*, which Ford was finishing as he wrote ‘On Impressionism’, and the post-War tetralogy, *Parade’s End* (1924-28). ‘On Impressionism’ is supplemented by Ford’s two-part ‘speculations’ on impressionism in *Poetry*, though the present chapter’s focus upon prose necessarily relegates their relevance here.17 Also of importance as a record of the theory of impressionism is *Joseph Conrad: A Personal Remembrance*. Section III of this text (labelled as a ‘novel’ by Ford in an interesting engagement with the generic boundaries of modernist biography and fiction which will be discussed in detail in my third chapter) looks back to the collaborative efforts of the biographer and subject, outlining ‘the formulae for the writing of the novel at which Conrad and the writer had arrived, say in 1902 or so’.18 The chapter includes brief explicit commentary upon impressionism, but also features other sections such as ‘General Effect’ and ‘Surprise’, which share close links with the content of ‘On Impressionism’. Written after ‘On Impressionism’, but recalling an earlier phase of his career, the content in the Conrad biography maintains Ford’s continued adherence to impressionistic principles.19

16 Ibid.
19 Max Saunders provides a substantial list of key sources in which Ford discusses impressionism in literature. Saunders, *Self Impression* p. 267.
Identifying continuity between the styles of Ford and Freud is not immediately heralded, since in his extensive two-volume biography of Ford, Saunders notes that ‘[a]part from a passing reference to having known about—and disapproved of—*The Interpretation of Dreams* before the war, there is no record of Ford’s having read Freud’, though Saunders does identify Ford’s knowledge of the Oedipus complex as ‘probable’, suggesting his psychoanalytic awareness.\(^{20}\) The Oedipal awareness manifests in *The Good Soldier* when the eponymous Edward Ashburnham falls in love with his ward Nancy Rufford, another element of the novel for which Saunders identifies James’s *What Maisie Knew* as a possible source of inspiration, with its ambiguous relationship between Sir Claude and Maisie.\(^{21}\) In the fourth volume of *Parade’s End, The Last Post* (1928), Ford suggests the sexual attraction of Sylvia Tietjens’s son towards his mother, (‘[t]he dominion of women over those of the opposite sex was a terrible thing. [...] Mother was splendid. But wasn’t sex a terrible thing… His breath came short’\(^{22}\)), and has the protagonist’s brother, Mark Tietjens, contemplate incest and how ‘[t]he Greeks made a hell of a tragic row about it’ (p. 832). Moreover, Sylvia explicitly acknowledges Freud in the first volume, *Some Do Not...* (1924) when she declares her inclination to ‘pin her faith’ to him.\(^{23}\)

Over the course of the present chapter, I take Ford’s essays and non-fiction, as well as his own fictional outputs, as models by which to understand impressionism. I then explore how these stylistic characteristics manifest in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. This operates at numerous levels within the text: the dream records themselves, the interpretive material that surrounds them, psychological theory, and formal aspects governing the structure of the text.

---


The impressionistic characteristics found across these elements are shown to accumulate to the point at which we are able to describe *The Interpretation of Dreams* as, on the whole, an impressionist book. Finally, I finish the chapter by considering how the experience, conception and representation of trauma engage with impressionist theory and method, with particular reference to the impact of the First World War.

**The Dream Records**

The dreams referred to over the course of *The Interpretation of Dreams* range from short, one-line accounts, to several paragraphs in length, with some mentioned briefly in support of an element of Freud’s psychological theory, and others returned to throughout the text to demonstrate theoretical continuity. Some are recorded in myth, legend, religious or fictional literature, whilst others are quoted from alternative psychological contexts, such as the treatment of patients by Freud’s colleagues. More still have been dreamt and recorded by the analyst himself. This section follows critics such as Rupprecht and Wax in approaching the dreams as texts.\(^{24}\) As mentioned above, they are inherently subjective, a fundamental trait of impressionism, as demonstrated in Ford’s comparison of the *Times* agriculturalist and the impressionist author in ‘On Impressionism’; the agriculturalist is concerned with facts and quotations, whereas the impressionist ‘gives you, as a rule, the fruits of his own observations and the fruits of his own observations alone. […] It is, for instance, not so much his business to quote as to state his impressions’.\(^{25}\) The subjective impression is therefore prioritised over the objective fact, a position adhered to throughout Ford’s career: as Saunders observes, ‘[t]he


idea that Impressionism is about what is perceived, not what can be subsequently proved is one that recurs throughout Ford’s criticism’. 26

Whilst Freud’s initial chapter of *The Interpretation of Dreams* on ‘The Scientific Literature Dealing with the Problems of Dreams’ relies heavily on the method of quotation, the dream records that succeed this are indeed comprised of subjective impressions, rendered in an impressionistic style to approximate what the experience of the dream is like. The essence of such subjectivity is rooted in the fact that, as Freud points out,

> the only check that we have upon the validity of our memory is objective confirmation, and [...] that is unobtainable for dreams, which are our own personal experience and of which the only source we have is our recollection. (IV, p. 47)

Thus when Freud records his dreams, the reader has no grounds to dispute his recollection of that dream, and the author has no grounds for proving it (IV, p. 284). Similarly, Freud recalls ‘A Lovely Dream’ experienced by a claustrophobic patient, but is forced to interrupt the account to acknowledge a gap in the dreamer’s memory: ‘(This part was obscure.)’; this dreamer, like all other dreamers, cannot prove to the analyst or to himself that he had experienced the dream as he related it, and there is also no possibility of verifying the objective truth of the ‘obscure’ portion of the dream (IV, p. 285). At the point of composing *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud estimates that he ‘must already have analysed over a thousand dreams’ of his own neurotic patients (IV, p. 104), but suggests that he will not utilise these in his study because full case histories would be required to understand the unconscious impulses driving both the patients’ neurotic symptoms and their dreams (though it should be noted that such dreams are nevertheless referred to over the course of the book). Freud describes how the process of dream interpretation is derived from and therefore similar to the process of psychoanalysis in the treatment of pathological symptoms, wherein ‘unravelling

[these symptoms] coincides with removing them’ (iv, p. 100). In order for the treatment to be successful, the patient must engage in ‘self-observation’, rather than self-reflection (iv, p. 101). This requires that the patient must be open to ‘involuntary thoughts’, and that he should ‘take the trouble to suppress his critical faculty’, which would curb the reporting of such material (iv, p. 102).

Freud’s connection of dreams with the psychoanalytic treatment of patients suggests that the analyst’s description of the ideal patient narrative described above can be extended to represent his ideal dream record. The suppression of the critical faculty, submission to involuntary thoughts and the privileging of observation over reflection are inherently impressionistic notions which coincide with Ford’s instruction to budding impressionist authors that their texts should record ‘the impression of the moment […]’, not the corrected chronicle’. This is because according to the view held by Ford, which he also attributes to Conrad, ‘[l]ife did not narrate, but made impressions on our brains. We in turn, if we wished to produce on you [the reader] an effect of life, must not narrate but render impressions’. Dreams are a particular aspect of life that make distinct impressions upon the minds of the dreamer, and the task of the analysand during the process of dream interpretation is similarly to render their impressions of the experience of the dream; it is then the analyst’s task to guide them towards transforming this into the corrected chronicle which exposes the latent meaning behind the dream.

27 The version of ‘On Impressionism’ printed in the Broadview edition of The Good Soldier, edited by Baker and Womak and used for most references to the essay in this thesis, gives this quotation as ‘the correlated chronicle’, rather than ‘the corrected chronicle’. However, the latter is used consistently in other editions, so this particular quotation is cited from an alternative source: Ford Madox Hefner, ‘On Impressionism’, in Poetry and Drama, ed. by Harold Monro (London: Poetry Bookshop, 1914), II, 167–75; 323–34 <http://archive.org/details/poetrydrama02monruoft> [accessed 17 April 2018].
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Part of Freud’s task in *The Interpretation of Dreams* is to effectively reproduce the patients’ narratives of their dreams (and those narratives belonging to the analyst’s healthier acquaintances). In effect, Freud is recording his impressions of his patients’ impressions of their dreams, but appropriating the first person narrative voice for the dream records enables him to disguise this further remove from the actual dream, though he is not consistent in his usage of this method. Consider, for instance, the dream of a young woman patient. At times, Freud claims to quote the patient directly, as in the following reproduction of the woman’s report: ‘I dreamt that I arrived too late at the market and could get nothing from either the butcher or from the woman who sells vegetables’ (IV, p. 174). The first person account suggests that the reader is receiving the patient’s impression of their dream directly, but Freud then transitions to the third person in the more detailed account that he prompts the patient to provide:

> I asked to be told it [the dream] in greater detail. She thereupon gave me the following account. She dreamt she was going to the market with her cook, who was carrying the basket. After she had asked for something, the butcher said to her: ‘That’s not obtainable any longer’, and offered her something else, adding ‘This is good too’. She rejected it and went on to the woman who sells vegetables, who tried to get her to buy a peculiar vegetable that was tied up in bundles but was of a black colour. She said: ‘I don’t recognize that; I won’t take it.’ (IV, p. 174)

Here, Freud more obviously takes on the role of narrator, producing a more conventional narrative comprised of direct speech, chronological action and logical reasoning. However, there is tension between the usage of the third person in the account and the way in which Freud introduces it; when he says that ‘she thereupon gave me the following account’, one would expect that account to be reproduced in the first person, especially since this is the format previously used in the shorter dream record. Instead we receive Freud’s impression of his patient’s extended account, which adheres to Ford’s recommendation, discussed below, that long speeches should not be rendered verbatim as it is unrealistic to suppose that they
could be remembered as such by the author/narrator.\textsuperscript{29} The third party dream records thus manifest not simply a patient’s impression of their dream, but Freud’s impressions of his interactions with others.

In the dream records of patients and other third parties then, we are presented with a form of impressionism, but this is far more pronounced in the records of Freud’s own dreams. Furthermore, the patient dream records are hampered by Freud’s acknowledgement that the patient’s necessary state of uncritical self-observation described above ‘seem[s] to be hard of achievement for some people’ (IV, p. 102). This is evident in the young woman patient’s censorship of some dream content in her first account. The analyst’s acute awareness of the importance of this frame of mind leads him to utilise 51 of his own dreams as the largest single source of evidence for his book. It serves the purpose of the present chapter to direct particular attention to the analyst’s accounts of his own dreams, as in these instances he is not reporting the narratives constructed by others, but exercising his own stylistic choices in deciding how to render his own impressions.

Though there is a paradoxical assertion within impressionism to the contrary, discussed below, Ford distinguishes the school of impressionism from other artistic and literary movements on the grounds ‘that it recognizes, frankly, that all art must be the expression of an ego’,\textsuperscript{30} ‘[f]or Impressionism, differing from other schools of art, is founded so entirely on observation of the psychology of the patron’.\textsuperscript{31} Again, ‘Impressionism is a frank expression of personality’.\textsuperscript{32} Certainly Ford’s own biographical experiences and authorial perspectives make their way into his texts, as demonstrated by Saunders’s frequent

\textsuperscript{29} Ford, ‘On Impressionism’, pp. 267-68.
\textsuperscript{31} Ford, ‘On Impressionism’, p. 266.
\textsuperscript{32} Ford, ‘On Impressionism’, p. 262.
extension of his discussion of Ford’s life into biographical literary criticism. For example, Saunders suggests that *The Good Soldier* reflects Ford’s own anxieties regarding morality, sexuality and literary craft. In addition to themes and tones that permeate the text to this effect, there are also distinctive elements with particular biographical associations, such as the narration of John Dowell to his ‘silent listener’, which reflects Ford’s dictation of the novel, first to Brigit Patmore and then to Hilda Doolittle (H.D.).

It is impossible to deny Freud’s ego (and also in more Freudian terms his id, since the central premise of his book is that dreams are a means of wish fulfilment), psychology or personality within the self-authored accounts of his own dreams, though this introduced further challenges for the author, as he noted in the preface to the first edition of *The Interpretation of Dreams*:

> if I was to report my own dreams, it inevitably followed that I should have to reveal to the public gaze more of the intimacies of my mental life than I liked, or than is normally necessary for any writer who is a man of science and not a poet. Such was the painful and unavoidable necessity; and I have submitted to it rather than totally abandon the possibility of giving the evidence for my psychological findings. Naturally, however, I have been unable to resist the temptation of taking the edge off some of my indiscretions by omissions and substitutions. But whenever this has happened, the value of my instances has been very definitely diminished. (IV, pp. xxiii-xxiv)

Despite the privileging of his own dream accounts, in part on the premise that his patients struggle to be forthcoming enough about their dreams, Freud too has his own resistances to overcome in which, he acknowledges, he is not always successful. By positioning himself as the subject of analysis, Freud experiences the uncomfortable vulnerability usually reserved for his patients, but while their confessions are confined to the treatment room (with the

---

exception of those in his case histories, though they may well have not foreseen the dissemination of their stories at the times of their telling), Freud’s are published for the world to read. Where he censors deeply personal information from the penetrating attention of the reader, he acknowledges that this is to the severe detriment of his ‘instances’. Such negative impact is to be expected from both the perspectives of psychoanalysis and impressionism, since these alterations lead Freud away from the painfully truthful impression of the moment to the chronicle that has been ‘corrected’ according to society’s standards; such correction actually leads to a falsification of the authentic impression. He suggests that sacrificing the ‘intimacies of [his] mental life’ to public scrutiny may be expected of the creative writer, but not the scientist. Bolstered by Ford’s comments upon the discernibility of the author in literature, and with his own argument in ‘Creative Writers and Daydreaming’, that literature is the expression of the author’s ego, Freud thus positions himself as a creative writer in The Interpretation of Dreams.  

In order to analyse the particularly impressionistic creative techniques employed by Freud in this activity, I reproduce below the ‘Irma’s injection’ dream, the so-called ‘specimen dream’ of psychoanalysis, the first that Freud ‘submitted to a detailed analysis’ (IV, p. 106), and so important that he later wrote to Fleiss, on 12 June 1900: ‘Do you suppose that some day a marble tablet will be placed on the house [wherein this dream occurred], inscribed with these words: in this house on July 24th, 1895, the Secret of Dreams was revealed to Dr. Sigmund Freud’.  

throughout the book, which sets the scene within which the dream was experienced. Then follows the account:

A large hall—numerous guests, whom we were receiving.—Among them was Irma. I at once took her on one side, as though to answer her letter and reproach her for not having accepted my ‘solution’ yet. I said to her: ‘If you still get pains, it’s really only your fault.’ She replied: ‘If you only knew what pains I’ve got now in my throat and stomach and abdomen—it’s choking me’—I was alarmed and looked at her. She looked pale and puffy. I thought to myself that after all I must be missing some organic trouble. I took her to the window and looked down her throat, and she showed signs of recalcitrance, like women with artificial dentures. I thought to myself that there was really no need for her to do that.—She then opened her mouth properly and on the right I found a big white patch; at another place I saw extensive whitish grey scabs upon some remarkable curly structures which were evidently modelled on the turbinal bones of the nose.—I at once called in Dr. M., and he repeated the examination and confirmed it. ... Dr. M looked quite different from usual; he was very pale, he walked with a limp, and his chin was clean-shaven. ... My friend Otto was now standing beside her as well, and my friend Leopold was percussing her through her bodice and saying: ‘She has a dull area low down on the left.’ He also indicated that a portion of the skin on the left shoulder was infiltrated. (I noticed this, just as he did, in spite of her dress.) ... M. said: ‘There’s no doubt it’s an infection, but no matter; dysentery will supervene and the toxin will be eliminated.’ ... We were directly aware, too, of the origin of the infection. Not long before, when she was feeling unwell, my friend Otto had given her an injection of a preparation of propyl, propyls — propionic acid — trimethylamine (and I saw before me the formula for this printed in heavy type). ... Injections of that sort ought not to be made so thoughtlessly. ... And probably the syringe had not been clean. (IV, p. 107)

The Irma’s injection dream is one of the longest dream records in The Interpretation of Dreams and recurs at various stages throughout the book, its length and prominence facilitating analysis of the many impressionistic techniques which also occur in other dreams. I therefore return to it throughout analysis of the various impressionistic characteristics of dreams and their stylised rendering. The subjectivity of Freud’s experience is evidenced in the Irma dream by the first person narration and the fact that the author’s central consciousness dominates both the action of the dream (the other characters are his friends, his patient; he is the protagonist, present at all times) and the thoughtful reflection, which is
represented both directly (‘I thought’) and indirectly (‘[i]njections of that sort ought not to be made so thoughtlessly. … And probably the syringe had not been clean’). Furthermore, we know that we are getting the momentary experiences and transient impressions as the dream is immediately introduced through the grammatically incomplete opening clause that has no temporal indicators. Subsequent short declarative sentences provide the reader with the scenes as Freud encounters them, maintaining the momentum as the transitions are facilitated by the dashes and ellipses.

A key element identified by both Freud and Ford within their subject matter is the prominence of sensory experiences. For example, Freud outlines the form in which dream content usually appears to the dreamer:

Dreams, then, think predominantly in visual images—but not exclusively. They make use of auditory images as well, and, to a lesser extent, of impressions belonging to the other senses. Many things, too, occur in dreams (just as they normally do in waking life) simply as thoughts or ideas—that is to say, in the form of residues of verbal presentations. Nevertheless, what are truly characteristic of dreams are only those elements of their content which behave like images, which are more like perceptions, that is, than they are like mnemic presentations. (Iv, pp. 49-50)

We would therefore expect to find in a faithfully impressionistic dream record, such elements as thought, sensory experiences, and above all visual perceptions. This is consistent with the impressionist aim to ‘render impressions’, as in Joseph Conrad, Ford described how their collaborative efforts were founded upon the shared belief, voiced by Conrad in his preface to The Nigger of the ‘Narcissus’, and also ‘profoundly held’ by Ford, ‘that the province of written art is above all things to make you see’. The statement, which is often regarded as the epitome of impressionist theory, highlights the prominence of the subjective, particularly visual impression. This quality is inherited from the concerns of impressionist painters, whose ‘success in challenging conventions of artistic representation’ Ford admired, leading
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him to seek ‘a literary equivalent to the new pictorial modes of representing the subjective awareness of reality in time and space’.\textsuperscript{37} Such priorities are conveyed, for example, in the scene of Maisie Maidan’s death in \textit{The Good Soldier}, first from the perspective of Leonora who found the body, and then from Dowell’s own perspective after Leonora had shown the body to him. In the former situation, the reader, like Leonora, first comes across the dislocated image of Maisie’s feet—‘Now, as soon as she came in, she perceived, sticking out beyond the bed, a pair of feet in high-heeled shoes’—before the confirmation that these belonged to the stricken woman:

Maisie had died in the effort to strap up a great portmanteau. She had died so grotesquely that her little body had fallen forward into the trunk, and it had closed upon her, like the jaws of a gigantic alligator. The key was in her hand. Her dark hair, like the hair of a Japanese, had come down and covered her body and face.\textsuperscript{38}

The scene is dominated by the visual, predominantly in the physical descriptions of Maisie’s ‘little body’, her hand, her ‘dark hair’, ‘her body and face’. This physical emphasis is appropriate to stress mortality, while the adjectives describing size and colour add vividness, and the simile of the giant alligator jaws snapping shut around Maisie’s body effectively conveys the grotesqueness attributed to her death. This much, we understand, Dowell has gleaned from Leonora’s testimony, but he also sees the body for himself after Leonora laid her on the bed with her hair about her. She was smiling, as if she had just scored a goal in a hockey match. You understand she had not committed suicide. Her heart had just stopped. I saw her, with the long lashes on the cheeks, with the smile about the lips, with the flowers all about her. The stem of a white lily rested in her hand so that the spike of flowers was upon her shoulder. She looked like a bride in the sunlight of the mortuary candles that were all about her, and the white coifs of the two nuns that knelt at her feet with their faces hidden might have been two swans that were there to bear her away to kissing-kindness land, or wherever it is. Leonora showed her to me.\textsuperscript{(p. 94)}

\textsuperscript{37} Lewis, pp. 60-61.
\textsuperscript{38} Ford, \textit{The Good Soldier}, p. 93.
Again, Maisie’s physicality and by association mortality is emphasised through the
descriptions of her hair, her expression, her heart, ‘the long lashes on the cheeks’, her
shoulder, her hands and feet. Yet the description of Maisie’s smile, rather than simply her
mouth, is suggestive of life, and the uncomfortable tension between life and death is
heightened as Dowell describes her resemblance to ‘a bride in the sunlight of the mortuary
candles’. The light adds a distorting dimension to the otherwise stark contrasts of Maisie’s
dark hair and white flower, conveying to Dowell the impression of life where none remains.

While scenes such as this demonstrate how impressionist techniques of using colour,
light, and tone can powerfully render the impressions inscribed upon characters, Dowell’s
perspective is also pointedly limited, driving the narrative as he attempts to piece together the
events leading to the deaths of his wife, Florence, and friend, Edward Ashburnham; the
reader is presented with his observations and is only subsequently aware of their implications,
learning these along with Dowell. For instance, when the two couples travel to Marburg,
Dowell observes Florence touching Edward’s arm, and Leonora’s reaction, but does not
appreciate its significance at the time; rather, he returns to it repeatedly, interrogating the
meaning of the incident until finally recognising the true intimacy implied by the contact after
the affair has already been revealed. Similarly, he observes Florence lying dead on her bed
with a phial in her hand, but only later realises that this was poison rather than medication for
her heart. In *The Good Soldier* we are therefore immersed within and limited by Dowell’s
visual observations.

In the Irma’s injection dream, auditory experience is conveyed in the conversations
that take place within the dream, as Freud hears the speech acts of his interlocutors. Most
prevalent though is the visual stimuli within the dream record. The opening (incomplete)
sentence of the Irma’s injection dream is a visual image of the ‘large hall’ and ‘numerous
guests’. The simile utilising the image of ‘women with artificial dentures’ is employed to assist the reader’s visualisation of the dreamer’s perception of Irma’s affliction, as is the identification of the model source of ‘the turbinal bones of the nose’ behind the image of the ‘remarkable curly structures’. As in Maisie’s death scene, the use of colour (‘white’; ‘whitish grey’) similarly adds detail to the image being constructed, as do the indications of size (‘big’; ‘extensive’), while the identification of the ‘patch’, ‘scabs’ and ‘curly structures’ convey depth and texture. Furthermore, when Freud endeavours to recall the contents of the injection given to Irma by Otto, he visualises the symbolic formula for the chemical trimethylamine: ‘I saw before me the formula for this printed in heavy type’—even details of the font are included to assist the reader in sharing in the visual experience (iv, p. 107). Freud maintains that in dreams, ‘we appear not to think but to experience’ (iv, p. 50), and in keeping with the impressionistic ethos, he endeavours to faithfully represent the perceptual facets of these experiences.

Similarly, a striking example of the depiction of sensory imagery can be found in the following extract from Freud’s self-dissection dream:

*Old Brück must have set me some task; STRANGELY ENOUGH, it related to a dissection of the lower part of my own body, my pelvis and legs, which I saw before me as though in the dissecting-room, but without noticing their absence in myself and also without a trace of any gruesome feeling. Louise N. was standing beside me and doing the work with me. The pelvis had been eviscerated, and it was visible now in its superior, now in its inferior, aspect, the two being mixed together. Thick flesh-coloured protuberances (which, in the dream itself, made me think of haemorrhoids) could be seen. Something which lay over it and was like crumpled silver-paper had also to be carefully fished out.*

---

Despite Freud’s active participation in the dissection, the overall impression is one of his detachment, rendered through the absence of physical pain and appropriate emotional anguish, and through the voyeuristic observation of his own body. The detailed anatomical description conveys colour, texture and spatiality, compiling unpleasantly vivid visual imagery that likewise positions the reader as spectator: as Freud saw before him his body, so too does the reader. The dream is apt for highlighting the connection between the visual and the meaningful, the overdetermined meanings of Conrad’s commitment to making the reader ‘see’, referring to both sight and understanding. Freud’s interpretation of this dream highlights how the act of physical dissection in the dream stands for his ‘self-analysis’ in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, and his anxiety at the intimate dissection of his mind being carried out under the gaze of the reader (v, p. 454); the physical self-dissection of the dream is a metaphor for the psychological self-dissection comprising the book. Like Dowell, who consistently conveys his imagined inferiority to Edward Ashburnham and who pityingly presents his persona to the reader, Freud conveys his negative self-image, being lacerated by the gaze of the reader. But whereas Dowell never attains actual self-knowledge, remaining blinded throughout *The Good Soldier*, Freud pays more conscious attention to his unconscious.

While the preferred literary style should, according to Ford, convey the impression of the moment rather than the corrected chronicle, he elaborates that it is perfectly possible that a piece of Impressionism should give a sense to two, or three, of as many as you will, places, persons, emotions, all going on simultaneously in the emotions of the writer. It is, I mean, perfectly possible for a sensitised person, be he poet or prose writer, to have the sense, when he is in one room, that he is in another, or when he is speaking to one person, he may be so intensely haunted by the memory or desire for another person that he may be absent-minded or distraught. [...] Impressionism exists to render those queer effects of real life that are like so many views seen through bright glass—through glass so bright that while you perceive through it a landscape or a backyard, you are aware that, on its surface, it reflects a
face of a person behind you. For the whole of life is really like that; we are almost always in one place with our minds somewhere quite another.\footnote{Ford, ‘On Impressionism’, p. 267.}

The technique is pronounced, for instance, in the second book of Ford’s \textit{Parade’s End, No More Parades} (1925), where the reader attempts to keep up (primarily) with Tietjens’s consciousness as it moves from present scene, to past memory, to thoughts of the future. For example, when Campion asks why Tietjens does not simply divorce his troublesome wife, Sylvia, his mind moves to the image of a village being shelled, then back to Campion still talking about divorce.\footnote{Ford, \textit{Parade’s End}, pp. 492-94.} This is one instance of Ford’s frequent use of the time shift, which as Richard Lid explains, ‘allows the writer to give full play to all tenses of memory, […] and allows him to achieve kaledisoscopic effects by juxtaposing events separated in time’.\footnote{R. W. Lid, \textit{Ford Madox Ford: The Essence of His Art} (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964), p. 13.} The idea of simultaneity adds depth to impressionism, defending it against the criticisms that a method so concerned with sensory perceptions, only provides a shallow, surface-level rendering of life,\footnote{Matz, \textit{Literary Impressionism}, pp. 3, 12.} and associating it instead with the dynamic, stratified conception of consciousness held by Freud.

In Freudian terms the impression could be said to be \textit{overdetermined}. The expression, first attributed to Freud in \textit{Studies on Hysteria} (1893-95), refers to ‘all the provoking causes’ behind a hysterical symptom,\footnote{Joseph Breuer and Sigmund Freud, \textit{Studies on Hysteria}, ed. & trans. by James Strachey, The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, 24 vols (London: Vintage, 2001), II, p. 173; see also note to p. 212.} and captures how the manifest content of a dream may represent multiple latent meanings; any element of a dream may be indicative not merely of the object/person/scenario directly represented, but also symbolic of other, unconscious associations. As Freud remarks in relation to one of his patients’ dreams,
[t]he two interpretations are not mutually contradictory, but cover the same ground; they are a good instance of the fact that dreams, like all other psychological structures, regularly have more than one meaning.\textsuperscript{45}

Thus, even when there do not overtly appear to be ‘superimposed’ components to the dream narrative, they may be discerned through analysis. In \textit{Studies on Hysteria}, Breuer laments that

[w]e have no way of conveying knowledge of a complicated set of simultaneous events except by describing them successively; and thus it happens that all our accounts are at fault to begin with owing to one-sided simplification and must wait till they can be supplemented, built on to, and so set right.\textsuperscript{46}

However, both Freud and Ford develop techniques to attempt to convey the multifarious strata of the subjective experience of dream-life and waking-life respectively. In the dream of Irma’s injection, the predominant impression, the view through the glass in Ford’s terms, is Irma’s illness and the observation of her symptoms. This is the activity in which Freud is engaged, and as readers we are drawn into this moment with him. However, once Dr. M. enters the scene, Freud is distracted by the reflection of this new character, literally his appearance, which strikes the author as ‘quite different from usual’. Irma is momentarily forgotten as Freud describes what the reader assumes are Dr. M.’s uncharacteristic physical attributes. The sense that Freud’s impressions are superimposed rather than sequentially related is heighted by the transience of the digression and the use of the pronoun ‘her’, rather than Irma’s name, when the narrative returns to the eponymous subject.\textsuperscript{47}

It may seem surprising that the sensory components of dreams such as the pelvis dissection and Irma’s injection are rendered so vividly, given the difficulties presented by ineffectual memory in recalling dreams. Freud explains that

\textsuperscript{45} Freud, \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams}, IV, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{47} Freud, \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams}, IV, p. 107.
It is a proverbial fact that dreams melt away in the morning. They can, of course, be remembered; for we only know dreams from our memory of them after we are awake. But we very often have a feeling that we have only remembered a dream in part and that there was more of it during the night; we can observe, too, how the recollection of a dream, which was still lively in the morning, will melt away, except for a few small fragments, in the course of the day [...]. On the other hand, it sometimes happens that dreams show an extraordinary persistence in the memory. (iv, p. 43)

The memory of the dream is thus likely to be fragmentary and incomplete, becoming more so as greater periods of time elapse after waking, though Freud allows that there are occasions when dreams are vividly remembered. If some portions of the dream are forgotten, Freud voices the suspicion that our mind may reinvent material to fill the gaps: ‘Since so great a proportion of dreams is lost altogether, we may well doubt whether our memory of what is left of them may not be falsified’ (iv, pp. 45-46). The reliability of the dream record is therefore called into question. However, the impressionistic style, which evokes the fragmentary confusion of the dream experience, in fact captures the experience of dreaming and waking particularly effectively.

Freud offers a series of studies of his own dreams to support his theory ‘that in every dream it is possible to find a point of contact with the experiences of the previous day’ (iv, p. 165), the ‘dream-day’ (iv, p. 166). He gives only a fragment of the dreams, ‘dream-elements the time of whose appearance in real life could be determined with certainty’ (iv, p. 167). Nevertheless these impressionistically render the struggles of knowledge and memory. For instance, in the ‘Dream of October 1\textsuperscript{st}-2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1910’ the fragment opens ‘Somewhere in Italy’ (iv, p. 167). The fragmented syntax captures the transience of the moment rather than presenting a falsely corrected narrative. It is unclear whether the exact location was known and then forgotten, or was never known at all. Similarly, in the ‘Dream of October 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th}, 1910’, Freud is invited by Hofrat L. ‘to come somewhere’, and his guide carried ‘a lamp or some other instrument’. There is also additional ambiguity surrounding Hofrat L.’s ‘clear-
sighted (?) far-sighted) look’, the parenthetical second-guessing undermining the authority of the description. The dream closes with Freud’s explicit acknowledgement that ‘[t]he remainder was forgotten’ (IV, p. 167). Once again we are faced with the connection between the visual and meaning: dreams are experienced as images, and the dream image conveys something to the dreamer, but the correlation between the dream image and the meaning it conveys is unclear. Similarly, in the Irma’s injection dream, Freud carries out Irma’s examination through her dress; he could not actually see through the dress, but in the dream this did not matter. The final dream fragment of the section, ‘Dream of October 2nd-3rd, 1910’, disrupts the chronological sequence by predating the second entry, contributing to the sense of confusion and disorientation. The opening sentence of the fragment is rendered incomplete by the lack of pronoun and verb, again immersing the reader within the transient moment. We are left uncertain about the subject matter through the vague indeterminacy of ‘[s]omething about Professor Oser’ and the acknowledgement of ‘[s]ome more that was forgotten’ (IV, p. 168). This confusion, typical of the dreams rendered in the book, is consistent with the fragmentation that characterised the authentic impression.48 We witness it also, for instance, in the Irma’s injection dream, wherein the abundance of dashes and ellipses convey fragmentation, gaps in the memory, and the time spent trying to remember. Similarly, the numerous options considered for the contents of Irma’s injection, ‘propyl, propyls … propionic acid … trimethylamine’, suggest uncertainty (IV, p. 107).

Freud recognises that the difficulties of memory experienced in relation to dreams are also experienced in waking life,49 therefore associating them with Ford’s suggestion that the limitations and faults of memory should be honoured in impressionist literature. In Ford’s fiction it becomes a major theme: In Parade’s End, Tietjens’s ‘tenacious’ memory and

49 Freud, The Interpretation of Dreams, IV, p. 43.
‘encyclopaedic knowledge’ are introduced early in *Some Do Not* as fundamental character attributes: we are told that ‘he had employed himself in tabulating from memory the errors in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and he is even described by Sir Reginald as ‘a perfect encyclopaedia of exact material knowledge’. ⁵⁰ Poignantly, a war injury results in Tietjens losing his memory, forcing him to relearn his general knowledge ‘every afternoon’ from the very encyclopaedia he had formerly corrected. ⁵¹ While memory may be bound up with physical and psychological trauma, as in this case, faults of memory are also an everyday concern, with abundant dashes and ellipses throughout the book rendering scenes remarkably similar to, say, Freud’s account of the Irma’s injection dream.

Similarly, the unreliability of Dowell’s narration in *The Good Soldier* is frequently highlighted by the narrator himself, as in when he cannot remember key dates or omits important details. A notable example occurs when, on the penultimate page of the novel, Dowell declares, ‘[i]t suddenly occurs to me that I have forgotten to say how Edward met his death’. ⁵² Such an important detail almost escapes the narrative and is seemingly only mentioned incidentally by the spontaneous resurgence of a memory that appears unsummoned. Such omissions and recollections dissolve the sense of a linear chronology, but Dowell reflects that this more faithfully represents how the mind works:

> I have, I am aware, told this story in a very rambling way so that it may be difficult for anyone to find their path through what may be a sort of maze. I cannot help it. I have stuck to my idea of being in a country cottage with a silent listener, hearing between the gusts of the wind and amidst the noises of the distant sea, the story as it comes. And, when one discusses an affair—a long, sad affair—one goes back, one goes forward. One remembers points that one has forgotten and one explains them all the more minutely since one recognizes that one has forgotten to mention them in their proper places and that one may have given, by omitting them, a
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false impression. I console myself with thinking that this is a real story and that, after all, real stories are probably told best in the way a person telling a story would tell them. They will then seem most real.  

This reflection upon narrative style, which embraces the indirect narrative, the quirks of memory, and the role of the silent audience formulating impressions based upon the narrator’s impressions, bears a striking resemblance to Ford’s explicit comments upon impressionist style, assimilating author and narrator. Like Dowell, Ford prioritises ‘le temps humain’, or ‘the mind’s time’, with all its distortions and fragmentations, over ‘le temps solaire’, or linear time measured by the calendar or clock. As he observes in Thus to Revisit, it is in that way that life really presents itself to us: not as a rattling narrative beginning at a hero’s birth and progressing to his not very carefully machined yet predestined glory—but dallying backwards and forwards […]—as forgotten episodes came up in the minds of simple narrators. And, if you put your Affair into the mouth of such a narrator your phraseology will be the Real thing in motes justes, for just so long as they remain within his probable vocabulary.  

Evidently Ford does just this in The Good Soldier, putting his affair into Dowell’s mouth and having Dowell reiterate the author’s own narrative stance.  

Ford also, in ‘On Impressionism’, offers additional guidance for conveying the ineffectuality of memory in order to make texts more believable; for instance, by never rendering long speeches verbatim: ‘The most that the normal person carries away of a conversation after even a couple of hours is just a salient or characteristic phrase or two, and a mannerism of the speaker’ (p. 267). Therefore for an author to pretend that this is not so, for instance by recording long speeches verbatim, is to sabotage the reader’s experience, ‘because the mind of the reader would at once lose some of the illusion of the good faith of
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the narrator. [...] The Impressionist, therefore, will only record his impression of a long speech’ (p. 267). Unlike impressionist novels, most of the dream records in The Interpretation of Dreams are short enough that were direct speech to be included, this would not constitute an attempt at reproducing ‘a long speech word for word’. Even in longer dream records such attempts tend not to be made; there is direct speech recorded in the Irma dream, but the utterances are relatively short, and they are combined with statements such as ‘[w]e were directly aware, too, of the origin of the infection’, which elides the conversation, leaving only its impression (IV, p. 107). By employing such techniques, Ford suggests (in very similar terms to those uttered by Dowell above) that ‘you would attain to the sort of odd vibration that scenes in real life really have; you would give your reader the impression that he was witnessing something real, that he was passing through an experience’. Freud therefore not only draws the reader into the experience of the dream, but also captures the experience of trying to recall dreams. His dream records are, like ‘any piece of Impressionism’ according to Ford, ‘the record of the recollection in your mind of a set of circumstances that happened ten years ago—or ten minutes’.

Ford’s call to embrace the imperfections of memory and represent them in literature contributes to his view that

the object of the novelist is to keep the reader entirely oblivious of the fact that the author exists -- even of the fact that he is reading a book. This is of course not possible to the bitter end, but a reader can be rendered very engrossed, and the nearer you can come to making him entirely insensitive to his surroundings, the more you will have succeeded.
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In contrast to the earlier assertion that the impressionist novel was an expression of the author’s ego, Ford’s preference here is for the effacement of the author. He argues that ‘[y]ou must not, as author, utter any views’, and asserts that as a novelist ‘[i]t is obviously best if you can contrive to be without views at all; your business with the world is rendering, not alteration’. Thus the purpose ‘to render life with [...] exactitude’ takes precedence over seizing the opportunity of the novel to express one’s authorial perspective or didactically ‘amend the human race’. The contradiction between these views and those acknowledging and encouraging the representation of the author is not lost on Ford, who acknowledges impressionism’s complexities and contradictions: ‘The Impressionist author is sedulous to avoid letting his personality appear in the course of his book. On the other hand, his whole book, his whole poem is merely an expression of his personality’. Impressionist theory is thus characterised by the confusion and contradicotoriness of life that it seeks to represent.

The engrossment of the reader, the suspension of their sense of external reality in favour of immersion within the book, positing this fictional world as reality instead, may be Ford’s mission in principle, but his practice in The Good Soldier is paradoxical in relation to this treatise. Dowell’s frequently intrusive first person narration risks shattering the reader’s ‘illusion of reality’ by reminding us that we are being told a story; his anxiety about his ability to convey his characters ironically undermines his success in doing so. On the other hand, as Saunders points out, ‘by making us unusually aware that the narrator is telling the story, has written the book we are reading, Ford uses the first-person form to efface himself behind the narrator’s persona’. Ford’s decision to utilise such a narrator highlights the paradoxical nature of impressionism. It draws attention to the difficulty of writing, shifts
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blame for any shortcomings onto Dowell rather than Ford, and suggests Ford’s literary skill in ironically surpassing the narrator he creates. Though Freud’s own dreams are recorded in the first person, he successfully effaces his analyst identity during the dream record, which taken in isolation could belong to any analysand or healthy person. Furthermore, within the dream text itself, he does not intrusively remind the reader that they are being told the tale of the dream in the same way that Dowell conducts his telling, but rather allows them to become immersed within it. The shorter length of the dream records helps to facilitate this, as the illusion of the impression need not be maintained for so long as in the novel.

**Impressionism beyond the Dream Records**

Thus far, this chapter has demonstrated that the dream records in *The Interpretation of Dreams* can be described as discreet impressionistic texts, exhibiting the theoretical perspectives and practicing the techniques put forth by Ford. However, the argument may be carried further, so that *The Interpretation of Dreams* as a whole can be considered an impressionist book, a label constituted by more elements than just the dream records. It is this broader claim to impressionism that subsequent chapters of this thesis pursue in relation to other of Freud’s publications. It is not, however, the categorisation of the book that Freud would have chosen, though his inclinations towards perfecting the literary aesthetics of the text are expressed: as Strachey recognises in his introduction to the book, its ‘severest criticisms came from the author himself, and these were directed principally against the style and literary form’ (IV, p. xx). He quotes a letter written by Freud to Fliess upon completion of the book in 1899, which demonstrates Freud’s dissatisfaction with the product:

> my self-criticism was not entirely unjustified. Somewhere hidden within me I too have some fragmentary sense of form, some appreciation of beauty as a species of perfection; and the involved sentences of my book on dreams, bolstered up on indirect phrases and with sidelong glances at their subject-matter, have gravely affronted some
ideal within me. And I am scarcely wrong in regarding this lack of form as a sign of an incomplete mastery of the material. (IV, p. xx)

In this private correspondence, Freud betrays his authorial instinct, his literary aspirations. But the terms of his dissatisfaction are steeped in paradox. On the one hand the sentences are deemed too ‘involved’, whilst on the other they are grammatically ‘indirect’, the sense of dislocation emphasised by the ‘sidelong glances at their subject matter’. Similarly, the reader can identify the conflicted yearning for ‘perfection’ and the impressionist fragmentation that Freud deems to prevent its fulfilment. However, the qualities identified by Freud here correspond both with the nature of dreams, and with Ford’s impressionistic style. As Christine Downing suggests, ‘[t]he dream-like quality of the book is suggested by its apparent fragmentation and incompleteness. The dreams and their interpretations become elements of one all-inclusive dream’. Freud has therefore faithfully recorded his subject matter using a style particularly equipped to do so.

Freud’s disappointment can be traced to the conflict between his classical literary ideals and scientific training on the one hand, and the vague, fragmentary subject matter with which he deals and his unembraced impressionist literary inclinations on the other. James Strachey’s editorial note demonstrates that he shared the view ‘that The Interpretation of Dreams is one of the major classics of scientific literature’ (IV, p. xxi); Freud’s dissatisfaction is rooted in that he too is fixated on seeing it as such, rather than embracing its unintentional contribution to modern, impressionistic literature. The struggle between Freud’s literary and scientific inclinations, and between his perfectly composed ideal and evanescent subject manifests at numerous levels throughout the book. For example, in subsequent editions of the text he claims to accommodate scientific innovations

by making numerous interpolations in the text and by additional footnotes. If these additions threaten at times to burst the whole framework of the book or if I have not everywhere succeeded in bringing the original text up to the level of our present knowledge, I must ask the reader’s indulgence for these deficiencies: they are the results and signs of the present increasingly rapid development of our science. (iv, pp. xxvii-xxviii)

In this instance, the attempt to maintain scientific accuracy paradoxically hinders the clear, neatly-structured composure of the text, introducing tensions and disorder as the scientific updates impressionistically threaten to burst through the imposed framework. Freud’s plea to the reader to accept his deficiencies calls to mind Dowell’s self-criticism in The Good Soldier, both in relation to the content of the tale and the manner of its telling: Dowell repeatedly seeks the forgiveness of his listener/reader for discrepancies in his tale resulting from faulty memory, and laments his inability to capture the character of Edward Ashburnham. Furthermore, he addresses the stylistic implications of his faulty memory by seeking forgiveness for the non-linear narrative which impressionistically moves back and forth in time with his memories.65

The conflict between form and content is also evoked in the opening pages of Freud’s chapter ‘The Scientific Literature Dealing with the Problems of Dreams’:

In the pages that follow I shall bring forward proof that there is a psychological technique which makes it possible to interpret dreams, and that, if that procedure is employed, every dream reveals itself as a psychical structure which has a meaning and which can be inserted at an assignable point in the mental activities of waking life. I shall further endeavour to elucidate the process to which the strangeness and obscurity of dreams are due and to deduce from those processes the nature of the psychical forces by whose concurrent or mutually opposing action dreams are generated. Having gone thus far, my description will break off, for it will have reached a point at which the problem of dreams merges into more comprehensive
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problems, the solution of which must be approached upon the basis of material of another kind. (IV, p. 1, my emphasis)

The language utilised by Freud in the above declaration captures the paradoxical nature of his task. On the one hand, he wishes to purport not merely a theory, but ‘proof’ regarding the nature of dreams. On the other, his task is interpretation, a particularly subjective experience, fraught with unscientific dangers. Freud’s mission, as he views it, is to introduce clarity to his strange and obscure subject through elucidation, hence his expression of dissatisfaction with his indirect narration, since he perceives this as a failure to master his subject. Furthermore, his description of his project highlights the extension of this problem from the particular issue of dreams to the broader field of psychology; fragmentation and the blurring of distinct boundaries are conveyed through his need to ‘break off’ and the merging of topics. He goes on to appreciate the need for ‘a series of detailed investigations’ in order to elucidate the ‘obscure matters’ of the mind, and informs his reader that ‘[a] piece of detailed research of that kind, predominantly psychological in character, is all I have to offer in these pages’ (IV, p. 6). Freud’s belittling of his product conveys modesty, if not the recurrence of his dissatisfaction. The description is vague and indistinct, defying classification in much the same way as the product itself.

The tension between impressionism and empiricism is also conveyed in the interpretation that supplements the dream records in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. As Didier Anzieu states, ‘[f]ew dreams have been the subject of so much comment’ as Freud’s Irma’s injection dream: ‘First there are Freud’s own observations, which take up thirteen pages immediately following the text of the dream […], then fill eleven more pages at ten other
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points in the book’. These have been followed by a large number of critical responses, which are mostly concerned with offering supplemental and alternative interpretations to that provided by Freud. Following the suggestion that ‘the dream report can be viewed as a text’, Milton Kramer has argued

that what we have learned about textual analysis can be used to establish dream meanings [...]. This view suggests a large number of possible approaches to dream interpretation, most of which are captured by the various schools of literary criticism.

What these responses have in common is the desire to assign meaning, which mirrors Freud’s own interpretive practice as applied to the dream records: “interpreting” a dream implies assigning a meaning to it—that is, replacing it by something which fits into the chain of our mental acts as a link having a validity and importance equal to the rest.

Anzieu describes Freud’s immediate interpretation of the Irma dream as initially appearing
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a trifle untidy, probably because of the way it is fragmented by the systematic use of free association. But it is in fact remarkably well structured, and unfolds like a play, with the characters being introduced in the early acts and the dénouement coming in the last.  

Anzieu’s description highlights the impressionistically ‘untidy’ appearance of the dream interpretation, akin to the uncontrollable, unsystematic dream content, as well as the inherently unsystematic nature of ‘free association’ as a general practice. This suggests that in addition to the impressionistic style of the dream text, the project of analysing dreams and the concepts involved—such as free association—are essentially impressionistic. Conversely, Anzieu’s description also demonstrates the competing urge for order employed by Freud in his ‘systematic’ application of this method, suggesting his desire to maintain control, if not of his dreams, then at least of his interpretations. Indeed, he does inform the reader that ‘I have not reported everything that occurred to me during the process of interpretation’. In analysing ‘the vital relationship between Freud and his work’, Anzieu suggests that the dream can be considered a fulfilment of Freud’s wish to identify wish fulfilment within dreams. I would argue that the process of interpretation similarly manifests a desire to impose order upon the muddled dream content, consistent with Freud’s rationalising impulses manifested throughout his publications and highlighted over the course of this thesis.

This rationalising impulse is in tension with the perspective held by Ford, whose carefully crafted texts utilise sophisticated narrative techniques and literary devices in order to embrace confusion and disorder. Referring to The Good Soldier, Saunders argues that Ford presents the novel’s intricate tangle as a problem to be experienced rather than to be solved. His technical certainty about what he is doing only focuses the uncertainty
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about what he is meaning. But then, that baffled sense of the problematic, the uncertain, was what, for him, represented ‘life’.74

The baffled sense of confusion is what Freud is trying to convey in his dream records, but the process of dream interpretation enacts Freud’s attempts to ‘solve’ the enigmatic riddle of the dreams, through identification of appropriate day residues, associations and symbolic representation. In this sense, the interpretive material which frames the dream records interrupts the ‘illusion of reality’ that was evoked during the dream itself for the dreamer, and during the dream text for the reader. As Ford states,

The moment you depart from presentation, […] the moment that, as a story-teller, you permit yourself the luxury of saying:

Now, gentle reader, is my heroine not a very sweet and oppressed lady?—

At that very moment your reader’s illusion that he is present at an affair in real life […]—at that very moment that illusion will depart.75

It is this kind of interruption which Freud presents in his interpretations: rather than allowing the reader to be indefinitely immersed within the illusion of the dream, the dream contents are systematically picked apart and analysed. Thus we progress from the longer dream narratives to line-by-line snippets followed by paragraphs of analysis, dispelling any illusion.

However, the stylistics and effects of these interpretations suggest that the distinction between impressionistic dream text and seemingly non-impressionistic interpretation is not so easily drawn. For example, according to Ford, ‘little impressions’ that may or may not appear immediately conducive to enhancing the story, ‘might be useful as contributing to illustrate your character’, in both the moral sense of the word, but also in the broader, more inclusive
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sense that encompasses characteristics such as taste or opinion.\textsuperscript{76} Indirect, seemingly minor details accumulate to give a broader impression of the character within a novel; as Ford observes, ‘[t]he novel more or less gradually, more or less deviously, lets you into the secrets of the characters of the men with whom it deals. Then, having got them in, it sets them finally to work’.\textsuperscript{77} So it is that in \textit{The Good Soldier} we only arrive at a sense of Edward Ashburnham as hopelessly sentimental philanderer through gradual revelations of his financial and romantic infidelities; in \textit{Parade’s End} we come to appreciate Christopher Tietjens’s morality through his entangled personal and professional affairs, such as his reactions to Sylvia’s torments and their consequences; and we come to know the character of Freud (this is, after all, a persona he has crafted, a narrative voice he has rendered) through his dream accounts, but also through the interpretations that accumulate over the course of the two-volume \textit{Interpretation of Dreams}, through the style in which the text is written and the theories it presents. For instance, we come to appreciate his deep-rooted professional anxieties through his uncomfortable concern that artistry in his narrative will undermine the science of his discipline, and through his censorship of his interpretations in print for fear they will undermine his professional status. Though unintended by Freud, we can therefore recognise another interpretation of his self-confessed ‘indirect phrases’ and ‘sidelong glances’ at his subject. (IV, p. xx)

The self-consciousness of the author naturally leads to reflection upon the reader. Ford instructs the budding impressionist to ‘[a]lways consider the impressions that you are making upon the mind of the reader’.\textsuperscript{78} Impressionism, then, not only relates to the representation of an author’s or character’s impressions, but also to the impressions made upon the audience. In ‘On Impressionism’ Ford pictures his reader as ‘a human soul in
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sympathy with his own; a silent listener who will be attentive to him.’

Though ultimately influential with regards to the modernist and psychoanalytic movements, *The Interpretation of Dreams* sold only 351 copies in the first six years following its publication, a neglect lamented by Freud in his ‘Preface to the Second Edition’, in which he writes: ‘The attitude adopted by reviewers in the scientific periodicals could only lead one to suppose that my work was doomed to be sunk into complete silence’ (IV, p. xxv). This attitude of disregard persists until, in the ‘Preface to the Third Edition’, Freud notes ‘the interest which is now being taken in [the book]’ (IV, p. xxvii). The early lack of scientific interest leads Freud to ‘feel indebted to a wider circle of educated and curious-minded readers, whose interest has led me to take up once more after nine years this difficult, but in many respects fundamental, work’ (IV, p. xxv). The grateful acknowledgement to a non-scientific readership opens the possibility for literary readership in a far more welcoming manner than Freud takes elsewhere. Indeed, the characterisation of *The Interpretation of Dreams* as both ‘difficult’ and ‘fundamental’ could apply not only to the psychological principles outlined, but also to the literary style in which the book is written.

On the other hand, Freud does maintain a degree of autonomy from his audience by upholding the value of the book regardless of its readership in the preface to the third edition: ‘just as formerly I was unwilling to regard the neglect of my book by readers as evidence of its worthlessness, so I cannot claim that interest which is now being taken in it is a proof of its excellence’ (IV, p. xxvii). The statement distances Freud from both scientific and non-scientific readers. Moreover, this reluctance to embrace the scientific readership that had initially shunned *The Interpretation of Dreams* also manifests in the somewhat bitter
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postscripts added at later dates to the section entitled ‘The Scientific Literature on Dreams’.
For instance, in the 1909 postscript to this section, Freud reflects:

It has, of course, received least attention from those who are engaged in what is
described as ‘research’ into dreams, and who have thus provided a shining example of
the repugnance to learning anything new which is characteristic of men of science. In
the ironical words of Anatole France, ‘les savants ne sont pas curieux’. If there were
such a thing in science as a right to retaliate, I should certainly be justified in my turn
in disregarding the literature that has been issued since the publication of this book.
The few notices of it that have appeared in scientific periodicals show so much lack
of understanding and so much misunderstanding that my only reply to the critics would
be to suggest their reading the book again—or perhaps, indeed, merely to suggest
their reading it. (IV, p. 93)

This statement reveals Freud’s disappointment in the audience he had conceived upon writing
*The Interpretation of Dreams*. His critique of ‘men of science’ for their lack of curiosity is
made more poignant by his usage of the French aphorism by poet and novelist France (who
would go on to be awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 1921), while the scathing tone is
conveyed by the ironical quotation marks surrounding ‘research’. The severity of the emotion
this evokes in him is similarly conveyed by the hyperbolic repetition of ‘so much’ and the
italicised stress of ‘lack’ of understanding and ‘misunderstanding’. He petulantly speaks of
wanting to enact his revenge against the scientific community by not reviewing subsequent
publications in later editions of his book, but simultaneously self-identifies as scientist, rising
above the conduct of his peers and respecting the integrity of his field. Five years later, the
1914 postscript to ‘The Scientific Literature on Dreams’ acknowledges that

[t]he preceding plea of justification was written in 1909. I am bound to admit that
since then the situation has changed; my contribution to the interpretation of dreams is
no longer neglected by writers on the subject. […] *The Interpretation of Dreams* has
raised a whole series of fresh considerations and problems which have been discussed
in a great variety of ways. (IV, p. 95)
With increased consideration and recognition of his contribution to the scientific field from his scientific peers, Freud is satisfied, whilst the attentions of alternative readers which he acknowledged in the earlier preface were not sufficient to suppress the 1909 postscript outburst. This certainly suggests the author’s desire to align the text not with a literary, impressionistic account, but with the doctrines of science. Recalling Ford’s comment above that an impressionist book is the expression of the author’s personality reinforces that Freud considers himself a scientist, rather than a literary author, and that a misreading of his book is also a misreading of himself; yet the changes to the preface and the addition of the postscripts would be considered by Ford as failures of the ‘sedulous’ attempts of the impressionist author ‘to avoid letting his personality appear in the course of his book’.  

Freud’s ‘plea of justification’ in defence of his book demonstrates his engagement with the ‘mystic’ concept of justification discussed by Ford in relation to the credibility of content. Ford writes:

> Before everything a story must convey a sense of inevitability: that which happens in it must seem to be the only thing that could have happened. […] The problem of the author is to make his then action the only action that character could have taken.  

Ford’s position here resembles Henry James’s construction of convincing plots and characters discussed in the next chapter. Freud’s task is not to convince his readers of his characters in the same way as a novelist, since they are impressionistically rendered as artefacts of observation rather than products of invention, but the pressure manifests in different ways. He must still convince the reader of the likelihood of his story; that is, he must convince them that the conclusions drawn from his observations are acceptable, and in turn that the reader should accept his dream theory.
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Alongside his fundamental conception of justification, Ford also stresses the importance of entertainment and style in literature: ‘if the final province of art is to convince, its first province is to interest. So that, to the extent that your justification is uninteresting, it is an artistic defect’. The importance of interest is also acknowledged by Henry James, who in ‘The Art of Fiction’ declared that ‘[t]he only obligation to which in advance we may hold a novel without incurring the accusation of being arbitrary, is that it be interesting’. Ford argues that

the only way in literature to produce an impression is to awaken interest. And, in a sustained argument, you can only keep interest awakened by keeping alive, by whatever means you may have at your disposal, the surprise of your reader. You must state your argument; you must illustrate it, and then you must stick something that appears to have nothing whatever to do with either subject or illustration, so that the reader will exclaim: ‘What the devil is the fellow driving at?’ And then you must go on in the same way—arguing, illustrating and startling and arguing, startling and illustrating—until at the very end your contentions will appear like a ravelled skein. And then, in the last few lines, you will draw towards you the master-string of that seeming confusion, and the whole pattern of the carpet, the whole design of the network will be apparent.

The success of impressionism, and the success of Freud’s dream theory, lies in the author’s ability to imprint an impression upon the reader, by capturing and maintaining the reader’s interest. This suggests an explanation for why Freud’s perceived aesthetic failure might be of such import to a self-identifying author of non-fiction, even aside from his literary inclinations, as according to Ford’s principles, convincing the reader of an argument will fail without capturing their interest. Freud explicitly expressed his intention to introduce revelation at the moment following his literature review in a letter to Wilhelm Fliess on 6 August 1899: he talks of bombarding the reader with information and making them feel that the path is lost, then guiding them through the seemingly un navigable forest towards the light.
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Ford identifies the responsibility for making a text interesting as resting with style; ‘[s]tyle, then, has no other business.\footnote{Ford, \textit{Joseph Conrad}.}’ Despite the different intentions of the texts, Strachey’s introduction to the Standard Edition is similarly concerned with the style of \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams}, seemingly indicating the direction in which his translational efforts have further removed \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams} from a literary genre to a scientific, but nevertheless betraying an innate sense of the literary within the text. He remarks that ‘[w]here the English rendering strikes the reader as unusually stiff, he may assume that the stiffness has been imposed by some verbal necessity determined by the interpretation that is to follow’ (IV, p. xxii), shifting blame for lack of eloquence from author to translator. On the other hand, he states that ‘[w]here there are inconsistencies between different versions of the text of the same dream, he may assume that there are parallel inconsistencies in the original’ (IV, p. xxii), suggesting that the original is impressionistically flawed. He argues that ‘verbal difficulties culminate in the fairly frequent instances in which an interpretation depends entirely upon a pun’ (IV, p. xxii). These instances lead him to adopt ‘the pedantic and tiresome’ method

of keeping the original German pun and laboriously explaining it in a square bracket or footnote. Any amusement that might be got out of it completely evaporates in the process. But that, unfortunately, is a sacrifice that has to be made. (IV, p. xxii)

Once again Strachey’s editorial activity acknowledges the ‘amusement’ Freud introduced into his texts, suggesting a purpose of entertainment rather than information. However, Strachey
sacrifices style in favour of content, losing amusement because of his stance that ‘[w]hat we want to hear about are the examples chosen by Freud—not someone else’ (IV, p. xxii). This privileging of content over style is rooted in Strachey’s perception of *The Interpretation of Dreams* as ‘one of the major classics of scientific literature’ (IV, p. xxi), rather than a literary text, since a literary reader would arguably be more concerned with style than a scientific reader focused upon content.

**Trauma & Impressionism**

The theme of trauma is one that permeates both modern impressionistic and psychoanalytic literature and is a subject upon which the theories of these disciplines converge. While much of the discussion in this area centres on the First World War, other instances of trauma feature in the literature. In *The Good Soldier*, for example, trauma affects Dowell’s ability to recount his experiences, for instance, in his inability to convey the character of Edward Ashburnham to the reader, having dealt with the tragedy of his friend’s and wife’s infidelity, their deaths, and the deaths of others in the ‘saddest story’ (as Ford initially intended to title the novel). Faced with such tragedy, the issue is not simply that Dowell cannot remember details, but that he cannot translate these experiences into words. As he repeatedly informs the reader, ‘[t]his isn’t Edward Ashburnham’. Furthermore, the muddled strands of Dowell’s narrative evoke the muddled, impressionistic, dream-like ways in which trauma returns.

Freud identifies the source of his own trauma in *The Interpretation of Dreams* when, in the preface to the second edition, he writes of his struggle to come to terms with the death of his father, Jakob Freud, in 1896:

> For this book has a further subject significance for me personally—a significance which I only grasped after I had completed it. It was, I found, a portion of my own self-analysis, my reaction to my father’s death—that is to say, to the most important
event, the most poignant loss, of a man’s life. Having discovered that this was so, I felt unable to obliterate the traces of the experience. (IV, p. xxvi)

That Freud was not initially aware of the manifestations of his trauma in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, but that ultimately he ‘felt unable to obliterate the traces of the experience’ from the text, suggests that he identifies his loss far beyond the few dreams that deal explicitly with his father’s death, though these certainly capture the pain of his loss. The ‘close the eyes’ dream is reported by Freud as follows:

> During the night before my father’s funeral I had a dream of a printed notice, placard or poster—rather like the notices forbidding one to smoke in railway waiting-rooms—on which appeared either

> ‘You are requested to close the eyes’
> or, ‘You are requested to close an eye’.

> I usually write this in the form:

> the ‘You are requested to close eye(s).’

> an

The dream itself evokes confusion and uncertainty through its options, and the description demonstrates Freud’s attempts to translate the experience into a textual record. However, the interpretation of the dream exposes a deeper indication of the analyst’s suffering in its contradiction of his own advice. Discussing vague wording used in the narration of dreams, Freud uses his own dream as an example of how to treat presentations of an either/or scenario such as this, in which there are two alternative options: ‘treat the two apparent alternatives as of equal validity and link them together with an “and”’ (IV, p. 317). However, he significantly only opts to explain one of the signage instructions in his dream, interpreting ‘close an eye’ as a request to ‘overlook’ the ‘puritanical simplicity’ of the funeral arrangements disapproved of by some of his relatives (IV, p. 318). The interpretation of the first wording, ‘close the eyes’, as a reference ‘to closing the dead man’s eyes as a filial duty’, is left to Strachey’s

editorial note (iv, p. 318). Such an omission, clearly in tension with the very methodological point being made by Freud, suggests an unacknowledged importance of this major life event.

Freud also records a dream of his father on his death-bed:

After his death my father played a political part among the Magyars and brought them together politically. Here I saw a small and indistinct picture: a crowd of men as though they were in the Reichstag; someone standing on one or two chairs, with other people round him. I remembered how like Garibaldi he had looked on his death-bed, and felt glad that that promise had come true.  

The dream is located within a section on absurdity, which Freud exposes to be a false attribute of the dream, identifying behind it instead a ‘literal picture of a figure of speech’ (as we also observed in the case of the ‘self-dissection’ dream) and the wish ‘to stand before one’s children’s eyes, after one’s death, great and unsullied’. The trauma of his father’s death manifests indirectly in relation to this dream, from the parenthetical way in which Freud introduces the record, ‘(I lost my father 1896.)’, to the interpretation of the wish behind the dream: this is depersonalised ‘—who would not desire this?’, and attributes the wish to fathers wanting to ‘appear unsullied’ to their children, rather than acknowledging the more painful alternative of children’s (Freud’s) desires to perceive their fathers in this way.

Freud’s later acknowledgement of the significance of his paternal loss in The Interpretation of Dreams suggests that the book enacts the process of the writing out of trauma. Saunders draws the connection between Freud and Ford in this area, connecting how ‘[t]he way the impressionist writer gets the sight out of his head is to get it into his reader’s’, with Freud’s explanation surrounding hysterical patients’ descriptions of their ‘vivid visual

91 Freud, The Interpretation of Dreams, v, p. 428.
memories’: ‘The patient is, as it were, getting rid of it by turning it into words’.\(^{92}\) However, Ford argues that

\[\text{[t]he artist can never write to satisfy himself—to get, as the saying is, something off the chest. He must not write rolling periods, the production of which gives him a soothing feeling in his digestive organs or whatever it is. He must write always so as to satisfy that other fellow [the reader].}\(^{93}\)

This suggests the discouragement of literary production for therapeutic purposes, but a different message is transmitted in the texts themselves. For example, when narrating *The Good Soldier*, Dowell imagines his silent reader/listener questioning his motives for writing, offering generalised explanations in response:

\[\text{For it is not unusual in human beings who have witnessed the sack of a city or the falling to pieces of a people to desire to set down what they have witnessed for the benefit of unknown heirs or of generations infinitely remote; or, if you please, just to get the sight out of their heads.}\(^{94}\)

Dowell’s telling of ‘the saddest story’ therefore enacts a similar cathartic writing out of the trauma he has experienced; his ‘narration is his talking cure’.\(^{95}\) The sonnet writing/translating competition between Tietjens and McKechnie in *No More Parades*\(^{96}\) is a scenario drawn from Ford’s own wartime experience, based on the poetic ‘rough products’, as Ford described them, ‘written whilst attending to the needs of 980 returned Expeditionary Force men’\(^{97}\) as a ‘military joke’.\(^{98}\) Though the subject of the poetry is not, in *Parade’s End*, war, literature is once again posited as a coping mechanism, in this instance as a means of coping with the extraordinary pressures of the conflict.

\(^{93}\) Ford, ‘On Impressionism’, p. 279.
Freud and Ford were both personally connected to, as well as culturally immersed within the war. Three of Freud’s sons were engaged in action, one, Martin, being confined to a prisoner of war camp; Freud was also called upon for his expert testimony during an enquiry ordered by the Austrian War Ministry, producing a ‘Memorandum on the Electrical Treatment of War Neurotics’ (1955 [1920]), in which he denounced ineffective electroshock therapies in favour of psychoanalytic processes such as dream interpretation, and which he supplemented with additional oral testimony.99 Following employment producing war propaganda, Ford joined the army in 1915 as an officer in the Welsh regiment and in July 1916 was sent to the Somme, where he was concussed by a shell explosion, causing him to lose his memory for three weeks, even forgetting his own name for several days. The experience is repeated in Parade’s End by Tietjens, who recounts it with difficulty to his wife. This correlation is one of the many instances (not all of which are so discernibly direct) of Ford’s wartime experiences feeding into his fiction.

The war drew significant attention to the issue of trauma, impacting upon both impressionist and psychoanalytic theory.100 Symptoms of the ill-defined condition of shell shock complicated the impressionist assertion that literature should convey the impression of an experience, because trauma interfered with the recollection of the moment, which may also not have been consciously fully experienced in the first place. As Freud writes six months after the outbreak of war,

---


[i]n the confusion of wartime in which we are caught up, relying as we must on one-sided information, standing too close to the great changes that have already taken place or are beginning to, and without a glimmering of the future that is being shaped, we ourselves are at a loss as to the significance of the impressions which bear down upon us and as to the value of the judgements which we form.101

Traumatic moments and the effects of shock thus differentiate representations of these experiences from the stream of consciousness style of more normative impressions. The latter are largely conscious, but the former more often include moments when consciousness is fragmented. Whilst fragmentation could be discerned from the outset of modernism, even, in fact, characterising its emergence in its break from nineteenth-century literature, Sarah Haslam argues that ‘[p]ost-war, the pattern [of fragmentation] can be discerned more clearly still’, quoting Peter Childs’s view in Modernism that ‘the modernists who followed after World War I were more noticeable for their pessimism and their sense of a failed, fragmented, society’.102 Thus, despite writers like Ford advocating that literary impressionism should be utilised as the most appropriate mode of writing needed for expressing the experience of the First World War, these experiences were so raw, the impressions so shocking, that the mind could not register them, let alone translate them into words.

These characteristics of trauma (the failure to consciously experience the moment of shock, and to subsequently recall it; the repeated return of traumatic moments; and the fragmentation of consciousness) all manifest within Ford’s fiction. For instance, given its 1915 publication, the title ‘The Good Soldier’, immediately identifies Ford’s novel with the war, an editorial decision knowingly taken by the publishers in changing the title from Ford’s

102 Haslam, p. 2; Childs, p. 27.
intended ‘The Saddest Story’. Beyond the title, Saunders notes how *The Good Soldier* is embroiled with the war as

its time-scheme takes Dowell’s writing of his experiences as far as May 1916—which must have been disconcerting to those who read the book upon publication in March 1915. Secondly, there is the crucial date, 4 August, which reverberates through the novel, rendering its silence about the war eloquent.\(^{103}\)

Saunders does, however, highlight that the latter of these war links has been debated as a possible coincidence, no record proving conclusively that the date was not set prior to the outbreak of war.\(^{104}\) Despite these connections, war explicitly appears in *The Good Soldier* far less than its title would lead one to expect. Edward Ashburnham’s connection with the war, which plays only a small part in the plot, is dominated by his romantic activities. War therefore implicitly permeates *The Good Soldier*, but is noticeable in its absence.

Ford draws upon his own experiences of the war to highlight another reason why battle may not be the focus of post-War literature, evoking separation and dislocation when he writes:

had you taken part actually in those hostilities, you would know how infinitely little part the actual fighting itself took in your mentality. You would be lying on your stomach, in a beast of a funk, with an immense, horrid German barrage going on all over and round you and with hell and all let loose. But, apart from the occasional, petulant question, ‘When the deuce will our fellows get going and shut ‘em up?’ your thoughts were really concentrated on something quite distant: on your daughter Millicent’s hair, on the fall of the Asquith Ministry, on your financial predicament, on why your regimental ferrets kept on dying, on whether Latin is really necessary to an education.... You were there, but great shafts of thought from the outside, distant and unattainable world infinitely for the greater part occupied your mind.\(^{105}\)

---

\(^{103}\) Saunders, *Ford Madox Ford*, 1, p. 436.

\(^{104}\) Ibid.

\(^{105}\) Ford, *Joseph Conrad*
It is therefore to be expected that the duplicate cerebration generally evoked in Ford’s impressionism will be a vivid component of the war experience.\textsuperscript{106} We see such a dislocation between perception of the immediate event/scenario and internal thought fictionalised when Teitjens is hit by the shell in \textit{Parade’s End}, or during the account of O-Nine Morgan’s death discussed below.

The experience of war is far more prominent in \textit{Parade’s End} than in \textit{The Good Soldier}, and illustrates how Ford adapted his impressionism post-War, heightening elements such as the inexpressibility of trauma. When Sylvia asks Christopher Tietjens about his experience of the war, he too struggles to express it. The written expression of its residues perceived by Valentine Wannop in \textit{A Man Could Stand Up—} (1926) merely records the peace-longing speech of Tietjens’s Lincolnshire Sergeant-Major, that ‘\textit{[a] man could stand up on a bleedin’ ‘ill!}’.\textsuperscript{107} The delayed composition of \textit{Parade’s End} also suggests that it may not have been possible for Ford to compose the tetralogy closer to his own experiences. The amnesia suffered by both Ford and Tietjens after being shelled is a key instance of how the moment which should be conveyed is unavailable, hampering the impressionist’s mission. This unavailability to the memory brings the shell-shocked impressions more in line with dreams, the amnesia relating to which is more significant than everyday memory inaccuracies.

The incident of O-Nine Morgan’s death and Tietjens’s reliving of this moment in \textit{Parade’s End} is an important example of the traumatic war experience in Ford’s literature, in contrast to the neatness of Florence’s suicide or the sentimentality of Edward’s in \textit{The Good


\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Ford, Parade’s End}, p. 652.
Soldier. When, in *No More Parades*, Morgan stumbles into Tietjens’s tent having been hit by an explosive, Tietjens does not experience the event as the man dying. His dislocation from the scene is made clear by his identification of the soldier’s blood with the viscosity of red paint, and his thoughts digress from the scene in front of him, for instance to prior subjects of conversation or the free-associative recollection of memories such as tending to an injured, bleeding horse. While these mental processes remove Tietjens from the immediate traumatic scene, he is nonetheless tethered to it by the sensory stimuli, the heat of the brazier burning his skin and the wetness and stickiness of Morgan’s blood, the weight of his body (pp. 307-11). When the stricken man initially stumbles in his identity is unknown, referred to merely as ‘another bloomin’ casualty’ (p. 307). We experience another moment of delayed decoding as Morgan’s identity is subsequently revealed to both Tietjens and the reader. We are immersed within Tietjens’s streaming consciousness as it veers between the immediate sensory perception of the scene before him, practical thoughts of his duties, the involuntary appearance of Valentine Wannop’s face in his mind and subsequent anxiety about how her expression might change in response to him, all punctuated by frequent ellipses. Tietjens is initially passive as ‘[h]e saw very vividly […] the face of his girl who was a pacifist’ (p. 308), and again as her anticipated disgust causes a physical reaction: ‘O God, how suddenly his bowels turned over!’ (p. 309). The scene feels hallucinatory as Valentine’s ‘undistinguished’ face is juxtaposed with that of the dead man and Tietjens struggles to make sense of the events:

The face below him grinned at the roof – the half face! The nose was there, half the mouth with the teeth showing in the firelight. … It was extraordinary how defined the peaked nose and the serrated teeth were in that mess. … The eye looked jauntily at the

---

peak of canvas hut-roof. … Gone with a grin. Singular the fellow should have spoken! After he was dead. He must have been dead when he spoke. (p. 309)

This gruesome description of the mutilation of Morgan’s body marks a sharp contrast with Dowell’s observation of Maisie Maidan’s body in The Good Soldier described above—both Maidan’s comically grotesque position upon discovery and her serene smile in the sentimentalised repose of her body lying on the bed. Tietjens then faces the guilt of having rejected Morgan’s request for leave in an attempt to protect him from dangers at home, before moving back to thoughts of Valentine. Recognising the physical reaction that thinking of Valentine provokes, Tietjens attempts to regain control over his mind and body by actively trying to recreate the sensation of his bowels turning over or, more successfully, his ‘obedient heart’ missing a beat (p. 309). The action is an apt example of the notion of repetition compulsion developed by Freud in ‘Beyond the Pleasure Principle’ (1920), a book significantly influenced by the trauma of war:

At the outset he was in a passive situation—he was overpowered by the experience; but, by repeating it, unpleasurable though it was, as a game, he took on an active part. These efforts might be put down to an instinct for mastery that was acting independently of whether the memory was in itself pleasurable or not.109

This theory would also explain patients reliving their harrowing experiences in their dreams, and the reason why this scene repeatedly recurs to Tietjens over the course of Parade’s End.

The Interpretation of Dreams is predominantly indicative of Freud’s early psychoanalytic theories, though the multiple editions accommodate revisions and footnoted addenda as these ideas were developed over the course of Freud’s life and career, thus

extending the possibility of inclusion of post-War theory. War was a considerable element of Freud’s wider oeuvre, with his ‘Thoughts for the Times on War and Death’, his ‘Memorandum on the Electrical Treatment of War Neurotics’, and the crucial impact of the war on his theoretical development in ‘Beyond the Pleasure Principle’. It would not, therefore, be inconceivable for Freud to revise or add to his discussion in The Interpretation of Dreams based on the impact of this event. However, the war itself is largely relegated to practical considerations in the prefaces, such as the preface to the fifth edition, which Freud used to highlight his text’s continued popularity in defiance of the war (IV, p. xxix). He acknowledges logistical difficulties imposed by the war upon the text’s development in both this preface and that of the sixth edition, where he writes of ‘the difficulties in which the book trade is placed at present’, which result in an unaltered reprint of the text, with only supplementary bibliographical material provided, not by Freud but by Dr Otto Rank (IV, pp. xxix-xxx). Whether the absence of the war in The Interpretation of Dreams is another example of the inexpressibility of trauma, or whether it stems from Freud’s unwillingness to alter what became ‘a historic document’¹¹⁰ (though he does incorporate later theory), cannot be confirmed.

One rare manifestation of war within The Interpretation of Dreams can be found in the news of Freud’s son from the front dream, which was added to the book in 1919. This runs as follows:

Indistinct beginning. *I said to my wife that I had a piece of news for her, something quite special. She was alarmed and refused to listen. I assured her that on the contrary it was something that she would be very glad to hear, and began to tell her that our son’s officers’ mess had sent a sum of money (5000 Kronen?) … something about distinction … distribution … Meanwhile I had gone with her into a small room,*

¹¹⁰ Freud, The Interpretation of Dreams, IV, p. xxxi. In addition to this comment in the preface to the eighth edition (1929), Freud had made a similar reference to the book’s ‘historic character’ in the 1918 preface to the fifth edition, p. xxix.
like a store-room, to look for something. Suddenly I saw my son appear. He was not in uniform but in tight-fitting sports clothes (like a seal?), with a little cap. He climbed up on to a basket that was standing beside a cupboard, as though he wanted to put something on the cupboard. I called out to him: no reply. It seemed to me that his face or forehead was bandaged. He was adjusting something in his mouth, pushing something into it. And his hair was flecked with grey. I thought: ‘Could he be as exhausted as all that? And has he got false teeth?’ Before I could call out again I woke up, feeling no anxiety but with my heart beating rapidly. My bedside clock showed that it was two thirty. (v, pp. 558-59)

The dream record opens with an admission of uncertainty, the fragmentation of which is compounded by the grammatically incomplete syntax, and accentuated by the roman font in contrast to the italics of the account that follows. Such uncertainty is demonstrated at numerous points throughout the dream, for instance through the use of rhetorical questions that interrogate specific details but ultimately leave them unconfirmed, as in the parenthetical ‘(5000 Kronen?)’ or ‘(like a seal?)’. The latter example also demonstrates the process of association taking place as Freud’s mind wanders from the immediate scene and simultaneously strives to convey it to the reader through visual imagery. Similarly, Freud refers to his son’s ‘face or forehead’, without deciding either way, and repeatedly conveys a lack of specificity (‘to look for something’) and speculation (‘as though’; ‘it seemed to me’). Such speculation specifically positions the account as being comprised of Freud’s subjective impressions. This is emphasised by the transience of other characters such as Freud’s son and wife within the dream as the narrator’s focus changes. His first person narration positions him as the subject of these particularly personal experiences as well as their reporter. The sparing use of direct speech (‘I thought: “Could he be as exhausted as all that? And has he got false teeth?”’) in favour of the predominantly indirect suggests a more faithful representation, both of the experience of the dream and of its recollection, since in dreaming thoughts are often not fully, verbally articulated, and their recollection is even less likely to be so. Freud’s use of ellipses suggest further fragmentation and missing information and effectively represent the gaps in his memory and the process of trying to recall the dream. We receive Freud’s
observations, such as his son’s attire, with specific details, such as the ‘little cap’, highlighted according to what he found striking. These impressions are framed according to Freud’s own points of reference; for instance, the small room into which the action of the dream moves is described as being ‘like a storage room’, which, as we learn in Freud’s interpretation, pertains to a similar room in which he injured his own mouth. We are made to feel that we are in the immediate moment of Freud’s recollection as we witness the development of his impressions, as in ‘he was adjusting something in his mouth, pushing something into it. And his hair was flecked with grey’. The simultaneity of impressions is also conveyed through the multiple strands of the narrative, represented through the indicative ‘meanwhile’, which suggests the difficulty of narrating events chronologically when they take place at the same time. Here, the subsequent clauses develop the impressions that precede them, with the syntax contributing to the effect of a just-remembered attentional detail. We are also given Freud’s immediate state upon waking from the dream, his seemingly conflicted lack of anxiety and bodily response of elevated heart rate.

Freud’s analysis of the dream is, he informs the reader, incomplete, but he nonetheless offers up ‘a few salient points’ (V, p. 559). The first is that the dream signalled his anxiety at having had no news of his son for a week, and that ‘energetic efforts were clearly being made at the beginning of the dream to replace the distressing thoughts by their contrary’. These failed, and instead of straight-forward wish fulfilment, ‘the dream set about giving direct expression to what it had first sought to deny’ (V, p. 559). Recognising allusions to other figures, including self-admonishment conflated into the image and actions of his son, Freud is led to conclude that the ‘concealed impulse […] which might have found satisfaction in the dreaded accident to my son’ was ‘the envy which is felt for the young by those that have grown old’ (V, p. 560). Although this dream relates to the anxieties of war, then, its underlying stimulation stems from more universal wishes and traumas which pre-date the
specific context of the conflict. Impressionism offers an apt style for the attempted representation of experiences such as dreams and trauma (or combinations of the two), as it seeks to reproduce these states, and their effects upon the mind, as faithfully as possible; the style reflects the subject matter, as can be seen in both Freud’s dream texts and the surrounding interpretive material in The Interpretation of Dreams. The subsequent chapters of this thesis continue to seek out Freud’s impressionist tendencies in the stylistic choices of his wider corpus, and the next chapter pays particular attention to the filtration of impressions through a central consciousness.
Max Saunders summarises how Henry James’s initially hostile attitude towards the impressionist style in painting gradually softened ‘towards a more appreciative attitude towards impressionism, particularly in literature’.¹ In his highly influential treatise, ‘The Art of Fiction’, James argues that ‘[a] novel is in its broadest definition a personal, direct impression of life’ (p. 507); repeatedly stressing the importance of ‘truth’, ‘reality’, and authenticity; not shying away from the ‘disagreeable’ and ‘ugly’ (p. 515); observing that ‘the province of art is all life, all feeling, all observation, all vision’, yet producing artistic constructions based upon selection (p. 515). Such characteristics of James’s ideal literature strikingly resemble the principles underlying Ford’s aesthetic and fiction discussed above. We therefore find James utilizing similar mechanisms to convey the impressionistic experience of characters in his literature. But James also framed his fiction with his own explicit literary criticism, one of the most prominent aspects of which is the recurring emphasis placed upon origins. I argue that this can be interpreted as James’s concern with initial impressions, and that Freud too shares this interest. The chapter then discusses how James and Freud transform these initial impressions into crafted narratives, which retain their impressionistic origins. Of particular import to both the initial impressions and the impressionistic narratives is, I argue, the vital role of the central consciousness. As Saunders notes, ‘[t]he impressionism of much of [James’s] fiction consists in its being the portrait of an imaginary consciousness: Isabel Archer; Maisie Farange; Lambert Strether’;² and the novels and prefaces in which these protagonists feature are drawn upon as sources of the Jamesian

² Saunders, Self Impression, p. 266.
aesthetic throughout the present chapter. Of particular relevance will be the shared theories in James’s *What Maisie Knew* (1897) and its preface, alongside Freud’s ‘Analysis of a Phobia in a Five Year Old Boy’ (the ‘Little Hans’ case history, 1909).

*What Maisie Knew* is the tale of a young child whose encounters of the world are coloured by her parents’ divorce and their manipulation of her to their own ends. She is, James tells us in his preface, ‘a register of impressions’. The novel is often considered a point of transition in James’s career, leading into his so-called late phase: Walter Isle highlights the experimental style of James’s novels of the 1890s as a point of ‘immediate genesis’ for his late style. Even prior to the revised texts of the New York Edition then, *What Maisie Knew* demonstrates many of the progressive qualities of James’s developed aesthetic ideas and impressionist tendencies. Like *Maisie*, ‘Little Hans’ offers a narrative of childhood development and depictions of family drama. Hans suffered from phobia and anxiety, and was, for the most part, treated by Freud indirectly via the child’s father, though there was a brief but revelatory encounter between the three individuals, in which Freud was able to identify Hans’s oedipal fear of his father. Like James’s representation of Maisie’s developing but limited knowledge and understanding over the course of his novel, Freud’s case history depicts the quest for understanding of the psychological causes of Hans’s symptoms and behaviour.

The New York Edition of James’s collected novels and short stories, published 1907-1909, is a vital source informing the discussion of the present chapter. Originally suggested by the publisher Charles Scribner to James’s agent Brand Pinker in 1900 and rejected by James, the author later reconsidered and wrote to Scribner in 1905 of his intention for

---


a handsome ‘definitive edition’ of the greater number of my novels and tales. [...] My idea is, further, to revise everything carefully, and to re-touch, as to expression, turn of sentence, and the question of surface generally, wherever this may strike me as really required.\(^5\)

The revised texts of the New York Edition continue to adhere to many of the characteristically impressionistic principles outlined in ‘The Art of Fiction’, but they also embody James’s later style. Isle identifies a pattern of development from James’s long novels of the 1880s through to those after the turn of the century, which generally mirrored the development from ‘Victorian’ to ‘Modern’ texts.\(^6\) Yet while Isle considers James’s modernism to emerge from the later texts rather than the earlier ones, the texts of the New York Edition imbue even those earlier publications with the later, more sustained impressionistic style. The New York Edition replaces ‘flawed’ earlier texts with ‘authorized’ versions elevated, according to Leon Edel, ‘to the level of [James’s] maturity’,\(^7\) much as Freud’s Standard Edition contains edited versions of his psychoanalytic texts with additional reflective/corrective footnotes, as a result of the development of his theories. While this may seem counter-intuitive to the immediacy of the dream impressionism and patients’ free-associative narratives in the previous chapter, my analysis of Freud’s impressionistic style surrounding the dream accounts in The Interpretation of Dreams has demonstrated how the apparently forthcoming narrative flow is actually highly crafted, and remains impressionistic despite later ‘corrections’—or rather, these further contribute to the overall impressionism of the text. These particular versions of James’s texts therefore form the basis of the present study. As such, the Oxford editions of James’s novels utilised in this chapter take the New


\(^6\) Isle, p. vii.

York Edition texts as their foundation, facilitating analysis of James’s more thoroughly considered impressionistic principles, manifested in the ‘definitive’ versions.

These versions of the texts are also significant given their relation to the corresponding prefaces published at the beginning of each volume, with the exception of major novels, which were published across two volumes, only the first of which contained a preface. James’s letter to Scribner outlines that these prefaces would be

representing, in a manner, the history of the work or the group, representing more particularly, perhaps, a frank critical talk about its subject, its origin, its place in the whole artistic chain, and embodying, in short, whatever of interest there may be to say about it.8

As Oliver Herford explores in his chapter on James’s prefaces in Henry James’s Style of Retrospect, of particular interest to James in these prefaces is ‘the origins of the novels and tales in the New York Edition, and […] the work of composition’ involved in their production.9 Paul B. Armstrong cautions that from his recollective perspective James’s prefaces can be problematic and at times inaccurate as guides to their corresponding texts.10

In part, the assumption of readers’ prior knowledge of the fiction problematizes the anticipated introductory function of the prefaces, as does the fact that they ‘are the result of [James’s] own rereading and reimagining’ of works,11 although edited, that were initially composed up to 33 years prior to the publication of the collection, in light of his later thought, style and aesthetic development.

8 Henry James, letter to Charles Scribner’s Sons, 30 July 1905, in James, Letters, iv, p. 367.
11 Ibid.
The prefaces thus embody a process of working-through comparable to that outlined by Freud, who describes the act of remembering as an objective of the process of analytic treatment, which can only be attained by overcoming resistances to memories. Once a resistance has been identified by the analyst and brought to the attention of the patient,

[one must allow the patient time to become more conversant with this resistance [...], to work through it, to overcome it, by continuing, in defiance of it, the analytic work according to the fundamental rule of analysis. Only when the resistance is at its height can the analyst, working in common with his patient, discover the repressed instinctual impulses which are feeding the resistance; and it is this kind of experience which convinces the patient of the existence and power of such impulses. The doctor has nothing else to do than to wait and let things take their course [...]. This working-through of the resistances [...] is a part of the work which effects the greatest changes in the patient and which distinguishes analytic treatment from any kind of treatment by suggestion.\(^\text{12}\)

In the Jamesian version of this scenario, having overcome his initial resistance to a collected edition of his works, the author tries, for the purposes of the prefaces, to remember details he deems—and hopes his readers will deem—to be ‘of interest’ about the corresponding text. This process is integral to the act of ‘reimagining’ identified by Armstrong, producing the great changes envisaged by Freud.\(^\text{13}\) In this case the changes relate to both the revised fiction and to the elements of the texts valued by James to the point of his discursive attention in the prefaces, as he reframes the texts in light of his later thought. The prefaces thus become important texts in their own right, akin to the theoretical essays of Ford, Woolf and Richardson.

---


\(^\text{13}\) Armstrong, ‘Reading James’s Prefaces and Reading James’, p. 126.
James expands upon his initially-proposed intention for the New York Edition in a letter to W. D. Howells on 17 August 1908, in which he expresses his purpose that the collected prefaces ‘ought […] to form a sort of comprehensive manual or vademecum for aspirants in our arduous profession’. This intention, the development of literary theory and improvement of literary output, supplies much of the material upon which the present chapter focuses. Whilst David McWhirter acknowledges James’s well-known ‘disappointment at the failure of the New York Edition […] to sell or garner any significant critical attention’ upon its initial publication, its impact is nevertheless considerable. McWhirter notes James’s appreciation of Percy Lubbock’s rare positive contemporary review in the *Times Literary Supplement*, which was particularly significant for its celebration of ‘the publication of the Edition, and especially its prefaces, as “an event, indeed the first event,” in the history of the novel’. McWhirter argues that Lubbock initiated a process of canonization of James’s work which was encouraged by the author and cemented by R. P. Blackmur’s collection of the prefaces for *The Art of the Novel*, which was first published in 1934, leading to a ‘vast and proliferating body of criticism’ subsequently devoted especially to the preface components of the New York Edition. Dorothy Hale confirms the success of the preface-manual when she remarks that ‘Henry James’s literary critical essays, especially the Prefaces that he wrote for

---


17 McWhirter, p. 2.
the New York Edition […], have generally been regarded as the foundational documents for Anglo-American novel theory’.\(^\text{18}\)

Indeed, James’s impact can be discerned upon the other authors considered in relation to Freud in this thesis. Woolf’s diaries record repeated references to Henry James and she published numerous reviews of his work in the *Times Literary Supplement*. The two sources often complement each other, as in the diary entry of 10 April 1920, which records that prior to the publication of her review of *The Letters of Henry James*,\(^\text{19}\) her eyes were ‘so intent upon Henry James as to see nothing else’.\(^\text{20}\) Similarly, in Dorothy Richardson’s 1938 Foreword to *Pilgrimage*, Richardson identifies James as ‘a far from inconsiderable technical influence’.\(^\text{21}\) As Mhairi Catriona Pooler suggests, this influence manifests in both explicit references to James’s fiction as it is encountered by Richardson’s protagonist Miriam Henderson, but also in the authors’ common acts of recording ‘a portrait of the artist’s creative processes, to be read in what they say about themselves, but also in the very style and method of their writing’.\(^\text{22}\) James’s aspiration for the New York Edition to impact upon literary theory and output has thus, demonstrably, been accomplished.

The unity of a developed literary theory suggested by James’s aspiration to the *vade mecum* is, however, contested. In Blackmur’s commentary in *The Art of the Novel*, he

---


\(^{22}\) Mhairi Catriona Pooler, ‘Of Language, of Meaning, of Mr. Henry James’, *Pilgrimages: The Journal of Dorothy Richardson Studies*, 2011

describes the collected essays as ‘the most sustained and I think the most eloquent and original piece of literary criticism in existence’. Similarly, in the introduction to his *Theory of Fiction: Henry James*, James E. Miller, Jr. asserts that James ‘remained remarkably consistent in his views from the beginning to the end of his career’. However, T. S. Eliot’s commentary of 1920 is more complex:

One thing is certain, that the books of Henry James form a complete whole. One must read all of them, for one must grasp, if anything, both the unity and the progression. The gradual development, and the fundamental identity of spirit, are both important, and their lesson is one lesson.

Eliot’s language paradoxically acknowledges the change implicit in ‘development’ and ‘progression’, whilst maintaining the ‘unity’ and ‘identity’ of the ‘complete whole’ of James’s canon. Increasingly though, the unity of the preface manual is being questioned in line with the dynamic, revisionary process of working-through highlighted by Armstrong’s arguments. For example, McWhirter argues that ‘if the [New York] Edition can be seen as an attempt at monolithic self-definition, it should also be apprehended as a conscious experiment in intertextuality’, in which the various texts that implicitly and explicitly comprise the Edition are brought ‘into relation, without insisting that they converge on any architectural or monumental completeness’. The present chapter adheres to the perspective that the prefaces do not necessarily present a unified aesthetic theory, but recognises their foundational importance and seeks to demonstrate how James’s literary principles, in their complexity, speak to Freud’s psychoanalytic theories and aesthetic practices.
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26 Armstrong, ‘Reading James’s Prefaces and Reading James’.  
27 McWhirter, p. 7.
Two significant links between Freud and Henry James can be identified in the figures of James (Jim) Putnam and William James. Putnam had been converted late in life to the ideas of psychoanalysis, a conversion facilitated by meeting Ernest Jones in 1908 and Freud himself at Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1909, where Freud was delivering what would later be published as *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (1910 [1909]). The correspondence between the men following these meetings demonstrates Putnam’s increasing involvement with the psychoanalytic movement; he went on to become a founding member of the American Psychoanalytical Association in 1911, and the organisation’s first president from 1911 to 1912. On 4 January 1912, Henry James wrote a letter to Putnam discussing supportive therapy he had received from Putnam in Boston in 1910. As Edel’s editorial note points out, ‘[t]his letter reveals that HJ […] was exposed briefly and beneficially to early Freudian theory’ through Putnam. Expanded commentary is offered by Edel and Lyall Harris, who discern Putnam as ‘[p]erhaps the most important’ of James’s doctors during his 1910 stay in America. They note records of multiple meetings between James and Putnam, and discern that Putnam’s ‘supportive therapy […] enabled [James] to unburden himself of many of his anxieties’, including ‘the loss and mourning for his brother, his sense of aging, his loneliness in spite of his worldly social life, and the isolation of Rye’. Though this therapy did not take place until after the New York Edition of James’s fiction, it demonstrates the esteem he placed on treatment that appears to practice the psychoanalytic ‘talking cure’. It was during his lectures at Clark University in 1909 that Freud adopted the term to describe
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30 In James, *Letters*, iv, p. 597.
the work of psychoanalysis, drawing it from Dr Josef Breuer’s patient Anna O (Bertha Pappenheim). 32

It was also at Clark University in September 1909 that Freud met Henry James’s brother, William, who had travelled to the event with the express purpose of meeting Freud. Both men reflected upon the meeting after the fact, with Freud noting the ‘lasting impression’ made upon him by the encounter in his ‘Autobiographical Study’ (1925 [1924]), in which he pensively admired James’s fearlessness ‘in the face of approaching death’. 33 There were, however, ideological differences, as is evident in William James’s letters following the meeting:

I hope that Freud and his pupils will push their ideas to their utmost limits, so that we may learn what they are. They can’t fail to throw light on human nature; but I confess that he made on me personally the impression of a man obsessed with fixed ideas. I can make nothing in my own case with his dream theories, and obviously ‘symbolism’ is a most dangerous method. A newspaper report of the Congress said that Freud had condemned the American religious therapy (which has such extensive results) as very ‘dangerous’ because so ‘unscientific.’ Bah! 34

William James’s ‘impression’ of Freud conveys his ongoing commitment to psychoanalysis and its aim of illuminating ‘human nature’, as well as his disagreement with particularly Freudian aspects of it. There is evidence that each harboured suspicion of the ‘dangerous’ methods valued by the other, with Freud’s reproach of an ‘unscientific’ alternative

particularly ironic given the frequency with which this criticism was levelled against his own practices. Evidently the men held different views on the particulars of psychological treatment, but these were tempered by personal and professional sympathies. The close relationship between Henry and William James is likely to have facilitated the communication of these views between the brothers.

As H. Peter Stowell suggests, ‘[t]he connection between Henry and William becomes fully realized in the context of impressionism. Only then is it possible to see that the explicit concerns of William were borne out in the fiction and criticism of Henry’.  

Moreover, in his commentary upon the meeting of Freud and William James, Robert I. Simon notes that it was ‘[n]ot by accident [that] Ernest Jones praises Freud’s literary ability by comparing it with the style of William James and his brother’, highlighting the ideological convergences between Freud and William, the fraternal closeness of William and Henry, and the similarities between all three men’s literary styles.  

Ernst Jones’s remark, to which Simon refers, is the comment that ‘[i]f William James wrote textbooks of psychology as if they were novels and his brother Henry wrote novels as if they were textbooks on psychology, Freud may be said to have combined the two aims in an enchanting degree’.  

Jones thus identifies Freud as mediating between the generic modes of fiction and non-fiction, with reference to the similarities borne by Freud’s texts to his impressionist literary counterparts, specifically the stylistic affinity between Freud and Henry James, which the present chapter analyses in greater detail.

---

37 Quoted in Simon, p. 832.
Making Impressions: Textual Origins & the Central Consciousness

As Herford notes, ‘an originary idea or anecdote is recorded [in the prefaces] for almost every work in the [New York] Edition’.\(^3^8\) That is to say that James’s initial impressions which serve as the impetus for his stories are repeatedly distinguished within the retrospective prefaces, demonstrating the lasting nature of these impressions. Like James, Freud too emphasises the importance of origins: ‘no moment of time is so favourable for the understanding of a case as its initial stage, […] though unluckily that stage is as a rule neglected or passed over in silence’.\(^3^9\) For both James and Freud, the origins from which novels and case histories develop repeatedly involve receiving information from others, often in the form of anecdotal communications. They thus set up a chain of impressions being conveyed between parties, as we saw in the previous chapter Freud’s patients attempting to convey their impressions of their dreams to Freud, who in turn attempts to convey his impressions of these to the reader. In his preface to *The Golden Bowl*, James describes his preference for constructing his fiction ‘not as my own impersonal account of the affair in hand, but as my account of somebody’s impression of it’, utilising ‘the opportunity and the sensibility of some more or less detached, some not strictly involved, though thoroughly interested and intelligent witness or reporter’.\(^4^0\)

For example, in the preface to *The Ambassadors*, James recalls the typical receipt of information that led to the conception of the novel:

> This had been given me bodily, as usual, by the spoken word, for I was to take the image over exactly as I happened to have met it. A friend [Jonathan Sturges] had repeated to me, with great appreciation, a thing or two ['Live. Live all you can: it’s a

---

\(^{38}\) Herford, p. 178.


\(^{40}\) James, *The Art of the Novel*, p. 327.
mistake not to.’] said to him by a man of distinction [William Dean Howells], much his senior, and to which a sense akin to that of Strether’s melancholy eloquence might be imputed – said as chance would have, and so easily might, in Paris, and in a charming old garden [owned by James McNeill Whistler] attached to a house of art, and on a Sunday afternoon of summer [in 1894], many persons of great interest being present.41

The summary highlights the typicality of receiving such information in the anecdotal form from third parties and reproduces it for the benefit of the reader. This includes the act of dialogue between parties, the affiliation between real-life interlocutor (Howells) and the protagonist into which he is transformed (Lambert Strether), and the details of the setting, all of which facilitate the reader’s recognition of the origins within the finished product. In the context of psychoanalysis, narration of the patient’s symptoms, behaviours, or dreams constitutes comparable anecdotal starting-points from which the case histories can be constructed. At times these narratives may be communicated by the patients themselves directly to the analyst in a therapeutic context, as in the Dora case history discussed in depth in the next chapter.42 Alternatively, they may be reported indirectly, via third parties, like James’s received anecdotes: Freud informs the reader of the Little Hans case, for instance, ‘I have for many years been urging my pupils and my friends to collect observations of the sexual life of children’.43 Like James then, we see the longevity of Freud’s reliance upon others as sources of information from which he can develop his theories and publications.

Both Maisie and ‘Little Hans’ were developed from typically anecdotal origins. James reflects how the ‘great oak’ of What Maisie Knew grew from ‘the little acorn’ of an ‘accidental mention’ to him of circumstances much resembling Maisie’s plight, ‘in which the situation of some luckless child of a divorced couple was affected, under my informant’s eyes, by the re-marriage of one of its parents’, leading to the subsequent ‘malpractice’ and

41 James, The Art of the Novel, p. 308.
‘treachery’ of the parents against ‘the wretched infant’. In the Little Hans case, Freud explains that

The case history is not, strictly speaking, derived from my own observation. It is true that I laid down the general lines of the treatment, and that on one single occasion, when I had a conversation with the boy, I took a direct share in it, but the treatment itself was carried out by the child’s father, and it is to him that I owe my sincerest thanks for allowing me to publish his notes upon the case. (X, p. 5)

While the case history is undoubtedly far more than Hans’s father’s published notes (as demonstrated below, these are supplemented and transformed by Freud’s interpretations and revisions), as Maisie is far more than a reproduction of the anecdotal narrative relayed to James, Freud gratefully acknowledges its origins in this instance of thanks. Furthermore, Strachey’s editorial note in the Standard Edition points out that ‘on its first publication in the Jahrbuch this paper was described not as “by” Freud, but as “communicated by” him’ (X, p. 4). Freud’s attribution of authorship elsewhere emphasises the reconstructive, interpretive element of his narrative, so reliant upon an external source; as in the presentation of Freud’s impressions of his patient’s impressions of their dreams discussed in the previous chapter, here, we largely receive Freud’s impressions of Hans’s father’s impressions of Hans’s development, a repeated sequence of subjective impressions. The father in the ‘Little Hans’ case takes on an unprecedentedly prominent role usually reserved for Freud, of author, narrator, analyst, and character at various stages of the case and its publication history. His importance in each of these roles is highlighted by Freud, in his attribution of authorship in the publication prior to the Standard Edition; in the nested narrative of the father’s observations within Freud’s framework; and in the footnoted comment that Hans’s ‘father in his perplexity was trying to practise the classical technique of psycho-analysis. This did not lead to much; but the result, such as it was, can be given a meaning in the light of later
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44 James, The Art of the Novel, p. 140.
disclosures’ (X, p. 38). Here, Freud patronizingly undermines his rival in each of the above roles, which he too embodies, whilst also demonstrating the significance of the father’s insights, if only for the sake of consistency with Freud’s own interpretations of ‘later disclosures’. Finally, the father’s position as character is evident from his contribution to the source of Hans’s anxiety as performer within the oedipal family drama, and the interest Freud takes in his development. Whilst Freud’s embodiment of positions such as author and narrator is clear, his status as a character may require further elaboration. In addition to the stylistic manifestations of the author within the text discussed in other chapters, Hans’s father creates Freud as a character by informing Hans that he would send his notes regarding the child’s behaviour ‘to a Professor, [Freud,] who can take away your “nonsense” for you’ (X, p. 38). Moreover, Freud becomes a direct participant in the story by meeting with the other characters of Hans and his father and narrating the contents of this analytic session to the reader, in which he demonstrates his prowess as analyst by discerning interpretations lost on the father-analyst. Furthermore, he precedes narration of the main activity of this meeting by highlighting to the reader his prior encounters with Hans, constructing a backstory to support the dramatic scene.

The anecdotal sources received by both Freud and James are the result of something having made an impression, in the first instance, upon those who relate them to the analyst/author, as in Ford’s suggestion, noted above, that ‘[l]ife did not narrate, but made impressions on our brains’. Daniel Hannah observes that ‘[t]hroughout James’s work, impressions reference both an experience of something outside the self and the mark left by that experience on the individual’. This is an important aspect of literary impressionism, which is concerned not merely with immediate perception, but also with the resultant

45 Ford, Joseph Conrad
formulation of an impression—‘what brushes by the mind and the physical impress it leaves there’, as Matz explains.\textsuperscript{47} In James’s case the anecdotes often relate to social exchanges or personal relations between known individuals, taking on an almost gossipy tone. They are given as a matter of course, incidentally, rather than with the intention that they will produce such an impression upon the author as to result in a novel. They are noteworthy enough to pass along, but probably do not produce as deep an impression upon those that initially observed them or received them via a chain of communication, as the impressions made upon Freud’s patients by the impetus for their therapy. The patients are, in Freud’s terms, driven by unresolved conflicts, traumas, or disrupted psychosexual development, which make such an impression upon their minds that they seek out therapy and an opportunity to tell their tales to Freud. For the patients, this telling will often amount initially to the relation of symptoms, leaving Freud to seek out the causes with the patient as collaborator. If we were to envisage the patient’s psyche as malleable, it is as if the initial conflict has produced a physical impression upon it; everything else falls into the grooves of this impression, creating the patient’s narrative, which attempts to get back to the original impression and its cause. In this sense, the patient can be viewed as an impressionist (co-)authoring their own experience.

Yet there are of course many anecdotes that are not ‘written-up’ by James or Freud into novels or case histories. To do so, they must make a significant impression upon their recipient. Following the summary of the anecdote from which \textit{The Ambassadors} was developed, James goes on to explain:

\begin{quote}
The observation there listened to and gathered up had contained part of the ‘note’ that I was to recognise on the spot as to my purpose – had contained in fact the greater part; the rest was in the place and the time and the scene they sketched: these constituents clustered and combined to give me further support, to give me what I
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{47} Matz, \textit{Literary Impressionism}, p. 45. Rebecca Bowler also applies this double sense of the impression to Henry James in her \textit{Literary Impressionism}, pp. 1-2.
may call the note absolute. There it stands, accordingly, full in the tideway; driven in, with hard taps, like some strong stake for the noose of a cable, the swirl of the current roundabout it.48

James articulates his identification of something noteworthy within the anecdote, here termed the ‘note’, elsewhere referred to as an initial hint, glimmer, seed or germ of inspiration, which has the potential to form the basis of a new textual production. The fundamental centrality of the germ to this subsequent process of construction and development, its highly important position within the finished product, is conveyed through the metaphor of the stake in the water. James specifies that it was the content of the observation itself, that call to ‘live’, that struck him as the seed of the story he was to write, rather than supplementary features such as setting. This is consistent with his view in ‘The Art of Fiction’, in which he ascribes to the literary artist, like artists of other media, the task of truthful conveyance of the impressions of life.49 So it is that the anecdotes he receives, as impressions of life, provide sound bases for his literature. However, James also attributes to the artist the tasks of discrimination and selection. These principles endure in the prefaces: ‘For I think, verily, that there are degrees of merit in subjects’,50 and so it follows that once James is offered an anecdote, he must evaluate its potential for transformation and its suitability as novel-material. Whilst Freud, like James, was prolific in his publications, the case history is the most direct counterpart to the Jamesian novel, and one need only look at the limited number of extended published case histories to know that these represent but a small sample of Freud’s patients. There must, then, be some distinguishing factor, a germinal component within the anecdote/patient report presented to the author, ripe with potential, from which a new narrative can be created—

48 James, The Art of the Novel, pp. 308-09.
50 James, The Art of the Novel, p. 309.
something which makes an impression upon the author and that they deem capable of making
an impression upon the reader.

In the preface to *The Portrait of a Lady*, James recalls a conversation with his friend,
the Russian novelist Ivan Turgenieff, upon the nature of distinguishing germs based upon

the intensity of suggestion that may reside in the stray figure, the unattached
character, the image *en disponibilité*. It gave me higher warrant than I seemed then to
have met for just that blest habit of one’s own imagination, the trick of investing some
conceived or encountered individual, some brace or group of individuals, with the
germinial property and authority.\(^{51}\)

This recognition of potential characters was, in fact, James’s preferred method of beginning
his fiction: ‘I was myself so much more antecedently conscious of my figures than of their
setting’, in contrast to ‘the imaginative writer so constituted as to see his fable first and to
make out its agents afterwards’. Reflecting upon the germ of *The Portrait of a Lady*, James
dismisses that this might have been found in ‘plot’, ‘relations’, or ‘situations’, ‘but altogether
in the sense of a single character, the character and aspect of a particular engaging young
woman, to which all the usual elements of a “subject”, certainly of a setting, were to need to
be super-added’.\(^{52}\) Plot, or ‘subject’, and other supplementary elements are thus second in
importance and conception to what will become the novel’s protagonist, Isabel Archer. Such
an instance is typical of James’s ‘general concern with point of view,’ (i.e. impressionism, in
contrast to literary modes such as realism) which Isle terms ‘the Jamesian trade-mark’.\(^{53}\)

Though James does not elaborate upon the specific inspirational figure for *The Portrait of a
Lady*, there is significant critical speculation that she has her roots in James’s cousin Mary

\(^{51}\) James, *The Art of the Novel*, p. 44.
\(^{52}\) James, *The Art of the Novel*, p. 42.
\(^{53}\) Isle, p. 8.
Despite this lack of explicit identification, the germinal potential within the anecdote lies in the ability of the real-life figure to transform into a protagonist whose centre of consciousness is capable of engaging both author and reader as the narrative is filtered through their perspective. Thus, we are left with strikingly memorable protagonists such as Isabel Archer in *The Portrait of a Lady*, Lambert Strether in *The Ambassadors*, and Maisie Beale in *What Maisie Knew*. As Millicent Bell observes, ‘[a] bemused, detached, central consciousness is the characteristic centre of Jamesian fiction’, and Kirschke links this ‘concern for refining and developing consciousness’ specifically with impressionism, as does John G. Peters.

The central consciousness in Freud’s case histories is similarly important to both the analyst in his conception of the case and in its subsequent reception. The tendency for the cases to become known by alternative titles to those chosen by Freud for their publication conveys the importance of the patient’s central consciousness in the public mind. In some instances these alternative titles take up variants of the pseudonyms used by Freud in the case histories, as in the cases of Dora and Little Hans. The descriptive epithet in the latter example highlights Hans’s youth, a feature key to the theories of childhood sexual development discussed in the case, to which Freud attributes Hans’s anxiety and phobia. Similar epithets, based upon distinctive characteristics of the patient’s symptoms/case, are also used for ‘The Rat Man’ (1909), referring to the symbolic meanings attached to rats in Ernst Lanzer’s
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obsessive fantasies, and ‘The Wolf Man’ (1911), referring to Sergei Pankejef’s dreams and paintings of the wolf tree. The popular retitling of all of these pieces emphasises the central consciousness within the case by displacing Freud’s medical titles and instead making the protagonist eponymous. Moreover, ‘The Rat Man’ and ‘Little Hans’ are published as the cover-titles in their respected volumes of the Standard Edition, demonstrating the early acceptance of their renaming.

But what is it about these real-life participants in anecdotal/analytic scenarios that distinguish them as germs from which to grow texts, and mark them out as holding more narrative potential as fictional central consciousnesses than others? Given the shared impressionistic and psychoanalytic concern with conveying impressions of life, I argue that for James and Freud the germinal central consciousness must reveal something about the wider human condition. In discussing William Jensen, Freud says of ‘true’ writers in general that ‘[t]he portrayal of the psychic life of human beings is, of course, his most special domain’. Dorothea Krook contests the criticism that James’s repeated depictions of the moneyed and elite classes of America, England and Europe render ‘un-representative types of humanity’ (p. 10), leading to ‘the basic “unreality” of the Jamesian world.’ (p. 11). Instead,

---


60 Dorothea Krook, The Ordeal of Consciousness in Henry James (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962). See also Dorothy Richardson’s letter to E. B. C. Jones regarding her novel The Singing Captives in September 1921, wherein Richardson argued that ‘all Henry James books are conceived & written in the vasty deep’, but ‘his vasty deep was a tank, & he never knew it’. Windows on Modernism: Selected Letters of Dorothy Richardson, ed. by
Krook argues that the economic power of these classes makes them “representative” of all humanity in the modern world [...] in the sense that they are acknowledged symbols of supreme power and prestige in their society’ (p. 13). The central consciousness selected by James must therefore be of sufficient interest in and of itself, but should also illuminate a broader human condition; indeed, this constitutes part of the interest.

Freud too has been heavily critiqued for his unrepresentative patient samples and unempirical tendency to extend unverifiable insights gleaned from the study and treatment of an individual patient to conditions of the wider population. However the claim of the Freudian psychoanalytic movement to universality attempts to dismiss these limitations. As we will see in the next chapter Freud justifies many of his case history interpretations through reference to a composite archive of experience from his personal encounters, those of his professional colleagues, and evidence in various cultural forms such as myth, literature and art. Whilst Freud’s professional practice may impose additional limitations upon publishable material, conforming to ethical restrictions of anonymity and consent as he laments in the Dora case, the case history documenting the symptoms and treatment of the individual patient is valued for its anticipated impact upon the field of psychoanalysis for the benefit of humankind. For example, amongst an array of other theories, Dora is believed by Freud to...

Gloria G. Fromm (Athens, GA.: University of Georgia Press, 1995), p. 53. A subsequent postcard from Richardson to Jones uses a key to explain that the tank symbolises the drawing room, the social connotations of which are elaborated upon in Richardson’s formal review of The Signing Captives, ‘The Perforated Tank’, in which she accuses James’s novels of creating a ‘shut-in world of advantageously-placed people, guests in a hotel whose being and smooth running are taken for granted’. Dorothy Richardson, ‘Postcard to E.B.C. Jones’, pmk. 26 September 1921, British Library; ——— ‘The Perforated Tank’, Fanfare, 1 (1921), 29. In each of these documents Jones is compared favourably to James, but Richardson did qualify that this was ‘no more meant as an insult to the magnificence of H. J. than ... as a “compliment” to [E. B. C. J.’. Cited in Gloria Glikin Fromm, Dorothy Richardson: A Biography (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977), p. 143.

illuminate the condition of hysteria; Hans and the Wolf Man, infantile sexuality (the latter of increased import due to Freud’s disputes with Alfred Adler and Carl Jung about this subject at the time); and the Rat Man, foundations for further discussion of obsessional neurosis, fulfilled in Freud’s ‘Further Remarks on the Neuro-Psychoses of Defence’ (1896). The accounts of the individual subject thus hold the germ of a universal narrative of existence governed by the unconscious; thus adhering to the ‘personal, but universal’ notion of the impression described by Matz. Freud’s case histories are therefore comprised of case studies of both the individual patient and particular Freudian theories. As his theoretical frameworks become more established over the course of his career, this may account for the reduction of published case histories, as the central consciousness was no longer required to the same extent in its facilitation of psychoanalytic theory.

In *What Maisie Knew*, James’s young eponymous heroine, his ‘light vessel of consciousness’, harboured from the outset germinal potential. James tells us in the preface that ‘[t]his figure could but touch the fancy to the quick and strike one as the beginning of a story – a story commanding a great choice of developments’ (p. 140). James reflects upon his ‘appreciation’ of how Maisie’s youthful perspective impacts upon secondary characters in the novel that would otherwise be ‘vulgar and empty’, but are transformed into ‘the stuff of poetry and tragedy and art’ through Maisie’s ‘freshness’: ‘she has simply to wonder, as I say, about them, and they begin to have meanings, aspects, solidities, connexions – connexions with the “universal”! – that they could scarce have hoped for’ (p. 147). Such connections between the central consciousness and secondary characters within the text are also played

64 James, *The Art of the Novel*, p. 143
out in Freud’s case history, since the focus upon Hans’s consciousness necessarily involves understanding his relationships with those around him, who likewise figure in ‘universal’ narratives. For instance, the family drama incorporates Hans’s mother’s ‘pre-destined part to play’, and his father’s contribution to his fear, in which Freud takes an interest: ‘The following dialogue, which I nevertheless give without alteration, is really of more importance in connection with the progress of the father’s enlightenment than with the little patient’. Therefore the father too becomes, as in James’s conception, a ‘thoroughly pictured creature’ through the medium of the central consciousness.

James argues in the preface that ‘the ugly facts’ and ‘sad’ business of Maisie’s suffering constitutes part of the germinal appeal; after all, the condition of suffering extends readily to a universal condition of life experienced in one form or another: ‘No themes are so human as those that reflect for us, out of the confusion of life, the close connexion of bliss and bale, of the things that help with the things that hurt’ (p. 143). However, he records the disagreeable response this garnered:

I was punctually to have had read to me the lesson that the ‘mixing-up’ of a child with anything unpleasant confessed itself an aggravation of the unpleasantness, and that nothing could well be more disgusting than to attribute to Maisie so intimate an ‘acquaintance’ with the gross immoralities surrounding her.

Thankfully, James was not dissuaded from telling Maisie’s tale. Freud faced comparable criticism for his association of childhood and the mature theme of sexuality, but similarly
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66 James, The Art of the Novel, p. 147.
67 James, The Art of the Novel, p. 141.
68 James, The Art of the Novel, pp. 148-49. See the third chapter of Hannah’s Henry James for a discussion of ‘James’s treatment of the sensitive child as a representative of civic futurity and aesthetic possibility’ (p. 15).
maintained the importance of infantile sexuality as ‘the motive forces of all the neurotic symptoms of later life’.\textsuperscript{70} Treatment of a child, rather than adult patient fulfils the wish for a more direct and less roundabout proof of these fundamental theorems. Surely there must be a possibility of observing in children at first hand and in all the freshness of life the sexual impulses and wishes which we dig out so laboriously in adults from among their own debris—especially as it is our belief that they are the property of all men, a part of the human constitution, and merely exaggerated or distorted in the case of neurotics. (\textit{X}, p. 6)

In general, then, according to Freud the child figure makes for especially appropriate case history material because they exhibit more directly the universal wishes disguised by adults.\textsuperscript{71} As Millicent Bell observes, the child figure also holds invaluable impressionist potential for James: ‘Maisie is the ultimate impressionist, dependent upon her immediate experiences, unequipped with sense-making, story-making conceptions, for worse or for better’.\textsuperscript{72}

Of the products of his ongoing solicitation of tales of children’s sexual development, Freud distinguishes Hans’s particular germinal potential, which made a significant impression upon him: ‘Among the material which came into my possession as a result of these requests, the reports which I received at regular intervals about little Hans soon began to take a prominent place’.\textsuperscript{73} Indeed, Strachey points out that ‘[s]ome records of the earlier part of little Hans’s life had already been published by Freud two years before’, in ‘The Sexual Enlightenment of Children’ (1907), and Hans’s case is also mentioned in Freud’s 1908 paper ‘On the Sexual Theories of Children’.\textsuperscript{74} Freud’s comments about the prominence

\textsuperscript{71} See Hannah, pp. 102-03 for discussion of appreciation of the significance of the child mind in psychological contexts in the 1880s and 1890s, including William James’s lectures to teachers.
\textsuperscript{72} Millicent Bell, p. 245.
\textsuperscript{73} Freud, ‘Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy’, \textit{X}, p. 6
\textsuperscript{74} In Freud, ‘Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy’, \textit{X}, pp. 3; 4.
of reports of Little Hans within the extended case history are immediately succeeded by the following declarations:

His [Hans’s] parents were both among my closest adherents, and they had agreed that in bringing up their first child they would use no more coercion than might be absolutely necessary for maintaining good behaviour. And, as the child developed into a cheerful, good-natured and lively little boy, the experiment of letting him grow up and express himself without being intimidated went on satisfactorily. (X, p. 6)

The immediate proximity of these statements to Freud’s act of distinguishing the case suggests causality: that Hans was acclaimed based upon his parents’ support of Freud and the implications of their method of child-rearing. The latter point here is presented with particular dramatic effect, since a happy, healthy child would require no analysis and present no case. Therefore the statement foreshadows Hans’s mental, emotional, and behavioural decline. Hans’s circumstances combine to mark out his suitability as the subject of a case history, worthy of more extensive and discursive attention than other figures accumulated, undistinguished, within broader studies of childhood sexuality.

The germ discerned by James and Freud within anecdotes/patient narratives is, then, an engaging central consciousness that has the potential to illuminate a broader human condition according to their respective theories. There remains, however, an elusive quality to these inspirational germinal seeds, upon which James ponders in his preface to The Portrait of a Lady:

As for the origin of one’s wind-blown germs themselves, who shall say, as you ask, where they come from? We have to go too far back, too far behind, to say. Is n’t [sic] it all we can say that they come from every quarter of heaven, that they are there at almost any turn of the road? They accumulate, and we are always picking them over, selecting among them. They are the breath of life – by which I mean that life, in its
own way, breathes them upon us. They are so, in a manner prescribed and imposed – floated into our minds by the current of life.\textsuperscript{75}

James’s version of impressionism here positions the author as receptor of a bombardment of impressions from which he must select, and which he must then attempt to render for the reader. An interesting comparison can be found in a letter from Freud to Martha Bernays (April 1, 1884), in which Freud describes how ‘[o]ver and again—I don’t know how!! Many stories have come into my mind, and one of them—a tale in an oriental guise—has recently taken a pretty definite shape’.\textsuperscript{76} James’s difficulty in identifying the origins of his germs is, according to psychoanalytic theory, to be expected. In his analysis of Hamlet, Ernest Jones lays ‘special stress [...] on the artist’s unawareness of the ultimate source of his creation’,\textsuperscript{77} which is rooted in the unconscious and therefore ‘incompatible with the standards of the conscious mind’.\textsuperscript{78} This view is consistent with that expressed by Freud in ‘Creative Writers and Daydreaming’, wherein he hypothesises that creative writing is the product of the author’s fantasies. However, he differentiates between ‘writers who, like the ancient authors of epics and tragedies, take over their material ready-made, from writers who seem to originate their own material’.\textsuperscript{79} As the discussion below demonstrates, such separation is unhelpfully artificial. Freud focuses his attention upon the latter kind of writer, and particularly popular, rather than critically esteemed authors (the reason for this distinction remains elusively undiscussed). Nevertheless, he argues that ‘[o]ne feature above all cannot fail to strike us about the creations of these story-writers: each of them has a hero who is the center of interest’. Freud, like James, therefore recognises the fundamental role of the central

\textsuperscript{75} James, \textit{The Art of the Novel}, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{76} The story did not, apparently, get written. Quoted in Jones, \textit{The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud}, III, p. 418.
\textsuperscript{78} Jones, \textit{Hamlet and Oedipus}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{79} Freud, ‘Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming’, IX, p. 149.
consciousness. Moreover, he discerns behind this hero ‘[h]is Majesty the Ego, the hero alike of every daydream and of every story’.  

This unconscious component offers an explanation as to why James might find the true origins of the germ impenetrable: ‘We have to go too far back, too far behind’, as James says—into childhood and the unconscious.

Architecture & Excavation: Transforming the germ through the craft of impressionism

Accepting the elusiveness of the germ, James uses his anecdotal origins as the foundations upon which to construct new narratives: it is thus an impression in the first instance which gives rise to a whole novel. Indeed, James preferred the anecdotes to be as brief as possible so as not to stifle the stories he was to create from them: ‘He liked a hint of something—the beginning, the outline of a situation, the mere egg, as it were—which he would then come to fertilize’.  

In tension with the natural imagery of the germ or seed, this process of elaboration is often presented through the metaphor of architectural construction. The mathematical precision of the architectural sketch at the planning stage is captured in James’s declaration in the preface to Roderick Hudson that ‘[r]eally, universally, relations stop nowhere, and the exquisite problem of the artist is eternally but to draw, by a geometry of his own, the circle within which they shall happily appear to do so’.  

Similarly, in a letter to Howells in 1900, James writes of The Ambassadors as being ‘absolutely condemned, from
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80 Freud, ‘Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming’, IX, p. 150.
81 James, The Art of the Novel, p. 43.
83 James, The Art of the Novel, p. 5.
the germ up, to be workable in not less than 100,000 words’. This statement highlights the foundational position of the germ and the medium of its construction. A particularly famous example can be found in the preface to *The Portrait of a Lady*:  

The house of fiction has in short not one window, but a million – a number of possible windows not to be reckoned, rather; every one of which has been pierced, or is still pierceable, in its vast front, by the need of the individual vision and by the pressure of the individual will. These apertures, of dissimilar shape and size, hang so, all together, over the human scene that we might have expected of them a greater sameness of report than we find. They are but windows at the best, mere holes in a dead wall, disconnected, perched aloft; they are not hinged doors opening straight upon life. But they have this mark of their own that at each of them stands a figure with a pair of eyes, or at least with a field-glass, which forms, again and again, for observation, a unique instrument, insuring to the person making use of it an impression distinct from every other.

James’s conception of this house of fiction is consistent with his views on life as the subject of literature since it posits the human scene as the focus of the literary gaze. The architectural metaphor extends beyond the preface of *The Portrait of a Lady*, to the novel itself; Alexander Holder-Barell notes how James enhanced the impression of Isabel Archer as ‘the keystone’ in the novel, ‘the centre about which everything and everybody circles’, by endowing ‘her with metaphors that picture her as a beautiful edifice which is the object of every one’s interest’. In the preface quotation above, the house itself can be interpreted as the fictional genre, and the ‘the pierced aperture, either broad or balconied or slit-like and low-browed, is the [particular] “literary form”’ through which the human scene is witnessed. The architectural conception highlights the issue of subjective perception, affected both by the choice of form
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85 James, *The Art of the Novel*, p. 46.
(the type of window) and the ‘individual vision’ (authorial perspective) extending from it. The recurring architectural motif ultimately denotes the act of building in relation to James’s process of novel-making: it suggests the addition of material to construct a new, more elaborate form from the germinal foundation, which remains embedded deep within the completed textual construction. The craft of fiction-writing thus develops the natural impetus of inspiration, transforming the germ into the house of fiction, as the impetus of the case study, the patient’s vessel of consciousness, is transformed into the case history text through the literary form, style and language.

The tension between the natural metaphor of the germ and that of architectural construction—origin and product—encapsulates the tension between life itself, in which ‘relations stop nowhere’, the germ growing outward of its own accord, remiss of authorial control and cultivation; and the carefully constructed house of fiction. The structured implications of the architectural motif highlight an important aspect of James’s style, one that I argue is shared by Freud: the aversion to ‘looseness’. In the preface to *The Tragic Muse*, James decries the ‘large loose baggy monsters, with their queer amalgamation of the accidental and the arbitrary’, epitomised by the novels of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. Instead he finds satisfaction in pattern, structure, form, and probability through selection. The scientific intention of Freud’s texts and his medical training demand a similar aversion to arbitrary unempirical looseness, in the sense that his interpretations must be relevant and convincing, or else his corresponding diagnoses and theories would be (and are) attacked. As we saw in the previous chapter, Freud was disappointed in the seemingly ‘loose’ style of his writing in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, which he interpreted as a failure to adequately grasp his subject; while in fact the text was highly crafted, the ‘loose’ qualities perceived by Freud mirrored the streaming consciousness in free association and dream interpretation, and the
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ambiguities of the unconscious. According to James, the artist’s task is to geometrically ‘draw’ the parameters of his depiction of life; beginning with the discriminating selection of only the most promising germs. Comparatively, Freud’s case histories seek to impose order upon the fluid expanse of the unconscious in a manner similar to that in which James’s novels represent life within boundaries. Yet since the ‘province of art is all life’ and the novel ‘is a personal impression of life’, and since Freud’s objective is similarly to create an authentic record of human motivations and behaviour, the looseness that characterises life must nevertheless be represented within the crafted text. Herein lies the task of impressionism.

Yet before we delve further into the impressionistic style in which life is represented in the finished narratives by James and Freud, it is worth noting that Freud’s activity in creating his case histories was conceived by the analyst not as architectural construction, but as archaeological reconstruction. Whereas James accepts that the germs ‘are floated into our minds by the current of life’, constructing narrative elaborations upon them without further question, Freud’s narratives portray the process of attempting to trace back the origins of the germs that form his plots and shape his character-patients, digging deeper downward to trace their roots. Whereas James works from a minimal anecdote, Freud’s cases are based upon longer encounters with his patients and careful consideration of their own primary narratives. Ernest Jones states that

an artist does not convey all that he wishes to solely in matter-of-fact literalness; if he left nothing to our imagination he would fail to stir it. Our response to his creative
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effort always implies a reading between the lines on our part, an extension of what he has actually written.\textsuperscript{92}

Jones’s description is especially applicable to impressionism, which places the onus on the reader to interpret the text to a greater extent than literary modes such as realism, because the meaning may not be immediately apparent. As Millicent Bell has noted, ‘James was also aware that his reader, receiving a succession of impressions from a reading, has an interpretive compulsion’.\textsuperscript{93} Indeed, Bell argues that ‘James is a writer who deliberately promotes impressionism in the reader, encourages the reader’s passive acceptance of the immediate, the temporary, and the suspension of the reader’s drive toward a conclusion’.\textsuperscript{94}

For the majority of this chapter I approach Freud as the artist, who practices, like James, impressionistic techniques that posit impressionist readers, but Jones’s scenario highlights how the patient, as creator of their own narrative, could be considered in this role, with Freud ‘reading between the lines’ in his acts of interpretation, extending what they have related to him by identifying latent, unconscious content. Such an act is not passive, but limits Freud’s authority, creative activity and original contribution to the case histories by positing him as engaged reader, rather than author. Whilst the course of analysis depicts a process of trying to control, through understanding, the patient’s unconscious, Freud cannot predict how their cases will progress. His character-patients also have the power to thwart his narratives, as demonstrated by Dora’s premature termination of her treatment, discussed further below and in the chapters to come.

Even when approaching Freud as writer rather than reader, the archaeological analogy enacts the process of the analyst’s regression deeper downwards into the patient’s

\textsuperscript{92} Jones, \textit{Hamlet and Oedipus}, pp. 21-22.
\textsuperscript{93} Millicent Bell, p. 7. See also Seymour Chatman’s comment that ‘the reader is supposed to figure things out on his own’. Seymour Benjamin Chatman, \textit{The Later Style of Henry James} (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1972), p. 40.
\textsuperscript{94} Millicent Bell, pp. 7-8.
unconscious to establish the cause of their symptoms, rather than as author creatively constructing an original narrative. Though, as Peter Gay warns, Freud’s claim to have read more archaeology than psychology was probably exaggerated, the analyst’s alignment of psychoanalysis and archaeology is well-known.\(^{95}\) In *Studies on Hysteria*, Freud describes his analytic method as ‘one of clearing away the pathogenic psychical material layer by layer,’ comparable to ‘the technique of excavating a buried city’.\(^{96}\) Certainly ‘Freud’s depiction of psychoanalysis as tomb raid’, to use Sally Blackburn’s phrase,\(^{97}\) is consistent with his own figuration of himself as adventurer in his letter to Fliess of 1\(^{st}\) February 1900:

> I am not really a man of science, not an observer, not an experimenter, and not a thinker. I am nothing but by temperament a *conquistador*—an adventurer, if you want to translate the word—with the curiosity, the boldness and the tenacity that belong to that type of being.\(^{98}\)

Similarly, in ‘The Aetiology of Hysteria’ (1896), Freud writes:

> Imagine that an explorer arrives in a little-known region where his interest is aroused by an expanse of ruins, with remains of walls, fragments of columns, and tablets with half-effaced and unreadable inscriptions. [...] He may have brought picks, shovels and spades with him, and he may set the inhabitants to work with these implements.

---


\(^{96}\) Breuer and Freud, *Studies on Hysteria*, II, p. 139.


Together with them he may start upon the ruins, clear away the rubbish, and, beginning from the visible remains, uncover what is buried.\(^9^9\)

This discussion encourages the reader to exercise their own imagination in order to visualise the analyst as explorer and the mind as fragmented, unintelligible ruins. It stresses the collaborative work of analyst and patient to make sense of the matter by excavating and uncovering ‘buried’ unconscious material. The different metaphors employed by James and Freud highlight the tasks of the novelist and analyst as the construction and reconstruction of narratives respectively, since architecture connotes a new construction, whereas archaeology carries connotations of restoration, revelation and discovery, suggesting that James invents a new story while Freud recovers a forgotten narrative leading back to the patient’s initial trauma or unresolved issue that created the impression upon their psyche.

The two are more similar than they might first appear, however. James is re-working an existing anecdotal narrative, however brief, so that the product is a record of life as well as invention. For instance, James questions his own control over the development of his texts: regarding *The Ambassadors*, he reflects upon the ‘energy with which it [the story] simply makes for itself […]. It rejoices, […] at its best, to seem to offer itself in a light, to seem to know, and with the very last knowledge, what it’s about’.\(^1^0^0\) Such a reflection denies authorial control over the developing text, which appears to grow autonomously. Similarly, the prominence of the germinal origins throughout the development of James’s novels also reminds us of his indebtedness to external sources. For instance, Richard Hocks explores how the records of the germ of *The Ambassadors* discussed above, exist in multiple forms, at


\(^1^0^0\) James, *The Art of the Novel*, p. 315. Freud makes a strikingly similar remark about his aforementioned Oriental tale, declaring his belief ‘that if the train of thought comes back it will really get done by itself’. Quoted in Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, III, p. 418.
various stages of the novel’s development. As James remarks in the preface, ‘[n]ever can a composition of this sort have sprung straighter from a dropped grain of suggestion, and never can that grain, developed, overgrown and smothered, have yet lurked more in the mass as an independent particle’. At various stages of the process of transformation, James repeats ‘I amplify and improve a little’ upon the original germ and upon his prior expansions. As Hocks argues, ‘[t]his seems to be a template for Jamesian genesis, composition, and nascent interpretation all together’. Moreover, Hocks highlights the ‘curious paradox’ of James’s ‘creative process’ as it manifests in James’s letters to Howells. For instance, discussing *The Ambassadors*, James claims

> it had long before – it had in the very act of striking me as a germ – got away from you or from anything like you! had become impersonal and independent. Nevertheless, […] if you hadn’t said the five words to Jonathan [Sturges] he wouldn’t have had them (most sympathetically and interestingly) to relate, and I shouldn’t have had them to work in my imagination. The moral is that you are responsible for the whole business.

The novel is therefore at once a direct product of Howells’s speech, without which it would not exist, and almost immediately (from the point of recognition/attribution of the germinal property) ‘independent’ of him, embodying the ambiguous limitations of James’s authorial authority.

Two further discussions by Freud utilising the archaeological metaphor similarly demonstrate the ambiguity between construction and reconstruction. In the Dora case,

> I had no choice but to follow the example of those discoverers whose good fortune it is to bring to the light of day after long burial the priceless though mutilated relics of

---

101 Hocks, pp. 42-51.
103 Hocks, pp. 41; 44.
104 Hocks, p. 44.
antiquity. I have restored what is missing, taking the best models known to me from other analyses; but, like a conscientious archaeologist, I have not omitted to mention in each case where the authentic parts end and my constructions begin.\textsuperscript{106}

Freud’s acts of restoration involve both the discovery of material forgotten by the patient, and also the constructive work of restoring it to its original condition by producing something new in addition to the authentic relics of the forgotten scene or event. Similarly, in ‘Constructions in Analysis’ (1937), Freud describes how

\begin{quote}
[The] analytic work of construction, or, if it is preferred, of reconstruction [of the patient’s forgotten years], resembles to a great extent an archaeologist’s excavation of some dwelling place that has been destroyed and buried or of some ancient edifice... Just as the archaeologist builds up the walls of a building from the foundations that have remained standing, determines the number and position of the columns from depressions in the floor, and reconstructs the mural decorations and paintings from the remains found in the debris, so does the analyst proceed when he draws his inferences from fragments of memories, from the associations and from the behaviour of the subject of the analysis. Both of them have an undisputed right to reconstruct by means of supplementing and combining the surviving remains. Both of them, moreover, are subject to many of the same difficulties and sources of error.\textsuperscript{107}
\end{quote}

Here the question of whether construction or reconstruction is the most appropriate verb to describe the archaeological/analytical task is directly acknowledged by Freud, but the answer remains ambiguous despite his subsequent usage of ‘reconstruction’. The spatial imagery extends both upwards and downwards from the acknowledged foundations, through observed ‘depressions’ and active upward building. The opportunity for error in the reconstructions suggests an ideal objective of authentic reconstruction, in this context of the patient’s life narrative. The act is not simply one in which Freud records the narrative related to him by the patient, including their symptoms, dreams, behaviours and memory fragments, but rather one


that requires elaboration achievable only by going backwards into the patient’s unspoken and unspeakable unconscious and past. Thus portions of Freud’s case histories, such as sections dedicated to analysis and discussion, are intended to restore and record existing elements of the patient’s mental architecture; yet the above quotation from the Dora case demonstrates that Freud recognises the disjuncture between the ‘authentic’ narrative explicitly voiced by the patient and that which is the analyst’s (re-)constructed elaboration, vowing (though not necessarily fulfilling the commitment) to draw the reader’s attention to the seams joining the two. In part, the need to highlight the boundaries between the two stems from the potential for arbitrary or erroneous interpretations acknowledged by Freud, since the unconscious causes of a patient’s symptoms may be any number of possibilities, complicated further by the concept of overdetermination in which a single symptom can have multiple unconscious causes.\(^{108}\) It is up to the analyst to decide which interpretations are correct and worthy of being recorded. If mistakes are made with regards to these decisions, then the product is an inauthentic fabrication of the original, problematically affirming the position of the case history as an act of construction, rather than reconstruction. Moreover, the repurposing of the patient’s narrative outside of individual treatment, its relocation into the context of informing developments in psychoanalytic theory with universal application, involves distinctly constructive, rather than reconstructive activity in which Freud unquestionably creates a new narrative. Freud is able to supply the medical terminology and diagnosis of which the patient had no prior knowledge, and he is able to use the patient’s experiences to make broader theoretical comments and push forward the progress of the psychoanalytic movement. These ulterior motives may inform the questions that he asks of the patient and therefore the version of their story recorded, suggesting the constructive, editorial nature of such directive decisions and highlighting how the case history presented to the reader constitutes Freud’s

\(^{108}\) See ‘Over-determination’ in Laplanche and Pontalis, pp. 292-93.
impression of the patient’s narrative and the forgotten stimulus behind it. As Mark Freeman argues with regards to Freud’s method of interpreting dreams, Freud’s archaeology in a sense attempts ‘to unearth that which has never existed before, that which is being made in the very process of being found’, since ‘interpretation leads back to an origin which has never been present in already articulated form’.109

To return to Maisie and Hans, James reflected that the initial seed for What Maisie Knew was only ‘the beginning of a story […] commanding a great choice of developments’.110 Making and implementing these choices demonstrates James’s controlled, selective, architectural construction of novel from anecdote. Freud, too, exercises similar control over the course of the Little Hans case, for instance, in dictating to Hans’s father an appropriate ‘programme’ of treatment for the child.111 In his typically carefully structured approach, Freud frames the ‘Case History and Analysis’, the analysis portion of which is a collaborative product of analysis by Freud and Hans’s father, with a preface-like Introduction, and a ‘Discussion’ that locates Hans’s individual experiences within a wider medical context from which psychoanalytic theories may be deduced. The publication itself thus transforms the father’s notes through editing, recasting, and the addition of Freud’s ‘Discussion’ section. Moreover, the father is displaced in the epilogue when Freud has renewed contact with Hans himself, whose development has matured to adulthood. This enforces Freud’s authorial control above that of the father.

The architectural and archaeological metaphors self-identified by James and Freud, and the processes of narrative production they represent are, as we have seen, significantly

110 James, The Art of the Novel, p. 140.
more complex than they appear at first glance. They embody one form of the impressionistic ‘in-betweenness’ identified by Matz and discussed in the introduction to this thesis, as they enhance our appreciation of the authors’ impressionism as stemming from both the impressions of their subjects and themselves. Given the architectural/archaeological transformations of the germs, the next task is to explore how James and Freud impressionistically convey their material through the medium of the central consciousness.

**Impressionist Stylistics in the Novel/Case**

Like Ford’s commitment to ‘a sense of inevitability’, the construction of the central consciousness in James’s and Freud’s texts is rooted in probability.\(^{112}\) Sarah Daugherty highlights the frequency with which James read ‘the fiction of his rivals and [devised] ways of improving on it’.\(^{113}\) This often involved James taking issue with the way in which authors represented characters’ actions and reactions to the events in the novel; James would imagine alternate developments of the characters that seemed to him more likely. Such activity is predicated on the assumption that the character’s consciousness extends beyond the boundaries of the novel. Ernest Jones highlights the tendency in literary and dramatic criticism to treat characters in this way (his own psychoanalytic reading of *Hamlet* is one example) and to measure ‘the dramatist’s success’ by their fulfilment of ‘this criterion’.\(^{114}\) Jones’s analysis suggests how James’s stylistic aversion to looseness speaks to more general expectations of plausibility based upon the notion of human nature held by readers, critics and writers. These are both imposed and managed, Jones and Freud would argue, by the common characteristics of the unconscious.

\(^{112}\) Ford, *Joseph Conrad*


A fitting example can be identified in the preface to *The Ambassadors*, wherein James recalls that having settled upon the central consciousness of his tale and reproduction of the anecdote from which it was sourced, his task became one of supplementing a ‘situation logically involved’ in leading to his crescendo:

the probable course to such a goal, the goal of so conscious a predicament, would have in short to be finely calculated. Where has he come from and why has he come, what is he doing [...] in that galère? To answer these questions plausibly, to answer them as under cross-examination in the witness-box by counsel for the prosecution, in other words satisfactorily to account for Strether and for his ‘peculiar tone’, was to possess myself of the entire fabric. At the same time the clue to its whereabouts would lie in a certain *principle* of probability: he would n’t [*sic*] have indulged in his peculiar tone without a reason [...]. One could only go by probabilities, but there was the advantage that the most general of the probabilities were virtual certainties. (pp. 313-14)

James’s language confirms his need for a tightly controlled narrative in which the events of the story and actions of the protagonist are governed by logic, reason, plausibility, probability and even certainty. The extent of this need is demonstrated in the cross-examination simile, which is used to convey the urgency and tension of James’s task, and the consequences should he fail to ‘satisfactorily’ convince the prosecuting reader/critic of the reality of Strether’s condition. In Freud’s case histories a large proportion of the narrative is dictated by the patients, meaning that he does not have to convince the reader of the likelihood of their actions, because these are confirmed by the patients themselves, rather than imagined by the analyst. What connects Freud’s challenge to that experienced by James (and Ford, as noted in the previous chapter), is the need for the interpretive components of the case history to be convincing, both to the reader and the patient if treatment is to be successful.
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While probability may seem integral to the plot of James’s novels, it is also importantly a matter of characterisation.\textsuperscript{116} James’s prioritisation of characterization over plot leads Howells to describe the Jamesian novel as ‘an analytic study rather than a story’, compounding the likeness between James’s and Freud’s textual outputs. According to Howells, ‘it is the character, not the fate of his people which occupies [James]; when he has fully developed their character, he leaves them to what destiny the reader pleases’.\textsuperscript{117} Howells is describing the open endings typical of James’s fiction, which prefigure a major modernist motif.\textsuperscript{118} James himself had declared that ‘[n]othing is my last word about anything’.\textsuperscript{119} His notebook entry on \textit{The Portrait of a Lady} anticipates disapproval of such endings:

\begin{quote}
The obvious criticism of course will be that it is not finished – that I have not seen the heroine through to the end of her situation – that I have left her \textit{en l’air}. – This is both true and false. The \textit{whole} of anything is never told; you can only take what groups together. What I have done has that unity – it groups together. It is complete in itself – and the rest may be taken up or not, later.\textsuperscript{120}
\end{quote}

As Daugherty observes, ‘[o]n the one hand, [such an ending] creates the illusion that Isabel’s life extends beyond the text; and on the other, it contributes to the novel’s formal unity’.\textsuperscript{121}


\textsuperscript{118} Kirschke, pp. 199; 210.


\textsuperscript{120} James, \textit{The Complete Notebooks of Henry James}, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{121} Daugherty, p. 61.
Freud too strives for formal unity in his case histories, but this is often thwarted by his patients, as in Dora’s premature termination of her treatment and her subsequent return, leading to Freud’s later addition of the Postscript section after the writing of the rest of the case.¹²² The very fact of the postscript’s addition demonstrates the difficulty of maintaining textual boundaries, but Freud does his best therein to tie up loose ends from the case, such as revealing the outcome of the treatment (Dora was, allegedly, cured) and the resolution of Dora’s relations with Herr and Frau K. The epilogistic passage gives the impression of a fairy-tale ending, in which the protagonist lives happily ever after in the real world, rather than one warped by unconscious forces. As Daugherty notes, to numerous critics of The Portrait of a Lady, ‘the novel’s open ending signals James’s relinquishment of authorial control’ in leaving the fates of his characters undecided.¹²³ Freud, by comparison, struggles to retain this authorial control as his patients continue their lives beyond the boundaries of treatment. According to Ethel Cornwell,

because he thinks that no one can completely know another, James presents his characters (to us, and to each other) in such a way as to leave deliberate ambiguities. He acquaints us with his people gradually, by accumulated impressions which lead by degrees toward a further, but never a complete, understanding of his characters.¹²⁴

Cornwell would thus disagree with Howells’s contention above that James ever achieves ‘fully developed’ characters. Like James’s (and Ford’s) protagonists, the subjects of Freud’s case histories are similarly built up through the accumulation of gradual impressions over the course of treatment, and yet we are left in both cases with the sense that our impressions of them are incomplete.
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¹²² Freud, ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’, vii, p. 120.
¹²³ Daugherty, p. 68.
James and Freud both utilise impressionistic techniques in order to produce the accumulating impressions of the central consciousness in their texts. Throughout the prefaces to the New York Edition, James privileges the visual, drawing the reader’s attention to his use of picture and the dramatic scene, both of which reposition the reader as spectator; as Stowell notes, ‘James’s use of the term impression is usually grounded in a visual, painterly sensibility’, and as Kirschke elaborates, ‘James most often used his visual images to turn his reader inward, to enlarge the range of his consciousness of the Jamesian characters, and of their situations in life’. For example, in the preface to The Portrait of a Lady, James discusses the potential impact of the quiet, meditative moment—rather than an episode of dramatic action or conversation—upon the development of the story, for instance, the striking moment when Isabel encounters Serena Merle alone in the drawing room and is struck by the realisation of this woman’s relationship with her husband, Gilbert Osmond. As Saunders observes, Osmond and Merle’s involvement could be considered a salient fact of the plot of The Portrait of a Lady, but ‘we never get anything so vulgar as the direct statement of [such facts]. Instead, [in novels such as this] we get the central consciousnesses imagining their way around them, receiving nuances and hints’. Such moments represent Isabel’s act of seeing, in both the visual sense and that of understanding. Daniel Hannah also finds in this moment one of the ‘crucial scenes of impression that punctuate James’s fiction, scenes in which central characters stand back, frame, and observe others from a threshold position.’ Similarly, in the preface to The Ambassadors, James argues that Lambert Strether’s development depends upon the revelatory moment in the Paris garden, in which the original germ once again clearly manifests and his outburst takes place: ‘he now at all events sees; so that the business of my tale and the march of my action, not to say the precious moral of

125 Stowell, p. 171; Kirschke, p. 201.
126 James, The Art of the Novel, pp. 56-57.
127 Saunders, Self Impression, p. 276.
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everything, is just my demonstration of this process of vision’. Until this moment, James had positioned Strether as an observer of life, but not necessarily a person who understood his subject, not being able to appreciate the motivations of the other characters. As readers aligned with Strether’s central consciousness, we follow his progression and endure the process of delayed decoding with him, experiencing, as and when he does, this moment of revelatory understanding.

Freud employs similar techniques in the literary crafting of his case histories. In Strachey’s editorial note preceding the Wolf Man case history, he takes the time to draw attention to the extraordinary literary skill with which Freud has handled the case. He was faced with the pioneer’s task of giving a scientific account of undreamt-of novelty and complexity. The outcome is a work that not only avoids the dangers of confusion and obscurity but from first to last holds the reader’s fascinated attention. Strachey’s appreciation of Freud’s literary skill, his punning identification of the case’s ‘novelty’, and the discernment of the reader’s fascination, suggest that the intention for a scientific account has been surpassed by one of entertainment, recalling Ford’s emphasis on this aim discussed in Chapter One and James’s articulation of interest as the fundamental obligation of the novel in ‘The Art of Fiction’ (p. 527). This generic distinction enables the less empirical use of impressionistic style to lead the reader through a process of understanding. Strachey’s comment may suggest that Freud avoids at all times any confusion or obscurity, but this is not the case; the text, like many of Freud’s publications, constantly follows a process of coming to understand the mind of the patient. Thus Peter Brooks is able to interpret the Dora case ‘as if Freud were one of Henry James’s baffled yet inventive narrators’. In the Wolf Man case history, as in the Dora case, Freud first reproduces the
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130 In Freud, ‘Notes on a Case of Paranoia’, XII, p. 6.
patient’s dream, before going on to explain it to the reader: like the delayed decoding of James’s novels, we do not understand the significance of the dream as it is recounted to us; this comes only with Freud’s interpretation. As we saw in the previous chapter, representing the apparent immediacy of the impression (the dream experience) requires a significant amount of literary crafting. The task is an intrinsic part of the rhetorical task of writing psychoanalysis, which is consistently faced with the challenge of never quite getting to the unconscious stimulus, but appreciates that recognising and articulating this fact brings one closer to it. It would therefore be issuing a disservice to Freud to concur with Strachey that he avoids confusion and obscurity; rather, he crafts these moments and subsequently the process of attempting to disambiguate them.

The process of following the development of the central consciousness in their texts is also reflected in the narrative methods employed by James and Freud. In his preface to *The Ambassadors*, James declares that ‘the first person, in the long piece, is a form foredoomed to looseness’. Despite the challenges introduced by alternative modes of narration, James favours these above ‘the romantic privilege of the “first person”’. As Peters notes,

[i]n his works, James employs what may initially appear to be an omniscient narrator; however, it soon becomes apparent that the narration is not omniscient but rather a rendering of the workings of a single or central consciousness. This main character then becomes the medium through which the reader also encounters the events of the narrative.

To achieve this James uses impressionistic techniques such as restricted point of view and subjective inner drama to convey Strether’s developing sense of self, techniques which foreshadow the stream-of-consciousness style of later writers. Moreover, the use of dialogue allows characters at once to inform their interlocutors and the reader of internal motivations.

---

and reflections. This is the reason for James’s utilisation of *ficelles* such as Maria Gostrey in *The Ambassadors*, to whom Strether can confide his opinions: Gostrey becomes, James tells us in the preface, not only Strether’s friend, but also ‘the reader’s friend’ by fulfilling this function.

As established in the previous chapter, the original form of the patient’s narrative is important for Freud’s analysis of their specific use of language. As such, the cases tend to include elements of first-person narration by the patient, especially in crucially important moments, such as the reproduction of their dreams. Moreover, the nature of the analytic treatment that Freud records is rooted in discourse between patient and analyst in a way that James does not have to consider. Therefore Freud generally has no use of *ficelles* in the case histories as he takes on the role of confidante himself. At times this communication is represented as direct speech, but the favoured method, which accounts for the majority of the case history styles, is that of indirect discourse in which Freud informs the reader of the patient’s journey through treatment. This method enables him to transition between discussing the patient’s thoughts in the third person, to expanding upon them with additional, theoretically informed commentary, often impressionistically eliding the boundaries between the patient’s account and his own interpretation.

A Case Study of Maisie and Hans

The examples of *What Maisie Knew* and the Little Hans case history are particularly appropriate for demonstrating the impressionistic stylistic choices exercised by Freud and James due to the representational challenge posed by the child consciousness in each of the texts. James explains that
small children have many more perceptions than they have terms to translate them; their vision is at any moment much richer, their apprehension even constantly stronger, than their prompt, their at all producible, vocabulary. Amusing therefore as it might at the first blush have seemed to restrict myself in this case to the terms as well as to the experience, it became at once plain that such an attempt would fail. Maisie’s terms accordingly play their part – since her simpler conclusions quite depend on them; but our own commentary constantly attends and amplifies. This it is that on occasion, doubtless, seems to represent us as going so ‘behind’ the facts of her spectacle as to exaggerate the activity of her relation to them.\textsuperscript{134}

As Isle suggests, in \textit{What Maisie Knew} the terms of the child consciousness manifest

primarily [as] a matter of style, the development of a linguistic method of showing the reader what Maisie sees which will simultaneously indicate the meaning to him, even though the child herself may not, probably will not, be fully aware of that meaning.\textsuperscript{135}

This is principally delivered through a third-person narrator, whose objective distance and recurring irony ‘attends and amplifies’ (another recurrence of James’s process of amplification), assisting the reader to progress beyond the limitations of Maisie’s own understanding.\textsuperscript{136} This could not have been achieved had James succumbed to the looseness of the first person and of the simultaneously more authentic yet limited consciousness of life that Maisie could understand and articulate.

This navigation of the narrative challenges imposed by the child consciousness is applicable not only to James’s novel, but also to the ‘Little Hans’ case. Like Maisie, Hans’s terms too play their part, but in this case most notably in the extensive dialogue between child and father, the latter of whom is, for significant portions of the case, the third person narrator akin to that in \textit{What Maisie Knew}. As Freud informs the reader at an early stage in relation to

\textsuperscript{134} James, \textit{The Art of the Novel}, pp. 145-46.
\textsuperscript{135} Isle, p. 121.
\textsuperscript{136} In \textit{Self Impression}, Saunders connects this structure in \textit{What Maisie Knew} to James’s autobiographical writing, which likewise makes use of ‘[t]hat gulf between the mature elaborate reminiscer and the childishness of the memories being elaborated […]. James finds a redemptive comedy in this disparity. The loss of the past is converted into imaginative opportunity’ (p. 274).
his editorial role, ‘I shall of course refrain from any attempt at spoiling the naïveté and directness of the nursery by making any conventional emendations’ to Hans’s speech (X, p. 7). James’s more subtle combination of child language and the adult perspective of the narrator is dislocated in Freud’s case. This often manifests visually in the script-like format of the interlocutors’ conversations, such as:

\[\text{I}: \text{‘Did they tell you anything about horses?’} \]

\[\text{Hans: ‘Yes.’} \]

\[\text{I}: \text{‘What?’} \]

\[\text{Hans: ‘I’ve forgotten.’ (X, p. 59)} \]

Such representations convey a sense of immediacy by evoking a dramatic scene and embedding the reader within this more directly than scenes rendered through straightforward prose; the visual representation of speech in this format confronts the reader with the spectacle of the conversation, purporting to achieve authenticity through exact reproduction (in contrast to the avoidance of long speeches noted in the previous chapter) and implicitly addressing the same criticism of inaccurate records that we will see Freud face in the next chapter. Thus we see Hans’s father making similar claims to the reliability of his records: ‘the following dialogue took place, which I immediately took down in shorthand’.137 The scripted method carries dramatic connotations, and is comparable to James’s use of dramatic scenes, some of which, in contrast to the quiet meditative moments discussed above, focus ‘attention on the dialogue’.138 The visual discernment of script-elements on the page in Freud’s case similarly creates a scene focused on dialogue, in which Hans’s language is exhibited.

---

138 Isle, p. 10.
However, as James remarks, ‘our commentary’ (that of the author/narrator, and the implicit interpretation of the reader) ‘constantly attends and amplifies’ the child’s language, going ‘behind’ the observable facts to elaborate upon them and instil greater understanding. The narrative observation and interlocution in the Little Hans case is less detached than James’s narration, because of the privileged parental position and the role of Hans’s father as character in his own right. At times, Freud and Hans’s father frame dialogic elements with interpretive commentary, and Freud enacts this process on a larger scale in, for instance, his Discussion section of the case history. At other times though, the way in which the commentary attends to the child’s language is to transform it before it is presented to the reader, as in this alteration by Hans’s father: ‘He then told me the following story, which I give here in a connected form’. Interpretive amplification is necessary, James argues, because of the child’s limited understanding of their own experiences and limited language to express them. Freud explains that ‘[t]he child cannot tell [at first] what he is afraid of; and when Hans, on the first walk with the nursemaid, would not say what he was afraid of, it was simply that he himself did not yet know’ (X, p. 25). Something has made an impression on him, but he does not know what; he attempts to convey it to his father, who in turn attempts to convey it to Freud. Indeed, such a limitation could be extended to all patients of psychoanalysis, since they are governed by unconsciousness forces. It is the task of the analyst (or analysts in the case of Freud and Hans’s father) and the narrator to elaborate and unpick the meaning expressed by the child. Thus, while Hans does not utilise the terminology, Freud is able to discern that ‘[i]n his own language Hans was saying quite definitely that it was a phantasy’ (X, p. 37).

---

139 Freud, ‘Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy’, X, p. 29
Over the course of *What Maisie Knew*, William Walsh identifies ‘the growing correspondence between what Maisie sees and what she understands’—again reminiscent of Conrad and Ford’s dual conception of seeing—implying that the interpretive activity of the narrator decreases as Maisie is more and more able to convey her experiences and their implications to the reader independently. As Stowell notes, Maisie’s development is ‘marked by the increasing sophistication of her impressionistic readings and responses’. Hans undergoes a similar process of enlightenment over the course of the text, but this is immediately reliant upon the interpretation of the analyst-narrator. This is particularly significant when Freud reveals to him the unconscious motivations that produce his fear. This enlightens Hans’s limited consciousness, the ignorance of which had produced anxiety (a less favourable consequence than Maisie’s wonder), so that he is able to overcome his fear. Once again then we witness the value of the child consciousness as predisposed to development; we expect to observe the ongoing acquisition of knowledge and the process of learning resulting in increased awareness and understanding as the child matures. The child type therefore epitomises the focus upon character development of the central consciousness found in James’s novels and Freud’s case histories.

In the preface to *What Maisie Knew*, James acknowledges the difficulty of enforcing his tight representations and clear depictions that facilitate understanding, in face of the constant force that makes for muddlement. The great thing is indeed that the muddled state too is one of the very sharpest of the realities, that it also has colour and form and character.

---

140 Cited in Isle, p. 154.
141 Ford, *Joseph Conrad*.
142 Stowell, p. 195.
143 James, *The Art of the Novel*, p. 149.
James therefore embraces the muddlement, discerning it to be a worthy subject of representation in itself, because of its authentic human condition. James acknowledges that ‘to live with all intensity and perplexity and felicity in its terribly mixed little world would thus be the part of my interesting small mortal’, but the appeal of this confusion, like Maisie’s suffering, lies in its connection with a broader human condition. Moreover, James unites form and content by allowing elements of muddlement to permeate the style as well as substance of his book. Similarly, in the ‘Little Hans’ case, Freud cautions that

[i]t is not in the least our business to ‘understand’ a case at once: this is only possible at a later stage, when we have received enough impressions of it. For the present we will suspend our judgement and give our impartial attention to everything that there is to observe. (X, pp. 22-23)

As we have established, understanding, for Freud, refers to the unpicking of the unconscious influences upon his patients’ symptoms, in this case Hans’s anxiety and phobia. The impressionistic observations lead the way towards the more re/constructive action of analysis and discussion. The reproduction of large segments of dialogue, usually between Hans and his father, in much the same way as James allows the reader to be privy to the private conversations of characters, creates the type of first-hand experience that enables the pretence of allowing the reader to form their own conclusions rather than relying on somebody else’s misinterpretations. Thus Freud announces that ‘[w]e will not follow Hans’s father either in his easily comprehensible anxieties or in his first attempts at finding an explanation; we will begin by examining the material before us’ (X, p. 22). The three paragraphs that follow in the case comprise this promised material in the form of correspondence from Hans’s father, apparently directly quoted. We are therefore presented with different versions of reality based upon the primary material and its secondary elaboration, since Freud initially warns the reader that their version is not absolutely correct. This creates a disjointed narrative in which—to borrow terms from Russian formalism—the sjuzet is far more complex than the
Freud repeatedly warns the reader of future content and casts back to previous remarks, meaning that they are never quite in the moment of the *fabula*, but rather frequently going back or thinking forward. Character, plot and scenes thus take on new forms as the narrative and meta-narrative commentary develop. By asking the right questions, Freud is able to produce a new narrative.

This new narrative must abide by the laws of probability and provide convincing interpretations. For example, James alters the *fabula* of his germinal anecdote in the creation of his new text by arranging that both of Maisie’s parents, rather than the one of the reality, should remarry, as he deemed this would provide ‘a perfect logic for what might come’ with regards to the parents’ behaviours towards Maisie. Similarly, James’s need for his protagonist to possess an intense sensibility dictates, to his mind, that the character should be female:

I at once recognised, that my light vessel of consciousness, [...] could n’t [*sic*] be with verisimilitude a rude little boy; since, beyond the fact that little boys are never so ‘present’, the sensibility of the female young is indubitably, for early youth, the greater, and my plan would call, on the part of my protagonist, for ‘no end’ of sensibility.

Though we may disagree with James about whether a male child could achieve the same literary effect as a female in Maisie’s situation, James nevertheless founds his decisions on a logic of his own, which he takes care to explain to the reader. It precludes any objections to the degree of the young child’s expansive perceptions and emotional intensity.

As discussed above, Freud’s task in the case history is to provide convincing interpretations of the patient’s observed behaviour; to convince the reader of the validity of

---

144 The *fabula* relates to the “‘raw material” of story events as opposed to the finished arrangement of the plot (or *sjuzet*). Baldick, p. 123.


146 James, *The Art of the Novel*, pp. 143-44.
his impressions. In the case of Little Hans, Freud verifies interpretations on the father’s behalf by citing Hans’s child consciousness as preventing him from offering complete confirmation:

Hans only confirmed the interpretation of the two giraffes as his father and mother, and not the sexual symbolism, according to which the giraffe itself represented the penis. This symbolism was probably correct, but we really cannot ask more of Hans. (X, p. 40)

Moreover, Freud remarks with satisfaction when Hans’s thought is consistent with interpretations of his previous behaviour: ‘[a] most suitable continuation of the giraffe phantasy’ (X, p. 41). He returns to Hans’s limited consciousness when he observes:

Hans’s singular remark, ‘it’s fixed in, of course’, makes it possible to guess many things in connection with his consolatory speech which he could not express in words and did not express during the course of the analysis. I shall bridge the gap for a little distance by means of my experiences in the analyses of grown-up people; but I hope the interpolation will not be considered arbitrary or capricious. (X, p. 35)

Here, Freud anticipates objections to his interpretations based upon incomplete evidence, for which he blames Hans’s limited consciousness. He justifies his interpretation by citing his prior professional experiences, and anticipates the criticism of inappropriately applying theories developed through treatment of adults, to children, dismissing them outright. This technique is one used frequently throughout the case histories and often features the omission of detailed evidence to support the dismissal of objections: ‘I cannot interrupt the discussion so far as to demonstrate the typical character of the unconscious train of thought which I think there is here reason for attributing to little Hans’ (X, p. 36).

Freud’s process of interpretation, depicted in the following scene of direct contact between Hans and the analyst, draws together many of the qualities discussed in relation to Freud and James so far:
That afternoon the father and son visited me during my consulting hours. I already knew the funny little fellow, and with all his self-assurance he was yet so amiable that I had always been glad to see him. I do not know whether he remembered me, but he behaved irreproachably and like a perfectly reasonable member of human society. [...] Certain details which I now learnt [...] were certainly not to be explained from what we knew. But as I saw the two of them sitting in front of me and at the same time heard Hans’s description of his anxiety-horses, a further piece of the solution shot through my mind, and a piece which I could well understand might escape his father. I asked Hans jokingly whether his horses wore eyeglasses, to which he replied that they did not. I then asked him whether his father wore eyeglasses, to which, against all the evidence, he once more said no. Finally I asked him whether by ‘the black round the mouth’ he meant a moustache; and then I disclosed to him that he was afraid of his father, precisely because he was so fond of his mother. It must be, I told him, that he thought his father was angry with him on that account; but this was not so, his father was fond of him in spite of it, and he might admit everything to him without any fear. Long before he was in the world, I went on, I had known that a little Hans would come who would be so fond of his mother that he would be bound to feel afraid of his father because of it; and I had told his father this. (x, pp. 41-42).

Freud begins by providing a clear temporal frame for the dramatic scene that is to follow, a lucid structure typical of a conventional narrative. He then identifies his pre-existing relationship with the patient, beyond the scope of the case history, suggesting his ability to harbour insights unavailable to the reader whose impressions of Hans are restricted to the boundaries of the current text, boundaries drawn by Freud. Hans’s conformity to the standards of ‘human society’ connects him to the universal condition and facilitates the extension of psychoanalysis as a universal theory. Freud highlights the non-linear szjuet by casting backwards to prior information and recasting this in light of new information. The breakthrough in the case for Freud comes through the combined multi-sensory experience of what he ‘saw’ and what he ‘heard’, the combination of which enabled him to formulate an impression. Hans’s father’s regular reports had been insufficient to illuminate the child’s case. Rather, Freud’s own direct experience of seeing father and son is integral to identifying the tension between Freud’s apparently indisputable observations (based on ‘all the evidence’) and the unreliable version of Hans’s subjectivity. The indirect speech, which
fulfils the dialogic component of James’s dramatic scene, is integral in identifying the skewed version of what Hans reported ‘against all the evidence’, which can now be verified and corrected by Freud. Reaching this stage required Freud knowing what questions to ask of Hans, positing Freud in an intuitive, authoritative position, the impression of which is enhanced when he ‘disclosed’ the patient’s own motivations to him with the confidence and certainty of declarative statements and superlative modifiers: ‘It must be’. This is finally compounded in the fable-like explanation that links Hans again with universal humanity, through Freud’s presentiment of his existence and the use of the indefinite article, ‘a little Hans’. Hans is thus elevated from individual consciousness to mythical archetype.

By the end of *What Maisie Knew*, James’s protagonist had, as Isle notes, modified and strengthened her innocence through experience, ‘because she learns and can make serious moral use of her knowledge’. This manifests in the choice she makes to depart with Mrs Wix (the caregiver that has prioritised Maisie’s wellbeing to a far greater extent throughout the text than the child’s biological family) at the end of the novel, leaving behind her mother and, the harder loss, Sir Claude. When Maisie and Mrs Wix depart, the latter ‘didn’t look back’, but Maisie did, demonstrating the compounded acts of seeing and understanding. That the look encompasses both is evident in Maisie’s exasperated response to Mrs Wix’s explanation that Sir Claude had returned to Maisie’s mother: ‘“Oh I know!” the child replied’. To this, ‘Mrs Wix gave a sidelong look. She still had room for wonder at what Maisie knew’. The adult character is not capable of seeing as Maisie sees; she looks ‘sidelong’, rather than at the situation full on. Mrs Wix is also imbued with the wonder which James ascribed, in the preface, to Maisie, demonstrating the enlightenment of the child over the course of the novel to the point of surpassing her elders. This development encapsulates

---

147 Isle, p. 158.
the novel as bildungsroman, though Maisie’s age at the end of the text is unclear because of the ambiguous way in which time passes. This at once offers a sense of crafted completion compounded by the repetition of the title in the closing sentence, and the possibility of Maisie’s future beyond the end of the novel.

In 1922, 13 years after the publication of the ‘Little Hans’ case, Freud added a postscript. In it, he informed the reader that he had been approached by the subject of the case so many years after its publication, and that this now ‘strapping youth of nineteen […] declared that he was perfectly well, and suffered from no troubles or inhibitions’ (X, p. 148). This extension of the case beyond Hans’s early childhood, the stage of life upon which the rest of the case had focused, reminds the reader of Hans’s continued development outside of the case boundaries (his parents had since divorced; he now lived alone but appeared generally happy and healthy). Moreover, it enables Freud to vindicate his psychoanalytic treatment in spite of the ‘indignation’ that his case had excited:

a most evil future had been foretold for the poor little boy, because he had been ‘robbed of his innocence’ at such a tender age and had been made the victim of a psycho-analysis.

But none of these apprehensions had come true. (X, p. 148)

The language of myth and fairy tale is again employed in juxtaposing the supposedly ‘evil’ consequences of psychoanalysis with the pitiable ‘victim’, relating Hans’s case to the wider practice. Once again the patient’s healthy development as the result of Freud’s treatment conveys a happily-ever-after reality to end the case.

However, Freud follows this neat closure with the following remarks:

One piece of information given me by little Hans struck me as particularly remarkable; nor do I venture to give any explanation of it. When he read his case history, he told me, the whole of it came to him as something unknown; he did not
recognize himself; he could remember nothing; and it was only when he came upon the journey to Gmunden that there dawned on him a kind of glimmering recollection that it might have been he himself that it had happened to. So the analysis had not preserved the events from amnesia, but had been overtaken by amnesia itself. Any one who is familiar with psycho-analysis may occasionally experience something similar in sleep. He will be woken up by a dream, and will decide to analyse it then and there; he will then go to sleep again feeling quite satisfied with the results of his efforts; and next morning dream and analysis will alike be forgotten. (x, pp. 148-49)

Despite the focus throughout the case, as throughout James’s novels, upon the acquisition of understanding, Freud fails to provide an explanation to interpret and elaborate upon Hans’s final remarks, which in themselves demonstrate a lack of awareness on the patient’s part through his amnesia of the whole case. Thus the solid archaeological design is ultimately undermined, as the case itself falls to ‘rubble’ to the patient, reduced to glimmers of recollection and an ultimate lack of recognition. Nevertheless, Freud reverts back to his familiar practice of citing his repertoire of professional experience, extended beyond his personal encounters to those of ‘[a]ny one who is familiar with psycho-analysis’, linking the individual case with the universal experience, even if its reasons cannot be explained. The case cannot be considered a failure since Hans had been cured of his phobia and anxiety, but the postscript compounds the tension between tight (re-)construction and the inevitable muddlement or looseness of life in which both James’s novels and Freud’s case histories are rooted ‘from the germ up’. 149

149 James, quoted in Hocks, p. 50.
BIOGRAPHICAL IMPRESSIONS: FREUD & WOOLF

Over the course of comparisons drawn in the previous chapters it has been noted that Freud’s intention to write science rather than fiction produces differences in his style compared with that of other impressionist authors. I want then, in the present chapter, to explore a different mode of impressionism, which similarly encompasses literary techniques but attempts to sketch the lives of its subjects under the label of biography. While Jesse Matz’s work on modernist impressionism has been fundamental to the theory underlying the previous chapters, Max Saunders extends Matz’s focus on fiction to biography and autobiography in the period. His seminal book Self Impression contains a chapter on ‘Impressionist Autobiographies’, in which he studies the impressionist memoirs of Ford, James and Conrad, and which demonstrates how ‘impressionist representations of subjectivity’ cross generic boundaries and render such distinctions between fiction and life writing ‘particularly hard, if not impossible, to draw’ (p. 261). Impressionism is not confined to a single chapter of Saunders’s substantial study, however; rather, a key aim of the book is to bring ‘auto/biography and auto/biografiction into relation with impressionism’ (p. 13). Thus impressionist principles also underlie Saunders’s chapter on ‘Woolf, Bloomsbury, the “New Biography”, and the New Auto/biografiction’, wherein he describes Woolf as ‘the British modernist whose work represents the most sustained fictionalizing engagement with biography’ and makes explicit connections with ‘the influence of Freud on Bloomsbury’ (p. 20). In the present chapter I pursue such connections, starting with Woolf’s theories of biography, highlighting their impressionistic elements, and demonstrating how Freud’s texts operate under similar principles.
To elaborate upon the instability of the divisions between these genres take, for instance, this oft-cited extract from one of the best-known essays theorising modernist literature:

Examine for a moment an ordinary mind on an ordinary day. The mind receives a myriad impressions — trivial, fantastic, evanescent, or engraved with the sharpness of steel. From all sides they come, an incessant shower of innumerable atoms; and as they fall, as they shape themselves into the life of Monday or Tuesday, the accent falls differently from of old; the moment of importance came not here but there; so that, if a writer were a free man and not a slave, if he could write what he chose, not what he must, if he could base his work upon his own feeling and not upon convention, there would be no plot, no comedy, no tragedy, no love interest or catastrophe in the accepted style, and perhaps not a single button sewn on as the Bond Street tailors would have it. Life is not a series of gig lamps symmetrically arranged; life is a luminous halo, a semi-transparent envelope surrounding us from the beginning of consciousness to the end. Is it not the task of the novelist to convey this varying, this unknown and uncircumscribed spirit, whatever aberration or complexity it may display, with as little mixture of the alien and external as possible?¹

Woolf’s ‘Modern Fiction’ (1925) effectually captures the author’s impressionist tendencies and her advocacy of these qualities in the writing of her contemporaries. Posited as a radical alternative to Victorian and Edwardian materialism, the view of literature here put forth moves away from a focus upon external observable detail, to conceiving the mind as both the subject and object of literature. Like Ford and James, Woolf is concerned with the mind’s reception of ‘a myriad impressions’, which fall in ‘an incessant shower of innumerable atoms’ as James’s germs are floated to the mind, and which are described with all the variance (‘trivial, fantastic, evanescent, or engraved with the sharpness of steel’) of Freud’s dreams. Woolf’s characterisation of ‘life’ as ‘a luminous halo, a semi-transparent envelope surrounding us from the beginning of consciousness to the end’ impressionistically suggests humanity’s immersion within sensory experience and multi-layered ‘complexity’. For Woolf, as for the other authors studied in this thesis, this is not just a style in which literature should

be written; it should be the very subject of modern literature, for which other literary concerns, ‘plot, [...] comedy, [...] tragedy, [...] love interest, [...] catastrophe’, should be discarded.²

As Saunders points out, Woolf’s ‘terms and techniques are the same, whether applied to life-writing or to fiction. [...] The privileging of internal, private, and evanescent impressions over the external, public and regulated markers is her cardinal principle for writing lives, or for writing “life”’.³ The blurring of generic boundaries is also evident when we consider Woolf’s conception of life as art as expressed in ‘Sketch of the Past’: ‘the whole world is a work of art [...] we are parts of the work of art’.⁴ The evanescence of Woolf’s above description of modern fiction, with its ephemeral luminosity and lack of circumscription, facilitates the extension of the authorial purpose across generic boundaries. Like the novelist, it is also the task of the biographer and the psychoanalyst to capture ‘life’, ‘consciousness’, ‘psychology’, ‘with as little mixture of the alien and external as possible’.

The dissolution of the distinction between genres is continued in Woolf’s theoretical writing on biography, as she suggests that this genre mediates between fact (the authoritative doctrine that Freud wished his theoretical contributions to be viewed as) and fiction (the genre which Freud’s work increasingly comes to resemble when one appreciates the literariness of the texts). Woolf’s essays on biography also raise the question of appropriate biographical subjects and suggest that biography should consist of a combination of seemingly oppositional elements: truth and personality; fact and fiction; action and thought; biography

³ Saunders, Self Impression, p. 441.
and autobiography. This paradoxical complexity mirrors that which should be evoked in the biographical and fictional subject and introduces greater scope for the subjectivity of impressions than formerly established biographical modes would allow (or, at least, acknowledge).

In essays such as ‘The New Biography’ (1927) and ‘The Art of Biography’ (1939), Woolf differentiates modern biography from the former style of Victorian biography, embodied for instance in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, edited for a time by her father, in the same way that she differentiates modern fiction from its materialist predecessors. It seems to be this earlier, less authentic mode of biography, which idealised its subjects and focused on major life events, that Freud denounces in a letter to Arnold Zweig in 1936:

To be a biographer you must tie yourself up in lies, concealments, hypocrisies, false colourings, and even in hiding a lack of understanding, for biographical truth is not to be had, and if it were to be had, we could not use it.5

Yet by the time this letter was written Freud had already commended historical/biographical insights and undertaken experimental biographical endeavours of his own. Over the course of this chapter I explore how Woolf’s complex explanations of modern biography correspond with Freud’s intention for his case histories to constitute scientific documents; ideas surrounding transference and countertransference; Freud’s analyses of his own unconscious activity; his choice of subject between patients and important cultural figures such as Leonardo da Vinci and Moses; and his explicit commentary upon biographical records. I discuss a range of Freud’s publications that have bearing upon our understanding of his views towards biography, but focus particularly upon the case history of Ida Bower (Dora), which I

approach as an impressionistic biographical record. Freud himself was aware of the case histories’ similarities to biographies, terming them *pathographies*. Critics have since concurred: Roy Schafer characterises psychoanalysis as a ‘life-historical discipline’; Peter Brooks reads in it the narrative ‘plot’ of a life; Jens Brockmeier describes how ‘[f]or Freud the investigation of life histories and, in particular, of autobiographical accounts was crucial to both psychology and psychopathology’, crediting him with transforming the patient’s life history from ‘medical discourse into the almost literary genre of “case history”’; and Saunders identifies parallels between the case histories and Lytton Strachey’s biographical experiments.

Granite and Rainbow

‘The New Biography’ opens with Woolf’s comparison of biographical elements to granite and rainbow, resonant similes that will colour our impressions of the forms of life-writing over the course of this chapter:

> On the one hand there is truth; on the other there is personality. And if we think of truth as something of granite-like solidity and of personality as something of rainbow-like intangibility and reflect that the aim of biography is to weld these two into one

---


seamless whole, we shall admit that the problem is a stiff one and that we need not wonder if biographers have for the most part failed to solve it.\textsuperscript{8}

This quotation raises numerous points key to Woolf’s theories of biography: the tangible solidity conveyed in the ‘granite-like’ truth is stylistically consistent with Woolf’s identification of objective ‘truth in its hardest, most obdurate form’, derived from ‘research’,\textsuperscript{9} and ‘verified by other people besides the artist’.\textsuperscript{10} Personality, on the other hand, is vibrantly intangible, and may be conveyed not through plainly observable, verifiable details, but through ‘facts as an artist invents them—facts that no one else can verify’; that is to say, impressions.\textsuperscript{11} Technically fictional elements, or components that do not carry direct evidentiary support, may thus offer an impressionistic kind of truth of their own. What differentiates modern biography from modern fiction then is that it strives to create a fuller impression of the subject by combining both the hard truth of fact and research, and the intangible truth of impressionism, whereas fiction is not bound by the former element (though as we have seen the rendering of impressions of the real world plays a significant role in producing convincing impressionist fiction). As suggested in the previous chapter, Freud’s crafted case history texts are limited by actual events and the real lives of his patients, but are also concerned with the intangible, unverifiable unconscious, necessitating his own impressionistic interpretation; he therefore operates under the same restrictions as the modern biographer. Yet Woolf highlights the difficulty of reconciling these elements and achieving adequate balance, and subsequently the scarcity of successful biography.

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
As Ruth Parkin-Gounelas has noted, ‘[i]n the history of the proximity between literary and psychoanalytic discourses,’ Freud’s ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’, or the Dora case history, ‘has acted as the show piece’.\textsuperscript{12} It is therefore unsurprising that we will find many of the amalgamations of Woolf’s conception of modern biography/fiction within the text. The textual history of this particular case demonstrates Freud’s attempts to stress the objective authenticity—the granite-like truth—of his study. Written in 1901, Freud’s case history of Dora was not published until four years later, yet as both Strachey and Freud inform the reader, few changes were apparently made between the initial recording and publication of the narrative. As Strachey observes,

The last section of the ‘Postscript’ (pp. 120 to 122) was certainly added, as well as some passages at least in the ‘Prefatory Remarks’ and certain of the footnotes. But apart from these small additions it is fair to regard the paper as representing Freud’s technical methods and theoretical views at the period immediately after the publication of \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams}.\textsuperscript{13}

Certainly Freud, in his footnote added in 1923, claims that ‘[i]n all essentials, therefore, I have left it as it was, and in the text I have merely corrected a few oversights and inaccuracies’.\textsuperscript{14} These declarations reveal author’s and editor’s concerns with the presentation of an objective, authentic record of Freud and Dora’s therapeutic interactions, and the resultant developments to Freud’s theoretical position at the time.

This claim to granite-like truth is important for the scientific readership of the case history as it is for the reader of biography in contrast to the reader of fiction. We have already witnessed Freud’s lamentation at the neglect of \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams} by a scientific audience, and in the Dora case he similarly explicitly and forcefully maintained the


\textsuperscript{13} In Freud, ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’, VII, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{14} Freud, ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’, VII, p. 13.
importance of his scientific readership. His efforts at anonymising the figures within the case supposedly guard against the interest of ‘a non-medical reader’, and ‘the publication of the case in a purely scientific and technical periodical should, further, afford a guarantee against unauthorized readers of this sort’ (VII, p. 8). Indeed, there are frequent references to the ‘medical’ reader throughout the text. The ‘unauthorized readers’ are those whose intentions in approaching the case history deviate from the purity of scientific and technical interest:

I am aware that—in this city, at least—there are many physicians who (revolting though it may seem) choose to read a case history of this kind not as a contribution to the psycho-pathology of the neuroses, but as a roman a clef designed for their private delectation. I can assure readers of this species that every case history which I may have occasion to publish in the future will be secured against their perspicacity by similar guarantees of secrecy, even though this resolution is bound to put quite extraordinary restrictions upon my choice of material. (VII, p. 9)

Freud’s diatribe against the ‘revolting’ literary reader is characterised by the decadent imagery of ‘private delectation’ in contrast to the intended public intellectual consumption; the ‘species’ is dehumanised, their animalisation suggesting the absence of higher powers of critical thought and reasoning. Saunders marks out the roman à clef as the most direct fictionalisation of biography, noting that

[i]n its purest form, one might say that only the names of the characters have been changed. If one changed them back to the real names of the original people, it would no longer be a roman at all, but biography, or autobiography. But of course novelists change more than just the names, and even a roman à clef might include invented episodes and speeches.\(^{15}\)

Freud’s identification of the case history with the roman à clef genre thus places it on the very cusp of the biographical/novelistic boundary, asserting his own resistance to the literary leaning while simultaneously acknowledging its tendency to be read in such a light. Yet it is questionable whether Freud’s ‘guarantees of secrecy’ would really discourage the novelistic

\(^{15}\) Saunders, *Self Impression*, p. 8.
reader, since the pseudonymic disguising of characters does not discourage the readers of the
roman à clef, and would be of no consequence to those embracing the text as a fictitious
construction containing invented characters, as opposed to a factual account of the lives of
contemporary individuals. Rather, the ‘secrecy’ adds to the intrigue of the text and piques the
interest of potential literary readers. Nevertheless, Freud’s denunciation of the novelistic
reading of his text stresses its claim to scientific application, thus distinguishing it from the
impressionist fiction discussed in previous chapters and aligning it instead with biography,
which as a genre is similarly governed by the aspiration to factuality and verifiability.

However, modern impressionist biography acknowledges the place of the subjective
impression alongside the granite-like fact, ‘blurring disciplinary distinctions’ as Matz informs
us that the impression is wont to do.\textsuperscript{16} Throughout the case Freud uses technical terminology
to produce a text appropriate to his medical readership.\textsuperscript{17} Moreover, he declares that such
frank, direct language is vital to the successful conduction of treatment: it should appease the
‘scandalized’ (VII, p. 49) ‘astonishment and horror’ of even the ‘medical reader’ (VII, p. 48) at
his sexual subject matter, and deter the ‘envy’ of readers expecting ‘titillation’ from sexual
discourse as part of the ‘therapeutic method’ (VII, p. 49). Comparing himself to a
gynaecologist, Freud argues that

[t]he best way of speaking about such things is to be dry and direct […]. I call bodily
organs and processes by their technical names, and I tell these to the patient if they—
the names, I mean—happen to be unknown to her. \textit{J’appelle un chat un chat.} (VII, p.
48)

Yet the summative epigram, rendered in French, is distinct from the medical terminology and
technical vocabulary employed elsewhere. It comprises a ‘deliberately lewd pun’, since

\textsuperscript{16} Matz, \textit{Literary Impressionism}, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{17} See, for example, Freud, ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’, VII, pp. 21, 22, 52.
*chatte* is a common slang term for vagina in French; thus while Freud claims to use the ‘technical names’, he also makes a joke about using slang.\(^\text{18}\) In a similarly literary vein, Freud alludes to the ‘temptation of writing a satire upon’ the readers who recoil from his sexual discourse (vii, p. 49) and finishes his critical interjection with an anecdotal reference to his satisfaction at hearing his patients exclaim: ‘Why, after all, your treatment is far more respectable than Mr X.’s conversation!’ (vii, p. 49). In discussing his ‘direct’ language, Freud utilises indirect, figurative discourse which mystifies his unconscious subject matter and leaves the reader removed from the patient. This creeping-in of the literary to the intended scientific text is suggestive of the amalgamation of granite and rainbow in Woolf’s impressionistic conception of biography. Indeed, such an amalgamation can be interpreted as a blending of fact and fiction, which we see Freud enact in many ways.

Despite the drive towards granite-like authenticity, the very nature of Freud’s professional analysis undermines the objective authenticity of his records and necessitates his impressionism, though he took pains to convince the reader otherwise. He concurrently treated multiple patients and acknowledged that the physician ‘cannot make notes during the actual sessions with the patient for fear of shaking the patient’s confidence and of disturbing his own view of the material under observation’ (vii, p. 9). However, the confidentiality of the therapy means that the contents of the sessions resist verification from external sources, and thus the ‘granite-like solidity’ of the piece is also challenged. Similarly, Richard Ellmann observes that ‘Freud himself was not inhibited by scarcity of documents or oral histories’, the kinds of evidentiary sources utilised in traditional forms of biography; rather, he often relied on occasional details as the limited origins of substantial biographical interpretations—much

as we witnessed James and Freud elaborating upon germs and hints in the previous chapter.\textsuperscript{19} Indeed, ‘paucity of information may even be an advantage, because it frees the mind for conjecture’\textsuperscript{20}—much as James ‘liked a hint of something’ in order to initiate his impressionistic creations.\textsuperscript{21} Such conjecture is key to the impressionist nature of modern biography. Moreover, given the heightened significance of fantasy acknowledged in the psychoanalytic context (it does not matter whether we witnessed the primal scene or imagined we did), Ellmann perceives that ‘[w]e live among feelings, to which facts may or may not adhere. Biographers have never felt so free of the necessity of distinguishing fact from fantasy’.\textsuperscript{22} Verifying interpretations based upon unconscious material is also a contentious issue, as we will see below.

The best that Freud can hope is to evoke the authenticity of the theories developed as a result of the treatment of the particular patient, that they may be corroborated by others in the field. Consequently, ‘the wording of’ Dora’s two key dreams, which form structural divisions within the text, ‘was recorded immediately after the session[s]’ in which they were related (\textit{VII}, p. 10). Freud claims that ‘they thus afforded a secure point of attachment for the chain of interpretations and recollections which proceeded from them’, due to the short temporal distance between reception and recording, yet after potential hours of subsequent discussion with the patient one questions whether Freud would have perfectly recalled the specific ‘wording’ (\textit{VII}, p. 10). The material surrounding the dream records is even further removed:

\textsuperscript{20} Ellmann, ‘Freud and Literary Biography’, p. 474.
\textsuperscript{21} Tóibín, p. xi.
\textsuperscript{22} Ellmann, ‘Freud and Literary Biography’, p. 470.
The case history itself was only committed to writing from memory after the treatment was at an end, but while my recollection of the case was still fresh and was heightened by my interest in its publication. Thus the record is not absolutely—phonographically—exact, but it can claim to possess a high degree of trustworthiness. Nothing of any importance has been altered in it except in some places the order in which the explanations are given; and this has been done for the sake of presenting the case in a more connected form. (VII, p. 10)

Freud’s disclaimer contradicitorily begins by emphasising the importance of the ‘wording’ of Dora’s dreams and of phonographic exactness, but attempts to mediate the significance of his failure to create such a record with regards to the wider case history by attesting that it is nonetheless trustworthy. As the analysis below demonstrates, lexical choices are highly significant within the case, and indeed are treated as such in other areas of psychoanalytic theory, such as in discussions of jokes and parapraxes. Moreover, despite Freud’s efforts to record case material as soon as possible in order to render a reliable account, there are numerous factual errors to be found within the case history, such as Freud’s recurrent mistaking of Dora’s age and the dates of the treatment.23 The case thus increasingly becomes discernible as an impressionistic document, rather than a record of strict factual accuracy.

Moreover, the necessary act of interpretation by Freud highlights the fictionalisation of patient narratives as they are conveyed from analysand to analyst, as various defence mechanisms distort content. In the case of the Rat Man, for instance, Freud immediately identifies Lanzer’s ‘delusion’ that ‘his parents knew his thoughts because he spoke them out loud without his hearing himself do it’.24 Similarly, Freud develops his theories of screen memories in a footnote to the Rat Man case. He cautions that

we must above all bear in mind that people’s ‘childhood memories’ are only consolidated at a later period […]; and that this involves a complicated process of

23 See Strachey’s Editor’s Note in Freud, ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’, VII, p. 5.
remodelling, analogous in every way to the process by which a nation constructs legends about its early history. (x, p. 206)

The likening to a fallacy of detached historical authenticity here highlights the difficulty of the biographical task in providing an authentic account of the subject, when the subject’s own account of their past is impressionistic rather than objective. Freud’s interpretive adaptations of his patients’ narratives in order to form more cohesive and complete narratives further removes the reader from an organic account of the treatment.

Woolf acknowledges that ‘it is easier’ to convey truth and personality ‘by considering that the true life of your subject shows itself in action which is evident rather than in that inner life of thought and emotion which meanders darkly and obscurely through the hidden channels of the soul’.25 Prior to 1800, Woolf argues, biographers favoured this ‘easier’ method for various reasons: observable actions are the more easily verified; they are the more readily available to the biographic enquirer; and the tradition of biography, epitomised by examples such as the Dictionary of National Biography, placed greater emphasis on major life events as constituting the subject. Such an approach is explicitly denounced by Woolf, and is mocked in her own quasi-biographical account of Vita Sackville-West, *Orlando* (1928):-

26 Though it contains biographical elements, *Orlando* is predominantly a fictional form, a novel rather than biography in the stricter sense, despite its subtitle of ‘A Biography’; though, as Hermione Lee notes, this led to the text ‘being placed on the biography shelves of bookshops, so advance sales were poor’. Hermione Lee, *Virginia Woolf* (London: Vintage, 1997), p. 516. See Saunders’s chapter on Woolf in *Self Impression* (pp. 438-83) for a fuller account of the blending of biography, autobiography and fiction within *Orlando*. 

If only subjects, we might complain (for our patience is wearing thin), had more consideration for their biographers! What is more irritating than to see one’s subject, on whom one has lavished so much time and trouble, slipping out of one’s grasp altogether and indulging—witness her sighs and gasps, her flushing and palings, her
eyes now bright as lamps, now haggard as dawns—what is more humiliating than to see all this dumb show of emotion and excitement gone through before our eyes when we know that what causes it—thought and imagination—are of no importance whatsoever?27

The passage parodies the formerly dominant biographical approach through the attitude of Orlando’s narrator, whose discomfort at Orlando’s rejection of expected outward activity is evidenced by his exclamation; his anacoluthic self-interruption; his rhetorical question.

Over the course of the nineteenth century, Woolf observes, biography began ‘to express not only the outer life of work and activity but the inner life of emotion and thought’,28 corresponding with impressionism’s interest in both outward sensory perception and inward self-perception. This transition is mirrored in Orlando’s conclusion, the time period having shifted to the then-present day, which conveys a sense of Orlando’s interiority through the stream-of-consciousness style familiar to readers of Woolf’s fiction. This representation of Orlando’s pursuit of her various selves during her fast-paced car journey mirrors the more modern form of biography which places a greater emphasis upon consciousness than action, and acknowledges the fallacy of a single cohesive identity in favour of a fragmented and dynamic conception of multiple selves. Woolf observes that practitioners of the ‘new school’ of biography like Harold Nicholson ‘maintain that the man himself, the pith and essence of his character, shows itself to the observant eye in the tone of a voice, the turn of a head, some little phrase or anecdote picked up in passing’.29 The phrase strikingly resembles Freud’s discussion of the process of uncovering the unconscious during his analysis of Dora’s first dream:

When I set myself the task of bringing to light what human beings keep hidden within them, [...] by observing what they say and what they show, I thought the task was a harder one than it really is. He that has eyes to see and ears to hear may convince himself that no mortal can keep a secret. [p. 78] If his lips are silent, he chatters with his finger-tips; betrayal oozes out of him at every pore. And thus the task of making conscious the most hidden recesses of the mind is one which it is quite possible to accomplish. (vii, pp. 77-78)

Framed by the claim to technical simplicity, Freud develops the epigram of the everyman’s exposure through the onomatopoeic ‘chatter’ and ‘oozes’, which betray the sounds he wishes to keep hidden. Both Woolf and Freud dissociate the physical components that comprise their subjects so as to draw attention to the necessity of attending to the minute and obscure details in order to illuminate the more intangible qualities of thought and emotion that constitute personality; these may manifest in outward actions but are subtle and require careful observation and interpretation. As Woolf wrote in her experimental novel Jacob’s Room (1922), 30 ‘[o]ne must follow hints, not exactly what is said, nor yet entirely what is done’. 31 In other words, one must formulate an impression.

This scenario of the biographic endeavour is strikingly resembled in the practice of analysis and the ensuing patient case histories, which combine outwardly observable behaviour or information received directly (autobiographically) from the subject, with analytic elaborations upon this information that reveal unconscious content of which the subject is unaware or unable to express. For example, Freud’s published account of the Little Hans case is constructed around observations of the child’s behaviour made by his father, such as his fear of horses and his preoccupation with excrement. As we saw in the previous

30 In another blending of fiction and biography, Jacob’s Room is often viewed, according to Rachel Bowlby, as ‘debunking [...] the ideals of Victorian biography’. From Bowlby’s Introduction to Virginia Woolf, Orlando: A Biography, ed. by Rachel Bowlby, Oxford World’s Classics, Reissued (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. xxii.

chapter, Freud is able to identify psychoanalytic processes at work behind these behaviours, such as the work of defence mechanisms and infantile sexuality, which give us a fuller, more dynamic appreciation of the subject. Moreover, Freud also argues that the process of analysis may draw out characteristics of the subject that may be displayed only subtly in their daily life:

Peculiarities in [the patient] which he had seemed to possess only to a modest degree are often brought to light in surprisingly increased intensity, or attitudes reveal themselves in him which had not been betrayed in other relations of life.\(^{32}\)

In various ways then, the process of psychoanalysis reveals personality to a greater degree than mere observation: outwardly verifiable actions and conscious thoughts are only a partial representation of the subject, whereas the analyst becomes akin to the artist of Woolf’s conception by revealing formerly unconscious material. As Richard Ellmann states, the modern biographer following Freud ‘conceives of himself not as outside but as inside the subject’s mind, not as observing but as ferreting’.\(^{33}\) This more active role leads to the formulation of impressions, rather than the simple recording of observations.

In a more overt amalgamation of granite and rainbow, fact and fiction, Freud’s style in the Dora case history—amongst the examples of and claims to scientific—is in many ways literary.\(^{34}\) As Laura Marcus suggests, for Freud, ‘[t]he “literary” or poetic […] can represent both the undoing of any claims to scientific or historical status, or it can stand for


unimpeachable cultural value, making, and substantiating, its own claims to historicity and truth’.  

Thus, as Marcus notes, at times we see Freud calling upon poetical inspiration and technique, as in this quotation from *Studies on Hysteria*:

> The fact is that local diagnosis and electrical reactions lead nowhere in the study of hysteria, whereas a detailed description of mental processes such as we are accustomed to find in the works of imaginative writers enables me, with the use of a few psychological formulas, to obtain at least some kind of insight into the course of that affection.

Elsewhere, however, he attempts to distance himself from such a literary position in order to depict ‘the world of reality’. Literary allusions abound in the Dora case, and tropes and analogies often lead the style away from concrete, literal terms. The alignment of psycho-biographical records and fictional accounts is also enhanced through the dissolution of the distinction between patient and fictional character. Woolf writes of her time:

> it would seem that the life which is increasingly real to us is the fictitious life […]. Each of us is more Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, than he is John Smith of the Corn Exchange. Thus, the biographer’s imagination is always being stimulated to use the novelist’s art of arrangement, suggestion, dramatic effect to expound the private life.

Freud’s use of literary techniques thus reflects the tone of self-identification with the fictional distinguished by Woolf here. Freud uses literature to develop and support his psychoanalytic theories, enforcing his sentiments that ‘[t]he poets and philosophers before me discovered the unconscious’, and that ‘our best source of knowledge’ about the methods of creative writers

---

lies in ‘the victims of nervous illness, who are obliged to tell their fantasies, among other things, to the doctor by whom they expect to be cured by mental treatment’.  

The amalgamation of patient and character narratives accounts for the instances of literary theory and criticism which are abundant within Freud’s texts, and influence the way in which we receive his own literariness. In one form of psychoanalytic literary criticism practiced in his texts, Freud seeks to psychoanalyse the author/artist via their works, as in his studies of Wilhelm Jensen (1907 [1906]), Leonardo da Vinci (1910), and Michelangelo (1914). In other instances, Freud focuses his analysis upon key characters, transposing onto literary texts the methods of decoding symbols and deciphering latent from manifest content, outlined in The Interpretation of Dreams. Thus, for Freud, Lady Macbeth epitomises ‘Those Wrecked by Success’; E. T. A. Hoffmann’s ‘The Sandman’ evidences the concept of the uncanny; and Hamlet, foreshadowing Woolf’s observation of psychological identification noted above, is a classic example of the defence mechanism of repression and the Oedipus complex, a concept itself derived from Sophocles’s Oedipus Rex. The symbolism involved in Woolf’s construction of character enacts a similar practice: reflecting upon the character of Mrs Brown in ‘Character in Fiction’ (1924), Woolf deduces that ‘[s]he popped in and out of the room, perching on the edges of chairs, picking meals out of saucers indulging in long,

40 Freud, ‘Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming’, IX, p. 146.
silent stares. The caterpillars and the oak trees seemed to imply all that’. Mrs Brown’s peculiar behaviour is condensed in the symbols of the caterpillars and oak trees that Woolf interprets. Such identification between patients and characters facilitates the impressionistic fictionalisation in the writing of lives.

Yet since Freud’s case history accounts are intended as pathographies rather than purely fictional narratives, Freud must temper the impressionistic fictionality of the texts in spite of his evident concern with the literary and his own practice of figurative language and literary techniques in documents such as the Dora case. This leads him at times to explicitly distance himself from literary pursuits:

I must now turn to consider a further complication to which I should certainly give no space if I were a man of letters engaged upon the creation of a mental state like this for a short story, instead of being a medical man engaged upon its dissection. The element to which I must now allude can only serve to obscure and efface the outlines of the fine poetic conflict which we have been able to ascribe to Dora. This element would rightly fall a sacrifice to the censorship of a writer, for he, after all, simplifies and abstracts when he appears in the character of a psychologist. But in the world of reality, which I am trying to depict here, a complication of motives, as accumulation and conjunction of mental activities—in a word, overdetermination—is the rule.

Freud’s charge that the literary ‘writer’ merely ‘simplifies and abstracts’, and as such is at odds with the overdetermined reality of their subjects, supplements our understanding of his explicit disavowal of the literary here. He intends psychoanalysis to endure as a science, not an art, so must emphasise the accuracy (in all its potentially inelegant complexity), rather than the creativity of his record. The generic conventions of impressionist biography impose

---

44 *Freud, ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’,* VII, pp. 59-60
similar restrictions. When the first-person narrator of Woolf’s short story, ‘An Unwritten Novel’ (1920), misinterprets her travelling companion’s situation in a scene suggestive of Woolf’s impressionistic account of Mrs Brown, the story itself is not diminished by the mistake. Rather, the narrator’s enthralled pursuit of the ‘mysterious figures’ foreshadows the doctrine of ‘Character in Fiction’ and the imaginative act of conveying only personality is sufficient. Such would not be the case had the tale sought to constitute biography or case history, since ‘[t]he biographer is bound by facts’, as is the analyst.

Freud’s attempts to distance the Dora case history from fiction and attest its authenticity serve the aims cited as his motivations for publication: in addition to his immediate intentions of the treatment for Dora herself, to alleviate her symptoms and repair gaps in her memory, publishing the case would fulfil Freud’s ‘duty’ (emphasised through appearances as plce and polyptoton throughout the paragraph in his Prefatory Remarks, VII, pp. 7-8), ‘not only towards the individual patient but towards science as well’, and by implication ‘towards the many other patients who are suffering or will one day suffer from the same disorder’ (VII, p. 8). Freud’s defiant and impassioned rhetoric, in which he purports to avoid a ‘disgraceful piece of cowardice’ by choosing to publish the case in spite of anticipated criticisms against his alleged ‘betrayal’ of the patient, strives to undermine the charges of critics from the offset and align the reader with both the case history as published document and with its theoretical contents (VII, p. 8). Freud writes that the publication was intended to supplement my book on the interpretation of dreams by showing how an art, which would otherwise be useless, can be turned to account for the discovery of the hidden and repressed parts of mental life. […] In the second place, I wished to stimulate interest in a whole group of phenomena of which science is still in complete ignorance.

---

48 Freud, ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’, VII, p. 18
to-day because they can only be brought to light by the use of this particular method. (VII, p. 114)

Psychoanalysis thus redeems symbolic interpretations from an autotelic fate in much the same way that Freud uses literary techniques to elucidate psychological principles within the case history.

To fulfil the aim of supplementing his previous publication, Freud refers the reader to *The Interpretation of Dreams* on a number of occasions throughout the text.\(^4^9\) Indeed, his Prefatory Remarks establish that since this case history presupposes a knowledge of the interpretation of dreams, it will seem highly unsatisfactory to any reader to whom this presupposition does not apply. Such a reader will find only bewilderment in these pages instead of the enlightenment he is in search of, and he will certainly be inclined to project the cause of his bewilderment on to the author and to pronounce his views fantastic. (VII, p. 11)

Freud not only alludes to, but quotes from his previous publication at length, for instance to elaborate his interpretation of Dora’s first dream, justifying his decision to quote his previous comments ‘here as they stand for I have nothing to add to them, and the analysis of this dream of Dora’s proves afresh that the facts are as I have supposed’ (VII, p. 87). Intertextual theoretical consistency strengthens Freud’s claim to fact, while his statement also concedes the interpretive nature of these so-called facts, which were initially ‘supposed’ rather than acquired through scientific methods. In Woolf’s terms, we thus see Freud attempting to move from the impressionistic ‘facts as an artist invents them--facts that no one else can verify’,\(^5^0\) to granite-like ‘truth in its hardest, most obdurate form’.\(^5^1\) In addition to promoting his previous text, such self-referential declarations by Freud shift the blame for an unfavourable reception of the current case from the author to the reader. Such hostility to the reader is

---

\(^{49}\) Freud, ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’, vii, pp. 56, 67, 85, 97, 100

\(^{50}\) Woolf, ‘The Art of Biography’, p. 120.

echoed in Freud’s letter to Fleiss, in which Freud wrote that the Dora case ‘is the most subtle thing I have yet written and will produce an even more horrifying effect than usual. One does one’s duty, however, and what one writes is not for the passing day’.\textsuperscript{52} The textual subtlety is thus associated with the endurance of the publication beyond the scope of contemporary audiences, whose horrified reactions attest not to the content of the case, but to their own limitations as readers.\textsuperscript{53}

Freud’s commitments to the individual patient and the development of psychoanalytic theory for the advancement of science manifest as he fluctuates between references to the general and specific. For instance, his frequent use of antonomasia in ambiguously referring to ‘the patient’ obscures whether he refers to Dora or to the general everyman patient, encompassing all those who ‘will one day suffer’ (\textit{VII}, p. 8). He switches between these broader references to specifically elaborating the situation ‘[i]n Dora’s case’ (\textit{VII}, p. 46). These transitions, while frequent, are not always seamless; as Freud recognises, they interrupt the narrative flow of Dora’s case history: ‘At this point I shall interrupt my report of the analysis in order to compare this small piece of dream-interpretation with the general statements I have made upon the mechanism of the formation of dreams’ (\textit{VII}, p. 67). There are theoretical digressions from the material of the specific case into subjects such as somatic compliance in hysteria (\textit{VII}, p. 41), childhood theory (\textit{VII}, p. 80), and neurotics (\textit{VII}, p. 110). At times, this theoretical discussion informs Freud’s diagnosis and treatment of Dora’s own symptoms, as in ‘[l]et us now apply our theory to the instance provided by Dora’s case’ (\textit{VII}, p. 55). On other occasions Freud identifies the conformity of Dora’s case to existing knowledge in the field, upon such subjects as hysteria and dream interpretation: ‘This is quite

\textsuperscript{52} Freud, Letter 140, January 25 1901\textsuperscript{,} to Fleiss; cited in Strachey’s Editor’s Note, to Freud, ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’, \textit{VII}, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{53} Parkin-Gounelas (p. 143) also suggests Freud’s pride in the subtlety of his literary renderings in this statement.
a typical example’ (VII, p. 102). Sometimes the divergence from specific to general (conveniently) obscures the technical analytic process between Freud and Dora, so that the application of Freud’s conclusions avoids interrogation by the reader: ‘I will pass over the details which showed how entirely correct all of this was, and I will instead add a few general remarks upon the part played in hysteria by the motives of illness’ (VII, p. 42). These various transitions demonstrate the connections between individual patient and the wider human condition which, as argued in the previous chapter of this thesis, makes the former appealing to Freud as the subject of extended textual accounts; but they also reflect the tension between Freud’s duties towards the individual patient and the scientific community.

Aware of the weight that theoretical continuity lends to his case history interpretations, Freud explicitly tackles the challenges of the application of his case findings to the wider theoretical milieu so as to anticipate and seemingly counter the charge of unfounded generalisations from an incredibly small sample:

Am I now going to assert that in every instance in which there are periodical attacks of aphonia we are to diagnose the existence of a loved person who is at times away from the patient? Nothing could be further from my intention. The determination of Dora’s symptoms is far too specific for it to be possible to expect a frequent recurrence of the same accidental aetiology. But, if so, what is the value of our elucidation of the aphonia in the present case? Have we not merely allowed ourselves to become the victims of a jeu d’esprit? I think not. (VII, p. 40)

In a construction of parallelism, rhetorical questions upon the wider application of case findings are followed by short, sharp replies in the negative, Freud’s acknowledgement and denial of inappropriate generalisation in quick succession. Also found within this denial is a further disavowal of autotelic literary pursuits, as Freud protects himself and his readers from becoming ‘victims’ of a flight of fancy; they are, rather, co-investigators of an important psychological malady.
In addition to the theoretical continuity which Freud used to strengthen his arguments, the pressure faced by biographer and analyst to create credible, verifiable accounts of their subjects leads the authors to use sources within their studies as grounds for their various forms of elaboration of personality. As mentioned above, the role of these sources was diminished in comparison to the forms of biography which preceded Woolf’s and Freud’s endeavours, but they nonetheless played their parts.\textsuperscript{54} Like Freud’s use of literary sources discussed above, Woolf frequently uses letters and historical documents, and includes photographs of Vita Sackville-West in \textit{Orlando}. In ‘Leonardo da Vinci’, Freud refers to what Abigail Gillman terms ‘cryptic memory texts—a childhood memory, a shopping list, the late paintings, and a diary entry—[…] to solve different parts of the puzzle’ that is da Vinci’s regression.\textsuperscript{55} Likewise, Freud’s practice of art criticism in ‘The Moses of Michelangelo’ evidences the physical sculpture and even reproduces sketches of the process of the tablet slipping and being regained, which Freud envisages.\textsuperscript{56} Freud’s case history of Sergei Pankejeff, the ‘Wolf Man’ (1918 [1914]), involves interpretation not only of free associative discussion with Pankejeff, but also of his artwork, diary records, and recourse to literary sources such as fairy tales.\textsuperscript{57} In her exploration of Freud’s engagement with modernist themes of entanglement and the dissolution of the self alongside James, Woolf, and Joyce, Maud Ellmann argues that the resurgence of the primal scene in Woolf’s \textit{To the Lighthouse} and Freud’s Wolf Man case history was manifested in Lily Briscoe’s painting and Pankejeff’s paintings and dreams respectively, which leave ‘a gap that generates the impulse to make

\textsuperscript{54} Ellmann, ‘Freud and Literary Biography’, p. 467.
\textsuperscript{55} Gillman, p. 31.
further scenes, whose frozen images disrupt the continuity of narrative. Accordingly, the over-determined images—the sources—are just as important, if not more so, than the narratives.

Similarly, Woolf and Freud both make use of various textual apparatus within their ‘biographies’, from footnotes and prefaces to forewords, introductions, appendices and indexes, in order to enhance the impression of truth, authority and authenticity in their accounts. Despite its necessarily fictional depiction and dependence on artistic interpretation and invention (the subject is, after all, a dog) Woolf’s *Flush* (1933) consciously, if playfully, attempts to counter the reader’s resistances to a biographical classification of the tale by presenting them with evidentiary support: the section titled ‘Authorities’ paradoxically claims that ‘[i]t must be admitted that there are very few authorities for the foregoing biography. But the reader who would like to check the facts or pursue the subject further is referred to’ a host of sources, including poems by Elizabeth Barrett Browning, letters between numerous correspondents, and a source of historical context. There are also notes by Woolf to be found over the course of the text. Similarly, Freud frequently employed footnotes referring the reader to other of his publications in which the topic at hand was addressed, as in the references to *The Interpretation of Dreams* in the Dora case, discussed above, which simultaneously credit both works under reference by demonstrating the internal consistency of interlinking psychoanalytical theories. Alternatively, Freud was also accustomed to qualifying previous theories and studies by adding footnotes or other supplementary material after the initial composition or publication. In his case history of Paul Schreber, published in 1911, for example, he adds a postscript read later that year before the Third International
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Psycho-Analytical Congress and published at the beginning of 1912. This supplement claims to further elaborate the case history as Freud experienced a ‘chance acquisition of knowledge’ following its publication. Whether of a corrective or confirmative nature, supplementary material such as this serves to demonstrate the author’s dedication to authenticity and accuracy.

Over the course of this section we have seen how Freud consciously ‘manoeuvres’ between the scientific and literary as he deems appropriate, in an effort to combine the verifiable and impressionistic kinds of truth discerned by Woolf in modern biography. However, a conscious effort to manoeuvre does not necessarily imply a successful negotiation. Woolf cites Lytton Strachey’s biography of Queen Elizabeth, Elizabeth and Essex (1928) as a prime example of an imbalance of truth and fiction in which the dominance of fiction undermines the attempt at representing the subject. Freud, however, differed from Woolf in his opinion of Elizabeth and Essex and wrote to Strachey to commend him upon the success of this biography:

This time you have moved me more deeply, for you yourself have reached greater depths. […] As a historian, then, you show that you are steeped in the spirit of psychoanalysis. […] you have known how to trace her character to the impressions of her childhood. You have touched upon her most hidden motives with equal boldness and discretion.

It is clear that in order to be successful, biography must balance the more intangible elements of personality with clear elements of truth if it is to carry credibility with its readers, yet

60 See Strachey’s Editor’s Note (pp. 3-4) in Freud, ‘Notes on a Case of Paranoia’, XII
61 Freud, ‘Notes on a Case of Paranoia’, XII, p. 80.
opinions regarding the exact measurements discerned to produce such balance differ between the authors. Notably Freud, the self-identifying scientist, commends the account by Lytton Strachey deemed an intangible failure by Woolf.

**Biography and Autobiography**

In addition to the amalgamation of granite and rainbow, Woolf also explores the modern combination of biography and autobiography, highlighting another sense in which the author’s (biographer’s or analyst’s) impressions shape the life narratives they present and further facilitating the dissolution of disciplinary boundaries. Woolf did not write a full autobiography of her own life, though autobiographical fragments are collected in the posthumously published *Moments of Being*, including ‘Sketch of the Past’, which, as Hermione Less describes, ‘begins what might have been a full-scale autobiography, had she lived’.65 Rather, Woolf’s generic experimentations saw her incorporate autobiographical material into other outlets, as critics such as Lee, Maud Ellmann, Julia Briggs, Max Saunders, and Elizabeth Abel have fruitfully explored.66 Woolf’s essays on biography and fiction offer explicit commentary upon the place of autobiography within these literary modes, while Lee argues that ‘*Moments of Being* is an evolving narrative about the process of life writing’.67 For the reader searching for an autobiographical depiction of Freud within his own psychoanalytic texts, there are explicit, self-conscious examples, such as ‘An Autobiographical Study’. This text, however, resembles earlier styles of biography that focus less on the intimacies of the individual’s private life, prioritising instead the more detached development of Freud’s career. On the other hand, Trilling argues (if too narrowly) that ‘the
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67 Lee, in *Moments of Being*, p. xiii.
basic history of psychoanalysis is the account of how it grew in Freud’s own mind, for Freud
developed its concepts all by himself. George W. Henry draws on Freud’s own
biographical and pathological development as a driving force behind his career in
psychoanalysis, attesting that ‘[h]is psychoanalytic writings are a record of personal
disabilities and efforts to overcome them. Freudian psychoanalytic doctrine is Freud’s
autobiography’. In *Freud’s Dora*, Patrick Mahony is highly critical of Freud’s treatment of
his patient, interpreting the analyst’s diagnostic interpretations of Dora’s symptoms and
dreams as reflections of Freud’s own personal sickness. Christine Downing argues that ‘[t]he
protagonists of Freud’s case histories become figures in his story’, which we care about only
as Freud’s inspiration, or as ‘characters’ in his writings; ‘Freud’s essays on the Moses of
Michelangelo, on Leonardo and Dostoevski, each reveal his own involvement’, and ‘[t]he
metapsychological essays of Freud’s later years are ultimately related to his “working
through”’ of his painful realisations of the human condition and personal traumas.

As the above scholarly studies suggest, Freud repeatedly drew upon examples of his
own experience in formulating his psychoanalytic theories, leading Laura Marcus to declare
that ‘[t]here is a sense in which psychoanalysis is founded on the work of autobiography’,
and not just that of the patients recounting their own life histories to the analyst. Marcus cites
the examples of Freud’s ‘own dreams, memories and reflections’ in the development of
theories such as screen memory, the Oedipus complex, and repetition-compulsion. A more
substantial source, seminal to the development of theories of the conscious and unconscious
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68 Lionel Trilling, ‘Introduction’, in *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, by Ernest Jones,
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70 Downing, pp. 210-11.
71 Marcus, *Auto/Biographical Discourses*, p. 82.
mind, is identified in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. As discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, the book contains a large proportion of Freud’s own dreams, leading him to bemoan his exposure and vulnerability.\(^2\) This is not the only time that Freud lamented his burden of self-revelation; in his introduction to Ernest Jones’s edited and abridged biography of Freud, Trilling reflects that Freud would have disapproved of the book, since

> [h]e felt that he had already in many passages of his writings divulged enough of his personal life—which, indeed, he later regretted having done—and that he had a right to keep private what remained; the world should get on with making use of his contributions to knowledge and forget about his personality.\(^3\)

*The Interpretation of Dreams* is, as Marcus tells us, ‘held to be Freud’s “true” autobiography’, an act of sustained self-analysis.\(^4\) It can, as Downing suggests, ‘be seen as his own case history’, and due to its literariness (Downing focuses on mythical connections but the argument could easily be extended to encompass the impressionism discussed in the first chapter of this thesis) ‘seem[s] to put into question the conventional distinction between autobiography and fiction’ (p. 227). Saunders describes the book as ‘an inverted autobiography’:

> Whereas autobiographers traditionally take the material of a life and seek a form or pattern with which to interpret it, Freud begins with the concept of interpretation, and seeks the material from his life that will substantiate it.\(^5\)

---


Although *The Interpretation of Dreams* contains the theoretical underpinnings of the Oedipus complex and the infantile roots of the unconscious, which necessarily involve familial dynamics, Freud was not initially conscious of the extent to which the text was also a personal reaction to the death of his father, as discussed in relation to trauma and the ‘close the eyes’ dream in Chapter One. Indeed, it was this dream that prompted the ‘systematic process of self-examination’ that constituted the *Interpretation of Dreams*, yet it figures so briefly and incompletely. As Freud remarked upon discovering the significance of his loss in the book, he then ‘felt unable to obliterate the traces of the experience’. Even in self-referential texts then, the reader may discern more of the author’s autobiography than he had intended to share.

Woolf welcomes the biographical technique epitomised by Harold Nicholson, in which the lines of autobiography and biography, biographer and subjects are blurred:

He is as much the subject of his own irony and observation as they are. [...] Indeed, by the end of the book we realize that the figure which has been most completely and most subtly displayed is that of the author. [...] It is thus, he would seem to say, in the mirrors of our friends, that we chiefly live.  

Max Saunders uses the example of *Orlando* to demonstrate Woolf’s appreciation of such a method in practice:

While the family history and the photographs are of Sackville-West, Orlando’s chief characteristics are Woolf’s too: especially bisexuality and writing. And if Woolf has made Sackville-West up, the result tells us as much about herself. It is also imaginary *self-portraiture: autobiografiction.*
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Moreover, as Saunders notes, ‘[p]sychoanalysis had been finding different terms—“identification”, “love object”, “transference”—for the way in which the mind can swarm with shadow selves of our loved ones’. 80

However, for Freud to appear in the mirror of his patients would be a distortion of his famous dictum that the task of the psychoanalyst was to hold a mirror to the patient. Indeed, there are instances when Freud’s autobiographical presence is more problematic, as in the dynamics of countertransference within an analytic setting. For example, Maud Ellmann argues in reference to the case of the ‘Wolf Man’, that ‘both Freud and Brunswick are unreliable narrators, who persistently overlook their countertransferential investments in the case’. 81 Consequently, these countertransferential ‘strategic oversights’ (p. 77) lead Freud to misread the wolf-tree of Pankejef’s dream, which instead of depicting the primal scene itself, Ellmann argues, portrays the residual, unknowable trauma that follows, as does the lighthouse of Woolf’s novel, which ‘functions as the gap of gaps, the totem of the intermittent and interstitial’ (pp. 86-87). Ellmann’s analysis highlights how Woolf’s fiction contains autobiographical elements, reading traces of Woolf’s sexual abuse in To the Lighthouse; but since such manifestations do not constitute misdiagnosis, they are not troublesome, much as creative fiction is not required to be factually accurate. Despite Woolf’s openness to and acknowledgement of the biographer within autobiography, Leon Edel notes that, like Freud, Woolf was also aware of the problems this posed: ‘Virginia Woolf was describing transference when she spoke of “suppression of the self.” She meant suppression of the fiction-making self, for if the biographer indulges in fiction the enterprise is doomed’. 82 Edel’s interpretation of Woolf’s view of autobiography within biography

80 Saunders, Self Impression, p. 480.
81 Ellmann, The Nets of Modernism, p. 73.
resembles the ambivalent relationship between fact and fiction in biography discussed above. Woolf’s stance on autobiography within biography thus resembles Ford’s paradoxical stance on the expression/suppression of the author in impressionist fiction discussed in Chapter One.

Freud had acknowledged the affinity between biographer and psychoanalyst in the context of transference in a letter to the writer Stefan Zweig of 18 May 1936: ‘For with the biographer as with the psychoanalyst we find phenomena which come under the heading of “transference”’. Freud retrospectively acknowledges his transferential position within the Dora case. His presence in this sense is initially muted, subjugated to a footnote in which he anticipates Dora’s termination of the treatment and alludes to it as a result of transference (VII, p. 70). Analysing the components of Dora’s first dream, he writes:

Smoke, of course, fitted in well with fire, but it also showed that the dream had a special relation to myself; for when she used to assert that there was nothing concealed behind this or that, I would often say by way of rejoinder: ‘There can be no smoke without fire!’ Dora objected, however, to such a purely personal interpretation, saying that Herr K. and her father were passionate smokers—as I am too for the matter of that. (VII, p. 73)

From this association Freud concludes ‘that the idea had probably occurred to her one day during a session that she would like to have a kiss from me’ (VII, p. 74). Freud’s identification of himself in Dora’s mind through the associations of the maxim is a ‘personal interpretation’ (or impression) that Dora does not accept, but that Freud maintains, illustrating how he forcefully inserts himself into her story. Moreover, in developing his commentary on transference during the Postscript, Freud suggests that ‘[t]he postponement of recovery or improvement is really only caused by the physician’s own person’ (VII, p. 115), ‘since it is

only after the transference has been resolved that a patient arrives at a sense of conviction of the validity of the connections which have been constructed during the analysis’ (vii, pp. 116-17).\(^8^4\) Freud’s presence is not only affecting how Dora’s symptoms manifest, but is also preventing their resolution.

Freud also finds space within the case history to express Dora’s impact upon him personally, rather than simply her impact upon the development of theoretical advancement in studies of hysteria and neuroses. Take, for instance, this extract from the penultimate paragraph of Freud’s section III:

Her breaking off so unexpectedly, just when my hopes of a successful termination of the treatment were at their highest, and her thus bringing those hopes to nothing—this was an unmistakeable act of vengeance on her part. Her purpose of self-injury also profited by this action. No one who, like me, conjures up the most evil of those half-tamed demons that inhabit the human breast, and seeks to wrestle with them, can expect to come through the struggle unscathed. Might I perhaps have kept the girl under my treatment if I myself had acted a part, if I had exaggerated the importance to me of her staying on, and had shown a warm personal interest in her—a course which, even after allowing for my position as her physician, would have been tantamount to providing her with a substitute for the affection she longed for? I do not know. […] In spite of every theoretical interest and of every endeavour to be of assistance as a physician, I keep the fact in mind that there must be some limits set to the extent to which
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psychological influence may be used, and I respect as one of these limits the patient’s own will and understanding. (VII, p. 109)

Pathos is built throughout the passage, beginning with Freud’s explicit perception of Dora’s emotions and developing to convey his own affect. For example, the abrupt syntactical ending ‘and—came no more’ not only reflects the abrupt ending of the treatment, but also intimates emotion. Freud’s hopes are thwarted by Dora’s ‘vengeance’ and his subsequent despair manifests in the hyperbolic personification of unconscious forces as ‘the most evil of those half-tamed demons’. His identification as the demon-wrestler that does not escape the treatment unscathed presents him as both victim and hero.85 We are discouraged from identifying this figure as a fictional persona in favour of an authentic representation of the analyst by Freud’s maintaining that ‘I have always avoided acting a part, and have contented myself with practising the humbler arts of psychology’ (VII, p. 109). Freud’s earlier reprimand (‘a medical man has no business to indulge in such passionate condemnation’ [VII, p. 49]) is forgotten amongst the affective periphrasis. His rhetorical question muses upon alternative outcomes, but ultimately bitterly accepts the reality of his incomplete case.

A slightly different consideration with regards to autobiography is the extent to which the reader feels that they receive the biographical account through the subject themselves. In her biography Roger Fry (1940), for instance, Woolf makes use of ‘fragments’ of Fry’s personal writings, sometimes in order to draw out brief quotations, at other times to provide accounts of important details of Fry’s life in his own words, as in his record of his momentous childhood garden-experience: ‘it was also the scene of two great emotional experiences, my first passion and my first great disillusion’.86 Diary entries such as those

85 Ernest Jones’s description of Freud’s self-analysis is also couched in heroic terms, stressing for instance his ‘indomitable courage’ and ‘Herculean labour’ in the endeavour. Jones, The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud, I, pp. 319-20.
used by Freud in the Leonardo da Vinci case, or the lengthy quotations from Paul Schreber’s memoirs in ‘Psycho-Analytic Notes on an Autobiographical Account’, are key examples of how the subjects’ own autobiographies are given voice and serve as a basis for the interpretive work of the analyst. In addition, we saw in the previous chapter how Hans’s terms played their part in his case history, and that as a result the patient’s voice was represented even when the first person was not used as the predominant narrative voice; this continues to engage the reader’s assumption that the accounts are authentic.

On the other hand, these autobiographical narratives may be subjugated by more dominant voices—usually belonging to the author. For instance, we saw that Hans’s voice was displaced by his father’s. Similarly, it may be argued that Dora is largely absent from her own case study since we hear her voice far less than Freud’s; even other characters within the family drama, especially Dora’s father, Philip, are at times afforded more input and dialogic space than Dora herself (though still to a far lesser degree than Hans’s father). As Michael Billig notes, the Dora case history ‘presents an early account of this new form of conversation—the psychoanalytic dialogue’, though the conversation is somewhat one-sided. Even when we do receive Dora’s voice seemingly verbatim, as in dialogue with Freud, we are aware that it is not phonographically exact, and that even the dream accounts, which Freud claimed to transcribe immediately after the sessions, may be distorted by faulty memory or motives. This provides a key example of Saunders’s conception of the ‘kinds of disjunction between fact and impression in [impressionist] autobiography—forgetting, evading, and distorting’, though in this case it betrays Freud’s autobiographical presence
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89 Saunders, Self Impression, p. 274; See also Max Saunders, ‘Reflections on Impressionist Autobiography: James, Conrad and Ford’, in Inter-Relations, Conrad, James, Ford and
within an attempt at pathography, the filtration of Dora’s voice through Freud’s, her impressions through his.

The embedded first-person narratives of Dora’s dreams in her own voice are mediated by Freud’s frame narrative. He not only transmits to the reader what Dora has said, but also the ways in which her words were spoken: ‘in accents more appropriate to a lover than to a defeated rival’; ‘more in sorrow than in anger’ (VII, p. 61). As such, he denies the reader the opportunity to form their own judgements about Dora’s statements, instead dictating their meaning. This contradicts the figuration of an engaged impressionistic reader discussed in the previous chapters, prioritising Freud’s impressions and negating ambiguity that would leave the reader space to formulate their own. On the other hand, it is consistent with the idea of Freud reporting the impression of a dream/the report of another’s dream and the building of a narrative architecture mentioned previously. He forms ‘reconstruction[s]’ of Dora’s scenes (VII, p. 30); presents ‘translated’ versions of her dreams (VII, p. 73); and takes control of her voice: ‘You said to yourself, as it were’ (VII, p. 67). Whilst drawing attention to the importance of the particulars of Dora’s expression, as he does elsewhere (VII, p. 65), Freud continues to efface it: ‘Certain details of the way in which she expressed herself (which I pass over here, like most other purely technical parts of the analysis) led me to see that behind this phrase its opposite lay concealed’ (VII, p. 47). Indeed, it is only when Freud’s interpretation diminishes that he, if not the reader, hears more of Dora’s tale: ‘My powers of interpretation were at a low ebb that day; I let her go on talking, and she suddenly recollected that it was Herr K.’s birthday too’ (VII, p. 59). This new information clarifies an ambiguous experience of the patient’s that Freud’s prior interpretive attempts had failed to decipher: ‘And it was
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90 See Freud, ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria’, VII, pp. 64, 94.
then no longer hard to explain why the handsome presents she had on her own birthday a few
days before had given her no pleasure.’

Even when Dora makes a point which Freud seemingly cannot refute he undermines it:

When a patient brings forward a sound and incontestable train of argument during
psycho-analytic treatment, the physician is liable to feel a moment’s embarrassment,
and the patient may take advantage of it by asking: ‘This is all perfectly correct and
true, isn’t it? What do you want to change in now that I’ve told it to you?’ But it soon
becomes evident that the patient is using thoughts of this kind, which the analysis
cannot attack, for the purpose of cloaking others which are anxious to escape from
criticism and from consciousness. (VII, p. 35)

Similarly, when Dora responds to one of Freud’s interpretations of her dream expression with
the phrase ‘I knew you would say that,’ Freud counters ‘[t]hat is to say, you knew that it was
so’, twisting her words and appropriating her voice: ‘You said to yourself: “This man is
persecuting me; he wants to force his way into my room. […]”’ (VII, p. 69). When Freud
encourages Dora to recount her story, he transforms this from free-associative monologue to
dialogue by asking questions, pointing out narrative concurrences and discrepancies, and
interjecting interpretive remarks based upon psychoanalytic theory and practice, all of which
examples feature in the dialogic elaboration of Dora’s second dream (VII, pp. 105-06). Freud
is thus an intrusive narrator that obscures Dora’s voice in a multitude of ways.

The effect of such interruptions is to heighten the sense of fragmentation that we
anticipate even from the titles of Freud’s case histories: ‘Fragment of an Analysis of a Case
of Hysteria’ (Dora); ‘Notes upon a Case of Obsessional Neurosis’; ‘From the History of an
Infantile Neurosis’ (my emphasis). The qualifying removes of these titles imply that any case
history with which we are presented will only constitute an incomplete portion of a
biographical subject. Indeed, as Parkin-Gounelas notes, ‘[w]ith its gaps and fragmentariness,
the Dora case has often been referred to as a classic piece of Modernist narrative’. 91 For instance, we recall Brooks’s association of Freud’s role in the text with ‘one of Henry James’s baffled yet inventive narrators’. 92 Yet despite their fragmentariness Freud nonetheless forms significant impressions of his analytic subjects and associated psychoanalytic theories within these case histories, consistent with Matz’s acknowledgement of the impression as based upon ‘incomplete […] observations that nevertheless convince’. 93 Like Woolf’s conception of the elusive ‘will-o’-the-wisp’ character, the multiple voices of the case histories signal complex, multi-dimensional subjects, those subjects being both the patient and the analyst. 94

Freud’s prefatory remarks about producing a connected narrative, discussed above, highlight the concerns with chronology and fragmentation which permeate the Dora case history. As Parkin-Gounelas explains,

[h]ysteria is about gaps in texts: repressions, amnesias, paramnesias even conscious silences, as Dora’s appear to be. Freud’s description of how he set about putting together his own narrative of the case shows him struggling to assert control, to emphasize his own immunity to such incoherence. (p. 143)

Freud’s initial suggestion that he attempted to introduce cohesion is in tension with his later observation that ‘[i]f I were to begin by giving a full and consistent case history, it would place the reader in a very different situation from that of the medical observer’ (VII, p. 16), since as part of his current analytic technique he allows

the patient himself [to] choose the subject of the day’s work, and in that way I start out from whatever surface his unconscious happens to be presenting to his notice at the
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moment. But on this plan everything that has to do with the clearing-up of a particular symptom emerges piecemeal, woven into various contexts, and distributed over widely separated periods of time. (VII, p. 12)

Contributing to the amnesias which affect the patient is the destruction of connections, ‘and a connection is most surely broken by altering the chronological order of events’ (VII, p. 17). Thus Freud’s very attempts at rendering a ‘connected’ case history signal omissions and amnesias: by cohering the narrative presented to the reader, he fragments and distorts the patient’s chronology. Moreover, attempts to create a cohesive narrative are frequently disrupted by his theoretical excursuses, his lengthy footnotes, and his dialogic interruptions of Dora’s accounts—indeed, Madelon Sprengnether describes Dora as ‘a silent witness to the anxieties and repressions of Freud’s narrative’.95 Far from a ‘full and consistent case history’, his ‘piecemeal’ narrative style thus has more in common with the patient’s.96

This is consistent with Freud’s use of a water analogy in which he compares the first account given to him by the patient of their life and illness, ‘to an unnavigable river whose stream is at one moment choked by masses of rock and at another divided and lost among shallows and sandbanks’ (VII, p. 16). In this metaphor Freud anticipates the ‘stream of consciousness’ style attributed first by May Sinclair to Dorothy Richardson’s *Pointed Roofs*, which became one of modernist literature’s distinguishing features, by acknowledging the fluidity of mental processes.97 Periods of coherence are ‘sure to be followed by another period

---

96 Parkin-Gounelas argues that ‘[i]n accounting so meticulously for its fragmentariness, therefore, Freud could be said to be attempting to forestall criticism of its deeper gaps. The explicit gaps or silences act as a defence, a decoy for the more unconscious ones’ (p. 145).
as to which their communications run dry, leaving gaps unfilled, and riddles unanswered’
(VII, p. 16).

The connections—even the ostensible ones—are for the most part incoherent, and the
sequence of different events is uncertain. Even during the course of their story patients
will repeatedly correct a particular or a date, and then perhaps, after wavering for some
time, return to their first version. (VII, p. 16)

The lexical use of ‘story’ is a significant departure from Freud’s previous denial of the case
as roman à clef, and his observation of ambivalent dates in the patient’s narrative is reflected
in his own erroneous dating of the case. The analyst is thus rendered as both the reader of the
patient’s fragmented, disordered, impressionistic study, and author of his own. As in The
Interpretation of Dreams, his style mirrors his subject.

A coherent narrative within the Dora case history may have been rendered impossible
by the fact of the ‘incomplete analysis’, which consequently ‘cannot enable us to follow the
chronological sequence of the changes in a symptom’s meaning, or to display clearly the
succession and coexistence of its various meanings’ (VII, p. 83). In addition to this impact
upon symptom development, Freud also blames the breaking off of the analysis as the reason
that ‘I am not equally certain at every point of the order in which my conclusions were
reached’ (VII, p. 95). The verisimilitude of the case history as accurate record of the treatment
is thus compromised by Freud’s altered chronology and piecemeal recollections. Indeed, he
impressionistically suggests that ‘I shall present the material produced during the analysis of
this [second] dream in the somewhat haphazard order in which it occurs to my mind’ (VII, p. 95).
On the one hand then, we witness Freud’s characteristically impressionistic acceptance
of incoherence and fragmentation. However on the other hand his unrelenting need to
introduce coherency manifests in his re-presentation of the haphazard remarks in the
extended footnote that delineates the interpreted structure of the second dream (VII, pp. 110-
11), much like the originally-footnoted ‘remarks which may help towards the synthesis of the [first] dream’, which were incorporated into the body of the text in editions after 1924 (VII, p. 88). Such efforts betray an inclination towards the linearity of more conventional realist narrative methods. Conversely, although these footnotes attempt to create coherency through their synthesis, they once again interrupt by drawing the eye of the reader from the body of the text. These contradictory inclinations suggest that Freud is grappling, on the one hand, with the pull towards rationality, coherence and linear narratives that correspond the more readily with his medical training, while on the other he is adhering to the authenticity of his discoveries through the practice of psychoanalysis and experience of this case, in all their irrational, fragmentary effusion.

Certainly there are elements of the case that resemble structural components of conventional narratives. Prior to the postscript, the final section of the second dream analysis resembles a conclusion to the larger case history. The penultimate paragraph of Freud’s section III, discussed above for its affective impact upon the analyst, signals Dora’s departure and the closure of the case: ‘She seemed to be moved; she said good-bye to me very warmly, with the heartiest wishes for the New Year, and—came no more. […] I knew Dora would not come back again’ (VII, p. 109). Yet these conclusive remarks are qualified by the epilogistic postscript. Freud contradicts his earlier certainty that Dora would not return by revealing that ‘Dora came to see me again: to finish her story and to ask for help once more’ (VII, p. 120). After this final brief visit, in which Freud refuses to treat Dora and thus enacts his own revenge, he fulfils the characteristic content of the epilogue by providing subsequent details of Dora’s life:

Years have again gone by since her visit. In the meantime the girl has married, and indeed—unless all the signs mislead me—she has married the young man who came into her associations at the beginning of the analysis of the second dream. Just as the
first dream represented her turning away from the man she loved to her father—that is to say, her flight from life into disease—so the second dream announced that she was about to tear herself free from her father and had been reclaimed once more by the realities of life. (VII, p. 122)

Such a concise, summative ending, in which the various elements of the case history are neatly tied together, is undermined by the footnoted admission included in the editions of 1909, 1912, and 1921, that Freud was in fact mistaken about the identity of Dora’s husband (VII, p. 122). The absence of this footnote in other editions suggests that Freud debated the importance of this information; its omission leaves the reader with a less fragmentary conclusion and greater sense of closure.

From the title of the case to the concluding postscript then, the fragmentary, incomplete nature of the case history is dwelled upon by Freud; it is evidently a source of anguish to the analyst and the reader’s comprehension of this demonstrates how the author of the biographical record becomes the subject of attention, rather than the patient.98 It is in light of the ‘incompleteness of [the] analytic results’ that Freud adopts the mantle of discoverer, recovering

the priceless though mutilated relics of antiquity. I have restored what is missing, taking the best models known to me from other analyses; but, like a conscientious archaeologist, I have not omitted to mention in each case where the authentic parts end and my constructions begin. (VII, p. 12)

Despite this disclaimer, Freud’s narrative often elides whether he is supplementing material or whether it came directly from Dora, yet the confidence of the reader in his conclusions is expected regardless, since he bases them upon ‘the best models […] from other analyses’: ‘Whatever I have brought forward for filling up the gaps’, Freud assures the reader, ‘is based upon other cases which have been more thoroughly analysed’ (VII, p. 85).

Dora’s termination of the treatment is only one of the forms of fragmentation that Freud himself identifies within the history, with others including a ‘kind of incompleteness which I myself have intentionally introduced’ (VII, p. 12) by reproducing only the results, rather than the process, of interpretation, and the fact that the elements of transference ‘did not come up for discussion during the short treatment’ (VII, p. 13). Freud notes that ‘a single case history, even if it were complete and open to no doubt, cannot provide an answer to all the questions arising out of the problem of hysteria’ (VII, p. 13). The implications of this fragmentation are that ‘[t]here are therefore many questions to which I have no solution to offer, or in which I can only rely upon hints and conjectures’ (VII, p. 23). The reader is also exposed to an incomplete record resulting from the withholding of information to protect the identities of Dora and others featured within her narrative, as in Freud’s footnote upon Dora’s surname: ‘Unluckily I cannot give the name and show how well designed it was to indicate something “ambiguous” and “improper”’ (VII, pp. 104-05). Finally, Dora’s own understanding of her case is incomplete because of Freud’s decisions to withhold information from her. His comment that if Dora were to read the case history ‘she will learn nothing from it that she does not already know’ (VII, p. 9), is contradicted by observations such as ‘I was careful not to tell her that […] I too was of the opinion that the offspring of luetics were very specially predisposed to severe neuropsychoses’ (VII, p. 75). Whereas one would expect the subjects of more traditional forms of biography to be familiar with the content upon reading the stories of their own lives, Freud’s impressionistic interpretation of Dora’s case means that there would in fact be points of revelation; she would find therein his own autobiographical mark upon her rendering.

Far from an objective account then, the comingling of biography and autobiography is reflected in the subjectivity of Freud’s approach. Freud’s representation of the Dora case history conveys a sense in which the analyst attacks the patient, putting her on trial for her
‘impossible behaviour’ towards her parents and the K.s, and for prematurely terminating the treatment (vii, p. 26). As Janet Malcolm observes, ‘Freud often conducted himself [in the Dora case] more like a police inspector interrogating a suspect than a doctor helping a patient’.99 Again and again Freud uses the rhetoric of interrogation, denial,100 and confession.101 For instance, he builds the evidence against Dora in points where she does not assent to his verdict/diagnosis, as in the conviction

that she had all these years been in love with Herr K. When I informed her of this conclusion she did not assent to it. [...] Later on, when the quantity of material that had come up made it difficult for her to persist in her denial, she admitted that she might have been in love with Herr K. at B——. (vii, p. 37)

Freud’s resentment of his patient is evident in his delight at using his interpretive facts ‘against her’ (vii, p. 59), his disdain of her ‘wearisome monotony’ (vii, p. 46) and ‘incessant repetition’ (vii, p. 54), his hope that Dora’s father would not take the steps (acknowledging Herr K.’s advances and terminating his affair with Frau K.) that Freud ‘felt quite convinced’ would lead to Dora’s recovery (vii, p. 42), and his derogatory identification of her using the epithet ‘the little “thumb-sucker”’ (vii, p. 74). Furthermore, there is a controlling tone to Freud’s comments on the discussion of sexual subject matter with ‘girls and women’, in which the success of these frank conversations depends upon the analyst’s ability to ‘make them feel convinced that it is unavoidable’, like the gynaecologist who ‘does not hesitate to make them submit to uncovering every possible part of their body’ (my emphasis, vii, p. 48). His manipulative control continues in his observation that ‘[t]he patients themselves are easy

to convince; and there are only too many opportunities of doing so in the course of treatment’ (VII, p. 49).

Whatever the charges levelled against Dora by Freud, he undertakes to prove her guilt, attempting to convince both the reader and Dora herself of the validity of his impressions. To Dora, he aims ‘[t]o prove to you how deeply impressed you were by the governess’s story’ (VII, p. 106); to provide her with ‘the conclusive proof’ of the “‘correctness” of his contentions’ (VII, p. 59). Although he attests that he does not intend to fulfil Philip’s ‘hope that I should “talk” Dora out of her belief that there was something more than a friendship between him and Frau K.’, he certainly attempts to ‘talk’ Dora into his interpretations (VII, p. 109). By aligning himself with his idealised reader (perceptive, but not too critical) throughout the case history, Freud creates the impression that they are reaching the same conclusions with him. Often he uses the collective pronoun ‘we’ to identify himself with the reader and involve them in his interpretation and diagnosis. The use of rhetorical questions is similarly inclusive, inviting the reader’s sentiments upon the matters at hand: ‘Shall we be going astray if we suppose that the situation which formed the façade of the dream was a phantasy of revenge directed against her father?’ (VII, p. 98).

Dora’s denials are undermined by a number of interpretive positions taken by Freud. If she ascribes one meaning to a symbol, he may justify another cause with the concept of ‘overdetermination’ (VII, p. 31). If she reproaches someone else, he suspects self-reproach: ‘All that need be done is to turn back each particular reproach on to the speaker himself’ (VII, p. 35). ‘Analogous’ stories ‘which bring forward something that agrees with the content of an assertion of mine’ are interpreted ‘as a confirmation from the unconscious of what I have said’ (VII, p. 57). ‘[A]n exclamation on the part of the patient of “I didn’t think that”, or “I didn’t think of that” […] can be translated point-blank into: “Yes, I was unconscious of that”’
Freud’s interpretive assertions are based upon his psychoanalytic experience, the extensiveness of which is frequently stressed, and are thus presented as irrefutable: ‘It must, indeed, be so; for I have never yet come through a single psycho-analysis of a man or a woman without having to take into account a very considerable current of homosexuality’ (VII, p. 60); ‘[a] very common way of putting aside a piece of knowledge that emerges from the repressed’ (VII, p. 69); ‘it does so in every case’ (VII, p. 81). Dora’s failure to recognise Freud’s revelations regarding her unconscious conflicts is merely a necessary component of repression, without which ‘the occurrence of the symptom [would not] be made possible at all’ (VII, p. 49).

The ‘No’ uttered by a patient after a repressed thought has been presented to his conscious perception for the first time does no more than register the existence of a repression and its severity; it acts, as it were, as a gauge of the repression’s strength. If this ‘No’, instead of being regarded as the expression of an impartial judgement (of which, indeed, the patient is incapable), is ignored, and if work is continued, the first evidence soon begins to appear that in such a case ‘No’ signifies the desired ‘Yes’. (VII, pp. 58-59)

There is, effectively, no way in which Dora can counter any of Freud’s interpretations, when he gleans affirmations from denials and all evidence is made to contribute towards proving Freud’s theories.

Dora’s perceived assents to Freud’s interpretations are rarely explicit affirmations, but rather more often silences which he interprets as tacit confirmation:102 ‘But she made no reply.—Yes’ (VII, p. 99). Dora’s silences, however, do not necessarily denote assent. Take, for example, this instance: ‘She no longer disputed my contention; but instead of answering my question she proceeded’ (VII, p. 66). Here Dora’s decision not to argue against Freud’s assertion, or to answer his question with a potentially contentious response, enables her to

---

102 Parkin-Gounelas, p. 146.
continue her narrative with greater control. In the Dora case, then, we witness an acute example of Paul Ricoeur's notion of the hermeneutics of suspicion, as Freud not only reads between the lines of Dora’s narratives to uncover meaning unacknowledged by her, but effectively interrogates the patient as well in order to achieve this. He therefore enforces his own impressions and suppresses hers. Thus, we see how, in line with critics such as Schafer, Brockmeier, and Saunders, ‘that there can be no such thing as a psychoanalytical or autobiographical “fact”’, in the strictest sense, since ‘there is no single, necessary, definitive account of a life history and psychopathology, of biological and social influences on personality, or of the psychoanalytic method and its results’. Rather, we are presented predominantly with Woolf’s conception of the ‘creative fact’ as imagined by the artist, ‘somewhere between analytic scrutiny and imaginative invention’, as Matz deems the impression. Despite Freud’s attempts to assert the correctness of his impressions, and the granite-like truth which plays an important, if limited, part, ‘[b]iographical or interpretative

105 Brockmeier, p. 181.
108 Mats, Literary Impressionism, p. 16.
objectivity is impossible, given that it issues from the subjective viewpoint of a biographer or interpreter.\textsuperscript{109}

**Appropriate Subjects**

The subjectivity of biographical impressions and the question of who is received through biographical accounts—subject or biographer—leads naturally to the question of whom such accounts should set about conveying; whose lives warrant biographical record? As Woolf articulates in ‘The Art of Biography’,

> the question now inevitably asks itself, whether the lives of great men only should be recorded. Is not anyone who has lived a life, and left a record of that life, worthy of biography—the failures as well as the successes, the humble as well as the illustrious? And what is greatness? And what smallness? We must revise our standards of merit and set up new heroes for our admiration. (p. 121)

Woolf’s identification of traditional and historical subjects of biography is twofold, centred around cultural significance and sex.\textsuperscript{110} Her biographies of Vita Sackville-West and Flush subvert both of these traditions by offering a representation of a female subject and undermining the concept of a fixed gender identity in the case of *Orlando*, and by choosing to portray subjects of personal rather than merely accepted cultural esteem. ‘The Lives of the Obscure’ also feature in her collection of essays *The Common Reader*.\textsuperscript{111} Though *Roger Fry* offers perhaps a more traditional portrait of a more traditional subject—deceased esteemed male artist—he was also a close friend of Woolf and had suggested she undertake the task of

\textsuperscript{109} Saunders, *Self Impression*, p. 441.


\textsuperscript{111} Virginia Woolf, *The Common Reader*, Ebook (Moorside Press, 2013) [https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=B6FNCAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false] [accessed 17 February 2018].
writing his life, so the personal connection endures.\textsuperscript{112} Anna Snaith describes this as Woolf’s ‘one conventional biography’, but notes that it ‘caused her much turmoil because she was obliged to stick to facts’, and that she proposed transforming it into ‘something “more fictitious” when she entered the biography herself in 1909’.\textsuperscript{113} Moreover, across texts not generically categorised as biography—and less overtly autobiografictional than, say, \textit{Orlando} or \textit{Flush}\textemdash Woolf continues to give voice to the under-represented. In ‘A Room of One’s Own’ (1929), for instance, she deplores the lack of biographical sources on ordinary women for posterity, and the lack of their texts: ‘All these infinitely obscure works [and lives] remain to be recorded’. Since this remark is directed to the female character of Mary Carmichael, we witness an example of Woolf acting to do just this.\textsuperscript{114} As Linda Anderson remarks, Woolf was ‘critically engaged all her life in the problem of writing lives and, in particular, the problem of writing women’s lives’.\textsuperscript{115} She may thus be said to create her own case histories of the (especially gendered) under-represented ordinary people.

Freud’s accounts address a wider range of subjects: male and female; child and adult; cultural icon and unknown individual (identities obscured to protect the rights of the patient). Despite the interest in ‘great men’ evidenced in Freud’s studies of Leonardo da Vinci, Moses, and Shakespeare (and, though it is not included in the Standard Edition of Freud’s work, the biography of Woodrow Wilson that he co-authored with former patient William C. Bullitt\textsuperscript{116}),

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{112} Woolf, \textit{Roger Fry}, p. 5.
\item \textsuperscript{116} For the controversial history and reception of the Woodrow Wilson biography, see J. F. Campbell, “‘To Bury Freud on Wilson”: Uncovering “Thomas Woodrow Wilson, A
Freud’s discourse upon the unconscious processes of cultural icons does not unquestioningly elevate such figures as the tradition of biography had established. While he acknowledged ‘a particular fascination in studying the laws of the human mind as exemplified in outstanding individuals’, Freud argued in his 1933 preface to Marie Bonaparte’s *The Life and Works of Edgar Allan Poe* that psycho-biographical studies ‘are not intended to explain an author’s genius, but they show what motive forces aroused it and what material was offered to him by destiny’. The fascination of such studies thus lies in the identification of exemplary figures’ passive submission to ‘motive forces’ and ‘destiny’: ‘outstanding individuals’ and the common people are all subject to the universal impulses brought to light by psychoanalysis, though they may affect each in different ways. Graham Frankland and Abigail Gillman both highlight that Freud’s intention was to rigorously explore the unconscious motivations of these characters in a more frank and authentic manner than their cultural status has traditionally elicited. In his Introduction to the Woodrow Wilson biography, for instance, Freud explains that Wilson ‘was from the beginning unsympathetic to me, and that this aversion increased in the course of years the more I learned about him’. In his study of Leonardo da Vinci, Freud directly addresses the inhibiting idealism of biographers when ‘fixated on their heroes’:

They obliterate the individual features of their subject’s physiognomy; smooth over the traces of his life’s struggles with internal and external resistances, and they tolerate in him no vestige of human weakness or imperfection. They thus present us

---


with what is in fact a cold, strange, ideal figure, instead of a human being to whom we might feel ourselves distantly related. That they should do this is regrettable, for they thereby sacrifice truth to an illusion, and for the sake of their infantile phantasies abandon the opportunity of penetrating the most fascinating secrets of human nature. (XI, p. 130)

This proposition employs a great deal of imagery similar to Woolf’s theories of biography explored over the course of this chapter. The ‘cold, strange’ representation of subject is in stark opposition to the vibrancy of Woolf’s rainbow-like conception of personality; the idealisation and subsequent misrepresentation of the subject fictionalises the character and elides the necessary ‘truth’ of biography; and the biographer’s own ‘phantasies’ manifest in the accounts. Thus in debunking the myths of cultural icons, Freud rewrites their biographies according to an ethos of biography shared by Woolf. It should be noted, however, that even in these biographical attempts the fictional aspect is still prominent: As Mahony points out, Freud acknowledged his essay on da Vinci to be ‘partly fiction’ and that some of his friends might evaluate it as a ‘psycho-analytic novel’ (S.E. 11: 134); and he wrote the first draft of Moses and Monotheism under the title The Man Moses: A Historical Novel.

As previously established in this chapter, such fictionalisation is indicative of Freud’s impressionism, which supplements hard facts in his biographical accounts. Moreover, when actively striving against inauthentic idealisation there is the risk of the analyst’s subjective bias manifesting in the opposite direction, as in the aggressive attack on Dora.


120 Mahony, Freud as a Writer, p. 8. For background to Freud’s deliberations on this matter in Moses and Monotheism, see Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, Freud’s Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991).
The selection of subjects by Woolf and Freud is significant to their wider conception of the role of biography. For Woolf, every life contains intrinsic value and meaning, and the ‘new biography’ attempts to convey this more accurately than previous methods. Her own biographical texts—case histories of the historically under-represented—intend to contribute to the formation of a more accurate and realistic social history by including those individuals that are subject to it. Freud’s case histories share the conception that the biographies of ordinary people are important, and seek to benefit these individuals since the narratives are directed as a form of diagnosis, aiming towards the resolution of symptoms. However, from studies of the individual, Freud aims to identify universal unconscious processes, hence his wider range of biographical subjects, from the child to the cultural icon: regardless of status, all are subject to the demands of the unconscious. For example, Freud claims that the assimilation of the individual case within the broader theory is justification for the publication of his Dora case:

No doubt this case history, as I have so far outlined it, does not on the whole seem worth recording. It is merely a case of ‘petite hystérie’ with the commonest of all somatic and mental symptoms […]. What is wanted is precisely an elucidation of the commonest cases and of their most frequent and typical symptoms. (VII, pp. 23-24)

Moreover, Freud explores the social implications of his theories in studies such as ‘Totem and Taboo’ (1913 [1912-13]) and ‘Civilization and its Discontents’ (1930 [1929]). Hence, both Woolf and Freud locate their biographical studies of the individual consciousness within a wider social discourse, much as we observed both James and Freud seeking connections between the central consciousness in their texts and more universal applications.

---

‘Something Betwixt and Between’

Biography, according to Woolf, has the potential to ‘[stimulate] the mind, which is endowed with a curious susceptibility in this direction as no fiction, however artful or highly coloured, can stimulate it’.\(^{122}\) Yet although Woolf praises biographers such as Lytton Strachey and Harold Nicholson, ultimately she feels her generation of writers has not yet succeeded in perfecting an ideal mode of biography: ‘Nor can we name the biographer whose art is subtle and bold enough to present that queer amalgamation of dream and reality, that perpetual marriage of granite and rainbow. His method still remains to be discovered’.\(^{123}\) Freud’s self-perceived shortcomings, as in the fragmentariness of the Dora case, suggest that while he may be considered another ‘craftsman’ of the new biography,\(^{124}\) he too felt the limitations of his biographical records.

Having measured Freud’s method of recording the biographies of his subjects against Woolf’s theories of biography as outlined in ‘The New Biography’ and ‘The Art of Biography’, it is clear that his practice converged with her own in many ways. While Freud’s method of the case history suggests an alternative form of biography, he still struggles under the same demands as Woolf herself, such as the difficult task of negotiating fact and impression. ‘Biography’, Woolf tells us in 1939, ‘is only at the beginning of its career’; Freud’s pathographies and biographical studies are an important step in this development.\(^{125}\) Comparing the artist and the biographer, Woolf claims that the work of the latter ‘is not a work of art, but something betwixt and between’.\(^{126}\) While other chapters of this thesis focus on the elements of Freud’s work which may be considered as impressionist artistry, the

\(^{125}\) Ibid.
\(^{126}\) Ibid.
present chapter has, by way of biography, elucidated Freud’s own view of his work as something that challenges conventional categorisation and does indeed lie somewhere ‘betwixt and between’.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{127} See also Freeman.
IMPRESSIONISTIC PILGRIMAGES: FREUD & RICHARDSON

The present chapter uses Dorothy Richardson’s *Pilgrimage* to draw together issues considered in previous chapters, such as the subjective filtration of impressions through a central consciousness, authorial manifestations within the text, and impressionistic fragmentation and misdirection in the experience of life and psychoanalysis. Examples are sourced from across Freud’s *oeuvre*, thus extending the comments made in previous chapters upon his relatively early publications and demonstrating the continuation of his impressionism across his career. Richardson’s *Pilgrimage* provides a particularly apt lens through which to view a larger selection of Freud’s work, given its own extended period of publication, its sheer length and its scope, all of which are discussed in more detail below. If *Pilgrimage* is considered Richardson’s life work then (as suggested in the previous chapter) psychoanalysis, specifically the narrative that articulates the development of the psychoanalytic movement, can be considered Freud’s. And this is not limited to specific texts such as ‘On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement’ (1914) and ‘An Autobiographical Study’, which explicitly set out with this aim. Rather, as argued below, it is Freud’s central consciousness (in the Jamesian sense discussed in the second chapter) that connects the individual psychoanalytic texts, so that they are at once one narrative and many, in the same way that Miriam Henderson’s consciousness connects the individual books of *Pilgrimage*. This is not an unprecedented approach: as noted above, T.S. Eliot argues that ‘the books of Henry James form a complete whole’, while Scott McCracken and Jo Winning suggest that it is not an ‘unreasonable proposition’ to consider ‘Joyce’s prose work from *Dubliners* to *Finnegan’s Wake* […] as one work’.¹ Moreover, Maud Ellmann applies the approach directly

to Freud when she argues that Freudian psychoanalysis ‘could be seen as a serial fiction’.\(^2\)

Faced with Freud’s and Richardson’s life works then, I want in this chapter to consider them in relation to McCracken and Winning’s conception of the long modernist novel, to consider in more detail the representation of a central consciousness across the texts, and, taking inspiration from Richardson’s title, to explore the impressionistic pilgrimages that these texts depict and enact. After highlighting convergences between Freud and Richardson’s impressionism in these areas, the chapter considers the unfinishability of the authors’ impressionistic and psychoanalytic projects.

_Pointed Roofs_—the first of thirteen chapter-books that would come to comprise Richardson’s _Pilgrimage\(^3\)_—was published in 1915, thus preceding many of the most iconic works of impressionist fiction in English, including Joyce’s _Ulysses_, originally serialised in the _Little Review_ between March 1918 and December 1920; _Jacob’s Room_ (1922), generally considered to be Woolf’s first experimental novel; and the epitome of Ford’s impressionism, _Parade’s End_ (1924-28). In her 1938 Foreword to _Pilgrimage_, Richardson herself describes the initial composition of _Pointed Roofs_ as occasioning ‘a sense of being upon a fresh pathway’, only later coming to recognise that the perceived ‘lonely track’ of her innovative stance became a ‘populous highway’ with the emergence of Woolf and Joyce (I, p.10). She is

---

\(^2\) Ellmann, _The Nets of Modernism_, p. 10.

\(^3\) The books of _Pilgrimage_ are as follows: _Pointed Roofs_ (1915); _Backwater_ (1916); _Honeycomb_ (1917); _The Tunnel_ (1919); _Interim_ (1920 [serialized 1919]); _Deadlock_ (1921); _Revolving Lights_ (1923); _The Trap_ (1925); _Oberland_ (1927); _Dawn’s Left Hand_ (1931); _Clear Horizon_ (1935); _Dimple Hill_ (1938); _March Moonlight_ (1967 [three sections had been published in 1946]). Richardson also added a Foreword in 1938. These are collected into and reprinted in the 1979 four-volume Virago _Pilgrimage_ as follows. Volume 1: Foreword (pp. 9-12); _Pointed Roofs_ (pp. 13-186); _Backwater_ (pp. 187-346); _Honeycomb_ (pp. 347-490). Volume 2: _The Tunnel_ (pp. 9-288); _Interim_ (pp. 289-453). Volume 3: _Deadlock_ (pp. 9-230); _Revolving Lights_ (pp. 231-396); _The Trap_ (pp. 397-509). Volume 4: _Oberland_ (pp. 9-128); _Dawn’s Left Hand_ (pp. 129-268); _Clear Horizon_ (pp. 269-400); _Dimple Hill_ (pp. 401-552); _March Moonlight_ (pp. 553-658). References made in this thesis give the volume and page number of the Virago edition.
subsequently able to identify her own style with the writing of impressionists such as Proust and James, as well as the author so idolised by Freud, Goethe (though not an impressionist in the sense of the other authors discussed in this thesis, Goethe’s connection with Freud and Richardson’s impressionistic principles is discussed further below). Richardson’s own retrospective recognition of her place within a developing literary milieu was anticipated by her contemporaries: May Sinclair, for instance, identified Richardson amongst a growing modern literary movement distinct from the ‘philosophic cant of the nineteenth century’ and including figures such as Joyce.\textsuperscript{4} Rebecca Bowler points out that ‘by the late 1920s four names were invariably linked: Joyce, Woolf, Marcel Proust and Richardson.’\textsuperscript{5} Ford Madox Ford referred in \textit{The March of Literature} to ‘that great figure Dorothy Richardson’, ‘who is still writing, though abominably unknown’,\textsuperscript{6} while Henry James’s significant influence is acknowledged by Richardson in her Foreword to \textit{Pilgrimage}, and fictionalised through Miriam’s reading within the text.\textsuperscript{7} Woolf reviewed two of Richardson’s \textit{Pilgrimage} books,

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{5} Rebecca Bowler, ‘Dorothy M Richardson Deserves the Recognition She Is Finally Receiving’, \textit{The Guardian}, 2015 \texttt{<http://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2015/may/15/dorothy-m-richardson-deserves-recognition-finally-receiving>} [accessed 1 June 2016].
  \item \textsuperscript{7} In her Foreword, Richardson writes of her admiration of James:
    keeping the reader incessantly watching the conflict of human forces through the eye of a single observer, rather than taking him, before the drama begins, upon a tour amongst the properties, or breaking in with descriptive introductions of the players as one by one they enter his enclosed resounding chamber where no plant grows and no mystery pours in from the unheeded stars, a far from inconsiderable technical influence […] (I, p. 11)
    James’s not-inconsiderable technical influence thus stems from the characteristics of his writing explored in the second chapter of this thesis: his ability to construct a central consciousness and effectively convey the events of the novel through this lens, without interruption. Though Richardson became increasingly critical of James over the years, both Richardson’s and Miriam’s complimentary comments, reflecting views at different stages of
\end{itemize}
The Tunnel (1919) and Revolving Lights (1923), noting ‘the discrepancy between what Richardson has to say and the form provided by tradition for her to say it in’ in the former review, and crediting Richardson with inventing ‘the psychological sentence of the feminine gender’ in the latter, highlighting Richardson’s gendered version of impressionism, though Woolf’s praise is tempered by criticism of Richardson’s protagonist, whom she complains enacts her limited perspective ‘too didactically’.  

Woolf’s discernment of the gendered sentence in Richardson’s writing hits upon a key feature particular to Richardson’s form of impressionism: not only does Richardson share the desire expressed in Woolf’s ‘A Room of One’s Own’ to accurately write female experience and express the female mind, Richardson also figures style in gendered terms, setting distinctly male and female styles in opposition, in contrast to Woolf’s preference for androgyny. Richardson deemed the dominant mode of realist fiction that preceded her own writing particularly inept for the communication of authentic experience. She recalls in the Foreword her intention of ‘attempting to produce a feminine equivalent of the masculine realism’ (IV, p. 9). This yielded what Edward Garnett, upon agreeing to publish Pointed Roofs, described as the first example of ‘feminine impressionism’. Part of what differentiates Pilgrimage from the literature of the other impressionist writers discussed above is thus Richardson’s essentialist attitude towards gender (that women think and write differently to men), which led her to produce a new style of impressionism.

The label ‘stream of consciousness’ was first applied to Dorothy Richardson’s writing before becoming a major stylistic characteristic bridging impressionism and modernism. The

Richardson’s life, acknowledge appreciation for James’s impressionism, the innovation of which was judged to challenge established forms.


connection with psychoanalysis is immediately apparent, but as discussed below Richardson resisted this description as failing to appreciate the depth of consciousness and the inherent consistency of the individual. She also resisted the label of ‘post-War Freudianity’ (I, p. 12), though critics such as Joanne Winning argue that *Pilgrimage* is ‘heavily influenced by the models of psychoanalysis’, producing readings that trace correlations between Richardson’s text and psychoanalytic principles.\(^\text{10}\) Though, as Winning observes, ‘Richardson’s opinion of psychoanalysis is never clear’ and ‘[s]he expresses contradictory views on it’ (p. 72), Richardson did address the subject favourably in 1920 in her review of Barbara Low’s book *Psycho-Analysis: A Brief Account of the Freudian Theory*, which appeared in the journal *Dental Record*. The review opens by likening the passionately divisive effects of psychoanalysis with the contentious debate that erupted upon the emergence of evolutionary theory, and speculates that as Darwinian theory has become ‘an unquestioned part of the technique of scientific thought, […] there are already signs that the Freudian theory is progressing towards a similar goal’.\(^\text{11}\) Richardson notes the impact of Freudian theory upon novelists and those in other professions, asserting that ‘for very many of them [it] has transformed the whole spectacle of individual, social and national life’, though she does not go so far as to count herself amongst those so heavily influenced.\(^\text{12}\) After outlining the development of psychoanalytic theory to date, Richardson turns her attention to Low’s book, prior to the appearance of which she judges that ‘no single clear authoritative statement was available to explain to the layman in non-technical terms exactly what the tumult was about’.\(^\text{13}\) Richardson extends the praise offered by Ernest Jones in his introduction to Low’s

---


\(^{11}\) Dorothy Richardson, ‘*Psycho-Analysis: A Brief Account of the Freudian Theory*, by Barbara Low’, *Dental Record*, 40 (1920), 522–24, p. 523.

\(^{12}\) Ibid.

\(^{13}\) Ibid.
text regarding her straightforward style and ease of expression, declaring the book ‘a small masterpiece of condensation, clear and fresh in style and luminous throughout with the true scientific spirit’. Moreover, Richardson judges that ‘the author is something more than a scientist with a highly-developed gift for literary expression’. Within the review then, we witness Richardson’s favourable response to Freudian psychoanalysis and the assimilation of scientific and aesthetic principles for its expression, but implicit is the suggestion that Low has achieved what Freud was unable to accomplish. Richardson’s comparative enthusiasm for psychoanalysis is compounded by an editorial note appended to the review, in which the journal editors distance themselves from her alignment with psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, declaring ‘we must express our opinion that followers of Freud are pushing things too far’.

In addition to her acquaintance with Low’s book on psychoanalysis and her friendship with the author, Richardson was also embedded within a network of connections that would have increased her familiarity with Freud. In the summer of 1923 she met Bryher (Annie Winifred Ellerman), who would become a close friend, generous benefactor, supporter of Richardson’s professional development, and ultimately ‘immensely important in Richardson’s life’. In 1927 Bryher launched the avant-garde film magazine Close Up and invited Richardson to contribute. Richardson was initially reluctant (though ultimately she contributed 21 articles over the six-year run of the journal), suggesting instead other potential contributors, including Barbara Low, who was in fact a mutual friend of both Richardson and

\[ \text{\tiny \cite{14,15,16,17}} \]

14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
Bryher. Bryher met Freud in 1927 and in addition to her financial support of Richardson, another direct beneficiary of Bryher’s generosity was the Verlag psychoanalytic publishing press. Richardson also became close friends with Bryher’s life partner, the poet H. D. (Hilda Doolittle). In 1933 Bryher arranged for H. D. to begin analysis with Freud, during which time analyst and analysand became friends themselves:

[Freud] lends H. D. books, introduces her to his family, shows her his art-objects, talks about another patient, and generally gossips with her. There is an ease and a friendliness and a sense of real enjoyment in the way Freud works with H. D., that is not at all incompatible with the seriousness of the project.

As Susan Stanford Friedman argues in the introduction to her edited collection of letters between Bryher, H. D., Freud and others in their network, H. D.’s disclosures about her experience of analysis provide ‘far more vividly detailed’ accounts than those briefer records of other analysands; it is these intimate insights into the analyst and his practice to which

---


Richardson would have been privy—and as we saw in the previous chapter, Freud would have been uncomfortable about such exposure.21

The Long Modernist Novel

As a recent special issue of the journal Modernist Cultures demonstrates, the long modernist novel was an important literary phenomenon in the period: texts by James, Ford, Woolf and Richardson all figure within the far from exhaustive canon sketched by guest editors McCracken and Winning, a list that also features authors such as Proust and Joyce.22 Length in itself was of course a familiar literary feature, most recently from the ample examples of the long Victorian novel, but in her essay ‘Novels’ (1948), Richardson decries the formulaic structure of novels such as these and authors that ‘supply a story complete with beginning, middle, climax, and curtain’, which overlook ‘the always unique modifications of contingency’.23 We thus find in Pilgrimage a text that refuses the formulaic dramatic structure found in the epic quest narrative and the long Victorian novel, in favour of contingency. It may be this earlier artificial form that Richardson had in mind when she declared that Pilgrimage was ‘not a novel’, though she does not fix on an alternative generic

22 McCracken and Winning, p. 270.
This would correspond with Miriam’s view in *The Trap* (the eighth book in the *Pilgrimage* series, first published in 1928) that

> it was he [Henry James] after all who had achieved the first completely satisfying way of writing a novel. If this were a novel. There was something holy about it. Something to make, like Conrad, the heavens rejoice. […] Style was something beyond good and evil. Sacred and innocent. (III, p. 410).

The particular style advocated is identifiable as impressionism through its connection with James and Conrad, and is deemed revolutionary enough to effect the destabilisation of genre—which helps us to understand Richardson’s own view of *Pilgrimage* as ‘not a novel’, since it too strives to depart from the traditional heritage of this form.

*Pilgrimage* does, however, correspond with the distinct style of the long modernist novel. McCracken and Winning explain how the term ‘long’ can be variously interpreted in this context:

1) The most obvious meaning, a long novel as measured by the length of the narrative: the number of pages or words it contains.
2) A novel about an extended duration […].
3) A novel that was written over a long time […] [involving] a recognition of how the narrative changed and developed in response to the author’s life, milieu, and historical circumstances.
4) A novel that takes a long time to read. […] [potentially due to the difficulty of the text as well as its printed length].
5) A novel that is published in several volumes over a long period of time.
6) A novel that is about a ‘long experience’ […]: the long process of reconfiguring, reflecting upon, and coming to terms with the shock experience of modernity.

Both *Pilgrimage* and the narrative of psychoanalysis across Freud’s *oeuvre* fulfil these interrelated criteria. In the simplest sense, both *Pilgrimage* and the Standard Edition of Freud’s *Complete Works* span thousands of pages. An unfinished *Pilgrimage* comprises 13

---

25 McCracken and Winning, pp. 275-76.
chapter-volumes, beginning with *Pointed Roofs* published in 1915 and ending with the posthumously published *March Moonlight* included in the 1967 Dent version of *Pilgrimage* collected into four volumes. The Standard Edition of Freud’s Complete Works spans 24 volumes, most of which contain multiple texts. The first volume contains pre-psychoanalytic publications and previously unpublished drafts, so in a sense is also amongst the latest-published Freudian works, though the earliest were written in the 1880s and 1890s. The second volume moves onto *Studies on Hysteria*, co-authored by Freud and Josef Breur (1893-1895). The penultimate volume contains Freud’s works from 1937-1939, while the final 24th comprises indexes and bibliographies. The writing of *Pilgrimage* occupied Richardson from 1914 until her death in 1957 and it fictionalises her life during the period 1893-1912, producing not only an autobiographical novel concerned with the individual, but also a text that reflects intertextual engagements and the changing historical circumstances of the time: as Bowler observes, ‘[Richardson’s] novels are not only remarkable works of modernist experimentation, they are a slice of history: the real struggles and the real joys of a solitary female worker in turn-of-the-century London’.\(^{26}\) Similarly, Michael Bell describes *Pilgrimage* ‘as if a camera or a tape recorder were left running unattended in an historical world’ in which ‘Miriam’s economic circumstances especially enforce her realism’.\(^ {27}\)

Freud’s subject matter similarly reflects the extended duration of his psychoanalytic enterprise, in both the personal and professional senses, since as we saw in the previous chapter the history of psychoanalysis is bound up with Freud’s life history. Strachey’s editorial matter and Freud’s own paratextual commentary and intertextual references frequently highlight how the analyst’s theories developed over the course of his career, responding to a growing milieu of publications (both within the psychoanalytic discipline and

\(^{26}\) Bowler, ‘Dorothy M Richardson Deserves the Recognition She Is Finally Receiving’.
beyond) and to social/cultural/historical stimuli such as war. There is a sense of progression in the Standard Edition from the ‘pre-psychoanalytic’ publications, the tentative origins in *Studies on Hysteria*, the landmark *Interpretation of Dreams*, through to the late texts, the summaries of the psychoanalytic movement, the impression of continued learning and increased knowledge. As Richardson observed of Freudian psychoanalysis,

> the theory itself continues to follow the characteristic development of all great revolutionary science. It is undergoing modification. Its first vast claim is restricted. What it cannot, as well as what it can accomplish is becoming more and more clearly evident. And there has been schism, dividing the psychoanalysts into hostile camps.  

This observation, made in 1920, clearly assimilates individual texts, reading instead a broader narrative of revision and development which would continue in the years to come.

Though Richardson’s contemporary readership was far more fragmentary than she would have liked due to writing and publication issues, she nonetheless encourages the reader to trace Miriam’s developmental narrative over the course of *Pilgrimage* through her insistence ‘that each novel was a “chapter” of the whole and that all the volumes should appear and be read as one sequence’. Modern critical responses to *Pilgrimage* often follow this trend: David Stamm approaches *Pilgrimage* in the romantic tradition as *Bildungsroman*, examining the metaphorical and symbolic resonances of Miriam’s visual and aural sensations across a range of motifs, including the journey, in order to elucidate her personal pilgrimage.

---

towards selfhood. Rebecca Bowler explores ‘[t]he struggle for identity begun in Pointed Roofs’ as continuing throughout the chapter-volumes, and María Francisca Llantada Díaz sees this first book of the Pilgrimage series as the initial scene in a traditional quest narrative.

One area in which Freud explicitly encourages us to read the narrative of psychoanalysis across multiple books is with regard to his Introductory Lectures. The Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis were delivered between 1915 and 1917 at the University of Vienna, and were published in three parts between 1916 and 1917, though the actual publication dates are uncertain. They cover subjects related to parapraxes, dreams and theory of neuroses, and according to Strachey ‘had a wider circulation than any of Freud’s works except, perhaps, The Psychopathology of Everyday Life’. The New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis were first published in 1932, though 1933 is the date of publication printed on the title page of both the original German version and first English

They constituted Freud’s response to the financial difficulties of the *Verlag*, given the popularity of the earlier lecture series text. They were never intended to be delivered but are written in a performative style containing, for instance, repeated addresses to the ‘[l]adies and gentlemen’ of the fictional audience. According to Freud,

The new lectures are by no means intended to take the place of the earlier ones. They do not in any sense form an independent entity [...] they are continuations and supplements, which, in relation to the former series, fall into three groups. A first group contains fresh treatments of subjects which were already dealt with fifteen years ago but which, as a result of a deepening of our knowledge and an alteration in our views, call for a different exposition to-day—that is to say, critical revisions. The two other groups contain what are true extensions, for they deal with things which either did not exist in psycho-analysis at the time of the first lectures or which were too little in evidence to justify a special chapter-heading. It is inevitable, but not to be regretted, if some of the new lectures unite the characteristics of more than one of these groups.

I have also given expression to the dependence of these new lectures upon the *Introductory Lectures* by giving them a numbering continuous with theirs. (XXII, p. 5)

The ‘new’ lectures feature summaries of material from the original *Introductory Lectures*; revisions of previous theories; and expansions, both into new developments as theories move forward and excursions into parapsychological subjects such as telepathy. Despite the progressive development implied by Freud’s continuous numeration, the new lectures are thus in fact multidirectional, moving backwards, forwards, and outwards into other directions. As Strachey points out, ‘[w]hat is especially noticeable about them [...] is the way in which they differ in character among themselves’, as they attempt to bring together such diverse subjects in one volume (XXII, p. 4). Moreover, continuity is disrupted by Freud’s other psychoanalytic publications that appeared between the collections, though arguably

34 See Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, III, pp. 174-75; and Strachey’s Editor’s Note, in Freud, ‘New Introductory Lectures’, XXII, p. 3.
35 Strachey’s Editor’s Note, in Freud, ‘New Introductory Lectures’, XXII, p. 3.
these should be subsumed into the content of the latter volume. While Freud attempts to categorise the new lectures into three groups (the critical revisions; new aspects of the field; and components with increased evidentiary support), the taxonomy is destabilised; the categorical distinctions between the volume’s contents are undermined, becoming hazy as the characteristics of various lectures unite across groups. Of particular interest is that at this late stage in his career, Freud judges such destabilisation of order to be ‘inevitable, but not to be regretted’. Previous chapters of this thesis have argued for the inevitability of such impressionistic disorder when dealing with Freud’s chosen subject matter, and have illustrated Freud’s discomfort when faced with such seemingly unscientific products. Here, however, the inevitability is explicitly acknowledged and is viewed in a far more positive light.

The subjects raised within the Introductory and New Introductory Lectures also continue beyond these textual boundaries. For instance, in his introduction to ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’ (1937), one of ‘the last strictly psycho-analytic writings by Freud to be brought out in his lifetime’, Strachey highlights how the text revisits lecture subjects, and not always consistently, though he attempts to diminish ‘what seem to be differences between the present work and its predecessors’, seeking to enforce coherence and consistency across Freud’s canon and making ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’ seem less ‘revolutionary’. Nevertheless, Strachey is forced to acknowledge that ‘[t]here is one respect, however, in which the views expressed by Freud in this paper seem to differ from, or even to contradict, his earlier [Lectures XXVII and XXVIII] ones—namely in the scepticism expressed by him here in regard to the prophylactic power of psycho-analysis’ (XXIII, p. 213).

He also notes that despite the ‘increased scepticism’ of ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’, Freud later, in his ‘Outline of Psycho-Analysis’ (1940 [1938]), ‘seems to revert perhaps to his earlier view’ (XXIII, p. 215). The notion of the progressive development of psychoanalytic theory is thus once again disrupted, yet conversely we are reminded of the continuity of the broad psychoanalytic narrative when Strachey observes that ‘at the very beginning of his practice Freud was worried by very much the same problems as these, which may thus be said to have extended over the entire length of his analytic studies’ (XXIII, p. 215). As Freud encourages us to read the Introductory and New Introductory Lectures in continuum rather than as ‘independent texts’, we are therefore also able to approach the rest of his psychoanalytic publications as a grand narrative, but remain open to the complexity and destabilisation of that narrative as Freud does in the quotation from the New Introductory Lectures given above.

As Matz demonstrated in Literary Impressionism and Modernist Aesthetics, authors of the period can embody both impressionist and modernist tendencies, impressionism often contributing to the authors’ modernity. Approaching Richardson’s and Freud’s bodies of work as long modernist novels enables us to explore how their impressionistic techniques contribute to the criteria of the genre identified by McCracken and Winning. Over the course of this chapter then I explore the narrative changes that resulted from developments in the authors’ ‘life, milieu, and historical circumstances’, the difficulty of the texts as the result of their impressionistic styles and the authors’ motivations for employing these, and ‘the long process of reconfiguring, reflecting upon, and coming to terms with the shock experience of modernity’.  

37 McCracken and Winning, pp. 275-76.
Miriam’s Pilgrimage

A pilgrimage is a journey of particular importance or spiritual significance, and its various definitions also encompass a sense of wandering from place to place, or the course of a mortal life. The ‘Pilgrimage’ of Richardson’s title is, as Freud would say, overdetermined. The most obvious pilgrimage with which we are presented in Richardson’s work is that undertaken by Miriam. Across the numerous books we witness Miriam’s ongoing development as she matures: we see her career develop as she moves from teaching and governess roles to secretarial work and eventually professional writing; we witness her romantic attachments to characters such as Michael Shatov and Hypo; we endure harrowing moments such as the death of her mother and her subsequent attempts to deal with this trauma, or her miscarriage and nervous breakdown; and we are privy to her changing opinions on culture, society and religion. At a structural level, ‘[m]any of the chapters in Pilgrimage begin with Miriam setting off for or arriving at some place, reinforcing the sense of a journey implicit in the title’.38 Such mirroring between the physical and psychological journeys of the protagonist has been investigated by critics such as Elisabeth Bronfen and Deborah Parsons.39 Miriam’s development is also enacted at a stylistic level: as Rebecca Rauve Davis points out,

[i]n Pointed Roofs, a seventeen-year-old Miriam, experiencing many things for the first time, is relatively unreflective. Thus, sentences are short and concrete, the punctuation uncomplicated […]. However, as time passes and Miriam grows more

39 Elisabeth Bronfen, Dorothy Richardson’s Art of Memory: Space, Identity, Text, trans. by Victoria Appelbe (Manchester University Press, 1999); Deborah L. Parsons, Streetwalking the Metropolis: Women, the City, and Modernity (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
reflective, her sentences lengthen and their syntax becomes more involved, mapping a consciousness that occupies multiple simultaneous positions.40

As Miriam’s consciousness becomes more complex, so too does the style in which Richardson presents it. Woolf’s review of The Tunnel, the fourth book in the series, criticises the superficiality of Miriam’s admittedly ‘vivid’ ‘sensations, impressions, ideas and emotions’ and the lack of depth in the character’s consciousness, but the book under review is still early in the series and in Miriam’s development.41 Moreover, it follows the suicide of Miriam’s mother which takes place at the end of Honeycomb, the third book, and depicts a protagonist not yet able to deal with the trauma she has experienced; she cannot stop and reflect at this point.

As demonstrated in the second chapter of this thesis, the construction of a central consciousness and the filtration of impressions through this was integral to the impressionistic task of both Freud and Henry James. In Pilgrimage, Richardson similarly—and in a more extreme fashion—provides prolonged periods in which the reader is submersed within Miriam’s consciousness. In the first usage of the term in a literary context, May Sinclair ascribes the label of ‘stream of consciousness’ to Pilgrimage. Drawn originally from William James’s psychological principles,42 the phrase is used to describe Richardson’s subject matter: ‘there is no drama, no situation, no set scene. Nothing happens. It is just life going on and on. It is Miriam Henderson’s stream of consciousness going on and on’.43 However, as Parsons notes, ‘the phrase was soon taken up by literary criticism in vague

42 As Suzanne Raitt points out, the phrase was widely used during the early twentieth century, so Sinclair may not have lifted it directly from James’s publication. Suzanne Raitt, May Sinclair: A Modern Victorian (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), p. 219.
reference to the narrative style of the modernist novel’. Richardson utilises the stream of consciousness as both subject and style; as Gillespie notes, ‘[s]he strove […] to make her style inseparable from her character’s consciousness’. It brings Richardson’s writing closer to Joyce’s radical representation of consciousness in *Ulysses*, than to the milder elements discernible in the works of, say, Ford or James. Moreover, Richardson’s style differs even from the closer example of Joyce, as ‘no single character or consciousness dominates *Ulysses* in the way that Miriam Henderson does throughout *Pilgrimage*’. Whether it be through Miriam’s first-person narration or the third-person narrative voice (the two fluctuate throughout *Pilgrimage*), we are constantly limited to Miriam’s perspective. As Sinclair observes, ‘[i]t is to Miriam’s almost painfully acute senses that we owe’ the ‘portraits’ of the other characters. The term ‘portraits’ of course suggests the connection of such literary impressionism with its visual equivalent, as did James’s *The Portrait of a Lady*. The contemporary reviewer L. P. Hartley went so far as to describe Miriam as a ‘Recording Angel’, but it is not just the relentlessness of Miriam’s observations that is of note, it is also, as Sinclair remarks, their quality: ‘You look at the outer world through Miriam’s senses and it is as if you have never seen it so vividly before’. As demonstrated below, this vivid quality is the product of impressionism.

In order to embed the reader within Miriam’s central consciousness and evoke its reality, Richardson must stylistically maintain the experience of life in the same way, for

---

instance, that Freud was challenged to convey the experience of dreaming or the process of free association through his texts. Thus we are bombarded with Miriam’s perceptions and impressions throughout *Pilgrimage*: ‘Strong impressions succeeding and obliterating each other too swiftly to be absorbed’ (III, p. 407). Within these, Richardson must convey the fragmentation, diversions, simultaneity and gaps, that we have come to see characterise life, psychoanalysis and impressionist fiction across the thesis. As Sinclair comments,

Miriam is an acute observer, but she is very far from seeing the whole of these people. They are presented to us in the same vivid but fragmentary way in which they appeared to Miriam, the fragmentary way in which people appear to most of us. Miss Richardson has only imposed on herself the conditions that life imposes on all of us.50

As such,

[t]he moments of Miriam’s consciousness pass one by one, or overlapping, moments tense with vibration, moments drawn out fine, almost to snapping point. On one page Miss Richardson seems to be accounting for every minute of Miriam’s time. On another she passes over events that might be considered decisive with the merest slur of reference. She is not concerned with the strict order of events in time. […] It is Miriam’s consciousness that is going backwards and forwards in time. The time it goes in is unimportant.51

Similarly, Woolf notes how the reader is invited
to register one after another, and one on top of another, words, cries, shouts, notes of a violin, fragments of lectures, to follow these impressions as they flicker through Miriam’s mind, waking incongruously other thoughts, and plaiting incessantly the many-coloured and innumerable threads of life.52

The stream of consciousness label thus fittingly evokes the flow of subjective perceptions and fragmented impressions experienced by Miriam in the mind’s time and the simultaneity of her experiences, as recognised by Sinclair and Woolf. Moreover, Rauve Davis argues that the

continuous flow of *Pilgrimage* is achieved through the ‘streaming style’ of Richardson’s sentences;\(^{53}\) her use of ‘watery imagery, hypnotic rhythms, and repetition’; and, drawing on the work of Caesar Blake, ‘Richardson’s way of making disparate scenes flow into one another by eliminating transitional statements’.\(^{54}\) Yet the stream of consciousness label also suggests a characteristic for which Richardson, and impressionism in general, has been criticised: a focus on surface perceptions at the expense of depth.

As Saunders suggests, the stream of consciousness technique which has become a hallmark of modernism was developed out of literary impressionism; ‘[i]t also makes us more aware of the medium, construction, composition, form, techniques, just as visual Impressionism intensifies awareness of the picture surface’.\(^{55}\) Conversely, Rauve Davis argues that ‘[d]espite its subjective focus, impressionism undermines identity by striving to represent discrete moments of subjective experience rather than unbroken flow’, and thus argues that Richardson should not be categorised as an impressionist.\(^{56}\) As we will see, however, the flow of Miriam’s consciousness is far from unbroken. The gaps between the books that comprise *Pilgrimage*, as well as between and within the chapters and scenes, are all interruptions that encourage us to read a series of moments and acknowledge that there is content missing for us as readers as it is lost on Miriam’s consciousness. Such gaps manifest in terms of both plot (we are given incomplete accounts of Miriam’s activity and there are jumps in the chronology) and style (there are frequent gaps on the pages and abundant punctuation signalling missing content, such as dashes and ellipses).

---


\(^{54}\) Rauve Davis, p. 324.

\(^{55}\) Saunders, *Self Impression*, p. 269.

\(^{56}\) Rauve Davis, p. 317.
Richardson herself considered the stream of consciousness label assigned to her writing a ‘muddle-headed phrase’, ‘isolated by its perfect imbecility’.\textsuperscript{57}

\begin{quote}
It’s not a stream, it’s a pool. A sea, an ocean. It has depth and greater depth and when you think you have reached its bottom there is nothing there, and when you give yourself up to one current you are suddenly possessed by another.\textsuperscript{58}
\end{quote}

This attempt at correcting the erroneous metaphor acknowledges depth over surface; mystery and ambiguity; multiplicity and indirection over a directed flow; all characteristics shared in Freud’s conception of the mind. It resembles, for instance, Freud’s topographical model of the mind divided into conscious, sub/pre-conscious, and unconscious, often referred to as the iceberg theory.\textsuperscript{59} Richardson’s critique of the label of ‘stream of consciousness’ and her alternative figurations of consciousness elucidate how we may conceptualise our deepening appreciation of Miriam’s development over the course of \textit{Pilgrimage} as an endeavour in plumbing the depths of her consciousness. Elsewhere, Richardson takes the stance that consciousness

sits stiller than a tree. ‘The mind’ may be or may become, anything from a rag-bag to a madhouse. […] But its central core, luminous point […] tho more or less continually expanding from birth to maturity, remains stable, one with itself thruout life.\textsuperscript{60}

\begin{footnotes}
\renewcommand{\footnoterule}{\hrule width 0.75in}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{57} Vincent Brome, ‘A Last Meeting with Dorothy Richardson’, \textit{The London Magazine}, June 1959, 26–32, p. 29.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{58} Ibid.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{59} Jones, \textit{The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud}, I, p. 374.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{60} ‘Dorothy M. Richardson’, in \textit{Authors Today and Yesterday: A Companion Volume to Living Authors}, ed. by Stanley J. Kunitz (New York: Wilson, 1933), pp. 562–64, (p. 562). See also Shiv Kumar, ‘Dorothy Richardson and the Dilemma of “Being versus Becoming”’, \textit{Modern Language Notes}, 74 (1959), 494–501, for a reading that prioritises Miriam’s fluid ‘stream of sensory impressions’ (p. 495); Shirley Rose, ‘The Unmoving Center: Consciousness in Dorothy Richardson’s Pilgrimage’, \textit{Contemporary Literature}, 10.3 (1969), 366–82, which adheres to Richardson’s advocacy of the ‘stability and changelessness’ of consciousness (p. 371); and Rauve Davis, which disputes the contention that Kumar and Rose’s contrasting perspectives are ‘mutually exclusive’ (p. 309).}
\end{footnotes}
Richardson’s description evokes both the potential for development and the internal coherence of identity, thereby perpetuating our focus upon Miriam’s personal development across *Pilgrimage* and encouraging our reading of the text for the central consciousness as a constant (if constantly developing) locus of interest. It facilitates our readerly gaze into the character as subject, rather than merely directing our attention outwards to the objects of her observation.

Life’s fragmentation, simultaneity, associations, and sensory bombardment characterise the pilgrimages depicted by both Freud and Richardson, but as raised in the first chapter of this thesis with reference to the writing of Ford and Freud, many of the most striking manifestations of this occur in the representation of trauma. Perhaps the most significant amongst the many examples of the mirroring between physical and psychical journeying in *Pilgrimage* occurs in relation to the death of Mrs Henderson, and Miriam’s subsequent attempts to process this trauma. In the final chapter of *Honeycomb*, Miriam had taken Mrs Henderson on what was intended to be a rejuvenating holiday following the elder woman’s mental collapse, demonstrating her awareness of the potential impact of a journey for improving mental wellbeing. A series of short fragmented scenes are presented, characterised by frequent ellipses and transient clauses, and separated by a high frequency of Richardson’s customary gaps on the page, suggesting the difficulty of recalling and recording the time. An uneasy tone is developed through the alternation of hopeful and distressing imagery. One of the many examples can be seen in the way positive experiences such as the entertainment of the show that Miriam and her mother watch are tinged with anxiety (‘[t]he sight of the cheap black printing on the thin pink paper threatened the spell of the yellow curtain. She must avoid reading it.’), suggesting the fragility of the scene’s carefully constructed enjoyment (1, p. 480). Similarly, the beauty of a later private lunch shared by the two women is narrated, but the pleasure of the experience is unstable:
If others had been there Mrs Henderson would have remarked upon the pleasantness of the situation and tried to respond to it and been dreadfully downcast at her failure, and brave. Miriam held her breath as they settled themselves. No remark came. The secret was safe. (I, p. 482)

Miriam’s sense of relief at the preservation of her mother’s stability during the meal is evident. The commonplace experience of meal-taking becomes ‘a great adventure’ in this context, and temporary relief inspires hope, as at the end of the scene ‘Miriam felt that a new world might be opening’ (I, p. 483). This hope is preserved across the textual gap between the lunch scene and the next, which begins, ‘[t]he storm has cleared the air wonderfully’, the literal observation of commonplace weather phenomena possessing the quality of pathetic fallacy, as the mood seems lifted, ‘jolly and fresh’ like the evening. Miriam ponders,

[p]erhaps in a few days it would be the real jolly seaside and she would be young again, staying there alone with mother, just ridiculous and absurd and frantically happy, mother getting better and better, turning into the fat happy little thing she ought to be, and they would get to know people and mother would have to look after her, and love her high spirits, and admire and scold her and be shocked, as she used to be. They might even bathe. It would be heavenly to be really at the seaside with just mother. They would be idiotic. (I, p. 483)

The thoughts are a regressive fantasy in which the roles of parent and child are reset to their former order, motivated by the reversal of roles occurring as Miriam cares for her mother, both in the context of the trip as a whole and during the more immediate medical treatment taking place: ‘Mrs Henderson lay very still as Miriam painted the acid above the unseen nerve centres’ (I, p. 483). It is the seaside holiday that facilitates this fantasy.

The major defining moment towards which the chapter has been building is not actually depicted, but has to be deduced by the reader: as Sinclair suggests ‘[s]omething does happen. Something tragic and terrible. We are not told what it is; we know as Miriam knows,
only by inference'. We go from Miriam escorting her mother from a visit with a nearby homeopath, to seeing her comforted. The chapter and the book thus end with the following scene:

The bony old woman held Miriam clasped closely in her arms. ‘You must never, as long as you live, blame yourself, my gurl.’ She went away. Miriam had not heard her come in. The pressure of her arms and her huge body came from far away. Miriam clasped her hands together. She could not feel them. Perhaps she had dreamed that the old woman had come in and said that. Everything was dream; the world. I shall not have any life. I can never have any life; all my days. There were cold tears running into her mouth. They had no salt. Cold water. They stopped. Moving her body with slow difficulty against the unsupporting air, she looked slowly about. It was so difficult to move. Everything was airy and transparent. Her heavy hot light impalpable body was the only solid thing in the world, weighing tons; and like a lifeless feather. There was a tray of plates of fish and fruit on the table. She looked at it, heaving with sickness and [p. 490] looking at it. I am hungry. Sitting down near it she tried to pull the tray. It would not move. I must eat the food. Go on eating food, till the end of my life. Plates of food like these plates of food. … I am in eternity … where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched. (t, pp. 489-90)

The aftermath of Miriam’s discovery of her mother’s suicide is characterised by a sense of detachment as Miriam struggles to differentiate reality from dream. The passage moves between the first and third person, suggesting the instability of Miriam’s sense of self, as well as her disorientation. Conflict and confusion are also conveyed through the juxtaposition between physicality and ephemerality; reality and dream; having no life and existing for eternity.

This is how we leave Miriam at the end of *Honeycomb*, in a moment of trauma ‘in eternity’. When *The Tunnel* commences, brief reference is made to the preceding events, but progression is clear: ‘Miriam paused with her heavy bag at her arm. It was a disaster. But it was the last of Mornington Road. To explain about it would be to bring Mornington Road here’ (II, p. 11). When Mrs Bailey follows this introductory thought with the statement ‘[i]t

---

doesn’t matter now,’ its close proximity to Miriam’s silent determination to move on with her life suggests that the reference could be taken to dismiss the need to discuss prior events; only in the text that appears afterwards do we learn that it refers to Miriam’s payment for her board at Tansley Street (II, p. 11). Her return to this establishment at which she had formerly resided, emphasised through the numerous references to how well she remembered it, embodies one of the ways in which progression is complicated within the text; Miriam has to go back to a previous abode in order to move forward. The immediate aftermath of Mrs Henderson’s suicide beyond the closing *Honeycomb* scene has been skipped over. The reader experiences only a moment of Miriam’s grief and the rest is, for now, denied.

Nevertheless, Miriam’s grief does recur at numerous stages throughout the rest of *Pilgrimage*, in fact constituting a major element of the protagonist’s titular endeavour. As Suzette A. Henke observes,

> [t]he social isolation, estrangement, malaise, and dysphoria that characterize much of Miriam’s stream-of-consciousness narrative in the ensuing volumes of *Pilgrimage* [following Mrs Henderson’s death] might, indeed, be ascribed to the effects of post-traumatic stress—a syndrome precipitated by an event so shocking that the author cannot directly record it.62

Chapter seven of the 33 chapters that comprise *The Tunnel*, marks, in Freudian terms, the return of the repressed. The entirety of the chapter is one half-page paragraph in length, which runs as follows:

> WHY must I always think of her in this place? … It is always worst just along here. … Why do I always forget there’s this piece … Always be hurrying along seeing nothing and then, suddenly, Teetgen’s Teas and this row of shops? I can’t bear it. I don’t know what it is. It’s always the same. I always feel the same. It is sending me mad. One day it will be worse. If it gets any worse I shall be mad. Just here. Certainly.

Something is wearing out of me. I am meant to go mad. If not, I should not always be coming along this piece without knowing it, whichever street I take. Other people would know the streets apart. I don’t know where this bit is or how I get to it. I come every day because I am meant to go mad here. Something that knows brings me here and is making me go mad because I am myself and nothing changes me. (II, p. 136)

Whilst not explicitly identified, the reader assumes that the unnamed ‘her’ refers to Mrs Henderson, and that Teetgen’s Teas is an emotionally-charged site of memory involving mother and daughter. The technique demonstrates Miriam’s unwillingness or inability to fully, consciously, embrace the trauma of her loss, the pain of which is conveyed through the rhetorical questions, the sense of exhaustion and frustration at repeatedly encountering the same distressing location. The association with Mrs Henderson is compounded by the numerous references to madness; though Mrs Henderson was described during the disastrous seaside holiday above as decidedly not mad in comparison to the other characters (while they were ‘mad’, she was ‘different’ [I, p. 479]), the proximity of the association endures. The scene is especially striking given the mode of narration employed throughout the text: as Bowler argues,

[t]he limiting point of view makes what Miriam does see and make note of very important. Miriam keeps her eyes open all the time, collecting impressions […]. Miriam’s unceasing observation of everything around her, and of the things happening in her own head, is what makes her herself, and what gives her her power.63

For Miriam at this stage to announce that she returns to this site ‘every day’ and ‘always think[s] of her in this place’, and moreover that she doesn’t know how she gets there, is disorientating to a reader who has followed her ‘unceasing observation’ and unyielding consciousness: this is the first encounter we have with an apparently frequent, significant occurrence. It draws attention to what is not recorded, beyond the obvious time lapses between chapters or life stages. In one sense, walking is the means by which Miriam

63 Bowler, ‘The Gaze of the Other’, pp. 76-77; See also Hartley, p.828.
physically arrives at the mnemonic catalyst, Teetgen’s Teas, which sparks thoughts of her mother. In another sense, it also facilitates an absent-minded mental condition, the suspension of the ‘critical faculty’ which Freud deemed the pre-requisite state of mind for the appearance of ‘involuntary thoughts’ and subsequent free association. Walking therefore also metaphorically enables Miriam to arrive at her psychological destination.

The condition is also encountered in the third chapter of *Deadlock*, the sixth book in the series:

walking in London, she would pass into that strange familiar state, where all clamourings seemed unreal, and on in the end into complete forgetfulness.

Two scenes flashed forth from the panorama beyond the darkness, and while she glanced at the vagrants stretched asleep on the grass in Hyde Park summer, carefully to be skirted and yet most dreadfully claiming her companionship, she saw, narrow and gaslit, the little unlocated street that had haunted her first London years, herself flitting into it, always unknowingly, from a maze of surrounding streets, feeling uneasy, recognizing it, hurrying to pass its awful centre where she must read the name of a shop, and, dropped helplessly into the deepest pit of her memory, struggle on through thronging images threatening, each time more powerfully, to draw her willingly back and back through the intervening spaces of her life to some deserved destruction of mind and body, until presently she emerged faint and quivering, in a wide careless thoroughfare. She had forgotten it; perhaps somehow learned to avoid it. Her imagined figure passed from the haunted scene, and from the vast spread of London the tide flowed through it, leaving it a daylit part of the whole, its spell broken and gone. (III, pp. 106-07)

Like the previously-discussed instance of the return of the repressed, this passage lends itself to Freudian interpretation. It is facilitated by the particular condition of Miriam’s mind within the moment, again akin to the state encouraged in the psychoanalytic patient, brought about by the physical act of walking that enables the mind to wander. The flash of vision beyond the ‘darkness’ can be interpreted as both the literal twilight of the evening into which Miriam
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64 Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, IV, p. 102. See also Laplanche and Pontalis, pp. 169-70.
embarks, and the revelatory insight brought forth by her descent into the ‘deepest pit of her memory’, the unconscious. Though again Mrs Henderson is not explicitly identified, and even the shop is unnamed in this instance (though Miriam is forced to read its name, it is not voiced here), the reader infers from the passages discussed above that the pain described stems from Mrs Henderson’s death, and the shop refers to Teetgen’s Teas. There is deliberateness to the ‘learnt’ forgetting or avoidance of the site as traumatic trigger, suggestive of repression. Facing it now enables Miriam to break its spell and dispel the dark power of the scene, as psychoanalytic treatment encourages patients to acknowledge and accept the unconscious triggers causing their symptoms in order to remove them; she brings it forth into consciousness, makes it ‘a part of the daylit whole’. Framed by a literal excursion into the city, the mental episode is figured as a journey: a descent into darkness, a flash of revelation, emergence into daylight. The trauma of Mrs Henderson’s death therefore facilitates powerful memories and emotions that disrupt the temporal progression of the text and direct us backward from Miriam’s consciousness to her unconscious. Whilst in this sense they fragment, the re-emergence of this highly significant life event across various books in Pilgrimage unites them as a singular text enacting the psychological pilgrimage of the protagonist.

At no subsequent point in Pilgrimage does Miriam arrive unawares at this location and experience the terrible suffering it had previously provoked. Rather, the next and final time, in the third chapter of the tenth book, Dawn’s Left Hand, the experience is acknowledged with a sense of progress:

And this street, still foul and dust-filled, but full now also of the light flooding down upon and the air flowing through the larger streets with which in her mind it was clearly linked, was the place where in the early years she would suddenly find herself lost and helplessly aware of what was waiting for her eyes the moment before it appeared: the grimed gilt lettering that forced me to gaze into the darkest moment of
my life and to remember that I had forfeited my share in humanity for ever and must go quietly and alone until the end.

And now their power has gone. They can bring back only the memory of a darkness and horror, to which, then, something has happened, begun to happen?

She glanced back over her shoulder at the letters now away behind her and rejoiced in freedom that allowed her to note their peculiarities of size and shape. (iv, pp. 155-56)

The transition from the third to first person demonstrates a self-awareness previously lacking, and although closure is not fully granted—something has only ‘begun to happen’—there is a definite sense of significant progression as Miriam is able to put the shop physically ‘behind her’ and its painful associations likewise.

As noted in the introduction to this thesis, my method has predominantly been to apply a literary-critical approach to Freud’s texts, rather than to produce psychoanalytic readings of the literature that involve unpicking symbolism, treating characters as if they were real people and producing readings of their unconscious informed by psychoanalytic principles, and discerning the author’s ego within the text. Yet over the course of the thesis I have at times done all of these things. The above analysis of trauma in Pilgrimage, for instance, practices the first two methods of psychoanalytic literary criticism, and one could easily pursue the third method with the knowledge that Richardson’s own mother committed suicide under similar circumstances. As stated in the introduction, however, such readings help to elucidate the connections between Freud and the other focal authors. While it is true that psychoanalytic readings could equally be applied to non-impressionist texts, as Maud Ellmann has noted, ‘Freudian ideas were “in the air”’ during the period and permeated ‘the modernist imagination’; it is therefore unsurprising that we find, as Ellmann did, ‘fertile correspondences’ between the content, style and theoretical perspectives underlying both
psychoanalysis and contemporaneously-produced literature. The seeping in of such psychoanalytic literary criticism demonstrates the extent to which impressionism and psychoanalysis are intertwined, both employing similar techniques in their attempts to authentically represent human experience—in this case in relation to the shared subject matter of psychological disturbances and processes. Richardson’s melding of the stream-of-consciousness content and style in her depiction of Miriam’s pilgrimage is a particularly apt demonstration of the fusion of the psychoanalytic and impressionistic disciplines, which is also found in Freud’s depictions of both his patients’ and his own pilgrimages towards self-knowledge.

Authorial Pilgrimages

If Miriam is Richardson’s chosen centre of consciousness, tying together the books of Pilgrimage, then the sustained consciousness we receive across Freud’s books belongs to the analyst himself (or at least a construction thereof). While the case histories discussed in the second and third chapters of this thesis attempted to present the patients in this role, we have increasingly come to recognise how such figures are the products of Freud’s subjective consciousness. The displacement of the patient protagonist by Freud’s own centre of consciousness is heightened when one considers Freud’s body of work as a whole, in which the narrative of the development of psychoanalysis is so closely intertwined with Freud’s own life story, as noted in the previous chapter. Similarly, Miriam’s experiences are modelled upon Richardson’s own life, though the autobiographical connections were not recognised by many of Richardson’s original readers and critics. In her essay ‘Novels’, Richardson conceives of all novels as conducted tours ‘into the personality of the author’, who ‘will

reveal whether directly or by implication, his tastes, his prejudices, and his philosophy’ (p. 434). In his introduction to *Pointed Roofs*, J. D. Beresford perceives Richardson as ‘the first novelist who has taken the final plunge; who has […] become a very part of the human element she has described’. The result, according to Beresford, is that Richardson’s text comprises ‘a new attitude towards fiction’ and her protagonist, Miriam, ‘is, indeed, one with life’ (p. viii). Readers of biographies of Richardson, notably that by Gloria Fromm, are able to explore the close parallels between the narrative of Richardson’s life and that of Miriam’s, and George E. Thomson’s *A Reader’s Guide to Dorothy Richardson’s Pilgrimage* draws out the abundant correspondences between people and places within the text and those in real life. Similarly, Rebecca Bowler and Carol Overrill offer supplemental ‘biographical notes’ on the real-life ‘cast of Backwater’. John Cowper Powys described *Pilgrimage* as ‘a universally significant psychic biography: the biography of a solitary human soul’, while Beresford describes how ‘Miss Richardson sat down to write the story of her own life’. Richardson’s embedding of herself within a quasi-autobiographical text thus challenges generic boundaries in ways resembling those practised by Woolf and Freud as demonstrated in the previous chapter; *Pilgrimage* is a work of *autobiografiction*, to use Max Saunders’s terminology.

Within *Pilgrimage*, Miriam’s reading and writing experiences show her growing recognition of the author in literature. For example, while reading Ibsen in *Interim*,

[s]he turned the pages backwards, re-reading passages here and there. She could not remember having read them. Looking forward to portions of the dialogue towards the end of the book she found them familiar; as if she had read them before. She read

---

69 Both quoted in Kunitz, p. 563.
them intently. They had more meaning read like that, without knowing to what they were supposed to refer. They were the *same*, read alone in scraps, as the early parts. It was all one book in some way, not through the thoughts, or the story, but something in the author. (II, pp. 382-3)

Miriam’s reading out of sequence here undermines linear chronology, and she rejects the ideas or ‘thoughts’ within the text, as well as the events of the ‘story’, in favour of the author, the figure that unites the text so that it truly becomes ‘all one book’. The notion compounds the view expressed in *Honeycomb*, wherein Miriam has the following epiphany:

> Then you read books to find the author! That was it. That was the difference … that was how one was different from most people. … Dear Eve; I have just discovered that I don’t read books for the story, but as a psychological study of the author […]. It meant … things coming to you out of books, people, not the people in the books, but knowing, absolutely, everything about the author. […] ‘stories’—they would never be that to her. They were people. More real than actual people. They came nearer. In life everything was so scrappy and mixed up. In a book the author was there in every word. (I, p. 384)

The view here that books are real people, or even ‘more real than actual people’, echoes and amplifies the sentiments of the authors studied in previous chapters, from Ford’s declaration that ‘Impressionism is a frank expression of personality’, to Woolf’s assessment of modern biography as ‘most completely and most subtly’ depicting the author.70 Here, Miriam not only rejects plot but also the characters being actively depicted, in favour of finding the author ‘in every word’. In *Revolving Lights*, Miriam’s stance is that ‘[b]ooks about people are lies from beginning to end. However sincere, they cannot offer any evidence about life’ (III, p. 322). This critical perspective is again directed towards textual attempts to write the lives of others, rather than those that embrace the authorial self.

In Miriam’s view—as in Richardson’s, expressed in the quote from ‘Novels’, above—the author ‘can’t help showing himself’ (I, p. 385) through the style of the texts. For
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instance, Richardson writes, ‘[a] moral writer only sees the mote in his brother’s eye. And you see him seeing it’ (iv, p. 385). The voyeuristic exercise of the chain of perception between reader, author and character demonstrates how the author’s style will dictate the content of their text, thereby providing the key to the reader’s discernment of the author behind the character. In *Deadlock*, we witness Miriam reflecting upon this experience during an exercise in translation:

> The story was turned away from her towards people who were waiting to read and share what she felt as she read. It was no longer even partly hers; yet the thing that held it together in its English dress was herself. It had her expression, as a portrait would have, so that by no one in her sight or within range of any chance meeting with herself might it ever be contemplated. And for herself it was changed. Coming between her and the immediate grasp of the text were stirring memories; the history of her labour was written between the lines; and strangely, moving within the whole, was the record of the months since Christmas. On every page a day or group of days. It was a diary. … (Iii, p. 143)

The experience further complicates the reader-perceiving-author-perceiving-character exercise described above, since in this case Miriam is a reader of an original text, but becomes the author of the translation, while still remaining a character within Richardson’s text, who is a fictionalised version of the author. To focus upon Miriam as author in this instance is the most effective approach. She becomes ‘the thing that held [the text] together’; the text becomes the record of her life, ‘a diary’ of her experiences which are subtly woven ‘between the lines’ through her ‘expression’. Authors such as Freud similarly become interwoven into their texts, though the scene does return us to the question of authorship in translation discussed in the introduction to this thesis, suggesting the fruitfulness of further comparisons between Freud’s original texts and Strachey’s translations.

Freud, too, recognises how subjectivity permeates even (especially) seemingly objective attitudes. As he remarks in ‘Civilization and its Discontents’,


his method of looking at things, which seems objective because it ignores the variations in subjective sensibility, is, of course, the most subjective possible, since it puts one’s own mental states in the place of any others, unknown as they may be. (xxi, p. 89)

The author’s selection, arrangement and stylistic representation of content involve implicit decisions on their part, therefore rendering the text subjective. This is also recognised in ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’: ‘Among the factors which influence the prospects of analytic treatment and add to its difficulties in the same manner as the resistances, must be reckoned not only the nature of the patient’s ego but the individuality of the analyst’ (xxiii, p. 247). The analyst therefore has a responsibility, in Freud’s view, to address his own psychological issues in order to minimise their impact upon the patient:

It cannot be disputed that analysts in their own personalities have not invariably come up to the standard of psychical normality to which they wish to educate their patients. […] Analysts are people who have learned to practice a particular art; alongside of this, they may be allowed to be human beings like anyone else. […] So long as he is capable of practising at all, a doctor suffering from disease of the lungs or heart is not handicapped either in diagnosing or treating internal complaints; whereas the special conditions of analytic work do actually cause the analyst’s own defects to interfere with his making a correct assessment of the state of things in his patient and reacting to them in a useful way. It is therefore reasonable to expect of an analyst, as a part of his qualifications, a considerable degree of mental normality and correctness. In addition, he must possess some kind of superiority, so that in certain analytic situations he can act as a model for his patient and in others as a teacher. And finally we must not forget that the analytic relationship is based on a love of truth—that is, on a recognition of reality—and that it precludes any kind of sham or deceit. (xxiii, p. 247)

The paragraph aligns the analyst with the artist and distances him from the medical physician. It also humanises him, acknowledging his imperfections and psychological vulnerability, but balances this with a need for ‘superiority’. Finally, it places his philosophical love of truth in high esteem, a value shared by Miriam/Richardson. However, while Richardson’s solution is to embrace the author within the text, Freud attempts to focus on the depiction of the patient-character, especially in his case histories, by minimising the psychical interference of the
analyst. These attempts are doomed to failure according to Miriam’s perspective: as noted above, ‘[b]ooks about people are lies from beginning to end’.71

Drawing on Walter Muschg’s ‘Freud ald Schriftseller’ and the revised French translation by Jacques Schotte, Patrick Mahony notes the amalgamation of ‘Freud the man, Freud the writer, and Freud the theoretician’ in the development of psychoanalysis.72 It is therefore difficult to disentangle the autobiographical, authorial and analytical pilgrimages that his writings depict and enact. Across his works, Freud repeatedly refers to the task of the reader, analyst, patient, and mankind in general in terms of journeying and, further, these journeys are characterised by detours, dangers, ambiguity and indirection. They thus recall Ford’s acknowledgement of the ‘way that life really presents itself to us: not as a rattling narrative beginning at a hero’s birth and progressing to his not very carefully machined yet predestined glory—but dallying backwards and forwards’.73 Freud also acknowledges that ‘[t]he imagery most frequently chosen’ by the patient to represent the process psychoanalytic treatment they are undergoing ‘is that of a journey’.74 Freud’s own configurations of his task as journey occur in each of the texts considered in depth in previous chapters of this thesis. For example, John Farrell interprets the ‘motto’ of The Interpretation of Dreams, published in Latin on the title page and translated as ‘[i]f I cannot move the upper regions, then I will move the lower’, as suggestive of a ‘heroic motif of the journey to the underworld’.75 Farrell utilises Freud’s letter to Fleiss, in which the plan of the text was laid out, to argue that

his heroic rhetoric was not merely decorative but part of a deliberate strategy, the whole being cast in the form of a romance with Freud as the Virgilian guide leading
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72 Mahony, Freud as a Writer, p. 11.
73 Hueffer, Thus to Revisit, p. 55.
74 Freud, The Interpretation of Dreams, iv, p. 410.
the reader on the difficult quest for truth. There can be no doubt that Freud, even at this early stage of his psychoanalytic career, took himself seriously in his role as a scientific hero. When he announces at the end of the journey that ‘dreams are a royal road to knowledge of the unconscious activities of the mind,’ the structure of his romance is complete, with a stress on the value of the goal (608). Yet, in spite of this seriousness of purpose, the manner of the narrative is predominantly satiric. We hear an echo of Dante in Freud’s description of the beginning of the journey, in the ‘dark wood of the authorities,’ but the turn is comical.  

Whilst I would question the interpretation of Freud’s tone as ‘comical’, Farrell raises important points about Freud’s utilisation of the journey motif. The analyst figures the text as journey, himself the ‘scientific hero’ of the quest whose goal is ‘knowledge of the unconscious activities of the mind’. Similarly, Meegan Kennedy discusses Freud’s attempts to traverse the ‘unNavigable river’ of Dora’s psyche, and Freud describes in the Little Hans case how the analyst guides the patient towards ‘a conscious grasp of his unconscious wishes’: ‘The physician is a step in front of him in knowledge; and the patient follows along his own road, until the two meet at the appointed goal’.

The journeying/pilgrimage metaphor for the analytic task recurs not just in these texts, but frequently across Freud’s oeuvre. Mahony, for example, describes the early Studies on Hysteria as a ‘processive text’, wherein Freud’s ‘dominant walking metaphor was aptly to express a series of adjusting perspectives’; moreover, ‘Freud’s itinerant procedure was verbally integrated into his very material. To put it otherwise, the form in Freud’s prose, […] was organic to his thought, so that form and content were unified’ (much as the stream of
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consciousness unifies content and style in *Pilgrimage*).\(^{80}\) Similarly, Mahony notes ‘that the *New Introductory Lectures* are also based on a journey’.\(^{81}\) In ‘Civilization and its Discontents’, Freud seeks direction in his analytic enterprise from Goethe:

> One is reminded of the great poet’s [Goethe’s] moving arraignment of the ‘Heavenly Powers’: [...]. And we may well heave a sigh of relief at the thought that it is nevertheless vouchsafed to a few to salvage without effort from the whirlpool of their own feelings the deepest truths, towards which the rest of us have to find our way through tormenting uncertainty and with restless groping. (XXI, p. 133)

This example makes clear the pilgrimage objective of psychoanalysis (and art/literature) to arrive at the ‘deepest truths’, the watery imagery of the whirlpool reminiscent of Richardson’s conception of the mind as ocean with its powerful currents.\(^{82}\) Whilst Goethe’s poetic spirit is aligned with the ‘few’ that arrive ‘without effort’ at the prize of this quest, Freud establishes himself as amongst the collective ‘us’ whose journey is characterised by ‘tormenting uncertainty’ and ‘restless groping’. Yet the uncertain, groping qualities of Freud’s endeavour contribute to the text’s creative, impressionistic tone, since they demonstrate a commitment to representing the *process* of obtaining knowledge, aligning the analyst with his own readership rather than conveying a sense of authorial authority reserved for the creative writer. As psychoanalysis as a whole is directed towards uncovering these deep truths, so each psychoanalytic text produced by Freud enacts this journey; each individual text within his *oeuvre* is also a strand of the macro-narrative of psychoanalysis, in the same way that Richardson’s books formed the *Pilgrimage* narrative of Miriam’s.

Notably, Richardson also turned to Goethe to lead the way in literary development in her Foreword to *Pilgrimage*, wherein she reflects upon the authorial process undergone in the writing of *Pilgrimage* as a pilgrimage of its own, ‘an adventure’ (I, p. 10), thereby figuring
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herself as pilgrim and constituting another of the title’s over-determined interpretations. In the Foreword, Richardson undercuts her praise of Henry James’s techniques by conceding that ‘it was nevertheless not without a sense of relief that the present writer recently discovered’ the literary principles of Goethe (I, p. 10).83 She reproduces a ‘manifesto’ extract taken from Goethe’s novel Wilhelm Meister (a classic example of the bildungsroman form), which argues that the novel should feature ‘reflection and incidents’ modelled according to ‘the thought-processes of the principal figure’ (I, p. 11). Freud’s appreciation of classical literature and admiration of authors such as Goethe has inclined critics to affiliate the analyst’s own writing style within a more Romantic, rather than modernist context. Yet Richardson’s deferral from Henry James to Goethe in her Foreword, and her practice of the principles of both within her fiction, illustrates how the Romantic emphasis upon individual subjectivity feeds into the modern impressionist principles explored across this thesis, and facilitates the reading of Freud as impressionist author without ignoring his Romantic influences and inclinations. Moreover, Richardson’s reference to Goethe here formally demonstrates one way in which Romanticism is brought into a modern context: the Romantic interest in the hero figure and the mythic quest might initially seem to be followed in Richardson’s authorial pilgrimage of the Foreword in which she is figured as adventurer, but her reversion from coming to locate herself, initially, amongst modern authors such as Joyce, Woolf, Proust and James, to identification with the eighteenth-century Goethe, disrupts the temporal linearity of the quest.84
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Linking Richardson and Henry James, Kate McLoughlin argues that these two authors wrote long novels in response to what they, and others, perceived as a crisis in transferable experience. More specifically, James and Richardson enable the reader to perceive the functioning of this experience by constructing moments of insight to which the works’ lengthiness is indispensable. The lengthiness, furthermore, not only makes it possible for the reader to view this experience working in action, but also actually fosters comparable experience in him or her.85

Thus, for example, we observed the long process of Miriam’s coming to terms with the trauma of her mother’s death in Pilgrimage, comparable to the prolonged treatment of Freud’s patients and also to the analyst’s pilgrimage in pursuit of psychoanalytic understanding, which is punctuated by similar moments of insight. The crisis of transferable experience is enacted in Richardson’s and Freud’s texts as both struggle to convey their subjects to the reader, leading them to employ impressionistic techniques. Indeed, literary impressionism consists of both the actual impression and ways of representing it in writing, thus the highly crafted, overworked writing of the authors studied in this thesis seeks to convey realistic impressions by appropriating that elusive original experience.

Richardson reflected upon the difficulty of this task in a letter to Henry Savage, noting that ‘all art, as every artist […] well knows, can never express fully, what he wants to express’, lamenting particularly the ineffectuality of language: ‘Oh the helplessness surrounding the helpfulness and manifold uses of speech, the dangers within the delights of metaphor’.86 As Bronfen explains,

86 Dorothy Richardson, Letter to Henry Savage, Good Friday, undated, Beinecke Rare Books Library, Yale University. Quoted in Bronfen, p. 3.
[t]he more indirect and ambiguous one makes a description, the more effective it will be as an expressive device. Accordingly, the appeal of metaphor derives from the way in which it captures the essence of a particular thing precisely by skirting around it and refusing to identify it directly.\textsuperscript{87}

Richardson’s utilisation of indirect means (figurative language and impressionistic techniques) to elucidate her subject is reminiscent of Freud’s aforementioned declaration that in \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams} his ‘indirect phrases and […] sidelong glances at their subject-matter’ are illustrative of his ‘incomplete mastery of the material’ (\textit{IV}, p. xx). Like Richardson, he is aware of the dangers within the delights of his impressionistic style, drawing the reader’s attention to the limitations of his expression and its failure to fully convey the subject.

Miriam echoes Richardson’s anxieties as she experiences similar difficulties when attempting to express the experiences of her pilgrimage. For instance, in \textit{The Tunnel}, she attempts to relate her play-going experience of the previous evening in a letter to her sister, Harriet. However, the line provokes an uncomfortable dissatisfaction: ‘Miriam flushed as the last words ran automatically from her pen. The sense of the richly moving picture that had filled her all the morning […] would be gone if she left that sentence’ (\textit{II}, p. 177). Further reflection confirms that ‘the words had shattered the spell of Shakespeare, and writing them down like that was spoiling the description of the evening, though Harriett would not think so’ (\textit{II}, p. 177). The authorial anxiety of expression also manifests within the text as Miriam attempts to write professionally. Recalling the experience of writing her first review in conversation with Hypo (a character based on H. G. Wells), Miriam declares in \textit{Revolving Lights}: ‘I went nearly mad with the responsibility and the awfulness of discovering the way words express almost nothing at all’ (\textit{III}, p. 369). When Hypo accuses Miriam of ‘a really surprising lack of expression’ and of misrepresenting herself, she responds: ‘You mean I

\textsuperscript{87} Bronfen, p. 3.
haven’t a voice, that way of talking about things that makes one know people don’t believe what they say and are thinking most about the way they are talking. Bah’ (III, p. 375). Her point is elaborated when Hypo instructs her to take heed of her experience so that she can ‘[w]rite it up’ with ‘perspective’, to which Miriam replies:

‘Oh, I hate all these written-up things: “Jones always wore a battered cricket cap, a little askew.” They simply drive me mad. You know the whole thing is going to be lies from beginning to end.’

‘You’re a romantic, Miriam.’

‘I’m not. It’s the “always wore.” Trying to get at you, just as much as “Iseult the Fair.” Just as unreal, just as much in an assumed voice. The amazing thing is the way men go on prosing on for ever and ever, admiring each other, never suspecting.’

‘You’ve got to create an illusion, you know.’

‘Why an illusion? Life isn’t an illusion.’ (III, p. 377)

Miriam rejects the false mode of writing propounded by Hypo and associated with a male literary tradition; she rejects the charge of romanticism (in both the personal and literary senses), arguing instead for a more authentic representation, rather than artificial construction, of life. Her rejection of mythical, legendary and fairy-tale narratives suggested by ‘Iseult the Fair’ indicates how her own pilgrimage refuses to conform to the neat closure of the traditional quest narrative, preferring instead to retain authentic adherence to ‘life’, rather than ‘lies’ and ‘illusion’.

In *Interim*, Miriam’s perceptions accumulate to form a powerful impression of incommunicability:

Miriam peered into space, struggling with a tangle of statements. Her mind leapt from incident to incident, weaving all into a general impression—so strong and clear that it gave a sort of desperation to her painful consciousness that nothing she saw and felt was visible to the three pairs of differently watchful eyes. Poured chaotically out it
would sound to them like the ravings of insanity. All contradictory, up and down, backwards and forwards, all true. The things they would grasp, here and there, would misrepresent herself and the whole picture. Why would people insist upon talking about things—when nothing can ever be communicated? (II, p. 306)

The characteristics of this impression—chaotic, contradictory, non-linear—are highly impressionistic, leading not only to the inability to convey this particular experience, but to a general sense that ‘nothing can ever be communicated’. Nevertheless, such a method of ‘pouring out’ is embraced in numerous ways in Pilgrimage, for instance, in the highly visual, fragmented opening of The Trap:

A short by-street paved from side to side. Narrow house-fronts, and the endmost houses, hiding the passage that curved round into the further street, high enough to keep out of sight the neighbouring cubes of model dwellings and to leave, as principal feature in the upper air, the tower of St Pancras church. An old little street. A scrap of London standing apart, between the Bloomsbury squares and the maze of streets towards the city. The light gleaming from its rain-washed flagstones gave it a provincial air and a freshness unknown to the main streets, between whose buildings lay modern roadways dulled by mud or harsh with grimy dust. (III, p. 399)

The scene possesses the cinematic qualities which critics such as Laura Marcus and Rebecca Bowler explore in Richardson’s work, conveying the simultaneous coexistence of the various aspects of the London cityscape through the cinematic scope of vision. Though necessarily narrated sequentially, the passage aims to convey coexistence, a single moment captured and narrated as the eye takes in the scene as a whole. In Dreams of Modernity, Marcus also explores the connection between dreams and cinema in a psychoanalytic context, despite Freud’s neglect of this modern innovation.88

88 For the visual and cinematic properties of Richardson’s work see Winifred Bryher, ‘Review of Dawn’s Left Hand, by Dorothy Richardson’, Close Up, December 1931, 337–38; Dorothy Richardson, Letter to Bryher (22 December 1931), in Fromm, Windows on Modernism, p. 231; Abbie Garrington, Haptic Modernism: Touch and the Tactile in Modernist Writing (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013); Marcus, The Tenth Muse;
Richardson’s reflections upon the challenge of communication can also be found in the Foreword to Pilgrimage. The publishers J. M. Dent and the Cresset Press solicited the Foreword for their collected 1938 edition of Pilgrimage, with the intention of increasing Richardson’s readership and the accessibility of her text. Yet a letter from Richardson to Bryher in December 1937 describes the ‘struggle’ of writing the Foreword as ‘the most horrible job I ever attempted’, and as George E. Thomson observes, the result, rather than offering an introduction to render text and authorial method more accessible, instead comprises ‘an act of obfuscation’, itself ‘in need of decoding’, which Thomson achieves by adding context, identifying irony and paraphrasing obscure passages to elucidate their meaning. In writing the Foreword, Thomson argues, ‘[t]he same contemplative/creative process—intense, inward, autobiographical—that engendered the novel now yields the vivid, though elaborately indirect, account of the genesis of Pilgrimage’. The Foreword, then, was neither straightforward to write nor to read, its underlying purpose at odds with Richardson’s method and style in her fiction. As such, the Foreword does not progress the reader’s understanding of the genesis of the text in the way we might expect, and does not explicitly detail Richardson’s authorial method in the same way as, say, James’s prefaces and notebooks, but it does continue to enact Richardson’s authorial pilgrimage and the crisis of communication central to the novel.

Amongst the obfuscation of the Foreword, Richardson reflects upon her complicating techniques within Pilgrimage, such as her characteristic lack of punctuation, which she
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deems the hallmark of ‘[f]eminine prose’. She accepts the charge that her work is ‘unpunctuated and therefore unreadable’:

Feminine prose, as Charles Dickens and James Joyce have delightfully shown themselves to be aware, should properly be unpunctuated, moving from point to point without formal obstructions. And the author of ‘Pilgrimage’ must confess to an early habit of ignoring, while writing, the lesser of the stereotyped system of signs, and, further, when finally sprinkling in what appeared to be necessary, to a small unconscious departure from current usage (III, p. 12).

The feminine prose defies established formal conventions and flawed semiotics to come closer to conveying the contemplated reality with which Richardson grappled, yet she is also acutely aware of the difficulties this poses for the reader: ‘the small innovation, in further complicating the already otherwise sufficiently complicated task of the official reader, helped to produce the chaos for which she is justly reproached’ (III, p. 12). It therefore at once brings her closer to conveying reality and hinders this aim, the conflict evident in the way the term ‘innovation’ suggests progress and accomplishment, but the development is towards complication and ‘chaos’, leading her ultimately ‘to offer to all those readers who have persisted in spite of every obstacle, a heart-felt apology’ (III, p. 12), a gesture which we have repeatedly seen Freud extend across his works.

Like Richardson’s lack of punctuation, Freud’s use of ill-fitting analogies in his writing similarly attempts to convey the difficulty of his analytic and authorial task, producing prose which more authentically captures his process. Analogies abound within Freud’s texts, and we have had the opportunity to examine a number of striking examples in detail in previous chapters, but they are often presented with (pseudo-)limited satisfaction: in ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’, he writes that he wishes to utilise ‘an analogy, though I know that in these matters analogies never carry us very far’ (XXIII, p. 236). In ‘Civilization and its Discontents’, we witness his creative attempts to illustrate, through
visual analogies of the city and the body, the processes of the mind. Each, he concludes in turn is ineffective, but if his visual, ‘pictorial’ analogies are so deficient, why include them in the text at all? Drawing attention to their deficiencies but failing to correct or replace the analogies suggests a contradictory enjoyment and frustration with the creative process, acknowledging both the importance and limitations of the indirect style, which may render the task of the reader more long and laborious, but which will bring them (and Freud) closer to understanding the functioning of the mind (xxi, pp. 70-71). Similarly, he goes on to reflect, ‘I do not think that I have made a complete enumeration of the methods by which men strive to gain happiness and keep suffering away and I know, too, that the material might have been differently arranged’ (xxi, p. 81). The comments express a perceived failure to master both form and subject, the content and its expression. Like Richardson, Freud is using an indirect style to draw attention to the challenge of representation, ‘the helplessness surrounding the helpfulness and manifold uses of speech, the dangers within the delights of metaphor’, since his ill-fitting analogies disrupt the flow of the narrative and construction of argument.  

Freud’s pilgrimage in search of psychoanalytic insights and understanding is thus not a direct journey to enlightenment, but is characterised more as itinerant wandering and a series of detours: ‘if we wish to fulfil the more exacting demands upon analytic therapy, our road will not lead us to, or by way of, a shortening of its duration’.  

In the identification of the text as journey in ‘Civiliszation and its Discontents’, Freud remarks:

Having reached the end of his journey, the author must ask his readers’ forgiveness for not having been a more skilful guide and for not having spared them empty stretches of road and troublesome detours. There is no doubt that it could have been done better. I will attempt, late in the day, to make some amends.

92 Quoted in Bronfen, p. 3.
In the first place, I suspect that the reader has the impression that our discussions on the sense of guilt disrupt the framework of this essay: that they take up too much space, so that the rest of its subject-matter, with which they are not always closely connected, is pushed to one side. This may have spoilt the structure of my paper; but it corresponds faithfully to my intention to represent the sense of guilt as the most important problem in the development of civilization and to show that the price we pay for our advance in civilization is a loss of happiness through the heightening of the sense of guilt. Anything that still sounds strange about this statement, which is the final conclusion of our investigation, can probably be traced to the quite peculiar relationship—as yet completely unexplained—which the sense of guilt has to our consciousness. (xxi, p. 135)

This self-depreciating assessment of his writing echoes Richardson’s plea for forgiveness from her own readers, and the much earlier regret expressed in *The Interpretation of Dreams* at Freud’s failure to master his subject and convey it in lucid terms to the reader. As determined in consideration of the earlier text, such regret manifests the tension between Freud’s subject matter and its resistance to his preferred classical style—that of the writers so frequently cited throughout ‘Civilization and its Discontents’. He therefore fails to achieve the Virgilian guide-status with which Farrell associates him. The ‘peculiar’ and ‘unexplained’ subject matter is ill suited to such a style, and instead demands the gaps and detours that come to characterise Freud’s particular style of impressionism, which offer a more honest admission of the difficulty of representing the subject.

In her autobiographical essay ‘Data for a Spanish Publisher’ (1959), Richardson expresses her ‘deep-rooted suspicion of “facts” and ordered knowledge’, favouring instead the ‘direct apprehension’ of the world around her.\(^9\) The scenario is reminiscent of Ford’s comparison in ‘On Impressionism’ of the *Times* agriculturalist’s facts with ‘the fruits of [the impressionist’s] observations’.\(^9\) Richardson thus firmly aligns herself with the latter. In

Revolving Lights, Miriam figures not only the style of representation but also the experience of life in gendered terms which she relates to science and an impressionistic alternative:

Damn facts. Those arranged tests and their facts are utterly nothing at all. Women’s controls appear to be feebler because they have so much more to control. I don’t mean physically. Mentally. By seeing everything simultaneously. Unless they are the kind of woman who has been warped into seeing only one thing at a time. Scientifically. They are freaks. Women see in terms of life. Men in terms of things, because their lives are passed amongst scraps. (III, p. 393)

In Miriam’s view, women then are better equipped to represent life as they better experience it, astutely observing its multitudinous facets as they occur in contrast to the masculine scientific arrangement of false facts. The contrast that Miriam figures here in gendered terms is the difficulty with which Freud has struggled due to the incompatibility between his desired scientific form and the resistance to this of his content—the unconscious subject matter—which demands alternative expression.

Late in his career, in ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’, Freud too denounces the way of looking at things that Miriam rejects, instead advocating a more impressionistic adherence to life:

We know that the first step towards attaining intellectual mastery of our environment is to discover generalizations, rules and laws which bring order into chaos. In doing this we simplify the world of phenomena; but we cannot avoid falsifying it, especially if we are dealing with processes of development and change. What we are concerned with is discerning a qualitative alteration, and as a rule in doing so we neglect, at any rate to begin with, a quantitative factor. In the real world, transitions and intermediate stages are far more common than sharply differentiated states. (XXIII, p. 228)

Arguing against the value of ‘falsifying’ generalisations aligns Freud with Miriam’s stance in Pilgrimage, wherein she associates generalisations and stereotyping with the unfavourable masculine way of living and writing (though both she and Freud contradictorily often make sweeping statements of their own):
Old men seemed to have some sort of understanding of things. But the things they said were worldly—generalizations, like the things one read in books that tired you out with trying to find the answer, and made books so awful … things that might look true about everybody at some time or other, and were not really true about anybody—when you knew them. (II, p. 97)

*Stereotyping*, in their fixed, mechanical men’s way […] (III, p. 379)

Freud thus distances himself from this detrimental stance, embracing instead the authentic chaos of life that Richardson acknowledged in her Foreword made its way into her text. Freud stresses the roots of his discourse ‘in the real world’, which is characterised by the fluidity, in-betweenness, and fragmentation which I have demonstrated over the course of this thesis is integral to his impressionism.

The very essay in which Freud makes clear his epistemological stance manifests the commitment to impressionism through its style.⁹⁶ In ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’ Freud includes an anecdote concerning two parties, a patient-analyst who himself experienced neurotic symptoms, and a ‘superior’ analyst from whom he sought help, appeared cured, but later ‘became antagonistic to the [superior] analyst and reproached him for having failed to give him a complete analysis’ (XXIII, p. 221). Sustained reference is made to both parties in the third person, but, as pointed out in Strachey’s editorial note, Ernest Jones identifies the first party as Sándor Ferenczi and the second as Freud, thereby facilitating one of the many ways that indirection is enacted within the textual journey. Likewise, Freud extends the boundaries of his subject by using a reference to Goethe’s *Faust* to introduce the significance of metapsychology, thus extending the scientific discourse to

encompass literature, and extending the boundaries of psychoanalysis to encompass metapsychology:

Without metapsychological speculation and theorizing—I had almost said ‘phantasizing’—we shall not get another step forward. Unfortunately, here as elsewhere, what our Witch reveals is neither very clear nor very detailed. We have only a single clue to start from—though it is a clue of the highest value—namely, the antithesis between the primary and secondary processes. (XXIII, p. 225)

The journey motif is again employed with reference to the obstacles inhibiting and means of attaining the progressive ‘step forward’, as well as to origins. Once again the journey is characterised by obscurity and difficulty. Even when the route seems clearer Freud’s obligation to state the obvious for the sake of the development of his argument undermines narrative coherency: ‘I feel as though I ought to be ashamed of so much ponderous exposition, seeing that everything I have said has long been familiar and self-evident’ (XXIII, p. 226). Furthermore, the forward-moving progression of knowledge is contradictorily undermined: on the one hand there are moments where it seems understanding is being developed through further thought, as in the suggestion of ‘whether all that we know about psychical conflict should not be revised from this new angle’ (XXIII, p. 244). On the other hand though, there are instances where the linear development of the narrative of psychoanalysis is disrupted. For instance, Freud acknowledges

that the dualistic theory […] has found little sympathy and has not really been accepted even among psycho-analysts. This made me all the more pleased when not long ago I came upon this theory of mine in the writings of one of the great thinkers of ancient Greece. I am very ready to give up the prestige of originality for the sake of such a confirmation, especially as I can never be certain, in view of the wide extent of my reading in early years, whether what I took for a new creation might not be an effect of cryptomnesia. (XXIII, pp. 244-45)
Like Miriam turning from James to Goethe in her Foreword in order to progress her writing of both the Foreword itself and Pilgrimage as a whole (I, p. 10), Freud has to look back to ancient Greece in order to further the progress of psychoanalytic theory.

Fragmentation and gaps, akin to Richardson’s impressionistic conveyance of Miriam’s consciousness and physical gaps on the page, occur frequently in ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’ in relation to incomplete knowledge and insufficient understanding of the processes at work. For example, Freud reports that ‘[o]ur knowledge of [defence mechanisms] is not yet sufficiently complete’ (XXIII, pp. 235-36). Similarly, in relation to the impact of analysis ‘sometimes succeed[ing] in eliminating the influence of an increase in instinct,’ or the limited effect of analysis in ‘increasing the power of resistance of the inhibitions,’ he remarks, ‘I really cannot commit myself to a decision on this point, nor do I know whether a decision is possible at the present time’ (XXIII, p. 228). When discussing young patients’ ‘psychical inertia’ he confesses, ‘[o]ur theoretical knowledge does not seem adequate to give a correct explanation of such types. Probably some temporal characteristics are concerned—some alterations of a rhythm of development of psychical life which we have not yet appreciated’ (XXIII, p. 242). Such admissions refuse to succumb to falsifying simplifications despite the intellectual mastery and order over chaos that they claim to offer; rather, Freud acknowledges the limitations of his knowledge and positions both himself and the reader amongst ‘transitions and intermediate stages’ (XXIII, p. 228).

The features of ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’ here discussed, along with the other examples of Freud’s impressionist style in individual texts, represent in microcosm Freud’s process across his life’s work. The development of the discipline of psychoanalysis was characterised by indirect paths, detours into metapsychology, major theoretical revisions such as Freud’s abandonment of the seduction theory as involving a literal act of childhood
sexual abuse, and a sense that, like Henry James, nothing was ever Freud’s ‘last word’ about any of it; rather, we find ourselves in intermediate stage after intermediate stage. Thus, Freud’s individual texts become palimpsests written over with his multiple prefaces, footnoted revisions and addenda, and we can figure the multiple texts of the Standard Edition as a similar palimpsest of processive thought.

Interminability

Having figured Freud’s and Richardson’s life works as impressionistic pilgrimages, it naturally follows to consider how these pilgrimages and narratives end. First published in 1967, Frank Kermode’s important contribution to narrative theory, *The Sense of an Ending*, charts the existential preoccupation of the human race with endings, arguing that it is through endings that we make sense of the world. It is therefore no surprise that literature should reflect this concern. According to Kermode,

> [m]en in the midst make considerable imaginative investments in coherent patterns which, by the provision of an end, make possible a satisfying consonance with the origins and with the middle. That is why the image of the end can never be *permanently* falsified. But they also, when awake and sane, feel the need to show a marked respect for things as they are; so that there is a recurring need for adjustments in the interest of reality as well as of control.

The anticipation of a satisfying ending is thus both desired by readers and at odds with ‘things as they are’, the untidier reality of life. As demonstrated throughout this thesis, impressionist authors prioritised this latter adherence to reality and this extends to their methods of concluding their texts. Moreover, Kermode highlights the consonance of endings with the origins and middles that precede them, but as we have seen impressionist texts are
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not governed by concerns of plot or action in which the beginnings and middles would play a more dominant role, but rather by character and style. Moreover, the origins in question are often obscure, as in Freud’s efforts to traverse back to the impressions in his patients’ unconscious; the fitting consonance is thus that the endings should be similarly obscure.

The problem of endings is reflected in the length of long modernist novels, which often lack the closure found in the outputs of their literary precursors, such as traditional forms of the *bildungsroman* or long Victorian novels with their ‘beginning, middle, climax, and curtain’ of the kind Richardson denounced. Open endings in the period became, as Earl G. Ingersoll points out, ‘a hallmark of modernist fiction’, suggesting that the long modernist novel as a form is in a sense unfinishable as the authors grapple with ‘the long process of reconfiguring, reflecting upon, and coming to terms with the shock experience of modernity’ noted by McCracken and Winning. Powys was right in his prediction that the volumes of *Pilgrimage* would contain ‘no neat “dénouement,” no rounding off of everything in the attainment of a certain spiritual “formula”’. Rather, as Michael Bell describes, *Pilgrimage* is ‘both long and aesthetically uncontained to the point of being unfinished’. ‘To know beforehand where you are going is to be going nowhere’, remarks Miriam, contrasting her more impressionistic stance on endings with the perspective held by Hypo, ‘Because it means you are nowhere to begin with’ (iv, p. 172). In her gendered terms, Richardson thus defies the male versions of the quest narrative and *bildungsroman* with their ultimate conquest and achievement. She also, as Rachel DuPlessis explores, depicts a female
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quest which defies the imposed endings of death or marriage that typified nineteenth-century endings for female characters.\textsuperscript{104} As Miriam remarks in \textit{Honeycomb},

> [p]eople thought it was silly, almost wrong to look at the end of a book. But if it spoilt a book there was something wrong about the book. If it was finished and the interest gone when you know who married who, what was the good of reading at all? It was a sort of trick, a sell. Like a puzzle that was no more fun when you had found it out. There was something more in books than that … (IV, pp. 384-85)

Beyond unsatisfying plot resolution, the something more, as we have seen, is the author and their implicit representation through style.

Not only is \textit{Pilgrimage} unfinished—\textit{March Moonlight} is incomplete and there is no telling how many additional books Richardson would have contributed to the series had she lived—the project is also arguably ultimately unfinishable. Consistent with Sinclair’s comment that Richardson’s text ‘is just life going on and on’,\textsuperscript{105} Bell identifies the narrative as being ‘closer to the spirit of a journal’ than a novel,\textsuperscript{106} possessing the lack of closure one would expect to find in the journal form, as life continues to stream onward. More importantly, the task of representing the female mind—the aim of Richardson’s feminine impressionism—is similarly ongoing, not something that can be satisfactorily accomplished and set aside as complete, but rather a perpetual endeavour of representation. Consequently, as Abbie Garrington points out and as we have seen over the course of this chapter, for Miriam as for Richardson, ‘it is the process of travelling, rather than the destination, which is
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Thus it is not some sacred destination but the very act of Richardson’s ongoing authorial pilgrimage which is important.

As explored above, Freud too makes use of the pilgrimage metaphor in his texts and, like Richardson, his priority is also the journey rather than the destination. Discussing Studies on Hysteria, Mahony aligns Freud’s ‘open-ended attitude to psychoanalysis’ with his ‘dominant walking metaphor’, characteristics which combine ‘aptly to express a series of adjusting perspectives’. Mahony also examines the open-endedness of other Freudian texts, such as Totem and Taboo and pays tribute to Schotte’s argument ‘that Freud’s theories and psychoanalytic explanations are but fragments of a process: properly understood, the knowledge of psychoanalytic theory must be recognized as essentially incomplete, undogmatic, and processive’. Like Richardson’s attempts to represent the female mind, Freud’s efforts to explore and represent the unconscious are also demonstrably unfinishable, so that we are faced in his corpus with his relentless impressions of ‘life going on and on’.

The question of endings proved problematic for Freud across his career. Unlike the fictional characters of James and Ford, Freud’s subjects are not under his control and his case histories are therefore open to further fragmentation, such as Hans’s adult amnesia or Dora’s premature termination of her treatment and subsequent return. In ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’, Freud discusses a similar extension made to the Wolf Man case history, informing the reader that when his patient ‘left me in the midsummer of 1914, with as little suspicion as the rest of us what lay ahead, I believed that his cure was radical and permanent’
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(XXIII, p. 217). However, ‘[i]n a footnote added to this patient’s case history in 1923 I have already reported that I was mistaken.’ Freud later had

to help him to master a part of the transference which had not been resolved. This was accomplished in a few months, and I was able to end my footnote with the statement that ‘since then the patient has felt normal and has behaved unexceptionally [...]’

Fifteen years have passed since then without disproving the truth of this verdict; but certain reservations have become necessary. (XXIII, pp. 217-18)

Pankejeff’s story thus extends beyond the boundaries of his own case history and into this much later theoretical text, highlighting once again the artificial boundaries of the text when representing life. Though the case history text was complete, Freud cannot help but comment, ‘I have found the history of this patient’s recovery scarcely less interesting than his illness’ (XXIII, p. 218).

The refusal of these cases to end with their original textual case histories drives Freud to explicitly take up the ‘deeply interesting question’ in ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’ of whether ‘there [is] such a thing as a natural end to an analysis—is there any possibility at all of bringing an analysis to such an end?’ (XXIII, p. 219). Initially he must clarify the ‘ambiguous phrase “the end of an analysis”’, to which he simply answers: ‘An analysis is ended when the analyst and the patient cease to meet each other for the analytic session’ (XXIII, p. 219). However, the qualifications attached to this occurrence reintroduce the ambiguity that the text apparently seeks to address:

This happens when two conditions have been approximately fulfilled: first, that the patient shall no longer be suffering from his symptoms and shall have overcome his anxieties and his inhibitions; and secondly, that the analyst shall judge that so much repressed material has been made conscious, and so much internal resistance conquered, that there is no need to fear a repetition of the pathological process concerned. If one is prevented by external difficulties from reaching this goal, it is better to speak of an incomplete analysis [as in Dora’s case] rather than of an unfinished one. (XXIII, p. 219)
Vagueness is indicated by the only approximate fulfilment of the first condition, while the second, dependent upon the analyst’s judgement, is highly subjective. Furthermore, in both the ‘incomplete’ and ‘unfinished’ analysis, closure is denied.

Yet Freud is also concerned with the prophylactic power of analytic treatment, a ‘much more ambitious’ interpretation of its ending:

In this sense of it, what we are asking is whether the analyst has had such a far-reaching influence on the patient that no further change could be expected to take place in him if his analysis were continued. It is as though it were possible by means of analysis to attain to a level of absolute psychical normality—a level, moreover, which we could feel confident would be able to remain stable, as though, perhaps we had succeeded in resolving every one of the patient’s repressions and in filling in all the gaps in his memory. (xxiii, pp. 219-220)

Freud thus seeks a permanent ‘cure by analysis’ but admits that ‘obstacles’ prevent it and there are ‘factors which are prejudicial to analysis and which may make its duration interminable’, but ‘it must be admitted that our knowledge in these matters is as yet insufficient.’ (xxiii, p. 221). Not only then does the requirement of testing a permanent cure appear ambitious because of the difficulty of measuring its success, since symptoms or further illness may appear years after the treatment is terminated, but the incomplete knowledge about the challenges to such a solution render further difficulties. There is an exception, however:

Only when a case is a predominantly traumatic one will analysis succeed in doing what it is so superlatively able to do; only then will it, thanks to having strengthened the patient’s ego, succeed in replacing by a correct solution the inadequate decision made in his early life. Only in such cases can one speak of an analysis having been definitively ended. (xxiii, p. 220)

This corresponds with Miriam’s progression through the trauma of her mother’s death in Pilgrimage; we have already seen the similarities that these episodes shared with the analytic
process, and this extends to their resolution, where Miriam was able to consciously face Teetgens Teas and its associations.

As noted above, Freud acknowledged in ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’ the transferential influence of the analyst upon the patient, and by association the author upon the text representing the patient-character. With so significant a stake in the narrative then, it is no surprise that Freud turns his attention to the interminable experience of the analyst as/as well as the patient. Freud advocated the analyst addressing his own psychological issues to minimise their interference with his observation of ‘truth’ (XXIII, p. 248). In order to achieve and maintain this perspective, he asserts that the analyst’s preparation must lie ‘in an analysis of himself’, though ‘[f]or practical reasons this analysis can only be short and incomplete’ (XXIII, p. 248):

This alone would not suffice for his instruction; but we reckon on the stimuli that he has received in his own analysis not ceasing when it ends and on the processes of remodelling the ego continuing spontaneously in the analysed subject and making use of all subsequent experiences in this newly-acquired sense. This does in fact happen, and in so far as it happens it makes the analysed subject qualified to be an analyst himself. (XXIII, pp. 248-49)

The analyst’s self-analysis is thus both incomplete and ongoing, permeating his interactions with patients and blurring the distinctions between and functions of both roles. Though the prolonged self-analysis continues unconsciously, Freud also advocates a conscious, regular review:

Every analyst should periodically—at intervals of five years or so—submit himself to analysis once more […]. This would mean, then, that not only the therapeutic analysis of patients but his own analysis would change from a terminable into an interminable task. (XXIII, p. 249).

Ernest Jones similarly acknowledges the ‘incompleteness’ of Freud’s self-analysis, which Freud set about consciously undertaking in 1897, and of psychanalyses in general. Jones
explains in his biography that ‘[a]t the head of this chapter only the initial date is given. The reason is that Freud told me he never ceased to analyze himself, devoting the last half hour of his day to that purpose’. 111

Faced with the interminable outcome, Freud is compelled to qualify the apparently hopeless circumstance by returning to the notion of practicality with which he began the text:

I am not intending to assert that analysis is altogether an endless business. Whatever one’s theoretical attitude to the question may be, the termination of an analysis is, I think a practical matter. Every experienced analyst will be able to recall a number of cases in which he has bidden his patient a permanent farewell rebus bene gestis [Things having gone well]. (XXIII, pp. 249-50)

Ultimately, he determines, ‘[t]he business of the analysis is to secure the best possible psychological conditions for the functions of the ego; with that it has discharged its task’ (XXIII, p. 250). Though the outcome is limited, this statement appears concluding, rounding-off the arguments presented in the text and addressing its aims. However, as in the postscripts and footnotes to his case histories, a final section follows the conclusion-like summation in ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’, undermining its closure. In this last section Freud addresses ‘two themes’ that ‘give the analyst an unusual amount of trouble’: penis envy in the female ‘and, in the male, a struggle against his passive or feminine attitude to another male’ (XXIII, p. 250). In both cases, he concludes,

[t]he repudiation of femininity can be nothing else than a biological fact, a part of the great riddle of sex. It would be hard to say whether and when we have succeeded in mastering this factor in an analytic treatment. We can only console ourselves with the certainty that we have given the person analysed every possible encouragement to re-examine and alter his attitude to it. (XXIII, pp. 252-53)

The riddle goes unanswered and consequently the very question of whether analysis is fundamentally interminable remains unresolved, because we are still unsure how we would
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know whether the disturbance has been mastered. Whatever the ultimate outcome of the patient’s case then, this particular text demonstrates the interminable nature of the broader psychoanalytic narrative, both at a structural level through the introduction of new difficulties after the conclusion, and in the context of further theoretical development after the text; there is hope that one day the ‘riddle of sex’ might be solved and that the question of analytic success might be resolved.

Given how deeply embedded within their life works—the narratives of psychoanalysis and Pilgrimage respectively—Freud and Richardson are, perhaps the only possible ending to their seemingly interminable pilgrimages might be in the death of the author: from this point they cannot continue to render the impressions that had constituted their subject matter. Yet both Richardson’s and Freud’s stories did continue after their deaths, impressionistically subverting the neat closure of their lives’ works, as posthumous publications appeared for both, and editorial engagement with their work continued, with Strachey’s Standard Edition of Freud’s Complete Psychoanalytic Works continuing its publication under Hogarth until 1957 and the series republished by Vintage in 2001. As mentioned in the Introduction, this Standard Edition has provided the source material of the present thesis, but there also now exist new translations published by Penguin. Similarly, Virago republished Dent & Cresset’s collected Pilgrimage (1938) in the 1970s as part of their commitment to ‘champion[ing] women’s talent’ and rediscovering the lives and work of neglected female writers.112 While Rebecca Bowler describes the Virago edition as an ‘admirable but temporary repopularisation of Richardson’,113 a new scholarly edition of the text is currently being prepared as part of the Dorothy Richardson Scholarly Editions project.
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for publication by Oxford University Press.\footnote{‘Dorothy Richardson Scholarly Editions Project’, Keele University \url{https://www.keele.ac.uk/drsep/} [accessed 17 April 2018].} The subsequent editions of Richardson’s and Freud’s works thus suggest the continued longevity of their texts beyond the authorial lifespan.

In addition to the texts’ extended production and reproduction, scholarly and popular engagement also extends their narratives. According to Trudi Tate,

[a]t the height of her career, Dorothy Richardson had a considerable reputation as a modernist novelist. But when she died in a nursing home in 1957, at the age of eighty-four, her reputation had declined so completely that the matron of the home thought her claims to be a writer were senile delusions. It was not until some years after her death that Pilgrimage was republished and her shorter writings began to be researched by scholars. With the growth of feminist criticism, Richardson’s work has become increasingly well known and respected as an important contribution to literary modernism on the one hand and to feminist fiction on the other.\footnote{Trudi Tate, ‘Introduction’, in Journey to Paradise: Short Stories and Autobiographical Sketches, by Dorothy Richardson, Virago Modern Classic, 321 (London: Virago Press, 1989), pp. ix–xxxvi, (pp. xvi-xvii).}

As Gillespie notes, Richardson had always had her admirers, from contemporaries such as John Cowper Powys, who produced a book-length study published in 1931; male critics that produced books on Richardson in the 1960s and 70s, such as Caesar Blake, Horace Gregory, John Rosenberg, and Thomas Staley; and female critics such as Gillespie herself, Gillian Hanscombe, Sydney Kaplan, and Shirley Rose, that began to appreciate ‘Richardson’s presentation of a female consciousness’ in the 1970s and 80s; as well as Gloria Fromm’s bibliography and biography.\footnote{Gillespie, pp. 393-94; John Cowper Powys, Dorothy M. Richardson (London: Joiner and Steele, 1931); Caesar Blake, Dorothy Richardson (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960); Horace Gregory, Dorothy Richardson: An Adventure in Self-Discovery (New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1967); John D. Rosenberg, Dorothy Richardson, the Genius They Forgot: A Critical Biography (New York: Knopf, 1973); Thomas Staley, Dorothy Richardson (Boston: Twayne, 1976); Diane F. Gillespie, ‘Political Aesthetics: Virginia
Pilgrimage and historians of the novel’—that Richardson was ‘one of the pioneers in psychological fiction’—Gillespie observes that by the time of Gender of Modernism’s publication, ‘the charges of inconsequence, dullness, obscurity and formlessness have, until recently, overbalanced any praise for the integrity and intense reality of the work’. Indeed, both Scott’s Gender of Modernism and Gender in Modernism hoped to ‘summon back into print authors such as Dorothy Richardson’ beyond the revival initiated through feminist presses such as Virago, which had held similar priorities in its republication of the four-volume Pilgrimage. Today, interest in Richardson continues to increase, manifesting in a scholarly context, for instance, in the peer reviewed journal Pilgrimages: A Journal of Dorothy Richardson Studies, established in 2008, which showcases essays and reviews concerned with Richardson, Pilgrimage, and a range of her other writing. Similarly, scholars and fervent advocates of Richardson such as Rebecca Bowler also promote her in popular outlets such as The Guardian and The Times.

Freud’s works have proven contentious and controversial, but undeniably influential. The psychologist John F. Kihlstrom argues that Freud ‘has been a dead weight on 20th century psychology’, and that there is ‘[n]o empirical evidence’ to support any of the specific...
propositions of psychoanalytic theory, psychoanalysis as an effective form of psychotherapy, or the mechanisms allegedly underlying its methods'. This view echoes Frederick Crews’s conclusion that ‘there is literally nothing to be said, scientifically or therapeutically, to the advantage of the entire Freudian system or any of its component dogmas’. Yet despite this, Kihlstrom acknowledges the common tendency to elevate Freud to the level of figures such as Copernicus or Darwin, though his contribution to humanity only offers unsubstantiated, even false, claims, where theirs has had a significant, valid, lasting impact on our understanding of our place in the world/universe. Indeed, that this associative tendency endures maintains Richardson’s linking of Freud and Darwin in her review of Low’s book on Freudian psychoanalysis. In *Deadlock*, Miriam ruefully envisages Darwin’s endurance:

Someone will discover some day that Darwin’s conclusions were wrong, that he left out some little near obvious thing with big results, and his theory, which has worried thousands of people nearly to death, will turn out to be one of those everlasting mannish explanations of everything which explain nothing. I know what you are going to say; a subsequent reversal of a doctrine does not invalidate scientific method. But these everlasting theories, and men are so ‘eminent’ and important about them, are appalling; in medicine, it is simply *appalling*, and people are just as ill as ever; and when they know Darwin was mistaken, there will be an end of Herbert Spencer. (III, p. 111)

---


122 ‘If the size and reach of a scientific theory may be measured by the disturbance it causes, psycho-analysis is so big and so far-reaching that it can be compared only to the revolutionary statements of our scientific past; perhaps most nearly, to that of Charles Darwin.’ Richardson, ‘Psycho-Analysis’, p. 523.
Psychoanalysis could be—and indeed is, as both Richardson’s and Kihlstrom’s associations demonstrate—considered Freud’s everlasting mannish theory, subsequently disproved but refusing to retreat. In part, this is because not all psychologists are as ready as Kihlstrom to accept that Freud was wholly mistaken; while Kihlstrom argues for a complete lack of scientific credence or legacy for any of Freud’s views, other psychologists more readily acknowledge his influence. Drew Westen, for instance, accepts that Freud’s theories are flawed and outdated, but argues that fundamental psychoanalytic principles, most notably the notion of unconscious processes, continue to inform the field of psychology and are widely accepted in the scientific realm. However, amongst other criticisms of Westen’s argument (such as acknowledgement of the unconscious predating psychoanalysis) Kihlstrom notes that many of the enduring principles relate to psychoanalysis more broadly, rather than to Freud’s specific theories. Nevertheless, Westen’s assimilation of Freud and psychoanalysis is in itself testament to Freud’s influence, such that both laymen and scholars fail to differentiate the two.

In addition, Freud’s theories have endured because their field of discussion has expanded beyond tight scientific/psychoanalytic circles. Even at the time of her review, Richardson acknowledged the spread of the Freudian theory to ‘the psychologists, the educationists and the novelists’. Kihlstrom acknowledges that ‘[m]ore than Einstein or Watson and Crick, more than Hitler or Lenin, Roosevelt or Kennedy, more than Picasso, Eliot, or Stravinsky, more than the Beatles or Bob Dylan, Freud’s influence on modern culture has been profound and long-lasting’. Such a view has endured from contemporary recognitions of Freud’s influence, such as that presented in W. H. Auden’s ‘In Memory of Sigmund Freud’:

---

if often he was wrong and, at times, absurd,
to us he is no more a person
now but a whole climate of opinion

under whom we conduct our different lives.\textsuperscript{125}

Kihlstrom argues that Freud ‘is better studied as a writer, in departments of language and literature, than as a scientist, in departments of psychology’, while Camille Paglia claims that ‘Freud has no rivals among his successors because they think he wrote science, when in fact he wrote art’.\textsuperscript{126} While, as Leonard Jackson observes, modern literary theorists’ re-readings of Freud ‘as a non-scientist’ would have ‘appalled’ the analyst,\textsuperscript{127} Freud made a similar point in relation to his utilisation of ancient Greek theory to support his own argument in ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’: ‘And no one can foresee in what guise the nucleus of truth contained in the theory of Empedocles will present itself to later understanding’ (XXIII, p. 247). In the same way, future engagements with Freud’s body of work are as yet unrecognised but await discovery, suggesting new ways of reading which engage the impressionism of future readers.

In a \textit{Guardian} article evaluating the scientific and literary merits of psychoanalysis from a twenty-first century perspective, A. C. Grayling acknowledges that Freud’s style is integral to the longevity of his theories:

\begin{quote}
He has the narrative skills of a first-rate novelist, and a knack for devising striking ways to describe the psychological phenomena he studied. It is a characteristic of highly speculative enquiries that the thinkers who most influence them are those who
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}

For Freud, this new way of expressing what became the narrative of psychoanalysis was through impressionism, in the various forms explored across the chapters of this thesis. It is this impressionist style which not only captures and conveys the interminability of the psychoanalytic project, but also contributes to that interminability, keeping it alive through its ‘compelling vocabulary’.
CONCLUSION

The first chapter of this thesis began by considering one of the most overtly impressionistic aspects of psychoanalytic interest—dreams. The interiority of the dream experience, void of the possibility of external verification, directs focus towards the subjective experience of the dreamer, and the subsequent techniques they utilise in their attempts to accurately convey the dream content. Despite the absence of the outward perception of external stimuli which underlies the impressionist project, dreams were shown nonetheless to present subjects rich in sensory stimuli, particularly of the visual kind. Such visual emphasis lends itself to scene-making rather than coherent narratives; often we experience dreams as a series of fragmentary, even chaotic impressions, lacking the comparative coherence of waking, conscious existence. Dreams are therefore closer at their core to the impressionistic conception of life. If we approach dream records as texts, we can identify points of coherence with Ford Madox Ford’s impressionistic theory. He argues that if authors are to convincingly convey experience they ‘must not narrate but render impressions’.\(^1\) Such is the task of the dreamer (whether Freud himself or someone recounting their dream to him). In order to do so, both Ford and Freud—since ultimately what we get in *The Interpretation of Dreams* is Freud’s impressions, both of his own dreams and of his patients’ accounts of theirs—utilise techniques such as time shifts to attempt to convey the simultaneity of experiences and ellipses to signal gaps in either the experience itself or the recollection of it; the fragmentation initially present within the dream at the time of dreaming is further heightened in its telling, as the communication is subject to the impact of imperfect memory. Like subjective perception, memory plays an important role in any impressionistic account, but its

\(^1\) Ford, *Joseph Conrad*
deficiencies are more pronounced in this case since ‘dreams melt away’ upon waking.\textsuperscript{2} This is even more prominent when one considers the experience and effects of trauma upon the mind, which renders waking experience more dream-like in its detachment and fragmentation, and impedes subsequent recollection through repression.

This initial chapter also extended attention beyond the dream records in \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams} to the impressionistic, ‘dream-like quality of the book’ as a whole.\textsuperscript{3} This includes Freud’s calls for his patients to suppress their critical faculties and embrace ‘involuntary thoughts’\textsuperscript{4}—akin to Ford’s call for literature to record ‘the impression of the moment […], not the corrected chronicle’\textsuperscript{5}—in order to facilitate successful interpretation of their dreams, thus inviting the use of stream-of-consciousness narrative styles in the dream accounts and their supplementary analysis. Freud’s interpretations strive, but fail, to impose form and order upon the unwieldy dream content; yet while Freud judges his ‘indirect phrases and […] sidelong glances at their subject-matter’ to be both an affront to his personal literary ideals and evidence of his ‘incomplete mastery of the material’,\textsuperscript{6} the style he reluctantly produces embodies many of Ford’s impressionist principles. Both men are conscious of the necessity of holding the reader’s attention through the use of an interesting and engaging style, and both are concerned with justification—Ford with the inevitability of his characterization within novels and Freud with the indisputability of his interpretive conclusions. Freud’s interpretations and stylistic choices add to the record of his authorial ego/psychology/personality put forward with an uncomfortable degree of vulnerability in the

\textsuperscript{2} Freud, \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams}, iv, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{3} Downing, p. 216.
\textsuperscript{4} Freud, \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams}, iv, p. 102
\textsuperscript{5} Hueffer, ‘On Impressionism’, p. 174.
\textsuperscript{6} Freud, \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams}, iv, p. xx.
dream records, producing the subtle kind of ‘little impressions’ that Ford claims ‘gradually’ and ‘deviously’ build up a sense of character.\(^7\)

As demonstrated in the second chapter, such a sense of character is also integral to Henry James’s fiction and to Freud’s case histories, from the very origins of their texts. Both are formed from a basis of impressions often belonging initially to third parties, which are conveyed to James and Freud by participants/observers of anecdotal scenarios or by patients experiencing symptoms that lead to their treatment. As James remarked in ‘The Art of Fiction’,

\[
\text{[e]xperience is never limited, and it is never complete; it is an immense spider-web of the finest silken threads suspended in the chamber of consciousness, and catching every air-borne particle in its tissue.}^{8}\]

Both James and Freud utilise their experiences to trap the air-borne particles of the accounts they receive, which contain a multitude of possible starting points for their texts. These must be picked over and selected according to their germinal potential. Freud’s case histories, like James’s novels, are thus ‘a personal impression of life’,\(^9\) and encompass those air-borne particles or ‘wind-blown germs’ which make the strongest impressions upon the authors’ minds.\(^10\) The germinal potential of the most promising accounts is often based upon the quality of the consciousness represented therein and its ability to illuminate broader, more universal aspects of the human condition. Considerations such as setting and plot are subordinate to the importance of the construction of character, the formulation of a centre of consciousness within the texts through which the narrative is impressionistically filtered in order to illuminate these connections with life.

\(^7\) Ford, *Joseph Conrad*
\(^8\) James, ‘The Art of Fiction’, p. 509.
\(^10\) James, *The Art of the Novel*, p. 43.
From their anecdotal origins, James and Freud embark upon a process of transformation to elaborate the initial glimmer of potential into crafted, published narratives. James identifies his creative transformation in architectural terms, building upon the germinal foundations with which he has been provided, while Freud characterises his endeavour as archaeological excavation, seeking out the stimuli behind his patients’ impressions as readers of impressionism are encouraged to read between the lines of the text. Yet the two processes are more alike than they may first appear, since James repeatedly stresses the role of his received origins within his product and the independence of the text beyond his authorial control, while a key aspect of Freud’s undertaking is impressionistic (re)construction from the rubble he unearths based on interpretation. The authors’ figurations of their narrative methods as architectural and archaeological activities both contrast with the natural imagery often used by James to describe the stimulus of his novels, highlighting the craftsmanship of their narratives.

Such craftsmanship is evident in the techniques used by James and Freud in order to convey the central consciousness in their texts. As in the first chapter, the authors here partake in the gradual accumulation of impressions of their protagonists, creating a sense of probability and, at its height, inevitability in their characterisation. While neither author confers upon their protagonists the privilege of the first person, the narrative is nonetheless filtered through their consciousness via techniques such as the visual emphasis of the dramatic scene, delayed decoding, and the integration of the characters’ own terms into the narration. These enable us to follow the characters’ development over the course of the texts, and are particularly effective when the central consciousness belongs to a child figure, as the characters of Maisie and Little Hans demonstrate. Finally, James’s open and Freud’s fragmented endings recall the origins of the texts by reminding the reader that the texts are
impressions of life, suggesting the extension of the central consciousness beyond the textual boundaries.

The significance of life beyond the confines of the text is heightened in the comparison of Freud’s case histories not just with impressionist fiction, but also with the impressionistic characteristics of modern biography. Virginia Woolf’s essays on the style of modern biography contemporaneously developing alongside her experimental fiction—and sharing many of the same aims and priorities—reveal the form to comprise an amalgamation of truth and personality; fact and fiction; action and thought; biography and autobiography. The first two of these pairs can almost act as synonyms for one another, since truth in this sense corresponds with hard, verifiable facts, while personality may be said to fictionalise the lives of the subject. It should be noted, however, that Woolf’s terms slip, so that she does recognise the truth of personality and the creativity of the artistic fact, suggesting the intricate entanglement of these biographical elements. As demonstrated over the course of the third chapter, Freud’s case histories similarly make use of observable behaviours and evidentiary sources, and he is keen to convince the reader of the correctness of his accounts; but even the most seemingly objective components are coloured by his subjective guidance. Moreover, the case histories comprise far more than plain or simple observations. Shifting the focus from observable action to the more problematic sources of insight such as thought and, even further removed, the unconscious, the majority of the substance of the case histories is comprised not simply of Freud’s observations, but of his interpretations, which combine to formulate his impressions. The subjective, interpretive component corresponds with Woolf’s notions of creative facts, personality and, to some extent, technically fictional elements. Creative writing is, as critics have long noted, integral to Freud’s conceptions of the mind, and Laura Marcus has explained how fiction both bolsters Freud’s interpretations and
threatens to undermine them as he navigates between art and science in his pathographies.\footnote{Marcus, \textit{Auto/Biographical Discourses}, p. 85.} This is especially evident in the Dora case, wherein we see him fluctuate between literary criticism and figurative writing on the one hand, and explicit distancing from literary pursuits in favour of empirical accuracy on the other.

In addition to melding fact and fiction, truth and personality, granite and rainbow, Woolf also acknowledges the amalgamation of biography and autobiography in modern biography, which in Freud’s case histories manifests in the first instance as patients’ autobiographical renditions of their life histories to the analyst. More interestingly though, this combination also draws attention to the ways in which Freud himself manifests autobiographically within his biographical accounts of others, reminding us that we are always receiving his impressions of his subjects, rather than the subjects themselves. It highlights his authorial control through his guiding of the treatment, his dominant narrative voice over that of the patient (as manifested in Dora’s comparative silences), and the subjectivity of his interpretations which leads to the formulation of his impressions of the patient’s illness and their place within the broader narrative of psychoanalysis. Since we repeatedly find Freud so present within his individual texts, it is therefore apt that critics have identified the history of psychoanalysis with Freud’s own life history, a key concern of this thesis’s fourth chapter. Freud came to recognise his entanglement within his patients’ stories and couched this in his own psychological terminology such as transference, though as in the Dora case this recognition may come too late and the counter-transferential significance may not be recognised at all, or to a far lesser degree. Additionally, we get a sense of Freud’s autobiography indirectly through his style—a point echoed by the other authors studied in this thesis—as in his uncomfortable excuses for the fragmentariness that characterises his case histories.
Finally, both Woolf and Freud expand the scope of traditional biography by extending their attention to marginalised figures and consciously resisting the urges to idealise their subjects. Freud still produced case studies of major cultural figures such as Moses, da Vinci and Shakespeare, and even co-authored a biography of Woodrow Wilson, all of which contained the elements of modern biography discussed above, but they sought to break away from unrealistically romanticised portraits of ‘outstanding individuals’,\(^\text{12}\) claiming to offer more honest impressions rather than idealising fictions. This enabled Freud to demonstrate connections between such major figures and their more marginalised counterparts—women, children, the sick—all of whom are subject to the forces of the unconscious. As in James’s novels, the issue becomes not just whose impressions we are receiving, but impressions of whom. Approaching Freud’s case histories from the perspective of Woolf’s theorising on modern biography enables us to appreciate the destabilisation of genres such as fact and fiction, biography and autobiography, which Freud’s own texts were also attempting to navigate.

The fourth and final chapter of the thesis moves from modern (auto)biography to Dorothy Richardson’s autobiographical novel, *Pilgrimage*. Rather than focusing upon a single text or case history, the chapter uses *Pilgrimage* to explore Freud’s impressionism across his life’s work, the narrative of psychoanalysis collected into the volumes of the Standard Edition. The length of these narratives, their processive tendencies, complexity and difficulty locate them within the context of the long modernist novel which, I argue, necessitates the authors’ use of impressionistic techniques in order to convey the ‘shock experience of modernity’.\(^\text{13}\) Both Richardson and Freud encourage such a cumulative reading

\(^{13}\) McCracken & Winning, p. 276.
of their corpora across the individual books that comprise *Pilgrimage* and Freud’s many publications throughout his career.

Richardson’s title for her series suggests a useful approach: focusing upon the pilgrimages depicted within and enacted by the texts. *Pilgrimage* portrays the physical and psychological journeying of its protagonist, Miriam Henderson. Richardson takes James’s filtration of impressions through a central consciousness to a greater extreme in her ‘feminine impressionism’, relentlesslly embedding the reader within Miriam’s stream of consciousness, capturing both its vividness and its fragmentary limitations. Moreover, Richardson’s own conception of consciousness emphasises depth in contrast to the shallower suggestion of the stream-of-consciousness label, thereby encouraging the reader to appreciate Miriam’s psychological development over the course of her pilgrimage. Physical and psychological pilgrimages, streaming impressions and psychological depth converge in Miriam’s experience of the trauma of her mother’s suicide and her subsequent attempts to process this, which strikingly resemble Freud’s understanding of trauma and related concepts such as the return of the repressed and repetition compulsion, as well as the analytic process of overcoming unconscious disturbances by bringing them into the conscious realm.

Yet the pilgrimages belong as much to the authors as to their characters—and often the distinctions between the two are blurred. Miriam’s pilgrimage is closely modelled upon Richardson’s own life, and Freud takes on the roles of narrator, protagonist and author across his works; whereas in the case studies the patient may have been the purported protagonist, this pretence is dropped when one considers Freud’s body of work as a whole. Furthermore, both Miriam and Richardson advocate reading for the author, identifying ‘his tastes, his

---

prejudices, and his philosophy’ through the style of the text,\textsuperscript{15} and acknowledging the implicit authorial consciousness as the unifying factor across the book(s).\textsuperscript{16} Such a reading is impressionistic in its acknowledgement of the author’s subjective decisions in rendering the text, a stance increasingly admitted by Freud as his career progressed. Richardson also reflected upon her authorial undertaking in the writing of Pilgrimage as a pilgrimage in itself, and Freud frequently figured his own personal, authorial and analytic tasks (the roles being difficult to separate) in terms of journeying. These strove to illuminate the mysteries of the unconscious and arrive at the ‘deepest truths’ of the human mind.\textsuperscript{17}

Faced with a modern crisis of transferable experience, however, both Freud and Richardson ambiguuated as they sought to disambiguate, much as we observed in Freud’s interpretive components surrounding the dream records in The Interpretation of Dreams. The authors thus depicted pilgrimages made impressionistic through their unwieldy lengths, indirection, and novel literary techniques, such as Richardson’s unique usage of punctuation and Freud’s ill-fitting analogies, all of which attempt to convey the authors’ complex experiences of consciousness, from Richardson’s gendered and Freud’s psychoanalytic perspectives. They also challenge the reader to engage impressionistically with the texts, utilising their own critical, interpretive faculties.

The impressionism of the pilgrimages extends also to their lack of endings. The length of the narratives signals the ongoing nature of the pilgrimages and their lack of closure, as both authors’ undertakings continue seemingly endlessly. It is not just that Freud and Richardson’s pilgrimages are unfinished, but rather that they are ultimately unfinishable; both the female mind of Richardson’s scope and the mind as approached from a psychoanalytic

\textsuperscript{15}Richardson, ‘Novels’, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{16}Richardson, Pilgrimage, II, pp. 382-3.
\textsuperscript{17}Freud, ‘Civilization and Its Discontents’, XXI, p. 133.
perspective prove too vast and mysterious for either author to explore or represent fully, thus their pilgrimages are interminable, defying even the death of the authors. Prolonged scholarly and popular engagement with Freud’s and Richardson’s life’s works demonstrate the engaged readership demanded by their impressionist styles, thus we continue to produce new readings of and engagements with their texts, such as the reading of Freud’s impressionism in the present thesis.

As Freud stated in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, and as quoted in the epigraph to this thesis, ‘[a]ll genuinely creative writings are the product of more than a single motive and more than a single impulse in the poet’s mind and are open to more than a single interpretation’. It is therefore fitting that both psychoanalytic literary criticism and interpretations of Freud’s own writing have evolved and expanded over time, producing new readings that reflect the overdetermined, subjective impressions of both author and reader. As Brockmeier points out, approaching Freud from a literary critical perspective necessitates that ‘we must even definitively exclude that there is one “true” or “correct” version of Freud’. Thus this thesis does not seek to dismiss alternative readings of Freud’s literary style, such as those produced by Mahony, Frankland, Gillman or Maud Ellmann, but rather, as Frankland hoped for his own study, aims to ‘leave the reader with […] a fresh sensitivity towards Freud’s writing, […] which in the best literary-critical tradition, should ambiguate rather than definitively categorize the work’. Accordingly, the impressionism of Freud’s writings illustrated herein adds to the existing scholarship which explores other, often related, dimensions of his style.

---

18 Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, iv, p. 266.
20 Frankland, p. xi.
Moreover, as Saunders suggests, literary impressionism itself is not a homogenous field, but rather should be thought of as ‘impressionisms’ in order to acknowledge the variance between authors’ styles and the styles of particular texts.\(^{21}\) This thesis demonstrates that whilst each of the chosen literary theorists/novelists engages with literary impressionism differently, Freud’s texts share common practice with each, while also establishing their own idiosyncratic approaches to the unit of the impression and the methods of its representation. Given the impressionistic qualities illuminated in Freud’s writing through comparison with the works of Ford, James, Woolf and Richardson, there is significant potential for future studies that expand this range of comparative figures to draw out additional elements of Freud’s impressionism, for instance by considering authors such as Conrad, Proust and H.D., who are touched upon within this thesis. In addition, it would be fruitful to explore possible variation in Freud’s impressionism when read in his original German or the many other languages into which his works have been translated. While this is unlikely to affect features such as the filtration of impressions through a central consciousness, or the texts’ open endings, study of the texts’ linguistic nuances in other languages would illuminate the impact of Strachey’s editorial choices and the construction of impressionism at a lexical level. Such investigations would continue the expansion of the field of impressionist studies and the appreciation of Freud’s significance as an impressionist author. The present thesis provides a foundation for such future considerations.

\(^{21}\) Saunders, *Self Impression*, p. 270.
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