

H.D. and Jung: Coherent Splendor in Search of Wholeness within Mystical Doctrines

Kuo-Liang Yu

According to Hopcke, the term, “Synchronicity,” first presented by C. G. Jung in his short speech given at the Eranos conference of 1951 is defined as:

a principle that links events acausally, that is, in terms of the subjective meaningfulness of the coincidence, rather than by cause and effect. Thus, understanding synchronicity and synchronistic events requires a way of thinking almost entirely foreign to Western culture, a way of thinking that does not separate the physical world from interior psychic events [...] Synchronicity requires that one consider the world a unified field in which subject and objects are fundamentally one, two different manifestations of the same basic reality. (72)

From this definition above, I want to proclaim that the possible coincidence between H.D. and Jung is a synchronistic splendor between the poet and the psychological doctor, because it is seemingly posed as an enigma.

Just as King indicates, there is more than one reader getting aware of the fact that H.D. becomes more Jungian in her works and studies during the rest of her life, even though she is always

called a “Freudian” woman (18). As a matter of fact, not only the readers, but quite a number of literary critics as well, take notice of this seemingly impossible connection between the two. Among these critics who think it possible or even try to prove it, it is John Walsh’s memoir on H.D. and Jung that opens a Pandora’s box of this enigmatic splendor by “puzzling out the implications of the emotional connections between H.D.’s thought and that of Jung” (18).

Naming his memoir as “H.D., C. G. Jung & Küsnacht: Fantasia on a Theme,” Walsh at the very beginning of his work seems to be trying to remind his readers of the fantasia pertaining to his argument by saying, “In a double sense the topic is an occult one: both in the ostensible meaning of the term [...] and in the significant sense that the facts of the matter are occluded, hidden, undiscovered (perhaps even non-existent?)” (King 60). This is because the topic he is going to deal with is “a free set of variations on a theme: a hermetic one wherein various threads are interwoven. The actuality of the situation being obscure, the fantasia is spun out in air [...] In essence, it is an exercise in ‘speculatio’...only leading where?” (59).

Although to build the bridge between H.D. and Jung sounds like a fantasia, the aim of this essay is not only to prove that this fantasia is not a fantasia at all, but to present the coherent splendor between them in terms of their search of the Wholeness within the very same areas: alchemy, the Kabbalah, and Hermeticism.

H.D. and Freud

Before talking about the relationship between H.D. and Jung further, we have to turn to the sessions H.D. first had with Sigmund Freud, because it is he who taught her how to recall her past memory and recover her lost self from it.

With her lifetime friend Bryher's urge and financial help, H.D.'s sessions with Freud were conducted from 1933 to 1934. As she wrote her first impression while in Freud's consulting room, full of historical antiques, she mentioned that:

she had gone back to her childhood, back to the breakup of her marriage and the birth of her child, back to the death of her brother in service in France, and the consequence death, from shock, of her father, and back to the breakup of her literary circle in London—Aldington, Pound, Lawrence, each gone his way. (Pearson v)

She also stressed that she had to see Freud, for she “wanted to dig down and dig out, root out my personal weeds, strength my purpose, reaffirm my beliefs, canalize my energies” (Guest 207). In fact, before going to see Freud, she had already had sessions with Havelock Ellis and Hanns Sachs, but it seemed that after undergoing these sessions at all, “she still bound to the prewar period, which she found was suffocating her and causing her to carry endlessly the thread of those prewar days through her short stories and novels” (207).

In his foreword to *Tribute to Freud*, Pearson says that it is Freud who “helped her [H.D.] to remember and to understand what she remembered.” For her, to remember the past is, to put it in her own words, “so important, my own LEGEND. Yes, my own LEGEND. Then, to get well and re-create it.” As Pearson explains, H.D. made use of the legend in many ways, such as “story, a history, an account, a thing for reading” (v). Also, it is in “Freud's fuller vision she found both stimulation and encouragement” (viii). Thanks to his encouragement, as she tried to remember her past by free association on fragments of memory as Freud taught her, she gradually freed herself from her writer's block, and started writing about the traumatic period in

her life. The trauma of her life was particularly derived from the losing of her male companions, Pound, Aldington, and D. H. Lawrence, which altogether contributed to her sense of impasse. Freud helped her regain the creative drive that was her true identity; just as H.D. said in her poem "The Master," "it was he himself, he who set me free to prophesy" (Duplessis and Friedman 425). Therefore, after those sessions with Freud, during the war, H.D. had reached an "astonishing revitalization," because within a few years, she began to write her well-known war trilogy, novels, and a number of short stories, even though some of them have yet to be published. "There were re-creations. All literature is," as Pearson adds (vi). Out of her love and gratitude toward Freud, H.D. said that he was always "the Professor," the "blameless physician," the "old Hermit who lived on the edge of this vast domain," because his guidance helped healing her self-knowledge (Duplessis and Friedman 418).

Even though Freud did much in helping H.D. remember the past and recover her lost self, there still exist a number of essays revealing the confrontation, conflict, and controversy between analyst and analysand. In *Tribute to Freud*, H.D. figured out their differences by saying, "the Professor was not always right" (18). As a matter of fact, they held different views in several things, because of the "argument implicit in our [H.D. and Freud] very bones" (Duplessis and Friedman 418).

The thing that H.D. was against Freud the most was "his androcentric theory of the female body as castrated, deficient without a penis," and to show her unhappiness, she kept saying, "I was angry at the old man [...] his talk of the man-strength" (Duplessis and Friedman 420). Regarding his misogynist attitude, in *Tribute to Freud* she referred to a significant incident in her session with Freud, during which he took her into his little office and showed her the ancient collections he had. He

thought that they might be connected to her unconscious, and let her take a look over the tiny statue of Pallas Athené:

“This is my favorite,” he said. He held the object toward me. I took it in my hand. It was a little bronze statue, helmeted [...] One hand was extended as if holding a staff or rod. “She is perfect,” he said, “*only she has lost her spear.*” I did not say anything [...] she has lost her spears. He might have been talking Greek. (68-69)

As Duplessis and Friedman point out, I think that Norman Holland is right in making his presumption about the above passage by arguing that “Freud chose to show H.D. the statue to make her confront the unconscious operation of penis envy in her psyche. This troubling interchange between analyst and analysand is as close as H.D. gets in *Tribute to Freud* to revealing that they ever discussed Freud’s related theories of penis envy, the girl’s castration complex, and rejection of the female body” (421). However, H.D.’s view of perfection is established “on the body and on sexuality,” and her ideal embodiment of perfection is “the female form [...] not the male,” which is rather different from Freud’s view (421-422).

Another reason that the tension is raised over their different opinions is simply because, from the analyst and analysand’s views, they were new to each other, as H.D. said:

‘Of course,’ she wrote, ‘as the Professor said, “there is always something more to find out.” I felt that he was speaking for himself (an informal moment as I was about to leave). It was almost as if something I had said was *new*, that he even felt that I was a new experience. He must have thought the same of everyone, but I felt his personal delight, I was *new*. Everyone else was new every dream and dream association was *new*. After the years and years of patient, plodding research, it was all *new*.’ (Pearson viii)

The “writing-on-the-wall” or the “flickering light-shadows” projected on the wall of the hotel in Corfu in 1919 was undoubtedly a new experience to Freud and H.D. Out of her eagerness, she asked Freud to analyze those unknown visions, but quite to her dismay, he called it “a dangerous symptom.” However, it was an “*inspiration*” to her, because she thought that the “writing-on-the-wall” was the Delphi oracle that she could turn to in her writings:

[...] the picture-writing on the wall of a hotel bedroom in Corfu, the Greek Ionian island, that I saw projected there in the spring of 1920 [...] a dim shape forming on the wall between the foot of the bed and the wash-stand. It was late afternoon; the wall was a dull, mat ochre. I thought, at first, it was sunlight flickering from the shadows cast from or across the orange trees in full leaf and fruit and flower outside the bedroom window. But I realized instantly that our side of the house was already in early shadow [...] Then there was the conventional outline of a goblet or cup, actually suggesting the mystic chalice, but it was the familiar goblet shape we all know, with round base and glass-stem. This chalice is as large as the head of the soldier, or rather it simply takes up the same amount of space, as if they were both formal patterns stamped on picture-cards, or even (now that I think of it) on playing cards [...] And this object is so simple yet so homely that I think again, “It’s a shadow thrown.” Actually, it could not have been, as this shadow was “light”; but the exact replica of this pattern was set on the upper shelf of the old-fashioned wash-stand, along with toothbrush mug, soap-dish and those various oddments. It was exactly the stand for the small spirit-lamp we had with us. (*Spirit-lamp?*) And I know that, if these objects are projected outward from my own brain, this is a neat trick, a short-cut, a pun, a sort of joke. [...] (*Tribute to Freud* 44-46)

Freud maintained that H.D.'s Corfu vision was simply a "danger symptom," because both of them cannot agree with each other over those transcendental issues. Therefore, what constantly bothered her was that, "Freud could not accept the immortality of the soul, that in general his rationalist perspective blinded him to the spiritual realities she found embedded in dreams, religious vision, occult traditions and art" From his rationalist or scientific point of view, H.D.'s mystic visions were just symptoms of "megalomania and an infantile desire for reunion with her mother" (Duplessis and Friedman 418).

Freud and the Occult

Indeed, Freud always believed that his research on psychology was based on the premise of science. However, it does not mean that he knew nothing about the occult at all. On the other hand, Freud's first biographer and colleague, Ernest Jones, presented a whole chapter to show Freud's interest in occultism, for Jones believed it would show "better than any other theme the explanation of his genius." It is in what he calls the "exquisite oscillation between skepticism and credulity" that he found a clue to Freud's genius (Jones 3: 374), and Freud "had inherently a plastic and mobile mind, one given to the freest speculations and open to new and even highly improbable ideas" (Jones 2: 429).

According to Materer, Freud was "among the great explorers of occult phenomena" (8). He took occultism for a principle in "the real existence of psychical forces other than the human and animal minds with which we are familiar," to compensate for the "loss of value" European society underwent after World War I (Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* 18 177-178). In this way, occultism could reimpose "the old religious faith" or the "superseded convictions of primitive peoples," in a spiritual world for the

diminished attractiveness of earthly existence (177-178). Like many thinkers in the late 19th century, Freud did not completely deny the existence of occultism, but rather took much interest in those occult phenomena. For example, he once told his colleagues, including Ernest Jones, about events that caused him to take notice of the possibility of telepathy through his visit to a medium. Even though he had a number of similar experiences, “[t]he comments on the possible reality of these events were made privately because he was worried, particularly after his quarrel with Carl Jung in 1912-13, about the damage a link between occultism and psychoanalysis would do to the latter’s status as a science” (Materer 9-10).

As Friedman reads David Bakan’s *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*, she notices Bakan is exploring on the similarity between psychoanalysis and mystical tradition, because it can be referred from the fact that Freud was a Jew and had the general knowledge about the basic concepts of Jewish mysticism, especially those in the Kabbalah. Even though it is hard to say whether or not Freud was really under the direct influence of esoteric Judaism, his basic assumption that manifestations of the unconscious usually turn out in disguised form is quite similar to those of esoteric tradition. The esoteric tradition argues that, “wisdom is a ‘Mystery’—hidden, obscure, and known only to those who have the key” (Friedman, *Psyche Reborn: The Emergence of H. D.* 190).

While she became so much interested in psychoanalysis, and in the frequent use of the Tarot, H.D. also came to recognize some of the remarkable similarities between Freud’s psychoanalysis and mystical traditions. These similarities and insights that she gained from her consultations with Freud “help demonstrate why Freud is a better guide than Jung to the significance of occultism.” This is because Freud helped her understand “the

meaning of her visions and their characteristic symbolism without inhibiting her ability to use them poetically” (Materer 21). Besides, her argument with Freud in the end enforced her belief in this spiritual world and psychological strengths. For her, occultism was an “alchemy of the word” that would never quench her poetic symbol making.

Beginning from H.D.’s sessions with Freud, her argument on his andocentric view against women, his reading of her experience in Corfu, to their similarities in combining psychoanalysis with mystical traditions, we have gotten a much clearer picture of how the relationship between analyst and analysand works out, and calling H.D. a “Freudian woman” is no doubt understandable. Even so, it still stands to reason to maintain that, “[l]ike many Freudians, she became quasi-Jungian and could bring the cabala [the Kabbalah], astrology, magic, Christianity, classical and Egyptian mythology, and personal experience into a joint sense of Ancient Wisdom,” as Pearson suggests in his foreword to H.D.’s *Hermetic Definition* (Pearson vi).

Freud and Jung

While talking about those strange lines she saw on the “writing-on-the-wall” of Corfu, H.D. got a sense of “drowning,” or a feeling of “half-drowned to the ordinary dimension of space and time,” because at that time she came to know that

I [she] must drown, as it were, completely in order to come out on the other side of things [...] I must drown completely and come out on the other side, or rise to the surface after the third time down, not dead to this life but with a new set of values, my treasure dredged from the depth. I must be born again or break utterly. (*Tribute to Freud* 54)

The “writing-on-the-wall” made a rather strong impression on her thought and let her want to be born again, because at that time, “[t]he years between seemed a period of waiting, of marking time. There was a growing feeling of a stagnation, of lethargy, clearly evidence among many of my own contemporaries” (57). She wanted to find a way out of this stagnation, for she believed that, “I [H.D.] must be different” (61).

While writing about Freud’s view on the meaningfulness or worthiness of dream in translatable terms, H.D. told us about something rather important in terms of man’s consciousness:

[...] the dream came from an unexplored depth in man’s consciousness and that this unexplored depth ran like a great stream or ocean underground, and the vast depth of that ocean was the same vast depth that today, as in Joseph’s day, overflowing in man’s small consciousness, produced inspiration, madness, creative idea, or the dregs of the dreariest symptoms of mental unrest and disease.

Then, following the previous passage, she pointed out the critical point by saying,

it was *the same ocean of universal consciousness* (my own [H.D.] italic) and even if not stated in so many words, he [Freud] had dared to imply that this consciousness proclaimed all men one; all nations and races met in the universal world of the dream; and he had dared to say that the dream-symbol could be interpreted; its language, its imagery were common to the whole race, not only of the living but of those ten thousand year dead.

Thus, as she continued explaining,

[t]he picture-writing, the hieroglyph of the dream, was the common property of the whole race; in the dream, man, as at the beginning of time, spoke a universal

language, and man, meeting in the universal understanding of the unconscious or the subconscious, would forgo barriers of time and space, and man, understanding man, would save mankind.

(*Tribute to Freud* 71)

Based on the explication H.D. observed on this same ocean of universal consciousness or unconsciousness in the dream, it is reasonable to say that she got some idea about the universal consciousness and something different.

It is definitely difficult to know whether H.D. really agreed with Freud in his revelation about the meaning of dream, but what is said in the passages quoted above sounds strikingly similar to Jung's conception of the archetype and the collective unconscious, as I quote Hopcke to pose against the explication of the above dream:

Archetypes were for him [Jung] "typical modes of apprehension" (*CW* 8, p. 137)—that is, patterns of psychic perception and understanding common to all human beings as members of the human race.

Jung came to posit the existence of such common modes of apprehension by way of *empirical* observation. His broad knowledge of mythology, anthropological material, religious systems, and ancient art allowed him to see that the symbols and figures that continually appeared in many of his patients' dreams were identical to symbols and figures that had appeared and reappeared over thousands of years in myths and religions all over the world [...]

[...] Jung conceived of a second layer of the unconscious, which he called the collective unconscious. This layer of the unconscious was the layer that contained those patterns of psychic perception common to all humanity, the archetypes. Because the collective unconscious was the realm of archetypal experience, Jung considered the collective

unconscious layer deeper and ultimately more significant than the personal unconscious. (13-14)

Though the way both Freud and Jung used in order to describe what they wanted to say was totally different, the common conception of “those patterns of psychic perception common to all humanity” and “the same ocean of universal consciousness” can be inferred from by reading the quotations cited above.

Therefore, according to H.D., we notice that Freud also understood the patterns of psychic perception common to all humanity. But why did not Freud want to admit that he knew it? As Materer suggests, Freud made his comments “privately” on the possible reality of those things related to uncanny experiences, including his interest in occultism and strange visits from the dead or to a medium, “because he was worried, particularly after his quarrel with Carl Jung in 1912-13, about the damage a link between occultism and psychoanalysis would do to the latter’s status as a science” (9-10).

However, besides his fear of doing damage to his scientific researches, there is another possible reason that he kept his acknowledgement of the existence of those uncanny experiences unknown: his Jewish inheritance. Jones wrote in his own memory of Freud:

One cannot describe the man Freud without laying stress on the fact that he was a Jew. Though never orthodox or in any way religious he held together with his people, was a Governor of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and took an interest in all that concerned the fate of Jewry [...] The fact itself is of more than personal interest, since it is doubtful if without certain traits inherited from his Jewish ancestry Freud would have been able to accomplish the work he did. (2: 427)

Also, as Bakan points out, “a cultural readiness for

psychoanalysis existed among the Jews in Vienna from the facts that Freud's first audience for his psychoanalytic ideas was his 'Jewish Society,' the B'nai B'rith, and that practically all of the early psychoanalysts were Jews" (57-58). In his lectures granted in Clark University, he even said that Breuer, his Jewish friend, was "the originator of psychoanalysis," even though he denied this later (57). From this point of view, we have come to know what an important role his Jewish background and communities might have had played in supporting his psychoanalytic researches.

But, Jung, apparently with his mystical Christian background, was the major non-Jewish researcher in Jewish Society. Owing to his non-Jewish identity, in 1910 at the Second International Psycho-Analytical Congress at Nuremberg, Jung faced a protest meeting held against him, while Freud tried to prompt him to be the permanent president:

"Most of you are Jews, and therefore you are incompetent to win friends for the new teaching. Jews must be content with the modest role of preparing the ground. It is absolutely essential that I should form ties in the world of general science. I am getting on in years, and am weary of being perpetually attacked. We are all in danger." Seizing his coat by the lapels, he said, "They won't even leave me a coat to my back. The Swiss will save us—will save me, and all of you as well." (Bakan 58)

We can image how difficult it was for Freud to persuade his Jewish fellows during the conference to accept someone with a different personal history to be the director, especially when the sentiment of anti-Semitism was rapidly rising in Vienna. The main motivation behind Freud's support of Jung was that "Jung [...] was extremely important to Freud, for in Jung he saw a bridge to the Gentile world. Jung was the only important member of the

early group of psychoanalysts whom Freud regarded as being able to command respect from the outside world, in view of the fact that he was a Gentile” (122). Besides, as Robertson proceeds to say, it was also very important for Freud to have his beliefs accepted by a Gentile, and without doubt, Jung was the one he expected very much to do that for him. This was because “Jung was his ‘son and heir’, his ‘eldest son’ and ‘Crown Prince’, the Joshua to his Moses” (qtd. in Jones 2: 37; Freud, *The Freud/Jung Letters: The Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung*: 218, 196-197), and their relationship involved “emotional dependence on a favorite who had to remain obedient” (Robertson 364).

However, much to Freud’s dismay, Jung kept away from him by a formal breaking with him in 1914, when “Jung’s revolutionary work on the subject of the unconscious disagreed with the Freudian emphasis on sexual trauma as the basis for all neurosis, and on the literal interpretation of the Oedipus complex” (“C. G. Jung”). This breaking annoyed Freud so much that he felt rather provoked at Jung’s defection, as he said that “he seemed ready to enter into a friendly relationship with me and for my sake to give up certain prejudices in regard to race which he had previously permitted himself” (Bakan 122). Indeed, as Robertson indicates further, when Jung resigned from his post as president of the International Psychoanalytic Association in 1914, Freud felt relieved to get rid of “the brutal, sanctimonious Jung”, and criticized Jung over his “lies, brutality and anti-Semitic condescension toward me” (qtd. in Freud, *A Psycho-Analytic Dialogue: The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham, 1907-1926* 186; Gay, *Freud, Jews and Other Germans* 241-242). In this way, Jung totally ruined Freud’s wish not to make psychoanalysis a national affair of the Jews. After Jung’s rebellion against him, as Robertson explains, “Freud portrayed

himself as a rationalist Jew opposed to an incorrigibly religious Gentile whose ‘religious-ethical “crisis”’ revealed his innate ‘Aryan religiosity’” (qtd. in Gay 241-242; Jones 2: 353). Freud then “conceded that their emotional division ran along the Jewish-Gentile fault-line” (Robertson 365).

According to *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, before the beginning of World War II, Jung became “president of the German Association for Psycho-therapy, a Nazi-influenced organization,” even though later on Jung felt quite uncomfortable and quitted because of the way the Nazis “forced their Aryan ideology on the association” (“C. G. Jung”). However, questions hindering over his alleged sympathy with the Nazis and his suspicious racial theories of the unconscious still remain.

In his article, “Dynamic Psychology, Utopia, and Escape from History: The Case of C.G. Jung,” Petteri Pietikainen says that Jung’s undisguised enthusiasm for the “German revolution [...] envisaged ‘national individuation,’ an attainment of authenticity on a national level,” as he acknowledged some good and bad aspects (41):

It is a regression and injustice, there is no doubt about that; but they [the Germans] cannot get together as a nation, they cannot celebrate their love feast, if strangers are in between. Of course you can say that Jews are scapegoats; of course they are scapegoats, but other people, individuals, do the same thing: in the process of individuation, for instance, they exclude many things, they may desert their relations, which is unjust, cruel, or foolish perhaps, but it serves that one purpose of individuation, of coming together. (Jung 2: 976)

Here Jung relates “the rise of the Third Reich (German revolution) to an individuation process [...] with an attainment of a new condition of collective consciousness” (Pietikainen 41). As

Pietikainen continues to talk about the relationship between Jung and the Third Reich, it seems to the former that, “the ideological implications [...] of Jung’s psychology were accepted and even favoured by the Nazi authorities, and government officials followed his activities,” and in this way, “[i]nvariably, Jung supplied ammunition to his critics by his insistence that there are elements in Nazi Germany that are potentially beneficial to the German people” (41).

H.D. and Jung

However, unlike Jung’s suspected pro-Nazi image, H.D. was clearly against the Nazi. In the section of reader’s note in H.D.’s *Trilogy*, the note, No. 101.7, says, “The SS (she was on the-writing-on-the-wall) is not a sanctifying of the Nazi SS or the Swastika—H.D. actively opposed the Nazis [...]” (*Trilogy* 191). In fact, while Friedman talks about H.D.’s works reflecting her modernism and politics stance, she indicates that H.D. developed a kind of a “modernism of the margins,” which H.D. named as “a modernism based on an identification with those left out of the cultural mainstream” (King 104). Thus, with this identification with the minority, it is very likely that “her involvement with psychoanalysis carried with it a profound identification with Jews,” which might be Freud’s heritage on her (115). In addition, H.D.’s friend, Bryher, whose father probably had Jewish origins, was “intensely anti-fascist” (102); and Bryher’s refugee works also helped Jews flee from the Nazi suppression. So with all these things above, it should be natural for H.D. to be against the Nazi, and “responsive to the plight of Jews in the 1930s” (Rainey 108).

In this view, we can say that the reason why H.D. did not pay so much attention to Jung and his works is quite possibly due to Jung’s falling out with Freud due to his racial prejudice, as

Freudian supporters claim, and most important of all, his alleged sympathy with the Nazi. It may be owing to this reason that we are prevented from exploring the coherent splendor between them, even though the possible connection between them has long been suggested by readers and critics alike.

Guest suggests the possible mystical rendezvous between H.D. and Jung in the chapter named “*Write, Write or Die*,” and says that Dr. Heydt, with whom H.D. had ever several sessions before she met Freud, was “ever aware of her states of mind—observed, intellectually she was shifting strict Freudianism” (328). Then, Guest also adds:

Geographically, there was Jung’s near presence on their shared Lake of Zurich at 228 Seestrasse. H.D. could watch the new buildings on his Bollingen property being constructed. Although still observing her daily ritual of Freudian self-analysis, in the poetry she was writing H.D. was drawing closer to the Jungian orbit. (328)

According to Walsh, H.D. “on and off between September 1946 and the spring 1961, resided at Küsnacht, becoming thereby a very near neighbor of C. G. Jung.” Even H.D. herself said that Jung’s house “lies just several gardens beyond, outside my window, by the lake.” As it turned out, “[a]ll of H.D. residences there—Seehof, Am Strand, Villa Verena—happened to be almost adjacent to Jung’s house at 228 Seestrasse.” Although there was no record uncovered to reveal their possible meeting by chance, it was rather strange for these two people “so immersed in the same esoteric tradition, studying the same—or similar—sources, and forming the same—or similar conclusions, should exist almost side-by-side,” and “a mere five minutes walk apart, in a small village Zürich, not knowing each other (did Jung even know of H.D.’s existence?) for close to fifteen years?” (King 60). It

would really have been unnatural for them neither to meet on the road nor to see each other during some occasions within their resident areas.

Besides, in terms of H.D.'s spiritual quest, "she was closer to Jung's Egypto-Hellenic orientation while writing *Helen in Egypt*, in spite of the appearance of Freud as Theseus and her verbal homage to him" (Guest 328). Here we can say that the closeness between H.D. and Jung in terms of their respective studies in the hermetic is an example of the Jungian concept of "synchronicity," as it is suggested in the quotation at the beginning of the essay. It seems to be the result of synchronicity within timeless time that the justification for the existence of parallels in thought human beings have in common within their unconscious and that at two different periods of time, H.D. and Jung both paid a visit to the motherland of hermetic lore, Egypt, and after visiting that sacred place, both of them had been inspired so much in their mystical studies. These parallels in thought make their communications possible both in lives and works, even though H.D. tried very hard to refute that she had any feasible connection with Jung and persisted in being loyal to Freud.

Furthermore, Walsh also suggests that, "H.D.'s motifs: the anima, androgyny, transformation/sublimation—culled from both inner experience and hermetic sources—appear, of course, throughout the entirety of Jung's writing." In addition, it is also amazing to discover Jung's fundamental concept, i.e., "quaternity," as H.D. said, "I was working this morning in my after-breakfast, 'meditation' hour, on a phrase from Jean Chaboseau, relating to the number 4, '*le Quaternaire*,' 'the earth-number, in the center of the circle, dividing it into four equal parts'." Thus, her way of thought connected her deeply to Jung, because of "her sensing an archetypal series of 'seven initiators,' elucidating an inherent pattern in her life" (King 60).

This “rather Jungian orientation” in H.D.’s *Tribute to Freud* can also be noted, which is “a seeing directly from a hermetic perspective” (61).

We can conclude that the similarity between H.D. and Jung in terms of their respective studies in the hermetic is an example of the Jungian concept of “‘synchronicity,’ meaningful coincidence, which forms an acausal connecting principle” (King 59), judging from their shared fascination with the reading of alchemy and hermetic lore, plus H.D.’s own literary motifs of blending anima/animus and transformation/ sublimation together. As Materer says, Jung’s psychoanalysis has always seemed more attractive to occultists than Freud’s (88). Therefore, both H.D. and Jung’s several similar interests in different fields of mysticism are clearly from the result of their coherent splendor in pursuit of Wholeness within the mystical doctrines.

Bibliography

- Bakan, David. *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*. New York: Van Nostrand, 1958.
- Doolittle, Hilda [H.D.]. *Collected Poems of H.D.* New York: New Directions, 1986.
- . *Helen in Egypt*. New York: New Directions, 1961.
- . *Hermetic Definition*. New York: New Directions, 1972.
- . *Tribute to Freud [Writing on the Wall, Advent]*. New York: New Directions, 1974.
- . *Trilogy*. Cheadle: Carcanet P, 1973.
- Duplessis, Rachel Blau, and Susan Stanford Friedman, “‘Woman is Perfect’: H.D.’s Debate with Freud.” *Feminist Studies* 3 (Fall 1981): 415-430.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. James Strachey. London: Hogarth P, 1955. 24 vols.
- . *A Psycho-Analytic Dialogue: The Letters of Sigmund Freud and*

- Karl Abraham, 1907-1926.* Eds. Hilda C. Abraham and Ernst L. Freud. Trans. Bernard Marsh and Hilda C. Abraham. London: Hogarth P, 1965.
- . *The Freud/Jung Letters: The Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung.* Ed. William McGuire. Trans. Ralph Manheim and R. F. C. Hull. London: Hogarth P, 1974.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Psyche Reborn: The Emergence of H. D.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.
- Gay, Peter. *Freud, Jews and Other Germans.* New York: Oxford UP, 1978.
- Guest, Barbara. *Herself Defined: The Poet H. D. and Her World.* Garden City: Doubleday, 1984.
- Hopcke, Robert H. *A Guided Tour of the Collected Works of C. G. Jung.* Boston: Shambhala, 1999.
- Jones, Ernest. *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud.* 3 vols. New York: Basic Books, 1953-1957.
- Jung, C. G. *Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930-1934.* Ed. Claire Douglas. 2 vols. London: Routledge, 1998.
- King, Michael, ed. *H.D.: Woman and Poet.* Orono, ME: National Poetry Foundation, 1986.
- Materer, Timothy. *Modernist Alchemy: Poetry and the Occult.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.
- Pearson, Norman Holmes. Foreword. *Tribute to Freud [Writing on the Wall, Advent].* By H.D. New York: New Directions, 1974. v-xiv.
- Pietikainen, Petteri. "Dynamic Psychology, Utopia, and Escape from History: The Case of C.G. Jung." *Utopian Studies* 12.1 (2001): 41-55.
- Rainey, Lawrence S. "Canon, Gender, and Text: The Case of H.D." *College Literature* 18.3 (1991): 106-125.
- Robertson, Ritchie. *The 'Jewish Question' in German Literature, 1749-1939: Emancipation and Its Discontents.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.
- "C. G. Jung." *The Columbia Encyclopedia.* 6th ed. New York: Columbia UP, 2000.