

On Lawrence's Psychological Writings

Koichi Kimura

(1)

One of D.H. Lawrence's (1885-1930) most powerful legacies is his probing of the life of the unconscious. Of course, he also devoted two essays specifically to the topic, addressing and rejecting some of the central ideas of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) in particular. In this essay I want to discuss how he came to know Freud's ideas luckily and unexpectedly, which were little known at the time. Then I want to trace the parallel evolution of the ideas of the unconscious of Lawrence and C.G. Jung (1875-1961), suggesting that, while one was a writer and the other a psychologist, they had much in common in their separate journeys into newly defined realm of unconscious life.

His elopement with Frieda Weekley (1879-1956), the German wife of his former modern language tutor in 1912, had a profound impact on Lawrence's life and writing. Frieda Weekley had become familiar with the psychoanalytical theory of Freud, mainly through pillow talk with the analyst Otto Gross (1861-1945). Later, Lawrence would have found her knowledge and insight useful, particularly in writing the final version of *Sons and Lovers* (1912), as psychoanalytical theory was not widely available and would probably have never

crossed his path in any other way except through such a chance encounter.¹

Considering the overall impact of Lawrence's intrigue into the unconscious mind, their meeting was an amazing example of synchronicity and fate, for if the two had never met, perhaps the world of Lawrence would have developed in an entirely different direction. As it were, the world has much to be grateful for this chance encounter, for after their meeting, we see that Lawrence began to write about the unconscious more and more. However, is it possible that a creative writer, a visionary, that is, a genius like Lawrence could only have discovered Freud and psychoanalysis through Frieda? It seems a viable possibility. Frieda's influence may well have got the "wheel turning," so to speak. However, knowing how analytical and critical Lawrence was throughout his life, it does not seem likely that he would have surrendered completely to any thought or notion, whether conveyed by Frieda or by Freud himself. Rather, whatever acceptance there might have been from Lawrence, it would probably have been simply a means for him to examine himself more deeply, to meet with the mystical forces within himself, and to achieve self-realization by confronting them head-on in his own writing. Amazingly, we see Lawrence go beyond Freud, to explain what Freud and others missed. Lawrence's works on the unconscious mind provide an added bonus for they give valuable insights into understanding the underlying psychology of his own writing.

The question thus arises, what was Lawrence's psychology? The answer to this question can best be determined by considering the creativity in his life and work and by drawing comparisons with the

1 John Worthen, *D.H. Lawrence-The Early Years 1885-1912*, Cambridge University Press, 1991, pp. 442-8. This situation is treated at some length in these pages of this book.

ideas and theories of Jung, a man with conflicting views to those of Freud, yet one that Lawrence seemed to be in general agreement with. Lawrence mentioned his attitudes toward the inner life in his Introduction to *The Dragon of the Apocalypse* by Frederick Carter (1929):

We can never recover an old vision, once it has been supplanted. But what we can do is to discover a new vision in harmony with the memories of old, far-off, far, far-off experience that lie within us. So long as we are not deadened or drowsy, memories of Chaldean experience still live within us, at great depths, and can vivify our impulses in a new direction, once we awaken them.²

First of all, it would be useful to know how Freud's key concepts were treated in Lawrence's two essays on the unconscious, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* (1920) and *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (1921). As a matter of fact, Lawrence nearly refused to accept Freudianism outright. In the first page of *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, he expressed his negative reaction to Freud's psychoanalysis:

The Oedipus complex was a household word, the incest motive a common-place of tea-table chat. Amateur analyses became the vogue. 'Wait till you've been analyzed,' said one man to another, with varying intonation. A sinister look came into the eyes of the initiates — the famous, or infamous, Freud look. You could recognize it everywhere,

² D.H. Lawrence, *A Selection from Phoenix*, edited by A.A.H. Inglis, Penguin Books, 1971, p. 550.

wherever you went.³

Freud's concepts had become quite popular and fashionable, and at times Lawrence may have seemed to be singular in his antagonism toward Freud. After rejecting Freud's ideas, he developed his own metaphysics of the unconscious based on the struggle with the mystical forces within himself. In the 1910's when Freud set out on his journey into the hinterland of human consciousness, Lawrence was thinking about what Freud had brought into the open:

With dilated hearts we watched Freud disappearing into the cavern of darkness, which is sleep and unconscious to us, darkness which issues in the foam of all our day's consciousness. He was making for the origins. We watched his ideal candle flutter and go small. Then we waited, as men do wait, always expecting the wonder of wonders. He came back with dreams to sell.

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

Is it true? Does the great unknown of sleep contain nothing else? No lovely spirits in the anterior regions of our being? None! Imagine the unspeakable horror of the repressions Freud brought home to us. Gagged, bound, maniacal repressions, sexual complexes, facial inhibitions, dream-monsters. We tried to repudiate them. But no, they

3 D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, p. 197.

were there, demonstrable. These were the horrid things that ate our souls and caused our helpless neuroses.⁴

Freud returned to this world with many dreams from the dark cave of the unconscious. But his dreams were full of sex and the horrors that might cause people to suffer from mental illnesses. Freud concentrated his psychology of neurosis on collecting these negative materials in order to establish a system for evaluating neuroses. Freud's concept of the unconscious was, in fact, a representation of the conception of our repressed sexual impulses. Of his central unconscious drives, the incest were particularly brought forth to the surface by the mind itself, even if unconsciously. In *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, Lawrence showed his complete disagreement with Freudian dream interpretation:

The Freudians point to this as evidence of a repressed incest desire. The Freudians are too simple. It is *always* wrong to accept a dream-meaning at its face value. Sleep is the time when we are given to the automatic processes of the inanimate universe. Let us not forget this. Dreams are automatic in their nature. The psyche possesses remarkably few dynamic images. In the case of the boy who dreams of his mother, we have the aroused but unattached sex plunging in deep, causing a sort of obstruction. We have the image of the mother, the dynamic emotional image. And the automatism of the dream-process immediately unites the sex-sensation to the great stock image, and produces an incest dream. But does this prove a repressed incest desire? On the contrary.

4 D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, pp. 199-200.

Why does the dream-process act so? For two reasons. First the reason of simple automatic continuance. The mother-image was the first great emotional image to be introduced in the psyche. The dream-process mechanically reproduces its stock image the moment the intense sympathy-emotion is aroused. Again, the mother-image refers only to the upper plane. But the dream-process is mechanical in its logic. Because the mother-image refers to the great dynamic stress of the upper plane, therefore it refers to the great dynamic stress of the lower. This is a piece of sheer automatic logic. The living soul is not automatic, and automatic logic does not apply to it.⁵

In *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious* (1934) and *Concerning the Archetypes, with Special Reference to the Anima Concept* (1936), Jung was also critical of the exclusively personal nature of Freud's world of the unconscious:

At first the concept of the unconscious was limited to denoting the state of repressed or forgotten contents. Even with Freud, who makes the unconscious—at least metaphorically—take the stage as the acting subject, it is really nothing but the gathering place of forgotten and repressed contents, and has a functional significance thanks only to these. For Freud, accordingly, the unconscious is of an exclusively personal nature, although he was aware of its archaic and mythological thought-forms.⁶

5 D.H. Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, pp. 164-5.

6 C.G. Jung, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, translated by R.F.C. Hull and included in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, edited by Sir Herbert Read

All the same, it was Freud who cleared the ground for the investigation of complex phenomena, at least in the field of neurosis.... This limitation of psychology was very welcome to the materialistic outlook of that time, nearly fifty years ago, and, despite our altered view of the world, it still is in large measure today. It gives us not only the advantage of a "delimited field of work," but also an excellent excuse not to bother with what goes on in a wider world.⁷

Ultimately, what Lawrence also found in Freud's way of conceptualizing desires was the realization that great human passions and emotions are beyond idealism. For Lawrence the greatest danger to modern men is idealism, that is, the discovering of reality in mental states rather than in existence itself. For Lawrence, the way out of false idealism was not to push the idealism to greater lengths, but to go back to the unconscious. In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, Lawrence expressed strong sentiments against Freud's psychoanalysis as lacking the basis of a general phenomenology:

By idealism we understand the motivizing of the great affective sources by means of ideas mentally derived.... This motivizing of the passionate sphere from the ideal is the final peril of human consciousness. It is the death of all spontaneous, creative life, and the substituting of the mechanical principle....

We are now in the last stages of idealism. And psychoanalysis alone has the courage necessary to conduct

and others, Princeton University Press, 1977, p. 3.

7 C.G. Jung, *Concerning the Archetypes, with Special Reference to the Anima Concept*, translated by R.F.C. Hull and included in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, edited by Sir Herbert Read and others, Princeton University Press, 1977, p. 55.

us through these last stages. The identity of love with sex, the single necessity for fulfilment through love, these are our fixed ideals. We must fulfil these ideals in their extremity. And this brings us finally to incest, even incest-worship. We have no option, whilst our ideals stand....

Yet we do know this much: that the pushing of the ideal to any further lengths will not avail us anything. We have actually to go back to our own unconscious. But not to the unconscious which is the inverted reflection of our ideal consciousness. We must discover, if we can, the true unconscious. where our life bubbles up in us, prior to any mentality. The first bubbling life in us, which is innocent of any mental alteration, this is the unconscious. It is pristine, not in any way ideal. It is the spontaneous origin from which it behoves us to live.⁸

Lawrence's unconscious was not the murky cellar in which the mind keeps the idea of sex and love as a repressed motive as described in Freud's theories. On the contrary, it contained the primitive unconscious that Freud's psychoanalysis failed to find. Lawrence wished to indicate by the unconscious "that essential nature of every individual creature, which is, by its very nature, unanalysable, undefinable, inconceivable."⁹ To this unique individuality Lawrence gave the name of "soul". He continued to define his nature of the unconscious:

8 D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, pp. 206-7.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 211.

It cannot be conceived, it can only be experienced, in every single instance. And being inconceivable, we will call it the unconscious. As a matter of fact. *soul* would be a better word. By the unconscious we do mean the *soul*. But the word *soul* has been vitiated by the idealistic use, until nowadays it means only that which a man conceives himself to be. And that which a man conceives himself to be in something far different from his true unconscious. So we must relinquish the idea word *soul*.¹⁰

This mystical self that is the foundation of experience more closely resembles the theories of Jung. Jung had a definition of the meaning of "soul" in a similar way. In *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, he described the "soul" as that which can activate our inner existence:

Being that has soul is living being. Soul is the living thing in man, that which lives of itself and causes life.... Were it not for the leaping and twinkling of the soul, man would rot away in his greatest passion, idleness. A certain kind of reasonableness is its advocate, and a certain kind of morality adds its blessing. But to have soul is the whole venture of life, for soul is a life-giving daemon who plays his elfin game above and below human existence, for which reason—in the realm of dogma—he is threatened and propitiated with superhuman punishments and blessings that go far beyond the possible deserts of human beings. Heaven and hell are the fates meted out to be the soul and not to civilized man, who in his nakedness and timidity

10 D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, p. 211.

would have no idea of what to do with himself in a heavenly Jerusalem.¹¹

Here we can see that Jung and Lawrence share a similar fundamental notion of the unconscious. By the time that Lawrence wrote his two essays, Jung had already parted from Freud's position on the unconscious and was on the way to developing his mature achievements in mythology, alchemy, and, in his later years, Oriental mysticism. If Lawrence had had an opportunity to keep up with these later thoughts of Jung, his views of Jung would have, more than likely, become compatible. Unfortunately, such an ideal encounter never occurred. In fact, it took Lawrence several years to acknowledge sympathies between his own ideas and Jung's unconscious. Writing to Katherine Mansfield on December 5, 1918, Lawrence seems to have favourably commented on one part of Jung's mother-incest theory, but his tone is still a little critical:

First, I send you the Jung book, borrowed from Kot in the midst of his reading it. Ask Jack not to keep it long, will you, as I feel I ought to send it back.¹²

- Beware of it - this mother-incest idea can become an obsession. But it seems to me there is much truth in it: that at certain periods the man has a desire and a tendency to return unto the woman, make her his goal and end, find his justification in her. In this way he casts himself as it were

11 C.G. Jung, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, translated by R.F.C. Hull and included in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, edited by Sir Herbert Read and others, Princeton University Press, 1977, pp. 26-7.

12 *The Selected Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, compiled and edited by James T. Boulton, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 163.

into her womb, and she, the Magna Mater, receives him with gratification. This is a kind of incest. It seems to me it is what Jack does to you, and what repels and fascinates you. I have done it, and now struggle all my might to get out. In a way, Frieda is the devouring mother. —It is awfully hard, once the sex relation has gone this way, to recover. If we don't recover, we die. —But Frieda says I am antediluvian in my positive attitude. I do think a woman must yield some sort of precedence to a man, and he must take this precedence. I do think men must go ahead absolutely in front of their women, without turning round to ask for permission or approval from their women. Consequently, the women must follow as it were unquestioning. I can't help it, I believe this...¹³

During the period when he published *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, it is clear that Lawrence admired elements of Jung's theory from his words in the first chapter of the essay: "Psychoanalysts know what the end will be. They have crept in among us as healers and physicians; growing bolder, they have asserted their authority as scientists; two more minutes and they will appear as apostles. Have we not seen and heard the ex cathedra Jung?"¹⁴ In addition, even toward the end of 1921, Lawrence became angry with his friend, Mabel Dodge Luhan, when she showed a curiosity about Jung's psychological works.¹⁵ Fortunately in 1926, Lawrence had an opportunity to read

13 *The Selected Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, compiled and edited by James T. Boulton, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 163.

14 D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, p. 197.

15 Emily Halm, *Mabel - A Biography of Mabel Dodge Luhan*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977, This situation is slightly treated in Chapter Twelve (pp.157-172) of this book.

Jung's earlier works, and in a letter to Mabel, September 23, expressed a changed attitude:

Jung is very interesting, in his own sort of fat muddled mystical way. Although he may be an initiate and a thrice-sealed adept, he's soft somewhere, and I've no doubt you'd find it fairly easy to bring his heavy posterior with a bump down off his apple-cart.¹⁶

Although, of course, the title of this book Lawrence read is still not known, perhaps it would have sounded like *Psychology of the Unconscious* (1917). Lawrence noticed a maturing of Jung's ideas in this book, and, as a result, softened his view of Jung's psychoanalysis as no more than an extension of Freud's concept. Thus, we can speculate again that if Lawrence had lived beyond the 1930's, he would have felt a strong spiritual bond with Jung as one who had captured a true understanding of "soul" in modern men. In the twenty-five years followed Lawrence's death in 1930, Jung continued to publish exciting and enlightening books: *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* with the essay, "Psychology and Literature" was published in 1933, *The Reality of Soul* with two essays, "Ulysses" and "Picasso" in 1934, a particular important work, *Psychology and Alchemy* in 1944, *Aion* in 1951, and *Mysterium Coniunctionis* in 1955.

What is important for this short essay is to discover in Lawrence's psychological writings genuine impulses similar to Jung's. As previously mentioned, the unconscious Lawrence was seeking was something equivalent to the "soul", only understood through direct experience and void of any cognition. For him, knowledge was actually

16 *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Volume V 1924-27*, compiled and edited by James T. Boulton and Lindeth Vasey, Cambridge University Press, 1989, p. 540.

a matter of the whole experience, knowing in full, and never of merely mental conception. What, then, would be the new psychology manifested by Lawrence? In *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, He discussed this new psychology, this creative development of the unconscious:

What we are suffering from now is the restriction of the unconscious within certain ideal limits. The more we force the ideal the more we rupture the true movement. Once we can admit the *known*, but incomprehensible, pretence of the integral unconscious; once we can trace it home in ourselves and follow its first revealed movements; once we know it habitually unfolds itself; once we can scientifically determine its laws and processes in ourselves: then at last we can begin to live from the spontaneous initial prompting, instead of from the dead machine-principles of ideas and ideals. There is a whole science of the creative unconscious, the unconscious in its law-abiding activities. And of this science we do not even know the first term. Yes, when we know that the unconscious appears by creation, as a new individual reality in every newly-fertilized germ-cell, then we know the very first item of the new science. But it needs a super-scientific grace before we can admit this first new item of knowledge. It means that science abandons its intellectualistic position and embraces the old religious faculty. But it does not thereby become less scientific, it only becomes at last complete in knowledge.¹⁷

17 D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, pp. 212-3.

Though Lawrence seemed to have been faced with the difficulty of trying to articulate concepts for which there were not yet acceptable words, he continued to describe the process of the formation of human consciousness generated by the unconscious. We can find this account especially centered on the theory of the great solar plexus, with slightly different nuances in both *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Lawrence begins with the development of the foetus from the centre, which still in the adult human is beneath the navel, in the solar plexus. He then goes into a complicated system of development based on a fourfold polarity of objective consciousness, polarized in the cardiac plexus and the thoracic ganglion in the breast and lower, dynamic-subjective consciousness in the solar areas. The following extracts are taken from these two essays:

You've got first and foremost a solar plexus, dear reader; and the solar plexus is a great nerve centre which lies behind stomach, I can't be accused of impropriety or untruth, because any book of science or medicine which deals with the nerve-system of the human body will show it to you quite plainly. So don't wriggle or try to look spiritual. Because, willy-nilly, you've got a solar plexus, dear reader, among other things....

Now, your solar plexus, most gentle of readers, is where you are. It is your first greatest and deepest centre of consciousness. If you want to know *how* conscious and *when* conscious, I must refer you to that little book, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*.

At your solar plexus you are primarily conscious: there, behind your stomach. There you have the profound and pristine conscious awareness that you are you. Don't say you haven't. I know I have. You might as well try to

deny the nose on your face. There is your first and deepest seat of awareness. There you are triumphantly aware of your own individual existence in the universe. Absolutely there is the keep *and* central stronghold of your triumphantly-conscious self. There you *are*, and you know it. So stick out your tummy gaily, my dear, with a *Me voilà*. With a *Here I am!* With an *Ecco mi!* With a *Da bin ich!* There you are, dearie.¹⁸

Consciousness develops on successive planes. On each plane there is the dual polarity, positive and negative, of the sympathetic and voluntary nerve centres. The first plane is established between the poles of the sympathetic solar plexus and the voluntary lumbar ganglion. This is the active first plane of the subjective unconscious, from which the whole of consciousness arises. Immediately succeeding the first plane of subjective dynamic consciousness arises the corresponding first plane of objective consciousness, the objective unconscious, polarized in the cardiac plexus and the thoracic ganglion, in the breast. There is a perfect correspondence in difference between the first abdominal and the first thoracic planes. These two planes polarize each other in a fourfold polarity, which makes the first great field of individual, self-dependent consciousness.

Each pole of the active unconscious manifests a specific activity and gives rise to a specific kind of dynamic or creative consciousness. On each plane, the negative voluntary pole complements the positive sympathetic pole,

18 D.H. Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, p. 22.

and yet the consciousness originating from the complementary poles is not merely negative versus positive, it is categorically different, opposite. Each is pure and perfect in itself.

But the moment we enter the two planes of corresponding consciousness, lower and upper, we find a whole new range of complements. The upper, dynamic-objective plane is complementary to the lower, dynamic-subjective. The mystery of creative opposition exists all the time between the two planes, and this unison in opposition between the two planes forms the first whole field of consciousness. Within the individual the polarity is fourfold. In a relation between two individuals the polarity is already eightfold.¹⁹

Lawrence's nomenclature seems to be confusing because he adopted it from any system he could find which would help get his ideas across. But, needless to say, this mystical vision of the polarized interaction between the dynamic centres both within and without the individual has little in common with Freud's scheme of id, ego, and super-ego being embedded in the triple mechanical structure of consciousness, pre-consciousness and the unconscious,²⁰ or with the Oedipus complex and other models based on libido and repression. Ironically, in the 1940's and the 1950's, numerous studies of *Sons and Lovers* interpreted the novel from this Freudian point of view. A deeper reading of Lawrence's masterpiece shows this sort of interpretation to

19 D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, pp. 232-3.

20 In his later works Freud differentiated his basic view. He called the instinctual psyche the "id," and his "super-ego" denotes the collective consciousness, of which the individual is partly conscious and partly unconscious because it is repressed.

be prejudiced. After establishing the nature of consciousness at each of the dynamic poles, that is, the direction of the dynamic-vital flow, and the resultant physical-organic development and activity, Lawrence went on to represent the importance of human beings developing through the polarized connection with other beings as another element in the complex business of human relationship:

The actual evolution of the individual psyche is a result of the interaction between the individual and the outer universe. Which means that just as a child in the womb grows as a result of the parental blood-stream which nourishes the vital quick of the foetus, so does every man and woman grow and develop as a result of the polarized flux between the spontaneous self and some other self ourselves. It is the circuit of vital flux between itself and another being or beings which brings about the development and evolution of every individual psyche and physique. This is a law of life and creation from which we cannot escape. Ascetics and voluptuaries both try to dodge this main condition, and both succeed perhaps for a generation. But after two generations all collapses. Man does not live by bread alone. He lives even more essentially from the nourishing creative flow between himself and another or others.²¹

(2)

Differences on the interpretation of the unconscious caused Jung to separate from Freud, and to establish a physiology of instincts. Jung's

21 D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, pp. 245-6.

insistence on the “collective unconscious” over Freud’s exclusively “personal unconscious” directly led to their separation, but Lawrence and the later Jung seem to have a great deal in common in stressing the old religious aspect of the unconscious. Jung was a psychologist and Lawrence a writer, but if Lawrence had read the later works of Jung, he would probably have adopted this new scheme of the unconscious, with its radical departure from the Freudian “dead machine—principles of ideas and ideals”. He would also have given meaningful comment on Jung’s para-psychology in which archetypes arose from the response to the problem of “soul” in modern men. Exactly where can we find similarities between their interpretations of the unconscious? While Freud searched for the root of all complexes in the trauma of an individual’s life history or in illnesses, and reduced it to the “personal unconscious”, Jung examined complexes in clinical treatment, and ascribed them to an universal “collective unconscious”, which constitutes the germ of potential images in the bottom of the unconscious as “primitive images”. Having inherited them through generations, the individual reacts toward the world in the same way as previous generations. Consciousness can be reduced not to the infant experiences of the individual, but to the repeated experiences of men in ancient times or to the timeless experience of generations. For Jung, human consciousness was essentially homogeneous:

A more or less superficial layer of the unconscious is undoubtedly personal. I call it the *personal unconscious*. But this personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the *collective unconscious*. I have chosen the term “collective” because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche, it has

contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substratum of a supra-personal nature which is present in every one of us.²²

Jung gave the name "Archetypes" to the contents of the "collective unconscious", and devoted his last forty years to exploring "Archetypes". According to Jung, archetypes are:

formal factors responsible for the organization of the unconscious psychic processes: they are "patterns of behaviour". At the same time they have a "specific charge" and develop numinous effects which express themselves as *affects*. This affect produces a partial *abaissement du niveau mental*, for although it raises a particular content to a supernormal degree of luminosity, it does so by withdrawing so much energy from other possible contents of consciousness that they become darkened and eventually unconscious. Owing to the restriction of consciousness produced by the affect so long as it lasts, there is a corresponding lowering of orientation which in its turn gives the unconscious a favourable opportunity to slip into the space vacated. Thus we regularly find that unexpected or otherwise inhibited unconscious contents break through and find expression in the affect. Such contents are very often of an inferior or primitive nature and thus betray

22 C.G. Jung, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, translated by R.F.C. Hull and included in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, edited by Sir Herbert Read and others, Princeton University Press, 1977, pp. 3-4.

their archetypal origin. As I shall show further on, certain phenomena of simultaneity or synchronicity seem to be bound up with the archetypes. That is the reason why I mention the archetypes here.²³

The concept of the archetypes, which is an indispensable correlate of the idea of the collective unconscious, indicates the existence of definite forms in the psyche which seem to be present always and everywhere. Mythological research calls the "motifs"; in the psychology of primitives they correspond to Lévy-Bruhl's concept of "représentations collectives", and in the field of comparative religion they have been defined by Hubert and Mauss as "categories of the imagination". Adolf Bastian long ago called them "elementary" or "primordial thoughts". From these references it should be clear enough that my idea of the archetype—literally a pre-existent form—does not stand alone but is something that is recognized and named in other fields of knowledge.²⁴

We have seen how effectively this Jung's theory of the archetype has been adopted in critical psychological works and in the New Criticism Movement. Jung's archetypes can be recognized in the image-cluster of Lawrence's works. For example, titles that are archetypal are: *Birds*, *Beast and Flowers*, *Pansies*, and *The Plumed Serpent*. From the structural aspect, *The Man Who Died* is really based on the 'birth-rebirth' archetype. Ursula, the protagonist, in *Women in Love* seems to develop

23 C.G. Jung, *Synchronicity*, translated by R.F.C. Hull, Princeton University Press, 1973, pp. 20-1.

24 C.G. Jung, *The Concept of the Collective Unconscious*, translated by R.F.C. Hull and included in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, edited by Sir Herbert Read and others, Princeton University Press, 1977, pp. 42-3.

on the basis of the 'earth-mother' archetype. *The Woman Who Rode Away* obviously includes the scapegoat archetype, that is, the 'death seeking' archetype. We would like to postulate that almost all Lawrence's writings were created through an archetypal consciousness. Of course, Lawrence did not use the term in his psychological writings in the way Jung used it, but his use of symbols and of the dynamic interactions of the unconscious would lead to "primitive images" and the "collective unconscious".

In the Introduction to *The Dragon of the Apocalypse* by Frederick Carter, Lawrence discussed symbols as the images of myth:

And the images of myth are symbols. They don't 'mean something'. They stand for units of human *feeling*, human experience. A complex of emotional experience is a symbol. And the power of the symbol is to arouse the deep emotional self, and the dynamic self, beyond comprehension. Many ages of accumulated experience still throb within a symbol. And we throb in response. It takes centuries to create a really significant symbol: even the symbol of the Cross, or of the horse-shoe, or the horns. No man can invent symbols. He can invent an emblem, made up of images: or metaphors: or images: but not symbols. Some images, in the course of many generations of men, become symbols, embedded in the soul and ready to start alive when touched, carried on in the human consciousness for centuries. And again, when men become unresponsive and half dead, symbols die.²⁵

25 D.H. Lawrence, *A Selection from Phoenix*, edited by A.A.H. Inglis, Penguin Books, 1971, p. 544.

Surely one of the greatest imaginative experiences the human race has ever had was the Chaldean experience of the stars, including the sun and moon. Sometimes it seems it must have been greater experience than any God-experience. For God is only a great imaginative experience. And sometimes it seems as if the experience of the living heavens, with a living yet not human sun, and brilliant living stars in live space must have been the most magnificent of all experiences, greater than Jehovah or Baal, Buddha or Jesus. It may seem an absurdity to talk of live space. But is it? While we are warm and well and “unconscious” of our bodies, are we not all the time ultimately conscious of our bodies in the same way, as live or living space. And is not this the reason why void space so terrifies us?²⁶

This sort of experience described earlier as a Chaldean experience, stored in the modern unconscious, is a primary example of the “collective unconscious”. In his later years, Jung proposed that the principle of “synchronicity” should replace the rational rule of cause-and-effect as a tool to move forward research into the unconscious. In *Synchronicity* (1952), Jung even approached Oriental fortune-telling as a part of this practice.

The problem of synchronicity has puzzled me for a long time, ever since the middle twenties, when I was investigating the phenomena of the collective unconscious and kept on coming across connections which I simply

26 D.H. Lawrence, *A Selection from Phoenix*, edited by A.A.H. Inglis, Penguin Books, 1971, p. 546.

could not explain as chance groupings or "runs". What I found were "coincidences, which were connected so meaningfully that their "chance" concurrence would represent a degree of improbability that would have to be expressed by an astronomical figure."²⁷

Lawrence wrote in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, "Cause-and-effect will not explain even the individuality of a single dandelion. There is no assignable cause, and no logical reason, for individuality. On the contrary, individuality appears in defiance of all scientific law, in defiance even of reason."²⁸ The notion of "correspondence", another aspect of "synchronicity", permeated Lawrence's psychological writings, just as it did Jung's in his later years.

All the time between the quick of life in the foetus and the great outer universe there exists a perfect correspondence, upon which correspondence the astrologers based their science in the days before mental consciousness had arrogated all knowledge unto itself.

The foetus is not *personally* conscious. But then what is personality if not ideal in its origin? The foetus is, however, radically, individually conscious. From the active quick, the nuclear centre, it remains single and integral in its activity. At this centre it distinguishes itself utterly from the surrounding universe, whereby both are modified. From this centre the whole individual arises, and upon this centre

27 C.G. Jung, *Synchronicity*, translated by R.F.C. Hull, Princeton University Press, 1973, p. 21.

28 D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, pp. 210-1.

the whole universe, by implication, impinges. For the fixed and stable universe of law and matter, even the whole cosmos. would wear out and disintegrate if it did not and find renewal in the quick centre of creative life in individual creatures.²⁹

Both Lawrence's theory of consciousness and Jung's scheme of personality growth based on individuation were linked with their notion of self-realization. A sort of aspiration to self-realization can clearly be found in Jung's *A Study in the Process of Individuation* (1934), *Conscious, Unconscious, and Individuation* (1939), and in Lawrence's two psychological essays, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Above all, among all the archetypes of Jung, his "shadow archetype" throws a useful light on Lawrence's idea of modern men, the "polarity" which is another crucial principle. This principle corresponds to Lawrence's opposing psychological demands: the one, corrupt and regressive, requiring reckless passions and instinctive features, and the other, spiritual and cultural, that is man's mission in the world. Those who refuse to confront destructive elements of the unconscious tend to lose touch with vital promptings of creativity, real emotion, and deep insight toward self-realization. Such confrontation leads to a new awareness of life which is inclusive and embraces the polarity of experience. Otherwise, the repressed "shadow" will take its revenge by interfering with the "self" and the maturing process. In *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, Lawrence said that "...if one mode is stressed more than the other, corruption sets in. ...two modes must act complementary to one another, the sympathetic and the separatist.... The goal of life is the coming to

29 D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, pp. 215-6.

perfection of each single individual."³⁰ Jung also described the process of individuation through the acceptance of the "shadow" in *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious* and in *A Study in the Process of Individuation*:

This confrontation is the first test of courage on the inner way, a test sufficient to frighten off most people, for the meeting with ourselves belongs to the more unpleasant things that can be avoided so long as we can project everything negative into the environment. But if we are able to see our own shadow and can bear knowing about it, then a small part of the problem has already been solved: we have at least brought up the personal unconscious. The shadow is a living part of the personality and therefore wants to live with it in some form. It cannot be argued out of existence or rationalized into harmlessness. This problem is exceedingly difficult, because it not only challenges the whole man, but reminds him at the same time of his helplessness and ineffectuality.³¹

Our case shows with singular clarity the spontaneity of the psychic process and the transformation of a personal situation into the problem of individuation, that is, of becoming whole, which is the answer to the great question of our day. How can consciousness, our most recent acquisition, which has bounded ahead, be linked up again with the oldest, the unconscious, which has lagged behind?

30 D.H. Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, London, William Heinemann LTD, 1961, p. 57.

31 C.G. Jung, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, translated by R.F.C. Hull and included in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, edited by Sir Herbert Read and others, Princeton University Press, 1977, pp. 20-1.

The oldest of all is the instinctual foundation. Anyone who overlooks the instincts will be ambuscaded by them, and anyone who does not humble himself will be humbled, losing at the same time his freedom, his most precious possession.³²

So in search of some harmony between “self” and “shadow” as an antidote to the mechanical life of modern civilization, Jung’s journey to Africa would be equivalent in many ways to Lawrence’s savage pilgrimage to Etruscan Europe and Mexico. And while Jung took an interest in the “Wotan” in the *Völuspá* of the German myth during World War II, Lawrence passionately espoused “blood-knowledge” in the so-called “leadership novels”, *Aaron’s Rod* (1922), *Kangaroo* (1923), *The Boy in the Bush* (1924), *The Plumed Serpent* (1926), from the impact of World War I. But fortune was not on their side. Through such unique endeavours, Jung was temporarily mistaken for a Fascist and Lawrence definitely branded as a Fascist by the English philosopher, Bertrand Russell (1872-1970). After all, on September 14, 1915, Lawrence wrote the following in response to Russell’s accusations:

I (*i.e.* Lawrence) am going to quarrel with you again. You simply don’t speak the truth, you simply are not sincere.... You are simply *full* of repressed desires, which have become savage and anti-social. And they come out in this sheep’s clothing of peace propaganda. As a woman said to me, who had been to one of your meetings. ‘It seemed so

32 C.G. Jung, *A Study in the Process of Individuation*, translated by R.F.C. Hull and included in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, edited by Sir Herbert Read and others, Princeton University Press, 1977, p. 350.

strange, with his face looking so evil, to be talking about peace and love. He can't have *meant* what he said.' I believe in your inherent power for realizing the truth. But I don't believe in your will, not for a second. Your will is false and cruel. You are too full of devilish repressions to be anything but lustful and cruel. I would rather have the German soldiers with rapine and cruelty, than you with your words of goodness. It is the falsity I can't bear. I wouldn't care if you were six times a murderer, so long as you said to yourself, 'I am this.' The enemy of mankind, you are, full of the lust of enmity. It is *not* the hatred of falsehood which inspire you. It is the hatred of people, of flesh and blood. It is a perverted, mental blood-lust. Why don't you own it.

Let us become strangers again, I think it is better.³³

D.H. Lawrence

Of course, Lawrence and Jung were essentially anti-Fascists, but both were swept along the violent torrents of a cruel and merciless epoch of each of the great wars, and they went through disgraceful ordeals that lie in wait for prophets.

Lawrence possessed a deep insight into the inner workings of the human mind, and his psychological writings continue to stir and move his readers today. As a result, Lawrence, through his psychological writings, manages to bring a special clarity to a troubled age. Though Lawrence's thinking of the unconscious developed separately, it bears many similarities to the psychological schemes of Jung. Thus, Jung's works can help our understanding of Lawrence's psychological writings, and these in turn help us to understand the psychic discourse

33 *The Selected Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, compiled and edited by James T. Boulton, Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp.107-8.

of his literary work. The process which may have begun with an innocent remark by his tutor's wife, Frieda, was full of consequence for Lawrence's writing.

[This essay is supported by the Waseda Tokui Fund (1998) and Waseda University Grant for Special Research Projects (Individual Research 99A-134, 1999)]