

The Influence of Freud and Psychoanalytic Concepts on Modernist Writers

Joseph J. Bell

University of Bisha,

Department of English,

College of Arts,

Saudi Arabia

<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1606-5167>

email: joseph@ub.edu.sa

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Received: 18 Dec 2024

Revised: 10 Feb 2025

Accepted: 28 Feb 2025

This paper examines the influence of Sigmund Freud on Modernist writers, with particular emphasis on D. H. Lawrence and James Joyce. This paper illustrates the ways in which Freud's conceptualization of the human psyche, with the deeper inner drives foremost, came to bear an imprint on the thematic and structural tenets of modern literature. This paper shows that Freudian thinking was so pervasive as to bear an imprint, even on authors who outwardly refuted psychoanalysis.

Keywords: Freud, Psychoanalysis, Modernism, D. H. Lawrence, James Joyce.

Sigmund Freud is considered among the most revered and controversial thinkers of the modern era, a time of profound cultural and societal change in which the formal and thematic contours of artistic creation underwent seismic shifts and in which Freud's influence was diversely expressed and widely felt. Indeed, it was the gravity of Freud's legacy that he is often placed alongside Karl Marx and Charles Darwin as one of the dominant forces shaping the intellectual landscape of the nineteenth-century world, especially in his contributions to our understanding of the human condition and its obscure and conjectural psychical depths. To be sure, Freud's work transcends scientific boundaries, seeking as it does to excavate and codify the human psyche and thus to instrumentally reveal the mechanics of thought, feeling, and emotion – a task of no small proportions, which drives the primal matter of human identity. Consequently, Freud's work has something to say on any topic wherein human identity plays a role, which is to say, virtually everything that forms a part of culture and society. Freud is credited with bringing psychology into the mainstream. His research also bestowed the English lexicon with now commonly known concepts such as the super-ego, Oedipus complex, and the Freudian slip, all of which have taken root firmly in Western culture in at least equal measure to their salience in technical psychoanalytic discourse. In addition, Freudian theory has exerted an immense impact on numerous (and ostensibly discrete) domains of scholarly and artistic composition, with literature playing a prominent role in this promulgation. Freud's theories were considered both shocking and brilliant when they were devised, inspiring equal applause and condemnation from the artistic community. Freud had his detractors and disciples in the arts; in either case, evoking powerful reactions and visceral engagement. Thus, some writers staunchly took up the Freudian mantle, working directly and overtly with his psychoanalytical themes, or even developing their own versions of the theory. D. H. Lawrence wrote whole books espousing his unique stripe of Freudian insight; further, it is credited with composing the first genuine Freudian novel, *Sons and Lovers* (1913), a novel that goes into precise detail regarding Oedipal dynamics, which is explored in depth in this essay for that reason.

Other modernist authors were less receptive toward Freud and some were outright hostile, denying his influence with virility, which is perhaps too conspicuous: the kind of defensiveness that would perhaps have given Freud himself subject material for psychoanalytical case study. One case in point is the modernist literary master James Joyce, who derided Freud privately and publicly, even mocking psychoanalysis in not-so-cloaked jibes within the pages of his epic of consciousness and dream-state, *Finnegans Wake* (1939). Joyce would minimize Freud's genius and even relegate his contributions on theorizing consciousness to an ancillary role, secondary (at best) to

Giambattista Vico, Joyce's Renaissance muse, whose philosophical writings, especially the notion of history following a circular trend, overtly shape the (admittedly fluid and ever-changing) structures of the *Wake*. Even in light of Joyce's marked antagonism to Freud, his writing is arguably the epitome of Freudian thought, exhibiting, as it does, all the fragmentation, discontinuity, and primal disjuncture of symbolism manifested in the Freudian interpretation of dreams. Indeed, Joyce's overt rejection of Freud might itself be interpreted as a mode of Oedipal anxiety, a rejection of the intellectual father figure, whose influence is refuted in a transmuted form of competitive (what we today would term "Freudian") angst. Indeed, this essay advances that claim. Hence, Joyce's apparent rejection of Freud is presented here as one of the modern era's most piercing ironies – an ironically Freudian irony no less. Whether Joyce saw anything of value in Freud or not, it is certain that his writing was heavily influenced by him, via the anxiety of influence, as Harold Bloom dubs it; at least that is what this essay will seek evidence. Accordingly, this essay examines the *Wake*, illuminating the many ways in which, notwithstanding the author's opinion, the text is powerfully Freudian and even Oedipal (in the sense Harold Bloom posits). By this examination of Joyce, who is perhaps chief among modernist writers in the English language, this essay seeks to demonstrate that Freud's influence on the modernist psyche was so potent that than even his most gifted literary detractor could not evade it.

Freud and Influence: The Shaping Mind of Modernism

In Freud's day, the idea of reading literary works as a mode of self-discovery was well established, derived from a classical understanding of the arts; that is, that one's emotional and intellectual response to aesthetics manifests in the recognition of feelings or passions observed (in the work), which we experience in ourselves. Freud takes this assumption further, arguing that works of art can be studied as expressions of the unconscious itself – seeing as both are commonly seen to derive from the realms of fantasy. In particular, the creative writing act is understood to be a form of fantasizing fused with early childhood memory, a revisiting of earlier experiences transmuted into an aesthetic form. The act of creative writing thus allows fantasy to be exercised, manifested in the artwork, thereby purging the artist of the psychical baggage it hitherto supposedly represented. Often, the fantasy element of the creative product is steeped in symbolism and consequently associated with dreams and their interpretation. In Freudian psychology, "dreams are expressions of the subconscious mind. They express, in symbolic form [. . .] Freud proceeded to analyze art, literature, religion, and even politics in the same manner he analyzed dreams' (Erickson and Murphy, 2008, p. 75). While the fantasy – or, as Freud has it, "daydream" – is posited as the catalyst of the creative act, the fantasy itself is rooted in more primal psychic stuff. In the first instance, all motives come down to the drives that Freud theorizes determine all human behaviour. In summary, then, "for Freud, the fantasy (daydream) is the source of the author's creativity, but the drives (erotic and ambitious) are the source of the fantasies' (Figueira et al., 1995, p. 127). From the Freudian vantage, consequently, no definitive division can be made between the workings of the unconscious mind and the workings of a literary text. These two entities are inextricably entangled into a complex causal chain. As shall be seen, this seemingly simple assumption yielded far-ranging consequences in the world of literary creation.

Freudian Theory and Human Nature

Freud was explicit about the influence of art on him. He states that "works of art exercise a powerful effect on me, especially those of literature and sculpture". A vital element of this "powerful effect" is connected with Freud seeking "to apprehend [the art] in my way". If he cannot achieve this, he is "almost incapable of obtaining any pleasure. Some rationalistic, or perhaps analytic, turn of mind in me rebels against being moved by a thing without knowing why I am thus affected and what it is that affects me" (1914, p. 253). Freud identified in literary works privileged knowledge of the human condition, a knowledge that he, as a scientist, struggled to bring to light. Freud indeed exhibits fascination with the "knowledge" of poets, their 'genius.' He saw the writer as follows: "The description of the human mind is indeed the domain which is most his own; he has from time immemorial been the precursor of science, and so too of scientific psychology" (Freud, 1907, pp. 43-44). Literary works came to Freud to constitute a paradigmatic model that confirmed psychoanalytic knowledge. Freud asserted in 1912 that psychoanalysis should, in examining literary works, see more than "a confirmation of findings that were done in trivial neurotic human beings"; it also should attempt to "know the material of memories and impressions in which a certain author based his work, and the methods and processes through which they converted that material into a

work of art” (cited in Downey, 1993, p. 87). This leads Freud to conclude that the examination of literary texts could lead to results similar to those obtained by research conducted during clinical practice. Accordingly, to understand how Freudian theory influences literature, it is necessary to first establish the theoretical parameters of Freud’s thinking in the capacity of clinical psychoanalysis.

Broadly stated, Freudian theory hinges on a conception of human behaviour as driven principally by inborn “drives” in the unconscious, whose workings are consequently obscure, intangible and therefore conjectural; and which must, for this reason, be inferred. This presupposition was counter to the (pre-Freudian) dominant view of the late nineteenth century: namely, that all mental acts “are conscious to us – that being conscious is the criterion of what is mental, and that, if there are processes in our brain which are not conscious, they do not deserve to be called mental acts and are no concern of psychology” (Freud, 1926, pp. 196-197). Freud intended to overthrow this perception and thus overhaul the field, crafting a new paradigm in thinking he avowed to parallel the Darwinian or Copernican revolutions that came before (Freud, 1924). From this starting point, Freud develops the “iceberg” model of the human mind, which compares the psychical operations of the brain to an iceberg, since the majority of the matter in question is submerged, beneath the surface. Three separate aspects were identified as making up the psyche: the id, ego, and super-ego, each of which must be balanced for mental health to be obtained. The ID contains basic needs and feelings, and is essentially the pleasure principle. The ego realizes that you cannot always get what you want and is the reality principle. The super-ego is the moral part of the mind that usually strives for perfection. Thus, the conscious part of the brain is like the tip of the iceberg that can be seen; a person is aware of his/her conscious mind, feelings, emotions, dreams, fantasies, thoughts, and memories. The unconscious is hidden and unknown; a person is unaware of its influence. Through investigative discussion with the patient, the psychoanalytical method sought to unearth and make known to the patient the psychic root of potential ill health. Hence, Freud and Josef Breuer (1896, p. 6) advert, with “great surprise,” to their discovery that “each individual hysterical symptom immediately and permanently disappeared when we had succeeded in bringing clearly to light the memory.” The process of revisiting the event – *abreaction* in psychoanalytical jargon – thus enables the sufferer to purge the memory of its damaging effect. Thus, a critical aspect of Freud’s method is bringing to light, *exposing* the supposed submerged forces and drives, which have led to one or another psychological eventuality.

Freud’s understanding of human motivation accordingly deems the unconscious mind deterministic. In this analysis, human behaviour is seen mostly as being shaped by determinants beyond free will. The theory suggests, then, that free will is illusory; instead, hidden mental processes (of which we are mostly unaware and have little control) ultimately govern us. Of these obscure governing forces, Freud put significant stress on the concept of sexual drives and called them the centrality of human life, actions, and behaviour, arguing that these drives exist in children at birth. A central idea in this respect is the Oedipal complex, which highlights the burgeoning sexuality of children. The Oedipus complex forms in early psychosexual development, between three and six years of age, and sees the male child cultivating son-to-father competition over the mother’s affection (Shaffer, 2009). Freud connected the Oedipal complex hypothesis to examples in literary writing using Sophocles’ *Oedipus Rex* as an illustrative case study. In this play, Oedipus inadvertently develops a romantic bond with his mother and even kills his father to marry his mother. Finally, his realization of the transgression induces him to blind himself. Freud’s blinding was symbolic. The study of dreams, he argued, has “taught us that anxiety about one’s eyes, the fear of going blind, is often enough to substitute for the dread of being castrated. The self-blinding of the mythical criminal, Oedipus, was simply a mitigated form of the punishment of castration – the only punishment that was adequate for him” by the law of retaliation, *lex talionis* (1919, p. 340). Freud posited that all male children develop profound emotional closeness towards their mothers and are envious of their fathers for the relationship they have with their mothers. Male children accordingly suppressed their sexual desire for the mother to evade castration from their fathers. This suppression is sustained until the child matures and can enact sexual desire on females of their own age, thus overcoming the proposed complex. However, if the subject carries this complex into adulthood, Freud believes that they would not be able to forge healthy relationships.

Freudian Influence on Literature

As Frederick J. Hoffman argues: “it is quite possible that Freud influenced the writing of our time more radically than other theorist because the subject matter with which he dealt was intimately related to aesthetic interests”

(Glücksberg, 2012, p. 14). Freud paved the way for complex new delineations of human experience, especially insofar as human consciousness is involved. Freud's work accordingly influenced many modernist writers who "were concerned with consciousness", with the "interior of characters' minds being explored", and thus the fictional personages becoming "more complex and contradictory", with "multi-voices, multi-layered narratives the natural outcome" (Armstrong, 2014, p. 48). Further, psychoanalytical theory foregrounds the investigative search for hidden causes behind neuroses and results in a critical focus on the notion of abnormality, especially in the sexual domain. This shift in focus alone reflects a grand departure from previous scientific inquiry on the human mind and is a shift replicated in literary arts. Under Freud's influence, sexuality, which had erstwhile been a profound taboo, came to the fore, in particular, all its neurotic and deviant components. Victorians treated sex as something bestial, to be covered up, sanitized, cloaked in euphemism, or ignored altogether. The advent of Freudian analysis turned this paradigm to its head. Now, sex was out in the open, as it was. As Chris Baldick observes, "the huge significance of this recent and supposedly scientific revelation [of the unconscious] lay in the value it assigned to the open discussion of sexual impulses" (2015, p. 51). With the newfound psychological and developmental importance of sexual impulses, sexual acts ascended to new heights in the realms of literary motifs. After Freud, "writers of fiction could more readily gain access to mythological materials by sounding the depths of the unconscious, there to excavate the lingering *effects* of the Oedipal drama and the 'family romance'" (Erwin, 2002, p. 352). As shall be seen, this excavation effort expanded with substantial reach into the Western Canon.

Freud aimed to create a grand, overarching, and codified theory of mental functioning and malfunctioning. The goal of psychoanalysis was to create a science of the mind, a technical and rational framework for understanding the often-irrational and inexplicable operations of the human psyche. Freudian psychology is very detailed, offering a technical analysis of the various components of human behaviour. These theoretical frameworks, in-depth as they are, tended to fit the longer format of prose fiction rather than the more contained scope of verse. For this reason, Freud's work has influenced the English novel much more than it has influenced poetry and drama. The novel, as a long-form textual work, offers greater leeway and scope for representing the diverse network of psychological forces that motivate human relationships. As far as English poetry and drama are concerned, the impact of Freud is only somewhat discernible. D. H. Lawrence's poem "Snake," avowedly a narration of a personal experience, is a Freudian acknowledgement of the potency of the sex instinct which is repressed by the ego into the dark layers of the unconscious: from which depths it emerges on occasion into the open (that is, consciousness), only to be forced to scurry back into its dark abode. The sex instinct in the poem is a snake. He is the "lord" of all creation and yet treated shabbily by civilized man. The major poets of the twentieth century, T. S. Eliot and W. B. Yeats, also acknowledge the supremacy of sex instinct, but their predilection is to sublimate or overcome it. In "The Waste Land," one of the twentieth century's foremost poems, Eliot blames sex, or rather its degradation and commercialization, as both the cause and the symptom of the decay of Western civilization. Eliot's poems like "The Love Song of Alfred J. Prufrock" and "The Waste Land" are structured on the basis of free association and make use of the technique of interior monologues. Prufrock is evidently a victim of this repression. His song remained unsung. With regard to drama, absurdist writers like Beckett and Pinter show a penchant for dramatizing the absurdity of existence as well as the interplay of subconscious drives. These poetic and dramatic examples are significant because the authors in question were hugely influential in shaping modernist literature, and thus in disseminating Freudian insights that they (consciously or otherwise) articulated. While these pre-eminent poets and playwrights are useful touchstones for the current study, it is really in the form of a novel that a full-blooded manifestation of Freudian theory comes to the foreground.

D. H. Lawrence and the "Birth" of the Freudian Novel

Arguably, the first true Freudian novel in English was *Sons and Lovers* (1913) by D. H. Lawrence, an artistic case study of a young male protagonist, Paul Morel, who worked under a heavy Oedipal burden. Even the title, with its semantic parallelism of "sons" and "lovers," signals this significant thematic association. Interestingly, Lawrence was critical of the psychoanalytical readings of his novel; he found them reductive and sterilizing. The author expressed disapproval in such approaches to *Sons and Lovers* for the way in which they "reduced the complexity of fiction of the schematic simplicity of psychoanalytic theory" (cited in Harrison, 2008, p. 4). Accordingly, a paradox arises: novelists may not be aware of the influences under which they create literary works. Lawrence himself implicitly invokes the Oedipal importance of his work in private correspondence, noting that, in the Morel

household, the mother “selects them [the sons] as lovers” and this has the effect that, in manhood, “they can’t love, because the mother is the strongest power in their lives” (cited in Ellis, 2015, p. 36). This is Freudian theory, albeit in non-Freudian terms. The novel’s plot structure solidifies Freudian interpretation, affording an Oedipal (“family romance”) drama. In the novel, Paul is the son of a sturdy but heavy drinker and coarse miner, and an educated, sensitive, but possessive mother who is beset by her abusive husband. The children, three sons, and two daughters formed a united front against their fathers. In particular, the mother transplants her love from the husband to the children: “At last Mrs. Morel despised her husband. She turned to the child; she turned from the father” (Lawrence, 1994, p. 20). For Freud, the mother, ageing, saves herself from an uneventful emotional life “by putting herself in her children’s place, by identifying herself with them; and this she does by making their emotional experiences her own” (Freud, 1913, p. 18). Paul is depicted as especially fragile, compared to William, his hardy older brother (and the mother’s favourite); described, indeed, as trotting “after his mother like her shadow” (p. 54). After the death of his older brother, Paul becomes exceptionally attached to his mother, thus constituting a surrogate husband. Consequently, as an adult, he is incapable of establishing a satisfying relationship with Miriam, his love and interest. After a long Platonic courtship, therefore, he leaves her ostensibly repelled by her excessive religiosity and (ironically) blames her for being too possessive. Of course, this accusation is a projection, inspired, one may assume, by deep internal forces which the protagonist does not fully understand. One may relate this scene to another in which Paul feels conflicted when quarrelling with his mother. “Instinctively he realized that he was life to her. And, after all, she was the chief thing to him, the only supreme thing” (p. 213). The key phrase, here, is “instinctively.” Paul knows, by some inborn sense, that his mother is the “supreme thing, though he cannot perceive the reasons for this. The inborn drives are very powerful in this depiction, rendering Paul an inadvertent pawn of the unconscious.

The aberrant mother-son relationship is underlined in the same scene, when the mother, railing against Miriam, accuses: “she exults so in taking you from me—she’s not like ordinary girls”, contending further, that “I can’t bear it. I could let another woman but not her. She’d leave me no room, not a bit of room” (p. 213). This language is charged with coded sexual overtones that indicate that the mother facilitates and exacerbates the oedipal complex, which obstructs her son’s healthy romantic maturation. The amorous implications are amplified directly after the above line, in the mother’s desperate exclamation: “And I’ve never—you know, Paul—I’ve never had a husband—not really—” (p. 213). The staggered and elusive nature of this phraseology reflects the disjointed and decenters operation of the psyche, as Freud viewed it, especially with regard to mother-son relations. Lawrence’s use of words, here, one may argue, is profoundly and deliberately Freudian. The evocation of marriage in conjunction with motherly possessiveness, in combination with the indirect request that Paul fulfil the husband’s role, allows for a very complete iteration of the Oedipal framework. Moreover, Paul’s mother seems to have equally invested in maladapted intimacy works to compound the complex and exacerbate Paul’s unhealthy psychosexual condition. Consequently, Paul’s emotional development has been stunted. Some years after composing the novel, Lawrence himself acknowledged the extreme degree of Paul’s psychological disfigurement. The mother, he writes, “throws herself into a last great love for her son, a final and fatal devotion, that which would have been the richness and strength of her husband and is poison to the boy” (1961, p. 125). Poison, indeed, of an immobilizing type. Due to his entanglement in the Oedipal dynamic, Paul can “never make the sexual and emotional transfer away from his mother, and the result is emotional paralysis” (Harvey, 1986, p. 22). *Sons and Lovers* presented a clear example of Freud’s contention that literary texts allow results similar to those obtained by research carried out during clinical practice. The above analysis of Paul Morel replicates the process of psychoanalytical examination, with the fictive character functioning for intents and purposes as a real person, a “patient.”

James Joyce and the Anxiety of Freudian Influence

James Joyce was one of *the* most challenging writers of the previous century. More than any of his literary contemporaries, Joyce in *Ulysses* (1920) and *Finnegans Wake* (1939), offered the Western Canon a deep excavation of the human psyche. His contribution to our understanding of the human condition in the literary domain might reasonably be considered equal to that of Freud’s contribution in the psychiatric domain. The work of Joyce presents an intriguing case, for the reason that, as shall be demonstrated, the author is demonstrably Freudian – even though he stridently denied this influence. Not only did Joyce refute Freud’s imprint on his fiction, he averred that he found the theories of psychoanalysis “distasteful”, and denigrated psychoanalysis, holding “my imagination

grows when I read Vico, but it does not when I read Freud and Jung” (cited in Cormack, 2008, p. 23). Moreover, Joyce explicitly expressed that “I have nothing to do with psychoanalysis” (cited in Ingersoll, 1996, p. 2). Nevertheless, Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake* clarifies, if askance, allusions to psychoanalysis. Freud – and his chief rival in the psychoanalytical school, Carl Jung – both crop up in the text, as in the following example: “we grisly old Sykos who have done our unsmiling bit on ‘alices, when they were yung and easily freudened in the penumbra of the procuring room and what oracular compression we have had to apply to them” (p. 115). Joyce puns on “young” and “Jung,” “Freud(ened)” and “frightened,” insinuating thereby a kind of naivety in the psychoanalytical conceptual framework. According to Thomas C. Hofheinz, the passage is a “jab” by Joyce at Freud, in particular, his ideas on the Oedipal complex and its undercurrents of incestuous coupling; hence the extract’s equation of “psychoanalysis with lechery” (1995, p. 160). In this regard, Joyce’s barbed humour echoes the conventional, obtuse, and Victorian criticism of Freud as a peddler of indecency.

At any rate, even though Joyce refutes Freud, he manifests him more than once in his writing. In this passage, Joyce parodies psychoanalytical jargon while making an arch observation of Freud’s emphasis on the sexual attention of children focused on parents: “what a neurasthene nympholept, endocrinepineal typus, of inverted parentage with a prepossessing drauma present in her past and a priapic urge for congress with agnates before cognates. . .” (p. 115). Again, these lines underscore the theme of incest, the “priapic urge” for “agnates before cognates,” reflecting an aberration, “inverted parentage” inverted parentage’. As Peter Mahon argues, the lines “poke fun at the incestuous insinuations made by students of psychoanalysis by offering a diagnosis of the daughter’s sexual problems in psycho-babble” (2007, p. 261). The sexual is taboo, and Joyce, who never shied away from controversial topics, demonstrates a rather uncharacteristic and glib position in relation to Freud, essentially travestying him as a lascivious quack. For Freud, humour played an important psychosocial role, enabling the subject to exclaim in hidden terms that they would not be permitted overtly to declare. Humour works as a roundabout means to exercise a need, a way to circumvent the discomfort of direct confrontation with taboos. A joke, so understood, works “in the first instance as an unintended discovery deriving from human social relations” (Freud, 2017, p. 223). Here, the joke played by Joyce on Freud ironically can be argued to inadvertently reveal a taboo that Joyce, unconsciously perhaps, was loathe to confront: his own influence by Freud. Joyce swerves this confrontation by adverting his reader’s gaze on the sexual element in Freud, mocking it in a rather subtle manner, thereby deflecting the potential interpretation of Freudian Joyce.

Joyce’s clear and dim view of Freud and his fiction in relation to psychoanalysis is not a matter of speculation. Nevertheless, despite these playful jibes at psychoanalysis and notwithstanding Joyce’s proclamation that he had nothing to do with the movement, *Finnegans Wake* is, as many critics have pointed out, a very Freudian novel. It is a work that delves into the flow of consciousness and combines the perceptions of everyday reality with reverie, dream, and fantasy, which plunges us into the depths of a dream state that often makes no sense to ordinary readers. The text requires no small interpretive effort on the part of the reader; it requires a form of exegesis. Primarily, this is because it is fragmentary and non-linear. The *Wake* on the “level of the psyche” opens “the way to the language of the dream, where the simultaneity of meanings replaces the sequential order they have in the waking state” (Creasy, 2011, p. 132). In this regard, the *Wake* recalls *The Interpretation of Dreams*, which highlights the prevalence in dreams for “the category of contraries and contradictions” and the “particular preference for combining contraries into a unity” (1899, p. 224). In either instance, the reader/analyst needs to make the conceptual, exegetic connections that the author/dream offers. In this respect, Freud and Joyce share a good deal in common.

The notion of Joyce, especially the *Wake*, as Freudian is controversial; certainly, Joyce himself would refute these assertions. Available evidence offers reasonable grounds for defending this position. More to the point, Joyce’s own opinions and refutations on one level have no bearing on a third party’s ascription of Freudian means to the author. Joyce may not recognize or be consciously aware of such an influence, but this does not mean that it is non-existent. In this regard, Joyce may be guilty of what Harold Bloom identifies in Nabokov, a “loathing of Freud, which equates to the necessity to “defend against an over-determined sense” (1987, p. 2). Perhaps a critical contextual issue in this debate relates to the operation – or contamination – of influence – the ability of one author’s thought to filter undetected into the mind, and thus work, of another. With Sigmund Freud, this issue was taken to the maximum pitch. As the literary critic and cartographer of influence Bloom notes, Freud’s vast impact on

modern thinking renders his influence virtually impossible to escape from; it will bear an imprint (1987, p. 3). In addition, with Joyce, perhaps more than any of his contemporaries, the links to Freudian thought are decidedly pronounced and no more so than in the *Wake*. For this reason, the literary scholar may assert, with only minimal irony, that *Finnegans Wake*, despite its author's best intentions, is an inadvertent reproduction of *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Joyce, of course, is a notoriously difficult writer, and the current analysis as defensively navigating the anxiety of Freud's influence may be charged with severity or even obtuseness. Joyce, like Freud, has disciples and will not be proselytized. In this particular, he is once again very Freudian.

Freud's views continue to create controversy, but no one argues against his significant influence. At the very least, he showed the crucial importance of unconscious thinking in all human thought and activities. In relation to creative writing, the author was deeply concerned with how the inner depths of the unconscious mind invested in the subject matter of artists' and writers. Likewise, many authors brought Freud's insights into how invisible drives were at play in directing the trajectory of the human mind. Freud, in an unprecedented manner, brought ideas and the modus operandi of psychoanalysis to the literary world. Hence, there are similarities between the narrative forms of Freud's case studies and the modernist story. Freud, moreover, was always ready to assimilate fictional characters for the explication of psychoanalytical points, such that, in the context of psychoanalytical study, there is little practical distinction – in the context of refining knowledge on the human condition – between a literary character and a real-life patient. Both exhibit the same mental forces, even if they come to the analyst's attention via different routes. Lawrence exhibits Freud's thinking in more or less direct terms, even if he treats them in his own vocabulary. Joyce reproduces Freud without meaning to, immersed as all modernist writers were, in the Austrian's seemingly ubiquitous influence.

Disclosure statement: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Author details: Joseph J. Bell¹

joseph@ub.edu.sa

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1606-5167>

Author contributions statement: This is a single-author paper and no other authors have contributed to the paper. The author confirms sole responsibility for the following: study conception and design, data collection, analysis and interpretation of results, and manuscript preparation.

Acknowledgements: This paper was written by Joseph Bell. Joseph Bell is responsible for all aspects of the research, including conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, writing – original draft preparation, writing – review and editing, visualization, and project administration.

Data availability statement: Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

References

- [1] Armstrong, J. (2014). *Experimental Fiction: An Introduction for Readers and Writers*. London: Bloomsbury.
- [2] Baldick, C. (2015). *Literature of the 1920s: Writers Among the Ruins*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [3] Bloom, H. (1997). *Anxiety of Influence*, 2nd Edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [4] Cormack, A. (2008). *Yeats and Joyce: Cyclical History and the Reprobate Tradition*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- [5] Creasy, M. (2011). *Errears and Erroriboose: Joyce and Error*. London: Rodopi.
- [6] Downey, H. (1993). *Gradiva by Wilhelm Jensen; and Delusion and Dream in Jensen's Gradiva*. Los Angeles: Sun and Moon Press.
- [7] Ellis, D. (2015). *Love and Sex in D.H. Lawrence*. Clemson: Clemson University Press.
- [8] Erickson, P. A. & Murphy, L. D. (2008). *A History of Anthropological Theory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

¹ Department of English Language and Literature, College of Arts and Letters, University of Bisha, Bisha, Saudi Arabia.

- [9] Erwin, E. (2002). *The Freud Encyclopaedia: Theory, Therapy, and Culture*. London: Routledge.
- [10] Figueira, S. A., Fonagy, P. & Person, E. S. (1995) On Freud's "Creative Writers and Day-dreaming". New York: Karnak.
- [11] Freud, S. (2001). *Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. James Strachey.
- [12] New York: Basic Books.
- [13] Freud, S. (1914). "The Moses of Michelangelo." *Standard Edition*, 13, 211–236.
- [14] Freud, S. (1913). *Totem and Taboo*. London: Beacon Press.
- [15] Freud, S. (1919) "The Uncanny" In: *Pelican Freud Library*, vol. 6. Trans. James Strachey, ed. Angela Richards. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- [16] Freud, S. (1926) "The Question of Lay Analysis. Conversations with an Impartial Person". *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XX (1925-1926): An Autobiographical Study, Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety, Lay Analysis and Other Works*. London: The Hogarth Press, pp. 177-258.
- [17] Freud, S. (1899). *The Interpretation of Dreams*. London: Penguin.
- [18] Freud, S. & Breuer, J. (1895). *Studies on Hysteria*. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume II (1893-1895)*. London: The Hogarth Press.
- [19] Glicksberg, I. (2012). *The Sexual Revolution in Modern American Literature*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- [20] Harrison, A. (2008). *D. H. Lawrence's Sons and Lovers*. Tirril: Humanities-E-Books.
- [21] Harvey, G. (1986). *The Critics Debate: Sons and Lovers*. New York: Macmillan.
- [22] Hofheinz, T. C. (1996). *Joyce and the Invention of Irish History: Finnegans Wake in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [23] Ingersoll, E. G. (1996). *Engendered Trope in Joyce's Dubliners*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- [24] Lawrence, D. H. (1961). *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- [25] Mahon, P. (2007). *Imagining Joyce and Derrida: Between Finnegans Wake and Glas*.
- [26] London: University of Toronto Press.
- [27] Shaffer, D. (2009). *Social and Personality Development*. Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Author: Joseph Bell received his Ph.D. in 2010, and has been an assistant professor of English at the University of Bisha since 2015. He has taught at both British and Saudi universities and has participated in developing English B.A. degree program course descriptions at the University of Bisha. His research interests include Victorian and early twentieth century literature.