

Psyche & Muse: Creative Entanglements with the Science of the Soul
on view at Beinecke Library, Yale University, January 28 through June 13, 2011

H.D. and Freud, the Poet and the Professor

Checklist and Descriptions

Exhibition Curator: Nancy Kuhl, American Literature (nancy.kuhl@yale.edu)

Photograph of H. D., 1930s.

[Ferdinand Schmutzer, *Etching of Sigmund Freud*, 1926].

In 1933, modernist poet H. D., then 46 and suffering from a severe writer's block, traveled to Vienna to be analyzed by Sigmund Freud. The "Professor," as he was often called, was 77 when her analysis began; "the work" as she called it in her letters to loved ones, took place over several months in the spring of 1933 and again in the fall of 1934. That the experience had a profound effect on H. D. is evident in the rich and detailed record she created in various documents over decades; during the period of her treatment, she wrote daily letters to loved ones, occasionally describing her sessions in detail; she also kept a journal while she was in Vienna, recording the events of her analysis, her impression of Freud and his family, and her experiences in Vienna. After her analysis was over, she wrote about it in poetry and prose; she continued to track her memory of the analysis in personal journals until late in her life. Perhaps more importantly, the effects of her treatment might also be seen in the extremely productive years that followed her time in Vienna. From the 1930s, through the upheaval of her war years in London, and in to the 1950, the poet wrote several novels and memoirs (including *Tribute to Freud*) and two of her most ambitious and important poetic works—*Helen in Egypt* and the three works that make up her War Trilogy.

Archival materials and facsimiles in the exhibition are from the H. D. Papers, the Bryher Papers, the Kenneth Macpherson Papers, and the Havelock Ellis Papers.

H. D., *Tribute to Freud*, [New York] Pantheon [1956].

H. D., *Selected works*, 1915–2009.

In a career that spanned some five decades, poet and prose writer H. D. created a rich body of work celebrated for its lyricism and formal innovation; she is counted among the most important writers of the modernist period. In 1911, Hilda Doolittle left her native Pennsylvania and traveled to London; there she joined the circle of writers and artists around her friend and one-time fiancé, poet Ezra Pound. The following year Pound "created" the poet "H. D." when,

without her knowledge, he signed her poems “H. D., Imagiste,” before sending them to *Poetry* magazine. From that point forward, H. D. was associated with Imagism, a poetic movement that emphasized economy of language and rejected traditional verse forms. Doolittle found the label too limiting to include the range of her poetic ambition. In poetry, translations, novels, and memoir, H. D. continually experimented with lyric and narrative forms. Her work often reflects her life-long love of ancient cultures and mythologies. In recasting mythic stories, often with a focus on the experience of women, H. D. both critiques and celebrates classical mythology. Filtering her own life experiences through an ancient lens, H. D.’s work locates new meanings in well-known texts.

Letter from H. D. to Bryher and Kenneth Macpherson, March 1, 1933.

Reproduction of photograph of Freud’s Consulting Room, in Edmund Engelman, *Bergasse 19, Sigmund Freud’s Home and Offices, Vienna 1938*, NY: Basic Books, 1976.

H. D. wrote a detailed letter to Bryher and Kenneth Macpherson after her first session with Freud. This most intimate account is full of the private language of nicknames, associations, and in-jokes that characterize the correspondence between H. D. and her unconventional family. The poet refers to herself by family pet names, Kat (or cat) and Mog, mentions psychoanalyst-friends Turtle (Hanns Sachs) and Chaddie (Mary Chadwick), and asks after her daughter Puss (Perdita); she also alludes to the work of their friend, film director G. W. Pabst (*Joyless Street*). It is in this very personal context that H. D. recounts her interactions with Freud, who she calls “a little white ghost” and “Oedipus Rex.” Their remarkable first session included Freud’s accusation that H. D. was disappointed by him and their standing side-by-side to see who was taller (roughly six feet tall, H. D. was taller, though “he was nearly as tall”). About the question of her disappointment, H. D. notes “We compromised ... but he seemed to have won.” She soon reverses her position: “... I did win after all.” Deeply affected by the session and “terrified” by Freud, H. D. writes “this old Oedipus Rex has got me ... I told him so, sobbing.” H. D. “chewed over” her sessions in letters home, especially to Bryher whose return letters commented on and further analyzed H. D.’s sessions. The Professor continually discouraged H. D. from writing about her sessions—either in letters or in her notebooks. After about three weeks, H. D. finally did as Freud asked; though she continued to write long letters about her experiences in Vienna, she no longer lingered over her sessions or her interactions with Freud.

Letter from Bryher and Kenneth Macpherson to H. D., March 3, 1933.

Photographs of H. D., Bryher, Perdita, and unidentified woman, Kenneth Macpherson, undated; Robert Herring, Kenneth Macpherson, and Bryher in Advent Bay, 1929.

H. D. was part of an unconventional family including: Bryher (Annie Winifred Ellerman), a novelist and heiress to one of the largest fortunes in Europe; Kenneth Macpherson, a writer and

filmmaker; and her daughter by Scottish composer Cecil Gray, Perdita. Family members shared extraordinary bonds, but their specific relationships were unusual: Bryher and Macpherson were married, but shared only a close platonic love; H. D. was, at different times, romantically involved with both Bryher and Macpherson. They all had lovers and attachments outside their trio. H. D. was devoted to Perdita, but Bryher and Macpherson officially adopted her. The family lived at Kenwin, Bryher's home in Switzerland, which took its name from her husband's given name, Kenneth, and her own, Winifred. Kenwin was a lively estate with a revolving complement of guests, including figures from literary and psychoanalytic communities in Europe; it was also home to the family's many pets, including cats, dogs, and eight monkeys. H. D. sent letters home from Vienna daily and she relied on correspondence from Kenwin for comfort and encouragement. Bryher regularly sent H. D. books and magazines, including current periodicals about increasing political tensions in Germany and across Europe. H. D. shared these publications with Freud; they frequently discussed current affairs before beginning analytic sessions. It was the habit of the Kenwin family to assign pet names to loved ones; their letters reflect this in word and image: Bryher and Macpherson often included images of dogs in their letters as they were called, respectively, Fido and Rover; H. D. was called Kat; Perdita was known as Puss or Pup. The Kenwin housekeeper was sometimes referred to as the Dragon or the Queen (pictured here as the "Queen shrieking mad!"). Nicknames for Freud included: Papa, Owl, Flea, and the Ghost. Written in response to H. D.'s March 1st letter describing her first session with Freud, this letter mentions an old friend, the poet Marianne Moore, and refers to others by nicknames, including Bryher's analyst Hanns Sachs, to whom she declares loyalty: "we all envy you, except that I would rather have TURTLE."

Letter from Bryher and H. D. to Kenneth Macpherson, April 6, 1933.

Letter from Bryher and H. D. to Kenneth Macpherson, April 11, 1933.

The correspondence between H. D., Bryher, and Macpherson during 1933 and 1934 offers a window into H. D.'s analysis with Freud; it also provides details about daily life in Vienna at an increasingly unsettled moment in history. When Bryher visited H. D. in April, 1933, they wrote to Macpherson at Kenwin about news of Nazi activity in Germany—book burnings, beatings, harassment; on April 4th, Bryher wrote "our friends here have no news of German relatives since weeks.... It is on the whole much worse than anything one ran into in the war." The same week, she wrote briefly "because I fear to speak much of political situation," concluding: "All Wein horribly nervy."

In Vienna, Bryher met with Freud to discuss pursuing analytic training. Using Bryher's family nickname, H. D. reported after one visit with Freud "Fido has made a great hit with F." After discussing the challenges of training in Vienna or Zurich, Bryher, referring to Freud's daughter Anna, wrote: "A. F. thinks that all might intercede for me with the Princess [Freud's friend and protégé Marie Bonaparte] and that I might be admitted into the Paris group, where they are not so strict." Though Bryher did not join the profession, she continued to advocate for analytic treatment among friends, offering in many cases to pay analysts' fees (it was Bryher, in fact, who

paid Freud's fees for H. D.'s analysis: about £100 a month for a six day week or about \$25 a session, more than \$400 an hour by 2011 values). Bryher also maintained a commitment to the ongoing development of psychoanalysis, donating money to the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, the International Psychoanalytischer Verlag to fund publications in the field, and establishing the Hanns Sachs Training Fund to support training for lay analysts; as war approached, Bryher provided money and assistance to many European analysts to aid their flight from Nazi occupied territories.

Letter from Bryher to H. D., April 30, 1934.

Writing from the Psycho-Analytic Congress at Lucerne in the summer of 1934, Bryher described “a most interesting lecture on the analysis of a negro in Johannesburg,” probably by Wulf Sachs whose *Black Hamlet; The Mind of an African Negro Revealed by Psychoanalysis* was published in 1937 (exhibited on the ground floor). She also mentioned a talk by Gregory Zilboorg who “spoke brilliantly on suicide” (materials from the Gregory Zilboorg Papers are exhibited on the north side of the mezzanine). Bryher included drawings of some of the analysts attending the conference: identified on the lower right are Anna Freud and Berlin psychoanalyst Max Eitington; unidentified looking in from the left is Bryher's analyst, Hanns Sachs (referred to in the letter as “Turtle”).

Joseph Ishill, *Havelock Ellis: In Appreciation*, Berkeley Heights: Oriole Press, 1929.

H. D. and Bryher maintained a decades-long friendship with British physician and writer Havelock Ellis—nicknamed “Chiron” after the great centaur-teacher of Greek mythology. Author of the groundbreaking seven-volume work *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1897–1928), Ellis's major contributions include early neutral studies in the areas of homosexuality and transgender and foundational work around the concepts of autoeroticism and narcissism, areas Freud later explored in depth. Ellis was both an influential colleague to Freud and an early supporter of his work. It was Ellis who ignited Bryher's interest in psychoanalysis in the early 1920s; in 1927 he wrote Bryher a letter of introduction to Freud. It was due in part to Ellis's recommendation that Freud agreed to accept H. D. for treatment.

Letter from H. D. to Havelock Ellis, March 13, 1933.

In this long letter written at the end of the second week of her analysis, H. D. tells Ellis her impressions of Freud and of their first meeting: “I was chiefly surprised and touched to find Freud's inner sanctum (where one has the analysis) a sort of little de lux museum of objects d'art, mostly Greek and Egyptian.... He let me wander about and then remarked rather

whimsically and ironically that he saw that I was not really interested in him, or in humanity, that the FIRST entrance of the analysand was most important, and my first instinct was to look at the Greek and Egyptian collection and not at HIM.” H. D. mentions that Freud has a photograph of Ellis hanging along with those of other esteemed colleagues, but also indicates that they have discussed their mutual friend more informally: “Freud said to me one day, ‘you see I loove Havelock Ellis.’”

Letter from Bryher to Havelock Ellis, June 8, 1933.

The growing Nazi threat and fear of coming war thread throughout H. D.’s and Bryher’s correspondence during the spring of 1933. “Already in Vienna,” H. D. wrote in *Tribute to Freud*, “the shadows were lengthening or the tide was rising.” She recalls the swastika chalked in front of Freud’s door and the curious and disconcerting “confetti-like showers from the air, gilded paper swastikas and narrow strips of printed paper.” By the first week of May, civil war is so clear a threat in Austria that soldiers and tanks line the streets in Vienna: “Then there were rifles. They were stacked neatly. They stood in bivouac formations at the street corners.” Writing to Ellis from Vienna in June, Bryher refers to the mass book burnings in Germany that had begun in May and to her efforts to provide assistance to friends fleeing Nazi violence; in the coming years at least 105 people, including sixty Jews and numerous psychoanalysts, escaped from Nazi occupied areas with her help and financial support. On June 13th, H. D. was trapped on a tram as a result of a bomb scare; her analysis with Freud was cut short when she and Bryher decided to leave Vienna on June 17th, several weeks before their scheduled departure.

***Close-Up*, 3.5, November 1928.**

Photograph of Kenneth Macpherson filming *Borderline*, [1929].

Bryher, Kenneth Macpherson, and H. D. collaborated to create Pool Films and *Close-Up*, a pioneering film journal. These projects reflected the trio’s interest in developing a context in which the young medium of film might interact with other art forms; it also provided opportunities to explore their abiding interest in psychoanalysis and the possibilities it might represent for experimental artistic expression. *Close-Up* was international in scope, including an ongoing critical discussion by writers such as Gertrude Stein, Marianne Moore, Nancy Cunard, Sergei Eisenstein, and other key figures in Modernist literature and film. Pool Films productions, which were directed by Macpherson and featured H. D. and Bryher as actors, employed innovative narrative forms and the use of dramatic lighting and effects such as montage to represent emotional and psychological conditions. *Borderline*, Pool Films’ only full-length feature, explored issues of race, class, sexuality, and gender. The film starred Paul Robeson, the only professional actor in the cast. As director, Macpherson used double and triple exposure and other inventive techniques to visually represent conscious and unconscious mental processes and extreme psychological states. Pool Films also made several short films, including *Monkey’s Moon*, an abstract film featuring two of Kenwin’s pet monkeys. Though this film was thought to be lost, the Beinecke Library recently acquired a copy.

Photograph of Hanns Sachs at Kenwin, [1929].

Letter from Hanns Sachs to Bryher, December 3, 1932.

Hanns Sachs, “Kitsch,” manuscript for *Close-Up*, ??

Freud’s acceptance of H. D. as a patient was facilitated by the recommendations of two key figures in early psychoanalysis: Havelock Ellis, pioneer in the study of the psychology of sexuality and mutual friend of Freud and H. D.; and Freud’s student Hanns Sachs, who had been Bryher’s analyst for some time. A member of Freud’s early circle, Sachs was, with Otto Rank, editor of *Imago*, and the founding editor of *American Imago*. Because of his interest in the application of psychoanalytic theories to the developing art of cinema, German Expressionist director G. W. Pabst hired Sachs as an advisor on his 1926 film *Secrets of the Soul*. Sachs was a frequent contributor to *Close-Up*, Bryher and Kenneth Macpherson’s groundbreaking journal dedicated to film as an art form. A warm friendship developed among them, and Sachs corresponded regularly with Bryher and H. D. and visited them at Kenwin, their home in Switzerland. As was their practice with intimates, Bryher and H. D. referred to Sachs by a nickname: Turtle. Sachs himself adopted this soubriquet, signing letters with a drawing of a turtle. His letter of December 3, 1933, expresses his enthusiasm about Freud’s willingness to treat H. D., and offers to write Freud about “her personality, achievements, etc, so that he is not altogether unprepared.” He concludes with an affectionate salutation to the whole family: “Love to Kenwin—analyzed and unanalyzed.”

Hans Casparius, *Photographs of Sigmund Freud with dogs*, undated.

Letter from H. D. to Bryher, April 26, 1933.

Letter from Bryher and Kenneth Macpherson to H. D., April 29, 1933.

Letter from Sigmund Freud to Bryher, June 4, 1933.

Freud’s dog Yofi (or Jo-fi), played a surprising role in H. D.’s analysis. In *Tribute to Freud*, H. D. describes her first interaction with dog and owner: “A little lion-like creature came padding toward me.... [T]he Professor says, ‘Do not touch her—she snaps—she is very difficult with strangers.’ Strangers?... Unintimidated but distressed by the Professor’s somewhat forbidding manner, I ...crouch on the floor so that she can snap better if she wants to.... Yofi snuggles her nose into my hand ... My intuition challenges the Professor, though not in words.... ‘She snaps, does she? You call me a stranger, do you?... I never was a stranger to this little golden Yofi.’” When Yofi delivers puppies, Freud offers to give one to H. D.’s daughter, Perdita. H. D. and Bryher are torn—they don’t want the dog, but they don’t want to hurt the Professor’s feelings. They already kept many pets—dogs, cats, and monkeys—and Bryher had long been unable to

find a reliable housekeeper to care for the animals when they were traveling. Their letters (including a draft letter to Freud and a detailed story about the “Kenwin Dragons” as the housekeepers were called) document their indecision: “I must have the puppy,” Bryher writes on May 4th, “but I can’t have the puppy....” The matter was complicated by the obvious pleasure Freud took in the gift, evident in a playful card written to Bryher accompanying a bouquet of flowers “on behalf of Jo-Fi.” Though they decided they could not accept Freud’s gift, they continued to worry over it throughout the period of H. D.’s analysis. More than twenty years later, H. D. recalled her emotional conflict about the puppy in a journal: “No, I could not have taken Jofi’s puppy,” she wrote, “I would have loved it too much.”

Letter from Freud to H. D., [June 1934?].

J. J. Van Der Leeuw, *Why a World Police is Inevitable*, London: New Commonwealth, [1937].

During the first phase of her analysis, H. D. occasionally encountered another of Freud’s analysands and pupils, a Dutch pilot and scholar named J. J. Van Der Leeuw. A Theosophist and New Education Fellowship advocate for progressive education, Van Der Leeuw was known in Vienna, Freud told H. D., as “The Flying Dutchman.” She admired the pilot from a distance and found his presence in the landscape of her treatment comforting: “Papa’s tall young man came out and pretended not to see me” she wrote in a letter to Bryher; “he and I are really devoted to each other. He is at least a foot taller than I ... and very charming. He succeeds me on the couch.” The Flying Dutchman came to represent her masculine alter ego; in a notebook in the late 1950s H. D. referred to him as an “idealized brother image.” In the summer of 1934, H. D. learned that Van Der Leeuw had died when his airplane crashed in east Africa. It is unclear whether his death occasioned or simply coincided with the brief, intense emotional collapse that sent H. D. back to Vienna to complete her analysis in 1934. She and Freud discussed her shock and grief at the loss of this compelling second self: “I always had a feeling of satisfaction, of security when I passed Dr. Van Der Leeuw on the stairs or saw him in the hall.... ‘I know that you have felt [his death] very deeply. I came back to Vienna to tell you how sorry I am.’ The Professor said, ‘You have come to take his place.’”

J. J. Van Der Leeuw, *The Conquest of Illusion*, London: Knopf, 1928.

Detailing Van Der Leeuw’s theosophical understanding of the processes associated with sense perception, *The Conquest of Illusion* attempts to extend understanding of the relationship between reality and consciousness in an effort to “pierce the veil of illusion.” Of plate 4 Van Der Leeuw writes “the world of our consciousness with its many images is shown in relation to *the* world. The smaller circles at the end of the rays from the center symbolize the consciousness-worlds of different cultures, more or less limited according to their stage of evolution ... when an event takes place in this world of Reality there is produced in the consciousness of each creature

concerned an awareness, or image, which is the event as we ‘see’ it.” Elsewhere in the text, Van Der Leeuw writes: “We always seek in the wrong direction, we always want *more* time; we demand even endless time in our quest of immortality. Yet the infinitely greater Reality is ever ours to enter if we but will.”

H. D., “The Master,” typescript, undated.

It is unclear exactly when H. D. wrote this lyric account of her analysis with Freud, but it is very likely her first description of the experience outside of her letters and personal journals. In a letter written about a year after she completed her analysis with Freud in the fall of 1934, H. D. mentions to Bryher that she has decided not to publish the poem in *Life and Letters To-Day* for fear of “spoiling” her analysis by making the experience public in her work. The poem, which includes a total of eleven sections, remained unpublished in H. D.’s lifetime.s

[H. D.], Notebook containing translations of Freud’s German letters, undated.

Letters from Sigmund Freud to H. D., various dates.

During and after the years of her analysis, H. D. and Freud corresponded, exchanging news of family and creative projects, as well as warm greetings and occasional small gifts. In December 1933, H. D. sent Freud an ivory figure of a dog that looked like Freud’s own, to which he replied “Ivory Jo-fi is absolutely charming.” Years later, when he was living in exile in London, H. D. sent Freud a bouquet of gardenias, to which he replied: “I got to-day some flowers. By chance or intention they are my favorite flowers, those I most admire. Some words ‘to greet the return of the Gods (other people read: Goods).’ No name. I suspect you to be responsible for the gift. If I have guessed right don’t answer but accept my hearty thanks for so charming a gesture.” Freud sometimes wrote to H. D. in German rather than English; she wrote out translations of these letters in a repurposed personal library notebook. When she sent him a new book in 1937, he responded: “I have just finished your *Ion*. Deeply moved by the play (which I had not known before) and no less by your comments, especially those referring to the end, where you extol the victory of reason over passions. I send you the expression of my admiration and kindest regards.”

Talbot W. Chambers, *The Bible Gallery*, illustrations by Gustave Doré, London: Cassell, Petter, Galpin and Co., 1880: “Moses in the Bulrushes.”

Sigmund Freud, *Moses and Monotheism*, New York, Vintage Books [c1939].

Of the dreams discussed during her analysis with Freud, H. D.'s "dream of the Princess, as we called her" was "the most luminous." The dream depicted an Egyptian Princess descending a staircase. "I, the dreamer," she wrote, "wait at the foot of the steps." Nearby, there is "a shallow basket or ark or box or boat. There is, of course, a baby nested in it. The Princess must find the baby." Both Freud and H. D. recognized traces of the story of Moses in her dream, and the poet recalled the print "Moses in the Bulrushes" from her family's Gustave Doré illustrated bible. Poet and professor interpret the dream by way of the print: "He asks if it is I, the dreamer, who am the baby in the reed basket? I don't think I am.... The Professor thinks there is the child Miriam, half concealed in the rushes; do I remember? I half remember. Am I, perhaps, the child Miriam? Or am I, after all, in my fantasy, the baby? Do I wish myself, in the deepest unconscious or subconscious layers of my being, to be the founder of a new religion?" In the summer of 1934, Freud finished a draft of a book, then titled *The Man Moses, a Historical Novel*. This became Freud's final book, *Moses and Monotheism*, first published in its entirety in 1939. Moses had long been a figure of interest for Freud; Michaelangelo's statue of Moses was the subject of his 1914 essay "The Moses of Michelangelo."

Sigmund Freud, *Leonardo da Vinci: A Psychosexual Study of an Infantile Reminiscence*, A. A. Brill, trans., reprint of the American edition with a preface by Ernest Jones, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1922.

Ernest Jones, *Psycho-analysis*, London: Ernest Benn, 1928.

Letter from Sigmund Freud to H. D., December 18, 1932.

H. D. and Freud were familiar with of one another's writing before they met in 1933. H. D.'s *HERmione*, completed in 1927, is a lyrical, fictionalized account of H. D.'s brief time at Bryn Mawr, her early romance with poet Ezra Pound, and her complex attraction to her classmate Frances Josepha Gregg; the title character's first encounter with Freudian ideas suggest that H. D. may have been introduced to psychoanalysis as early as 1911. "Fayne read a lot of books, wanted to lend me some books, psychoanalysis, German books," Hermione reports. One book was about "mother and father and Oedipus complex and it made a pattern on a brain that rose from black mesh." The book reveals to Hermione that "there were people who loved ... differently. There were people with suppressions...." H. D.'s archive includes her well-read copies of books by Freud and British psychoanalyst Ernest Jones from the 1920s. In 1932, Freud wrote to Bryher requesting copies of H. D.'s books in advance of her analysis: "It would help my empathy considerably if I had read her works." To H. D. he wrote: "I did not ask for your books in order to criticize or to appreciate your works ... I wanted to get a glimpse of your personality as an introduction to making your acquaintance." Freud mentions specifically H. D.'s *Palimpsest*, and it's likely Bryher also sent him the novel *Hedylus* (1928) and H. D.'s book of poetry, *Red Roses for Bronze* (1931).

H. D., “Advent,” first draft, typescript, corrected, 1948.

H. D., “Writing on the Wall,” notebook and typescript, 1944.

The poet’s prose account of her analysis with Freud appeared serially in *Life and Letters To-day* in 1945, as “Writing on the Wall: To Sigmund Freud, Blameless Physician;” the first edition of *Tribute to Freud*, including “Writing on the Wall,” and a selection of Freud’s letters to H. D., was first published in 1956. This memoir of her analysis, H. D. later reported, “was written in London in the autumn of 1944, with no reference to the Vienna notebooks of spring 1933” which were then in Switzerland. The H. D. Papers at the Beinecke Library include various typescript drafts as well as her 1940s notebook. Describing the last time she saw Freud, in London in June of 1938, H. D. wrote in a notebook: “I only saw the Professor once more. It was summer again. French windows opened on a pleasant stretch of lawn...” When she returned from London to Switzerland in 1948, H. D. edited and revised the 1933 journal, calling it, “‘Advent,’ the continuation of ‘Writing on the Wall,’ or its prelude.” This addition to the story remained unpublished until a new edition of *Tribute to Freud*, including a forward by H. D.’s friend and literary executor Norman Holmes Pearson, was published in 1974. “Advent” is a more personal and detailed account. Pages featured here, dated March 8th, 1933 (just more than a week into her analysis), describe a dream of H. D.’s one-time friend D. H. Lawrence, and her associations about her father, her ex-husband Richard Aldington, Havelock Ellis, and her analysis with Freud.

H. D., Hirslanden Notebooks, 1956–7.

Photograph of H. D. at Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University, September 1956.

Photograph of H. D., Norman Holmes Pearson, and Bryher at Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University, September 1956.

After her analysis with Freud, H. D. pursued an ongoing self-analysis, tools of which included correspondence, personal writing, and published work. In journals from 1956–7, H. D., then 70 years old and recovering from an injury at Klinik Hirslanden in Zurich, recorded and explored dreams, recent life events, as well as memories of her analysis with Freud nearly twenty-five years earlier. She recounted a dream of writer Thornton Wilder and figures she associated with Kenneth Macpherson and his friend Islay Lyons. Her description refers to her recent visit to Yale University, where Professor Norman Holmes Pearson curated an exhibition of materials from the H. D. Papers: “they had seen a newspaper photograph of me that Norman Pearson had had mounted with others of the Yale Library display of my books and papers for my 70th birthday. Kenneth was shocked and said it was frightful. It is true that the photograph that Kenneth found so unflattering frightens me with its puritan severity.” The same month, H. D. recalled the pleasure she felt Freud took in their exchange and in his analytic work in general: “Of course, as the Professor said, ‘there is always something new 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 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*.”
