"STEALING FROM 'MUDDIES BODY'": H.D. AND MELANIE KLEIN

Susan Edmunds

Early arguments concerning H.D.'s faith in a peace-loving women's tradition have been challenged in recent years by the increasing interest in her portrayals of female ambivalence and female aggression. In her new book, *Penelope's Web*, Susan Friedman makes an intriguing case for the centrality of matricidal fantasies in H.D.'s work and career. Proposing that H.D.'s "flight from home" and resettlement in London in 1911 was "a 'killing' of the motherland and fatherland embedded in the psyche of the fleeing artist," Friedman argues that "to break free means—terrifyingly—to 'kill' the mother" who would deny her daughter's artistic powers as she had previously denied her own.[1] Yet while this reading fully recognizes the imbrication of anger and art for H.D., *Penelope's Web* as a whole maintains a curious split between a readiness to explore women's aggression within the mother-daughter dyad and a reluctance to explore women's aggression in the context of war.

In Friedman's account, female figures in H.D.'s work can imagine and even act on their hostile feelings towards other women, but repeatedly settle for the position of masochistic victim of men's sadistic aggression in "the interlocking economies of war and motherhood" (*PW* 282). Friedman finds strong support for her argument in H.D.'s 1934 analysis with Freud, where together they traced her fears of violence to an unconscious equation between the primal scene and the father's murder of the mother. On the basis of this analysis, Friedman proposes that during World War II the Nazis assume for H.D. "the part of the Father Who Terrifies—the one who kills and maims the mother and daughter in a sadomasochistic scene of violence and desire" (*PW* 290, 340). But her account passes over at least two possibilities in silence: women's own sadism, and the mother's or daughter's murderous aggression against father or son.

Friedman does offer a qualified version of this latter possibility when she argues that in her analysis with Freud H.D. was afraid to reveal an unconscious "wish for Freud to occupy the position of victim as the precondition of rebirth—the killing of the Father Who Terrifies and the 'birth' of the wounded son who would be her equal" (*PW* 342). Here, Friedman carefully tempers the threat of the daughter's aggression by linking her

patricidal wishes to more admirable wishes for social equality and the father's rebirth. This account contrasts sharply with that of H.D.'s matricidal fantasies, where the daughter kills for the comparatively selfish ends of revenge and self-advancement, and where the fate of the mother in death is of no concern.

The disparity between H.D.'s patricidal and matricidal fantasies in Friedman's account suggests, most prominently, that H.D. herself had greater difficulty in exploring female aggression against men than against women in a patriarchal society which values the father's life above the mother's. But Friedman replicates the double standard which she uncovers within H.D.'s fantasies; her account accedes to a patriarchal logic which would define the mere wish for the father's death as a public matter, requiring social justification, while bracketing the wish for mother's death as a private matter, of consequence only to the daughter. The pressure on feminists to represent even a woman's most deeply repressed patricidal fantasies as civic-minded may proceed from a more general need to defend ourselves against the American right's rhetorical campaigns to redefine antipatriarchal agendas as antisocial. But this defense cannot take the form of denying any antisocial element to the female or feminist unconscious. For in disowning the antisocial impulses which line the daughter's antipatriarchal bid for equality—the unconscious wish to kill the offending father as well as the mother, whatever their chances for rebirth—we also disown the work of reformulating and reclaiming those impulses for positive social aims: of finding, in other words, socially productive uses for female anger.

Records of H.D.'s sessions with Walter Schmideberg between October of 1935 and May of 1937 (*PW* 292)[2] suggest that H.D. used the years leading up to the Second World War to undertake precisely this kind of work in an analysis ambivalently indebted to the theories of Melanie Klein. During the same years, Klein's pioneering speculations on infantile aggression, paranoia, and reparation became the object of increasing contention in the British Psychoanalytic Society, with her daughter, Melitta Schmideberg, standing as one of Klein's leading detractors. This highly volatile professional struggle between mother and daughter, combined with H.D.'s therapeutic focus on her own capacity for antisocial and (self-)destructive behavior, created a new frame of reference for her war experiences; and, with the writing of the *Trilogy*, she began to articulate a revised vision of war which called women's, as well as men's, aggression into account.

From the start of H.D.'s analysis, Schmideberg (whom H.D. called Uhlan and Bear) gravitated to "the war period" of the 'teens and H.D.'s "deep fund of repressed aggression."[3] On November 10, 1935, H.D. tells Bryher that Schmideberg

> thinks I have a deep, very early guilt suppression about wanting to steal a baby, a brother or cousin, and that I had a lot of that when I "stole" you and went to Greece. I think this is a new and very sound idea. . . . S. and I talk chiefly [about] this guilt and the suppressed rage.

The focus on H.D.'s wish to steal a child culminated in her "out-burst" of protest when Bryher conveyed her mother's request to spend the day with Perdita on her seventeenth birthday in March of 1936. Schmideberg attributed H.D.'s rage to her unconscious fear that Mrs. Ellerman was stealing Perdita just as H.D. had long ago stolen her own daughter Bryher: "Sch. seems to think it a valuable snag in the UNK [unconscious], baby stolen by bad-mother, mixed up with good-mother protecting same."[4] They traced this fantasy back to H.D.'s early childhood attachment for a "huge doll" named Dolly. In a loosely associative letter which clearly alludes to Klein's idea that infants carry out fantasy raids on "the mother's body," robbing it of its precious contents, H.D. tells Bryher:

> You and Pup [Perdita] apparently double in the UNK for myself, or the Dolly . . . South A. at first, was to UNK a sort of Ali Baba cave with treasures . . . fear of getting shut in, stealing from "muddies body" and so on . . . very clever Uhlan. (H.D.'s ellipses)[5]

And in October of 1936, H.D. was still discussing her aggression in Kleinian terms of the infant's jealousy over the mother's "hidden phallus," which, according to Klein, she ingests during intercourse with the father and stores in her belly:

> I am in such an aggressive bear-layer, it is as well, to shift it out. He says an important point was reached and passed - I told you - with externalization of the "hidden phallus." But it seems to me endless . . . .[6]

This focus on aggression allowed H.D. to supplement Freud's account of her unconscious terror of male sadism towards women with fresh evidence of her own hostile impulses, towards men and women alike. On November 14, 1936, H.D. reports, "Bear is most kind, I am getting terribly up-stage and 'aggress' at him." A month earlier, on October 8, 1936, she notes to Bryher that Silvia Dobson, also in analysis with Schmideberg,

> was getting released like mad, I suspect the B[ear] will suspect you of

> incendiary bombs in her UNK, as evidently she threw communism vs. fascism at him, her whole hour. . . . Both of us seem to be a bit on the war-path but I am taking it out in a more subterranean manner.

Schmideberg's sessions with Perdita took a similar course, as he tried to redirect the teenager's "amorous onslaughts" on her mother and to "help her 'aggression'" by encouraging her passion for driving. [7] In addition, he may have used his wife as a lightning rod to expose H.D.'s aggression towards her own mother. On June 15, 1937, H. D. complains to Bryher, "Bear very nice but a little snappy. I get so tired of Oedipus, it now appears I must hate Melitta."

Walter's move to explore H.D.'s hostility towards Melitta along the standard Freudian lines of the little girl's sudden hatred for the mother at the advent of the oedipal complex surprises a reader lulled into thinking that he took a thoroughly Kleinian approach in H.D.'s analysis. But in fact Walter's reception of Klein was intensely ambivalent, as was Bryher's. Both explicitly balked at aligning themselves with the London school of psychoanalysis, increasingly associated with Klein, over the Viennese school, still loyally backing Freud. In a letter dated November 28, 1936, in which she asserts her own distance from "Albion" in these matters, Bryher questions Walter as to why he and Melitta "include yourselves with the English group? The Professor himself assured me you were brought up most carefully according to the strictest Viennese principles."

If Bryher's question suggests that Walter Schmideberg equivocated in his alliances in 1936, Klein's biographer, Phyllis Grosskurth, recounts that by the Extraordinary Meetings of 1942, which erupted into discussions of whether Klein should be allowed to continue practicing, he was discussing her theories in hostile terms. Such a stance would suggest that he did in fact align himself with the Viennese; yet this alignment is itself ambiguous since it was his contention in 1942 not that Klein's theories were heretical but that they plagiarized established concepts of Viennese Freudians.[8] H.D.'s own take on the matter appears to have been less divisive and partisan than either Bryher's or Walter's; she writes to Bryher on November 28, 1936: "I needed to get together IN London on psa-[psychoanalysis], and the Bear is perfect as he combines Wien and London."

H.D.'s letters to Bryher support this diagnosis and suggest that in her sessions Walter Schmideberg was practicing an uneasy hybrid of Freudian and Kleinian approaches, which emphasized precisely those areas in Freud's theories which Klein would greatly expand upon, and mixed in specifically Kleinian terms and postulations with those which were more properly Freud's. Even Bryher seems to have been more knowledgeable and

accepting of Klein's theories than she was wont to let on. On October 14, 1936, she declares to Walter that she knows "all the books of Susan Isaacs," one of Klein's main disciples, "and agree with them partly," and on March 3 and March 13 of 1940, she asks him to clarify the meanings of the Kleinian terms: "depressive" and "manic defence." Furthermore, when H.D.'s letters to Bryher begin to fill up with Kleinian terms: "hidden phallus," "good" and "bad mother," "muddies body," Bryher responds in kind with passing discussions of "infantile fantasies" and "sado–masochistic infantile tendencies."[9]

At least to some extent, Bryher's and Walter's ambivalence towards Klein must have been influenced by Melitta Schmideberg's growing hostility towards her mother. While Melitta's first professional essays suggest an initial sympathy with Klein, Grosskurth reports that she and Edward Glover began to campaign against Klein as early as 1933.[10] Although Melitta grounded her attacks on her mother in theoretical disagreements and professional reservations about Kleinian practice, her public airing of their differences was, by all accounts, extremely personal, violent, and bitter. By 1941, the battle over Klein's work, which had been greatly exacerbated by the influx of Viennese refugees who regarded Klein's departures from Freudian orthodoxy with horror, erupted into a general crisis in the British Psychoanalytic Society. This crisis gave rise to the five Extraordinary Meetings of 1942 and the Controversial Discussions, which began in January of 1943 and lasted until March of 1944. While the Extraordinary Meetings devolved into spite campaigns and personal attacks, the Controversial Discussions were more formal, and more fruitful, meetings in which Klein and several of her female disciples offered summary papers of her theories in an attempt to clarify her debts to, and departures from, Freudian thought. However, there was general agreement that both series of meetings, in which feelings often ran high, served as displaced sites for expressing deeper anxieties about World War II. In April of 1942, Sylvia Payne told the Society: "The conflict is extraordinarily like that which is taking place in many countries and I feel sure that it is in some way a tiny reverberation of the massive conflict which pervades the world."[11]

For H.D., in regular contact with the Schmidebergs throughout this period, Klein's and her daughter's violent professional struggle could well serve to confirm a capacity for aggression and injury among women as great as that being tapped by the male architects and antagonists of World War II. However, her analysis with Walter Schmideberg had already posed connections between female aggression and war in even more startling terms. Because the hungry Kleinian infant experiences the absence of the breast as an active maternal assault, H.D. was vulnerable to suggestions that she had played the role of the persecutory mother in Perdita's infantile fantasies. Letters to Bryher report that

H.D. and Walter discussed her "guilt that I did not feed Puss [Perdita] after death of father," and her unconscious need to be assured that her first, stillborn daughter "was 'wanted.'" Several months later, the theme emerges again when H.D. records Walter's connection between the adolescent Perdita's recent outburst—"you are tearing me from my mother's arms"—and the time H.D. spent apart from her daughter in infancy: "'perhaps Perdita really DID feel the early separation' etc."[12]

While Walter Schmideberg was eager to uncover—or induce—guilt in H.D. for her refusal to comply with conventional expectations in mothering Perdita, he also encouraged H.D. to explore her infantile grievances against Helen Doolittle. Apparently, Walter believed that H.D.'s war—terror had been grafted onto her own early fantasies of the bad mother. In an astounding letter to Bryher, dated March 28, 1936, H.D. discusses her reactions to the current political "situation" of impending war:

> [I] am not going to allow myself to be bullied by any 'situation,' whatever. Blast them all. It couldn't be worse than the last [world war] and I survived that . . . and who wants to survive i[f] it IS worse. I don't believe in it anyhow . . . will simply hold my own against the "bad mother" as Sch. calls that incarnation of Brittania on the war—posters. There is also the good mother . . . and the joke king, as the world knows. (H.D.'s ellipses)

Three later letters to Bryher flow in and out of an elliptical style which makes it difficult to pin down all of H.D.'s references precisely. Nevertheless, these letters strongly suggest that Walter associated war with "weaning" and hence with the Kleinian infant's paranoid perception of its own hunger as a kind of "air—war" attack by the persecutory mother's biting breasts and her burning and explosive excrement.[13] On May 2, 1936, H.D. comments on her "war—starvation material": "perhaps air—war does not mean starvation . . . I don't know"; on May 6, 1936, she continues:

> The Bear . . . gets up a lot about food and cleaning the house, having to do with the war having not made it worth while to eat or in any way, make an effort. Weaning of course, but applied direct to Cuth [Aldington] and the general slump in tinned beans etc. Anyhow, I am no longer sick of a morning, but all the same find food hard to chew, but that will come back now, I think.

And on October 5, 1936, she writes that she is still "doing all the time, one way and another, food, starvation, and so on."

While an exclusive focus on Kleinian sources for the war *Trilogy* is obviously inadequate to the poem's syncretic complexity, even a quick glance at Klein's influence on the poem uncovers important aspects which have previously been overlooked, and suggests provocative new readings. One may begin with the theme of "food [and] starvation" in the hunger stories of *The Walls Do Not Fall*. Sections 4 and 6 establish the theme through two narrators, the mollusk and the worm, who both inhabit the hostile and terrifying environments so common in the first poem of the *Trilogy*. Giving life to the abstract "land" of section 2, where "they were angry when we were so hungry / for the nourishment, God" (*CP* 511), the mollusk and worm usher us into a world stalled at the oral stage, where heaven is the chance to "feed forever / on the amber honey–comb // of your remembered greeting" (*CP* 532), and yet, at any moment, the gods may choose to devour, rather than nourish, their worshippers.

Derived from the actual conditions of wartime London, with the long food–lines, short rations, and constant threat of attack, this world might equally be the product of the Kleinian infant's paranoid fantasies of maternal attack; thus, a passage like the following, drawn from section 29, easily encompasses both experiences:

> but the old–self,
>
> still half at–home in the world,
> cries out in anger,
>
> I am hungry, the children cry for food
> and flaming stones fall on them (*CP* 532)

Like the Kleinian infant, the inhabitants of *The Walls Do Not Fall* are frequently tiny and genderless, at once vulnerable, needy, and self–obsessed. Their world itself often appears to exist without nuances; split sharply into rival camps of "us" and "them," "Good" and "Evil" (*CP* 511), it too recalls the paranoid phase of the Kleinian infant and its strictly demarcated fantasies of the good and bad mother. In this world, the nursery joins forces with the carnival, making heroes of the mollusk, who proclaims: "so I in my own way know / that the whale // can not digest me," and the worm who rejoices: "I profit / by every calamity; // I eat my way out of it" (*CP* 513-14, 516).

Rachel DuPlessis has noted that while the "first poem [of the *Trilogy*] is, in the main, about Amen, the father God," the mother–goddesses maintain "a muted pres–ence."[14] The ongoing focus in the sequence on "food, starvation, and so on" confirms this sense; yet it also underlines the fact that the spiritual seekers of *The Walls Do Not Fall* cannot count on the mother's good will, for they live in a nightmare of constantly reversing agency where food itself turns out to have an appetite, growing "shell–jaws" that "snap shut" on the hungry (*CP* 513). Thus, when Amen appears as "the Ram" in section 21, he confronts a child–like seeker who begs both to be taken home and to be eaten alive: "let your teeth devour me, / let me be warm in your belly" (*CP* 527). Where Freud consistently traces childhood animal phobias back to a fear of the castrating father, the seeker's fantasy of self–annihilation follows an alternative pattern laid down by the cannibalistic Kleinian mother. Amen himself, in bearing the inhabitable belly of the mother as well as the phallic horns of the Mosaic patriarch, takes after this same figure, who acquires phallic traits when she swallows the father's penis during intercourse.

In sections 25 through 29, H.D. returns to the motif of the persecutory nourisher in her use of Christ's parable of the grain of heaven sown in the hearts of men. Describing how the grain splits and scalds the heart, consuming its core as "nourishment" (*CP* 530), she obliquely suggests that the hope of heaven inflicts and feeds on the heart's suffering in much the way that a hungry Kleinian infant feels invaded by the devouring breast. Literally broken–hearted, the seeker moves from spiritual despair to "anger" in section 29 (*CP* 532). As the scalding grain dropped from above in sections 25 and 28 becomes the "flaming stones" of the air–raids falling on the starving children, the good news of heaven turns into the threat of persecution and death, and the body's own hunger remains unsatisfied. Yet the seeker's very demand that God confront its own anger and hunger brings about an even more frightening reversal, which stems directly from the fantasy of satiety born of such intense need. Praying to Christ in section 29 to "say again, as you said, // *the baked fish is ready, / here is the bread*" (*CP* 532), the seeker painfully conveys the severity of both its physical and spiritual hunger by equating the Messiah's return with the chance for a hot meal. However, section 30 immediately transports the seeker into the "sub–conscious ocean where Fish / move two–ways, devour" (*CP* 533). With this final reversal of the seeker's attempt to transform the fear of being eaten into the hope of being full, the sacred meal itself becomes the eater, and the seeker's ability to govern the direction of its own imagination spins out of control in a vertiginous space defined by the "*reversion of old values, / oneness lost, madness*" (*CP* 534).

As if chastened by this threat of madness, H.D. concludes *The Walls Do Not Fall*

in a fragile mood which admits to a new measure of compromise and uncertainty. With the confession in section 34 that "hunger / may make hyenas of the best of us" (*CP* 536), the seeker acknowledges the raging strength of hunger rather than fantasizing its quiet end, and abandons faith in any simple purity of love for the mixed powers of Isis, "the original great-mother, / who drove// harnessed scorpions / before her": a goddess as willing to kill as she is to cure (*CP* 536).[15] This equivocal mother-figure takes center-stage in *Tribute to the Angels*, where she presides over the jewel sequence as a "breaker, seducer, / giver of life, giver of tears" (*CP* 552). Similarly, the jewel placed "in the heart of the bowl" recalls the scalding grain of heaven "lodged in the heart-core" (*CP* 552, 530). But where its consumption of the seeker's heart aligns the grain with all the other transcendent devourers of *The Walls Do not Fall*, the jewel's bite is confined to its bitterness: the ferocity and oral violence of the earlier poem here fades into a distant memory-trace, a taste left in the mouths of those "who rebel" (*CP* 552). With this transition from biting to bitterness, H.D. pulls out of the terrifying, persecutory world of *The Walls Do Not Fall* to enter a more self-reflective space in which to examine the residue of her own anger, frustration, and grief.

Both the structure and content of *Tribute to the Angels* reveal strong debts to Klein's theory of reparation. According to Klein, at weaning the infant pulls out of an initial phase of paranoia and enters a phase of guilt and mourning, in which it desires to make reparation to the mother whose body it has raided and attacked in its early fantasies (*DPA* 203). Deterred by its own anxiety from approaching the mother's body directly, the infant appropriates other objects as symbolic substitutes for her.[16] Acting out both its sadistic and its reparative fantasies with these symbols, the infant learns to tolerate its aggressive feelings and to realize their limited capacity for harm. As the infant gains faith in other people's integrity and ability to survive its assaults, its sharply divided world of good and bad part-objects gives way to an integrated world of whole people who are both good and bad, and for whom one has good and bad feelings.[17] Likewise, a world in which all good experiences are canceled out by the inevitable return of hunger and pain gives way to one in which the infant's memories of good experiences endure and accumulate, providing the materials (good internal objects) by which it can replenish and repair the mother's body in fantasy.[18] At the same time, the infant's symbol-making activities, fueled by its "epistemophilic and aggressive impulses," expand and enrich its knowledge of the world and stand as the first forms of its creativity.[19]

In section 1 of *Tribute to the Angels*, H.D. directly models the "new-church," which "spat upon // and broke and shattered" the icons and rituals of its predecessors, on the

Kleinian infant who "has, in his aggressive phantasies, injured his mother by biting and tearing her up." And where Klein goes on to state that the infant "may soon build up phantasies that he is putting the bits together again and repairing" his mother's body (*LHR* 61), H.D. calls for her fellow "thieves and poets" to "collect the fragments of the splintered glass, . . . / melt down and integrate, //re-invoke, re-create" the lost mother-goddesses (*CP* 54 7 -48). This plea makes way for the central acts of reparation in the bitter jewel sequence, whose imagery again alludes to Klein. Under the page heading "Bitterness of Feeling" in *Love, Hate, and Reparation*, Klein analyzes emotional bitterness into its components of "frustrated greed, resentment and hatred" (*LHR* 118). She traces these feelings back to the infant's early grievances against its persecutory parents, and argues that the work of reparation is to replace "bitterness of feeling" with love and "content-ment":

> If we have become able, deep in our unconscious minds, to clear our feelings to some extent towards our parents of grievances, and have forgiven them for the frustrations we had to bear, then we can be at peace with ourselves and are able to love others in the true sense of the word. (*LHR* 119)

Deborah Kloepfer argues that the bitter jewel sequence functions as "the space in which H.D. begins to work through the intense ambivalence of her early work," by "attempting to fuse" "conflicting aspects of the mother."[20] Two moments in H.D.'s earlier writing support Kloepfer's reading and its compatibility with the Kleinian model of reparation. In "The Wise Sappho," Sappho is said to find Eros a "bitter, bitter creature, . . . who has once more betrayed her"; in turn, her own "manners" and "gestures are crude, the bitterest of all destructive gibes of one sensitive woman at the favourite of another" (*NTV* 65, 60). H.D. also ascribes to Kreousa an "inner fire and concentrated bitterness" in her annotated translation of Euripides' *Ion*; as a mother who both longs for the safety of her abandoned child and attempts to poison him, Kreousa adds to the connotations within bitterness of lesbian betrayal, jealousy, and aggression the Kleinian connotations of the good and bad mother (*Ion* 59). Finally, one of the more oblique, and troubling, sources for the bitter jewel sequence may well be Walter Schmideberg's interpretation of the female "incarnation of Brittania on the war-posters" as a "bad mother." For H.D. uses repetition to trace adult aggression: our capacity to harbor "passionate, bitter wrongs" and to conduct "bitter, unending wars," back to the "bitter

jewel" and child's unresolved "bitterness of feeling" towards the persecutory mother (*CP* 549).

Yet in recognizing these ancient feelings of frustration and anger, H.D. is newly able to acknowledge their positive as well as negative effects. Associated (at the opening of *The Flowering of the Rod*) with "the anger, frustration, / bitter fire of destruction" (*CP* 578), the bitter maternal jewel is also associated with "the fire / of strength, endurance, anger / in [the] hearts" of the heroic Londoners who refuse to abandon their city during the Blitz (*CP* 551, 556). Source of the self–respect, courage, and resistance among these Londoners of "unbroken will" and "unbowed head," bitter anger and aggression receive the poet's thanks in her tribute to Uriel, angel of war. H.D.'s very decision to "give / thanks" to Uriel, left unhallowed until now (*CP* 551), reflects Klein's sense that aggression plays a necessary and productive role in human development. Thus, H.D. lights a candle to Uriel of "the red–death" and one to "*Annael*, / peace of God" on either side of the bitter jewel sequence, and insists that the "one must inexorably // take fire from the other / as spring from winter" (*CP* 551, 556, 557). Reenacting the drama of the Kleinian child, whose willingness to acknowledge and work through its anger toward the mother occasions its successful entrance into language and love, this passing of the flame from war to peace prepares the way for H.D.'s dream of the Lady, whose "kindly" look dissolves "primitive terror" (*CP* 568, 570). With the poet's declaration that "she must have been pleased / with the straggling company of the brush and quill" who have honored her image in words and paint, we too experience the reparative power of symbols: "we are satisfied, we are happy, / we begin again" (*CP* 568, 573).

As we begin our investigations of Klein's influence on H.D., it is important to raise the question of whether H.D.'s reception of Klein may be called feminist. Links such as those Walter Schmideberg posed between war and the "bad mother" can only make feminists profoundly uneasy. However, Kleinian theory also has its merits. H.D.'s exploration of female aggression in the 1930s and 1940s provides a refreshing counterpoint to her previous tendency to regard aggression and sadism as a purely masculine affair: if such a shift in focus made it impossible to scapegoat men for the (self–)destructiveness of world war, it also granted women a powerful tool for self–defense and self–assertion. Klein's primary focus on the mother–child dyad did not provide H.D. with significant models for exploring female aggression against men. However, in contrast to psychoanalytic accounts which place the mother–child dyad outside the social domain–outside the Law of the Father–Kleinian theory did allow H.D. to grant the mother a central role in the child's socialization. In turn, H.D.'s poetic interpretation of the Kleinian child's recruitment of

its own aggression for the ends of healing and creativity offers feminists a richly imaginative account of the conversion of individual anger into communal testimony and vision. Recognizing in her own "suppressed rage" the equivocal properties of fire, H.D. is able to take from the "blinding rage of / the lightning" over London the unexpected gift of "fire-to-endure" (*CP* 556). It is a gift no poet would scoff at, for it flares with the speech of the Pentecost and the gift of tongues:

> the festival opens as before
> with the dove's murmuring;
>
> for Uriel, no temple
> but Love's sacred groves,
>
> withered in Thebes and Tyre
> flower elsewhere. (*CP* 558)

NOTES

1. Susan Stanford Friedman, *Penelope's Web: Gender, Modernity, H.D.'s Fiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990) 220, 278, 343. Subsequent references to this work, abbreviated *PW*, appear parenthetically in the main text.

2. Letters from H.D. to Bryher, dated Oct. 5, 1936 and July 27, 1937, indicate that H.D. saw Schmideberg "fives times a week," for "9" and then "7 straight months," before she stopped having regular sessions with him in May 1937. I thank the curators of the Yale Collection of American Literature, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, for permission to quote from the correspondences between H.D. and Bryher, and Bryher and Walter Schmideberg.

3. Letters, H.D. to Bryher: Oct. 20, 1935; Nov. 7, 1935.

4. Letter, H.D. to Bryher: Mar. 1, 1936.

5. Letter, H.D. to Bryher: Mar. 12, 1936. Schmideberg made this interpretation in the same month that Joan Riviere and Melanie Klein were giving public lectures on material they would later revise for *Love, Hate, and Reparation*, 1937 (New York: Hogarth Press, 1967). (See the Table

of Contents, p. vii.) There, Klein argues that the young child "has phantasies of robbing [the mother] of the contents of her body—among other things of babies, which are felt to be precious possessions," and further associates "phantasies of exploring the mother's body" with "man's interest in exploring new countries" (103-04). Subsequent references to this work, abbreviated *LHR*, appear parenthetically in the main text. Barbara Guest notes that Bryher's father called her Dolly as well. *Herself Defined* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1984) 112.

6. Letter, H.D. to Bryher: Oct. 23, 1936. For an account of the "hidden phallus," see Melanie Klein, et al., *Developments in Psycho-Analysis*, ed. by Joan Riviere (London: Hogarth Press, 1952) 165. Subsequent references to this work, abbreviated *DPA*, appear parenthetically in the main text.

7. Letters, H.D. to Bryher: Sept. 28, 1936; Apr. 13, 1937.

8. Grosskurth quotes from Walter Schmideberg's speech to the British Psychoanalytic Society on March 11, 1942 in *Melanie Klein: Her World and Her Work* (New York: Knopf, 1986) 293. Bryher and H.D. may have read his speech in full; in a letter to Bryher dated Apr. 10, 1942, he encloses "a speech I made some weeks ago *against* nearly the whole of the British Psychoanalytic society."

9. Letters, Bryher to H.D.: Apr. 15, 1937; Sept. 16, 1937. Fantasy played both a more central and a much earlier role in childhood development for Klein than for Freud. For an overview of their differences, see Hanna Segal, *Melanie Klein*, ed. Frank Kermode (New York: Viking Press, 1979) 60.

10. Grosskurth 212.

11. Grosskurth 297-98. A letter from Bryher to H.D., dated Mar. 18, 1936, suggests that the two were fully aware of the controversy between British and Viennese camps over Klein's work on infantile paranoia and oral sadism. Bryher is discussing her plan to read "a paper on paranoia in polar bears" (a nickname for the Schmidebergs) at the 1936 International Congress: "I refuse to allow them to take this all so seriously. . . . I think with the connivance of Anna [Freud], we'll probably give the sad story of the English analyst who was devoured by his polar bear, and the poor bear that died under the attack of Wien. . . . I should think that the Congress will all end in one superb fight."

12. Letters, H.D. to Bryher: Feb. 4, 1936; Feb. 26, 1936; Sept. 26, 1936.

13. For Kleinians, urine is a "burning," "drowning," and "poisonous" agent, while feces take on the "explosive" capacities of bombs (*DPA* 163, 201).

14. Rachel Blau DuPlessis, *Writing Beyond the Ending: Narrative Strategies of Twentieth-Century Women Writers* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1985) 116.

15. Isis' relations with scorpions and children would be highly suggestive to anyone familiar with Kleinian theory. In the story of Isis' journey to recover Osiris' limbs, four children die: two (including her own son Horus) by poisonous stings from her own scorpions when she has left them unattended, one by fire when its mother interrupts and defeats Isis' attempts to burn away its mortality, and a fourth from the fright of her angry gaze. She only brings the first two back to life. Sir James George Frazer, *Adonis Attis Osiris*, Part 4, vol. 2 of *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*, 3rd. ed.; 12 vols. (London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966) 8-10.

16. Klein makes this major argument in "The Importance of Symbol-Formation in the Development of the Ego," *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 11 (Jan. 1930): 24-39; see 26, 30.

17. Segal, *Melanie Klein*, 127.

18. Hanna Segal, *Introduction to the Work of Melanie Klein* (New York: Basic Books, 1974) 76.

19. "The Importance of Symbol-Formation," 33.

20. Deborah Kelly Kloepfer, *The Unspeakable Mother: Forbidden Discourse in Jean Rhys and H.D.* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989) 130.