

University of Groningen

Unresolved Questions in the Freud/Jung Debate. On Psychosis, Sexual Identity and Religion
Vandermeersch, Patrick

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
1991

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Vandermeersch, P. (1991). *Unresolved Questions in the Freud/Jung Debate. On Psychosis, Sexual Identity and Religion*. s.n.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Chapter V

Collaboration in the Investigation of Psychosis (1906-1909)

Two periods of collaboration between Freud and Jung can be distinguished. The first period, from the end of 1906 until their trip to America in September 1909, was dominated by the problem of the distinction between neurosis and psychosis. The second period of collaboration began after the trip to America. Both authors then directed their attention to the study of mythology and religion in search of a central complex in the human psyche. It was this research which eventually led to the break in their relationship and to Jung's resignation as chairman of the International Psychoanalytic Association on 20th April 1914.

It is mainly the correspondence between Freud and Jung during the first period of their collaboration which sheds light on the respective ways in which they attempted to formulate the problem of psychosis. The publications of both men at that time revealed no sign of this interest. Freud's best known publications from this period were his analyses of 'Little Hans'¹ and of the 'Ratman'.² The latter, however, was hardly mentioned in his correspondence with Jung. Rather, the problem of dementia praecox occupied a central position. Freud himself said that he had little experience with dementia praecox until then. Jung, on the other hand, had been continually confronted with this condition while at the Burghölzli.

1. S. FREUD, *Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy*, G.W. VII, 241-377, S.E. X, 1-147.

2. S. FREUD, *Notes upon a Case of Obsessional Neurosis*, G.W. VII, 379-463, S.E. X, 151-249.

Mutual Contact

A Short History

The publication of the correspondence between Jung and Freud enables us to closely follow the evolution of both thinkers during their collaboration. This correspondence opened with a letter from Freud, dated 11 April 1906, thanking Jung for having sent him a copy of his recently published *Diagnostic Association Studies*. The last article in that collection, *Psychoanalysis and Association Experiments*, should have been of particular interest to Freud yet he offered Jung no comment on it. The letter was simply an expression of gratitude for the gift of the book and hence, there was no reply from Jung. It was only later, on October 5th 1906, after Freud had sent him a copy of his *Collected Short Papers on the Theory of Neuroses*, that Jung made a reply.

Nonetheless, Freud's first letter initiated more than a merely superficial contact. This can be clearly seen in a lecture Freud delivered in June 1906, where he commended Jung's association test.³ Jung, in turn, wrote a paper entitled *Freud's Theory of Hysteria*, in response to Aschaffenburg's fierce attack on Freud at the Baden-Baden Congress in May 1906.⁴ This paper was especially important since it was the first public defence of Freud from within the academic world. However, it also illustrated Jung's attitude towards Freud. Jung reproached Aschaffenburg for exclusively concentrating on the fact that Freud discussed sexuality so often and for summarily dismissing without further investigation the rest of Freud's theories which were far more important. In Jung's opinion, Freud's greatest merit lay in his having indicated the influence of unconscious formations on consciousness. Concerning Freud's view that all hysteria was reducible to sexuality, Jung replied that Freud did not claim to have investigated all cases of hysteria and that he might have presented things rather one-sidedly in this respect. Jung considered that Freud would not have objected to modifying his statement as follows: "An indefinitely large number of cases of hysteria derive from sexual roots".⁵

3. S. FREUD, *Psychoanalysis and the Establishment of Facts in Legal Proceedings*, S.E. IX, 97-114, G.W. VII, 1-15.

4. E. JONES, *Sigmund Freud. Life and Work*, New York, Basic Books, 3 vol., 1953-1957, vol. II, p. 124.

5. C.G. JUNG, *Freud's Theory of Hysteria*, C.W. IV, § 6-8.

Even before Jung published this paper, Freud has sent him the copy of the *Collected Short Papers on the Theory of Neuroses*.⁶ In writing to thank Freud, Jung mentioned that he had conducted lively correspondence with Aschaffenburg concerning Freud's theory and that he had adopted a view with which Freud might not agree entirely. He wrote:⁷

"What I can appreciate, and what has helped us here in our psychopathological work, are your psychological views, whereas I am still pretty far from understanding the therapy and the genesis of hysteria because our material on hysteria is rather meagre. That is to say your therapy seems to me to depend not merely on the affects released by abreaction but also on certain personal rapports, and it seems to me that though the genesis of hysteria is predominantly, it is not exclusively, sexual. I take the same view of your sexual theory. Harping exclusively on these delicate theoretical questions, Aschaffenburg forgets the essential thing: your psychology, from which psychiatry will one day be sure to reap inexhaustible rewards."

In the same letter, Jung told Freud about his book, *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox*, which was then being printed. This marked the definite beginning of their correspondence. In his reply, Freud expressed his hope that Jung, like himself, would gradually discover the role of sexuality.⁸ In the meantime, Jung's article, *Association, Dream and Hysterical Symptom*, had appeared and he sent a copy to Freud.⁹ Freud was pleased that the sexual theme emerged so clearly in this article and that the problem of transference was outlined, a problem with which Freud was particularly concerned at that time.¹⁰

In December 1906, Jung's *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox*¹¹ was published and a copy was immediately sent to Freud. Unfortunately, the letter to Jung in which Freud discussed this book has been lost. He must have offered considerable criticism for Jung's next letter revealed his disappointment.¹² Among other things, Freud must have pointed out some weak points in one of Jung's dream interpretations.¹³ Jung replied

6. As is apparent from 6J and 7J.

7. 2J.

8. 3F.

9. 4J.

10. 5F.

11. Dated 1907.

12. 9J.

13. C.G. JUNG, *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox*, C.W. III, § 123-133.

that he was well aware of the fact that the dream was insufficiently analyzed, adding that since the dream was his own, he had chosen not to reveal himself completely. More important was Jung's reply to the remark by Freud concerning the concept of 'indistinctness' which Jung employed to explain dream symbolism. According to Jung, one should not read too much into this concept. He had accepted it because it was compatible with Wundt's psychology and because it provided a visual image accessible to ordinary human understanding. In Jung's view, the concept merely explained the fact that certain dream images could be displaced but offered neither the cause of nor the reason for this displacement. Instead of 'indistinct' ideas, one could just as easily speak of ideas 'poor in association'.¹⁴ This concept of indistinctness obviously touched upon the problem of the essential difference between Freud's view of the unconscious and that of Jung. In his reply, Freud wrote that in employing the concept of 'indistinctness', Jung had omitted a considerable amount of dream work. Nevertheless, he considered it too difficult to write down all he had to say on this matter and he invited Jung to visit him in Vienna.¹⁵ Another item which Freud hoped to discuss with Jung was the problem of sexuality, a problem which Jung's hypothesis of toxins had overlooked. Jung gladly accepted the invitation to visit Vienna and went there with his wife and Ludwig Binswanger, who was then working under Jung's supervision. He met with Freud on Sunday, 3 March, 1907.¹⁶ Most of the day was spent discussing infantile sexuality. This was one aspect of the Freudian theory which Jung had previously ignored and which he still found difficult to accept.

Freud's Thought Seen in a New Light

In 1906, it was quite a revelation for Jung to read *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, *Collected Short Papers on the Theory of Neuroses* and *Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria*. In the first place, these articles, written in the period between the publication of *Studies on Hysteria* and *The Interpretation of Dreams*, revealed a very different side

14. 9J.

15. "A great deal might be said about the 'indistinctness' which supposedly makes much of the usual dream work superfluous; too much for a letter. Perhaps you will be coming to Vienna before you go to America (it's nearer). It would give me the greatest pleasure to spend a few hours discussing these matters with you." 11F.

16. Not on 18 or 27 February as recorded by Jones. See the biographical note between 16J and 17J in *The Freud/Jung Letters*.

of Freud's thought than Jung had thus far been acquainted with. It was not the theory of the affect but rather that of repression which was now most important and, in the aetiology of neuroses, sexuality was accorded a decisive role. As has been mentioned above, this was not in keeping with Jung's previous understanding of Freud's thought.

While Jung read in the *Collected Short Papers on the Theory of Neuroses* that Freud had once considered the root of all neuroses to be a real sexual trauma which had occurred during infancy, accompanied by an actual irritation of the genitals¹⁷, he also discovered that Freud had abandoned this theory, replacing the sexual trauma with infantile sexuality.¹⁸ The theme of infantile sexuality was central to the discussions in *Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria* and in *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, both of which were published in 1905. Without going into too much detail, we shall briefly sketch this turning point in Freud's thought.

Prior to 1905, Freud had considered the root of hysteria to have been an actual seduction by an adult. Resistance shown by patients when narrating the event had convinced Freud that this was indeed the case. In this context, there was no real mention of infantile sexuality. The child had merely suffered the consequences of an adult's interference which had introduced sexuality into the child's life.¹⁹ It was the sexuality of the adult which was originally predominant in Freud's thought. This was also apparent in the fact that Freud had distinguished anxiety neurosis (a nosographical entity) from neurasthenia as the direct consequence of an actual unfulfilled sexuality.²⁰

It was quite some time before Freud began to suspect the reality of these sexual traumas. Eventually however, he came to admit that he was really dealing with fantasies which, after being transformed during puberty, reverted back to the remembrance of sexual interests and experiences from the patient's infancy. This implied the existence of infantile

17. S. FREUD, *Further Remarks on the Neuro-Psychoses of Defence* S.E. III, 159-185, G.W. I, 377-403; *The Aetiology of Hysteria*, S.E. III, 187-221, G.W. I, 423-459.

18. S. FREUD, *My views on the Part played by Sexuality in the Aetiology of the Neuroses*, S.E. VII, 269-279, G.W. V, 147-159.

19. Freud originally interpreted hysteria as the consequence of a sexual aggression which had been passively endured. Obsessional neurosis, on the other hand, arose from a precocious sexual event, though even in this case, Freud sought the ultimate cause in the adult who had seduced the child into premature sexual activity. See S. FREUD, *Heredity and the Aetiology of the Neuroses*, S.E. III, p. 156, G.W. I, p. 421.

20. S. FREUD, *On the Grounds for Detaching a Particular Syndrome from Neurasthenia under the Prescription 'Anxiety Neurosis'*, S.E. III, 85-115, G.W. I, 313-342.

sexuality. Freud also discovered that the unconscious fantasies of neurotics were mostly concerned with perverse forms of sexuality. This discovery provided him with an insight into the characteristics of infantile sexuality.

In *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, Freud made a reconstruction of infantile sexuality based on the analysis of an adult. The scheme is well known. The first section of the work dealt with a description of generally known sexual perversions. Freud intended to demonstrate that these perversions essentially consisted in the predominance of a specific erotic component which appeared to be either isolated or dominant. In normal sexuality, on the other hand, this component was either wholly integrated or largely inhibited by feelings of repulsion or shame. Sexuality thus appeared to be a complex combination of a considerable number of separate erotic components which only achieved unity by means of a structuring process. Whenever this structuring process was lacking, the perversions which occurred clearly demonstrated the existence of isolated, partial instincts.

In the second section, Freud described the sexuality of a child, which still remained in this polymorphous, perverse stage in which the erotogenic zones separately strived for satisfaction. At this point, the child was not directed to any external object. He was therefore autoerotic. What occurred, however, was that the erotogenic zones gradually united under the primacy of the genital zone and sexuality abandoned autoeroticism in order to look for an object in the opposite sex. This particular process was the theme of the third section of Freud's work which dealt with the 'transformation of puberty'.

Freud called the process by which the various erotogenic zones were united under the primacy of the genital zone sublimation. By this, he meant that extremely strong impulses, originating from a particular zone, were transmitted to another area. In the process, these impulses were checked by feelings of repulsion or shame. According to Freud, this led not only to a decrease of energy in the erotogenic zones, which were forced to submit to the primacy of the genital zone, but also to a general recession of sexuality as such. The child entered into the period of latency, a necessary phase during which he might acquire culture by means of sublimated energy. It should be noted, however, that this theory of sublimation was still quite rudimentary, especially in the 1905 edition of *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*. In light of the ideas which Jung later developed concerning this matter, there was a rather striking passage where Freud stated that the sublimation process, whereby the sexual forces were structured, was set in motion in a way that was organic and

determined by hereditary factors. Furthermore, it was said that education only acted to support this process.²¹

Whatever the precise origin of this process, Freud's claim was that normal sexual orientation only came about if the erotogenic zones were structured by the sublimation process. When this did not take place, perversion occurred. There was, however, a third possibility, namely that the separate erotic components were not sublimated but were violently repressed. Hence, the origin of neurosis which, in a certain sense, could be defined as the negative side of perversion. While perversion gave free reign to all partial instincts arising from the erotogenic zones, neurosis violently repressed these instincts. The result was that the perversions were relegated to the unconscious. The normal course of sublimation was thus situated between neurosis and perversion.²²

What we do not find in *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* is the representation of the Oedipus complex in its classic form. Freud certainly pointed out that the child's first love was for the mother but there was no mention here of the father's role nor of the process of identification. It was particularly during the period of collaboration with Jung that Freud further investigated these problems.

Concerning Dementia Praecox. From Jung's Visit to Vienna until Freud's visit to Zurich (March 1907 - September 1908)

Dementia Praecox and Autoeroticism

While Jung was in Vienna, Freud had explained to him the meaning of the notion 'libido' in broad terms. Furthermore, he had suggested to Jung that dementia praecox was essentially a return to autoeroticism. This interview had greatly puzzled Jung. Not only did he find it difficult to accept Freud's theoretical insights but a number of personal problems had also arisen, problems which were to characterize his subsequent relationship with Freud. In his correspondence, Jung repeatedly mentioned this religious father-son relation with Freud with its unmistakable erotic undertones.²³

It was almost a month after the interview before Jung was able to resume his correspondence with Freud. He wrote that he had tested

21. S. FREUD, *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, S.E. VII, p. 177-178, G.W. V, p. 78.

22. S. FREUD, *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, S.E. VII, p. 171-172, G.W. V, p. 71-72.

23. See especially 49J and 50J.

Freud's ideas in a number of cases and that he had to admit that auto-eroticism was indeed an obvious characteristic of dementia praecox.²⁴ This was discussed at some length in their letters prior to June 1907. Jung presented a considerable amount of case material to which Freud applied his insights. Three of Freud's letters are of particular importance in this respect since, for the first time, Freud attempted to draft a model for the dementia praecox-paranoia group. He began spontaneously from the presentation of the psychic apparatus which he had already given in the seventh chapter of *The Interpretation of Dreams*. There was, however, no explicit reference to this source which probably explains why Jung seemed to have initially had so much trouble in understanding Freud.

The psychic apparatus as seen by Freud was a set of systems operating in a fixed order. To begin with, there was the system of perception which guaranteed the reception of stimuli that came from the external world or were generated from within by the needs of the organism itself. The perceived stimuli were then conducted through the memory system which ascribed a meaning and an affective value to them. One of the deepest dimensions of the memory system was the unconscious, which most decisively determined what meaning a stimulus would receive. Closely connected to the unconscious was the preconscious. The preconscious determined whether the stimulus was to be further admitted on its way to the motor end of the psychic apparatus where it could be neutralized by a discharge.

It was this model of the psychic apparatus, together with his theory of projection as developed in *Further Remarks on the Neuro-Psychoses of Defence*, that Freud applied to dementia praecox and paranoia. Indeed, he had always remarked that he failed to understand why such a sharp distinction had been drawn between dementia praecox and paranoia since the time of Kraepelin. For this reason, he chose to speak of paranoia in all cases.²⁵

In his first letter, which bore the heading 'A Few Theoretical Remarks on Paranoia'²⁶, Freud began with the following example. A woman desired sexual intercourse with a man. The desire was repressed but reappeared in the following manner: she heard that people were saying of her that she was anxious to have sexual intercourse and she vehemently denied such slander.

24. 17J.

25. 8F, 25F.

26. 22F.

To understand this, according to Freud, one had to distinguish between the different stages in the development of paranoia. Therefore, the manner in which the desire for sexual intercourse arose must also be understood. In general, a wish originated as follows. The sexual drive, which was originally autoerotic, induced the cathexis of memory images of earlier objects, thereby creating the sexual fantasy. The object-love, which subsequently arose, could then be repressed in various ways. Such repression could occur just before the desire became conscious. In that case, we can recognize the respective characteristics of the various neuroses.²⁷ In paranoia however, a different type of repression occurred. The libido was withdrawn from the object by becoming autoerotic again. The decathected object then became insignificant, so that it could safely be projected onto the outside world. This took place in the case of Jung's patient. For her, it seemed to be a simple observation: "People say that I love coitus". At first, the person in question was quite indifferent to this suggestion.

What was typical of paranoia was the failure of this defence created by affective de-cathexis and projection of the representation of the object. The libido was not satisfied in its regression to the autoerotic stage and turned once again towards the projected image. The erotic desire now reached the subject from the outside world. This made the subject all the more vulnerable since the system of perception registered everything coming from the outside world as being true. As a consequence of this, the subject exhausted herself in secondary defences against the re-cathected object, which she seemed to perceive continuously: "People say that I love coitus. That is what they say but it's not true".

A more precise statement of Freud's view can be found in his subsequent letters devoted to this problem.²⁸ In the first place, he made a sharper distinction between the primary defence mechanism, consisting of de-cathexis and projection of the image, and the return of the libido to the projected image which elicited the secondary defence typical of paranoia. In this context, Freud re-introduced the distinction between dementia

27. There is an error in the English translation of this letter. The translator based himself upon an incorrect transcription of the German original ("*denn sie muss* der Verdrängung unterworfen werden, ehe sie bewusst wird, so mag das auf verschiedenen Wegen geschehen (Hauptcharaktere der einzelnen Psychoneurosen).") while in fact Freud wrote: "*kann sie nun...*") Instead of "a wish fantasy ... *because it must be subjected* to repression ..." we should read "a wish fantasy ... *If it can be subjected* to repression before it becomes conscious, it can occur in various ways."

28. 25F and 30F.

praecox, paranoia and dementia paranoides, though he still regarded them as a single group of related syndromes. Dementia praecox corresponded to the case in which the primary defence mechanism would be sufficient. The libido was withdrawn from the object and returned permanently to the autoerotic stage. Freud pointed out that this view was in keeping with the facts provided by Jung. Such subjects clearly exhibited autoerotic traits and were sometimes able to discuss their most intimate problems quite frankly and openly without the least resistance. Paranoia in its purest form corresponded with a complete collapse of the defence mechanism, causing the libido to return entirely to the projected object, so that the libidinous re-cathexis took place within the perception. The attempt at defence started all over again but this time within the field of perception. Freud termed this process 'rejection' instead of 'repression'.²⁹ Between the extremes of a completely successful return to autoeroticism and a total failure of this kind of defence, there was the hybrid of dementia paranoides in which part of the libido remained autoerotic while another part proceeded to lend re-cathexis to the projected object.

There was, however, one point which Freud himself admitted as being rather vague, namely the precise nature of projection. In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, he had presented the theory that hysterical hallucination and dreaming were a kind of wish fulfilment. Censorship preventing entering consciousness at the motor end of the psychic apparatus, the cathected image regressively ran through the psychic apparatus to reappear as a perception at the perception end. This process was supposedly set in motion by the strong affective charge of the image. Freud found it difficult to reconcile this with his views on paranoid projection as outlined above, according to which the image should be de-cathected before it could be projected. In such cases, the return of the libidinous re-cathexis could only reinforce the hallucination in a secondary way.

Freud hoped to find the solution to this antinomy by sharply distinguishing between regression and projection. But no more details were given in the letter. The fact that paranoia was usually accompanied by auditory hallucinations and not by visual images was, in Freud's view, another possible characteristic of the distinction between paranoid projection and hallucinatory fulfilment. This would indicate an intensification of the thought process.

29. "Then the delusional idea becomes more intense and resistance to it more and more violent, the entire defensive battle is fought all over again as rejection of reality" (repression is transformed into rejection). 25F.

The third letter contained further information on the distinction between both forms of projection.³⁰ The letter was written after Jung had admitted that he did not quite grasp Freud's explanation. Jung had asked him to further illustrate his theory by means of two short case descriptions which Jung himself quoted. The following section of the case history was significant for the problem of projection.³¹

A young man, living in Zurich, met a certain Lydia X, with whom he fell madly in love. A few years later, he was dismissed from his job in London. He wandered the streets for three days. He occasionally heard his name called. And, on his way to the train station one day, an unknown woman came towards him, obviously making advances. But when she came closer, he realized that he was mistaken and that the lady was in fact very respectable. Later, standing on the platform at the station, he saw a man with a young woman whom he thought was a girl he knew in Zurich. When he came home, he saw for the first time that his house was number 13. That night, he tried to commit suicide. The attempt failed and later he seemed to make a complete recovery.

After ten years, he returned to Zurich where he learned that Lydia X was engaged. This has such an affect upon him that eventually he had become committed. Megalo- and other persecution manias developed: he was God, Monseigneur, doctor, the lot. He saw Lydia X in everyone he met and blamed her for every misfortune that befell him.

In his discussion of the case, Freud first considered the episode in London. What happened there, he said, was something of the nature of a hallucinatory wish fulfilment except, however, that there was no actual regression of the psychic images to perceptions. The regression was limited to influencing the memory images of recent perceptions. The patient had seen a woman coming towards him and this recent memory image was immediately transformed into the wish: "She is making advances towards me". It was clear that the wish could only falsify the memory and that it was incapable of penetrating the perception itself since a second perception could still correct the falsified memory image: "The lady is in fact very respectable".

In this process then, there was something in the nature of a hallucinatory wish fulfilment. According to Freud, both cases involved the basic process which distinguished neurosis from psychosis. Unlike neurosis, where the unconscious was repressed, in psychosis the unconscious over-

30. 30F.

31. 29J.

powered the reality-connected ego. The difference between the case in question, which later developed into paranoia, and a direct hallucinatory wish fulfilment seemed to be that in the paranoid process, the regression did not penetrate the system of perception but came to a halt in the preceding system, namely the memory system.

The analysis of the second episode in Zurich, in which paranoia clearly emerged, showed how the object of the libido, Lydia X, affected the subject from without. Freud held that this was understandable if one assumed that a libidinous de-cathexis of the object had taken place between both periods. During this interval, the de-cathected image was projected outward. On hearing about the engagement of Lydia X, this form of defence was no longer sufficient and the projected object was again cathected by the libido. Freud readily admitted that in such cases of paranoia, there was considerable difficulty in indicating the intermediary stage of the process in which the object had been de-cathected and the libido had been diverted to autoeroticism. Nevertheless, based on the observation of cases of pure dementia praecox, he inferred that such a process did exist.

So much for Freud's explanation in these three letters. Jung responded by affirming that he also regularly encountered autoerotic elements in dementia praecox patients. Such cases were repeatedly described in his letters. He pointed out that these patients masturbated frequently, relished playing with their excrement and smearing themselves with it, drank urine and so forth.³² This was an obvious regression to autoeroticism. Bleuler, with whom Jung often discussed Freud's insights, found these ideas more difficult to accept. Jung realized that Bleuler's personal concerns and emotional sensitivities were deeply involved here but it was quite some time before he managed to free himself from Bleuler's authority.³³ He was simply delighted when he wrote to Freud that "Bleuler has now accepted 70% of the libido theory"....³⁴ Not long afterwards, Jung was able to announce that Bleuler had agreed to use the concept of autoeroticism in his contribution on dementia praecox in G. Aschaffenburg's *Handbuch der Psychiatrie*³⁵, though he still preferred

32. See especially 21J and 24J.

33. 17J.

34. 19J.

35. *Dementia Praecox or the Group of Schizophrenias* formed one volume in Aschaffenburg's *Handbuch der Psychiatrie*, Spezieller Teil, 4. Abteilung, 1. Hälfte, Leipzig, Deuticke, 1911.

to use the terms 'autism' or 'ipsism'.³⁶

On closer examination, however, there seems to be a considerable difference between Freud's view on autoeroticism and that of Bleuler and Jung. Although in his letters, Jung frequently pointed out that all kinds of masturbatory and perverse sexual impulses could be observed in dementia praecox patients, he did not connect these autoerotic manifestations with loss of object-directedness and regression into an entirely objectless state. What concerned Jung much more was the withdrawal from reality into fantasy. He wrote:³⁷

"When you say that the libido withdraws from the object, you mean, I think, that it withdraws from the *real object* for normal reasons of repression (obstacles, unattainability, etc.) and throws itself on a fantasy copy of the real one, with which it then proceeds to play its classic autoerotic game. The projection towards the perception end springs from the original wish for reality, which, if unattainable, creates its own reality by hallucination."

Jung thus considered autoeroticism as a flight into fantasy which could also be accompanied by an autoerotic longing for sexual fulfilment. For this reason he interpreted projection as a wish fulfilment just as he had in the other cases. Since reality was lacking, the fantasy world was projected. In this way, Jung resolved the difficulty he had with the difference between hallucinatory wish fulfilment and paranoid projection. In both cases, it was a matter of wish fulfilment. In his reply, Freud pointed out this misunderstanding.³⁸

"I do *not* think that the libido withdraws from the real object to throw itself on the mental representation of the object, with which fantasy it proceeds to play its autoerotic game. By definition, the libido is not autoerotic as long as it has an object, real or imagined. I believe, rather, that the libido departs from the object-image, which is thereby divested of the cathexis that has characterized it as internal and can now be projected outward and, as it were, perceived. Then for a moment it can be perceived calmly as it were and subjected to the usual reality-testing. 'People say that I love coitus. That is what they say, but it's not *true!*' Successful repression would accomplish this much; the liberated libido would somehow manifest itself autoerotically as in childhood."

36. 24J.

37. 24J.

38. 25F.

In other words, Freud claimed that the object-directedness disappeared entirely and the libido, thus released, was divested into objectless autoeroticism. The background to this was to be found in the opinion he expressed in *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, namely, that the sexual instinct consisted of separate components which could become object-directed only by being united under the primacy of the genital zone. In his first letter on the problem of paranoia, he had given a more detailed account of this idea by affirming that the object-directedness originated from linking the unified sexual instinct to memory images from former objects.³⁹ In paranoia, this link would once more disintegrate.

Jung's view was exactly the opposite. The idea of a de-cathexed image which could again become a perception was completely foreign to him. On the contrary, he included the erotic fantasy world in autoeroticism. In such a fantasy world, the images would be so affectively charged that they were hallucinated.

It is unlikely that Freud or Jung realized just how much they differed. Freud was pleased that Jung, together with Bleuler, gradually came to accept autoeroticism as the nucleus of dementia praecox-paranoia. It is true that he complained about Jung not being able to regard autoeroticism as having no object but he did not yet seem to be aware of all the consequences of Jung's position.⁴⁰

There was, however, misunderstanding on two important points. In the first place, the relation between drive and representation was seen by Freud and Jung from completely different perspectives. Only later, once Jung equated 'autoeroticism' with 'introversion' and after Freud published his *Formulations on the Two Principles of Mental Functioning* (1911), did this difference become clear. Another misunderstanding arose concerning the distinction between dementia praecox and paranoia. Freud considered both as being identical and preferred to use the term 'paranoia'. If, under Jung's influence, he gradually came to admit that there was a certain difference between dementia praecox, dementia paranoides, and paranoia, it was no more than a difference of the degree to which the de-cathexis of the object was a successful defence. The problem was precisely that Freud's model of the illness's development was based upon the presupposition that dementia praecox and paranoia belonged together. In his model of the de-cathexis, projection and re-cathexis of the image, he admitted that de-cathexis (the necessary condition for projection) was not

39. 22F.

40. 25F.

observable in paranoia but only in dementia praecox, where the libido found its autoerotic outlet. Thus the whole theory of projection, which was viewed as typical of paranoia, depended upon the correctness of the presumed relation between dementia praecox and paranoia.

Here Freud abandoned the view that projection was the defence mechanism of paranoia, since he saw a certain contradiction between projection as a defence mechanism and projection as wish fulfilment in dreams and hallucination. At this stage, however, he did not see any clear solution to the problem.

Jung never explicitly attacked Freud for connecting dementia praecox and paranoia. In fact, he was mainly concerned with the former illness. What he found most striking was that patients were locked inside their fantasy world. The problem of distinguishing between two forms of projection, as Freud did on the basis of observation of pure paranoia, simply did not exist for him. He failed to understand Freud's preoccupation with this question and pointed out that in dementia praecox, projection consisted of 'a crazy mixture of wish fulfilment and the feeling of being injured'.⁴¹

A considerable misunderstanding had arisen then on the subject of autoeroticism as well as on the distinction between dementia praecox and paranoia. With regard to repression, however, Jung's views seemed to be more in keeping with Freud's. Writing to Freud that Bleuler continued to contest the purposefulness of dreams, Jung himself affirmed that this amounted to a denial of the distorting effect of the complexes, the central thesis of *The Interpretation of Dreams*.⁴² In this same period, Jung wrote the paper *Disturbances of Reproduction in the Association Experiment*, in which he further investigated the reproduction test. He almost came to regard this test as an experimental proof of repression.⁴³ If, during the first test, the subject of the experiment had reacted under the influence of an affectively charged complex, he would forget how he had answered. Jung gradually came to realize that the idea of repression also had certain implications for the manner in which the inner psychic constitution should be understood. After reading Bleuler's *Affektivität, Suggestibilität, Paranoia*, Freud wrote to Jung that he had no use for Bleuler's ideas of 'personality' or 'ego', since these concepts merely belonged to surface psy-

41. 24J.

42. 17J.

43. 26J.

chology.⁴⁴ In his reply, Jung expressed his full agreement with Freud and, in fact, quite explicitly added that the concept of the ego complex, as he (Jung) had conceived it up to that point, was likewise to be discarded.⁴⁵

Further Hesitant Investigations

It might have been expected that Jung's preparation for his lecture at the Amsterdam Congress would have led to extensive correspondence on the theory of hysteria. This was not the case however. One has the impression that he did not have many problems in drafting the text by himself nor did he seek Freud's advice to any great extent. Only on one occasion do we find Jung asking for some explanation concerning the role Freud assigned to sexuality. The question was posed whether Freud regarded sexuality as the mother of all feelings or merely as one component of the personality (though the most important one). In other words, Jung's concern was whether any complexes other than sexuality could possibly determine hysterical symptoms.⁴⁶

The question was put forward quite bluntly. Freud's reply was equally as concise. The relation between sexuality and the other drives was a rather difficult matter and for this reason, Freud provisionally continued to hold the popular concept of two instinctual sources, namely, hunger and sexuality. As to the relation between hysteria and sexuality, Freud pointed out that he posited the necessary role of the sexual complex on theoretical grounds and not merely on the frequency or intensity of its occurrence in hysteria.⁴⁷

No further explanation was offered. This reply was too short for Jung to realize the extent to which Freud's views differed from his own. That this was so became clear from Jung's Amsterdam lecture, where he gave evidence of being acquainted with all of Freud's writings and the evolution of Freud's ideas but nonetheless constantly emphasized the aetiological significance of the affect which was connected with sexuality.

Jung's lecture was, on the whole, not successful. In the first place, he exceeded the time limit so much that he was not allowed to finish. The audience, it seems, was also rather hostile.⁴⁸ Moreover, the content was

44. 40J.

45. 41J.

46. 39J.

47. 40F.

48. See 43J and 44J.

somewhat confused. Fully aware of this, Jung's excuse was that Freud himself had not yet designed a clear theoretical basis for his psychoanalytical theory.⁴⁹ In his lecture, Jung explained how Freud's theory developed from his opinion that the core of hysteria consisted of non-abreacted, affective images into a theory concerning a real sexual trauma in infancy, and finally arriving at the view that an infantile, polymorphous-perverse, sexual disposition determined later neurosis. In working out the formula of hysteria, Jung placed particular emphasis on the elaboration of infantile memories during puberty. He even went as far as to affirm that the Freudian theory was not applicable to child neuroses.⁵⁰

In his report, Jung made a few incidental remarks that were rather typical of him. Announcing the presentation of *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, he immediately warned that they were difficult to understand unless one kept in mind that Freud's concept of sexuality was exceptionally broad. Jung felt that Freud's notion of sexuality should not only be understood as a sexual drive in the strict sense but as everything connected with the 'urge towards preservation of the species', namely, all perversions and a large part of the psychosexual derivatives. In the next sentence, Jung even went a step further. He explained the concept 'libido' as distinct from that of sexuality:⁵¹

"This concept, originally borrowed from 'libido sexualis', denotes in the first place the sexual components of psychic life so far as they are volitional, and then any inordinate passion or desire."

For Jung therefore, the term received an even wider significance than for Freud, who ultimately connected the libido only with the erotogenic zones. In his appreciation of Freud's theory of hysteria, Jung limited himself to affirming that there were indeed cases such as Freud described. "The Freudian hysteria exists".⁵² However, he did not exclude the possibility of other forms of hysteria. He gave the examples of hysteria in children and psycho-traumatic neurosis.⁵³

It is evident from this lecture that Jung was still reluctant to wholeheartedly accept Freud's views on sexuality. We find little mention of the content of this lecture in their correspondence. It was not until seven months later, in April 1908, that Freud even had the occasion to read the

49. C.G. JUNG, *The Freudian Theory of Hysteria*, C.W. IV, § 27 and 48.

50. *Ibid.*, § 62. See also 82F and 83F.

51. *Ibid.*, § 49.

52. "... cases which conform exactly to Freud's scheme really do exist". *Ibid.*, § 62.

53. *Ibid.*, § 62.

text.⁵⁴ Jung was most apologetic in sending Freud his text, having realized in the meantime that it was not the first-rate defence of Freud that he had wished it to be.

After Jung's lecture in September 1907, the correspondence took a different turn. Several topics were discussed: the founding of a 'Freudian Society' in Zurich⁵⁵; Jung's painful realization of his transference relation to Freud⁵⁶; Jensen's *Delusions and Dreams in Jensen's 'Gradiva'*, about which Freud had written a paper; and finally, the practical organization of the first psychoanalytic congress in Salzburg. Only occasionally was there mention of anything important for the later theories. For instance, Jung pointed out with some concern that a certain measure of sexual repression was in fact indispensable as a civilizing factor, even though it might become pathogenic in the case of weaker individuals.⁵⁷ This observation was made in the context of a remark made to Jung by a fellow psychoanalyst, Otto Gross, to the effect that one could put a quick stop to the transference by leading the patient into sexual immorality which, according to Gross, was a truly healthy state for the neurotic.

Freud's reply to this letter is missing however. In a letter written in November⁵⁸, and in reference to an observation on Jensen's *Gradiva*, Freud expressed the view that it was vital for the first object of human love to remain unconscious.⁵⁹

"Our love-objects form series, one is a recurrence of another (the Master of Palmyra), and each one is a reactivation of an unconscious infantile love, but this love must remain unconscious; as soon as it is aroused to consciousness, it holds the libido fast instead of guiding it onward, and a new love becomes impossible."

In January 1908, Jung delivered a lecture in Zurich on *The Content of the Psychoses*. This lecture, given before a large audience, contained little new material. Freud, however, was delighted with the popular ver-

54. 81J.

55. 47J.

56. See especially 49J, 50J and 51J.

57. 46J.

58. 53F.

59. 53F.

sion of the text and had it published as soon as possible in his series *Papers on Applied Psychology*.⁶⁰

The Content of the Psychoses was a plea for a psychological approach to psychiatry. Without rejecting the importance of the organic aspects, Jung pointed out that in 45 percent of the cases admitted to the Burghölzli, anatomical brain analysis failed to be of any assistance, whereas a psychological analysis allowed for the possibility of finding a certain meaning in otherwise senseless symptoms. This was illustrated by a few cases in which Jung, time and again, emphasized that the illness originated from an affectively meaningful event. He concluded with the observation that the core of mental disturbances was nothing other than the deepest existential questions that arose in each person. Like the ordinary man and the poet, the mentally disturbed person built himself a fantasy world in order to mitigate the harsh reality of daily life. Unlike the others, the mentally disturbed person got caught up in that dream. Nonetheless, there was much that he could teach the sane person. He did not reveal anything new or unknown. Rather, he demonstrated "the foundation of our own being, the matrix of these vital problems on which we are all engaged".⁶¹

Once the practical difficulties of organizing the Salzburg Congress had been settled, the problem of psychosis reappeared in the correspondence between Freud and Jung. Freud wrote that he had treated a few cases of paranoia and that in each case, he had encountered a detachment, though only partial, of the libido. Each case involved a homosexual component which, until then, had been normally and moderately cathected. This component was detached only to reappear in a projected form. Thus Freud found confirmation for his hypothesis on paranoia and, at the same time, a further specification of his view by the discovery that the de-cathexis of the libido could be partial since, in the cases recorded, the de-cathexis was restricted to the homosexual component.⁶²

In his reply, Jung for the first time set down his own views in opposition to Freud's theoretical formulations on dementia praecox. He suggested that the regression to autoeroticism was a teleological process. The de-cathexis of the object and the regression of the libido to autoerotic forms served the psychological self-preservation of the individual who felt threatened in his relation to the outside world. While hysteria was re-

60. See 66F, 67F and 68F.

61. C.G. JUNG, *The Content of the Psychoses*, C.W. III, § 387.

62. 70F.

stricted to the plane of preservation of the species, dementia praecox was situated on the plane of self-preservation. It was this urge for self-preservation which Jung equated with autoeroticism:⁶³

"The detachment of libido, its regression to autoerotic forms, is probably well explained by the self-assertion, the psychological self-preservation of the individual. Hysteria keeps to the plane of 'preservation of the species', paranoia (dementia praecox) to the plane of self-preservation, i.e., autoeroticism. A patient once told me: 'Everything that happens has something so *gripping* about it!' Autoeroticism serves as a purposive defence against this. The psychoses (the incurable ones) should probably be regarded as defensive encapsulations that have misfired, or rather, have been carried to extremes.... Autoeroticism, as an overcompensation of conflicts with reality, is largely teleological."

What is important here was that Jung regarded autoeroticism as a form of the urge for self-preservation. The individual encapsulated himself in order to escape from conflicts with reality - the rigidness of the symptoms were an indication of this. Freud replied that Jung's observations had struck a responsive chord in him and he described Jung as "the only one capable of making an original contribution"....⁶⁴ But when Freud attempted to further elaborate the formulation in question, he, strangely enough, dismissed the teleological theory.⁶⁵ Once again, he merely outlined the concepts of de-cathexis and projection of the image which he considered to be the core of paranoia. As for hysteria and obsessional neurosis, Freud delineated the aetiology as follows. They arose from a defect in the development of genital primacy, whereas paranoia originated from a defect in an earlier phase of development, namely, in the transition from autoeroticism to object-love. However, he rejected the teleology which Jung saw in the regression to autoeroticism. The severity and inaccessibility which were characteristic of psychosis need not, in Freud's opinion, be explained as the consequence of the individual's encapsulation in an attempt of protect himself against the threat of the outside world. Freud believed that these phenomena were adequately explained by projection. Once the image was projected, it reached the subject through the perception and what came into the psychic system through the perception *ipso facto* evaded the reality-testing since the latter was to be found precisely within the perception. The paranoiac's delusion was thus

63. 72J.

64. 74F.

65. 76F.

posited beyond all doubt and, for this reason, the illness had such a severe and inaccessible character.

Jung replied that his views on the paranoia question seemed to differ quite considerably from Freud's. He admitted, however, that he had some difficulty in following Freud's line of thought.⁶⁶ He presented his own (somewhat confused) analysis of a particular case, asking Freud to apply his theory to it. The matter remained unclear. Freud did not respond directly to Jung's request since, in the meantime, he had received Jung's paper for the Amsterdam Congress together with the article, *Complexes and the Cause of Disease in the Case of Dementia Praecox*, written by Jung and Bleuler.⁶⁷

In this article, Jung and Bleuler presented their respective views on the organic basis of dementia praecox. Bleuler held a primary, organic disturbance, which he considered as not having been sufficiently studied, to be the direct cause of primary psychic symptoms. The classical symptomatology of the illness was merely concerned with the secondary outcome of the primary symptoms and it was on this level that the psychic determination of the Freudian model operated. Jung, on the other hand, denied the existence of these primary symptoms. Although he accepted an organic causality in his toxin hypothesis, he left unanswered the question whether this organic process was primary or whether it was the consequence of affects which were too intense.

It seems that Jung had made no previous mention of this publication to Freud. The latter was therefore displeased and even suggested that Jung attached such importance to the organic side simply in order to placate the medical public.⁶⁸ Jung replied that he had never lost sight of the importance of the organic side but, for him, this did not exclude the psychological approach. The brain, he said, was not a piano upon which the soul could play at will.⁶⁹

Meanwhile, the Salzburg Congress was about to begin. This meeting provided a forum for the continuation of the discussions on dementia praecox and also resulted in a personal conflict between Jung and Karl Abraham. Moreover, the problem of dementia praecox was emphasized in a particularly painful and practical manner by the situation of Otto Gross.

66. 79J.

67. E. BLEULER and C.G. JUNG, *Komplexe und Krankheitsursachen bei Dementia Praecox* In: *Zentralblatt für Nervenheilkunde* 31 (1908) 220-227 (not translated into English).

68. 82F.

69. 83J.

Abraham and the First Psychoanalytical Publication

The theme of dementia praecox, which had disappeared from the correspondence between Freud and Jung during the summer of 1907, due to the impending Amsterdam Congress, was continued meanwhile in the correspondence between Freud and Abraham.

Karl Abraham (1877-1925) had studied psychiatry in Berlin and later joined the staff of the Burghölzli at the end of 1904. From January 1907 onward, he was first assistant under Jung who was then first Oberarzt, which meant that he came just after Bleuler in the hospital hierarchy.⁷⁰ Jung did not care much for Abraham. He reproached him for remaining aloof with regards to team research while keeping a careful eye on everything in progress and listening whenever Jung and Bleuler were discussing their results and hypotheses, then suddenly coming up with a publication, as if he had done the pioneering research.⁷¹

It was precisely with such a publication that Abraham introduced himself to Freud. In 1907, Abraham sent him the article *On the Significance of Juvenile Traumas for the Symptomatology of Dementia Praecox*.⁷² In his introduction, Abraham affirmed that Bleuler and Jung had clearly demonstrated that the same mechanisms occurred in dementia praecox as Freud had discovered in hysteria. For this reason, it had seemed worthwhile to investigate whether infantile sexuality was at the basis of the more advanced symptoms of dementia praecox in the same way as in hysteria. Abraham then presented some case material to demonstrate that, in the course of the analysis, the same traumatizing sexual facts could be found and that the symptoms could be connected with these facts.

Clearly then, the article dealt with the central theme of the correspondence between Jung and Freud. This probably accounted for Jung's antipathy whenever Freud inquired about Abraham.⁷³ Freud, however, rather liked the article because the problem of sexuality was directly dealt with while Jung and Bleuler still showed a certain reluctance to take this approach. Incidentally, it should be noted that Abraham also employed Jung's model here. The symbolic expressions found in dementia praecox were explained as the consequence of a disturbance of attention.

70. See 35J.

71. 39J.

72. K. ABRAHAM, *On the Significance of Juvenile Traumas for the Symptomatology of Dementia Praecox*. In: K. ABRAHAM, *Clinical Papers and Essays on Psychoanalysis*, New York, Basic Books, 1955, 13-20.

73. See 39J, 40F and 41J.

This marked the beginning of the correspondence between Freud and Abraham. Jung was obviously jealous.⁷⁴ Soon afterwards, Abraham sent Freud the text of another article, *The Experiencing of Sexual Traumas as a Form of Sexual Activity*.⁷⁵ Following Freud's example, he here investigated the exact relation between the traumatic experiences recounted by patients and their later illnesses. The article, for the most part, contained a number of anamneses from which Abraham concluded that while the trauma certainly determined the content of the symptoms, the ultimate cause of the illness was to be found in the abnormal psychosexual constitution of the patient as a child. From this perspective, the traumatic events were not seen as accidental but as being provoked by the child himself in most cases. According to Abraham, this was valid for hysteria as well as for dementia praecox. In each case, there was an abnormal development of the libido in that the child reached maturity too early or his sexual instinct was abnormally strong. This led to the sexual experiences which were partly provoked by the child himself. At a later stage, he attempted to repel these memories. In hysteria, this took place through conversion and in obsessional neurosis, by means of displacement.⁷⁶

Thus far, Abraham faithfully reflected Freud's experience prior to the latter's abandoning the trauma theory. The only new element in the article was the affirmation that the analysis of dementia praecox patients had yielded similar results. Abraham then adopted an original standpoint, namely, that in addition to the two repression mechanisms of the neuroses (conversion and displacement), dementia praecox also used a third mechanism: the creation of a delusion of self-indictment, which was then displaced to different images.⁷⁷ According to Abraham, it was simply a matter of constitution which determined why one defence mechanism was used in the first case and another in the second.⁷⁸ In his opinion, the distinction between the various illnesses was undoubtedly situated in the psychosexual area yet he preferred to await further investigations before giving a more detailed account.

74. 39J.

75. *The Experiencing of Sexual Traumas as a Form of Sexual Activity*. In: *Selected Papers of Karl Abraham*, New York, Basic Books, 1968, 47-63.

76. *Ibid.*, p. 55.

77. *Ibid.*, p. 55-56.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 57.

Having read Abraham's article, Freud wrote to him, explaining his theory on regression to autoeroticism as the core of dementia praecox.⁷⁹ Freud believed that the disposition to dementia praecox, which Abraham was looking for, was to be found in the fact that the evolution from autoeroticism to object-love had never been completed.⁸⁰

Meanwhile, Abraham left the Burghölzli (November 1907) following a quarrel. It seems that he, as a German, felt somewhat slighted by the Swiss. On his trip to Berlin, where he intended to start a private practice, he stopped off in Vienna to visit Freud. The latter immediately took kindly to him, especially since both of them were Jews. For a while after the visit, the correspondence between them contained only a few references to the problem of dementia praecox and mostly dealt with Abraham's new practice. However, when Abraham received an invitation to the Salzburg Congress, accompanied by a request to deliver a short lecture, he thought this would be the ideal opportunity to give a synthetic exposition of the problem. He announced that he would lecture on 'The Psycho-Sexual Differences between Hysteria and Dementia Praecox'.

There was little new material in the lecture as far as our purposes are concerned. It was a clear, well-structured exposition which demonstrated how, in dementia praecox, the libido was withdrawn from the object and was discharged in autoeroticism while in hysteria, there was an excessive affective cathexis of the object. The point emphasized by Abraham was that regression to autoeroticism also implied a loss of sublimations, since these had originated from repressed autoerotic components. He located the predisposition to dementia praecox in a defect in the development from autoeroticism to object-love. With such patients, there had never been a complete transition from one to the other. The problem of projection, however, was not touched upon by Abraham. It seems then that this theme, which received a thorough treatment in the letters Freud exchanged with Jung, was never discussed in his correspondence with Abraham. With this lecture and its subsequent publication, Abraham put his name to the first psychoanalytic synthesis of the problem. Jung was probably more than a little irritated by the lecture, especially by Abraham's concluding remark that:⁸¹

79. Letter of Freud to Abraham, 5-7-1907. In: *A Psychoanalytic Dialogue. The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham*, 1-4.

80. Letter of Freud to Abraham, 26-7-1907. In: *ibid.*, p. 5.

81. K. ABRAHAM, *The Psycho-Sexual Differences between Hysteria and Dementia Praecox* In: *Selected Papers of Karl Abraham*, p. 78.

"A great part of the pathological manifestations of dementia praecox would, it seems to me, be explicable if we assumed that the patient has an abnormal psychosexual constitution in the direction of autoeroticism. Such an assumption would render the recently discussed toxin theory unnecessary."

That same morning, Jung delivered his lecture also dealing with dementia praecox. In his presentation, he contended that his toxin hypothesis did not exclude a psychological approach.⁸² Unfortunately, the text of his lecture has been lost.⁸³

The Case of Otto Gross

The problem of dementia praecox was highlighted in Salzburg by the case of Otto Gross (1877-1919). It seems that Gross, a psychiatrist and former assistant of Kraepelin, had recently turned to psychoanalysis. Freud was pleased to have him and considered him, next to Jung, as the most brilliant of his followers, even though he had heard from Jung that Gross had a very complex and somewhat unbalanced personality.⁸⁴ Shortly before the Salzburg Congress however, Freud was informed that Gross had become addicted to opium and had started to show symptoms of paranoia. Freud suggested to Jung that they use the Congress, which Gross was expected to attend, to have the latter admitted to the Burghölzli.⁸⁵

Gross agreed to be admitted to the Burghölzli. It had been Freud's original plan that Jung would only give a withdrawal treatment and that he himself would later commence with his analysis in October.⁸⁶ Jung, however, proceeded immediately with the analysis.

Gross' treatment meant a great deal to Jung personally, though it was conducted in a manner quite far removed from the strict rules of the present-day technique. Jung wrote that he was occupied with Gross night and day. Whenever the analysis ceased to make progress, roles were reversed and Gross had to analyze Jung. Within two weeks, Jung felt that the analysis was practically complete and that Gross's withdrawal from

82. See the biographical notes in *The Freud/Jung Letters* under 85J.

83. Jung always took the organic factors of schizophrenia into consideration, partly because of the similarity between the fantasies of schizophrenics and drug users. See C.G. JUNG, *Schizophrenia*, C.W. III, § 582.

84. See 34F.

85. 84F, 85J.

86. 90F, 94F.

opium had been successful.⁸⁷ As for the diagnosis, Jung first considered obsessional neurosis but soon came to realize that this was a case of dementia praecox.⁸⁸ He was rather disappointed in his originally high expectations from the therapy. A month and a half after being admitted, Gross escaped from the Burghölzli by jumping over a garden wall and he returned to Munich. Jung remarked somewhat bitterly that he had only succeeded in providing Gross with one more delusion, namely, that he had been cured by Jung.⁸⁹

The analysis of Gross had a very strong influence on Jung. He claimed that he had discovered so many aspects of his own nature in Gross that he seemed like a twin brother.⁹⁰ Moreover, the analysis had led Jung to a further development in his views on dementia praecox. What he found particularly striking in the analysis was the constant uncovering of very early infantile material which did not lead to any psychic development. It seemed as if the events of early childhood remained eternally new and operative. Although the patient could be made aware of this fact, the infantile material remained the inexhaustible source of all affects:⁹¹

"... he reacts to today's events like a six-year-old boy, for whom the wife is always the mother, every friend, everyone who wished him well or ill always the father, and whose world is a boyish fantasy filled with heaven knows what monstrous possibilities."

Jung considered this as characteristic of dementia praecox. The illness was directly determined by the earliest infantile sexual complex whereas in hysteria, the complex was mediated by a complex belonging to later life. Jung expressed this metaphorically. "In hysteria, there is both Pompeii and Rome, in dementia praecox only Pompeii".⁹² The fact that dementia praecox occurred in later life was simply deceptive; it was nothing but the occasion of a secondary conflict. Upon closer investigation, it was evident that the patient had become ill in early infancy when sexuality was still completely autoerotic. This accounted for the persistent autoeroticism and devaluation of reality in dementia praecox patients.⁹³

87. 95J.

88. 98J.

89. 98J.

90. 98J.

91. 98J.

92. 98J.

93. 98J.

In his reply, Freud expressed his doubt as to whether the predisposition to dementia praecox was actually to be found in a very early infantile fixation. He admitted, however, that he was still very uncertain about the differentiation between fixation and repression. He also wondered whether the diagnosis of paranoia was correct in Gross' case or whether it was in fact a case of obsessional neurosis with negative transference, which could also explain the apparent absence of transference.⁹⁴ Jung replied that he believed he had observed certain typical features of dementia praecox such as infantile fixation, infantile association and absolute incurability - the permanent exclusion of certain components of reality - which led him to exclude hysteria.⁹⁵

The problem was discussed once again during Freud's visit to Zurich in September 1908, when he had occasion to meet Jung's patient Babette (whose case Jung had described in *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox*). Upon his return, Freud wrote that one of his patients who had no history of dementia praecox suddenly announced: "I am an officers' corps". This seemingly paranoid statement, very similar to the utterance of Jung's patient Babette, was to be interpreted here as an hysterical formula. Freud observed that, in the patient, the officers' corps, by way of the Latin term *cor, cordis*, led to cardiac symptoms. There was, as it were, an unconscious paranoia which led Freud to admit to Jung that there was some truth in the latter's statement that analysis guided hysteria patients along the road to dementia praecox.⁹⁶ While it seems that Jung was not surprised by this phenomenon, he was still amazed by the fact that the replacement of reality by such products could be purely psychogenic in origin.⁹⁷

It is difficult to fully understand the content of these last letters. There were obvious references to what Jung and Freud had discussed in Zurich. The relation between hysteria and dementia praecox became somewhat clearer in their correspondence of December 1908 and particularly within the context of their discussions on autoeroticism.⁹⁸

Jung once more expressed his agreement with Freud that autoeroticism was the most striking characteristic of dementia praecox. However, he pointed out that certain forms of autoeroticism could also be

94. 99F.

95. 100J.

96. 110F.

97. 111J.

98. 121J.

found in hysteria and that "actually every repressed complex was autoerotic".⁹⁹ Both dementia praecox and hysteria began in the same way. For some reason, the libido did not find compensation in reality and this led to autoeroticism. In hysteria, there was an attempt to compensate for this regression into autoeroticism by means of an excessive re-cathexis of the object. In dementia praecox, this attempt at compensation failed and only then did autoeroticism find its specific form which was characteristic of the illness.

Freud pointed out that Jung was still using the concept of autoeroticism in a very broad sense.¹⁰⁰ Jung included fantasy in autoeroticism while Freud chose to restrict the concept to the objectless. Freud, nonetheless, gave occasion for misunderstanding by saying that Jung's conception of paranoia agreed exactly with his own.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, Freud's statement, that the problem of a precise definition of the concept 'autoeroticism' involved the problem of the distinction between fantasy and reality¹⁰², must surely have given Jung the impression that he had a correct understanding of Freud.

Conclusion

Upon reviewing the period between Jung's visit to Vienna and Freud's visit to Zurich, it appears that the misunderstanding concerning autoeroticism was particularly relevant for the change in the relationship between Freud and Jung. Freud was especially eager to convince Jung of the enormous role which sexuality played in human life. He believed that he had succeeded in doing so when Jung, like himself, came to accept autoeroticism as constituting the core of dementia praecox. For Jung, however, autoeroticism did not only signify the autoerotic search for pleasure with one's own body but also included the whole erotic fantasy world into which one could withdraw. What gradually emerged then was Jung's very different view on the relation between drive, thought and reality. This developed by reflecting on infantile sexuality, which Freud had previously

99. 121J.

100. 122F.

101. "What you write about paranoia tallies exactly with certain of the hypotheses we, Ferenczi and I, worked out in Berchtesgaden, ..." 122F.

102. "May I suggest that you should not use the term autoerotism as inclusively as H. Ellis, that it should not include hysterical utilizations of libido, but only truly autoerotic states, in which all relation with objects have been abandoned." 122F.

constructed from the vantage point of the adult but which was now directly observed by both Jung and Freud.

In the meantime, Jung offered some noteworthy suggestions on the 'teleological' function of autoeroticism. Many of these were in keeping with Freud's later theory of narcissism. It is surprising then that Freud resolutely discarded these suggestions. The most probable explanation is that, owing to his conception of the psychic apparatus, Freud was primarily concerned with the problem of projection and did not as yet deal with the problem of the ego.

Infantile Sexuality (September 1908 - September 1909)

The *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen* was established at the Salzburg Congress. As editor, Jung had occasion to read most of the publications on psychoanalysis. The first issue of the *Jahrbuch* began with Freud's analysis of 'Little Hans', which immediately raised the issue of infantile sexuality and the role of the father. Jung received the manuscript of this analysis in August 1908¹⁰³ which may account for the fact that he immediately started to write the article, *The Significance of the Father in the Destiny of the Individual*, for that same issue of the *Jahrbuch*.

Jung himself presented the article to Freud as a sign of loyalty to the Freudian cause.¹⁰⁴ At the Salzburg Congress, Freud had reproached Jung for his continuing reluctance to accept the role of sexuality in the human psyche, associating this reluctance to the abiding influence of Bleuler's authority. The latter was even more hesitant than Jung with regards to all theories of sexuality. Things became rather unpleasant when Abraham, whom Jung had never forgiven for his Salzburg lecture, wrote several times to Freud, informing him that psychoanalysis was considered outdated in Zurich.¹⁰⁵ Consequently, it was with more than a little anxiety that Freud went to Zurich in September. He found Bleuler to be most hesitant but he was reassured of Jung's loyalty and pleased that the relation between Jung and Bleuler was almost at an end.¹⁰⁶

103. See 104F.

104. 117J.

105. Letter of Abraham to Freud, 16-7-1908 and 31-7-1908. In: *A Psychoanalytic Dialogue. The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham*, p. 44-49.

106. Letter of Freud to Abraham, 29-9-1908. In: *ibid.*, p. 51-52.

The Significance of the Father

It was in this atmosphere that Jung wrote *The Significance of the Father in the Destiny of the Individual*. The article mainly dealt with four brief case studies which showed the decisive role of the father relation in the child's later life. Three of the four cases concerned patients who had unconsciously structured their lives according to the model imposed upon them by their relationship with their fathers and who had succumbed to neurosis the moment they broke this pattern. Jung did not elaborate upon this very much. For instance, he simply gave a two page outline of a female patient who was suffering from depressive moods, nocturnal fear, palpitations of the heart and light nervous spasms. The anamnesis revealed that, as a child, she had been her father's favorite while her sister had been favoured by her mother. The father died when the patient was eight years old. As a faithful widow, the mother always impressed upon the children the need to venerate the deceased father. During adolescence, the patient fell in love exclusively with older men and, at the age of twenty-four, she married a widower of forty-four. He died four years later and for eighteen years, she remained a faithful widow. Finally at the age of forty-six, faced with the prospect of menopause, she suddenly felt a great need for love. Through a marriage bureau, she married the first available man, in this case, a rather coarse, violent man of sixty who had already been married twice and had been divorced by both wives in turn. She persevered with him for five years and when she finally got a divorce, neurosis set in.

Jung pointed out the transparency of the case. Until she was forty-six, the patient experienced nothing but a faithful reproduction of her family milieu. Sexuality, which finally announced itself urgently but too late, led her to accept a poor reincarnation of the father-surrogate. The failure of this attempt marked the beginning of neurosis.

This was a good illustration of Jung's views concerning the relation between infancy and later life. In infancy and early childhood (between 1 and 5 years), a certain constellation was imprinted upon the child, a certain manner of reacting. The child learned to conform to the parental pattern. The 'parent constellation' arising from this process of conformity should be understood within the context of the concept of associationism in Jung's theory of complexes. The child's ego complex constellated associations following the same type of pattern as that of the parents. Jung's theory was based on the research performed by one of his students, Emma Fürst, who had conducted association tests in twenty-four families. She had found that the father and son, on the one hand, and the mother and

daughter, on the other, usually belonged to the same reaction type. If, for instance, the mother generally reacted to the association test with value judgments, the daughter would do likewise.

The anamneses thus led Jung to the general conclusion that the child adapted to his parents and lived out his life in accordance with the constellation received in this manner. Jung wondered what made children attach themselves to their parents so strongly that they remained under the parents' influence for the rest of their lives. It was at this point that Jung introduced the sexuality of the child, which, even at that stage, influenced the child's relationship to his parents.

By way of illustration, Jung described the case of an eight year old boy who suffered from enuresis. Jung drew attention to the typical attitude of rivalry in the boy who was subject to attacks of fear at night because he had dreamed that a black snake or a black man wanted to kill his mother. The boy's crying had the effect of removing his mother from his rival. He also had dreamed that he himself was bitten by a black snake, which Jung interpreted as a homosexual component. The boy identified himself with his mother, who was being aggressively overpowered in coitus. In this perspective, enuresis was regarded as a surrogate for sexual desire.

Jung's view was as follows. Because the child had sexual desires, he conformed to his parents, adopting the parental constellation and possibly remaining its captive for life. Freud's influence was unmistakable here, particularly in Jung's conclusion:¹⁰⁷

"The infantile attitude, it is evident, is nothing but infantile sexuality. If we now survey all the far-reaching possibilities of the infantile constellation, we are obliged to say that *in essence our life's fate is identical with the fate of our sexuality.*"

There was, however, little mention of infantile sexuality as such. Jung merely pointed out that the son felt as if he was his father's rival. He added that the father's influence on the child was greater than the mother's. Even if the mother's role appeared predominant, one could usually discern the figure of the grandfather behind the mother. Concerning female patients as well, Jung emphasized the father's role in the

107. C.G. JUNG, *The Significance of the Father in the Destiny of the Individual*, C.W. IV, § 739 (original text in the footnote). Although the *Collected Works* limit themselves mostly to the last revised edition of Jung's works, in this particular case the original text of the article is given in footnote. The detailed confrontation of both versions gives a very sharp view on the way in which Jung later on modified his insights.

anamneses. Nevertheless, from the results of Emma Fürst's research, it appeared more likely that the stronger relations were rather between father and son on the one hand and mother and daughter on the other. Jung, however, did not explain how those elements were reconciled.

Consideration was also given to the opposition between desires imprinted by the parental constellation and personal desires arising in the adolescent life. In the second case description, for example, Jung remarked:¹⁰⁸

"The neurosis set in the moment the libido was withdrawn from the infantile relationship and for the first time came a bit nearer to an individually determined goal. In this as in the previous case, the family constellation proved to be by far stronger, so that the narrow field of neurosis was all that was left over for the struggling individuality."

A similar remark can be found elsewhere:¹⁰⁹

"In the most formative period between the first and the fifth year all the essential characteristics, which fit exactly into the parental mould, are already developed, for psychoanalytical experience teaches us that the first signs of the later conflict between the parental constellation and the individual's longing for independence, of the struggle between repression and libido (Freud), occur as a rule before the fifth year."

The question which arose here was what was the origin of these sexual desires which were in opposition to the parental constellation. In Jung's opinion, it seemed that they simply arose spontaneously in the individual. The equations parent constellation = repression and individual independence = libido seemed to point in this direction but Jung did not really consider the question. On the very first page, he defined the term 'libido' as the 'energy of the will'. Jung wrote: "Libido is what in older psychiatry is called 'will' or 'tendency'. The Freudian term is 'denominatio a potiori'.¹¹⁰ Clearly then, Jung's remarks here amounted to no more than paying lip service to Freud's theory of infantile sexuality.

Another important section of *The Significance of the Father in the Destiny of the Individual* was the three pages on religion and collective history. Jung began with a reference to Freud's article *Obsessive Actions*

108. *Ibid.*, § 715.

109. *Ibid.*, § 701. (Translation slightly modified to be nearer to the German original in the *Jahrbuch* 1 (1909) p. 159).

110. *Ibid.*, § 693 (original text in the footnote).

and Religious Practices.¹¹¹ In this article, Freud indicated the parallel between religious rites and the neurotic obsessive ceremony, drafting the following hypothesis: both obsession and religion were based upon the fact that certain drives were denied fulfilment. Their fundamental difference was to be found in the nature of the repressed drives. In obsession, only the sexual drives were repressed while in religion, there was repression of all the egotistical and anti-social components of the instinctual life. In his conclusion, Freud adopted the following view on cultural history: the prerequisite for the development of human culture seemed to lie in the foregoing of the direct primary fulfilment of instincts. This was largely the task of religion which required man to sacrifice his instinct to the gods. The claim of religion, that revenge belonged to the gods alone, was an expression of the fact that man had relinquished his anti-social tendencies. The gods therefore were originally endowed with all human vices. Since the gods held the right of exacting revenge, man could not make use of it. It should be noted that nowhere in this description did Freud use the terms 'projection' or 'identification'.

In *The Significance of the Father in the Destiny of the Individual*, Jung proceeded along the same lines as Freud, from reflection on the role of the father in the life of the individual to more general ideas on the meaning of religion. Jung did, however, employ the term 'identification'. He presented the following outline. The religion of the Old Testament raised the father to the level of a god in an incomplete and unsuccessful sublimation. This merely led to neurotic fear. Then came the prophets, who accomplished the identification with Yahweh; in other words, complete sublimation. Christ, who came to fulfil the prophecies, eliminated the fear of God, teaching that the true relation to God was one of love.¹¹² It is in this article that we find all elements of the Oedipus complex, including identification described for the first time in psychoanalytic literature.

This was not the end of Jung's presentation of religion. He further analyzed its development in the life of the individual. In this analysis, certain elements which were to be characteristic of later Jungian thought can be clearly discerned. As a child, man lived spontaneously under the parent's authority as if under a destiny. As the child grew, however, a

111. S. FREUD, *Obsessive Actions and Religious Practices*, S.E. IX, 115-127, G.W. VII, 127-139.

112. C.G. JUNG, *The Significance of the Father in the Destiny of the Individual*, C.W. IV, § 738 (original text in the footnote).

conflict arose between the infantile constellation and the emerging individuality. A consequence of this was that the parents' influence was repressed but did not disappear, thus making itself felt from the unconscious often in rather mysterious ways. This was the root of 'religious sublimations'. At the same time, the father image was split up in a remarkable way. The place of the father with his constellating virtues and faults was now taken up, on the one hand, by an absolute and exalted God, who was credited with sublime love, and, on the other hand, by the devil, who was attributed with the lower sexual drive. In neurosis, this conflict was pushed to the extreme. God became the symbol of the strongest form of sexual repression while the devil became the symbol of sexual desire. By splitting up, the father constellation became like the head of Janus with its yes and no components, as did all unconscious complexes.¹¹³

What was particularly striking in Jung's representation was his concept of the conflict as taking place between on the one hand, the constellation, which the child had received from its parents, and on the other hand, individuality, which apparently originated through maturation from an innate germ. Another point to be noted was the theme of the splitting up of the components. Here one could already discover traces of the later theory of enantiodromia. Unfortunately, Jung did not treat this theme more fully in the article.

We do not have any comment made by Freud concerning this article. It is possible that he did not read it until the publication of the *Jahrbuch* in March 1909. That same month, Jung visited Freud in Vienna and many matters were discussed. In the meantime however, *The Significance of the Father in the Destiny of the Individual* was no longer at the centre of attention since both Freud and Jung were fascinated by the observations on Jung's daughter Agathli, whose reaction to the birth of her brother in late 1908 showed remarkable similarities to 'Little Hans'. Jung published his observations on his daughter in the following issue of the *Jahrbuch*, under the title *Psychic conflicts in a Child*. For the occasion, 'Agathli' was called 'Anna'.¹¹⁴

113. *Ibid.*, § 741 (original text in the footnote).

114. According to the catalogue of Jung's manuscripts in the Library of the University of the Swiss Confederation (ETH) in Zurich, the original title for the study was *Observations on the Origin and the Development of a Phobia in a Four-Year-Old Girl*, (Beobachtungen über Entstehung und Verlauf einer Phobie bei einen 4-jährigen Mädchen), reflecting Freud's *Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy*.

Little Anna

Freud regarded his *Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy* as the confirmation, through direct observation, of his theory of infantile sexuality, which he had earlier deduced from the analysis of adult patients. The basic element of the boy's (little Hans) phobia proved to be rivalry with his father for the possession of his mother. It also became unmistakably clear that fear of castration held a central position in the rivalry attitude. With little Hans, one also came across various infantile fantasies concerning pregnancy and birth as well as the burning question of the father's mysterious role in all of this. Jung had already read Freud's manuscript when, on the occasion of the birth of his son Franz (December 1908), his four-year-old daughter Agathli (little Anna) appeared to have many questions and fantasies which sounded very similar to those of little Hans. From January until August 1909, Jung gave a detailed account of this to Freud who showed a lively interest in the new information for his own hypothesis. These reports were finally published in 1910.¹¹⁵

The question troubling Anna was, of course, where did children come from? It was observed that, while playing, she tried to picture how this would happen. The stork story had made her suspicious from the very beginning since her mother's pregnancy had not passed unnoticed. After she had realized that the baby came out of the mother, she tried to imagine how it got out of the mother's body and then how it had gotten there in the first place. Did it come out of the anus like excrement? Was it thrown up? Did the child get into the mother through the mouth? And finally, what was the role of her father in all this? There was much symbolism in her fantasies. She dreamed, for instance, of Noah's Ark with a trap-door at the bottom, through which the animals fell out.

However, more important than these and other fantasies which showed an obvious Oedipal character, was the theoretical context in which Jung placed his observations. On this point, his hypothesis was different and even poorer than Freud's.

In the first place, there was a short phobic episode. At night, Anna often woke her parents in fear, because of an earthquake. During the day, she was also preoccupied with this theme. Whenever she was taken for a walk, she asked whether they would not return to find the house destroyed by an earthquake. A stone on the road was also from an earthquake. Once

115. *Psychic Conflicts in a Child*, C.W. XVII, § 1-179. It is clear from 151J that the article had already been edited before the trip to America in September 1909. One of his lectures in Worcester dealt with this article.

she was told that earthquakes only occurred in places where there were volcanoes, she never tired of looking at atlases, in which she wanted to be shown all the volcanoes.

Jung did not analyze the content of the phobia. He merely indicated that this phobia began during a period when Anna distrusted her parents because they had told her the stork story. The fear generated by this distrust fixated itself upon the theme of the earthquake of Messiah, which had recently been discussed at table. Anna's interest in volcanoes disappeared the moment she was told that children grew in their mothers' bodies.

Jung's explanation did not proceed from a content analysis of the phobia but from the 'typical process of introversion'. This was the first explicit mention of the term in Jung's writings. The distrust caused by the stork story caused the child to withdraw part of her love for her parents. The libido which had been cathected in the parents thus became objectless and was 'introverted'. In other words, it was directed towards the subject herself and it expressed itself in a heightened fantasy. Introversion then was a compensation for the de-cathexis of the object.¹¹⁶

"The elegiac reveries express the fact that part of the love, which formerly belonged, and should belong, to a real object, is now introverted, that is, it is turned inwards into the subject and there produces an increased fantasy activity."

This passage was extended with a footnote:

"This process is altogether typical. When life comes up against an obstacle, so that no adaptation can be achieved and the transference of libido to reality is suspended, then introversion takes place. That is to say, instead of the libido working towards reality there is increased fantasy activity which aims at removing the obstacle, or at least removing it in fantasy, and this may in time lead to a practical solution. Hence the exaggerated sexual fantasies of neurotics, who in this way try to overcome their specific repression."

It seems then that the term 'introversion' corresponded exactly to the concept of autoeroticism as understood by Jung. In a de-cathexis of a libidinous object, reality was replaced by fantasy. What we also find here is Jung's theory that this withdrawal of the libido into the individual's own fantasy world served to protect the individual. Jung considered that since Anna was only four years old and consequently possessed little

116. *Ibid.*, § 13.

capacity for sublimation, introversion could do no more than produce some slight symptoms. Fear was released so that Anna once again, just as a few years before, attempted to force her mother's love by crying at night.¹¹⁷

What was new in Jung's theory was the affirmation that introversion prepared a solution for the reality conflict. However, Jung's precise position on this point remained unclear. In the case of Little Anna, he only mentioned that once she had been told the truth about birth, she conquered her phobia for volcanoes by imagining that she had a big brother who could do everything and who protected her. In the meantime, however, trust had been restored from the outside, so that the phobic episode seemed to have been brought to an end by a solution to the reality conflict rather than by introversion itself.

Signs of Reversal

The most significant expressions of Jung's theoretical insights in the period between Freud's visit to Zurich and the trip to America were *The Significance of the Father in the Destiny of the Individual* and 'Little Anna'. After the publication of 'Little Hans', Freud was especially concerned with the analysis of the 'Ratman'. There was little mention of this in his letters to Jung. He merely stated that he was fascinated by the case since it provided him with a deeper insight into the nature of obsessional neurosis.

The correspondence in this period was rather poor on the theoretical level except for the sections on the treatment of Otto Gross and the observations of Little Anna. The letters mostly dealt with problems of organizing and some reflections on the evolution of the psychoanalytic movement. Nevertheless both gave certain indications of new insights.

Freud wrote several times that he was obsessed by the idea of a central complex as the basis of all neuroses.¹¹⁸ The term 'Oedipus complex' was not yet mentioned here but having noted the central position of castration in the analysis of 'Little Hans' and the 'Ratman', Freud summarized this central complex in the following way: fear of the father and distrust in adults. Both of these elements could be completely transferred to the analyst.¹¹⁹

117. *Ibid.*, § 18.

118. 118F, 129F.

119. 129F.

Jung was also in search of a central complex but a complex that was connected with the prospective tendencies of the human psyche. "If there is a 'Psychoanalysis', there must also be a 'Psychosynthesis' which creates future events according to the same laws."¹²⁰ This term seems thus to have been coined by Jung. We know that he met R. Assagnoli (1888-1974) a few months later. The following year, the latter defended his famous thesis on 'Psychosynthesis'.¹²¹

Coinciding with his faith in the hidden teleology of the psyche was Jung's renewed interest in parapsychological phenomena, both of which were connected to a very complex affective relation to Freud. When Jung visited Freud in March 1909, they discussed parapsychology and precognition. Freud dismissed the topic as so much nonsense. Just then, a loud bang was heard from the next room. Jung immediately predicted a second bang which was actually heard. At the time of the event, Freud was rather bewildered. However, he later wrote to Jung that with the latter's departure, the impression made by the event had also disappeared. During the same visit, they had also discussed the father-son relation between them.¹²² Once he had returned home, Jung wrote to Freud that he was happy since he now felt free of any oppressive paternal authority.¹²³ Freud replied bitterly:¹²⁴

"It is strange that on the very same evening when I formally adopted you as eldest son and anointed you - *in partibus infidelium* - as my successor and crown prince, you should have divested me of my paternal dignity, which divesting seems to have given you as much pleasure as I, on the contrary, derived from the investiture of your person."

In September 1909, Jung and Freud travelled to America together, where they had both been invited by Stanly Hall to accept an honorary doctorate from Clark University. Their personal problems came to the surface as early as the port of Bremen, where they embarked on the trip with Dr. Sandor Ferenczi. At table, they discussed the well-preserved prehistoric bodies which had been found in the marshes of Northern Germany. The topic made Freud nervous and he repeatedly asked Jung what he was hinting at with the story of these bodies. Then Freud suddenly fainted. He later explained that he had been convinced that Jung

120. 138J.

121. G. WEHR, *Jung. A Biography*, p. 111.

122. 139F and C.G. JUNG, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 152-154.

123. 138J.

124. 139F.

wished him dead. Such affective problems were regularly discussed by Jung and Freud, especially when they were doing collective dream analyses.¹²⁵ In his autobiography, Jung wrote that one of the turning points in his relation with Freud was when the latter refused to reveal certain matters from his private life during one of these dream analyses because he was afraid of undermining his own authority.¹²⁶

At Clark University, Freud delivered a series of lectures *On Psychoanalysis*. Jung gave three lectures: one on his association test, one on family constellations and one on his analysis of 'Little Anna'.

Conclusion

After a period of hesitation, Jung came to accept the role of sexuality in psychic development. It appeared to Freud as if Jung had finally accepted the nucleus of the psychoanalytical theory.

On closer examination, however, it can be seen how, from the very beginning, Jung viewed psychic phenomena from a quite different perspective. While Freud's attention was mainly focused on a detailed analysis of the sexual drive, Jung remained preoccupied with the constitution of the subject. A typical example of the latter perspective was Jung's misunderstanding of the return to autoeroticism as a regression into a fantasy world. In light of von Hartmann's Romantic view of the unconscious and with the later evolution of Jung's thought in mind, one can clearly express Jung's conception in the following way: the unconscious was the mother of the conscious. Fantasy was the lower form of psychic activity from which thought and orientation to the outside world later developed. Jung evidently discerned a certain teleology. Fantasy played a role in the constitution of the ego and was concerned with psychic self-preservation. In his analysis of Little Anna, Jung was not primarily concerned with finding parallels with the case of Little Hans. His attention was mainly focused on the mechanism of introversion, which he did not merely regard as a morbid, regressive phenomenon but also as a return to the source. Jung clearly saw this constitution of the subject as taking place from within. The conflict between parental constellation and individuality about which he spoke, could hardly be thought of as anything other than individuality unfolding itself through a process of maturation.

125. C.G. JUNG, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 155-156.

126. *Ibid.*, p. 154.

Freud, on the other hand, placed much more emphasis on the influence of the outside world on the subject. In 'Little Hans' and the 'Rat-man', the father-figure was central. It was not long before Freud arrived at his most explicit thesis: the difference between pleasure and reality.

Apart from this difference in their final views on the unconscious, we have seen both Freud and Jung beginning to reflect upon the problem of culture and religion. Both of them felt that culture and religion involved the renunciation of an immediate fulfilment of drives. Both still valued religion positively. It was religion which gave rise to culture.

As for schizophrenia, it is quite remarkable how Freud combined dementia praecox and paranoia in a theory which brought together observations from both syndromes. It is also apparent that Freud displayed a spontaneous affective repulsion for an organic approach, whereas Jung did not find a somatic approach irreconcilable with psychological analysis.