

Ferenczi and Jung: some parallel lines?¹

André Haynal, *Geneva* & Ernst Falzeder, Salzburg

Abstract: In the complexity of the entangled interactions within the group of psycho-analytical pioneers, their divergent interests and views, the Ferenczi-Jung relationship is of particular interest given the importance that both had in the field of the history of ideas. It is striking to discover some parallel lines, but interpersonal, institutional and socio-cultural factors contributed to the fact that this peaceful and complementary collaboration was not possible in the long run. Perhaps for the present generation, in retrospective, it is easier to notice seminal strokes and also some deficiencies in all these thinkers.

Key words: Ferenczi, Freud, Jung, libido, symbols, taboo, totem.

The early history of psychoanalysis, particularly the entangled interactions within the group of psychoanalytic pioneers, are more complex than has generally been supposed or admitted. In this paper, we want to have a closer look at one of those interactions, the relationship between Carl Gustav Jung and Sándor Ferenczi, based on recently published correspondence, primarily the Freud/Ferenczi correspondence, and, to some extent, that between Freud and Jung, Freud and Abraham, and others.

The relationship between Ferenczi and Jung cannot be conceived independently of the shadow that Freud always cast upon it. In fact, it is a triangular relationship, with Freud and Jung as the possible leaders – Freud the founder of psychoanalysis, and Jung the heir apparent – and Ferenczi in between, always very keen to be close to Freud, whatever sacrifice this implied. Maybe Ferenczi himself harboured some hopes to become the heir himself – we have some references for this. So Ferenczi writes about himself: ‘... he became the proclaimed crown prince ... Freud seems to have expected something similar of Jung years ago’ (1985 [1932], 4.8.1932). One of the facts that could further support this supposition is situated around their famous trip to Clark University in 1909: Freud and Jung were personally invited, and Freud in his turn

¹ A former version of this text was presented by André Haynal at the Second History of Analytical Psychology Symposium organized by the C. G. Jung Institute of San Francisco, and co-sponsored by the JAP, in Tiburon, CA, April 2002.

invited *Ferenczi* to accompany him – and not Abraham or any other of his disciples.

Beginnings

Let us begin by situating the work of our two protagonists. At the start, the two of them were rather close to each other, due, among other things, to a certain *parallelism* in their thinking. Despite their different cultural backgrounds, there are some striking similarities in their respective approaches.

- Ferenczi shared Jung’s fascination with the *association* experiment – a link to the upcoming ‘scientific’ psychology of their time, as in the work of Wilhelm Wundt and others.
- At that time, both showed a strong interest in psychoanalysis as a *therapy*. They had an ambition to practise it in the best possible way, even with very *disturbed* patients.
- Mirroring this primary interest in the therapeutic aspect of psychoanalysis, they attributed great importance to *transference and countertransference*.
- If countertransference, for both of them, helped to better understand the patient, they also acknowledged that patients enlighten and help themselves. Jung, for instance, writes to Freud in the case of Otto Gross: ‘Whenever I got stuck, he analysed me. In this way my own psychic health has benefited’ (25 May 1908; Freud & Jung 1974, p. 153). Or, regarding the case of Frau Hirschfeld (cf. Falzeder 1994): ‘I couldn’t withhold my sympathy, and, since it was there anyway, I gladly offered it to the patient’ (Jung to Freud 2 January 1912; Freud & Jung 1974, pp. 476–477). To the authors, this is indeed reminiscent of Ferenczi’s later dictum in his Clinical Diary (1985): ‘*Ohne Sympathie keine Heilung*’ [There is no healing without sympathy]. And also reminiscent, by the way, of Ferenczi’s learning about himself through the case of R. N. (whom we can identify today as Elisabeth Severn) (*ibid.*).
- Interestingly, both of them practised *mutual analysis* in certain situations, one of the first occasions being the dream analyses between Freud, Jung and Ferenczi on board the steamer *George Washington* on their way to America. We know about the famous (or infamous) incident in which Freud stopped associating to one of his dreams, declaring that he did not want to lose his authority, while Jung later told that this was precisely the moment when Freud lost it in his eyes (Jung 1962).
- Moreover, Ferenczi and Jung emphasized the ‘here and now’ in the therapeutic situation – ‘catching the hare in the present’, in Ferenczi’s words, as opposed to ‘slaying the dragons of the past’, to use Freud’s metaphor (cf. Haynal & Falzeder 1993).
- They also saw the major role of the analyst in this perspective, and thus we find basically the same attitude towards all these problems, especially as far as the importance of training analysis is concerned.

- Approaching the end of their lives, both wrote their memoirs about their inner experiences, Ferenczi his *Clinical Diary* (1985 [1932]), Jung his *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (1962).
- On a theoretical level, let us mention their consideration of the role of the mother in the development of the individual.

In early 1911, Ferenczi wrote to Freud about Jung:

After mature reflection, I must also unreservedly share your opinion about Jung's future role in psychoanalysis. His two great deeds: his courageous and independent stand in recognizing your ideas – as well as the first experiments in psychiatry assure him this role, even if he didn't accomplish any more. Where the Viennese have a head-start over him is in the psychoanalytic *routine* acquired with you. But I see in my own case that only some practice and a little sense for solving psychological riddles is required to acquire *this*. But what eludes the Viennese and what Jung possesses in ever increasing measure is the recognition that psychoanalysis must begin with self-criticism, without which every analysis can acquire a paranoid wrapper (see Adler)

(192 Fer., 3 January 1911; Freud & Ferenczi, 1993, p. 248, italics in the orig.)

Speaking about self-criticism implies speaking about the introspection of the analyst, and, as Ferenczi would later speak of it, about *honesty* and modesty (Ferenczi 1928 [1927], p. 94, 95 and 1985 [1932], *passim*). Jung and Ferenczi were inclined, and more so than others such as Freud, to descend into their own profound unconscious. Jung, however, was more cautious, also warning against this (perhaps out of a certain fear of psychosis), while Ferenczi was more optimistic and went ahead without guarding himself too much – and by consequence suffered in many ways, somatically with hypochondriac symptoms as well as emotionally in depressive spells.

Another interest they shared (in opposition, e.g., to Jones and Abraham) was in *occultism*. We know of Jung's experiments with his cousin, Hélène Preiswerk, who became the subject of his medical dissertation (i.e., his work for the MD degree in Basel), and we know of Ferenczi's enthusiastic hunt for clairvoyants and other parapsychologically interesting persons all over Europe, especially after their joint trip with Freud to America in 1909. Perhaps it is just this sensitivity that brought about *erotic* temptations or acting-out in their work; it is remarkable how they struggled to come to terms with the consequences in general in an honest and self-critical way. Jung's '*ménage à trois*' with his wife Emma and his former analysand and later mistress, Toni Wolff, is notoriously mentioned; Ferenczi's imbroglio with Elma Palos, daughter of his mistress Gizella and also his analysand, also became a frequent subject of lengthy discussions in the exchanges between Ferenczi and Freud (Freud/Ferenczi 1993, 2000 *passim*).

It is also important to note that, contrary to Freud's neurological background, they both had an in-depth *psychiatric* training and vast experience with psychiatric cases; Ferenczi was even as an expert witness before the Budapest court, and Jung was in a senior position at one of the most progressive and

famous University Clinics in continental Europe at that time. Against this background, it is not surprising that Ferenczi, in his correspondence with Freud, often expressed a very positive opinion about Jung.

Last but not least, we can even surmise that Ferenczi's first analyst may have been Jung (transcript of Aniela Jaffé's interviews with Jung, Library of Congress; Sonu Shamdasani, personal communication); this analytic encounter may be situated at the beginning of Ferenczi's interest in analyses, before his first visit to Freud and the subsequent 'tranches' of psychoanalysis with him.

On the other hand, it is equally true that their respective *conceptions* about psychoanalysis often *diverged* and this from the beginning, too. Ferenczi's adherence to the theory of trauma, especially in his late work, is certainly opposed to Jung's perspective of pathology as a consequence of human constitution, relatively independent of influences of the outer world. In this, Jung is closer to Abraham, and perhaps even more so to the latter's pupil, Melanie Klein. Thus Jung can write that what exists in the *Innenvelt* [the inner world] of the newborn is not nothing, but 'a complicated precondition that is very precisely determined in each individual case' [*komplizierte in individuell aufs schärfste determinierte Voraussetzung*] (Jung 1954, pp. 92–93). For Jung, neurosis is not determined by a 'pathological misconception or denial of the outer world' [*krankhafte Verkennung oder Verleugnung der Aussenwelt*], but the psyche is determined also independently of the personal experience. The events in the individual's history mobilize archetypal forces, and the interplay between the two determines inner life. In this context it is interesting to note that Freud published *Totem and Taboo* after the break with Jung (1912/13) – was it in the framework of his mourning work? – with its emphasis on the phylogenetic heritage. This idea gave place to a lively discussion between him and Ferenczi under the headline 'Lamarck-work'. After a series of enthusiastic reactions (Freud bought a lot of books to prepare this supposedly common work with Ferenczi) Freud deserted this subject and Ferenczi took it on himself to write this alone and he published it under the title 'Thalassa' (1924).

Typological differences also play an important role, leading to the 'personal equation' [*persönliche Gleichung*] – a notion that appears (late) in Freud's *The Question of Lay Analysis* (1926e, p. 220), where he makes reference to this originally astronomical metaphor. Ferenczi takes this expression up in 1928 (Ferenczi 1928 [1927], p. 88)...

In this context, it is interesting to see the image that Jung gives about the unconscious: 'Regardless how large the conscious may be, it is and remains the smaller circle, embedded in the larger one, the unconscious – the island *surrounded by the sea*. And just like the sea, the unconscious gives birth to an infinite and always reviving number of living beings, whose richness cannot be approached. Even if one has long known about the importance, the effects, and the properties of the unconscious elements, one has never fathomed their depth and possibilities, as they are able of endless variations, and cannot be decreased to a lower power. The only practical way to deal with them is to try

to give the conscious such an attitude which *allows the unconscious to cooperate* instead of to oppose' (Jung 1946, pp. 21–22; our translation, italics in the original).

This metaphor of the sea gives us a good idea of how Jung conceived of the unconscious, and also of what it implies, the insecurity that the ego can feel, i.e. its being threatened of being overwhelmed in psychosis: 'The doctor knows very well that the sick person needs an island, without he would be lost' (Jung 1946, p. 18). We can contrast this with Freud's metaphor of the Zuider Zee that has to be drained so that 'Where id was, there ego shall be' (1933a, p. 80). As far as Ferenczi is concerned, one could think that, with the importance he attaches to the notion of *splitting*, his is a somewhat different (third) model. (The notion of splitting – in this sense – appears only very late in Freud's work, e.g. in 1938 [Freud, 1940e (1938)], possibly after years of mourning work over the loss of his dear friend Ferenczi.) Nevertheless, let us also mention the later Jung's statement: 'The doctor must not elude being touched if the cure shall succeed' (1946, pp. 57–58). Isn't this parallel to the importance of *Einfühlung*, of *empathy*, in the case of Ferenczi? Jung's warning against the dangers of intensive transference relationships finds another parallel in Freud's analogy between psychoanalysis and 'the effect of X-rays on people who handle them without taking special precautions' (Freud 1937c, p. 249). (Incidentally, X-rays were discovered by Wilhelm Conrad Röntgen in 1895, the year in which Breuer's and Freud's *Studies on Hysteria* were published.) Perhaps Freud and (later) Jung share a kind of aversion to deep regression that Ferenczi, with his imperturbable optimism, seems more to ignore.

Triangle

But not everything runs parallel and, with times changing, the picture begins to change. After a meeting between Freud and Jung did not come about, on the occasion of Freud's visit to Binswanger in Kreuzlingen – what Jung later calls the 'Kreuzlingen gesture' – Freud explained to Ferenczi: 'It is now quite clear with Jung. I received the following letter from him after five weeks' interruption:

... Dear Professor, Until now I didn't know what to say to your letter. Now I can only say: I understand the Kreuzlingen gesture. Whether your policy is the right one will become apparent from the success or failure of my future work. I have always kept my distance, and this will guard against any imitation of Adler's disloyalty.

(316 F, 28 July 1912; Freud & Ferenczi 1993, p. 398)

The scientific break between Freud and Jung was brought about, to a large extent, by the latter's work on *Symbols and Transformations of the Libido* [*Symbole und Wandlungen der Libido*] (Jung 1911/12). Freud initiated a 'war-plan' against it in his journal, as he wrote to Ferenczi:

The Zentralblatt is obligated to review all publications and has, up to now, grossly neglected this duty with respect to the *Jahrbuch*. Now, I want to inspire these critiques myself. But I can't write them myself, and I should select people here, perhaps Reitler, Hitschmann, Tausk, who are prepared to delineate my views. It should not be a secret that I am behind it. But I am counting on you as the general staff in this internal campaign. I don't need to inspire you, so I am asking you directly whether you want to participate in these critical papers about the *Jahrbuch*. If so, then I will make sure that a *pars leonina* [the lion's share; the greatest part] remains reserved for you.

(325 F, 2 October 1912; *ibid.*, p. 409)

Ferenczi answered in an embarrassed and somewhat ambivalent manner: 'As you see, I am beginning to get into the critique of Jung. But I don't consider this task a personal one; I only want to be the exponent of our common efforts' (330 Fer, 21 October 1912; *ibid.*, p. 415). And he asked Freud to help him in this task, contrasting this with the 'significant scene' in Palermo, when Ferenczi had refused to take down the notes Freud had wanted to dictate to him. This created a highly interesting context, because in his next letter to Freud Ferenczi reproaches Jung for not understanding that the most important task of psychoanalysis would be the 'demolition of the father imago':

He identifies confession with psychoanalysis and evidently doesn't know that the confession of sins is the lesser task of a therapy: the greater one is the *demolition of the father imago*, which is completely absent in confession. Evidently Jung *never* wanted (and was not able) to let himself be demolished by a patient. So he has *never* analysed, but has always remained the *saviour* to his patients, who suns himself in his God-like nature!

And here he introduced the idea of the Christian community, saying that in Freud Jung has found a man who resembles God and wants to be a saviour of his patients. 'At every moment he [Jung] slides off the tracks of observational science and becomes the founder of a religion. His main concern is not *libido theory* but the salvation of the Christian community' (331 Fer, 25 October 1912; *ibid.*, p. 417, italics in the original).

Two months later Ferenczi wrote to Freud:

Jung's behaviour is uncommonly impudent. He forgets that it was *he* who demanded the 'analytic community' of students and treating students like patients. But as soon as it has to do with him, he doesn't want this rule to be valid anymore. *Mutual analysis* is nonsense, also an impossibility. Everyone must be able to tolerate an authority over himself from whom he accepts analytic correction. You are probably the only one who can permit himself to do without an analyst; but that is actually no *advantage* for you, i.e., for your analysis, but a necessity [...]. Despite all the deficiencies of self-analysis (which is certainly lengthier and more difficult than being analysed), we have to expect of you the ability to keep your symptoms in check. [...] But what is valid for *you* is not valid for the rest of us. [...] For better or for worse: in future you also have to content yourself with self-analysis, from which such a rich harvest has grown for the benefit of science [...] – I, too, went through a period of rebellion against your 'treatment' [...] Jung is the typical instigator and founder of religion.

The *father* plays almost no role in his new work; the *Christian community of brothers* takes up all the more room in it.

(362 Fer, 26 December 1912; *ibid.*, pp. 449–450, italics in the original)

Here we witness the beginnings of how alleged differences between Christians and Jews were viewed as problems, with Jung and the Zürichers on the one side, and Freud, Ferenczi, and others (e.g., Abraham) on the other one. At first, Freud thought of Jung's Christianity as an advantage for the psychoanalytic movement, as we read in his letter to Abraham: 'I was almost going to say that it was only by his [Jung's] emergence on the scene that psychoanalysis was removed from the danger of becoming a Jewish national affair' (3 May 1908).² Or, again to Abraham: 'Our Aryan comrades are really quite indispensable to us, otherwise psychoanalysis would fall a victim to anti-Semitism' (26 December 1908). But if Freud did not want psychoanalysis to become an all-Jewish affair, he neither wanted it to be entrusted to the Goyim, as he stated later to Ferenczi: 'In the Society we are now in the process of setting up a Society hangout attached to Rank's new home. It is supposed to be the clear expression of our will to live independent of Aryan patronage' (392 F, 4 May 1913; Freud & Ferenczi, 1993, p. 482). Freud decides, telling Ferenczi: no more diplomacy, because 'Diplomacy will certainly no longer be of use against the anti-Semitism unleashed by our Zürichers' (*ibid.*, p. 481).

Freud's work on *Totem and Taboo* (1912/13) actually runs parallel to his gradual separation from Jung; he finished the text in May 1913, and he finished practically with Jung in the same summer. Obviously, he was satisfied with what he did: 'I am now writing about the totem with the feeling that it is my greatest, best, and perhaps my last good thing. Inner certainties tell me that I am right' (392 F, 4 May 1913; Freud & Ferenczi 1993, p. 482). Ferenczi also praised *Totem and Taboo*, but his interpretation was different: he considered it as the last act in the demolition of the father (406 Fer, 23 June 1913; *ibid.*, p. 494). This is the context in which Freud suddenly could work on omnipotence (327 F, 17 October 1912; *ibid.*, p. 411). As already mentioned, Freud's situation in his circle seemed to be mirrored in *Totem and Taboo*. We could also say that it is a mythic elaboration of his feelings about the group composed by his (male) collaborators. Immersed in his work on *Totem and Taboo*, Freud wrote, based on an account of Binswanger, that the Swiss 'were now doubting the influence of infantile complexes and are at the point of already

² The Freud/Abraham letters are quoted according to the complete edition in a new translation by Caroline Schwarzacher, being prepared for publication by Ernst Falzeder (forthcoming). The complete quotation would run: 'Be tolerant and do not forget really it is easier for you to follow my thoughts than for Jung, since to begin with you are completely independent, and then you are closer to my intellectual constitution through racial kinship, while he as a Christian and a pastor's son finds his way to me only against great inner resistances. His association with us is therefore all the more valuable. I was almost going to say that it was only by his emergence on the scene that psychoanalysis was removed from the danger of becoming a Jewish national affair' (*ibid.*).

appealing to racial difference in order to explain the theoretical discrepancy. Those must be pretty shallow experiences to make such doubts possible. The fact that, once again, it is a matter of the ‘way for travelling salesmen’ [*Weg für Handlungsreisende*]³ is evident from a statement of Jung’s reported by Oberholzer to the effect that it is not necessary in analysis to go into the details of the experiences; one can be content with uncovering the ‘tendencies’! Jung must now be in a florid neurosis. However this turns out, my intention of amalgamating Jews and Goyim in the service of $\psi\alpha$ seems now to have gone awry. They are separating like oil and water’ (316 F, 28 July 1912; *ibid.*, p. 399). Ferenczi answered: ‘The other Swiss are all too much under the influence of his suggestion, and they are all a bunch of anti-Semites. It has never been so clear to me as now what a psychic advantage there is in having been born a Jew and having remained protected from this atavistic nonsense’ (317 Fer, 6 August 1912; *ibid.*, p. 400).

Two months later Freud reported: ‘A long letter from Maeder about our differences, very friendly, open, and decent; no attempt at all to gloss over Jung’s behaviour, but otherwise full of slanted views and clear anti-Semitic stirrings’ (327 F, 17 October 1912; *ibid.*, p. 411). And he concluded this letter in writing: ‘According to my mood, I would sooner compare myself with the historical Moses than the one by Michelangelo, which I interpreted’ (*ibid.*). (Freud interpreted Moses as a man who suppresses an immense rage and wrath [Freud, 1914b].) Moses was on his mind: ‘I am working further on Moses, of whom there is also a plaster cast here’ (338 F, 3 November 1912; *ibid.*, p. 424). Freud’s interest in Michelangelo’s statue was of old standing. He went to see it on his very first visit to Rome in 1901, as well as on many later occasions, for instance immediately after the Munich Congress (September 1913).⁴ This was the last congress Freud and Jung attended together, and Freud spoke about the case of their common patient, Frau Hirschfeld, his ‘grand patient’ and ‘chief tormentor’ (Falzeder 1994), using it to distance himself from Jung’s views. In Rome, he went every day to see Michelangelo’s statue of

³ *Weg für Handlungsreisende*: an expression Freud repeatedly used in his correspondence when he wanted to warn against the dangers of compromises in order to ‘sell’ psychoanalysis (e.g. 947 F, 4 February 1924; Freud & Ferenczi, 2000, p. 122, in connection with Otto Rank). Freud’s metaphor might be based on the fact that *Handlungsreisende*, because of their travelling, had only very little storage capacity for their goods, and so concentrated only on things that sold well and were to the taste of their customers. The ‘way’ for travelling salesmen might thus be the one provoking the least resistance.

⁴ Cf. his letter to Edoardo Weiss: ‘My relationship to this work [Moses] is something like that to a love child [*Kind der Liebe* = illegitimate child]. Every day for three lonely weeks in September of 1913 I stood in the church in front of the statue, studying it, measuring and drawing it until there dawned on me that understanding which in the essay I only dared to express anonymously. Not until much later did I legitimize this nonanalytic child’ (12 April 1933; Freud 1960, p. 416). Cf. also Freud’s recently published *Reisebriefe* (Freud 2002).

Moses (while at the same time he wrote his essay on narcissism, not on Moses).

Fury, passion, transgression, violation of the law – basically the subject of the son's rebellion against the father: these are the essential themes behind the Moses text, as also present later in November 1923, when he interprets one of his dreams 'to mean that 'young David' – Rank – wanted to slay 'boastful Goliath' – Freud; 'You are the formidable David who, with his trauma of birth, will manage to invalidate my work'' (Gay 1988, p. 480). Clearly, these are the topics that are occupying Freud; and, in fact, the male version of what he calls the Oedipus complex is the central theme of his life's work.

He was also aware of the ambivalence such a constellation arouses. Did he not write, exactly in *Totem and Taboo*: '*dass der Verehrung, ja Vergötterung [der privilegierten Personen] im Unbewussten eine intensive feinselige Strömung entgegensteht*' (1912/13, GW IX, p. 63) ['... that alongside the veneration, and indeed idolization, felt towards them, there is in the unconscious an opposing current of intense hostility'; SE 13, p. 49]. We are reminded of Ferenczi's observation in his *Clinical Diary*: '[Freud] alone can afford not to be analysed'. We would add: not to be analysed – unlike other human beings.

Epilogue

John Kerr (1993) is right in thinking that the great tragedy in the history of psychoanalysis is that of Freud and of modernity – i.e. the idea that there can be only one Truth, and that one great narrative of modernity in psychotherapy should be constructed. Jung, in the same epoch, conceived different *Psychologische Typen* (Jung 1921), psychological types, of different sensibilities, subjectivities, and thus different ways of understanding; moreover, that there is not only the Oedipus myth but many other myths which may reflect deep intrapsychic realities – a concept that we can see today as post-modernist.

Freud wanted to be a hero of modernity, like Galileo, Darwin, or Einstein, a discoverer of *the* Truth (the one and only 'scientific' Truth), or at least be the one, like Moses, who has to proclaim it. He did not suspect that he would only be able to declare *his own* truth. Therefore he had to fight against the truth of others, in the case of Jung and the Zürichers confounding anti-Semites with persons who simply thought differently, but also in the cases of Adler, Rank, Ferenczi, or others, who could not be accused of anti-Semitism, being Jews themselves. Historically, this problem is to be understood in the situation of Vienna and the specific historical tensions there (Beller 1989; Brook-Shepherd 1997) at the turn of the century (with its mayor Lueger!), as opposed to a completely different situation in Zürich lacking at that time any major intellectual Jewish community.

When the Freud family prepared to leave Vienna, various people offered their help. One of these offers is perhaps apocryphal: At Jung's initiative, the son of Jung's colleague Franz Riklin was sent to Vienna, carrying the

equivalent of 10,000 dollars hidden in his pockets. At Berggasse 19, Anna opened the door. Young Riklin told her that he had come in the name of Jung and his father, who wanted to give Freud money to enable him to go to England. Anna left him to speak to her father, and returned in saying that Freud would not accept this offer. When Riklin insisted, Freud himself came to the door. 'I refuse to be indebted to my enemies,' he said... (McCully 1987; Donn 1988).

That may have been the last, indirect, contact between Freud and Jung. There was a similar one with Ferenczi before the Wiesbaden Congress, in the same style of rejection. The rest is silence.

TRANSLATIONS OF ABSTRACT

Pour différentes raisons, la relation entre Sándor Ferenczi et C. G. Jung est d'un intérêt particulier, étant donné l'importance qu'ils ont l'un et l'autre dans l'histoire du développement des idées, et les deux ont joué un rôle prépondérant dans l'interaction complexe et entrelacée dans le groupe des pionniers de la psychanalyse. Quoiqu'ils aient eu des intérêts et des points de vues divergents, il est fascinant de découvrir des parallélismes dans leur pensée. Même si des facteurs personnels, interpersonnels, institutionnels et socio-culturels n'ont pas permis qu'une collaboration harmonieuse s'installe à long terme, aujourd'hui, rétrospectivement, nous pouvons reconnaître les mérites respectifs de chacun.

In der Komplexität der verstrickten Interaktionen innerhalb der Gruppe der psychoanalytischen Pioniere und ihren divergierenden Interessen und Ansichten ist die Beziehung zwischen Ferenczi und Jung von besonderem Interesse angesichts der Wichtigkeit, die beide im Bereich der Geschichte der Ideen hatten. Es ist erstaunlich, einige parallel laufende Linien zu entdecken; jedoch trugen zwischenmenschliche, institutionelle und soziokulturelle Faktoren dazu bei, daß diese friedliche und einander ergänzende Zusammenarbeit auf längere Sicht nicht möglich geworden ist. Vielleicht ist es für die gegenwärtige Generation in der Rückschau einfacher, schöpferische Züge und auch manche Unzulänglichkeiten bei all diesen Denkern wahrzunehmen.

Nella complessità delle intricate relazioni all'interno del gruppo dei pionieri della psicoanalisi, delle loro divergenze di interessi e punti di vista, la relazione tra Ferenczi e Jung appare di particolare interesse data l'importanza che entrambi ebbero nel campo della storia delle idee. Sorprende scoprire alcune linee parallele, ma fattori interpersonali, istituzionali e socioculturali contribuirono a far sì che questa pacifica e complementare collaborazione non poté durare a lungo. Forse per la generazione attuale è più facile notare, in retrospettiva, fertili intuizioni e anche alcune carenze di tutti questi pensatori.

En la complejidad de las enredadas relaciones dentro del grupo de los pioneros del psicoanálisis, sus divergencias en intereses y puntos de vista, la relación de Jung y

Ferenczi es de particular interés debido a la importancia que ambos tuvieron en el desarrollo de la historia de las ideas. Es sorprendente descubrir algunos paralelismo, sin embargo factores interpersonales, institucionales y socio-culturales a que esta colaboración pacífica y complementaria no fuese posible a largo plazo. Posiblemente para la generación actual, en retrospectiva, será más fácil notar algunos encuentros primordiales y también algunas deficiencias en todos estos pensadores.

References

- Beller, S. (1989). *Vienna and the Jews 1867-1938: A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brook-Shepherd, G. (1997). *The Austrians: A Thousand-Year Odyssey*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers.
- Donn, L. (1988). *Freud and Jung, Years of Friendship, Years of Loss*. New York: Scribner.
- Falzeder, E. (1994). 'My grand-patient, my chief tormentor. A hitherto unnoticed case of Freud's and the consequences'. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 63: 297-331.
- Ferenczi, S. (1924). 'Thalassa: a theory of genitality'. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 2 [1934]: 361-403; 3 [1934]: 1-29, 200-22.
- (1928 [1927]). *Final Contributions to the Problems and Methods of Psycho-Analysis*. London: Karnac, 1995.
- (1985 [1932]). *The Clinical Diary of Sandor Ferenczi*. Ed. Judith Dupont. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Freud, S. (1912/13). *Totem and Taboo*. SE 13.
- (1914). 'The Moses of Michelangelo'. SE 13.
- (1926). *The Question of Lay Analysis*. SE 20.
- (1933). *New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*. SE 22.
- (1937). 'Analysis terminable and interminable'. SE 23.
- (1940 [1938]). 'Splitting of the ego in the process of defence'. SE 23.
- (1960). *Letters of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. Ernst L. Freud. New York: Basic Books.
- (2002). *Unser Herz zeigt nach dem Süden. Reisebriefe 1895-1923*. Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag.
- Freud, S. & Abraham, K. (2002). *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham*. Ed. Ernst Falzeder. Trans. Caroline Schwarzacher. London: Karnac.
- Freud, S. & Ferenczi, S. (1993). *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi. Volume 1, 1908-1914*. Eds. Eva Brabant, Ernst Falzeder & Patrizia Giampieri-Deutsch. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- (2000). *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi. Volume 3, 1920-1933*. Eds. Ernst Falzeder & Eva Brabant. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Freud, S. & Jung, C. G. (1974). *The Freud/Jung Letters. The Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung*. Ed. William McGuire. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Gay, P. (1988). *Freud, A Life for Our Time*. New York: Doubleday.
- Haynal, A. & Falzeder, E. (1993). 'Slaying the dragons of the past or Cooking the hare in the present. A historical view on affects in the psychoanalytic encounter'. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 13, 4: 357-71. Reprinted in André Haynal (2002)'s *Disappearing and Revising: Sándor Ferenczi in the History of Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac.
- Jung, C. G. (1911/12). *Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido [Psychology of the Unconscious: A Study of the Transformations and Symbolisms of the Libido]*.

- Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen*, 1911, 3: 120–227; 1912, 4: 162–464.
- (1921). *Psychologische Typen (Psychological Types)*. Zürich: Rascher. Achstes Tausend 1940.
- (1923). *Die Beziehungen der Psychotherapie zur Seelsorge*. Zürich: Rascher, 1923.
- (1934). *Zur gegenwärtigen Lage der Psychotherapie. Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie*, 7, 1–16.
- (1942 [1940/41]). *Das Wandlungssymbol in der Messe. Eranos Jahrbuch 1940/41*. Zürich: Rascher, 1942.
- (1946). *Die Psychologie der Übertragung*. Zürich: Rascher.
- (1954). *Von den Wurzeln des Bewusstseins*. Zürich: Rascher.
- (1962). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* by C. G. Jung. Recorded and edited by Aniela Jaffé. New York: Random House.
- Kerr, J. (1993). *A Most Dangerous Method. The Story of Jung, Freud, and Sabina Spielrein*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- McCully, R. S. (1988). 'Remarks on the last contact between Freud and Jung'. *Quadrant*, 20, 2, 73–4.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to express their deep felt gratitude to Joe Cambray for the thorough reading of the manuscript and for his valuable editorial advice.

[MS first received December 2002; final version March 2003]

Copyright of Journal of Analytical Psychology is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.