

‘Jung and Ferenczi – the emergent conversation’ Introduction

Joe Cambray, *Providence, RI*

To study history one must know in advance that one is attempting something fundamentally impossible, yet necessary and highly important. To study history means submitting to chaos and nevertheless retaining faith in order and meaning.

Hermann Hesse (*Magister Ludi*)

The papers in this section were presented as a panel at the *Second History of Analytical Psychology Symposium* held at the Tiburon Lodge, north of San Francisco, California and co-sponsored by the C. G. Jung Institute of San Francisco and the *Journal of Analytical Psychology*. They offer an opportunity to begin an exploration of a sparsely studied area at the interface of the history of analytical psychology and psychoanalysis, i.e., a comparison of the theories, practices and personalities of C. G. Jung and Sandor Ferenczi along with the implications of this for contemporary analysis. Though their contact was limited, it was of historical importance. Jung introduced Ferenczi to Freud and apparently served as his first analyst in what would have been the very first training analysis (Falzeder 1994, pp. 171–2 & n.2). Over time their relationship was marred by hostility, for example when Ferenczi attacked *Waldlungen und Symbole der Libido* in a review at Freud’s behest. Nevertheless, the two men shared a host of interests, from the psychology of mediums and anomalous phenomena to the analyst’s use of his/her own personality, including various aspects of countertransference reactions, as a key element in analysis (in its most extreme form, their experiments in mutual analysis). These papers are particularly timely as both figures and their contributions have been marginalized traditionally and disregarded in the psychoanalytic literature, but recently Ferenczi’s work has found revitalization through the relational school of psychoanalysis, while Jung’s work still suffers minimization.

The growing recognition and valuing of the relational dimensions to the analytic process, together with the role of the analyst’s subjectivity in shaping the intersubjective encounter, have begun to open new areas of engagement both between and within various analytic schools – lines of analytic thought

and practice having historical roots in the opuses of both Jung and Ferenczi. Both men pursued the limits of analysis and analytic formulations, leading them to develop their own unique visions of the psyche and analysis despite the cost of professional and personal affiliations. The possibility that Ferenczi followed Jung, serving, in turn, as 'heir' in Freud's re-orienting shift from a 'crown prince' to a 'secret grand vizier' to champion the psychoanalytic movement before subsequently falling into disrepute, is mentioned in Haynal and Falzeder's paper. In addition, a further detail of the acting out of this fantasy that both separates and links Jung and Ferenczi to Freud may be decipherable in the timing of Ferenczi's first analysis with Freud. Jung's final letter at the end of the series of his on-going correspondence with Freud was in April 1914. Within six months, in the fall of 1914, at the outbreak of World War I, Freud finally relented after years of entreaty and agreed to accept Ferenczi into analysis, which we know ultimately led to bitterness (Falzeder 1997). It is as if Freud attempted to foreclose on his grief from the vacuum left by Jung's final departure (Homans 1995) by transferring the functions which Jung had served to the next carrier of the archetypal heroic son, Ferenczi.

As 'kindred spirits' (Rachman 1997, p. 57) Jung and Ferenczi were pioneers even in their innovative failures. Thus, their respective forays in mutual analysis (e.g., Jung with Otto Gross and Sabina Spielrein, among others; Ferenczi with Elizabeth Severn, as well as the three-way analysis of dreams with Freud on the trip to the US in 1909) can be read not only as countertransference-driven errors, losing the necessary asymmetry of the analytic frame, but also as attempts (at least partially unconscious) to experience and reconceive the analytic relationship within a larger interactive field model – something which Jung, as he matured, discussed and developed in letters, in person and finally went on to publish more explicitly, though abstractly, in 1946 with his theoretically brilliant *The Psychology of the Transference*.

Similarly both men's interest in the psychological dimensions of 'occult' phenomena brought them to the margins of experience where Freud could neither follow his own interest nor successfully induce them to collaborate (Freud & Ferenczi, 1994, p. 274 – May 11, 1911). Ferenczi's fascination with thought transference led to various clinical explorations of the uses of empathy in analysis, while Jung's interest in 'meaningful coincidence' eventually resulted in the theory of synchronicity, but there is no record available of the two men having compared details of these investigations.

In the past fifteen years Ferenczi's contributions have been increasingly recovered and revalued, largely stemming from the publication of his clinical diary and the three volumes of letters between him and Freud. However, Jung's work in this area has not received the same recognition. Despite growing interest in the notion of the 'analytic third', Jung's clinically grounded views of symbols as potentially forming a *tertium* have been largely ignored. The obvious contemporary relevance of Jung's relational understanding, preceding even *The Psychology of the Transference*, is apparent as in the following exemplary

quotes. First, when responding to James Kirsch on a series of explicit transference dreams that one of Kirsch's patients was having, Jung commented:

With regard to your patient, it is quite correct that her dreams are occasioned by *you* ... In the deepest sense we all dream not *out of ourselves* but out of what lies *between us and the other*.

(29 September 1934; Jung 1973)

Then, when discussing 'telepathic dreams' with Charles Baudouin that same year, Jung summed up his thoughts on the matter according to Baudouin by,

act[ing] them out as follows: with brief, firm gestures he touched first my forehead, then his own, and thirdly drew a great circle with his hand in the space between us; the three motions underscored the three clauses of this statement; 'In short, one doesn't dream here, and one doesn't dream here, one dreams there'. And *there* the hand kept turning, like the above-mentioned sling and the idea, like the messenger, was launched.

(Baudouin in *C. G. Jung Speaking*, p. 80)

Juxtaposing Jung and Ferenczi, who only had limited personal contacts but inhabited overlapping worlds of depth and relational complexity, is also to bring strands of analytic thought and practice that have not had much formal engagement into a nascent, uncertain relationship. The hope and challenge are to explore the possibility of dialectic, between theories, methods, personalities and histories, as well as between past and present.

One way of understanding the importance of the present contributions is to treat them as 'emergent phenomena' – a term coming from the literature on complex adaptive systems. This is at the forefront of much of modern science cutting across the usual disciplinary divisions, with observations of self-organizing properties found throughout nature from the subatomic world on up through the molecular, biological, and into cultural behaviours, such as the fractal-like patterns found in analysis of the stock market, traffic jams or some modern art, as well as describing the way mental events supervene on physical states. These studies consistently reveal more complex levels of organization arising out of interactions from agents at a lower level in a manner unpredictable from the known properties of those agents. George Hogenson has proposed recently a reconsideration of archetypes from such a perspective, concluding that they are 'the emergent properties of the dynamic developmental system of brain, environment, and narrative' (2001, p. 607).

Applied to the brief papers of the panel, only a partial glimpse of such a pattern can be gleaned. Additionally I would argue that much of Jung and Ferenczi's interest in so-called 'occult' phenomena could be re-examined in terms of the observation of emergent processes. This could be done both in terms of the larger cultural context from the period spanning the 1870s through to the 1920s in which this aspect of their work was embedded and in how we might seek to understand such a class of observations. Clinical parallels can be found

in explorations of interactive fields where participants become aware of larger constellations in fields that appear unconnected from the individual perspective yet are strikingly coincident (Cambray 2002).

Further discussion of the rich interface touched upon in this panel will be included in a future *Journal of Analytical Psychology* conference.

References

- Baudouin, C. (1977). 'From Charles Baudouin's Journal: 1934'. In C. G. Jung *Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, eds. William McGuire & R. F. C. Hull. Bollingen Series XCVII, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cambray, J. (2002). 'Synchronicity and emergence'. *American Imago*, 59, 4, 409–34.
- Falzeder, E. (1994). 'The threads of psychoanalytic filiations of psychoanalysis taking effect'. In *100 Years of Psychoanalysis, Contributions to the History of Psychoanalysis*, eds. A. Haynal & E. Falzeder. Geneva: Cahiers Psychiatriques Genevois, Special Issue, 169–94.
- (1997). 'Dreaming of Freud: Ferenczi, Freud and an analysis without end'. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 17, 4, 416–27.
- Freud, S. & Ferenczi, S. (1994). *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi, Volume 1, 1908–1914*, eds. E. Brabant, E. Falzeder & P. Giampieri-Deutsch. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hogenson, G. (2001). 'The Baldwin effect: a neglected influence on C. G. Jung's evolutionary thinking'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 46, 4, 591–611.
- Homans, P. (1995). *Jung in Context: Modernity and the Making of a Psychology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2nd edn.
- Jung, C. G. (1973). *C. G. Jung Letters, Volume 1: 1906–1950*, ed. Gerhard Adler in collaboration with Aniela Jaffé, trans. R. F. C. Hull. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Rachman, A. W. (1997). *Sandor Ferenczi: The Psychotherapist of Tenderness and Passion*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

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.