

The cryptomnesic origins of Jung's dream of the multi-storeyed house

Steve Myers, West Kirby, Wirral, UK

Abstract: Jung first recounted his dream of the multi-storeyed house in the 1925 seminars to illustrate the concept of the collective unconscious and explain the influence of phylogeny on his split with Freud. However, his telling the story of the dream belies a cryptomnesic influence of the early writings of psychoanalysis because Josef Breuer used a similar image to illustrate the structure of the psyche which Édouard Claparède associated with a phylogenetic inheritance. When telling the story of the dream, Jung misrepresented Freud's position, creating the impression of there being a bigger difference between their theories than was actually the case, and giving the dream a fictional significance for the breakdown of their relationship. In fact, Jung followed Freud into the fields of mythology and phylogenetics, and their split was due primarily to their different attitudes towards sexuality rather than phylogeny. The dream image has therefore led to a misunderstanding of Freudian theory when viewed from within a Jungian perspective. Freud believed there was a phylogenetic layer in the psyche, though he held a different view to Jung on its nature and importance.

Key words: Breuer, Claparède, complex, cryptomnesia, dream, house, Jung, Freud, Oedipus

Introduction

In *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, C. G. Jung is reported as telling the story of his and Freud's trip to the United States in 1909, during which time they analysed each others' dreams:

One [dream] in particular was important to me, for it led me for the first time to the concept of the 'collective unconscious'. . . I was in a house . . . in the upper storey . . . Descending the stairs I reached the ground floor. There everything was much older . . . I discovered a stone stairway that led down into the cellar . . . Descending again, I found myself in a beautifully vaulted room which looked exceedingly ancient . . . the walls dated from Roman times . . . again I saw a stairway of narrow stone steps leading down into the depths . . . Thick dust lay on the floor [and] remains of a primitive culture.

(Jung 1963, pp. 182–3)

The significance of the house, for Jung, was that the lower cellars represented a *phylogenetic* layer in the unconscious – inherited biological remnants of

the evolutionary history of the human psyche (as opposed to the contents of the unconscious being solely *ontogenetic*, the result of the individual's development). Jung also suggested, when first telling the dream story in 1925, that it established a clear differentiation between him and Freud, whom he described as being unable to accept the existence of the phylogenetic layer:

all my dreams pointed to a break with Freud. I thought, of course, that he would accept the cellars below his cellar, but the dreams were preparing me for the contrary.
(Jung 1925, p. 24)

Raya Jones has traced the morphology of Jung's accounts of the dream, between 1925 and 1961, arguing that the story was reconstructed in retrospect to mirror the development of Jung's thought. She doubts the fidelity of the account to the dream because it is 'the end product of protracted poetic labour . . . he confused his early imaginative creation with the dream itself' (Jones 2007, p. 209):

Jung's dream as we know it is first and foremost an autobiographical memory—not a narration of a dream once dreamed, but an active, dynamic, narrative reconstruction influenced by its cumulative significance for him.
(Jones 2007, p. 208)

The present essay looks at the development of the dream story before the period examined by Jones. By examining the origins of Jung's use of the word 'complex', evidence is provided to suggest that Josef Breuer's writing was a source of cryptomnesic material for Jung (cryptomnesia is a natural process where someone else's ideas, or associations between ideas, are forgotten and sink into the unconscious, only to resurface at a later date as if they were one's own). This essay also argues that Jung's house image originated with Breuer and was associated with phylogeny by Édouard Claparède. As Jung had forgotten these and other related events by 1925, the cryptomnesic nature of the recollection created some misunderstandings. Contrary to Jung's assertions, Freud led Jung into the fields of mythology and phylogeny, and psychoanalysis provided some important ideas that were to become a cornerstone of analytical psychology. In Jung's misrepresentation of the source of the dream he also misrepresented the reasons for his and Freud's relationship unfolding, and created a misunderstanding of Freud's attitude towards phylogeny that continues in Jungian and post-Jungian circles today.

Cryptomnesia

The modern legal use of the term cryptomnesia tends to be quite limited, referring only to inadvertent plagiarism, but for Jung cryptomnesia was a normal and common phenomenon (Jung 1912, p. 313). Jung was introduced to it through the work of Flournoy (Flournoy 1900) whilst working on his dissertation (Jung 1902, pp. 81–87). It is an 'image [that] vanishes without trace from the memory, to reappear later at some important juncture' (Jung

1946, p. 110), one that can 'mislead the scientist, author or composer into believing that his ideas are original' (Jung 1902, p. 81). Although cryptomnesia is a 'normal and necessary process . . . to make room in our conscious minds for new impressions and ideas' (Jung 1964, p. 25), Jung drew a distinction between cryptomnesia and creative genius depending on whether the supposedly new idea, or new association of old ideas, has the quality of being known:

only those associations which have once passed through our conscious minds have the quality of being known . . . consciousness must . . . ask each thought: Do I know you, or are you new?

(Jung 1905, pp. 98–100)

The work of genius is very different [from cryptomnesia]; it fetches up these distant fragments [that may individually be recalled cryptomnesically] in order to build them into a new and meaningful structure'.

(Jung 1905, p. 105)

Cryptomnesia does not involve any intent to deceive, but if the author claims to be 'totally ignorant' of the original material, yet has read it, then Jung held the view that it 'must be regarded as cryptomnesia' (Jung 1910/11, p. 55). Therefore, in order to evaluate whether Jung claimed originality for a cryptomnesic product, one has to identify previous similar material that Jung had read, forgotten and then either reinvented or recalled whilst claiming it as his own. The time span between these events is irrelevant, for it is possible for the reading and the recollection to be separated by many decades (Jung 1921, p. 484). However, the recollection and/or association between cryptomnesic fragments has to show some literal fidelity with the original source(s) whilst being heralded as original (Jung 1902, p. 83).

Jung gives an inadvertent hint early in the 1925 seminars that *On Dreams* or *The Interpretation of Dreams* [*Dreams*] and *Studies in Hysteria* [*Studies*] might be cryptomnesic sources. When Jung started work at Burghölzli, he was asked to review Freud's book by Eugen Bleuler (Jung 1957, p. 277). He may not have read the full version of *The Interpretation of Dreams* at that stage, but only Freud's short summary *On Dreams*, which formed the basis of his review (Jung 1901, pp. 361–8). In the 1925 seminars, Jung recalled his reading of these books by saying:

In 1900 I read Freud's *Dream Interpretation*. I put it aside as something whose significance I did not fully grasp. Then I returned to it in 1903 and found in it the connection with my own theories.

(Jung 1925, p. 8)

the discovery by me that my experiments in association were directly connected with Freud's theories was most unwelcome . . . [A] devil whispered in my ear that I . . . had worked out my experiments long before I knew of Freud, and so could claim complete

independence of him as far as they went. However, I saw at once there was an element of lying involved.

(Jung 1925, p. 15)

Jung also read *Studies* in 1900 (Jung 1959, p. 430). His recognition of similarities between the theories he had formed by 1903 and the content of Freud's theories gives them the 'quality of being known', which points to Breuer and Freud's books as potential cryptomnesic sources.

A closer examination of *Theoretical* from *Studies* shows that there may be a case of cryptomnesia in Jung's use of the German word 'Komplex' (e.g., Jung 1995b, p. 341, Breuer/Freud 1991, p. 249). For example, in 1932 Jung claimed that 'the discovery of so-called "complexes" was independent... of the Freudian school' (Jung 1932, p. 515), and in 1936 he claimed that the term was his own creation:

The concept of the 'Gefühlsbetonter Komplex' as it is used in the association test is really my own invention, if one doesn't insist that the word 'complex' has been used in many other ways before my time. But I'm not aware that it has been used in the particular way I have been using it.

(Jung 1973, p. 210)

Although the term *complex* had been used in various forms in the late nineteenth century, most of these prior instances were a different use of the term from Jung's description of Janet's *idée fixe subconsciente* (Ellenberger 1970, p. 149). But in Breuer's 1893 essay *Theoretical* from *Studies* [*Theoretical*], a text for which Breuer probably had sole responsibility for writing¹, the term *complex* appears over 20 times and in many instances Breuer applies it to Janet's concepts, e.g.,

unconscious ideas exist and are operative... as has been shown by the valuable work carried out by French investigators, large complexes of ideas and involved psychological processes with important consequences remain completely unconscious in a number of patients and co-exist with conscious mental life.

(Breuer 1893, p. 221)

Janet's view is the following... sense-impressions that are not apperceived and the ideas that are aroused but do not enter consciousness cease without producing further consequences. Sometimes, however, they accumulate and form complexes – mental strata withdrawn from consciousness; they form a subconsciousness.

(Breuer 1893, pp. 230–31)

Strachey comments in the footnote to his English translation of *Studies* that:

This use of the word 'complex' seems to come very close to that which Jung is generally regarded as having introduced some ten years later.

(Breuer 1893, p. 231fn)

¹ This is suggested both by a review of the scientific styles of Breuer and Freud (Schlessinger/Gedo/Miller 1967) and the fact that Freud credits Breuer with the multi-storeyed building image (Freud/Jung 1979, 55F).

Although within the psychoanalytic community the term *complex* was generally viewed as having been introduced by the Zurich school (Strachey 1906, p. 100), based on Jung's own notes Ellenberger credits it to Ziehen (Ellenberger 1970, pp. 691–92). However, having read *Studies* in 1900, Jung was exposed to the term *complex* in Breuer's writing before he encountered Ziehen's work; for example, Jung used the term 'complex' ('*Komplexe*') in his dissertation (Jung 1902, p. 53; Jung 1995a, p. 60) in which he also cited *Studies* (Jung 1902, p. 78fn). He does not cite Ziehen's work until his later work on word associations (e.g., Jung 1904, p. 11). The involvement of cryptomnesia is suggested by the fact that Jung used the term, in a similar manner to that used in Breuer's work, after reading Breuer and before working on Ziehen's experiments, whilst later claiming the term was his own invention.

The origins of the 1925 dream recollection

The question of whether cryptomnesia is involved in the 1925 story of the dream is a little more complicated because it involves the association of disparate ideas. In 1893, Breuer used the image of a building of several storeys to describe the psyche, though what is important for this essay is the image's association with a phylogenetic inheritance. We can only examine the 1925 story for cryptomnesia, and not the original 1909 dream, because for the latter there is no contemporary record. However, we can and will return later to look at contemporaneous events in 1909 to assess what impact his dream may have had on his work and relationship with Freud.

To dream of a building or house was not in itself original, and there are various reasons why Jung may have had such a dream. For example, the metaphor of a house built on sand or rock is an old illustration of foundational principles, which may have appealed to the romantic side of Jung as it represented the idea of the fundament. Also, recent research suggests that dreams about buildings may be very common, with houses appearing in 7 out of 31 therapists' dreams (Kron/Avny 2003, p. 326)². Freud also alludes to the frequency of house dreams by citing, in *Dreams*, Scherner's belief that a house is a favourite representation of the body (Freud 1900a, p. 72). And even though house metaphors were in public abundance there may additionally have been some private sources for the dream. For 18 months prior to the dream, Jung had been working on the design and construction of his new house in Küsnacht (Bair 2004, p. 124). In later years Jung also observed that the dream house bore some similarity to his uncle's house (Jones 2007, p. 211). And in *Man and His Symbols* he also alludes to a similarity between the dream house and the house he 'grew up in' (Jung 1964, p. 43).

² This needs to be taken with the caveat that, as this research post-dates Jung's dream by nearly 100 years, the high incidence of houses in therapists' dreams may be a consequence of the popular awareness of Jung's dream rather than an indication that there were frequent house dreams in the early part of the 20th century.

We have already established that Jung read Breuer's work in 1900, and he also presented the dream as original. What is left, therefore, in order to establish whether Jung recalled Breuer's image cryptomnesically, is the question of whether there is some literal fidelity between Jung's and Breuer's images, and whether there is a source where Breuer's image is associated with phylogeny.

The dream image that Jung recalled in 1925 was a multi-storeyed building that represented the structure of the psyche, with consciousness at the top. He described two buildings, which represented his understanding of the psyche before and after he had his dream. Jung's first building image, the one that represented his understanding of the psyche prior to the dream, had two main layers, with instincts coming up from the body:

I thought of the conscious as of a room above, with the unconscious as a cellar underneath and then the earth wellspring, that is, the body, sending up the instincts.
(Jung 1925, p. 22)

Jung's 1925 description of his second building, 'after' the dream, is a more complicated description, 'with many rooms, passages, and stairways' (Jung 1925, p. 23), as well as some cellars. In addition to the top layer, which by implication is consciousness, there are three main levels – a Gothic layer, a Roman layer and a prehistoric layer that appears to be a tomb. Jung does not discuss complexes in this particular version, but by implication they are in the higher storeys of the building. The key message of Jung's dream image is that the bottom layer is phylogenetic, as each layer represents an increasingly archaic historical era, extending down to impersonal strata of the unconscious, remnants of earlier stages of the evolution of the human race.

In *Theoretical*, Breuer also offered a pair of building images that had consciousness at the top. The first building image that appears in Breuer's discussion also has two layers, and he differentiates consciousness from the unconscious using words that are similar to Jung's, though with ideas being fed from the brain rather than the body:

when we speak of ideas which are found in the region of clear consciousness and of unconscious ones . . . we almost inevitably form pictures of . . . a building with its dark, underground cellars . . . it is in the same brain . . . that conscious and unconscious ideas alike have their origin.

(Breuer 1893, p. 228)

Breuer's second use of the building metaphor appears in the section subsequent to the first, where he discusses the biological, innate foundation of hysteria. His description of the building, which has both similarities with and differences from Jung's image, is much more complicated than his first image and spread over several pages, but in summary 'it is a building of *several storeys*' (Breuer 1893, p. 244; original emphasis). It is built on the foundation of a biological layer that includes the nervous system. On top of this is a layer containing 'conversions of affective excitation' (Breuer 1893, p. 245), and 'phenomena . . . which owe their origin to suggestion (mostly auto-suggestion)' (Breuer 1893, p. 247).

There is then the hypnoid state; although Breuer does not discuss complexes in this section of *Theoretical*, by implication from earlier discussion it is in this layer that he places 'complexes of ideas' (Breuer 1893, p. 217) or 'ideational complex[es]' (Breuer 1893, p. 235). Finally, although Breuer does not refer to consciousness during his description of the building, as with Jung's image it is implied as another layer above the hypnoid state (e.g., see Breuer 1893, p. 216).

There is some literal fidelity between Breuer's two images from *Theoretical* and Jung's 'before and after' descriptions in the 1925 seminar. Both the first images have two layers, being fed from the body or brain, and both the second images have multiple storeys, with an implied top layer of consciousness, biological foundations and an implication that the complexes should be placed in the higher storeys. There is a minor difference in that Breuer's image is one of building up from a foundation whereas Jung's image is one of excavating down from the street level. However, the idea of excavation appears elsewhere in *Studies*, in the case histories where Freud describes his 'regular method' as being to excavate the several layers of the psyche (Freud 1893, p. 139).

Breuer's image does not, however, include the association with phylogeny. It might be claimed that, even if Jung had cryptomnesically recalled Breuer's image of a house, by associating the bottom layer with a phylogenetic inheritance he gives it an original quality, which puts the image in the category of a 'work of genius' because it is an original association between cryptomnesic fragments. However, the association between Breuer's building image and a phylogenetic inheritance is made in a French article, *Some Words on the Definition of Hysteria*³, published in 1907 by Édouard Claparède, whom Jung knew well. For example:

[Breuer and Freud] rightly compared hysteria to a multi-storey building, each floor with its own symptoms⁴ . . . This search for the biological significance of a [hysterical] reaction seems very important⁵.

(Claparède 1908, p. 185)

the human body is the culmination of a long series of developments⁶ . . . One might ask, following this line of thought, if the phenomena of hysterical rash would not be a *revival of ancestral reactions*⁷.

(Claparède 1908, p. 187; original emphasis)

Although there is no published English translation of Claparède's article (the above translations have been produced specifically for this essay) a review and summary was published in English in 1908 which mentions Claparède's

³ 'Quelques mots sur la définition de l'hystérie'.

⁴ 'Ils ont comparé fort justement l'hystérie à un « édifice à plusieurs étages », chaque étage ayant ses symptômes propres'.

⁵ 'Cette recherche de la signification biologique d'une réaction me paraît très importante'.

⁶ 'L'organisme humain est l'aboutissement d'une longue série de formations'.

⁷ 'On pourrait se demander, en suivant cette ligne de pensée, si les phénomènes d'éruption cutanée hystériques ne seraient pas une *réviviscence de réactions ancestrales*'.

discussion of phylogeny but leaves out his discussion of the building (Harrison Town 1908, p. 305). Much of Claparède's article poses a series of questions to show how little is known about hysteria, but he argues for the association of phylogenetic traits with the biological layer. He sees hysterical symptoms that arise from this layer as being associated with what were once animal reactions that normal people no longer use. He goes on to describe a building with 5 storeys, naming the bottom layer as *primitive disorder*⁸ (Claparède 1908, p. 192). Freud subsequently writes to Jung indicating that Claparède's image of the multi-storeyed building was originally Breuer's but that he was not in full agreement with it:

Claparède's article on the definition of hysteria amounts to a very intelligent judgement on our efforts; the idea of the building of several storeys comes from Breuer (in the general section of the *Studies*), the building itself, I believe, ought to be described rather differently.

(Freud/Jung 1979, 55F)

None of the above should be surprising for, as has already been noted, at the start of the 20th century building metaphors were aplenty and there was an increasing psychological interest in phylogeny. At most the above provides an illustration of an obvious fact, that Jung's theories emerged out of the cross-fertilization of ideas from various contemporary sources. What is surprising, however, is Jung's 1925 portrayal of the source of his ideas. He presented it as the result of an original dream rather than acknowledging that the image emerged from the work of Breuer and Claparède, even though at the time of Claparède's article he had recognized that the introduction of a phylogenetic component to the lower storey was Claparède's innovation:

In the concluding chapter [Claparède] develops his own views... He sees bodily symptoms as a revivification of ancestral reactions that were once useful.

(Jung 1908, pp. 400-401)

All the main components of the dream and their main associations had, at one time, passed through Jung's conscious mind. By presenting the image in 1925 as his own creation he was meeting all the criteria he himself had previously established for cryptomnesia.

In the 21st century, the fact that Jung may have drawn a key image from the writings of Breuer and Claparède may not seem particularly important – it is the image and not the source that matters. However, the image was used to misportray Freud's theories and create a misunderstanding that continues in some quarters even today. Understanding the dream of the multi-storeyed house as a cryptomnesic image does not alter our understanding of the Collective Unconscious, but it does shed light on a common Jungian misunderstanding of Freud's attitude to phylogeny.

⁸ 'trouble primitif'.

Mythology and phylogenesis in 1909

The main problem in Jung's recounting of the story of the dream is his portrayal of Freud as rejecting the lower cellars and being unable to accept the principle of phylogeny:

When Freud's and Jung's theories are described . . . [the] impression is left that Jung, but not Freud, conceptualized and thought important the presence of inherited memories in mankind. This representation is inaccurate.

(Heyman 1977, p. 461)

Freud's positive attitude towards phylogeny can be seen in a 1911 letter to Jung where he noted that 'a phylogenetic memory in the individual . . . will soon be undeniable' (Freud/Jung 1979, 274F), or the paragraph he added to *The Interpretation of Dreams* in 1919⁹:

dreaming is . . . an act of regression . . . a resuscitation of his childhood. Behind this childhood of the individual we are then promised an insight into the phylogenetic childhood, into the evolution of the human race, of which the development of the individual is only an abridged repetition . . . Nietzsche was right when he said that in a dream 'there persists a primordial part of humanity which we can no longer reach by a direct path' and we are encouraged to expect, from the analysis of dreams, a knowledge of the archaic inheritance of man, a knowledge of psychical things in him that are innate. It would seem that dreams and neuroses have preserved for us more of the psychical antiquities than we suspected; so that psychoanalysis may claim a high rank among those sciences which endeavour to reconstruct the oldest and darkest phases of the beginning of mankind.

(Freud 1900b, p. 388/9)

The difference between Jung and Freud on phylogeny was, therefore, only one of emphasis and interpretation: Freud favoured ontogenetic explanations over phylogenetic ones, taking recourse in the latter only when the former had been exhausted, whereas for Jung the emphasis was the other way round; Freud saw the phylogenetic heritage as having its origin within concrete events whereas for Jung it was the product of a more abstract evolutionary process; and for Freud, the material that was phylogenetically transmitted was a memory trace whereas for Jung the material consisted of different patterns of thought and behaviour.

Jung had split the theory between himself and Freud, and thereby dissociated the similarities between them, such as the fact that there is a phylogenetic inheritance and that the same complex can lie at the heart of mythology and neurosis, the latter being Freud's idea (Freud/Jung 1979, 106F). Hoffer takes the argument even further by claiming that the initiative for the discussion of phylogenetics between the two men lay with Freud (Hoffer 1992). In summary,

⁹ According to the Standard Edition of Freud's completed works, this paragraph was added to the 5th edition published in 1919 (Freud 1900, p. 548fn). Although the accuracy of the Standard Edition's dating has been questioned (Marinelli/Mayer 2003, p. 139), the paragraph does not appear in Freud's first edition (Freud 1900a).

it was Freud who first flagged the idea that there might be a phylogenetic inheritance with Jung two years before his dream in 1907 (Freud/Jung 1979, 106F), and it was Freud who persuaded Jung of the role played by phylogenetic factors, it taking the latter until 1911 to become convinced (i.e., two years after his dream). Some of Hoffer's argument, taken in isolation, may be open to debate. For example, he takes Freud's use of the word 'prehistory', when commenting on one of Jung's cases in 1907, as referring to phylogenetics. But various other writings by Freud suggest that, in the context of a case study, he may also use the word 'prehistory' to refer to an ontogenetic development that preceded the available history of the case. However, even if one rejects Hoffer's argument, there are various other sources that show Freud had an interest in phylogenetics before Jung's 1909 dream, such as his view that the origin of man's peculiar sexuality lies in the 'prehistory of the human species' (Freud 1905, p. 234)¹⁰, his reading of 'prehistory and the like, without any serious purpose' (Freud 1900c), or his collaboration with Otto Rank to explore phylogenetically-based explanations for child development (Marinelli/Mayer 2003, p. 86). What is clear is that any dream Jung had in 1909 could not have led Jung *away* from Freud into the area of phylogenesis because Freud was already in that territory.

There is a similar argument with respect to mythology, that Jung followed Freud's lead, for which the evidence is even clearer. A significant change in Jung's attitude around the time of the dream can be seen in his letters, as shortly afterwards he developed an obsession with both mythology (Freud/Jung 1979, 157J) and phylogenesis (Freud/Jung 1979, 159J). There is a popular view that one led to the other, that the dream prompted Jung's obsession (e.g., Noll 1999, p. 53), with the implication that Jung resisted Freud's Oedipal interpretation of the dream. However, this is not supported by the contemporary evidence for after the trip the 'difficulties between the two were now quiescent' (Wallace 1980, p. 123) and the exchange of letters suggests events initially took a somewhat different course from the way they were later described by Jung.

Jung had long held an interest in mythology before his dream, though at the time of the Clark trip (Aug/Sept 1909) he had not yet joined the many psychoanalysts who were researching the topic seriously and writing about it (Bair 2004, p. 151). Freud had developed his own 'obsession' (Freud/Jung 1979, 118F) with mythology in 1908, telling Jung that:

One thing and another have turned my thoughts to mythology and I am beginning to suspect that myth and neurosis have a common core.

(Freud/Jung 1979, 106F)

¹⁰ What Freud meant by 'prehistory' at this time may not have been fully formed in his own mind, as it was not until the third edition of *Three Essays* in 1914 that he provided a clear differentiation of ontogenesis and phylogenesis (Freud, 1905, p. 131).

When Jung starts his own work on mythology, after the dream, the fact that Jung is following Freud's lead is evident from Jung's request for Freud's guidance:

Archaeology or rather mythology has got me in its grip . . . Won't you cast a beam of light in that direction, at least a kind of spectrum analysis *par distance*?
(Freud/Jung 1979, 157J; original emphasis)

Freud warmly welcomes this move, reasserting a point he had made a year earlier (Freud/Jung 1979, 106F) that he believes the complex lying at the heart of neurosis also lies at the heart of mythology:

I was delighted to learn that you are going into mythology. A little less loneliness. I can't wait to hear of your discoveries . . . I hope you will soon come to agree with me that in all likelihood mythology centres on the same nuclear complex as the neuroses.
(Freud/Jung 1979, 160F)

As Jung starts his research into mythology he not only adopts the same (sexual) starting point as Freud, but also develops a positive interest in the Oedipus myth:

For me there is no longer any doubt what the oldest and most natural myths are trying to say. They speak quite 'naturally' of the nuclear complex of neurosis. A particularly fine example is . . . Ares, brought up abroad, returns home to his mother in order to *sleep* with her . . . I was most interested in your views about Oedipus . . . Can you give me sources for the Oedipus myth?

(Freud/Jung 1979, 162J; original emphasis)

The immediate impact of the dream was therefore not to lead Jung *away* from Freud, or from an Oedipal interpretation, because he *followed* Freud into mythological and phylogenetic research and used his theories as the starting point. There must, therefore, have been another reason for Jung's new-found interest.

Wallace has noted that as early as 1907 'Jung developed feelings of sibling rivalry toward Rank, Abraham, Eitingon . . . and, later, Jones' (Wallace 1980, p. 115). Similar problems arose during the Clark trip with Ferenczi, who wrote to Freud and Jung a couple of months after the trip about his 'brother complexes', attempting to clear the air and remove any apparent rivalry by reinforcing Jung's position as Freud's natural successor (Ferenczi 1909). In Jung's reply it is clear that there has been tension in their relationship, and he was very conscious of the potential role played by ambition, envy and the usurping of roles (Jung 1973, p. 12). However, the warmth of the correspondence between Jung and Freud immediately after the trip suggests that, at a conscious level at least, the tension was primarily in the relationship between Jung and Ferenczi (e.g., Freud/Jung 1979, 155J & 157J). This sibling rivalry may have been exacerbated by Freud's inability to 'submit to analysis *without losing [his] authority*' (Freud/Jung 1979, 330J; original emphasis), as it denied Jung the type of relationship with Freud he was seeking. The degree to which Jung's

interests in mythology and phylogenetics were influenced by his relationship with Freud becomes clearer a couple of months later, when he writes:

most of all I was struck by your remark that you longed for archaeologists, philologists, etc... By this, I told myself, you probably meant that I was unfit for such work. However, it is in precisely these fields that I now have a passionate interest.

(Freud/Jung 1979, 170J)

Bergmann has suggested that Jung's dream indicates he was threatened by what his self-analysis might uncover (Bergmann 1997, pp. 69–86). Perhaps that threat was of being sidelined, of losing the type of relationship he sought from his adopted father figure. Whilst Freud had been supporting other psychoanalysts in their independent mythological and phylogenetic research, he saw Jung's future as being an administrative figurehead and a representative of his (Freud's) ideas to the non-Jewish community. At some point during the Clark trip, perhaps during a visit to antiquities (e.g., Freud 1909), in a dream analysis or some other discussion, a passing comment by Freud implies he doesn't think Jung is up to the job of phylogenetic and/or mythological research. This represents a threat to Jung's ambition as his sibling rivals were usurping the type of role and relationship he sought with Freud. This causes tension between Jung and Ferenczi, which stimulates Jung into developing a competitive interest. However, sibling rivalry does not explain why Jung later split from Freud, nor why he maintained his interest in mythology throughout the rest of his life

Sex and the split

Although immediately after the dream Jung and Freud's relationship seemed to remain very close, it is not long after Jung starts his work on mythology before one of the key factors in his eventual divergence from Freud begins to re-emerge. The point of contention is not a new topic introduced by the dream, but rather a fault-line in their relationship that had been present from the very start – the exclusivity of infantile sexuality as an explanation for neurosis. In 1906, when Jung had originally introduced himself to Freud by letter, he wrote:

it seems to me that though the genesis of hysteria is predominantly, it is not exclusively, sexual.

(Freud/Jung 1979, 2J)

This difference was ever-present in their relationship, although by June 1909 it seemed to Freud that Jung had had a 'conversion' to his point of view (Freud/Jung 1979, 149F). After the Clark trip, Jung was evidently still on board with the Freudian position, because he used it to start his research. However, in late December Jung starts to become dissatisfied with that position again, and signals his intention to Freud to expand his field of research:

I am turning over and over in my mind the problem of antiquity. It's a hard nut! Without doubt there's a lot of infantile sexuality in it, but that is not all. Rather it

seems to me that antiquity was ravaged by the struggle with *incest*, with which sexual *repression* begins (or is it the other way round?)

(Freud/Jung 1979, 170J; original emphasis)

In an otherwise warm reply from Freud, he welcomes Jung's work but circumscribes the area in which the development of religious ideas should take place, to try and check any tendency in Jung to move away from the centrality of infantile sex:

Of my own flashes of inspiration . . . I can confide only one. It has occurred to me that the ultimate basis of man's need for religion is *infantile helplessness*.

(Freud/Jung 1979, 171F; original emphasis)

Although Jung sends an equally warm reply, it is clear that he recognizes the potential difference emerging between them but chooses not to discuss it:

Mythology certainly has me in its grip . . . I don't want to say too much now but would rather wait for it to ripen . . . The main *impedimentum* is lack of knowledge, which I am trying to remedy by diligent reading.

(Freud/Jung 1979, 173J)

The topic of mythology and religion is then effectively dropped for a year until early 1911, when the extent to which Jung has in the meantime diverged from Freud starts to emerge (e.g., Freud/Jung 1979, 230J). There is no need to expand here on how the story then unfolds, for 'the rest is history'.

What these letters show is that, although Jung's and Freud's positions don't start to diverge seriously until 1911 (Ellenberger 1970, p. 669) there has been a fault-line in their theoretical positions since the very start of their relationship. Although it narrows and widens at various points during their collaboration, it is this crack – the nature of libido and the exclusivity of sexuality as an explanation – that is ultimately the theoretical factor in the conflict between them, not the dream or its phylogenetic implications (on which, as it happens, they had much closer views than is normally portrayed in the dream account). The dream was given greater significance in later years probably because it coincided with the start of Jung's obsession and it is much more palatable to describe events as the result of an inspirational dream than attribute them to a combination of one's own insecurities and following a rival's lead.

Breuer's cryptomnesic influence on Jung may even have extended to this theoretical rift that developed between Jung and Freud. In *Theoretical*, Breuer says he regards sexual instinct as 'undoubtedly the most powerful' source of neuroses, but he does not place exclusivity on it (e.g., Breuer 1893, pp. 199–200). He says hysteria cannot be explained with a 'single causal nexus' (Breuer 1893, p. 245) and lists a number of causes other than sex:

It is self-evident and is also sufficiently proved by our observations that the non-sexual affects of fright, anxiety and anger lead to the development of hysterical phenomena.

But it is perhaps worth while insisting again and again that the sexual factor is by far the most important and the most productive of pathological results.

(Breuer 1893, pp. 246–47)

Jung's opening letter to Freud had stated a similar position – that 'though the genesis of hysteria is predominantly, it is not exclusively, sexual' (Freud/Jung 1979, 2J). Although there are other factors at play in both the split from Freud and the long term direction of Jung's theoretical interest, the disagreement over the exclusivity of sex is a dominant theme before, during and after the period of their collaboration. Whilst it is not possible to have certainty about the degree of Breuer's influence on this aspect of Jung's thinking, it is possible that, because of similarities in their personal and theoretical conflicts with Freud, Jung may have felt an unconscious affinity with Breuer, whose broader and prescient ideas made him feel unconvinced by Freud's own psychoanalytic position.

Conclusion

The story that Jung created around the dream, and the significance he gave it for the breakdown of his relationship with Freud, has created two major problems. The first is an enduring misrepresentation within Jungian and post-Jungian circles of Freud's attitude towards phylogeny because, far from rejecting the principle, Freud regarded it as essential:

To the end of his life Freud . . . continued to feel that he could not do without genetics for the inheritance of acquired traits . . . To him the alternative – that these memories had been acquired during childhood – was not tenable.

(Gottlieb 2006, p. 1743)

Although Jung had serious theoretical differences with Freud, the primary factor in their split was the exclusivity of sex as an explanation for neurosis. In the area of phylogeny their views were not so far apart, as they had merely a difference of emphasis and a different view of the nature of the inheritance. This may have implications not only for the Jungian understanding of Freudian theory, but also for those elements of the post-Jungian developmental school that seek to explain everything in terms of ontogeny rather than phylogeny.

The second problem created by Jung's dream story is in tracing the sources of key ideas within analytical psychology and giving appropriate credit to the pioneers and innovators involved. When examining the context in which Jung's ideas developed, the lines of influence that are drawn usually include Freud alongside the likes of Janet, James, Flournoy etc. However, Jung's dream of the multi-storeyed house belies a direct, albeit unconscious, influence of Breuer and Claparède on Jung and his theories. Breuer hasn't been given due credit, for example, for his part in introducing the term 'complex' to describe the unconscious associations of ideas.

Also, the dream story shows that Jung, when tracing the sources of his own ideas, discounts the prior psychoanalytic and psychological research into

phylogeny that preceded and informed his thinking. Jung appropriates for himself Édouard Claparède's linking of Breuer's innate, biological layer to phylogeny, giving the misleading impression that the phylogenetic inheritance in the psyche was wholly his own invention. Therefore, although Jung changed the terminology and expanded the theory, it was Édouard Claparède who first came up with the idea of the phylogenetic collective unconscious, and not Jung.

Also, the correspondence around the time of Jung's dream shows that his starting point for mythological research was Freud's belief that the Oedipus complex lay at the heart of myth and neurosis, which Freud concluded was a phylogenetic inheritance (e.g., Freud 1939, p. 99). Therefore, although Jung again changed the terminology and expanded the theory, it was Freud who came up with the archetypal concept that became a cornerstone of analytical psychology. Jung eventually acknowledged this, somewhat belatedly in the 1950s, when he described Freud's Oedipus Complex as being the first archetype (Jung 1958, p. 348). He also pointed out some of the shortcomings he saw in Freud's concept:

[The Oedipus Complex] is what I call an archetype. It was the first archetype Freud discovered, the first and only one. He thought this *was* the archetype. Of course, there are many such archetypes . . . [but] Freud omits completely the fact that with this Oedipus complex there is already given the contrary, namely the resistance against it . . . a compensation.

(Jung 1957, pp. 288–290, original emphasis)

Jung's story of the house dream has become an important part of Jungian mythology – but that is how it should be understood, as mythology and not as an historical account of how the ideas in analytical psychology were created. Whilst there is no doubt that the overall collection of ideas that Jung assembled and his theoretical differences from Freud made analytical psychology a unique theory, Jung's account of the dream and its significance was a sort of 'phylogenetic fantasy' that disguised some of his sources and influences. Breuer's *Theoretical* house image, Claparède's phylogenetic linking of animal and human psychology, and Freud's obsession with a (phylogenetically inherited) nuclear complex lying at the heart of neurosis and myth, were all used as springboards from which Jung created his own theory. Jung does give Freud greater credit in his later years, for example writing in a letter in 1957¹¹:

I cannot fail to recognize, even in the teeth of my resentment, [Freud's] significance as a . . . psychological pioneer. A true assessment of Freud's achievement would take us far afield, into dark areas of the mind . . . which I have sought to illuminate in my writings. Without Freud's 'psychoanalysis' I wouldn't have had a clue.

(Jung 1976, p. 359)

¹¹ This may have been written by Aniela Jaffé, on Jung's behalf and with his approval, as during this period she was drafting Jung's letters and reading them to him for correction/approval (Shamdasani 1999, p. 38).

However, what the story of the dream suggests is that Josef Breuer and Édouard Claparède may have given him some important ‘clues’ as well.

TRANSLATIONS OF ABSTRACT

Jung relata son rêve de la maison à plusieurs étages dans les séminaires de 1925 afin d’illustrer le concept d’inconscient collectif et d’expliquer le rôle de la phylogénèse dans sa rupture avec Freud. Cependant, son récit de ce rêve cèle une influence cryptomnésique des premiers écrits de la psychanalyse; en effet, Josef Bleuler utilisa une image similaire pour illustrer la structure du psychisme qu’Édouard Claparède associa à un héritage phylogénétique. En rapportant l’histoire du rêve, Jung déforma la position de Freud, créant l’impression d’une dissension théorique plus importante qu’elle ne l’était en réalité et faisant porter au rêve la signification fictive de leur rupture. De fait, Jung suivit Freud sur les terrains de la mythologie et de la phylogénétique et leur rupture était essentiellement due à une différence de positionnement quant à la sexualité. L’image du rêve a donc conduit à une méconnaissance de la théorie freudienne envisagée du point de vue jungien. Freud était convaincu de l’existence d’un niveau phylogénétique du psychisme, bien que ses vues quant à sa nature et son importance aient différé de celles de Jung.

Jung berichtete erstmalig seinen Traum vom mehrgeschossigen Haus in den 1925-er Seminaren um das Konzept des kollektiven Unbewußten zu illustrieren und den Einfluß der Phylogenese bei seiner Trennung von Freud zu verdeutlichen. Dennoch widerlegt seine Erzählung der Geschichte vom Traum einen kryptomnestischen Einfluß der frühen Schriften der Psychoanalyse, denn Josef Breuer benutzte ein ähnliches Bild um die Struktur der Psyche zu illustrieren was Édouard Claparède mit einem phylogenetischen Erbe in Verbindung brachte. Bei der Erzählung des Traumes mißinterpretiert Jung Freuds Position und läßt den Eindruck entstehen, daß ein größerer Unterschied zwischen den Theorien bestünde als dies wirklich der Fall war und gibt dem Traum eine fiktionelle Bedeutung für das Zerbrechen ihrer Beziehung. Tatsächlich folgte Jung Freud in die Gebiete der Mythologie und Phylogenese und ihre Trennung war primär ihrer unterschiedlichen Haltung zur Sexualität zuzuschreiben als der zur Phylogenese. Das Traumbild hat deswegen zu einem Mißverstehen der Freudschen Theorie geführt wenn diese aus einer jungianischen Perspektive betrachtet wird. Freud ging davon aus, daß eine phylogenetische Schicht in der Seele existierte, doch hatte er andere Anschauungen über deren Natur und Wichtigkeit als Jung.

Jung raccontò per la prima volta il sogno della casa a più piani nei seminari del 1925 per illustrare il concetto di inconscio collettivo e spiegare l’influenza della filogenesi sulla sua separazione da Freud. Tuttavia il suo racconto della storia del sogno fa pensare a una influenza criptomnesica dei primi scrittori di psicoanalisi, poiché Josef Breuer usò un’immagine simile per illustrare la struttura della psiche che Édouard Claparède associò a una eredità filogenetica. Nel raccontare la storia del sogno Jung non rappresentò correttamente la posizione di Freud, creando l’impressione che ci fosse una differenza

fra le loro teorie maggiore di quanto di fatto fosse, e dando al sogno un significato romanzesco a proposito della rottura della loro relazione. Di fatto Jung seguì Freud nel campo della mitologia e della filogenesi, e la loro scissione fu dovuta soprattutto alle loro differenti vedute sulla sessualità più che sulla filogenesi. L'immagine del sogno ha quindi portato a una incomprensione della teoria freudiana se vista secondo una prospettiva junghiana. Freud credeva che ci fosse uno strato filogenetico nella psiche, sebbene il suo punto di vista differì da quello junghiano in quanto alla sua natura e importanza.

Jung contó de nuevo su sueño de 'la casa de varios pisos' en los seminarios de 1925, para ilustrar el concepto del inconsciente colectivo y explicar la influencia de la filogenia en su fractura con Freud. Sin embargo, al narrar su sueño ignora, en forma criptomnésica, la influencia de las escrituras tempranas del psicoanálisis, ya que José Breuer utilizó una imagen similar para ilustrar la estructura de la psique que Édouard Claparède asoció a una herencia filogenética. Al contar la historia del sueño, Jung falsificó la posición de Freud, creando la impresión de que la diferencia entre sus teorías era más grande de lo que realmente venía al caso, y de dar al sueño una significación ficticia para el deterioro de su relación. De hecho, Jung siguió a Freud en los campos de la mitología y la filogénesis, y su fractura fue debida, sobre todo, a sus diversas posiciones en relación a la sexualidad. La imagen del sueño por lo tanto ha originado un malentendido de la teoría freudiana cuando está es vista dentro de una perspectiva Jungiana. Freud creyó que había una capa filogenética en la psique, aunque mantuvo una visión distinta a la de Jung en cuanto a su naturaleza e importancia.

References

- Bair, D. (2004). *Jung, A Biography*. New York: Back Bay Books.
- Bergmann, M.S. (1997). 'The historical roots of psychoanalytic orthodoxy'. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 78.
- Breuer, J. (1893). 'Theoretical'. In *Studies on Hysteria. SE II* (1893–1895).
- Breuer, J., Freud, S. (1991). *Studien über Hysterie (Studies in Hysteria)*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Claparède, E. (1908), 'Quelques mots sur la définition de l'hystérie'. *Archives de Psychologie*, VII. Geneva: Flournoy/Claparède.
- Ellenberger, H. (1970). *The Discovery of the Unconscious*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ferenczi, S. (1909). *Letter to Freud, December 7, 1909. The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi Volume 1, 1908–1914*. Delaware: Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing.
- Flournoy, T. (1900). *From India to the Planet Mars*. Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing.
- Freud, S. (1893). *Studies on Hysteria. SE II* (1893–1895). Delaware: Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing.
- (1900a). *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Translation by J. Crick, 1999. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1st edn.
- (1900b). *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Translation by A.A. Brill. Ware: Wordsworth Editions.
- (1900c). *Letter to Fliess, 8 January, 1900. The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887–1904*. Delaware: Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing.
- (1905). *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality. SE VII* (1901–1905). Delaware: Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing.

- (1909). *Letter to Sándor Ferenczi, 9 August 1909. The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi Volume 1, 1908–1914*. Delaware: Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing.
- (1939). *Moses and Monotheism. SE XXIII (1937–1939)*. Delaware: Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing.
- Freud, S, Jung, C.G. (1979), *The Freud/Jung Letters*, edited by William McGuire, abridged by Alan McGlashan, London: Pan Books.
- Gottlieb, R.M. (2006). 'Review: A compulsion for antiquity: Freud and the ancient world'. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 87, 6, 1724–50. <www.interscience.wiley.com>, 2/1/2008.
- Harrison Town, C. (1908). 'Review: *Quelques Mots sur la Définition de L'Hystérie*'. *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, 5, 11, 302–6. <www.jstor.org/stable/2011982>, 3/1/12/2008.
- Heyman, S.R. (1977). 'Freud and the concept of inherited racial memories'. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 64, 461–64. Delaware: Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing.
- Hoffer, P. (1992). 'The concept of phylogenetic inheritance in Freud and Jung'. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 40, 517–30. Delaware: Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing.
- Jones, R. (2007). 'A discovery of meaning: the case of C.G. Jung's house dream'. *Culture & Psychology*, 13, 203–30. London: Sage Publications.
- Jung, C.G. (1901). 'Sigmund Freud: "On Dreams"'. In *The Symbolic Life, CW 18*.
- (1902). 'On the psychology and pathology of so-called occult phenomena in psychiatric studies'. *CW 1*.
- (1904). 'The associations of normal subjects' by C.G. Jung and Franz Riklin. In *Experimental Researches, CW 2*.
- (1905). 'Cryptomnesia'. In *Psychiatric Studies. CW 1*.
- (1908). 'Abstracts of the psychological works of Swiss authors'. *CW 18*.
- (1910/11). 'On the significance of number dreams in Freud and psychoanalysis'. *CW 4*.
- (1912). *Symbols of Transformation. CW 5*.
- (1921). *Psychological Types. CW 6*.
- (1925). *Analytical Psychology: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1925*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- (1932). 'The hypothesis of the collective unconscious'. *CW 18*.
- (1946). 'Analytical psychology and education'. In *The Development of Personality, CW 17*.
- (1957). 'The Houston Films'. In *C.G. Jung Speaking*, eds. W. McGuire & R. F. C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- (1958). 'Flying saucers: a modern myth of things seen in the skies'. In *Civilization in Transition. CW 10*.
- (1959). *The 'Face to Face' Interview in C.G. Jung Speaking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- (1963). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Recorded and edited by Aniela Jaffé. London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1995.
- (1964). *Man And His Symbols*. London: Picador, 1978.
- (1973). *C.G. Jung Letters I*. Edited by Gerhard Adler & Aniela Jaffé. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- (1976). *C.G. Jung Letters II*. Edited by Gerhard Adler & Aniela Jaffé. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- (1995a). *Psychiatric Studies. CW 1*.
- (1995b). *Experimental Researches. CW 2*.

- Kron, T. / Avny, N. (2003). 'Psychotherapists' dreams about their patients'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 48, 3.
- Marinelli, L., Mayer, A. (2003). *Dreaming by the Book*. New York: Other Press.
- Noll, R. (1999). 'Jung the Leontocephalus'. In *Jung in Context, A Reader*, ed. P. Bishop. London: Routledge.
- Schlessinger, N., Gedo, J.E., Miller, J. (1967). 'The scientific style of Breuer and Freud in the *Origins of Psychoanalysis*'. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 15, 404-22.
- Shamdasani, S. (1999). 'Memories, Dreams, Omissions'. In *Jung in Context, A Reader*, ed. P. Bishop. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Strachey, J. (1906). 'Editor's note to psycho-analysis and the establishment of the facts in legal proceedings'. *SE of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*.
- Wallace, E.R., IV (1980). 'A commentary on the *Freud-Jung Letters*'. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 67, 111-37.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express thanks to Roderick Main, Andrew Samuels and Matt Ffytche for their comments, advice and suggestions whilst preparing this essay for publication.

[Ms first submitted September 2008; Final version April 2009]

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.