

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

## The snares of seduction in life and in therapy, or what do young girls (Spielrein) seek in their Aryan heroes (Jung), and vice versa? Part 1

ZVI LOTHANE

New York, USA

### Abstract

The publication of the relationship between Sabina Spielrein and Carl Jung in 1980 gave rise to a veritable cottage industry of mythomania at the expense of historical truth. The fictions grafted upon the historical facts have conjured up a sensational aura of scandal and gossip about the protagonists. The arch fiction is that Spielrein and Jung had a sexual relationship during her analysis by Jung. At the very least, based on documents published by the author, this opinion can no longer be maintained beyond reasonable doubt. After 1905, Spielrein was no longer Jung's patient but continued as Jung's medical student, whereupon Jung sought her out as friend. In addition, it was Spielrein herself who fell passionately in love with Jung, and analysed this relationship as a case of mutual oedipal dynamics. The author further pursues the oedipal analysis of and links it to (1) love as reality and transference, (2) the reality of Jewish and Gentile relationships in Europe, and (3) mutual ethnic transferences between Spielrein and Jung. Jung, who was also passionately drawn to Spielrein, displaced his marital problems owing to a "Don Juan complex" to concocted problems in treatment, deceiving both himself and Freud out of the dread of social consequences.

**Key words:** *Spielrein, jung, sex scandal, seduction, jews and gentiles*

### Introduction

Psychoanalysis is a historical science, as memory, in spite of the inherent problems of recall, is the instrument for getting to biographical facts in psychoanalysis as research and as treatment. This definition seems to embody an oxymoron: how can history, that is, remembering and telling, ever be considered as science? It can, because, like science, psychoanalysis also starts with observed facts: persons acting in specific places and times. Consider another paradoxical definition: psychoanalysis is a science of the particular. But does not science rest on the foundation of general hypotheses and laws, that is, universals and not particulars? Indeed, but in an individual biography, unlike in actuarial research or controlled experiments, the person, in his or her particularity and singularity, comes first, and universal generalizations are an afterthought.

We need to distinguish further between a chronicle and a history: the former lists the events, the latter describes both the events, that is, the external or

material reality, and the internal, or psychological, reality of actors in events—their emotions and thoughts, their motives, supposals, and fantasies. Freud addressed these problems by offering a crucial distinction between material and psychic reality: "phantasies possess *psychical* as contrasted with *material* reality, and we gradually learn to understand that *in the world of the neuroses it is psychical reality which is the decisive kind*" (1910a, p. 368, Freud's italics). Is Freud's dictum limited to neuroses or does it apply to life writ large as well? More tellingly, in his 1910 "biographical study" of da Vinci, Freud conjectured that Leonardo's childhood memory of a bird striking him on his lips was nothing but "a phantasy, which he formed at a later date and transposed to his childhood" (p. 82), with no historical evidence for such a guess. Clearly, Freud favored fantasies over facts.

But *are* fantasies more decisive than facts? Are not both equally important in the search for historical *truth*? Does not external reality matter? Besides, invoking "fantasy" as the only counterpart to material

reality poses the danger of neglecting other psychological facts: there are *public* events and there are the *personal experiences and evaluations* of the events, in addition to fantasies formed either before or after the event; thus, to understand the *meaning* of a life, of a person, we need to give equal importance to both. Moreover, fantasies do not spring from nowhere, they are themselves derivatives of prior experiences: symptoms derive from memories of traumatic events and conflicts, dreams—from day residues, both emerging in consciousness as *transformations*, by unconscious dynamisms, as a conscious manifest dream or day-dream content. To paraphrase a famous saying of Kant: events without fantasies are empty, fantasies without events are blind.

As fantasies became the staple of psychoanalysis it was easy to slip into regarding the main purpose of psychoanalysis, whether therapeutic or applied, as *interpreting* the varieties of fantasy, at the expense of *finding* the truth of the historical facts of a life. In the 1980's it became fashionable to debate the merits of narrative truth vs. historical truth, as expounded, for example, in Donald Spence's 1982 book *Narrative truth and historical truth. Meaning and interpretation in psychoanalysis*, whose main thesis I critiqued as follows:

On the ruins of Freud's method of free association, the basic instrument for achieving the goal of the person's examined life with its symptoms, dreams, and transferences, Spence has erected a new method . . . derived from a brand of literary criticism heavily influenced by French structuralists. Brutally stated, Spence's thesis runs as follows: because free association in the patient is unreliable, . . . and because memory is fallible and the interlocutors in the psychoanalytic dialogue gullible, one should give up the hope that the classical technique is capable of generating a true story of the patient's past. . . . Because the patient's recollecting cannot be the source of valid *historical truth*, there is no choice but to make do with a substitute, i.e., *narrative truth*. This second-choice narrative truth is strictly the achievement of the analyst, an exercise of his or her professional competence. The analyst fabricates the likely story and imposes it upon the patient. (Lothane, 1984, pp. 63–64)

the analyst sacrifices historical truth to narrative truth, also called the narrative fit. The latter is true 'because plausible', because 'there is no evidence against it'; . . . the analyst creates a statement that is 'coherent and sayable', 'finding a narrative home' for the patient's 'anomalous happening'. The narrative closure' takes away the strangeness and mystery' from the patient's sayings. Such a construction

acquires narrative truth in the process of being created', it 'not only shapes the past – it *becomes* the past' (*italics in the original*). Such constructions are gratefully accepted by the patient; they give him explanation in place of uncertainty, and they sometimes lead to further recall'. ( p. 71)

Lives of persons and collectives present a continuous interplay of facts and interpretations of facts, and both are important, as they are in medicine, law, politics, and science. By contrast, analysts at times seem to be caught in their own countertransference: interpretations displace facts and take on a life of their own such that rather than analysing fantasies, the analyst is actually spinning them. A good interpretation should illuminate connections between facts but should not replace historical facts. Moreover, the primacy of interpretation belongs to the analysand, not the analyst, the latter acting as a Socratic midwife, a facilitator, rather than an arbiter of truth (Lothane, 1981, 1984, 2004a).

Ever since the publication of Carotenuto's book about her in 1980, historical facts have turned into narrative fictions, or myths, and have cast a shadow on the legacy of Sabina Spielrein, both in the professional literature and in the popular press and plays. Here are some myths that fly in the face of the historical record: (1) Spielrein was schizophrenic or psychotic while an inmate in the hospital and seduced Jung; (2) after her discharge she was treated by Jung in his private analytic practice; (3) during the alleged analytic treatment, Jung abused Spielrein sexually and thus crossed a professional boundary; (4) this behavior caused a scandal that then was a cause of the break-up of the Freud–Jung friendship. I have debunked these myths in previous publications and focus here on other facets of the remarkable Spielrein–Jung relationship. I have also presented historical facts compared with narrative fictions in another remarkable story, that of Paul Schreber (Lothane, 1992, 2004b, 2005b).

### No sex between Spielrein and Jung

Prior to my discussion of Elisabeth Márton's moving docudrama *Ich hieß Sabina Spielrein* (2002) and following its screening at the meeting of the New York Psychoanalytic Society on March 11, 2003, I conducted an impromptu unscientific poll: I asked the audience for a show of hands as to whether, in their opinion, Sabina Spielrein and C.G. Jung consummated sexual intercourse during their love relationship that Sabina Spielrein defined as "poetry." The number of the yeas and the nays was split approximately half and half. Márton's film is ambiguous regarding this question or who seduced whom.

How could the yea-sayers be so sure? In the secondary literature about their relationship, wild conjecture has overtaken sober knowledge of historical facts. Some went even further: in the play *The talking cure* by Christopher Hampton (2002), produced in London, there is an implied defloration scene of Spielrein by Jung with red blood stains on the sheets. A film released in 2006, *Where love reigns*, is said to be “based on the true story of Sabina Spielrein, a Russian Jewish patient, who in 1904, at the age of 19, was referred to Dr. Carl Jung. During her treatment, she and Jung would embark upon a passionate and forbidden love affair”; this was inspired by Snoo Wilson’s (2000) crude play, *Sabina*, in which Jung reassures Sabina that he has enough condoms. Renate Höfer (1996), pp. 156–186) is sure that Spielrein not only fantasized about having Jung’s child but had actually become pregnant and had a miscarriage.

And what considerations moved the nay-sayers? My own opinion as nay-sayer, based on the written testimony of the protagonists, a close reading of the *Freud–Jung letters*, and documents I found in Geneva, is that, at the very least, there is reasonable doubt that sexual intercourse was part of the relationship (1999, 2001a, 2003a, 2003b).

This cautious stance is also supported by the *Zeitgeist* a century ago, before European sexual mores changed as a result of the impact of the Great War and other social developments. In those days, people were not as ready to jump into bed as they are nowadays, and unconsummated sex made the relationship even more poignant and vibrant with longing. The straw poll I conducted also shows that historical reality is repeatedly bound to lose the battle against what Freud called psychic reality: people will believe what they are inclined to believe based on their own personal histories, projections, and prejudices. However, we owe to it to historical accuracy and to the memory of the people involved to expose the legends and better understand our own eternally recurrent ethical rules and conflicts about sexuality, and the guilt over it, both in society and within the profession of psychoanalysis.

In considering the sexual mores of our time, it is also important not to fall into one of the two extremes: either to moralize about sexual behavior or to sensationalize it for commercial exploitation. In this regard, there are notable differences between America and the UK on one side, and continental Europe on the other. Only in America could we have the sensational sex scandal of president Clinton and Monica Lewinski, which cost the Democrats the White House and gave us president Bush; only in the UK could we have the obsession with the sex life of

the royals. No such sensation surrounded the loves of French Prime Minister Mitterand.

Among psychoanalysts, who may like everybody else harbor prejudices about sexual behavior, the projection of a sexual relationship between Spielrein and Jung has been enhanced by a concern endemic to the profession: the breach of the rule of sexual abstinence or, as it is now called, boundary violations during treatment. Such violations are not just countertransference on the part of the analyst, and Freud was clear on that in 1915: “For the doctor, ethical motives unite with the technical ones—to restrain him from giving the patient his love” (p. 169). That statement was made by Freud years before it became a requirement that analysts undergo a personal analysis as part of their training. By that time, he may have had in mind the relationship between his favorite son Ferenczi and Gizella Palos and her daughter Elma (Mahony, Bonomi, and Stensson, 1997, pp. 203–223), in which the authors repeat the old myths about Spielrein.

Moreover, there is also the unfounded opinion that sex between Spielrein and Jung was consummated *during* a conventional analytic treatment, the way it is done today, couch and all. But whereas it was Jung who created the false impression that Spielrein continued to be his patient after her discharge from the hospital, Spielrein herself declared in 1909 *expressis verbis*:

Well: I cannot help complaining of a faithless lover. . . . Four and a half years ago Dr. Jung was my doctor, then he became my friend and finally my “poet,” i.e., my beloved. Eventually, he came to me and things went as they usually do with “poetry.” He preached polygamy, his wife was supposed to have no objection, etc., etc. Now my mother receives an anonymous letter that minces no words, saying she should rescue her daughter, since otherwise she would be ruined by Dr. Jung. . . . I kept absolutely mum. . . . There is reason to suspect his wife. . . . My mother writes him a moving letter, . . . begging him not to exceed the bounds of friendship. Thereupon his reply: “I moved from being her doctor to being her friend when I ceased to push my own feelings into the background. I could drop my role as a doctor the more easily because I did not feel professionally obligated, for I never charged a fee. . . . Therefore I would suggest that if you wish me to adhere strictly to my role as doctor, you should pay me a fee as suitable recompense for my trouble. . . . My fee is 10 francs per consultation. I advise you to choose the prosaic solution, since that is the more prudent one and creates no obligation for the future.” . . . How terribly insulting that must

have been for my mother. (Carotenuto, 1980, pp. 93–94)

First, it is unthinkable that sex could have taken place while Spielrein was at Burghölzli, where Jung lived with his wife and two children—where would this have occurred: in Spielrein’s hospital room, in a hallway, on the grounds? Second, after Spielrein left Burghölzli, there was *no* ongoing analysis either on or off the couch, neither five times, three times, or once a week, complete with free associations and fees paid. Spielrein did *not* complain to Freud that Jung abused either therapy or transference: “I am analytical enough, know myself well enough, and am sure that for me infatuation a distance would be best” (Carotenuto, 1980, p. 92). Third, I do not find Jung’s letter callous, just business-like. Thus, since powerful sexual emotions in the transference and countertransference are as radioactive today as ever before, and since ethical boundary violations by analysts and analysands remain a recurrent problem in many places, it is much easier and safer to project such misconduct onto the dead than openly discuss it among the living, especially when the persons involved are prominent members of the psychoanalytic community.

The projection of an ethical scandal has been complicated by another: that of casting Spielrein in the role of victim and Jung in the role of abuser. I have disproved this thesis, too, again based on Spielrein’s own testimony: “we are either equally guilty or not guilty” (Lothane, 2003a, p. 260). On this matter, there is unanimity between myself and Professor Wolfgang Eckart, chief of the Department History of Medicine at Heidelberg University, even though he was the supervisor of the feminist doctoral dissertation about Spielrein (Wackenhut & Willke, 1994). When the victim is a small child and the perpetrator is an adult, abuse is not in doubt; when two adults are involved, both participants may play the dual role of victim and perpetrator. This faulty logic is used by von Petersdorf (Hensch, 2003), citing Ferenczi’s famous 1932 paper, “Confusion of tongues between adults and the child,” about adults sexually traumatizing small children. But Spielrein was no child! Was Spielrein Jung’s victim because he, and not a young man, was her first love and aroused her passionate love? Was he her victim when he mistakenly concluded that she was spreading malicious rumors about him, which was subsequently proved to be wrong? Last but not least, Spielrein was also unjustly blamed for the break-up between Freud and Jung (Kerr, 1993) and nothing could be further from the truth, as proven by Freud’s letters to Jung (Lothane, 1996, 1999), or to Spielrein after she married in 1913 (see below), and by the real reasons for this break-up: Jung’s denial of Freud’s libido

theory and the dispute over the interpretation of Schreber (Lothane, 1997).

Let me for a moment play devil’s advocate and agree with Jung that Spielrein fell in love with him during her treatment, that is, in Burghölzli, and not he with her, as he claimed in his unpublished report of September 25, 1905, written after Spielrein had left the hospital: “In the course of her treatment the patient had the *bad luck to fall in love with me*. She continues to rave blatantly to her mother about this love and her secret spiteful glee in scaring her mother is not the least of her motives. Therefore the mother would like, if needed, to have her referred to another doctor, with which I naturally concur” (Minder, 1993/2001, pp. 121–122, emphasis added, translated Z. L.; Lothane, 2003a, p. 255). Jung does not ask the question but I shall: was Spielrein experiencing genuine love or was it merely transference love? Transference as unreal, make-believe love, as Freud said, “*eine falsche Verknüpfung*” (a false connection), was experienced and discussed by Freud in 1895 in the *Studies on hysteria*; countertransference was also experienced then, but it would first be so named in 1910.

Jung does not explain the nature of Spielrein’s love for him. He only considers the erotic content and intent of this falling in love and seems oblivious of its possible hostile meaning and intention. But on his own showing, the 20-year-old Spielrein has created an oedipal triangle with the purpose of provoking and taunting her mother and Jung, thus making trouble for both. The mischievous acting out in the transference is very much in evidence, and it was amply documented by Jung in Spielrein’s clinical chart (Minder, 1994). However, there is no indication that she ever actively seduced or forced Jung to love her, although she expressed such an association in one of Jung’s association experiments (Minder, 1994). By the way, it was this 1905 report, and not any motive to cause trouble between Freud and Jung, that gave Spielrein the idea to write to Freud on May 30, 1909 requesting an audience.

Ten years later, Freud (1915) would analyse more incisively the nature of make-believe, that is, transference falling in love:

If one looks into the situation more closely one recognizes the influence of motives which further complicate things – of which some are connected with being in love and others are particular expressions of resistance. Of the first kind are the patient’s endeavor to assure herself of her irresistibility, to destroy the doctor’s authority by bringing him down to the level of a lover and to gain all the other promised advantages we may suspect that on occasion it makes use of a declaration of love on the patient’s part as a means of putting her analyst’s

severity to the test, so that, if he should show signs of compliance, he may expect to be taken to task for it. But above all, one gets an impression that the resistance is acting as an *agent provocateur*; it heightens the patient's state of being in love and exaggerates her readiness for sexual surrender in order to justify the workings of repression all the more emphatically, by pointing to the dangers of such licentiousness. (p. 163)

Aggression is not yet a fully appreciated motive in Freud's theories, but, as a moralist and practicing analyst, he is very much aware of it, and it is here acknowledged under the rubric of resistance, clearly an aspect of the negative transference. Jung was not blind to the fact of aggression either, and the success of Spielrein's treatment as an inpatient was due not only, as he wrote to Freud in a letter of October 23, 1906, to "treating an hysteric with your method" (McGuire, 1974, p. 6)—actually, in those early days rather with Breuer's method, as happened with Anna O.—but also due to Jung's ability to withstand *agent provocateur* Spielrein's trying chicaneries, to endure her aggressive behavior with patience and sympathy, to help her resolve the sizable aggressive component of her neurosis, and to guide her to recovery: the termination of her treatment and matriculation at Zürich University School of Medicine. He was later her teacher in medical school and the instructor of the dissertation with which she graduated as doctor in medicine. Eventually, she would become a Freudian, not a Jungian, psychoanalyst and a member of the Vienna and Geneva Psychoanalytic Societies.

As noted above, Spielrein did demand love of Jung, like patients Freud knew:

At a first glance it certainly does not look as if the patient's falling in love in the transference could result in any advantage to the treatment. No matter how amenable she has been up till then, she suddenly loses all understanding of the treatment and all interest in it, and will not speak or hear about anything but her love, which she demands to have returned. . . . There is a complete change of scene; it is as though some piece of make-believe had been stopped by the sudden irruption of reality — as when, for instance, a cry of fire is raised during a theatrical performance. (Carotenuto & Hensch, 1986, p. 161).

Even so, Freud argues,

We have no right to dispute that the state of being in love which makes its appearance in the course of analytic treatment has the character of a 'genuine' love. If it seems lacking in normality, this is

sufficiently explained by the fact that being in love in ordinary life, outside analysis, is also more similar to abnormal than to normal mental phenomena. (Carotenuto & Hensch, 1986, p. 168)

Whereas Plato was the first to regard love as a form of madness, it was left to Freud to discover that all love, inside or outside treatment, is colored by transference. For, like love, transference is not limited to the analytic relationship: it plays a role in all relationships at all times. Transference is as ubiquitous as bacteria in the air. It is only in the laboratory that bacteria are studied under the microscope for the purpose of diagnosis and treatment. Similarly, it is only in the special conditions of the analytic treatment that transference is observed, studied, and analysed for the purpose of freeing the patient from the shackles of his or her infantile relationships. In my view, the love of the 34-year-old Jung and 24-year-old Spielrein was real and genuine, not just a play in the theater of the mind, when they switched from friendship to love in late 1908 or early 1909, even if it was affected by their unresolved transferences. No matter who made the first step, or who seduced whom, which cannot be reconstructed from the documents, the former patient and doctor ended having a real, passionate, but essentially platonic love relationship, based on Spielrein's definition of "poetry" as tenderness short of coitus (Hensch, 1987; Lothane, 1999); if this is granted, then 'platonic' here means expressions of affection accompanied by necking, that is, kissing and hugging, and it also means *agape*, or love writ large (Lothane, 2001a).

Their love was from the outset beset by social obstacles for both: Spielrein had dreams of conquering a married man so that they could have a mixed Germanic-Jewish child named Siegfried; Jung never promised to leave his wealthy wife to marry a Jewish girl, and preferred to remain an adulterer, that is, to commit marital infidelity toward Emma, his wife and the mother of his children. It is for this reason—knowing how passionate Spielrein's love for him was and not wanting to leave his wife—that Jung would have been careful not to engage in sexual intercourse, for this would make Spielrein's involvement with him all the more demanding and all the more difficult to sever if and when he decided to do so. It is uncertain whether, before their love episode, Jung had already been promiscuous—he was described as such by Spielrein in 1910 in her diary, citing another Jewish young woman from Russia who wrote her doctoral thesis under Jung's chief Bleuler: "When I was out walking, I met Fräulein Aptekmann. She was once a patient of my friend's and is now one of the many" (Carotenuto, 1980, p. 17). She also wrote to her mother in 1909 that "He preached polygamy, his

wife agrees, etc, etc.” (Lothane, 2003b). Jung himself referred to his promiscuity as “polygamy,” but rather than to search for his motivation, he attributed it to the ideas and influence of his former patient and collaborator, the notorious Austrian psychiatrist Otto Gross, as Jung states in a letter of September 25, 1907:

Dr. Gross tells me that he puts a quick stop to the transference by turning people into sexual immoralists. He says the transference to the analyst and its persistent fixation are mere monogamy symbols and as such symptomatic of repression. The truly healthy state for the neurotic is sexual immorality. Hence he associates you with Nietzsche. It seems to me, however, that sexual repression is a very important and indispensable civilizing factor, even if pathogenic for many inferior people. . . . I feel Gross is going along too far with the vogue for the sexual short-circuit, which is neither intelligent, nor in good taste, but merely convenient, and therefore anything but a civilizing factor. (McGuire, 1974, p. 90)

Gross’ critique of conventional sexual hypocrisy had a counterpart in Freud’s subversive of view of “civilized’ sexual morality” in 1908, which sounded almost like Wilhelm Reich two decades later. Freud would ultimately agree with Jung that sexual repression was the price that mankind had to pay for culture, at least in the Western world. But can we believe Jung draping himself in the mantle of Judeo-Christian morality while at the same time wanting to be a Dionysian pagan dreaming of other women, or, via Groß’s comparison with Nietzsche, indirectly accusing Freud of advocating free sex? Freud certainly did not, and a comparison of Freud’s and Jung’s sexuality bears a relationship to these themes.

In 1909 Freud was 53, and (according to Jones) had not been sexually active since the birth of his last child Anna, never got romantically involved with his ex-patients, and had no mistresses. He went through an intense process of self-analysis of his own incest complex and made the Oedipus complex into a pillar of his theories of sexuality and love, of disorder and character development, and of Freudian ethics, anthropology, and theory of culture. Jung, on the other hand, presumably kept his incest complex under repression, broke with Freud over his de-emphasis of sexuality in Schreber (Lothane, 1997) and the revision of the concept libido, and ultimately developed a mystical theory of culture and, by all appearances, did not practice what he preached. One more difference between the two titans of psychoanalysis related to the incest complex: both harbored a latent homosexual conflict, and Jung confessed to

having a crush on Freud (Lothane, 1997), but they achieved a different resolution: Jung was homophobic and refrained from treating homosexual patients, whereas Freud remained tolerant towards homosexuality.

At 24 Spielrein was, as she tells us, an innocent virgin:

My parents, actually my mother, took pride in the ‘purity’ and ‘naiveté’ of their daughter; my women friends, too, did not want to ‘soil’ me by means of explanations [of sexuality]. In the high school, out of consideration for good manners, mating among animals was eliminated from the teaching of science. Finally, my ‘innocence’ pleased me myself and I retained a certain fear of becoming impure as a result of knowledge [of sexuality]. Thus it happened that during my university studies I learned about sexual matters from lectures in zoology. (Hensch, 1987, p. 144)

Apparently, Spielrein did not receive any lessons concerning sexual matters from anybody before she met Jung: she does not tell us whether, as a high-school student, she was in love with any boy her age. As a medical student, she filled that gap in her education rather quickly, not only through reading but by having an experienced teacher in Jung. He became her first, passionate, exclusive, and boundless love, a love of Romeo for Juliet, who happened to be an older married man. For Jung, however, she was only a supplementary love, an extramarital affair, fulfilling a deep need for stormy romantic involvements, a much-needed sustenance for his scientific work.

### **Jung’s marital problems**

Three months after Jung first anonymously mentioned Spielrein to Freud as a difficult case (McGuire, 1974, p. 7), he confessed to having a problem with infidelity in a letter dated December 29, 1906, in response to Freud’s analysis of Jung’s dream initially misrepresented by Jung as a patient’s dream:

You have put your finger on the weak points in my dream analysis. I do in fact know the dream material and the dream thoughts much better than I have said. I know the dreamer intimately: he is myself. The ‘failure of the rich marriage’ refers to something essential that is undoubtedly contained in the dream, though not in the way you think. My wife is rich. For various reasons I was turned down when I first proposed; later I was accepted, and I married. I am happy with my wife

in every way (not merely from optimism), though of course this does nothing to prevent such dreams. So there has been no sexual failure, more likely a social one. The rationalistic explanation, 'sexual restraint', is, as I have said, merely a convenient screen pushed into the foreground and hiding an *illegitimate sexual wish* that had better not see the light of day. One determinant of the little rider, who in my analysis at first evokes the idea of my chief, is the wish for a boy (we have two girls). (p. 14, emphasis added)

What failure could Jung be referring to? Surely not the fact that he had married a rich wife. Is this not a displacement from his real neurotic sexual problem: his obsession with "polygamy," that is, the temptation of promiscuity, the forbidden fruit of infidelity, which he admitted to Freud on a number of occasions? It has been asserted that Jung originally approached Freud because of Spielrein. The passage quoted here points to a different motive: he turned to Freud because of his sexual neurosis, his Don Juan complex. However, he did not ask Freud to analyse him as his patient, as he should have, whether out of pride or because he did not really want to give his womanizing up. Like the First Analyst, the Swiss "crown prince" did not have the benefit of a personal analysis, unlike Sandor Ferenczi, Freud's Jewish favorite son, who met Freud in 1908, a year after Jung, and was later analysed by Freud. This did not, however, prevent Ferenczi from having problems with female ex-patients.

It is not that Jung's sexual wish was illegitimate, it is his adultery that was illegitimate. First, it was a transgression against one of the Ten Commandments, "Do not commit adultery," delivered by God to Moses on Mount Sinai and reaffirmed in the Gospel of St Luke (18:20). Second, in spite of the widespread practice of the double standard in the Europe of those days, a man could keep mistresses but a woman was not permitted to have lovers, and in many jurisdictions adultery and fornication were illegal and grounds for divorce. But can his affair with Spielrein be considered adulterous even in the absence of coitus? Not legally but emotionally so, at least the way Emma Jung saw it.

More than three years later, Jung tells Freud in a letter of January 30, 1910:

During the time when I didn't write to you I was plagued by complexes, and I detest wailing letters. This time it was not I who was duped by the devil but my wife, who lent an ear to the evil spirit and staged a number of jealous scenes, groundlessly. At first my objectivity got out of joint (rule 1 of psychoanalysis: principles of Freudian psychology

apply to everyone except the analyser) but afterwards snapped back again, whereupon my wife also straightened herself out brilliantly. Analysis of one's spouse is one of the more difficult things unless mutual freedom is assured. The prerequisite for a good marriage, it seems to me, is the license to be unfaithful. I in my turn have learnt a great deal. The main point always comes last: my wife is pregnant again, by design and after mature reflection. (McGuire, 1974, p. 289)

Like Galileo's defiant "*eppur si muove*," Jung is still unrepentant about his infidelity. But who was Emma jealous of? It appears that the Jungs had a big fight, but was Emma threatened by her husband? She was now pregnant for the third time, and Jung may have been sexually frustrated. It is not clear whether the talk of freedom for both parties meant that he gave his wife the same right to unfaithfulness as he had claimed for himself in the next breath. At any rate, it was she who made the jealous scenes and it was he who arrogated to himself the male—and egoistic—prerogative of the double standard. Men tend to view an unfaithful wife as debased by her infidelity and themselves as deceived, or as robbed of their rightful possession. By contrast, an unfaithful husband is a hero in his own and other people's eyes and will be idolized as a virtuoso of the bedroom (at times even by his own wife), as long as the marriage stays intact. Thus, social fidelity and keeping up appearances is seen as more important than sexual fidelity per se. If there was ever any doubt—or hope—in Spielrein's mind of getting Jung for herself as a husband, the third pregnancy sealed the marriage of Carl and Emma Jung as permanent. In due course, after the noise of the affair with Spielrein had died down, Emma Jung would accept the permanent extramarital arrangement between her husband and his ex-patient and student, Antonia Wolff (Lothane, 1996).

By the way, one should never analyse one's own wife, or vice versa; and the rules of analysis—and other ethical principles as well—*do* apply to everybody, analysand and analyst alike: the double standard cannot be tolerated in analysis. Above all, as I have argued (Lothane, 2003a), in representing his affair with Spielrein to Freud predominantly as a problem in treatment, thus using treatment as a plausible rationalization, Jung got Freud to play along with this deception and avoided delving into the reasons for his personal problems.

But his romantic relationship with Spielrein was his problem in real life, not in therapy, and that relationship was ended by a reality shock: the aforementioned anonymous German letter received by her mother. I suspect that Jung had dropped hints

to Emma and was thus an accomplice in sending that letter, in order to put an end to the love affair. Sabina's mother subsequently had a confrontation with Jung and thereafter persuaded her daughter to give Jung up (Lothane, 1999). The thunderbolt woke Spielrein from her unrealistic dreams and hopes, even though the "poetry" continued sporadically for some time after and the friendly epistolary relationship lasted until 1919. Perhaps even without that anonymous letter (which I suspect might have been known to Jung before it reached its destination), Spielrein might have eventually seen the light anyway and walked away from a hopeless relationship.

The complexes cast a long deep shadow on Jung. Half a century after the Jungs first visited the Freuds in Vienna in 1907, when Jung was now 82, four years before his death, he would tell a visitor from America named Billinsky that Freud's sister-in-law Minna Bernays confided in him that she and Freud had a sexual relationship, a story that later appeared doubtful to some and truthful to others, like the allegation of sex between Jung and Spielrein. Was Jung still seeking to be on equal footing with Freud after all these years? Was this the revenge of a man with a guilty conscience? By the way, the story became a justification for a sizable sensational secondary literature, about both Freud and Bernays, based on the "*cherchez la femme*" formula of the true and tried *roman à clef*.

As already noted, the love of Spielrein and Jung was both a passionate encounter framed by what the Greeks called *agape* and *philia*, and also contained for both of them transference meanings rooted in their respective oedipal constellations. It is to these that we now turn. We can thus ask further: what were the desires and dynamics that fueled this love and accounted for the powerful attraction that they felt for each other? What did they seek from each other? What were the facets of their personalities that drove them to each other? We shall seek answers in Freud's papers of 1910b, 1912, and 1918, his "Three contributions to the psychology of love (*Liebesleben*)," as well as in statements by both protagonists, while keeping in mind that the woman was a Jewess and the man a Christian.

### Sex, love, and the Oedipus

In the fateful year of 1909, Jung published a paper on father-child dynamics, inspired by his encounter with Spielrein and Gross, and containing a few interesting case histories, in which Jung reworked some of Freud's earlier ideas but did not break new ground. In 1909 Freud published his papers on family romances, and in 1912 those on the Oedipus

complex, two interrelated psychoanalytic concepts. These concepts were central attempt to explain the dynamics, or the necessary love preconditions (*Liebesbedingungen*), as he called it, of various forms of sexual behavior in health and disease as related to monogamous marriage and its breach: choice of spouse, promiscuity, infidelity, jealousy, homosexuality, and, not to be overlooked, the role of egoistic and power motives as well. Neurotics engaged in spinning family romances, said Freud (1909), show:

... a quite peculiarly marked imaginative activity ... the familiar day-dreaming which persists far beyond puberty. If these day-dreams are carefully examined, they are found to serve as the fulfillment of wishes and as a correction of actual life. They have two principal aims, an erotic and an ambitious one – though an erotic aim is usually concealed behind the latter too. At about the period I have mentioned, then, the child's imagination becomes engaged in the task of getting free from the parents of whom he now has a low opinion and of replacing them by others, who as a rule, are of higher social standing. (p. 238)

Such behavior could only be explained by the dynamics of the incest complex or, euphemistically, the Oedipus complex, as Freud outlined in the First Contribution (1910b). Addressing the problem of "'the' necessary [pre]conditions for loving' which govern people's choice of an object, and the way in which they bring the demands of their imagination into harmony with reality" (p. 165), Freud invoked the Oedipus complex to explain four character types of love-object choice among men, among them a type of man dominated by:

the precondition that there should be' an injured third party'; it stipulates that the person in question shall never choose as his love-object a woman who is disengaged – that is, an unmarried girl or an unattached married woman – but only one to whom another man can claim right of possession as her husband, fiancé or friend. (p. 66)

Implicit in this formulation was that a woman could similarly only fall in love with a man that belongs to another woman.

Another form of love-object choice was the second precondition, to the effect that

a woman who is chaste and whose reputation is irreproachable never exercises an attraction that might raise her to the status of a love-object, but only a woman who is in some way or other of bad repute sexually, whose fidelity and reliability are

open to some doubt... This second necessary condition may be termed, rather crudely, 'love for a prostitute', (p. 166)

What is most startling of all to the observer in lovers of this type is the urge they show to 'rescue' the woman they love. The man is convinced that she is in need of him, that without him she would lose all moral control and rapidly sink to a lamentable level (p. 168).

These emotional attitudes and behaviors were a "derivation from the mother-complex" (p. 170), that is, the split image of the mother as both a Madonna-like figure, "a person of unimpeachable moral purity" (p. 170), and a whore. As a result, the man:

begins to desire his mother herself in the sense with which he has recently become acquainted, and to hate his father anew as a rival who stands in the way of this wish; he comes, as we say under the dominance of the Oedipus complex. He does not forgive his mother for having granted the favor of sexual intercourse not to himself but to his father, and he regards it as an act of unfaithfulness. (p. 171)

It became important to understand how "unconscious incestuous fantasies" affect overt behavior in men and women. Ferenczi (1922) accordingly described the reverse negative side of this dynamics in "family romances of degradation," according to which well-born individuals displayed a kind of a "*nostalgie de la boue*" and could only feel comfortable in the company of servants and persons of a lower social status.

In the Second Contribution (Freud, 1912), starting with the attempt to elucidate the dynamics of anesthetic men and frigid women, Freud continued to develop, within the frame of a general psychoanalytic psychology of the tender and sensuous currents in the love life of mankind, a development and maturation of the libido: from the primary infantile love object choice of the original dyadic relationship with mother to its transition to the triadic, or triangular, relationship with both parents, and later its resolution as adaptive or maladaptive forms of adult love life. For the woman, the oedipal love choice of the father meant the wish to bear his child.

Juxtaposing the two aspects of love, *eros* and *agape*, Freud (1910b) derives a dynamic explanation of male impotence and female frigidity as follows:

The whole sphere of love in such people remains divided in the two directions personified in art as sacred and profane (or animal) love. Where they

love they do not desire and where they desire they cannot love. They seek objects which they do not need to love, in order to keep their sensuality away from the objects they love. . . . The main protective measure against such a disturbance which men have recourse to in this split in their love consists in a psychical *debasement* of the sexual object, the overvaluation that normally attaches to the sexual object being reserved for the incestuous object and its representatives. As soon as the condition of debasement is fulfilled, sensuality can be freely expressed, and important sexual capacities and a high degree of pleasure can develop. (p. 183)

The attraction of Spielrein and Jung for each other could be seen as an example of one of the above-described types of oedipal dynamics: (1) both experienced social failure, for the relationship presented social obstacles for both, and (2) the accompanying conflicts and emotional storms constituted a regression to earlier unresolved oedipal conflicts, including dependency conflicts. It is known that Jung's family romances included a fantasy that he was a bastard great-grandson of Goethe. I have not researched Jung's relation to his mother, or his incestuous fantasies, or how these determined his promiscuity. Upon the birth of his son Franz, he expressed ambivalent emotions in a letter of December 3, 1908 to Freud: "Heartiest thanks for your congratulatory telegram. You can imagine our joy. The birth went off normally, mother and child are doing well. Too bad we aren't peasants any more, otherwise I could say: Now that I have a son I can depart in peace. A great deal more could be said on this complex-theme" (McGuire, 1974, p. 184). But we are left in the dark about the details. This ambivalence may still be operating three years later in a letter of May 18, 1911 in which Jung complained again, even more sarcastically than before, about his family conflicts:

All is well with us, except for the worry (another false alarm fortunately) about the blessing of too many children. One tries every conceivable trick to stem the tide of these little blessings, but without much confidence. One scrapes along, one might say, from one menstruation to the next. The life of civilized man certainly does have its quaint side. (McGuire, 1974, p. 424)

It might be safe to speculate that, in such a constellation, young Spielrein, both virginal and vivacious, was a welcome relief after a wife both physically and emotionally exhausted, or perhaps even aged, by pregnancies. Also, might it perhaps lend support to Jung's denial of coitus, given his

chronic dread of pregnancy: why would he risk getting Spielrein pregnant? She could, however, be attractive as “the foreign woman,” the whore-like seductress, a foil to the unimpeachable purity of Jung’s own wife.

I do not know if Spielrein had read Freud’s aforementioned literature, but in 1909 she put together a sophisticated analysis of her and his complexes as follows.

Just recently Jung finished his paper that created such a stir, ‘Über die Rolle des Vaters im Schicksale [sic!] des Einzelnen’ [Jung, 1909], in which he shows that the choice of the future [love] object is determined in the first relations of the child with his parents. That I love him is as firmly determined as that he loves me. He is for me a father and I am a mother for him, or, more precisely, the woman who has acted as the first substitute for the mother (his mother came down with hysteria when he was two years old); and he became so attached to the [substitute] woman that when she was absent he saw her in hallucinations, etc, etc. Why he fell in love with his wife I do not know . . .

. . . Let us say, his wife is ‘not completely’ satisfactory, and now he has fallen in love with me, a hysteric; and I fell in love with a psychopath, and is it necessary to explain why? I have never seen my father as normal. His insane striving ‘to know himself’ is best expressed in Jung for whom his scientific activity is more important than anything in this world . . . An uneven dynamic character coupled with a highly developed sensibility, a need to suffer and to be compassionate ‘ad magnum’ [to the fullest]. You can do to him and get from him anything you want with love and tenderness. Twice in a row he became so emotional in my presence that tears just rolled down his face! If you could only hide in the next room and hear how concerned he is for me and my fate, you would be moved to tears yourself. Then he starts reproaching himself endlessly for his feelings, for example, that I am something sacred for him, that he is ready to beg for forgiveness, etc. I cannot quote the exact phrases for it is a bit sentimental, but you can well imagine everything. Remember how dear daddy was apologizing to you exactly in the same manner! It is unpleasant for me to quote all those self-reproaches he addressed to himself, because we are both either equally guilty or not guilty. Look, how many female patients have been to see him and, without fail, each one of them would fall in love with him but he could only act as a physician because he did not love in return! But you know how desperately he struggled with his feelings! What could one have done? He suffered through

many nights thinking about me. We also considered the possibility of separating. But this solution was rejected as not feasible because we are both living in Zurich . . . He felt responsible for my fate, and howled as he pronounced these words . . . he did not want to stand in the way of my happiness . . .

. . . And he had reasons to fear for my future (in case we separated). – This conversation took place almost two weeks ago and we both felt literally tormented, unable to utter a word, etc. The heart to heart talk came to an end. *Ducunt volentem Dei nolentem trahunt*. We stood still, in the most tender poetry . . . Let tomorrow bring darkness and cold! Today I shall offer my heart to the sun! I shall be gay! I shall be young! I shall be happy, that’s what I want! [the four last statements are grammatically masculine, as if they depicted Jung’s mood]. Then I get a post card and a letter in one day, that I should not be sad, and last Friday he came again. Poetry again, and as usual, will I ever in my life forgive him what he had concocted with me; he did not sleep the night, became exhausted; he cannot fight it any longer. – But by the same token, I should also be saying: will he ever forgive me for what I have done to him! The difference is that I know that for him scientific activity is above all else in life and that he will be able to bear everything for the sake of science . . .

The question is only how my intellect is going to relate to this whole story and the trouble is that the intellect does not know how to relate. I should not be writing about him and his family but about me. The question for me is whether to surrender with all my being to this violent vortex of life and to be happy while the sun is shining, or, when the gloom descends, to let the feeling become transferred to a child and science, i.e., the scientific activity that I love too much? Firstly, who knows how this story will end? ‘Unknown are the ways of the Lord’. Anyway, today’s youth looks at these matters differently and it is very possible that I will fall in love again and will have success, i.e., I will find myself a husband. – But don’t you forget that this is still very far in the future and therefore, do not worry. *So far we have remained at the level of poetry that is not dangerous, and we shall remain at the level, perhaps until the time when I will become a doctor, unless circumstances will change.* (Lothane, 1999)

It is amazing how Spielrein has matured since 1905, not only as a human being, but also as an insightful depth psychologist. She understood the oedipal transference nature of the attraction between her and Jung, and not only as sexual but as an enactment of a neurosis of destiny determined by the

reciprocal fit of their respective parental character identifications: Jung with his mother, she with her father, an important extension of the libidinal dynamics delineated by Freud. She also made it very clear what she meant by poetry and the boundaries she set on the physical expression of romantic passionate emotions. It is surprising, however, that in this analysis of Jung, Spielrein is silent about the other powerful factor in their mutual attraction: her being a Jewess and Jung a Gentile, and the role the attraction of Jewish women to Gentile men played in the lives of mother and daughter and, vice versa, the impact on her of Jung's own "Jewish complex."

### Jews and Gentiles

In her diary, Spielrein tells that:

Mother was very much afraid of falling in love with a Christian or of being loved by a Christian. What happened? One man who perished out of unhappy love for her was a Christian, a respected figure in Saint Petersburg: she told him that she would never marry a Christian, because that would destroy her parents; the next day he shot himself. (Carotenuto, 1980, p. 23).

The Christian was a taboo love object, forbidden, as far as her mother's orthodox Jewish parents were concerned. Similarly, as a Jewess, Spielrein would have been taboo to Jung as a wife. Their situation illustrates the deep gulf of social, ethnic, and religious taboos that separated Jews and Gentiles in Europe and cast a deep shadow on Jewish-Gentile mixed marriages. For the Jews, one of the ways to facilitate intermarriages was conversion to Christianity, not an option here.

In *Totem and taboo* (Freud, 1912/1913), Freud's response to the mystical anthropology of Jung's 1912 *Transformations and symbols of the libido*, after discussing the nature of taboo in primitive cultures and how the transgression against it was punishable by death, was to define the taboo psychologically, as something sacred, forbidden, unclean and uncanny (*unheimlich*), the latter combining the qualities of both foreign and dangerous. Among the taboos, none was more important than incest, qualified by him interchangeably as horror, barrier, taboo, and prohibition of incest, to be avoided and resolved by exogamy:

One of the reactions to the parricide was after all the institution of totemic exogamy, the prohibition of any sexual relation with those women of the family who had been tenderly loved since child-

hood. In this way a wedge was driven in between a man's affectionate and sensual feelings, one still firmly fixed in his erotic life today. As a result of this exogamy the sensual needs of men had to be satisfied with strange and unloved women. (Freud, 1921, p. 141)

Whereas the taboo of incest was seen by Freud as the foundation of marriage as a social institution and of civilized society, there was a common denominator to exogamy, in the narrow sense, within the primitive clan and, in the wider sense, across tribal and national boundaries in civilized societies. With the help of this dynamic, Freud also explained "being in love . . . somewhat in the sense of Bernard Shaw's malicious aphorism . . . that being in love means greatly exaggerating the difference between one woman and another" (1921, p. 140). By the way, one of the reasons for primitive exogamy was the dearth of females in the clan and the need for the conquest of women from other clans. A famous exogamous conquest of women was the rape of the Sabine women perpetrated by the Romans. Was Jung thinking of his falling in love with Sabina Spielrein as his private rape of the Sabine woman?

In his last great essay published in 1939 in its finished form, *Moses and monotheism*, Freud completed the arc of *Totem and taboo* and *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego*:

It must be supposed that after the parricide a considerable time elapsed during which the brothers disputed with one another for their father's heritage, which each of them wanted for himself alone. . . . The first form of a social organization came about with a renunciation of instinct, a recognition of mutual obligations, the introduction of definite institutions, pronounced inviolable (holy) – that is to say, the beginnings of morality and justice. Each individual renounced his ideal of acquiring his father's position for himself and of possessing his mother and sisters. Thus the taboo on incest and the injunction to exogamy came about. (p. 82)

The incest complex was here once more given its social *raison d'être*: united with group dynamics, it is the foundation of the social contract and of civilized society. But the tension between social order and the temptation of the taboo remains. Psychologically, the taboo was for Freud also symbolic of the ambivalent split between something originally desired and later prohibited. As a result, the prohibition is honored as much in the observance as in the breach: whatever guilt and punishment are associated with breaking the taboo, the pleasure gained

by the aggression of breaking the taboo often appears worth the danger. Related to this, Freud's identification with Moses may refer to the recurrent symbolic slaying of the father and the repetition of orthodoxies and heresies in the history of the psychoanalytic movement: rivalries, fights, secessions, and persecutions—the stories of Stekel, Adler, Jung, Rank, Lacan, and their latter-day derivatives (Lothane, 2001b, 2003c).

Does the drive to exogamy explain Jung's polygamy? Or the great crisis? Not entirely. Does it explain Spielrein's and Jung's Jewish complex? Let us consider some of its aspects in both. In a letter to Freud of June 20, 1909, Spielrein analysed Jung's "Jewish complex," which she traced to Jung's attraction to Freud's daughter Mathilde, whom Jung would have met in Freud's home in 1907:

In the course of an analysis it turned out that so-and-so many years ago Dr. Jung had been fond of a dark-haired hysterical girl called S.W., who always described herself as Jewish (but in reality was not). . . . This girl was deeply rooted in him, and she was my prototype. It is also significant that right at the beginning of my therapy Dr. Jung let me read his dissertation, in which he described this S.W. Later on he would sometimes turn reflective when I said something to him; such and such a woman had spoken in just this way, etc. And it was always this girl! Now in his fear he has forgotten everything about that; he comes to Freud and looks for an excuse and help. He recalls that Freud's daughter once appealed to him so much, and now the easiest way to obtain the father's favor is to explain the matter as a transference of the affinity with your daughter. You will certainly understand, Professor Freud, that it is completely irrelevant to me whether his love for me is a transference from Frl. S.W. or X. Freud; the latter transference would even be more to my liking, for . . . (Carotenuto, 1980, p. 105)

Spielrein's breaks off her analysis in midstream. She is also silent about the motives for her own wish to have a Gentile for a father of a interracial son bearing the name Siegfried. Was this her defense against incestuous emotions she experienced against a younger brother? Or was she dreaming of merging the Jews and the Gentiles in bonds of love everlasting?

And now comes Jung's own confession to Freud about his "Jewish complex" in the important letter of June 4, 1909, in which finally, three years after first referring to Spielrein anonymously on October 23, 1906, he identifies her as "Spielrein:"

As I have indicated before, my first visit to Vienna had a very long unconscious aftermath, first the compulsive infatuation in Abazzia, then the Jewess popped up in another form, in the shape of my patient. Now of course the whole bag of tricks lies there quite clearly before my eyes. During the whole business Gross's notions flitted about a bit too much in my head. (McGuire, 1974, p. 229)

The secret is out: Jung is prisoner of the fatal enchantment of Jewish women and of his victimization by Spielrein! He is brimming with deceptions, rationalizations, and paranoid fears:

Since I knew from experience that she would immediately relapse if I withdrew my support, I prolonged the relationship over the years and in the end found myself morally obliged, as it were, to devote a large measure of friendship to her, until I saw that an unintended wheel had started turning, whereupon, finally broke with her. She was, of course, systematically planning my seduction, which I considered inopportune. Now she is seeking revenge. Lately she has been spreading a rumor that I shall soon get a divorce from my wife and marry a certain girl student . . . I need hardly say that I have made a clean break. (McGuire, 1974, pp. 228–229).

Above all looms a basic fact: the exotic Spielrein, as an enactment of some mysterious unconscious foreplay, that is, Jung's dimly understood mother complex, exerts upon him the added uncanny fascination via the taboo of the foreign, different, and mysterious Jewishness.

A different facet of Jung emerges when oedipal dynamics combine with projections about Jewish sexuality when (in the aforementioned letter of September 25, 1907, just before praising Gross' immorality), he says this about Max Eitingon (1881–1943), another Jewish doctor who came to work and study at Burghölzli:

I consider Eitingon a totally impotent gasbag – scarcely has thus uncharitable judgment left my lips than it occurs to me that I envy him his uninhibited abreaction of the polygamous instinct. I therefore retract "impotent" as too compromising. He will certainly never amount to anything; one day he may become a member of the Duma. (McGuire, 1974, p. 90)

In this mini-fragment of free-association (proof that Jung is using the correspondence as a substitute for a therapeutic analysis with Freud, without declaring it to be so), Jung ambivalently

projects on Eitingon, six years his junior, both extremes of sexual performance: sexual inhibition and impotence, and sexual prowess and promiscuity, both related to an unresolved Oedipus complex. Did Jung experience occasional impotence? I don't know, but it is not unheard of among civilized men. He surely shows where his true desires are: in contrast to the pious talk about Gross' immorality, he envies the younger man's opportunities to enjoy women without guilt. These associations also reveal two often seen factors: the trans-racial and trans-cultural, invidious and idolatrous, fetishizing of men of the other race as hypersexed and hyperpotent, here the Gentile seeing the Jew in a manner similar to the American white man seeing the black man; it is also a putdown of the potential rival for Freud's admiration and love. For Max Eitingon has since 1907 been a member of the "Wednesday society," the future Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, and thus the first Freudian from abroad. According to Bair (2003):

Jung was even more envious when Eitingon returned from Vienna and boasted of having attended several meetings of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society in January 1907. He had met privately with Freud and was full of anecdotes about the intimacy of their personal meetings, long walks, and the intense conversations that later came to be known as the first training analysis. (p. 107)

In due course, Eitingon would become the sixth member of the famous/infamous "Committee" of overseers of analytic orthodoxy, and in 1910 a founding member, with Abraham, in 1910 of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society, later the German Psychoanalytic Society and the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute. He would play an important role in the history of German psychoanalysis under the Nazis and emigrate in 1934 to Palestine, to found there the future Israel Psychoanalytic Society (Lothane, 2001b, 2003c). The other facet of Jung's deprecation of Eitingon as a member of the impotent Russian parliament, just after having retracted the comment about impotence, is that it betrays a thinly veiled anti-Semitism towards a Jew seeking the limelight of fame.

The following questions thus come to mind: did Spielrein suspect any tinge of anti-Semitism in Jung's attitude towards her, and did she reassert her solidarity with her Jewish origins? There is no clear indication. Was Freud aware early on of this streak in Jung? Probably, based on a number of Freud's reactions, starting on June 14, 1912, to the news of Spielrein's coming to Vienna, and then to her

marriage in 1912 to the Russian-Jewish physician Pavel Sheftel:

Dear Frau Doktor,

I look forward as October approaches to receiving your decision about coming to Vienna in order to break your dependence on Jung. (Carotenuto, 1980, p. 116).

So you are a married woman now, and as far as I am concerned that means that you are half cured of your neurotic dependence on Jung. Otherwise you would not have decided to get married. The other half still remains; the question is what is to be done about that. My wish is for you to be cured completely. I must confess, after the event, that your fantasy about the birth of the Saviour to a mixed union did not appeal to me at all. The Lord, in that anti-Semitic period, had him born from the superior Jewish race. But I know these are my prejudices. (p. 116–117)

My personal relationship with your Germanic hero has definitely been shattered. His behavior was too bad. (vol 9, p. 118)

I am sorry to hear that you are consumed with longing for J., and this at a time when I am on such bad terms with him, having almost reached the conclusion that he is unworthy of all the interested concern I have bestowed on him. . . . I gather that you are composing your thoughts, which is bound to benefit the child. That is the right course. . . . You will also find it easier now to be content with being restricted to just one man. (p. 119–120) I am glad to hear that you are quite rightly beginning to use your spare time in order to come to terms with the present and with life. Let us hope that this bad period will save you an analysis. I can hardly bear to listen when you continue to enthuse about your old love and past dreams, and count on an ally in the marvelous little stranger.

I am, as you know, cured of the last shred of my predilection for the Aryan cause, and would like to take it that if the child turns out to be a boy he will develop into a stalwart Zionist. He or it must be dark in any case, no more towheads. Let us banish all these will-o'-the-wisps! (vol 9, p. 120)

Well, now, my heartiest congratulations! It is far better that the child should be a "she". Not we can think again about the blond Siegfried and perhaps smash that idol before his time comes. (vol 9, p. 121)

Of course I want you to succeed in casting aside as so much trash your infantile dreams of the Germanic champion and hero, on which hinges your whole opposition to your environment and to your origins; you should not demand from this phantom the child you must once have craved from your father. (p. 122)

Freud's portrayal of Jung as a "phantom" is a far cry from the way he wrote to him in 1909:

It is strange that on the very same evening when I formally adopted you as eldest son and anointed you – *in partibus infidelium* – as my successor and crown prince, you should have divested me of my paternal dignity, which divesting seems to have given you as much pleasure as I, on the contrary, derived from the investiture of your person. (McGuire, 1974, p. 218)

Clearly, Freud's father/son oedipal transference does not fully explain the anointment and investiture of Jung as his crown prince and heir, for investiture is a social institution of paternal authority and office. Similarly, the idea that Spielrein originally wanted a child from her father and therefore one from Jung, a mix of oedipal transference and neurotic dependence, even if true, is insufficient to explain her attraction to Jung. It was easier for Freud to accept the loss of Jung as a result of the inevitable symbolic murder of the father: Freud had done this to his father-like mentors Breuer and Fliess (the former actually 14 years older, the latter two years younger than Freud). Later Freud was the murderous father in reacting competitively to a number of sons: Stekel and Adler before Jung, Tausk, Ferenczi, and Rank after; but he had plenty of substitutes lined up. For Spielrein, Jung was replaced by a much less glamorous husband.

The reason why Jung appeared so fascinating and glamorous to Freud and Spielrein is as much because of his uncanny otherness as due to his intellectual aura and a promise of greatness, and thus an appeal to their narcissism. He certainly lived up to this promise of greatness. Spielrein came from a privileged, educated, and partly assimilated Jewish family: as Madame Jung, Spielrein would have shared in his glory and fame. As Freud's heir apparent, Jung offered Freud the much sought-after legitimacy and credibility in a Gentile world in which Jews were still a target of anti-Semitic propaganda and persecution. In these letters to Spielrein, Freud proudly, nay defiantly, reaffirms his Jewish identity and solidarity with Jewish causes. He remained a Jew proud of his heritage all his life. No, psychoanalysis was never a Jewish science, but Aryan and Jewish

identifications themes would play out fatefully between Freud and Jung in the 1930s.

When first writing to Jung about Abraham prior to meeting the latter, Freud does not directly ask Jung if the man is a Jew but uses a circumlocution: "By the way, is he a descendant of his eponym?" (McGuire, 1974, p. 80). Later he defends Abraham's being "inhibited:" "I believe he is prevented from unbending by preoccupations that I understand only too well" (p. 109). In gossiping to Jung about Jones, Freud again avoids the word "Jew:" "I find the racial mixture in our group most interesting; he is a Celt and consequently not quite accessible to us, the Teuton and the Mediterranean man" (p. 165). Freud is quite direct, however, in telling Jung why he needs him:

My selfish purpose, which I frankly confess, is to persuade you to continue and complete my work by applying to psychoses what I have begun with neuroses. With your strong and independent character, with your Germanic blood which enables you to command the sympathies of the public more readily than I, you seem better fitted than anyone else I know to carry out this mission. (McGuire, 1974, p. 168)

We are certainly getting ahead; if I am Moses, then you are Joshua and will take possession of the promised land of psychiatry, which I shall only be able to glimpse from afar. (p. 197)

However, during the same period, 1907–1909, Freud was also assuring Abraham of his loyalty to and solidarity with the Jews:

Be tolerant and do not forget, that actually you have it easier than Jung to follow my thoughts; for firstly, you are completely independent, and secondly, in your intellectual temperament you are closer to me thanks to the racial background we share, whereas he as a Christian and a pastor's son is only able to find his way against the obstacle of considerable inner resistances. For that reason his adherence [to our cause] is all the more valuable. (Abraham & Freud, 1980, p. 47)

We Jews have it altogether easier since we do not possess the mystical element. . . . Might it not be, that it is the shared Jewish traits that attract me to you? I suspect that in myself it is the hidden anti-Semitism of the Swiss, which is spared me, is projected upon you with greater intensity. I just want to say, that we Jews, when we wish to make a contribution somewhere, usually develop a measure of masochism and should thus be ready to

accept injustice done to us. Otherwise, it does not work. Rest assured, that if my name were Oberhuber, my discoveries would have met with much less resistance. (p. 57)

The opportunity to show what we are capable of will come, even if we should not be successful in this case. Be optimistic! Our ancient Jewish stubbornness would prove itself superior this time as well. (p. 72)

Jung is now [1913, Z. L.] in America. His bad theories do not compensate me for his unpleasant character. He is imitating Adler ... (p. 137)

So we are finally rid of the brutal holy Jung and his followers. (p. 180)

Was Freud also thinking of Spielrein's Jewishness and its role in the relationship, both before, during, and after the crisis with Jung in 1909? It is hard to imagine he had no thoughts at all about it, but whatever he missed then, he made up for in his letters to her in 1913. Jung, too, was bitter after the break-up: writing to his Swedish colleague and analyst Poul Bjerre, he said: "I have until now not been an anti-Semite, but now, I think, I am becoming one" (Ljunggren, 2001, p. 87). For me, Jung's has been a rather a parochial, garden-variety kind of anti-Semitism, not much to get worked up about, and certainly no collaborator with the Nazis (Lothane, 2005).

## References

- Abraham H. C. & Freud E. L. (Eds.). (1980). *Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham. Briefe 1907–1926. [Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham. Letters 1907–1926.]* Frankfurt: S. Fischer.
- Bair, D. (2003). *Jung. A biography.* Boston: Little, Brown.
- Carotenuto, A. (1980). *A secret symmetry. Sabina Spielrein between Jung and Freud.* New York: Pantheon Books.
- Carotenuto, A., & Hensch, T. (Eds.). (1986). *Tagebuch einer heimlichen Symmetrie. Sabina Spielrein zwischen Jung und Freud. [Diary of a secret symmetry. Sabina Spielrein between Jung and Freud.]* Freiburg im Breisgau: Kore Verlag.
- Ferenczi, S. (1922). Social considerations in some analyses. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 4, 475.
- Ferenczi, S. (1932). Confusion of tongues between adults and the child. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 20, 225.
- Freud, S. (1895). *Studies on hysteria.* London: Hogarth Press, SE 2.
- Freud, S. (1909). *Family romances* (p. 9). London: Hogarth Press, SE 9, 235–241.
- Freud, S. (1910a). *Leonardo da Vinci and a memory of his childhood* (p. 11). London: Hogarth Press, SE 11, 63–177.
- Freud, S. (1910b). A special type of choice of object made by men. In *Contributions to the psychology of love, I.* London: Hogarth Press, SE 11, 163–175.
- Freud, S. (1912). On the universal tendency to debasement in the sphere of love. In *Contributions to the psychology of love, II.* London: Hogarth Press, SE 11, 179–190.
- Freud, S. (1912/1913). *Totem and taboo* (p. 13). London: Hogarth Press, SE 13.
- Freud, S. (1915). *Observations on transference-love* (p. 12). London: Hogarth Press, SE 12, 149.
- Freud, S. (1918). The taboo of virginity. In *Contributions to the psychology of love, III.* SE 11, 193–208.
- Freud, S. (1921). *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego* (p. 18). London: Hogarth Press, SE 18.
- Freud, S. (1939). *Moses and monotheism* (p. 23). London: Hogarth Press, SE 23.
- Hampton, C. (2002). *The talking cure.* New York: Faber.
- Hensch, T. (Ed.). (1987). *Sabina Spielrein. Sämtliche Schriften. [Sabina Spielrein Collected works.]* Freiburg im Breisgau: Kore Verlag.
- Hensch T. (Ed.). (2003). *Sabina Spielrein. Tagebuch und Briefe. Die Frau zwischen Jung und Freud. [Diary and letters. The woman between Jung and Freud.]* Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Höfer, R. (1996). Sabina Spielrein (1885–1941). In S. Duda, & L. F. Pusch (Eds.), *WahnsinnsFrauen. [Crazy women.]* (2nd ed). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Jung, C. G. (1909). The significance of the father in the destiny of the individual. In C. G. Jung, *The collected works* (Vol. 4), Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1912). *Transformations and symbols of the libido.* Princeton, Princeton University Press
- Kerr, J. (1993). *A most dangerous method. Freud, Jung and Sabina Spielrein.* New York: Knopf.
- Ljunggren, M. (2001). Sabina and Isaak Spielrein. *Slavica Lundensia*, 21, 19–95.
- Lothane, Z. (1981). Listening with the third ear as an instrument in psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 68, 487–503.
- Lothane, Z. (1984). A new metapsychology: Psychoanalysis as storymaking. *International Forum for Psychoanalysis*, 1, 63–84.
- Lothane, Z. (1992). *In defense of Schreber. Soul murder and psychiatry.* Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- Lothane, Z. (1994). The analyzing instrument and reciprocal free association. *Journal of Clinical Psychoanalysis*, 3, 65–86.
- Lothane, Z. (1996). In defense of Sabina Spielrein. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 5, 203–217.
- Lothane, Z. (1997). The schism between Freud and Jung over Schreber: Its implications for method and doctrine. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 6, 103–115.
- Lothane, Z. (1999). Tender love and transference: Unpublished letters of C. G. Jung and Sabina Spielrein. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 80, 1189–1204.
- Lothane, Z. (2001a). ber zwei Arten von Liebe in der Psychoanalyse. [On two kinds of love in psychoanalysis.]. *Psychoanalyse und Philosophie*, 3, 41–44.
- Lothane, Z. (2001b). The deal with the devil to "save" psychoanalysis in Nazi Germany. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 88, 195–224.
- Lothane, Z. (2003a) Nachwort. [Afterwords] In: *Spielrein.*
- Lothane, Z. (2003b). Tender love and transference: Unpublished letters of C. G. Jung and Sabina Spielrein In C. Covington, & B. Wharton (Eds.), *Sabina Spielrein: Forgotten pioneer of psychoanalysis* Hove, Newyork: Brunner & Routledge. (pp. 191–225).
- Lothane, Z. (2003c). Power politics and psychoanalysis – an introduction. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 12, 87–97.
- Lothane, Z. (2004a). A note on the psychoanalytic method: process interventions and formulaic interpretations. Presentation at the IPA 2004 Congress in New Orleans, USA.

- Lothane, Z. (2004b). *Seelenmord und Psychiatrie Zur Rehabilitierung Schrebers*. [Soulmurder and psychiatry. Rehabilitating Schreber.] . Giessen: Psychosozial Verlag.
- Lothane, Z. (2005a). Review of Bair, D. Jung. A biography. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 53, 317–324.
- Lothane, Z. (2005b). Daniel Paul Schreber on his own terms, or how interpretive fictions are converted into historical facts. In H. Steinberg (Ed.), *Leipziger Psychiatriegeschichtliche Vorlesungen* (pp. 127–156). Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Mahony, P., Bonomi, C., & Stensson, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Behind the scenes: Freud in correspondence*. Stockholm: Scandinavian University Press.
- Márton, E. (2002). *Ich hieß Sabina Spielrein*. [My name was Sabina Spielrein.]. Felixson AB, Sweden: Film produced by Helgi Felix Idé Film.
- McGuire, W. (Ed.). *The Freud/Jung letters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Minder, B. (1993). A document: Jung to Freud 1905: A report on Sabina Spielrein. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 46, 67–72.
- Minder, B. (1994). Sabina Spielrein. Jung's Patientin am Burghölzli. [Jung's Patient at the Burgholzli hospital] *Luzifer-Amor*, 14, 55–127.
- Spence, D. (1982). *Narrative truth and historical truth. Meaning and interpretation in psychoanalysis*. New York: Norton.
- Wackenhut, I., & Willke, A. (1994). *Sabina Spielrein Missbrauchüberlebende und Psychoanalytikerin. Eine Studie ihres Lebens und Werkes unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Tagebücher und ihres Briefwechsels*. [Sabina Spielrein. Survivor of sex abuse and psychoanalyst. A study of her life and works with special consideration of her diaries and letters.] Inaugural Dissertation, Medizinische Hochschule, Hannover, Germany.
- Wilson, S. (2000). *Snoo Wilson Plays: Vol 2*. London: Methuen.

## Author

**Zvi Lothane, M. D.** Clinical Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York. Author of the standard work *In defense of Schreber: Soul murder and psychiatry* (1992) and of the expanded German edition, *Seelenmord und Psychiatrie Zur Rehabilitierung Schrebers* (2004).

Copyright of International Forum of Psychoanalysis is the property of Routledge 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.