

# BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

## GENERAL

The secondary literature on Freud is vast, rapidly growing, almost out of control. Some of this avalanche is revealing, much of it useful, more of it provocative; an astonishing share is malicious or downright absurd. I have not tried for completeness in this essay, but have concentrated rather on the works I found informative on matters of fact, interesting in their interpretations, or worth debating. I have written it, that is to say, to give reasons (briefly) why I have adopted, or failed to adopt, one position or another, and to indicate from whom I have learned most.

The best German edition of Freud's psychoanalytic writings is *Gesammelte Werke, Chronologisch Geordnet*, ed. Anna Freud, Edward Bibring, Willi Hoffer, Ernst Kris, and Otto Isakower, in collaboration with Marie Bonaparte, 18 vols. (1940-68). Though very valuable, it is not flawless: it is not quite complete; its running heads are not as helpful as they might be; the editorial notes and the indexes to individual volumes are skimpy. Most troubling of all, the *Gesammelte Werke* does not differentiate among the various editions of such much-revised works of Freud's as *The Interpretation of Dreams* and *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*. This differentiation is supplied by the handy *Studienausgabe*, ed. Alexander Mitscherlich, Angela Richards, and James Strachey, 12 vols. (1969-75). The *Studienausgabe* has limitations of its own; it omits some minor papers and Freud's autobiographical writings and its arrangement is not chronological but topical. But the editorial apparatus, based on the English *Standard Edition*, is copious.

The international authority of that *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, tr. under the general editorship of James Strachey in collaboration with Anna Freud, assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson, 24 vols. (1953-74), is deservedly assured, whatever new and better translations may be offered sometime in the future. It is a heroic enterprise. Where necessary, it offers variorum texts; it wrestles with intractable material (such as the German jokes Freud quotes in his book on jokes); and it introduces each work, even the slightest paper, with indispensable bibliographical and historical information. The translations have been quite controversial—and not unjustly: shifts in tenses, rebarbative translations like “anaclitic” and “cathexis” for technical terms for which Freud used ordinary, highly suggestive German words have provoked severe criticisms. The most severe (and, I think, cranky) of those is Bruno Bettelheim, *Freud and Man's Soul* (1983), which argues in essence that the translators have ruined Freud's argument and that anyone reading Freud only in Strachey's English cannot understand Freud's concern with man's soul. Far soberer, and more reasonable, are the papers by Darius G. Ornston; see esp. “Freud's Conception Is Different from Strachey's,” *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXXIII (1985), 379-410; “The Invention of ‘Cathexis’ and Strachey's Strategy,” *Int. Rev. Psycho-Anal.*, XII (1985), 391-99; and “Reply to William I. Grossman,” *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXXIV (1986), 489-92. The *Standard Edition* can now be used in conjunction with S. A. Guttman, R. L. Jones, and S. M. Parrish, *The Concordance to the Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, 6 vols. (1980). The most vigorous translations into English, capturing Freud's virile and witty German speech better than



any other, can be found in vols. I–IV of *Collected Papers* (1924–25), mainly tr. by the brilliant Joan Riviere. Vol. V, ed. James Strachey, appeared in 1950. No wonder this edition, which contains virtually all of Freud's shorter papers and his case histories, remains the favorite of older American psychoanalysts.

Occasional rare finds enlarge the corpus of Freud's psychoanalytic writings. We owe the most exciting recent discovery, one of the missing metapsychological papers (see text, pp. 367–68 and 373–74), to Ilse Grubrich-Simitis, who has also beautifully edited and introduced it: Sigmund Freud, *A Phylogenetic Fantasy: Overview of the Transference Neuroses* (1985; tr. Axel and Peter T. Hoffer, 1987). An edition of Freud's voluminous and, for the biographer, important prepsychoanalytic writings has long been in preparation and would be a desideratum.

Much of Freud's enormous correspondence has been published. A mouth-watering chronological selection is *Briefe 1873–1939*, ed. Ernst and Lucie Freud (1960; 2d enlarged ed., 1968; English version, *Letters of Sigmund Freud, 1873–1939*, tr. Tania and James Stern, 1961, 2d ed., 1975). Most other editions present the letters correspondent by correspondent. These editions vary exceedingly in merit and must be used with care. Among the most authoritative is Sigmund Freud, C. G. Jung, *Briefwechsel*, impeccably ed. William McGuire and Wolfgang Sauerländer (1974; English version, *The Freud/Jung Letters: The Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung*, ed. William McGuire and tr. Ralph Manheim [Freud's letters] and R. F. C. Hull [Jung's], also 1974). A third printing of the German edition (1979) has some corrections, mainly in the notes. Hull's renderings do Jung no favor: he raises Jung's already rather coarse language to heights of vulgarity. For example, he renders Jung's "schmutziger Kerl," which is essentially "dirty fellow," as "slimy bastard" (Jung to Freud, June 2, 1910, 359 [325]). Another instance: Jung wrote Freud, according to Hull, that the psychiatrist Adolf Albrecht Friedländer, a vehement critic of psychoanalysis, has been "puking again" (April 17, 1910, 339 [307]); what Jung actually wrote, "*Friedländer hat sich wieder übergeben*," is far more accurately rendered as "Friedländer has thrown up again." Freud's all-important letters to his "Other," Wilhelm Fliess (a collection for which the word "indispensable" is for once absolutely just), raise smaller difficulties. The American edition, *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887–1904*, ed. and tr. Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson (1985), is extremely valuable, for all its minor interpretative vagaries. But the edition of the original German letters, *Briefe an Wilhelm Fliess 1887–1904*, which appeared later (1986), also ed. Masson, assisted by Michael Schröter and Gerhard Fichtner, is superior in its annotations and also contains Ernst Kris's long, fascinating introduction to the selection that first appeared in 1950. For an interesting if limited set of letters, see Martin Grotjahn, ed., *Sigmund Freud as a Consultant: Recollections of a Pioneer in Psychoanalysis* (1970), which contains letters from Freud to the Italian analyst Edoardo Weiss, with comments by the latter. The German edition is *Sigmund Freud–Edoardo Weiss. Briefe zur psychoanalytischen Praxis. Mit den Erinnerungen eines Pioniers der Psychoanalyse* (1973). H. D. [Hilda Doolittle], *Tribute to Freud* (1956) contains, as an appendix, several letters from Freud to her; the complete collection is at the Beinecke Library at Yale. Freud's schoolboy letters to his friend Emil Fluss (not yet translated into English) have been carefully edited by Ilse Grubrich-Simitis in her fine edition of Freud's "self-portrait": Sigmund Freud, "Selbstdarstellung." *Schriften zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse* (1971; corr. ed., 1973), 103–23. (This edition contains the complete version of Freud's autobiography; the version in *GW*, which I usually cite as "Selbstdarstellung," omits a few sentences, which I quote from *Selbstdarstellung*. The volume also includes several documents in addition to Freud's letters to Emil Fluss.) For Freud's letters to his even closer friend Eduard Silberstein, long being prepared for scholarly publication, I used the originals in the Library of Congress. As this volume went to press, they had not yet appeared in print. I have also consulted, with profit, the careful transcriptions by William J. McGrath for his book on Freud's younger years, *Freud's Discovery of Psychoanalysis: The Politics of Hysteria* (1986). (For an appraisal of that book, see the essay for chapter 1, below.) See also Heinz Stanesco, "Unbekannte Briefe des jungen Sigmund Freud an einen rumänischen Freund," *Zeitschrift des Schriftstellerverbandes des RVR*, XVI (1965), 12–29.

The editions of Freud's other epistolary exchanges, precisely because the letters can be so extraordinarily revealing, offer a rather more disheartening picture. A selection from Freud's important correspondence with his favorite and most dependable disciple in Berlin is presented in Sigmund



Freud, Karl Abraham, *Briefe 1907–1926*, ed. Hilda Abraham and Ernst L. Freud (1965; English version, *A Psycho-Analytic Dialogue: The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham, 1907–1926*, tr. Bernard Marsh and Hilda Abraham, 1965). This edition tantalizingly lists the total number of letters the two exchanged and the number of those printed, but does not indicate *which* letters have been excised; the editors also cut paragraphs, sentences, at times single words, from the printed text without indicating the omissions with suspension points. They do equip each letter that has cuts with an asterisk—not much help. Ernst Pfeiffer, editor of Sigmund Freud, Lou Andreas-Salomé, *Briefwechsel* (1966; English version, Sigmund Freud, Lou Andreas-Salomé, *Letters*, tr. William and Elaine Robson-Scott, 1972), at least uses suspension points to show omissions, but excludes some of the most important letters (notably those touching on Anna Freud, in the Freud Collection, LC) entirely. Ernst L. Freud and Heinrich Meng, editors of Sigmund Freud, Oskar Pfister, *Briefe 1909–1939* (1963; English version, *Psychoanalysis and Faith: The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Oskar Pfister*, tr. Eric Mosbacher, 1963) employ suspension points to mark the places where they have wielded their editorial scissors, but they drop many significant (certainly the most intimate) letters between these friends. Omissions also compromise the value of Sigmund Freud, Arnold Zweig, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Ernst L. Freud (1968; paperback ed., 1984; English version, *The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Arnold Zweig*, tr. William and Elaine Robson-Scott, 1970), which makes some drastic cuts without specifying them. Ludwig Binswanger made his own selection of his epistolary exchanges with Freud, complete with commentary, in *Erinnerungen an Sigmund Freud* (1956). See also F. B. Davis, “Three Letters from Sigmund Freud to André Breton,” *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXI (1973), 127–34. Other highly instructive correspondences (notably Freud–Jones and Freud–Ferenczi, at present available only in archives) are in the process of being edited for publication. The Freud–Eitingon correspondence also would repay publication. So would the exchanges between Freud and Anna Freud, to say nothing of those between him and his fiancée Martha Bernays, of which Ernst Freud has published only an alluring selection of some ninety-three. Many hundreds more lie under lock and key at the Library of Congress, and a number of unpublished ones (that I could consult) at Sigmund Freud Copyrights. Ernest Jones prints numerous and extensive excerpts from Freud’s letters in his three-volume biography, but, as I noted in the text, he was induced by Anna Freud to correct “the most disturbing mistakes” of her father’s English letters on the ground that he was very sensitive about his somewhat less than complete mastery of the language. (Anna Freud to Ernest Jones, April 8, 1954. Jones papers, Archives of the British Psycho-Analytical Society, London.) I have quoted Freud’s English precisely as he wrote it, restoring his minor mistakes and imaginative, delightful coinages.

Obviously, Freud’s autobiographical statements, open and concealed, are of inestimable importance, both for what they disclose and for what they refuse to disclose. His “Autobiographical Study,” published in 1925, is doubtless the most important of these documents. Freud’s reminiscences in *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900) virtually all dredged up as he analyzed his own dreams, are of course invaluable, and have been widely cited. They must be read, if possible, with what else we know about him. The same holds true of the revelations that he scattered in such papers as “Screen Memories” (1899) and *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (1901).

I shall explore the many biographical studies covering particular parts of Freud’s life in the sections on the relevant chapters. The classic biography of Freud remains, for all its evident and much-criticized flaws, Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, 3 vols. (1953–57; one-volume abridgment by Lionel Trilling and Steven Marcus, 1961). Jones knew Freud intimately and through many years of combat (with others and, to a lesser degree, with Freud himself). As a pioneering psychoanalyst and by no means slavish follower of Freud, Jones was extremely well informed on all the technical issues. And he could comment with confidence on Freud’s family life no less than on the infighting within the analytic establishment. Though rather graceless in style and (more important) unfortunately disposed to separate the man and the work, Jones’s biography contains many astute judgments. The most serious charge against him has been that of malice against other followers of Freud, a supposedly unconquerable jealousy that led him to be scathing about such rivals as Ferenczi. There is something in this criticism, but less than is commonly thought. Indeed, Jones’s final verdict on Ferenczi, which heavily hints that in his last years Ferenczi was subject to psychotic



episodes, and to which strong exception has been taken, largely echoes the opinion that Freud expressed in an unpublished letter to Jones. His life of Freud remains indispensable.

There are many other lives, in many languages. The earliest of them all, which Freud did not much like and criticized in a letter to the author, was Fritz Wittels, *Sigmund Freud: His Personality, His Teaching, and His School* (1924; tr. Eden and Cedar Paul, 1924). The most usable recent biography is Ronald W. Clark, *Freud: The Man and the Cause* (1980), based on much diligent research, reasonable in judgment, and particularly full on Freud's private life, but fairly skimpy and heavily dependent on others in its treatment of Freud's work. A picture biography, well annotated and using quotations from Freud as captions, is Ernst Freud, Lucie Freud, and Ilse Grubrich-Simitis, eds., *Sigmund Freud: His Life in Pictures and Words* (1976; tr. Christine Trollope, 1978); it includes a dependable biographical sketch by K. R. Eissler. Max Schur, *Freud, Living and Dying* (1972), by the physician who was Freud's private doctor during his last ten years and later became a psychoanalyst, is invaluable for its private revelations and judicious, well-informed judgments. I shall cite it repeatedly. Among shorter biographies, O. Mannoni, *Freud* (1968; tr. from the French by Renaud Bruce, 1971) is perhaps the most informative. J. N. Isbister, *Freud: An Introduction to His Life and Work* (1985) is typical of the denigratory school, uncritically drawing upon the biographical speculations and reconstructions of Peter J. Swales. Steven Marcus's review of this book, "The Interpretation of Freud," *Partisan Review* (Winter 1987), 151-57, is devastating, and justly so. Ludwig Marcuse, *Sigmund Freud. Sein Bild vom Menschen* (n.d.) is an informal mixture of essay and biography. Gunnar Brandell, *Freud: A Man of His Century* (1961; rev. ed., 1976; tr. from the Swedish by Iain White, 1979) tries to enlist Freud among such Naturalists as Zola and Schnitzler; see also Louis Breger, *Freud's Unfinished Journey: Conventional and Critical Perspectives in Psychoanalytic Theory* (1981), which reads Freud as at the junction of nineteenth- and twentieth-century cultures. Helen Walker Puner, *Freud: His Life and His Mind* (1947), one of the early lives, is fairly hostile and neither very scholarly nor very reliable; it was influential enough to have Jones explicitly take it to task in the first two volumes of *his* biography.

Then there is Paul Roazen. His *Freud and His Followers* (1975) pays particular attention to Freud's entourage, and includes much usable material. A maddening mixture of hard digging, extensive interviewing, snap judgments, and uncertain tone, it must be used cautiously. Reviewing the book for the *Times Literary Supplement* (March 26, 1986, 341), Richard Wollheim shrewdly characterized it, and a whole school: "Professor Roazen has many criticisms to make of Freud. Freud, he tells us on different occasions, was cold, snobbish, excessively interested in money, indifferent to his family: he never fed his children bottles nor did he once change their diapers; he was a respecter of persons but not of the truth, over-controlled, resentful, narrow-minded, authoritarian. Yet alongside all these different criticisms, and there are few that do not surface on one page or another, there is one reiterated eulogy: Freud was a great man, we must not forget to praise him for his bravery and his genius. Freud has as a good a friend in Professor Roazen as ever Brutus found in Mark Antony." Precisely. In sharp contrast, the best study of Freud's thought in my judgment is Richard Wollheim's own compact, precise, illuminating *Freud* (1971). I must admit, too, that Roazen is justified in complaining about the protective way that Freud's family and adorers have withheld some of the most intriguing material or sought to "correct" his image for posterity; see his "The Legend of Freud," *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XLVII (Winter 1971), 33-45.

Naturally, many of these writings explicitly or implicitly assess Freud's character; so do other works I shall mention in their appropriate places. *Jones* should be singled out for "The Man," part 3 of vol. II, a brave attempt at a coherent estimate, which is valuable but (as I try to show in the text) overrates Freud's serene "maturity" and misreads Freud's relations with his mother, which were, I believe, far less secure than Jones believed. Jones, *Sigmund Freud: Four Centenary Essays* (1956) is, naturally, very admiring, but not without its insights. Philip Rieff, *Freud: The Mind of the Moralizer* (1959; rev. ed., 1961) is an elegant extended essay eminently worth reading. Among innumerable other appraisals, I single out John E. Gedo, "On the Origins of the Theban Plague: Assessments of Freud's Character," in *Freud, Appraisals and Reappraisals: Contributions to Freud Studies*, ed. Paul



E. Stepanky, I (1986), 241–59. Hanns Sachs, *Freud: Master and Friend* (1945) is slight in volume but intimate in information; admiring but not sycophantic, it “feels” right. *Freud and the Twentieth Century*, ed. Benjamin Nelson (1957) contains a series of brief and sometimes illuminating appraisals and appreciations by Alfred Kazin, Gregory Zilboorg, Abram Kardiner, Gardner Murphy, Erik H. Erikson, and others. Lionel Trilling, *Freud and the Crisis of Our Culture* (1955), his Freud Lecture for 1955, somewhat revised and expanded, is a brilliant, civilized ruminative defense. Ilse Grubrich-Simitis, who has done invaluable editing of Freud texts, has a particularly sensitive “Einleitung” to her edition of Freud’s “Selbstdarstellung” (cited above), 7–33. Richard Sterba, who knew the old Freud in Vienna, has some touching words of appreciation, “On Sigmund Freud’s Personality,” *American Imago*, XVIII (1961), 289–304.

The debate over the scientific status of Freud’s ideas has been so prolonged (and at times venomous) that I can cite only a few titles here. The most discriminating, most careful, and to my mind most satisfactory study is Paul Kline, *Fact and Fantasy in Freudian Theory* (1972; 2d ed., 1981). See also Seymour Fisher and Roger P. Greenberg, *The Scientific Credibility of Freud’s Theories and Therapy* (1977), a wide-ranging and well-informed survey, somewhat less positive than Kline; it should be supplemented with the same authors’ anthology, *The Scientific Evaluation of Freud’s Theories and Therapy* (1978), which fair-mindedly includes a spectrum of views. Helen D. Sargent, Leonard Horwitz, Robert S. Wallerstein, and Ann Appelbaum, *Prediction in Psychotherapy Research: A Method for the Transformation of Clinical Judgments into Testable Hypotheses*, Psychological Issues, monograph 21 (1968) is technical and sympathetic. *Empirical Studies of Psychoanalytic Theories*, ed. Joseph Masling, 2 vols. (1983–85) contains much fascinating material on the work done by such psychoanalytic experimenters as Hartvig Dahl. The most formidable among the skeptics, who has made the credibility of Freudian science (or lack of it) into an obsessive concern for a decade, is the philosopher Adolf Grünbaum; he has summed up his researches in *The Foundations of Psychoanalysis: A Philosophical Critique* (1984). It is taken seriously, but ably questioned, in Marshall Edelson, “Is Testing Psychoanalytic Hypotheses in the Psychoanalytic Situation Really Impossible?” *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XXXVIII (1983), 61–109. See also Edelson, “Psychoanalysis as Science, Its Boundary Problems, Special Status, Relations to Other Sciences, and Formalization,” *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, CLXV (1977), 1–28; and Edelson, *Hypothesis and Evidence in Psychoanalysis* (1984). The debate over Grünbaum, with an abstract of the book, a series of comments, and the author’s reply, is presented in “Précis of *The Foundations of Psychoanalysis: A Philosophical Critique*,” *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, IX (June 1986), 217–84. A searching, critical, but by no means unsympathetic extended analysis of Grünbaum’s book is Edwin R. Wallace IV, “The Scientific Status of Psychoanalysis: A Review of Grünbaum’s *The Foundations of Psychoanalysis*,” *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, CLXXIV (July 1986), 379–86. One incidental benefit of Grünbaum’s polemic is that it disposes of Karl Popper’s argument, long thought (by many) irrefutable, that psychoanalysis is a pseudoscience, since its propositions cannot be disconfirmed. For this argument, see esp. Popper, “Philosophy of Science: A Personal Report,” in *British Philosophy in the Mid-Century: A Cambridge Symposium*, ed. C. A. Mace (1957), 155–91; this essay is also included in Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge* (1963; 2d ed., 1965), 33–65. Other instructive assessments of psychoanalytic claims to scientific validity include a series of lectures by Ernest R. Hilgard, Lawrence S. Kubie, and E. Pumpian-Mindlin, *Psychoanalysis as Science*, ed. E. Pumpian-Mindlin (1952); these are quite positive. B. A. Farrell, *The Standing of Psychoanalytic Theory* (1981) is far more critical, as is Barbara Von Eckardt, “The Scientific Status of Psychoanalysis,” in *Introducing Psychoanalytic Theory*, ed. Sander L. Gilman (1982), 139–80. For some revealing papers on Freud by philosophers, see the anthology *Freud: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Richard Wollheim (1974; 2d ed., enlarged, *Philosophical Essays on Freud*, ed. Wollheim and J. Hopkins, 1983). Paul Ricoeur, *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation* (tr. Denis Savage, 1970) is a highly disciplined study by the leading advocate of psychoanalysis as hermeneutics. A challenging (as they say) reading of Freud’s thought, it deserves close attention, but Ricoeur’s Freud is not my Freud. For comments on Freud as a child of the Enlightenment, see Peter Gay, *A Godless*



*Jew: Freud, Atheism, and the Making of Psychoanalysis* (1987), esp. ch. 2; and Ilse Grubrich-Simitis, "Reflections on Sigmund Freud's Relationship to the German Language and to Some German-Speaking Authors of the Enlightenment," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LXVII (1986), 287-94—brief but valuable comments on papers by Didier Anzieu and Ernst A. Ticho delivered at the International Psychoanalytic Congress in Hamburg in 1985.

A definitive census of Freud's books is not yet available, but Harry Trosman and Roger Dennis Simmons, "The Freud Library," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXI (1973), 646-87, offers a valuable preliminary assessment.

## CHAPTER ONE · A Greed for Knowledge

Freud's ancestry, his father's background and mysterious second wife, as well as his early days in Freiberg and Vienna, have been exhaustively canvassed in Marianne Krüll, *Freud and His Father* (1979; tr. Arnold J. Pomerans, 1986), a book based on much patient, at times somewhat speculative, investigation; Krüll depends, as must all students of those years in Freud's life, on the pioneering researches of Josef Sajner: "Sigmund Freuds Beziehungen zu seinem Geburtsort Freiberg (Příbor) und zu Mähren," *Clio Medica*, III (1968), 167-80, and "Drei dokumentarische Beiträge zur Sigmund-Freud-Biographik aus Böhmen und Mähren," *Jahrbuch der Psychoanalyse*, XIII (1981), 143-52. Wilma Iggers provides background material on Bohemia in her anthology, *Die Juden in Böhmen und Mähren: Ein historisches Lesebuch* (1986). Didier Anzieu, *Freud's Self-Analysis* (2d ed., 1975; tr. Peter Graham, 1986) is an important, enormously detailed (if in minor points debatable) study of Freud's early life as mirrored in the dreams he chose to recount and analyze in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Another very clear view into Freud's intimate early life is provided by Alexander Grinstein, *On Sigmund Freud's Dreams* (1968; 2d ed., 1980). The reminiscences of Freud's sister Anna Freud Bernays, *Erlebtes* (privately printed, ca. 1930) and "My Brother, Sigmund Freud," *American Mercury*, LI (1940), 335-42, have been much quoted, since they recount vivid episodes from Freud's childhood (such as his objections to his sisters' piano lessons) that are both picturesque and impossible to come by (and hence to verify) elsewhere. Unfortunately, her writings must be used with the greatest caution, since a number of the facts that *can* be independently checked, like her father's age at his marriage, turn out to be wrong. Judith Bernays Heller, "Freud's Mother and Father," *Commentary*, XXI (1956), 418-21, is brief but evocative. And see Franz Kobler, "Die Mutter Sigmund Freuds," *Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts*, V (1962), 149-71, which is as informative as the limited evidence will permit. For his first years, there is also Siegfried and Suzanne Cassirer Bernfeld, "Freud's Early Childhood," *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, VIII (1944), 107-15. Marie Balmory, *Psychoanalyzing Psychoanalysis: Freud and the Hidden Fault of the Father* (1979; tr. Ned Lukacher, 1982) is imaginative enough to be of some interest even to those who, like me, find no rational basis for her speculation that Freud's mother was pregnant before her marriage to Freud's father (a claim that works only if—a most improbable *if*—Freud was born on March 6, not May 6, 1856, the conventional, and I think correct, date); Balmory also asserts that Jacob Freud's second wife, Rebecca, about whom we know nothing at present, committed suicide by jumping from a train. With Freud, fiction seems to replace fact with ease. Kenneth A. Grigg, "'All Roads Lead to Rome': The Role of the Nursemaid in Freud's Dreams," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXI (1973), 108-26, brings together material relevant to the Catholic nurse whom the toddler Freud loved. P. C. Vitz, in "Sigmund Freud's Attraction to Christianity: Biographical Evidence," *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought*, VI (1983), 73-183, has amassed an abundant number of Roman Catholic themes in Freud's early life but has not, I think, successfully demonstrated his attraction to Christianity.

Freud's uncle Josef Freud, the dealer in counterfeit currency, whom Freud mentions in his "R. was my uncle" dream in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, is ably, if briefly, discussed, with valuable archival documentation, in Krüll, *Freud and His Father*, 164-66. Krüll rightly criticizes Renée Gicklhorn's angry and malicious pamphlet *Sigmund Freud und der Onkeltraum. Dichtung und Wahrheit* (1976) for unfounded speculations. More evidence concerning Jacob Freud's involvement (like that, possibly, of his sons Emanuel and Philipp, by 1865 settled in Manchester) would be



welcome. See also Leonard Shengold's interesting exploration, "Freud and Joseph," in *The Unconscious Today: Essays in Honor of Max Schur*, ed. Mark Kanzer (1971), 473-94, which takes off from Freud's uncle Josef to comment incisively on Freud's encounters with other Josephs, and on Freud's character formation generally.

For Freud's intellectual and emotional development during his years at school, at the university, and in medical practice, down to the discovery of psychoanalysis in the 1890s, see, of course, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, *passim*, and the early pages of his "Autobiographical Study." Anzieu, *Freud's Self-Analysis* is particularly informative. There is abundant good material (with often unhackneyed illustrations) in Ernst Freud et al., eds., *Sigmund Freud: His Life in Pictures and Words*; and see Jones I, which relies extensively on the pioneering researches of Siegfried Bernfeld. In addition to the article cited just above, these include "Freud's Earliest Theories and the School of Helmholtz," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XIII (1944), 341-62, a most influential paper; "An Unknown Autobiographical Fragment by Freud," *American Imago*, IV (1946-47), 3-19; "Freud's Scientific Beginnings," *American Imago*, VI (1949), 163-96; "Sigmund Freud, M.D., 1882-1885," *Int. J. Psychoanal.*, XXXII (1951), 204-17; and, with Suzanne Cassirer Bernfeld, "Freud's First Year in Practice, 1886-1887," *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, XVI (1952), 37-49. A. Pokorny's almost unobtainable history of Freud's school (I discovered it in the Siegfried Bernfeld papers, container 17, LC), *Das erste Dezennium des Leopoldstädters Communal- Real- und Obergymnasiums (1864-1874). Ein historisch-statistischer Rückblick* (n.d., evidently 1874) shows (p. 44) that while in 1865 there were 32 Jews in that Gymnasium, by 1874 there were 335; the number of Roman Catholics had risen only from 42 to 110, and that of Protestants from 1 to 3. Dennis B. Klein, *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement* (1981) has instructive pages on Freud's schooling (and early Jewish allegiances). McGrath, *Freud's Discovery of Psychoanalysis* is an impressive scholarly study (particularly valuable on Freud's time at the university and his studies with Brentano), somewhat undercut by the untenable thesis that Freud developed psychoanalysis as a "counterpolitics," defiantly chosen, McGrath strongly suggests, because in anti-Semitic Vienna the political career Freud wanted was closed to him. (This thesis was first broached by McGrath's mentor Carl Schorske, in an influential but to my mind eccentric article, "Politics and Patricide in Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams*," *American Historical Review*, LXXVIII [1973], 328-47, reprinted in his *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* [1980], 181-207.) That notion apart, one can learn much from McGrath's book. For background to Freud's translations from Mill, see Adelaide Weinberg, *Theodor Gomperz and John Stuart Mill* (1963). There is also much of interest in Théo Pfrimmer, *Freud lecteur de la Bible* (1982), with a long section on the young Freud at home and thoughts on the role of religion in the making of his mind.

Of the ample collection of biographical studies in *Freud: The Fusion of Science and Humanism: The Intellectual History of Psychoanalysis*, ed. John E. Gedo and George H. Pollock (1976), the following are particularly pertinent to this chapter: Gedo and Ernest S. Wolf, "From the History of Introspective Psychology: The Humanist Strain," 11-45; Harry Trosman, "Freud's Cultural Background," 46-70; Gedo and Wolf, "The 'Ich.' Letters," 71-86; Gedo and Wolf, "Freud's *Novelas Ejemplares*," 87-111; Julian A. Miller, Melvin Sabshin, Gedo, Pollock, Leo Sadow, and Nathan Schlessinger, "Some Aspects of Charcot's Influence on Freud," 115-132. S. B. Vranich, "Sigmund Freud and 'The Case History of Berganza': Freud's Psychoanalytic Beginnings," *Psychoanalytic Review*, LXIII (1976), 73-82, makes an interesting (somewhat extravagant) claim for Freud's role as a "psychoanalyst" in his adolescent identification with Cipio, one of the dogs in Cervantes's *Coloquio de los perros*. For Freud's youthful "calf love" for Gisela Fluss, see the thoughtful paper by K. R. Eissler, "Creativity and Adolescence: The Effect of Trauma on Freud's Adolescence," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XXXIII (1978), 461-517. Heinz Stanesco has published an early poem of Freud's in "Ein 'Gelegenheitsgedicht' des jungen Sigmund Freud," *Deutsch für Ausländer: Informationen für den Lehrer* (1967), 13-16.

Freud's Vienna has been dissected in Ilsa Barea, *Vienna* (1966), a disillusioned, sobering historical essay on the city falsely known as the world headquarters of gaiety, waltzes, and the Beautiful Blue Danube. Arthur Schnitzler's posthumous autobiography, *My Youth in Vienna* (1968; tr. Catherine Hutter, 1970), is laden with trenchant, quotable observations. Robert A. Kann, *A History of the*



*Habsburg Empire, 1526–1918* (1974; corr. ed., 1977) sets the city into its Austrian and long-range historical context. A. J. P. Taylor, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809–1918: A History of the Austrian Empire and Austria-Hungary* (1941; 2d ed., 1948) is vintage Taylor: amusing, racy, opinionated. David F. Good, *The Economic Rise of the Habsburg Empire, 1750–1914* (1984) is a sensible monograph. William M. Johnston's full *The Austrian Mind: An Intellectual and Social History, 1848–1938* (1972) soberly surveys leaders of culture (economists, lawyers, and political thinkers as well as musicians and artists); Johnston's abundantly illustrated picture book, *Vienna, Vienna: The Golden Age, 1815–1914* (1981; preceded by Italian version, 1980) attractively displays much familiar but also much unfamiliar material. See also the fascinating catalogue of an exhibition in the Schiller-Nationalmuseum, Marbach: *Jugend in Wien: Literatur um 1900*, ed. Ludwig Greve and Werner Volke (1974). In a sizable literature on politics, Richard Charnatz, *Adolf Fischhof. Das Lebensbild eines österreichischen Politikers* (1910) is, if old-fashioned, particularly informative. There is much to be learned from Joseph Roth's beautiful novel about the empire in decline, *Radetzky Marsch* (1932). Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna* (1973), a sophisticated compendium of Viennese intellectual life, is to my mind excessively eager to construct connections among disparate groups. In contrast, for Freud's detachment from most of this Vienna, see the fine article by George Rosen, "Freud and Medicine in Vienna," *Psychological Medicine*, II (1972), 332–44, conveniently accessible in *Freud: The Man, His World, His Influence*, ed. Jonathan Miller (1972), 21–39. Most of the other short essays in Miller's well-illustrated volume are rather skimpy. See also Rupert Feuchtmüller and Christian Brandstätter, *Markstein der Moderne: Österreichs Beitrag zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (1980) and the early chapters of David S. Luft, *Robert Musil and the Crisis of European Culture, 1880–1942* (1980).

Schorske, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna* is a collection of elegant essays; the best of these, far more defensible than the one on Freud, is "The Ringstrasse, Its Critics, and the Birth of Modern Urbanism" (24–115). See also in this connection William J. McGrath's first book, *Dionysian Art and Populist Politics in Austria* (1974). John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848–1897* (1981) impressively sets out, with scholarly thoroughness, the political situation in which Freud lived down to his early forties. Kirk Varnedoe, *Vienna 1900: Art, Architecture and Design* (1986) is a splendidly illustrated exhibition catalogue which, in its text, rightly refuses to idealize the painters and designers of the period or to establish between them and Freud links which were not there.

There is much reliable modern scholarship on the Jews in Vienna. See above all the authoritative, concise monograph by Marsha L. Rosenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867–1914: Assimilation and Identity* (1983) and John W. Boyer, "Karl Lueger and the Viennese Jews," *Leo Baeck Yearbook*, XXVI (1981), 125–41. I have learned from Steven Beller, "Fin de Siècle Vienna and the Jews: The Dialectic of Assimilation," *Jewish Quarterly*, XXXIII (1986), 28–33, and am also indebted to Beller's unpublished manuscript, "Religion, Culture and Society in Fin de Siècle Vienna: The Case of the Gymnasien," which he let me read in the summer of 1986. See also Wolfdieter Bihl, "Die Juden," in *Die Habsburger Monarchie, 1848–1918*, ed. Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch, vol. III, *Die Völker des Reiches* (1980), part 2, 890–96. On Jewish liberalism, including Freud's, see Walter B. Simon, "The Jewish Vote in Austria," *Leo Baeck Yearbook*, XVI (1971), 97–121. A moving collection, in both German and English, of essays about Vienna's Jews—reminiscences, memoirs, papers on the Jewish share in the city's professional life, on the history of the community and its extermination—is *The Jews of Austria: Essays on Their Life, History and Destruction*, ed. Josef Fraenkel (1967); inevitably uneven, this collection at its best lights up more than a century of Jewish life. It includes a revealing essay by Martin Freud on his father, with some comments on his mother: "Who Was Freud?" 197–211. While Martin Freud's affectionate, humorous, and eminently usable *Sigmund Freud: Man and Father* (1958) is particularly relevant to chapter 4, it also offers good material on Freud's youth. See also, for miscellaneous information, Johannes Barta, *Jüdische Familien-erziehung. Das jüdische Erziehungswesen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (1975); the reminiscences of Friedrich Eckstein, "Alte unnennbare Tage!" *Erinnerungen aus siebzig Lehr- und Wanderjahren* (1936); and those of Sigmund Mayer, *Ein jüdischer Kaufmann 1891 bis 1911. Lebenserinnerungen* (1911). Mayer, *Die Wiener Juden. Kommerz, Kultur, Politik* (1917; 2d ed., 1918) is personal,



mournful, but revealing on the late nineteenth century. Peter G. J. Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria* (1964) is an excellent, terse survey; ch. 4, "Austria, 1867–1900," is particularly relevant here.

For Freud's debts to the thought and thinkers of his time, see the papers by Lucille B. Ritvo, esp. "Darwin as the Source of Freud's Neo-Lamarckianism," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XIII (1965), 499–517; "Carl Claus as Freud's Professor of the New Darwinian Biology," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LIII (1972), 277–83; "The Impact of Darwin on Freud," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XLIII (1974), 177–92; and, with Max Schur, "The Concept of Development and Evolution in Psychoanalysis," in *Development and Evolution of Behavior*, ed. L. R. Aronson et al. (1970), 600–619. Freud's acquaintance Friedrich Eckstein reports on Freud's shift from law to medicine in his "Alte unnennbare Tage!" For Brentano's influence on Freud, see—in addition to McGrath, *Freud's Discovery of Psychoanalysis*—Philip Merlan, "Brentano and Freud," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, VI (1945), 375–77, and Raymond E. Fancher's more extensive "Brentano's Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint and Freud's Early Metapsychology," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, XIII (1977), 207–27. The standard English-language study on Feuerbach is Marx W. Wartofsky, *Feuerbach* (1977); for Freud's reading in that thinker, see Simon Rawidowicz, *Ludwig Feuerbachs Philosophie. Ursprung und Schicksal* (1931), 348–50. Peter Amacher, *Freud's Neurological Education and Its Influence on Psychoanalytic Theory*, Psychological Issues, monograph 16 (1965) is sound but could have been longer. Larry Stewart, "Freud before Oedipus," *Journal of the History of Biology*, IX (1976), 215–28, is fairly slight. More substantial is Rudolf Brun, "Sigmund Freuds Leistungen auf dem Gebiet der organischen Neurologie," *Schweizer Archiv für Neurologie und Psychiatrie*, XXXVII (1936), 200–207.

For Freud's teachers in medical school, see (in addition to Rosen's liberating article "Freud and Medicine in Vienna") Erna Lesky's monumental *The Vienna Medical School of the 19th Century* (1965; tr. L. Williams and I. S. Levij, 1976), to which every student of Vienna's medicine must be indebted; Dora Stockert Meynert, *Theodor Meynert und seine Zeit: Zur Geistesgeschichte Österreichs in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (1930); Ernst Theodor Brücke, *Ernst Brücke* (1928); and Sherwin B. Nuland, *The Masterful Spirit—Theodor Billroth*, The Classics of Surgery Library (1984), 3–44. Julius Wagner-Jauregg, *Lebenserinnerungen*, ed. and completed by L. Schönbauer and M. Jantsch (1950), has a few vivid glimpses of Freud.

The best collection of materials on the controversial cocaine episode is *Cocaine Papers by Sigmund Freud*, ed. Robert Byck (1974), with notes by Anna Freud; it contains Freud's publications on the subject and a thorough, dependable introduction. See also Siegfried Bernfeld, "Freud's Studies on Cocaine, 1884–1887," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, I (1953), 581–613. Hortense Koller Becker, "Carl Koller and Cocaine," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XXXII (1963), 309–73, carefully details the share of Freud's friend in the discovery of cocaine as an anesthetic. Peter J. Swales, "Freud, Cocaine, and Sexual Chemistry: The Role of Cocaine in Freud's Conception of the Libido" (privately printed, 1983) has some characteristic speculations. And see Jürgen vom Scheidt, "Sigmund Freud und das Kokain," *Psyche*, XXVII (1973), 385–430. E. M. Thornton, *Freud and Cocaine: The Freudian Fallacy* (1983) is a model in the literature of denigration; it attempts to persuade the reader that Freud, "a false and faithless prophet" (p. 312), originated psychoanalysis in the haze of a cocaine psychosis; the author claims that "the 'unconscious mind' does not exist, that his theories were baseless and aberrational and, greatest impiety of all, that Freud himself, when he formulated them, was under the influence of a toxic drug with specific effects on the brain" (p. 1).

For Charcot, see A. R. G. Owen's rather skimpy *Hysteria, Hypnosis and Healing: The Work of J.-M. Charcot* (1971). Georges Guillain, *J.-M. Charcot, 1825–1893: His Life—His Work* (1955; tr. Pearce Bailey, 1959) is far more substantial but concentrates on Charcot's early neurological work somewhat at the expense of his later studies on hysteria. For these, Mark S. Micale (whose dissertation on Charcot and male hysteria [Yale, 1987] is authoritative) has already published "The Salpêtrière in the Age of Charcot: An Institutional Perspective on Medical History in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Journal of Contemporary History*, XX (1985), 703–31. See also the article by Miller et al., "Some Aspects of Charcot's Influence on Freud."



CHAPTER TWO · *The Theory in the Making*

For Freud's fateful friendship with Fliess, *Freud-Fliess* is naturally a princely source. Max Schur, who in the 1960s had access to then unpublished portions of the correspondence, has sagacious comments in *Freud, Living and Dying*. Schur's pathbreaking article "Some Additional 'Day Residues' of 'The Specimen Dream of Psychoanalysis,'" in *Psychoanalysis—a General Psychology: Essays in Honor of Heinz Hartmann*, ed. Rudolph M. Loewenstein, Lottie M. Newman, Schur, and Albert J. Solnit (1966), 45–85, is, despite its innocuous title, explosive: in elucidating the dream of Irma's injection, it throws rather lurid light on Freud's infatuation with Fliess. K. R. Eissler, "To Muriel M. Gardiner on Her 70th Birthday," *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Association for Psychoanalysis*, XXII (1972), 110–30, is a thoughtful and in the best sense suggestive essay on Freud and Fliess. See also Edith Buxbaum, "Freud's Dream Interpretation in the Light of His Letters to Fliess," *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, XV (1951), 197–212. Frank J. Sulloway's extensive *Freud, Biologist of the Mind: Beyond the Psychoanalytic Legend* (1979) suffers from some overkill, presenting itself as a great unmasking document but bringing the essentially old news that Freud's theory had a biological background; however, chaps. 5 and 6, analyzing Freud's dependence on Fliess and what Sulloway calls "nineteenth-century psychophysics," have much of value. Patrick Mahony, "Friendship and Its Discontents," *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, XV (1979), 55–109, meticulously examines Freud in the 1890s, with particular attention to the German material. Erik H. Erikson, "The Dream Specimen of Psychoanalysis," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, II (1954), 5–56, principally examines the Irma dream, but also comments on the Freud-Fliess association. Peter J. Swales, "Freud, Fliess, and Fratricide: The Role of Fliess in Freud's Conception of Paranoia" (privately printed, 1982) goes so far as to intimate that Freud may have tried to murder Fliess during their last "congress" in 1900. George F. Mahl, "Explosions of Discoveries and Concepts: The Freud-Fliess Letters," ch. 4 of *A First Course in Freud*, as yet unpublished, meticulously and dependably canvasses this correspondence. The deterioration of the Freud-Fliess friendship left traces in the inscriptions that Fliess put into his books. In 1897, when he sent Freud his substantial monograph *Die Beziehung zwischen Nase und weiblichen Geschlechtsorganen. In ihrer biologischen Bedeutung dargestellt*, he wrote, "Seinem teuren Sigmund, innigst, d. V."; five years later, in 1902, he sent his *Über den ursächlichen Zusammenhang von Nase und Geschlechtsorgan* with the far cooler inscription "Seinem lieben Sigmund!" *Teuer* is a very affectionate term—"dearest" perhaps renders it best—and *innigst* means something like "most affectionately"; but *lieb* is a commonplace form of address—"dear," as in "Dear Sir." (These inscribed copies are in the Freud Museum, London.)

For Martha Bernays Freud, see the biographies of her husband, notably *Jones I*, and the unpublished fragments of letters I quote in the text. A short article by Martin Freud's wife, Esti D. Freud, "Mrs. Sigmund Freud," *Jewish Spectator*, XLV (1980), 29–31, evokes the "serenity" (p. 29) for which Martha Freud had a certain (but not completely uncontroverted) reputation. Peter Gay, "Six Names in Search of an Interpretation: A Contribution to the Debate over Sigmund Freud's Jewishness," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, LIII (1982), 295–307, suggests something of Freud's domestic authority. Among studies of Stefan Zweig (on whom Martha Freud commented so scathingly), D. A. Prater, *European of Yesterday: A Biography of Stefan Zweig* (1972) provides the necessary background.

By far the most authoritative study of the case of "Anna O.," and of Breuer in general, is Albrecht Hirschmüller's exhaustive (but not exhausting) dissertation, *Physiologie und Psychoanalyse im Leben und Werk Josef Breuers*, supplement 4 to *Jahrbuch der Psychoanalyse*, X (1978); it satisfactorily sets right faulty conjectures and dubious interpretations, puts Breuer securely on the map of Freud scholarship, and explores Freud's medical world. The documents concerning Anna O.'s medical history and those by Anna O. herself are fascinating. Hirschmüller argues instructively with Julian A. Miller, Melvin Sabshin, John E. Gedo, George H. Pollock, Leo Sadow, and Nathan Schlessinger, "The Scientific Styles of Breuer and Freud and the Origins of Psychoanalysis," and with Pollock, "Josef Breuer," both in *Freud, Fusion of Science and Humanism*, ed. Gedo and Pollock, 187–207, 133–63. Paul F. Cranefield, "Josef Breuer's Evaluation of His Contribution to Psycho-Analysis," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XXXIX (1958), 319–22, reproduces and analyzes an interesting 1907 letter from



Breuer to Auguste Forel, which throws retrospective light on his earlier attitudes. Henri Ellenberger, "The Story of 'Anna O.': A Critical Review with New Data," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, VIII (1972), 267–79, persuasively corrects Jones's misreading and Freud's misremembering of the case. Hirschmüller has also dug up a fascinating case history of a severe hysteric, "Nina R.," referred to the Bellevue sanatorium at Kreuzlingen by Freud and Breuer: "Eine bisher unbekannte Krankengeschichte Sigmund Freuds und Josef Breuers aus der Entstehungszeit der 'Studien über Hysterie,'" *Jahrbuch der Psychoanalyse*, X (1978), 136–68. For the admirable later career of Anna O. (Bertha Pappenheim) as a leading Jewish feminist and social worker, see Ellen Jensen, "Anna O., a Study of Her Later Life," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XXXIX (1970), 269–93. Richard Karpe, "The Rescue Complex in Anna O's Final Identity," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XXX (1961), 1–24, connects her neurosis with her later achievement. Lucy Freeman, *The Story of Anna O.* (1972), is a popular treatment. But see the excellent historical study by Marion Kaplan, *The Jewish Feminist Movement in Germany: The Campaign of the Jüdischer Frauenbund, 1904–1938* (1979), which has important material on Bertha Pappenheim's career.

For Freud's study on the aphasias, a rather neglected text, see the useful, if perhaps too compressed, paper by E. Stengel, "A Re-evaluation of Freud's Book 'On Aphasia': Its Significance for Psycho-Analysis," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XXXV (1954), 85–89. One of Freud's early hysteric patients, "Frau Cäcilie M.," has been studied in rewarding detail by Peter J. Swales, "Freud, His Teacher, and the Birth of Psychoanalysis," in *Freud, Appraisals and Reappraisals*, ed. Stepansky, I, 3–82. See also Swales's essay on "Katharina": "Freud, Katharina, and the First 'Wild Analysis,'" typescript of a lecture, with added materials (1985). Ola Andersson, "A Supplement to Freud's Case History of 'Frau Emmy v. N.' in Studies on Hysteria 1895," *Scandinavian Psychoanalytic Review*, II (1979), 5–15, includes biographical material. See also Else Pappenheim, "Freud and Gilles de la Tourette: Diagnostic Speculations on 'Frau Emmy von N.,'" *Int. Rev. Psycho-Anal.*, VII (1980), 265–77, which suggests that this patient may not have been a hysteric at all, but instead may have been suffering (as Freud, too, conjectured for a time) from Gilles de la Tourette's syndrome.

Freud's "Psychology for Neurologists," abandoned incomplete, was first published in *Aus den Anfängen der Psychoanalyse. Briefe an Wilhelm Fliess, Abhandlungen und Notizen aus den Jahren 1887–1902*, ed. Ernst Kris, Marie Bonaparte, and Anna Freud (1950; English version, *The Origins of Psychoanalysis*, tr. Eric Mosbacher and James Strachey, 1954). In his introduction to this first, severely truncated edition of the Fliess letters, Kris deals with the place of the project in Freud's thought. The project is conveniently available in English, under the title "Project for a Scientific Psychology," in *SE* I, 283–397. It has been beautifully appreciated in Wollheim, *Freud*, esp. ch. 2. Isabel F. Knight argues in "Freud's 'Project': A Theory for *Studies on Hysteria*," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, XX (1984), 340–58, that the project was designed as a critique of Breuer's theories. John Friedman and James Alexander, "Psychoanalysis and Natural Science: Freud's 1895 Project Revisited," *Int. Rev. Psycho-Anal.*, X (1983), 303–18, an important essay, suggests that Freud was at this early date trying to free himself from the constraints of late-nineteenth-century scientific discourse. See also, on Freud's "Newtonianism," Robert C. Solomon, "Freud's Neurological Theory of Mind," in *Freud: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Wollheim, 25–52.

The discussion over Freud's so-called seduction theory has been muddied by Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson, *The Assault on Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory* (1984), which argues—preposterously—that Freud abandoned that theory because he could not tolerate the isolation from the Vienna medical establishment to which his radical ideas had condemned him. One wonders why, if Freud had been made so anxious, he then proceeded to publicize even more unsettling theories, such as those on infantile sexuality and the ubiquity of perversion. In fact, the reasons Freud gave in his letter to Fliess of September 21, 1897 (*Freud–Fliess*, 283–86 [264–67]) are (*pace* Krüll) good and sufficient. Moreover, Freud never disputed the depressing truth that the seduction or the rape of young girls—and boys—whether attempted or consummated, was only too real an event. He could point to patients (including Katharina) of his own. The standard accounts of Freud's attitude toward his seduction theory, given in *Jones* I, esp. 263–67, and by other writers, stand up.

For Freud's self-analysis, especially as it relates to his father, see the materials already listed in the essay for chapter 1, notably *The Interpretation of Dreams*; Krüll, *Freud and His Father*; Anzieu,



*Freud's Self-Analysis*; and Grinstein, *On Sigmund Freud's Dreams*. And see also George F. Mahl, "Father-Son Themes in Freud's Self-Analysis," in *Father and Child: Developmental and Clinical Perspectives*, ed. Stanley H. Cath, Alan R. Gurwitt, and John Munder Ross (1982), 33–64; and Mahl, "Freud, *Father and Mother: Quantitative Aspects*," *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, II (1985), 99–113, both of which bring precision to a murky area. Schur's extensive comments in *Freud, Living and Dying* are indispensable. *Freud and His Self-Analysis*, ed. Mark Kanzer and Jules Glenn (1979) brings together some interesting papers, but is a little miscellaneous.

Did Freud have an affair with his sister-in-law Minna Bernays? The first to have made this charge was apparently Carl G. Jung, in private (it is reported) and then in 1957 in an interview with his friend John M. Billinsky, who published it in 1969: "Jung and Freud (the End of a Romance)," *Andover Newton Quarterly*, X (1969), 39–43. The relevant passage occurs in Jung's account of his first visit to Berggasse 19, in 1907: "Soon I met Freud's wife's younger sister. She was very good-looking and she not only knew enough about psychoanalysis but also about everything that Freud was doing. When, a few days later, I was visiting Freud's laboratory, Freud's sister-in-law asked if she could talk with me. She was very much bothered by her relationship with Freud and felt guilty about it. From her I learned that Freud was in love with her and that their relationship was indeed very intimate. It was a shocking discovery to me, and even now I can recall the agony I felt at the time. Two years later Freud and I were invited to Clark University in Worcester, and we were together every day for some seven weeks. From the very beginning of our trip we started to analyze each other's dreams. Freud had some dreams that bothered him very much. The dreams were about the triangle—Freud, his wife, and wife's younger sister. Freud had no idea that I knew about the triangle and his intimate relationship with his sister-in-law. And so, when Freud told me about the dream in which his wife and her sister played important parts, I asked Freud to tell me some of his personal associations with the dream. He looked at me with bitterness and said, 'I could tell you more, but I cannot risk my authority'" (p. 42).

What is one to make of this? Jung, as many of his contradictory autobiographical comments suggest, was a less than reliable reporter. The story about Freud's refusal to help interpret one of his own dreams aboard ship may be true enough; Jung repeated it more than once in Freud's lifetime, once in a letter to Freud (Jung to Freud, December 3, 1912. *Freud-Jung*, 583–84, 584n [526, 526n]), and Freud never denied it. But in other respects this particular account is exceedingly odd. Freud, of course, did not have a "laboratory." His consulting room was next door to his study, and Jung might have been referring to either of these rooms, but the expression remains a strange one. Moreover, while such judgments are of course highly subjective, I submit that the photographs we have do not show Minna Bernays to have been "very good-looking." She may indeed have been to Freud's taste, but it seems highly implausible that Jung, who had an eye for feminine beauty and was himself sexually quite active during these years, beyond the bounds of marriage, would really have found her so. Schur, who admittedly knew Minna Bernays only in relatively advanced age, found her quite unattractive (interview with Helen Schur, June 3, 1986). Again, it seems quite improbable that Minna Bernays would have confided such an intimate matter to a total stranger—a man whom she had just met and who was alien to her in religion and culture and professional interests. To be sure, she might conceivably have seen an outsider, especially one who would soon depart again, as precisely the right person to confide in. But I find it virtually impossible to visualize the scene.

More recently, Peter J. Swales has made the same claim, offering confident conjectures as demonstrated fact, in "Freud, Minna Bernays, and the Imitation of Christ" (an unpublished 1982 lecture, photocopy courtesy Mr. Swales); and "Freud, Minna Bernays, and the Conquest of Rome: New Light on the Origins of Psychoanalysis," *New American Review: A Journal of Civility and the Arts*, I (Spring/Summer 1982), 1–23. Swales utilizes what I should call the "Bernfeld way of reading," a fruitful but risky method. Siegfried Bernfeld, who intended to write a biography of Freud and amassed a great deal of material, read certain of Freud's texts, notably his paper "Screen Memories" (1899), as disguised autobiographical revelations. It was thus that he discovered Freud's adolescent infatuation with Gisela Fluss. To be sure, perfectly plausible, and sometimes correct, inferences can be drawn from many of Freud's statements (*The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* is a particularly rich source of indirect self-revelations); put together until they tell a coherent story, they may take on a weight



they would not have individually. Swales does this sort of thing well, and the psychoanalytic technique of digging beneath manifest surfaces virtually invites it. Concentrating on material from Freud's "Screen Memories," *The Interpretation of Dreams*, and *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, Swales constructs a sequence of events in Freud's life which he takes to prove that Freud did indeed have an affair with his sister-in-law. When a statement that Freud makes concerning someone else may well apply to himself, Swales accepts it as evidence; when a statement fails to fit, he accuses Freud of disguising the material, or of brazen deception. He may, of course, be right: the dream work, a mixture of revelation and concealment, proceeds somewhat in this way, and any clever storyteller knows that one most effective tactic is to mingle truth with fiction. So, Freud *may* have had an affair with Minna Bernays.

Ernest Jones's pertinent comments hint, not so much perhaps that Jung's story is necessarily true, but that it had been circulating and seemed persuasive enough (at least to some) to deserve explicit refutation. Certainly, Jones is emphatic enough on the matter to cause the suspicious to wonder whether he is not being a little defensive. Thus he calls Freud "monogamic in a very unusual degree," a man who "always gave the impression of being an unusually chaste person—the word 'puritanical' would not be out of place" (*Jones I*, 139, 271). In his criticism of Puner's biography of Freud he feels impelled to say a few words on Freud's "married life, since various strange legends seem to be in vogue about it. . . . His wife was assuredly the only woman in Freud's love life, and she always came first before all other mortals. . . . [As for Minna Bernays,] her caustic tongue gave rise to many epigrams that were cherished in the family. Freud no doubt appreciated her conversation, but to say that she in any way replaced her sister in his affections is sheer nonsense" (*Jones II*, 386–87). Clark, too (see his *Freud*, 52), has considered the evidence, notably the Jung interview, and rejects it as highly improbable.

The Freud Collection at the Library of Congress includes a packet of letters between Freud and Minna Bernays that are being scrutinized before being released; at this writing they are (maddeningly) not yet available. Given the incompleteness of the evidence (another instance of how the restrictive policy of Freud's guardians, either denying or slowing down access to important materials, nourishes rumors), one cannot be dogmatic—at least, I cannot be. Freud wrote some passionate letters to Minna Bernays while he was engaged to her sister, but this, rather than offering support to the Jung-Swales theory, seems to me to make it all the less probable. If dependable independent evidence (as distinct from conjecture and clever chains of inferences) should emerge that Freud did indeed have an affair with his sister-in-law and actually (as Swales has argued in some detail) took her to get an abortion, I shall revise my text accordingly. Meanwhile, I must accept the established, less scandalous view of Freud as correct.

### CHAPTER THREE · *Psychoanalysis*

For the making of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, the *Freud–Fliess* letters are, of course, beyond compare. See also, once again, for detailed explorations of his dreams that Freud uses in the book, Anzieu, *Freud's Self-Analysis* and Grinstein, *On Sigmund Freud's Dreams*. In addition, Freud's dream theory is examined in Fisher and Greenberg, *Scientific Credibility of Freud's Theories*, ch. 2 (a good, full discussion), and in *Jones I* and in other biographical studies I have already listed. For the reasons given in the essay for chapter 1, I cannot accept McGrath's "political" interpretation of Freud in *Freud's Discovery of Psychoanalysis*, but I have found many of his readings of Freud's dreams to be subtle. See also Ella Freeman Sharpe, *Dream Analysis* (1937; 2d ed., 1978), an elegant text by an eminent English lay analyst; Bertram D. Lewin's suggestive Freud Lecture, *Dreams and the Uses of Regression* (1958); several early papers by Ernest Jones, conveniently collected in his *Papers on Psycho-Analysis* (3d ed., 1923) and together interesting as indications of how dream interpretation penetrated the psychoanalytic profession: "Freud's Theory of Dreams" (1910), 212–46; "Some Instances of the Influence of Dreams on Waking Life" (1911), 247–54; "A Forgotten Dream" (1912), 255–65; "Persons in Dreams Disguised as Themselves" (1921), 266–69; and "The Relationship between Dreams and Psychoneurotic Symptoms" (delivered in 1911), 270–92.



More recent papers include a survey by D. R. Hawkins, "A Review of Psychoanalytic Dream Theory in the Light of Recent Psycho-Physiological Studies of Sleep and Dreaming," *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, XXXIX (1966), 85-104, and a rewarding paper by Leonard Shengold, "The Metaphor of the Journey in 'The Interpretation of Dreams,'" *American Imago* XXIII (1966), 316-31. A short, readable, and eclectic essay by the analyst Charles Rycroft, *The Innocence of Dreams* (1979), surveys the recent literature, not confining itself to psychoanalytic work. Research on dreams goes on; one intriguing theory, admittedly very tentative (and explicitly critical of Freud's), is presented in Francis Crick and Graeme Mitchison, "The Function of Dream Sleep," *Nature*, CCCIV (1983), 111-14, which proposes that REM sleep is designed to remove "undesirable modes of interaction in networks of cells in the cerebral cortex." See also James L. Fosshage and Clemens A. Loew, eds., *Dream Interpretation: A Comparative Study* (1978), and Liam Hudson, *Night Life: The Interpretation of Dreams* (1985), in which this psychologist offers an interpretative scheme of his own. One other profitable item in the literature Freud's dream book has generated, Walter Schönau, *Sigmund Freuds Prosa. Literarische Elemente seines Stils* (1968), has some interesting and to my mind convincing material (pp. 53-89) on the mottos that Freud rejected, and the one he used, for *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Erikson, "The Dream Specimen of Psychoanalysis," is an interesting long paper on the Irma dream. See also A. Keiper and A. A. Stone, "The Dream of Irma's Injection: A Structural Analysis," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, CXXXIX (1982), 1225-34. Other useful essays on Freud's dreams are the brief paper by Leslie Adams, "A New Look at Freud's Dream 'The Breakfast Ship,'" *American Journal of Psychiatry*, CX (1953), 381-84; the deservedly well-known paper by Eva M. Rosenfeld, "Dream and Vision: Some Remarks on Freud's Egyptian Bird Dream," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XXXVIII (1956), 97-105; and once again, Buxbaum, "Freud's Dream Interpretation in the Light of His Letters to Fliess" (cited in the essay for chapter 2).

The genre of autobiography, which flourished uncommonly in the nineteenth century, and to which Freud's program in its own unique way belongs, is attracting an increasing number of scholars. I here briefly mention only a handful of the most interesting recent titles: Jerome Hamilton Buckley, *The Turning Key: Autobiography and the Subjective Impulse since 1800* (1984), from which I have learned a good deal; William C. Spengemann, *The Forms of Autobiography: Episodes in the History of a Literary Genre* (1980), which covers some nineteenth-century examples in the last chapter; Linda H. Peterson, *Victorian Autobiography: The Tradition of Self-Interpretation* (1986), which is more concentrated; A. O. J. Cockshut, *The Art of Autobiography in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century England* (1984), full of sage comment; and Avrom Fleishman, *Figures of Autobiography: The Language of Self-Writing* (1983).

Quite directly to Freud's work. For Freud's own ideas in those years, we have the valuable study by Kenneth Levin, *Freud's Early Psychology of the Neuroses: A Historical Perspective* (1978). There is no historians' consensus on nineteenth-century mental science, or on madhouses. These topics have been attracting a great deal of attention and stirred a good deal of debate recently, not least thanks to Michel Foucault's (to my mind, if stimulating, generally baleful) radical revisionism; I particularly have in mind Foucault's influential *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (1961; tr. Richard Howard, 1965). Lancelot Law Whyte, *The Unconscious before Freud* (1960; paperback ed., 1962) is a brief but helpful survey. Far more comprehensive is Henri F. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry* (1970), a rather swollen but thoroughly researched nine-hundred-page volume, with long chapters on the early history of psychology, and on Jung, Adler, and Freud. Though far from elegant, though opinionated and not always reliable in its quick judgments (such as its verdict that Freud was the quintessential Viennese), it is a rich source of information. Robert M. Young, *Mind, Brain and Adaptation in the Nineteenth Century: Cerebral Localization and Its Biological Context from Gall to Ferrier* (1970) is a minor modern classic. There is a fine anthology, *Madhouses, Mad-Doctors, and Madmen: The Social History of Psychiatry in the Victorian Era*, ed. Andrew Scull (1981); with no wish to single out some contributions at the expense of others, I may say that I learned most from William F. Bynum, Jr., "Rationales for Therapy in British Psychiatry," 35-57, and Michael J. Clark, "The Rejection of Psychological Approaches to Mental Disorder in Late Nineteenth-Century British Psychiatry," 271-312. Another fascinating anthology, which shows Foucault's impact but resists



sensationalism, is *The Anatomy of Madness: Essays in the History of Psychiatry*, vol. I, *People and Ideas*, and vol. II, *Institutions and Society*, ed. Bynum, Roy Porter, and Michael Shepherd (1985). Raymond E. Fancher, *Pioneers of Psychology* (1979) lucidly, though economically, lays out the field from René Descartes to B. F. Skinner. J. C. Flugel, *A Hundred Years of Psychology: 1833-1933* (1933) covers a wide field necessarily in the tersest manner. See also Clarence J. Kariel, *Scientists of the Mind: Intellectual Founders of Modern Psychology* (1986), with even-handed chapters on ten modern psychologists from William James to Otto Rank, not forgetting Freud, Adler, and Jung. Gerald N. Grob, ed., *The Inner World of American Psychiatry, 1890-1940: Selected Correspondence* (1985) is well chosen and annotated. And see Kenneth Dewhurst, *Hughlings Jackson on Psychiatry* (1982), an excellent short monograph; and *Essays in the History of Psychiatry*, ed. Edwin R. Wallace IV and Lucius C. Pressley (1980), a useful collection of pieces on George M. Beard (by Eric T. Carlson) and others. Steven R. Hirsch and Michael Shepherd, *Themes and Variations in European Psychiatry: An Anthology* (1974) have dug up, among other material predating the First World War, papers by Emil Kraepelin, Karl Bonhoeffer, and others. Barry Silverstein, "Freud's Psychology and Its Organic Foundations: Sexuality and Mind-Body Interactionism," *Psychoanalytic Review*, LXXII (1985), 203-28, fruitfully pursues the proposition that the impact of Freud's neurological education should not be overstated, and that psychoanalysis, though it does not give up mind-body interaction, insists on the independence of the mental. For a fascinating modern attempt by an analyst to link psychoanalytic with neurological theories, see Morton F. Reiser, *Mind, Brain, Body: Toward a Convergence of Psychoanalysis and Neurobiology* (1986). And see R. W. Angel, "Jackson, Freud and Sherrington on the Relation of Brain and Mind," *American Journal of Psychiatry* (1961), 193-97. Anne Digby, *Madness, Morality and Medicine: A Study of the York Retreat, 1796-1914* (1986) is a fine specialized study that should be a model to others. Equally exemplary are the writings of Janet Oppenheim, notably "The Diagnosis and Treatment of Nervous Breakdown: A Dilemma for Victorian and Edwardian Psychiatry," in *The Political Culture of Modern Britain: Studies in Memory of Stephen Koss*, ed. J. M. W. Bean (1987), 75-90; and her monograph, *The Other World: Spiritualism and Psychical Research in England, 1850-1914* (1985).

K. R. Eissler, *Sigmund Freud und die Wiener Universität. Über die Pseudo-Wissenschaftlichkeit der jüngsten Wiener Freud-Biographik* (1966) is the authoritative study, superseding all others, of Freud's slow rise to a professorship; it proves in a spirited polemic against two Austrian researchers, Joseph and Renée Gicklhorn, that Freud's promotion to professor was held up for years.

The most searching, extremely negative examination of Freud's thesis that the mental order is revealed in ordinary slips of the tongue and related symptomatic acts is Sebastiano Timpanaro, *The Freudian Slip: Psychoanalysis and Textual Criticism* (1974; tr. Kate Soper), which is worth wrestling with, though I do not find it convincing.

Freud on sexuality has been explored probably even more than Freud on dreams. For an examination of respectable nineteenth-century sexuality, norms, and realities, of which Freud was a part as well as a critic, see Peter Gay, *Education of the Senses* (1984) and its companion volume, *The Tender Passion* (1986), vols. I and II of *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud*; these portray the "Victorian" bourgeoisie as far less hypocritical or repressed than its critics have claimed. See also the revealing, wide-ranging essay by Stephen Kern, "Freud and the Discovery of Child Sexuality," *History of Childhood Quarterly: The Journal of Psychohistory*, I (Summer 1973), 117-41; it should be read in conjunction with Kern, "Freud and the Birth of Child Psychiatry," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, IX (1973), 360-68. And see Sterling Fishman, "The History of Childhood Sexuality," *Journal of Contemporary History*, XVII (1982), 269-83, useful but slighter than Kern. There is a survey of contemporary medical opinion in K. Codell Carter, "Infantile Hysteria and Infantile Sexuality in Late Nineteenth-Century German-Language Medical Literature," *Medical History*, XXVII (1983), 186-96. Freud's view of marriage is discussed in John W. Boyer, "Freud, Marriage, and Late Viennese Liberalism: A Commentary from 1905," *Journal of Modern History*, L (March 1978), 72-102, which includes an important statement of Freud's in the original German.



CHAPTER FOUR *Sketch of an Embattled Founder*

For my sketch of Freud at fifty, I have drawn on all the obviously relevant biographies, monographs, and reminiscences previously mentioned; on his correspondence, published and unpublished; and on Anna Freud's important letters to Ernest Jones (in Jones papers, Archives of the British Psycho-Analytical Society, London) and the unpublished recollections of Freud's analysand the psychoanalyst Ludwig Jekels (in Siegfried Bernfeld papers, container 17, LC). Jones, Schur, Sachs, and above all Martin Freud, are particularly indispensable. For Freud's apartment, the photographs by Edmund Engelman in *Berggasse 19: Sigmund Freud's Home and Offices, Vienna 1938* (1976) are evocative. These photographs, taken in May 1938, show Freud's consulting room as he rearranged it after he became partly deaf in one ear. See also my introduction to that collection, "Freud: For the Marble Tablet," 13-54, and the revised version, "Sigmund Freud: A German and His Discontents," in *Freud, Jews and Other Germans: Masters and Victims in Modernist Culture* (1978), 29-92. Rita Ransohoff's captions to Engelman's pictures are only moderately helpful; a professional catalogue of Freud's possessions, especially his antiquities, is a desideratum. See also the thoughtful comments of an early intimate, Max Graf, "Reminiscences of Professor Sigmund Freud," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XI (1942), 465-77; Ernst Waldinger, "My Uncle Sigmund Freud," *Books Abroad*, XV (Winter 1941), 3-10; and an interview by Richard Dyck with another nephew, Harry Freud: "Mein Onkel Sigmund," *Aufbau* (New York), May 11, 1956, 3-4. Bruno Goetz, "Erinnerungen an Sigmund Freud," *Neue Schweizer Rundschau*, XX (May 1952), 3-11, is short but charming and touching. Excerpts from a number of these reminiscences, as well as many others, have been diligently collected in *Freud As We Knew Him*, ed. Hendrik M. Ruitenbeek (1973), a very comprehensive anthology. For the context of Freud's musical taste (especially for opera), I have sampled the vast literature; I single out Paul Robinson's fascinating and persuasive *Opera and Ideas from Mozart to Strauss* (1985), which argues that music *can* convey ideas. For Karl Kraus, see esp. Edward Timms, *Karl Kraus, Apocalyptic Satirist: Culture and Catastrophe in Habsburg Vienna* (1986), a scholarly biography that carefully corrects widespread misreadings of Freud's relations with Vienna's most celebrated literary gadfly.

For Freud's early adherents, see Franz Alexander, Samuel Eisenstein, and Martin Grotjahn, eds., *Psychoanalytic Pioneers* (1966), a rich but uneven anthology containing material unavailable elsewhere. The biographical comments in the four volumes of the *Protokolle* of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society concerning Freud's circle are far from uninformative though too brief. Lou Andreas-Salomé, *In der Schule bei Freud. Tagebuch eines Jahres, 1912/1913*, ed. Ernst Pfeiffer (1958) is vigorous and perceptive. One of the most important among the Viennese, Otto Rank, has had more than one admiring biography: Jesse Taft, *Otto Rank* (1958) and the full study by E. James Lieberman, *Acts of Will: The Life and Work of Otto Rank* (1985), which sets the accents somewhat differently from the way I am setting them in this chapter and later. For the early days of the movement in Vienna and elsewhere, Ernest Jones's autobiography, *Free Associations: Memories of a Psycho-Analyst* (1959), is terse, opinionated, and informative.

The "foreigners" can use fuller treatment than they have so far received. There is no biography of Pfister, but his autobiographical statement, "Oskar Pfister," in *Die Pädagogik der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, ed. Erich Hahn, 2 vols. (1926-27), II, 161-207, is a good start. Nearly the complete Freud-Pfister correspondence is at the Sigmund Freud Copyrights, Wivenhoe, and, in conjunction with the Pfister papers in the Zentralbibliothek, Zurich, would make the basis for a biography. See meanwhile Willi Hoffer's obituary of Pfister, *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XXXIX (1958), 615-16, as well as Gay, *A Godless Jew*, ch. 3. The biography of Karl Abraham by his daughter Hilda Abraham, *Karl Abraham: An Unfinished Biography* (1974), is a valiant and incomplete first effort (its German version, *Karl Abraham. Sein Leben für die Psychoanalyse*, tr. into German by Hans-Horst Henschen, 1976, contains some important letters of Abraham's quoted in the original); far more needs to be done. Ernest Jones, a fascinating and documented figure, deserves better than Vincent Brome, *Ernest Jones: Freud's Alter Ego* (English ed., 1982; American ed., 1983); its principal virtues are reports of interviews with Jones and abundant quotations of texts from the archives, but it lacks critical judgment and is downright perfunctory. The papers published on the occasion of the centen-



ary of Jones's birth, *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LX (1979), are expectably admiring but do include some nuggets: Katharine Jones, "A Sketch of E. J.'s Personality," 171-73; William Gillespie, "Ernest Jones: The Bonny Fighter," 273-79; Pearl King, "The Contributions of Ernest Jones to the British Psycho-Analytical Society," 280-87; and Arcangelo R. T. D'Amore, "Ernest Jones: Founder of the American Psychoanalytic Association," 287-90. Binswanger, *Erinnerungen*, already cited for the letters of Freud's it quotes with abandon, also has Binswanger's own responses. There is all too little on the handsome, elegant, and brilliant Joan Riviere, but we have two affectionate obituaries by James Strachey and Paula Heimann, in *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XLIV (1963), 228-30, 230-33. Perhaps the most severe lacuna is a full biography of Ferenczi (or, for that matter, a history of the Budapest institute). The best sources now are Michael Balint's fond, well-informed "Einleitung des Herausgebers," in Sándor Ferenczi, *Schriften zur Psychoanalyse*, ed. Balint, 2 vols. (1970), I, ix-xxii; and Ilse Grubrich-Simitis, "Six Letters of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi on the Interrelationship of Psychoanalytic Theory and Technique," *Int. Rev. Psycho-Anal.*, XIII (1986), 259-77, well annotated and commented upon.

Hannah S. Decker, *Freud in Germany: Revolution and Reaction in Science, 1893-1907* (1977), is a model monograph on the early reception of Freud in Germany; it revises oversimplifications in Freud's and Jones's references to this reception without falling into the trap of revisionism for its own sake. Similar monographs on Freud's early reception elsewhere would be desirable.

For Otto Weininger, about whom a sizable literature has collected, I found particularly instructive Hans Kohn's pamphlet *Karl Kraus. Arthur Schnitzler. Otto Weininger. Aus dem jüdischen Wien der Jahrhundertwende* (1962); the relevant pages of Johnston, *The Austrian Mind*, esp. 158-62; Paul Biro, *Die Sittlichkeitsmetaphysik Otto Weininger. Eine geistesgeschichtliche Studie* (1927); and Emil Lucka, *Otto Weininger, sein Werk und seine Persönlichkeit* (1905; 2d ed. 1921).

A note on Eitingon: On January 24, 1988, the *New York Times Book Review* published an article by Stephen Schwartz, identified as "a fellow at the Institute of Contemporary Studies in San Francisco," which makes extremely serious charges against Max Eitingon. Schwartz links Eitingon to an international network of artists and intellectuals who, chiefly in the 1930s, served Stalin's murderous policy across the western world—in France, Spain, the United States, Mexico—helping to orchestrate, or participating in, the abduction and assassination of those whom Stalin or his secret police wanted eliminated. The allegations came at a most awkward time for me. I had never heard or read anything of the kind about Eitingon, and the chapters of my biography were past page proofs; only this bibliographical essay, at the printer's, allowed me an opportunity to comment. I thought I had learned a good deal about Eitingon in the course of writing this book, and the notion that he might have been among those ready to set aside their independence and their humanity to lend themselves to Stalin's murder machine seemed preposterous. But I was not disposed to take Schwartz's charges lightly, even though his account of Eitingon does not inspire confidence. (Schwartz, among other misstatements, calls Eitingon, "from 1925 to 1937," Freud's "factotum and shield against the world. Abraham was dead, Ferenczi and Rank were alienated from the master, and Sachs and Jones were unsuited to the role Dr. Eitingon carried out so well, attending to the ailing Freud with continuous kindnesses. He was a virtual social secretary to the old man." Readers of this biography will know that this is absurd: Eitingon saw Freud a few times at most in those years, either on a rare visit to Vienna or during Freud's even rarer visits to Berlin. As Freud's *Chronik* reveals, after Eitingon emigrated to Palestine at the end of 1933, he came to Berggasse 19 once a year.)

Still, however uninformed Schwartz, or the research assistant he acknowledges, may be about the life of the psychoanalytic establishment, this ignorance does not by itself disprove his case. And although there was not the slightest hint in Eitingon's letters to Freud of any possible sympathies with the Bolsheviks, I did not therefore automatically acquit him. After all, had Eitingon really been a Soviet agent, he would not have revealed that fact to his intimates—especially not to Freud, whose aversion to Bolshevism, and even to Socialism, was well known. But if Schwartz's charges proved true, it was incumbent on me to reveal that appalling fact to the readers of this biography, however marginal Eitingon may be to its central concerns.

I therefore decided to investigate the matter as thoroughly as time permitted. I consulted Wolfgang Leonhard, one of the world's most eminent specialists on Soviet iniquity. He had never heard



of Max Eitingon, and could not find anything about him in his extensive specialized library. In addition, I went through a sizable literature on the Soviet secret police at home and abroad, including such classic texts as Robert Conquest, *Inside Stalin's Secret Police: NKVD Politics, 1936-1939* (1985) and a number of other monographs in English, French, and German. Though teeming with the names and activities of Soviet agents, none of these books so much as mentioned Max Eitingon. Beyond that, I paid particular attention to the two sources on which Schwartz relied, John J. Dziak, *Chekisty: A History of the KGB* (1988) and Vitaly Rapoport and Yuri Alexeev, *High Treason: Essays on the History of the Red Army, 1918-1938*, ed. Vladimir G. Treml and Bruce Adams, and tr. Adams (1985). Schwartz's first allegation is that Eitingon had participated in the kidnapping of a White Russian, General Yevgeni Karlovich Miller, in Paris in 1937, collaborating in this venture with the well-known Russian folk singer Nadezhda Plevitskaya and her husband, Nikolay Skoblin, both members of a special unit of the Soviet secret police. In addition, Schwartz hints darkly at another crime. "There is evidence," he writes, "that Dr. Max Eitingon was instrumental in preparing the 1937 secret trial in which the highest leaders of the Soviet Army, including the chief army commissar and eight generals, fell before the Stalinist execution machine." That secret trial, I should note, involved the sinister cooperation of NKVD agents with such prominent Nazi officials as Reinhard Heydrich, who conspired to decimate the leadership of the Soviet Army. While Schwartz does not document this accusation beyond asserting that there is evidence, he cannot resist concluding, "And, not to put too fine a point on it, it is not pleasant to imagine an associate of Freud in league with a henchman of Heydrich." Admittedly, it is not pleasant. But is it true?

Since Schwartz offers no corroboration for his second assertion, I concentrated my inquiries on the first. This is how he summarizes the findings of Dziak's *Chekisty*: "Mr. Dziak reports that one of the group's key agents in the kidnapping of General Miller was none other than a close personal associate of Sigmund Freud and a pillar of the psychoanalytic movement, Dr. Max Eitingon . . . the brother of Leonid Eitingon." Leonid, I should note, was a mysterious figure, also called by at least one source Naum Ettingon; he appears to have been a high official in the NKVD and a mastermind in the murder of Trotsky in 1940. "In his book," Schwartz writes, "Mr. Dziak concludes that it was Dr. Max Eitingon who recruited Skoblin and Plevitskaya into the special unit [of Stalin's assassins]." Toward the end of his article, Schwartz sounds far less categorical: "It may be argued that his [Max Eitingon's] own participation, over all, must have been slight. . . ." But this partial disclaimer cannot repair the damage done by his earlier indictments. In fact, however, Dziak is far more prudent than Schwartz makes him out to be. Dziak mentions Max Eitingon only three times in his book more or less in passing and notes that "Marx [*sic!*] apparently was linked to General Skoblin and his wife Plevitskaya" (p. 100, italics mine). While Plevitskaya's "financial connection" with Max Eitingon "apparently involved significant financial support," Dziak is not at all sure, for "whether the money came from the Eitingon family or from Soviet sources is unclear" (p. 101, italics mine). Indeed, "Mark Eitingon's name came up in the trial [of Plevitskaya] but not Naum's. Yet a Soviet *dissident source* claims it was *Naum* who organized and ran the Miller abduction" (p. 102, italics mine). And in an endnote, Dziak, showing real restraint in face of the paucity of dependable material, remarks resignedly that "there is considerable confusion over the activities of the two Eitingon brothers" (p. 199). This does not clear Max Eitingon's name but it raises crucial doubts about his involvement.

Schwartz's use of his other principal source is no less wayward. This is how he paraphrases the conclusions of Rapoport and Alexeev: they "declare flatly . . . that Dr. Eitingon . . . was the control agent for Skoblin and Plevitskaya." In fact, they do nothing of the sort. "Plevitskaya's superior in the NKVD was the legendary Naum Ettingon [*sic*]. Her contact and bagman," they write, "was Ettingon's brother Mark [*sic*]." They note further that "for many years he [Max Eitingon] was the generous patron of Nadezhda Plevitskaya. She said at her trial that 'he dressed me from head to foot.' He financed the publication of her two autobiographical books." These skimpy facts lead them to speculate: "It is unlikely that he did so only for the love of Russian music. It is more likely that he acted as messenger and finance agent for his brother Naum" (p. 391). Whatever else we may say of these conjectures, they sound far less conclusive than Schwartz's confident insinuations.

In the end, virtually all the allegations against Max Eitingon lead back to a book by B. Prianishnikov, *Nezrimitaia pautina (The Invisible Web)*, published by the author in Russian in the United



States in 1979. Prianishnikov reprints substantial excerpts from the defendants' testimony at Plevitskaya's trial in Paris after the kidnapping of General Miller. This is, for obvious reasons, a problematic source: it is extremely hard to fathom just what someone on trial will find it advantageous to testify. This granted, all that emerges from the testimony is a set of innocuous-sounding assertions: Plevitskaya knew Max Eitingon well; he had often given her presents; he was very generous with his money (something that readers of this biography will be able to confirm); she had never "sold" her sexual favors to anyone for money or gifts (and certainly not to Max Eitingon); he was in fact a clean, decent man uninterested in gallant adventures. Indeed, so clean was his reputation that when a French interrogator alluded to Max Eitingon, a Russian witness corrected him to say that the person in question was Max's brother.

None of this, to be sure, guarantees Max Eitingon's innocence. The fact that he had a brother who, on better grounded evidence, was a senior official in the Soviet secret police says very little if anything about his possible role in these scurvy affairs. We can establish from Freud's correspondence with Eitingon and with Arnold Zweig, who became very friendly with the Eitingons during the exile they shared in Palestine, that Eitingon spent most of his time in Jerusalem attending to his analytic practice and to the business of organizing a psychoanalytic institute there. We know, too, from Freud's *Chronik*, that Eitingon was in Europe during the summer of 1937. None of this amounts to a great deal. It is certainly not enough to require a reevaluation of Eitingon's character. To be sure, almost by definition, uncovering the activities of a clandestine operative is a formidable enterprise. But the almost uniform silence about Max Eitingon in the literature is not without significance. At times, when the dog fails to bark in the night, this only means that the dog is safely asleep. It may be, of course, that Schwartz in a forthcoming book, or some of the researchers to whom he alludes, have as yet unpublished materials that will point to Eitingon's guilt. But until that evidence is published and analyzed, I conclude that Schwartz's findings are unsubstantiated.

#### CHAPTER FIVE · *Psychoanalytic Politics*

There is no biography of Jung anywhere near comparable to Jones's life of Freud. The principal reason is the difficulty in gaining access to important documents. Jung's imaginative, very inward autobiography, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (1962; tr. Richard and Clara Winston, 1962), is well titled, emphasizing as it does dreams. Like many autobiographies, it is more revealing than the author meant it to be. No less revealing is the substantial collection of Jung's pronouncements, *C. G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, ed. William McGuire and R. F. C. Hull (1977), which amplifies, modifies, and sometimes contradicts his autobiography. There are, meanwhile, some fairly informative lives, mainly by those who knew and enormously admired him. Liliane Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung: A Comparative Study of the Psychology of the Unconscious* (1969; tr. Fred E. and Evelyn K. Engreen, 1974) is typical of this literature. Note among other lives E. A. Bennet, *C. G. Jung* (1961), which is terse; and by an intimate, Barbara Hannah, *Jung: His Life and Work, A Biographical Memoir* (1976), which stresses—and shares—Jung's mysticism. Ellenberger, *Discovery of the Unconscious*, ch. 9, is very thorough. Robert S. Steele, *Freud and Jung: Conflicts of Interpretation* (1982) repays reading. Aldo Carotenuto, *A Secret Symmetry: Sabina Spielrein between Jung and Freud* (1980; tr. Arno Pomerans, John Shepley, and Krishna Winston, 1982; 2d ed. with additional material, 1984), lavishly using documents, throws a lurid and disagreeable light on Jung as it tells the story of Jung's brilliant patient (and mistress)—a story in which Freud does not come off particularly well either.

Jung's work is readily accessible in comprehensive editions in both German and English. For the years of Jung's association with Freud, see esp. the papers collected in Jung, *Freud and Psychoanalysis* (1961; corr. ed., 1970), vol. IV of the *Collected Works*; and Jung, *The Psychoanalytic Years*, ed. William McGuire (1974), drawn from vols. II, IV, and XVII. I have already noted McGuire's admirable edition of the all-important Freud–Jung correspondence. In the growing monographic literature, I found the "contextual approach" of Peter Homans, *Jung in Context: Modernity and the Making of a Psychology* (1979) particularly thoughtful. Ernest Glover, *Freud or Jung?* (1956) is a partisan Freudian—though to my mind defensible—polemic. On the other hand, Paul E. Stepansky,



"The Empiricist as Rebel: Jung, Freud and the Burdens of Discipleship," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, XII (1976), 216-39, is in my judgment, though careful and intelligent, too partisan to Jung. K. R. Eissler, "Eine angebliche Disloyalität Freuds einem Freunde gegenüber," *Jahrbuch der Psychoanalyse*, XIX (1986), 71-88, offers a carefully reasoned defense of Freud's conduct toward Jung in 1912. Andrew Samuels, *Jung and the Post-Jungians* (1984) follows the fate of Jung's ideas beyond Jung's death, from a Jungian perspective. Among the many reviews of the Freud-Jung correspondence, I single out as most instructive Hans W. Loewald, "Transference and Counter-Transference: The Roots of Psychoanalysis," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XLVI (1977), 514-27, conveniently accessible in Loewald, *Papers on Psychoanalysis* (1980), 405-18; Leonard Shengold, "The Freud/Jung Letters: The Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXIV (1976), 669-83; and D. W. Winnicott, in *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XLV (1964), 450-55. On the vexed question of the break between Freud and Jung, see Herbert Lehman, "Jung contra Freud/Nietzsche contra Wagner," *Int. Rev. Psycho-Anal.*, XIII (1986), 201-9, which attempts to fathom Jung's state of mind. See also the intelligent essay by Hannah S. Decker, "A Tangled Skein: The Freud-Jung Relationship," in *Essays in the History of Psychiatry*, ed. Wallace and Pressley, 103-11.

Freud's visit to the United States can profitably repay further study. William A. Koelsch, "*Incredible Day Dream*": *Freud and Jung at Clark*, The Fifth Paul S. Clarkson Lecture (1984) is brief and popular but authoritative, based on thorough knowledge of the archival material. Nathan G. Hale, Jr., *Freud and the Americans: The Beginnings of Psychoanalysis in the United States, 1876-1917* (1971), a fine, detailed study (for Freud at Clark, see esp. part I) sets the visit into its context. So does Dorothy Ross, *G. Stanley Hall: The Psychologist as Prophet* (1972), a very full and responsible biography.

The prolific Stekel tells his side of his break with Freud (or Freud's break with him) in the posthumously published *The Autobiography of Wilhelm Stekel: The Life Story of a Pioneer Psychoanalyst*, ed. Emil A. Gutheil (1950). Fritz Wittels's unpublished autobiography, "Wrestling with the Man: The Story of a Freudian" (typescript, Fritz Wittels Collection, Box 2, A. A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Institute), is far kinder to Stekel than Freud let himself be. For the long-continued canvass of masturbation in the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, in which Stekel still took part, see esp. Annie Reich, "The Discussion of 1912 on Masturbation and Our Present-Day Views," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, VI (1951), 80-94. The best life of Adler is Phyllis Bottome's authorized biography, *Alfred Adler: Apostle of Freedom* (1939; 3d ed., 1957); it is anecdotal, not very searching, and, not surprisingly, shows its subject in the most favorable light possible. Paul E. Stepansky, *In Freud's Shadow: Adler in Context* (1983) is far more sophisticated; it meticulously analyzes the Freud-Adler relationship, including the decisive split, but (watch Stepansky's adjectives) is inclined to give Adler the benefit of most doubts in the controversy. Ellenberger, *Discovery of the Unconscious*, has a substantial chapter (ch. 8) using, among other unpublished materials, a manuscript by an assiduous Adler researcher: Hans Beckh-Widmanstetter, "Kindheit und Jugend Alfred Adlers bis zum Kontakt mit Sigmund Freud." Adler's writings are readily available in English and German paperback editions; for informative biographical details, see the introductory essay by Heinz L. Ansbacher on Adler's growing influence, and the biographical study by Carl Furtmüller, both in Alfred Adler, *Superiority and Social Interest: A Collection of Later Writings*, ed. Heinz L. and Rowena R. Ansbacher (1964; 3d ed., 1979). Freud's own account, "On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement" (1914), *SE* XIV, 1-66, is fiery and partisan, and must be read as a polemic, but it remains most enlightening. Jones's autobiography, *Free Associations*, also has revealing pages on these years and combats. Walter Kaufmann's comprehensive study, *Discovering the Mind*, vol. III, *Freud versus Adler and Jung* (1980) sets Freud's great disputes into a larger context.

## CHAPTER SIX · *Therapy and Technique*

The literature on Freud's published case histories is understandably almost unmanageable. Quite as understandably, the "Dora" case, with its irresistible implications for feminist and literary interpret-



ers, has generated the largest and most impassioned literature; what follows is therefore merely a representative selection. For psychoanalysts' papers, see esp. Jules Glenn, "Notes on Psychoanalytic Concepts and Style in Freud's Case Histories" and "Freud's Adolescent Patients: Katharina, Dora and the 'Homosexual Woman,'" both in *Freud and His Patients*, ed. Mark Kanzer and Glenn (1980), 3-19, 23-47; the same volume also contains worthwhile pieces by Melvin A. Scharfman, "Further Reflections on Dora," 48-57; Robert J. Langs, "The Misalliance Dimension in the Case of Dora," 58-71; Kanzer, "Dora's Imagery: The Flight from a Burning House," 72-82; and Isidor Bernstein, "Integrative Summary: On the Re-viewings of the Dora Case," 83-91. See also the special issue of *Revue Française de Psychanalyse*, XXXVII (1973), with no fewer than seven papers devoted to this single case; Alan and Janis Krohn, "The Nature of the Oedipus Complex in the Dora Case," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXX (1982), 555-78; and Hyman Muslin and Merton Gill, "Transference in the Dora Case," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXVI (1978), 311-28. Thoughtful work on the same case, from a historian's perspective, has been done in Hannah S. Decker, "Freud and Dora: Constraints on Medical Progress," *Journal of Social History*, XIV (1981), 445-64; and in her ingenious "The Choice of a Name: 'Dora' and Freud's Relationship with Breuer," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXX (1982), 113-36. Felix Deutsch's well-known (I should hope notorious) and gratuitously nasty follow-up, describing a middle-aged Dora in the most unfeeling way, "A Footnote to Freud's 'Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria,'" *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XXVI (1957), 159-67, is a document in analysis as aggression. Arnold A. Rogow, "A Further Footnote to Freud's 'Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria,'" *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXVI (1978), 331-56, a more good-tempered follow-up to Deutsch, addresses the familial context of Dora's life. See also the brilliant (if, I think, somewhat harsh) comments in Janet Malcolm, *Psychoanalysis: The Impossible Profession* (1981); she suggests (pp. 167-68) that the pseudonym "Dora" echoed the name of the mythical creature who brought evil into the world with her "box."

*In Dora's Case: Freud—Hysteria—Feminism*, ed. Charles Bernheimer and Claire Kahane (1985) is a provocative anthology of essays mainly by literary critics; the papers are of extremely varying merit, and their authors have very different axes to grind. Not without interest, the book contains two lengthy introductions by the editors, and sizable excerpts from Steven Marcus, "Freud and Dora: Story, History, Case History" (originally published in *Partisan Review*, [Winter 1974], 12-108, and reprinted in his *Representations* [1975], 247-309). Marcus, insisting on reading the case history as a species of literature, is partly responsible for the heavy burden of often arbitrary interpretations "Dora" now has to bear. One object lesson from this anthology is Toril Moi, "Representation of Patriarchy: Sexuality and Epistemology in Freud's Dora," 181-99. The author quotes Freud as saying that he had brought to light "the priceless though mutilated relics of antiquity" (*SE* VII, 12), and makes much of Freud's adjective: "'Mutilated' is [Freud's] usual way of describing the effect of castration, and 'priceless' . . . means just what it says: price-less, without value. For how can there be value when the valuable piece has been cut off?" (p. 197). This is absurd even in English, but Moi has used only the translation from the *Standard Edition*, unwilling (or unable?) to look up the German. Yet in the original, Freud used *unschätzbaren*, and there is no way that anyone can legitimately read this as "without value." It means "inestimable," or, if you will, "beyond price," the highest praise a German adjective can bestow.

Little Hans has received far less attention. Joseph William Slap, "Little Hans's Tonsillectomy," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XXX (1961), 259-61, has an interesting hypothesis complicating Freud's interpretation of Hans's phobia. Martin A. Silverman offers "A Fresh Look at the Case of Little Hans," in *Freud and His Patients*, ed. Kanzer and Glenn, 95-120, with a full bibliography on infantile experience. See also, in the same volume, Glenn's interesting paper "Freud's Advice to Hans' Father: The First Supervisory Sessions," 121-34.

The most sustained exploration of Freud's case history of the Rat Man, his family and his neurosis, and of the differences between Freud's process notes and the published case history, is Patrick J. Mahony, *Freud and the Rat Man* (1986). Elza Ribeiro Hawelka has made a meticulous transcription of the full German text of Freud's process notes (the much-used English text in *SE* X, 253-318, is neither complete nor completely reliable), adding a facing French translation, notes, and commentaries: Freud, *L'homme aux rats*. *Journal d'une analyse* (1974). The holograph manuscript of those notes,



with annotations that look much like Freud's later handwriting, is in LC, among still unsorted materials. The rather sparse underlinings and marginalia suggest that Freud possibly wanted to return to this case, but no other manuscript on the Rat Man has come to light. Elizabeth R. Zetzel offers some interesting psychoanalytic second-guessing in "1965: Additional Notes upon a Case of Obsessional Neurosis: Freud 1909," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XLVII (1966), 123-29, to be read in conjunction with the article directly following: Paul G. Myerson, "Comment on Dr. Zetzel's Paper," 130-42. See also in *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.* Samuel D. Lipton, "The Advantages of Freud's Technique As Shown in His Analysis of the Rat Man," LVIII (1977), 255-73, and his follow-up, "An Addendum to 'The Advantages of Freud's Technique As Shown in His Analysis of the Rat Man,'" LX (1979), 215-16; as well as Béla Grunberger, "Some Reflections on the Rat Man," LX (1979), 160-68. As before, contributions to *Freud and His Patients*, ed. Kanzer and Glenn, are of interest, here notably Judith Kestenberg, "Ego Organization in Obsessive-Compulsive Development: The Study of the Rat Man, Based on Interpretation of Movement Patterns," 144-79; Robert J. Langs, "The Misalliance Dimension in the Case of the Rat Man," 215-30; and Mark Kanzer, "Freud's Human Influence on the Rat Man," 231-40. One of the earliest comments came in Ernest Jones's paper "Hate and Anal Erotism in the Obsessional Neurosis" (1913), in Jones, *Papers on Psycho-Analysis* (3d ed., 1923), 553-61.

For Freud's paper on Leonardo da Vinci, Meyer Schapiro, "Leonardo and Freud: An Art-Historical Study," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XVII (1956), 147-78, is, in a word, indispensable. K. R. Eissler's response, *Leonardo da Vinci: Psycho-Analytic Notes on the Enigma* (1961) ranges widely and offers some brilliant comments, but is an instance of Eisslerian overkill—a 350-page book attempting to dissect an article of approximately 30 pages. From the library on Leonardo, I single out Kenneth Clark, *Leonardo da Vinci: An Account of His Development as an Artist* (1939; rev. ed., 1958), short, lucid, well-informed, and sympathetic. The first to call attention to Freud's mistake about the "vulture" was Eric Maclagan, "Leonardo in the Consulting Room," *Burlington Magazine*, XLII (1923), 54-57. Edward MacCurdy, ed., *The Notebooks of Leonardo da Vinci* (1939), is most useful.

The authoritative study of Schreber, diligently correcting earlier work, is the thesis by Han Israëls, *Schreber, Father and Son* (1980; tr. from the Dutch by the author, 1981; further modified in the French version, *Schreber, père et fils*, tr. Nicole Sels (1986). One particular virtue of Israëls's work is that it places Schreber in his family environment. His book has, however, not wholly antiquated a series of pioneering articles by William G. Niederland, three of them included in *Freud and His Patients*, ed. Kanzer and Glenn, 251-305, and all collected in *The Schreber Case: Psychoanalytic Profile of a Paranoid Personality* (1974). These demonstrate that some of Schreber's "inventions," such as the machines torturing him, bore a strong resemblance to devices his father strapped him into when he was a boy. Between Israëls and Niederland, both the substantive and the polemical aspects of the case are covered sufficiently—and impressively.

Patrick J. Mahony has dealt as thoroughly with the Wolf Man, in *Cries of the Wolf Man* (1984), as he has with the Rat Man, paying particular attention to Freud's style. (Mahony has also written a separate study of that style, *Freud as a Writer* [1982].) Among psychoanalysts' papers reviewing the case, the most interesting is William Offenkrantz and Arnold Tobin, "Problems of the Therapeutic Alliance: Freud and the Wolf Man," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LIV (1973), 75-78. Harold P. Blum, "The Borderline Childhood of the Wolf Man," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXII (1974), 721-42, conveniently accessible in *Freud and His Patients*, ed. Kanzer and Glenn, 341-58, suggests that this famous analysand was rather more disturbed than Freud diagnosed him to be. This volume also has a fine paper by Mark Kanzer, "Further Comments on the Wolf Man: The Search for a Primal Scene," 359-66. Ruth Mack Brunswick, who analyzed the Wolf Man for a time in the 1920s, reports on him in "A Supplement to Freud's History of an Infantile Neurosis" (1928), conveniently reprinted in *The Wolf-Man by the Wolf-Man*, ed. Muriel Gardiner (1971), 263-307. This fascinating volume also contains the Wolf Man's reminiscences, including his account of Freud, and Gardiner's report on the Wolf Man's later years. J. Harnik began a discussion, worth following up, criticizing Brunswick's dealings with the Wolf Man: "Kritisches über Mack Brunswicks 'Nachtrag zu Freud's 'Geschichte einer infantilen Neurose,'" *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XVI (1930), 123-27; Brunswick's reply,



directly following, is "Entgegnung auf Harniks kritische Bemerkungen," 128–29. This in turn provoked Harnik's "Erwiderung auf Mack Brunswicks Entgegnung," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XVII (1931), 400–402, which is directly followed in the same issue by Brunswick's final word, "Schlusswort," 402. Karin Obholzer, *The Wolf-Man Sixty Years Later: Conversations with Freud's Controversial Patient* (1980; tr. Michael Shaw, 1982) records some interviews with the very elderly Wolf Man which are of quite limited value and must be read with caution.

Most later psychoanalysts' papers and books on psychoanalytic technique can be safely read as commentaries on Freud's classic papers, though the best among them, of course, do not lack a certain originality and introduce refinements on Freud's pioneering expositions. Among those I have found most instructive—I am slighting a number of important shorter papers—are Edward Glover, *Technique of Psycho-Analysis* (1955), lucid and vigorous; Karl Menninger, *Theory of Psychoanalytic Technique* (1958), enviably succinct; and the splendid essay by Leo Stone, an expanded Freud Lecture, *The Psychoanalytic Situation: An Examination of Its Development and Essential Nature* (1961). Ralph R. Greenson, *The Technique and Practice of Psychoanalysis*, vol. I (1967), the only volume to appear, is a thorough, highly technical textbook, with an instructive treatment of the working alliance; it is mainly intended for candidates in psychoanalytic institutes. I have learned much from Loewald's series of elegant (subtly revisionist) papers grouped together under the subtitle "The Psychoanalytic Process," in his *Papers on Psychoanalysis*, most notably "On the Therapeutic Action of Psychoanalysis," 221–56; "Psychoanalytic Theory and the Psychoanalytic Process," 277–301; "The Transference Neurosis: Comments on the Concept and the Phenomenon," 302–14; "Reflections on the Psychoanalytic Process and Its Therapeutic Potential," 372–83; and the stimulating, original "The Waning of the Oedipus Complex," 384–404. Sándor Ferenczi's controversial papers on technique are available in the two-volume *Schriften zur Psychoanalyse*, ed. Balint; in English, the volume *Further Contributions to the Theory and Technique of Psycho-Analysis* (1926; 2d ed., 1960) makes many of them easily available. Also among the most valuable papers on technique are Rudolph M. Loewenstein's short survey, "Developments in the Theory of Transference in the Last Fifty Years," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, L (1969), 583–88; and several contributions by Phyllis Greenacre, collected in her *Emotional Growth: Psychoanalytic Studies of the Gifted and a Great Variety of Other Individuals*, 2 vols., continuously paginated (1971), esp. "Evaluation of Therapeutic Results: Contributions to a Symposium" (1948), 619–26; "The Role of Transference: Practical Considerations in Relation to Psychoanalytic Therapy" (1954), 627–40; "Re-evaluation of the Process of Working Through" (1956), 641–50; and "The Psychoanalytic Process, Transference, and Acting Out" (1968), 762–76, to name only the most significant. Janet Malcolm's witty and wicked *Psychoanalysis: The Impossible Profession* has been praised by psychoanalysts (with justice) as a dependable introduction to analytic theory and technique. It has the rare advantage over more solemn texts of being funny as well as informative.

## CHAPTER SEVEN · Applications and Implications

Freud's writings on aesthetics are scattered. "Delusions and Dreams in Jensen's *Gradiva*" (1907), *SE IX*, 3–95, is, after a few hints in letters to Fliess and *The Interpretation of Dreams*, his first venture in psychoanalysis applied to the unriddling of a literary text. (Incidentally, Wilhelm Jensen's letters to Freud regarding *Gradiva* are to be found in *Psychoanalytische Bewegung*, I (1929), 207–11.) "Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming" (1908), *SE IX*, 141–53, was an influential early text, a finger exercise never developed into a theory. See also Freud's moving reading of two famous scenes, one in *King Lear*, the other in *The Merchant of Venice*, in "The Theme of the Three Caskets" (1913), *SE XII*, 291–301. His first incursion into the biography of an artist is, of course, "Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood" (1910), *SE XI*, 59–137, a daring, in important ways flawed, exploration. (Much is to be learned about this famous paper from the fine article by Schapiro, "Leonardo and Freud: An Art-Historical Study," already cited.) Freud's next venture, published anonymously, was "The Moses of Michelangelo" (1914), with a "Postscript" (1927), *SE XIII*,



211–38. (Amid a sizable literature, there are some particularly weighty comments on that statue in Erwin Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* [1939], ch. 6; see also the observations in Robert S. Liebert, *Michelangelo: A Psychoanalytic Study of His Life and Images* [1983], ch. 14. Another controversial paper of Freud's is "Dostoevsky and Parricide" (1928), *SE XXI*, 175–96, attacked a little too savagely (but not without reason) by Joseph Frank in "Freud's Case-History of Dostoevsky," the appendix to his *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt, 1821–1849* (1976), 379–91.

The most satisfactory general analysis of Freud's complex attitude toward the arts, from which I have learned a good deal, is Jack J. Spector's precise and perceptive *The Aesthetics of Freud: A Study in Psychoanalysis and Art* (1972). See also Harry Trosman, *Freud and the Imaginative World* (1985), esp. part II. Among earlier art critics dealing with Freud, the most interesting is probably Roger Fry, who, in *The Artist and Psycho-Analysis* (1924) criticized Freud for unduly minimizing the aesthetic pleasure residing in the formal aspects of art—a criticism to which Freud would have assented.

Many psychoanalysts among Freud's earliest adherents did not resist the temptation to psychoanalyze poets and painters (sometimes to Freud's chagrin). Among the most notable, and most praised, of their efforts is Karl Abraham's early essay *Giovanni Segantini*, subtitled *Ein psychoanalytischer Versuch* (1911). In "Methodik der Dichterpsychologie," a paper given at the Wednesday Psychological Society on December 11, 1907, the musicologist Max Graf, who was for some years close to Freud, attempted in a fascinating proposal to win his colleagues away from traditional pathographies of artists and writers. (See *Protokolle*, I, 244–49.) While he never published this paper, Graf did publish *Aus der inneren Werkstatt des Musikers* (1911) and *Richard Wagner im "Fliegenden Holländer"*. *Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie des künstlerischen Schaffens* (1911), the latter first given as a talk to the Wednesday Society. In the preface, Graf gratefully paid tribute to his "uninterrupted exchange of views with Professor Freud." Eduard Hitschmann, for many years a member of the psychoanalytic inner circle in Vienna, wrote a number of "psychoanalyses" of poets and novelists, groping efforts rather than definitive researches. A number of these are available in English in Hitschmann, *Great Men: Psychoanalytic Studies*, ed. Sydney G. Margolin, with assistance of Hannah Gunther (1956). Ernest Jones, venturing into literary analysis, took off from a few pregnant pages in *The Interpretation of Dreams* in a paper of 1910 (continuously enlarged until it became the book *Hamlet and Oedipus* in 1949). The essay has been severely, and I think excessively, criticized for its presumed reductionism—it has the modest aim of elucidating only why Hamlet hesitates to kill Claudius—but Jones's controversial treatment retains its interest. Otto Rank was indefatigable in his psychoanalysis of literary figures and themes. The manuscript he carried on his first visit to Freud was published as *Der Künstler* (1907; 4th enlarged ed., 1918). His *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero* (1909; tr. F. Robbins and Smith Ely Jelliffe, 1914) is probably his most enduring essay. (A sophisticated companion piece, drawing on materials first published in the 1930s, is Ernst Kris and Otto Kurz, *Legend, Myth, and Magic in the Image of the Artist: A Historical Experiment* [1979].) But the most compendious of his ventures, which Freud apparently thought well of, is Rank's bulky study of the incest theme in poetry, prose, and myth, *Das Inzest-Motiv in Dichtung und Sage* (1912; 2d ed., 1926). Among Rank's many other papers, perhaps the most interesting is his long essay "Der Doppelgänger," *Imago*, III (1914), 97–164 (English version, *The Double*, tr. Harry Tucker, 1971). It also appears in a useful collection of papers from *Imago: Psychoanalytische Literaturinterpretationen*, ed. Jens Malte Fischer (1980); equipped with a substantial introduction, this anthology also includes papers (among others) by Hanns Sachs and Theodor Reik. The latter, as I recount in the text, introduced himself to Freud with a thesis on Flaubert, subsequently published as *Flaubert und seine "Versuchung des Heiligen Antonius"*. *Ein Beitrag zur Künstlerpsychologie* (1912). One influential text in "applied analysis" has been Marie Bonaparte's psychobiography, *The Life and Works of Edgar Allan Poe: A Psycho-Analytic Interpretation* (1933; tr. John Rodker, 1949); it is somewhat rigid and mechanical, but spirited. After a decade in the United States, Hanns Sachs, that cultivated Central European, published a collection of papers on art and beauty, *The Creative Unconscious: Studies in the Psychoanalysis of Art* (1942), which has been unjustly neglected: in particular, ch. 4,



"The Delay of the Machine Age," is a suggestive piece of conjectural history from a Freudian perspective.

Not surprisingly, psychoanalysts (and psychoanalytically trained lay people) have actively continued to play in this field. A small sampling must do. To begin with the analysts: Gilbert J. Rose's meaty *The Power of Form: A Psychoanalytic Approach to Aesthetic Form* (1980) studies the complex interaction of the primary and the secondary process in the arts. The imaginative British psychoanalyst D. W. Winnicott has touched on aesthetic experience in a number of his papers, most excitingly perhaps in "Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena" (1953), conveniently available in a version he calls a "development" in his *Playing and Reality* (1971), 1-25. That collection also contains his important paper "The Location of Cultural Experience" (1967), 95-103. William G. Niederland, "Psychoanalytic Approaches to Artistic Creativity," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XLV (1976), 185-212, repays close reading, as does his earlier "Clinical Aspects of Creativity," *American Imago*, XXIV (1967), 6-34. Robert Waelder's Freud Lecture, *Psychoanalytic Avenues to Art* (1965) is rich in suggestions beyond its brief text. John E. Gedo, *Portraits of the Artist: Psychoanalysis of Creativity and Its Vicissitudes* (1983) is a collection of essays attempting to approach the secrets of the creative artist. From many psychoanalysts' efforts at full-scale psychobiography, I single out Liebert, *Michelangelo* (cited above), not uncontested yet most interesting; and Bernard C. Meyer, *Josef Conrad: A Psychoanalytic Biography* (1967).

As for the "amateurs": Meredith Anne Skura, *The Literary Use of the Psychoanalytic Process* (1981) is a sophisticated analysis taking four principal themes of psychoanalysis—case history, fantasy, dream, transference—as possible models for literary criticism. I have also learned much from Elizabeth Dalton, *Unconscious Structure in "The Idiot": A Study in Literature and Psychoanalysis* (1979), a brief, daring essay which attempts (successfully, I think) to treat characters in Dostoevsky's novel as psychologically coherent beings. Ellen Handler Spitz, *Art and Psyche: A Study in Psychoanalysis and Aesthetics* (1985) examines the presence of the artist in his work, its psychological implications, and the artist's relations to his audience. Among the most precisely targeted and stimulating studies on this last issue—reception of the work of art—are those of Norman N. Holland, esp. *Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare* (1966); *The Dynamics of Literary Response* (1968); and *Poems in Persons: An Introduction to the Psychoanalysis of Literature* (1973). Richard Ellmann, "Freud and Literary Biography," *American Scholar*, LIII (Fall 1984), 465-78, is at once critical and, as expected, immensely intelligent.

*The Practice of Psychoanalytic Criticism*, ed. Leonard Tennenhouse (1976) collects a number of fairly recent articles, largely from *American Imago; Literature and Psychoanalysis*, ed. Edith Kurzweil and William Phillips (1983) starts with Freud and moves into modern analytic criticism, including a classic piece by Lionel Trilling, "Art and Neurosis," previously published in Trilling, *The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society* (1950), 160-80. See also the theoretical statement by Simon O. Lesser, *Fiction and the Unconscious* (1957), to be complemented with the collection of Lesser's papers, *The Whispered Meanings*, ed. Robert Sprinch and Richard W. Noland (1977).

Philosophers have not neglected this field. See esp. Richard Wollheim, *On Art and the Mind* (1974) and the anthology *Philosophical Essays on Freud*, ed. Wollheim and Hopkins (already cited). Richard Kuhns, *Psychoanalytic Theory of Art: A Philosophy of Art on Developmental Principles* (1983) draws on ego psychologists like Heinz Hartmann and object-relations theorists like D. W. Winnicott for a stimulating integration of all the dimensions of artistic productivity. In *Art and Act: On Causes in History—Manet, Gropius, Mondrian* (1976), I have attempted to place artistic creation within the network of private, craft, and cultural experience. *Freud for Historians* (1985), my effort to persuade my fellow historians that psychoanalysis should be productively, and can be safely, employed in my profession, has, as far I can see, largely fallen on stony ground. On the encouraging side I single out Peter Loewenberg, *Decoding the Past: The Psychohistorical Approach* (1983), a series of papers on theory and application (most of them antedating my own work) by a historian trained in psychoanalysis. The opening chapter, "Psychohistory: An Overview of the Field," 9-41, ably surveys the territory, while subsequent chapters exemplifying the psychoanalytic approach include sev-



eral on Austrian history: "Theodor Herzl: Nationalism and Politics," 101–35; "Victor and Friedrich Adler: Revolutionary Politics and Generational Conflict in Austro-Marxism," 136–60; and "Austro-Marxism and Revolution: Otto Bauer, Freud's 'Dora' Case, and the Crises of the First Austrian Republic," 161–204, a paper of particular relevance to this biography. Saul Friedländer, *History and Psychoanalysis: An Inquiry into the Possibilities and Limits of Psychohistory* (1975; tr. Susan Suleiman, 1978), is a model of rational argumentation.

For *Totem and Taboo*, Edwin R. Wallace IV, *Freud and Anthropology: A History and a Reappraisal* (1983) offers an excellent judicious survey. Alfred L. Kroeber's famous two reviews of Freud's book (the second less scathing than the first) deserve rereading: "Totem and Taboo: An Ethnologic Psychoanalysis," *American Anthropologist*, XXII (1920), 48–55; and "Totem and Taboo in Retrospect," *American Journal of Sociology*, LV (1939), 446–57. So does the witty treatment by R. R. Marett, "Psycho-Analysis and the Savage," *Athenaeum* (1920), 205–6. Suzanne Cassirer Bernfeld, "Freud and Archeology," *American Imago*, VIII (1951), 107–28, is an abundant source from which others have drawn. The most convincing recent attempt to rescue Freud's central argument (though not the historical reality of the primal crime) is Derek Freeman, "Totem and Taboo: A Reappraisal," in *Man and His Culture: Psychoanalytic Anthropology after "Totem and Taboo,"* ed. Warner Muensterberger (1970), 53–78. Sandor S. Feldman, "Notes on the 'Primal Horde,'" in *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*, ed. Muensterberger, I (1947), 171–93, is a relevant companion piece. See also Robin Fox, "Totem and Taboo Reconsidered," in *The Structural Study of Myth and Totemism*, ed. Edmund Leach (1967), 161–78. I must mention the brilliant essay by Melford E. Spiro, *Oedipus in the Trobriands* (1982), a psychoanalytically informed anthropologist's refutation of Malinowski's skepticism about the applicability of Freud's ideas to the Trobriand Islanders—based entirely on Malinowski's own materials.

Because Freud never fully developed the idea of character—that organized cluster of habits and fixations—there has been a disposition to return to his early statements, to the short important paper "Character and Anal Erotism" (1908) and to the trio of papers published eight years later under the collective title "Some Character-Types Met With in Psychoanalytic Work," *SE* XIV, 309–33, the three types being "The 'Exceptions,'" "Those Wrecked by Success," and "Criminals from a Sense of Guilt." An interesting expansion on Freud's definition of "exceptions" is Edith Jacobson, "The 'Exceptions': An Elaboration of Freud's Character Study," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XIV (1959), 135–54; and a no less interesting commentary on the same paper of Freud's is Anton O. Kris, "On Wanting Too Much: The 'Exceptions' Revisited," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LVII (1976), 85–95. In view of Freud's failure to pull the material together, Otto Fenichel's fairly systematic comments are particularly welcome. See above all, "Psychoanalysis of Character" (1941), in *The Collected Papers of Otto Fenichel*, ed. Hanna Fenichel and David Rapaport, 2d Series (1954), 198–214. See also the relevant chapters in Fenichel's substantial, far from outdated work *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis* (1945), notably "Digression about the Anal Character," 278–84, and "Character Disorders," 463–540. In this connection, David Shapiro's terse essay *Neurotic Styles* (1965) has helpful things to say. So does P. C. Giovacchini, *Psychoanalysis of Character Disorders* (1975).

This is not the place to rehearse the debates about narcissism that have been agitating psychoanalysts in recent years. Sydney Pulver, "Narcissism: The Term and the Concept," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XVIII (1970), 319–41, presents a clarifying survey. Among the numerous clinical and theoretical studies on narcissistic disorders by Otto F. Kernberg, see esp. *Borderline Conditions and Pathological Narcissism* (1975). Two papers by Heinz Kohut in *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*—"The Psychoanalytic Treatment of Narcissistic Personality Disorders," XXIII (1968), 86–113, and "Thoughts on Narcissism and Narcissistic Rage," XXVII (1972), 360–400—are still experimental and tentative, having been written before Kohut turned his particular reading of narcissism into an ideology. And see R. D. Stolorow, "Toward a Functional Definition of Narcissism," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LVI (1975), 179–85; and Warren Kingston, "A Theoretical and Technical Approach to Narcissistic Disorders," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LXI (1980), 383–94. Arnold Rothstein, *The Narcissistic Pursuit of Perfection* (1980) reviews and seeks to redefine the concept. Among discussions of the issue by "classical" analysts, certain papers by Heinz Hartmann are particularly pertinent here, esp.



“Comments on the Psychoanalytic Theory of the Ego” (1950) and “The Development of the Ego Concept in Freud’s Work” (1956), in *Essays on Ego Psychology: Selected Problems in Psychoanalytic Theory* (1964), 113–41, 268–96. The well-known monograph by Edith Jacobson, *The Self and the Object World* (1964) is no less important.

Oron J. Hale, *The Great Illusion, 1900–1914* (1971) dependably synthesizes recent historiography on the atmosphere before Armageddon. Walter Laqueur and George L. Mosse have edited an interesting collection of essays, moving from country to country, *1914: The Coming of the First World War* (1966). On the war psychosis that gripped presumably cosmopolitan and intelligent professional people on all sides, including in some measure Freud, see the well-documented, sobering essay by Roland N. Stromberg, *Redemption by War: The Intellectuals and 1914* (1982); it can be read in tandem with Robert Wohl, *The Generation of 1914* (1979). For the First World War, on which whole libraries have been written, it should suffice to name a few dependable texts: B. H. Liddell-Hart, *The Real War, 1914–1918* (1930); Corelli Barnett, *The Swordbearers: Supreme Command in the First World War* (1964); and René Albrecht-Carrié, *The Meaning of the First World War* (1965). Fritz Fischer, *Griff nach der Weltmacht. Die Kriegszielpolitik des kaiserlichen Deutschland 1914/1918* (1961; 3d ed., 1964) caused a storm among German historians with its fierce critique of German war aims, and its violation of German taboos against frankly exploring the causes of the war; it is a salutary text, particularly useful in this chapter for its collection of bellicose, “manly” statements by diplomats. It can be read in connection with Hans W. Gatzke, *Germany’s Drive to the West* (1950).

#### CHAPTER EIGHT · Aggressions

For the history of the unconscious from a nonpsychoanalytic perspective, see, once again, Whyte, *The Unconscious before Freud* and the far more extensive Ellenberger, *Discovery of the Unconscious*. For psychoanalytic comments on the unconscious, see amidst a large literature, above all Edward Bibring, “The Development and Problems of the Theory of the Instincts,” *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XXII (1934), 102–31; Bibring, “The Conception of the Repetition Compulsion,” *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XII (1942), 486–516; Robert Waelder, “Critical Discussion of the Concept of an Instinct of Destruction,” *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Association for Psychoanalysis*, VI (1956), 97–109; and several influential papers by the ego psychologist Heinz Hartmann, collected in his *Essays on Ego Psychology*. These include “Comments on the Psychoanalytic Theory of Instinctual Drives” (1948), 69–89; “The Mutual Influences in the Development of Ego and Id” (1952), 155–81; and (already cited) “Comments on the Psychoanalytic Theory of the Ego” and “The Development of the Ego Concept in Freud’s Work,” a particularly helpful historical essay. Hartmann also joined his fellow ego psychologists Ernst Kris and Rudolph M. Loewenstein in “Comments on the Formation of Psychic Structure” (1946), in their *Papers on Psychoanalytic Psychology* (1964), 27–55. The terse study by Max Schur, *The Id and the Regulatory Principles of Mental Functioning* (1966) has much of value. David Holbrook, ed., *Human Hope and the Death Instinct: An Exploration of Psychoanalytic Theories of Human Nature and Their Implications for Culture and Education* (1971), though in no way hostile to psychoanalysis, brings together papers devoted to escaping from destructiveness and in search of a humanist conscience.

On death as it touched Freud—both as an idea and as a threat—Schur, *Freud, Living and Dying* is magisterial. For Freud’s recognition of the aggressive drive, so long delayed (though the drive was not wholly disregarded), see the survey by Paul E. Stepansky, *A History of Aggression in Freud* (1977). It may be supplemented with Rudolf Brun, “Über Freuds Hypothese vom Todestrieb,” *Psyche*, VII (1953), 81–111. From the avalanche of papers on this subject, I select some outstanding contributions: Otto Fenichel’s important paper “A Critique of the Death Instinct” (1935), in *Collected Papers*, 1st Series (1953), 363–72; two papers in *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, III/IV (1949): Anna Freud, “Aggression in Relation to Emotional Development: Normal and Pathological,” 37–42, and Beata Rank, “Aggression,” 43–48; Heinz Hartmann, Ernst Kris, and Rudolph M. Loewenstein, “Notes on the Theory of Aggression” (1949), in their *Papers on Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 56–85; René A. Spitz, “Aggression: Its Role in the Establishment of Object Relations,” in



*Drives, Affects, Behavior: Essays in Honor of Marie Bonaparte*, ed. Rudolph M. Loewenstein (1953), 126–38; T. Wayne Downey, “Within the Pleasure Principle: Child Analytic Perspectives on Aggression,” *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XXXIX (1984), 101–36; Phyllis Greenacre, “Infant Reactions to Restraint: Problems in the Fate of Infantile Aggression” (1944), in her *Trauma, Growth, and Personality* (1952), 83–105; Albert J. Solnit, “Aggression,” *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XX (1972), 435–50; and—to me most important—Solnit, “Some Adaptive Functions of Aggressive Behavior,” in *Psychoanalysis—A General Psychology*, ed. Loewenstein, Newman, Schur, and Solnit, 169–89. Among those who, in contrast to most other analysts, take Freud’s doctrine of the death drive seriously, K. R. Eissler has been the most persuasive—or least unpersuasive—in “Death Drive, Ambivalence, and Narcissism,” *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XXVI (1971), 25–78, a spirited defense of Freud’s controversial idea. Alexander Mitscherlich examines it from the perspective of psychoanalytic social psychology in “Psychoanalysis and the Aggression of Large Groups,” *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LII (1971), 161–67. For one eminent psychoanalyst’s profoundly skeptical view of the possibility of treating aggression as a single entity, see Leo Stone, “Reflections on the Psychoanalytic Concept of Aggression,” *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XL (1971), 195–244, a most unsettling piece.

There is for obvious reasons little material on Freud’s “lost” metapsychological papers. One brilliant essay is Ilse Grubrich-Simitis, “Trauma or Drive; Drive and Trauma: A Reading of Sigmund Freud’s Phylogenetic Fantasy of 1915,” the Freud Lecture delivered in New York on April 28, 1987, not yet published at this writing. In her essay on Freud’s twelfth metapsychological paper, which she discovered, deciphered, and published as *A Phylogenetic Fantasy*, Grubrich-Simitis suggestively connects the high-flying theorizing of Freud’s phylogenetic fantasy with the lifelong battle in his thinking between the trauma theory and the drive theory of neuroses. This view is congruent with the Freud I present in this book: a man engaged in a titanic subterranean struggle between the urge to speculate and the need for self-discipline. There are also usable conjectures in Barry Silverstein, “‘Now Comes A Sad Story’: Freud’s Lost Metapsychological Papers,” in *Freud, Appraisals and Reappraisals*, ed. Stepansky, I, 143–95. (I should also like to call attention to the anti-metapsychological school of psychoanalytic thought, which chooses to stress Freud’s clinical thinking instead. Among the most original, but to my mind in the end unpersuasive, essays in this vein are the papers of George S. Klein, notably “Two Theories or One?” in his *Psychoanalytic Theory: An Exploration of Essentials* [1976], 41–71, to be read in conjunction with other papers in that volume. Merton M. Gill and Philip S. Holzman have collected some suggestive papers from this perspective in *Psychology versus Metapsychology: Psychoanalytic Essays in Memory of George S. Klein* [1976].)

For the end of the war and its immediate aftermath among the defeated Central Powers, the best account is F. L. Carsten’s scholarly study, *Revolution in Central Europe, 1918–1919* (1972), which draws on unpublished sources as well as printed material and has extensive chapters on Austria. John Williams, *The Other Battleground: The Home Fronts, Britain, France and Germany 1914–1918* (1972) goes beyond its title with comments on Austria on the way to defeat. Otto Bauer, *Die österreichische Revolution* (1923) is an account by a Socialist participant. Modern scholarship is soberly and economically presented in *Österreich 1918–1938. Geschichte der Ersten Republik*, ed. Erika Weinzierl and Kurt Skalnik, 2 vols. (1983); note esp. Wolfdieter Bihl, “Der Weg zum Zusammenbruch—Österreich-Ungarn unter Karl I. (IV.),” 27–54; Karl R. Stadler, “Die Gründung der Republik,” 55–84; and Fritz Fellner, “Der Vertrag von St. Germain,” 85–106. Also of particular significance in this volume are Hans Kernbauer, Eduard März, and Fritz Weber, “Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung,” 343–79; Ernst Bruckmüller, “Sozialstruktur und Sozialpolitik,” 381–436; and Erika Weinzierl, “Kirche und Politik,” 437–96. One of these authors, Karl R. Stadler, can be read in English: *The Birth of the Austrian Republic* (1966). The memoir by Anna Eisenmenger, *Blockade: The Diary of an Austrian Middleclass Woman, 1914–1924* (tr. anon., 1932) is moving. Also worth reading in this connection is Ottokar Landwehr-Pragenau, *Hunger. Die Erschöpfungsjahre der Mittelmächte 1917/18* (1931). *Aufbruch und Untergang. Österreichische Kultur zwischen 1918 und 1938*, ed. Franz Kadrnoska (1981) is an illuminating pendant, containing essays on the theater and the circus, caricatures and movies, painters and festivals; Ursula Kubes’s article “‘Moderne Nervositäten’ und die Anfänge der Psychoanalyse,” 267–80, is particularly relevant here. Walter Goldinger, *Ge-*



*schichte der Republik Österreich* (1962) is a sober survey. Among reminiscences, see esp. Bertha Zuckerandl, *Österreich intim. Erinnerungen 1892–1942*, ed. Reinhard Federmann (1970). Christine Klusacek and Kurt Stimmer, eds., *Dokumentation zur österreichischen Zeitgeschichte, 1928–1938* (1982) offers well-chosen snippets on all aspects of Austria's history during this decade. Jacques Hannak, *Karl Renner und seine Zeit. Versuch einer Biographie* (1965) is an exhaustive biography of the Socialist politician and theorist, with extensive quotations from documents. Peter Csendes, *Geschichte Wiens* (1981) is a skimpy survey. *The Jews of Austria*, ed. Fraenkel, is indispensable once more in a number of its selections. A. J. May has a useful essay, "Woodrow Wilson and Austria-Hungary to the End of 1917," in *Festschrift für Heinrich Benedikt*, ed. H. Hantsch et al. (1957), 213–42. Wilson is also the subject of Klaus Schwabe, *Woodrow Wilson, Revolutionary Germany, and Peacemaking 1918–1919: Missionary Diplomacy and the Realities of Power* (1971; tr. Rita and Robert Kimber, 1985). Three biographies already cited are valuable for this epoch: Timms, *Karl Kraus, Apocalyptic Satirist*; Luft, *Robert Musil and the Crisis of European Culture*, and Prater, *European of Yesterday: A Biography of Stefan Zweig*.

Victor Tausk's suicide has been the subject of envenomed controversy. First canvassed in Paul Roazen's tendentious study, *Brother Animal: The Story of Freud and Tausk* (1969), which makes Freud the villain of the piece, it was re-canvassed by K. R. Eissler in a characteristic reply (very indignant and very circumstantial), *Talent and Genius: The Fictitious Case of Tausk Contra Freud* (1971), and re-re-canvassed by Eissler in *Victor Tausk's Suicide* (1983).

Freud's testimony on war neuroses before the Vienna courts has been discussed in K. R. Eissler's very thorough *Freud as an Expert Witness: The Discussion of War Neuroses between Freud and Wagner-Jauregg* (1979; tr. Christine Trollope, 1986). See also Eissler, "Malingering," in *Psychoanalysis and Culture*, ed. George Wilbur and Warner Muensterberger (1951), 218–53. The recognition of analysts that soldiers' psychological traumas were grist for their mill gained wide publicity with some papers at the international congress of psychoanalysts in Budapest in 1918; see Sándor Ferenczi, Karl Abraham, Ernst Simmel, and Ernest Jones, *Psycho-Analysis and the War Neuroses* (1919; tr., probably by Ernest Jones, 1921). Freud's "Introduction" to that volume, and his "Memorandum on the Electrical Treatment of War Neurotics," written in 1920 and published in 1955, are conveniently accessible in *SE XVII*, 205–15. One pioneer in this work, in Germany, was Ernst Simmel, whose *Kriegsneurosen und psychisches Trauma* (1918) was influential; another pioneer, in England, was M. D. Eder; see his *War-Shock. The Psycho-Neuroses in War: Psychology and Treatment* (1917).

Details on Freud's way of living in hungry, cold Vienna after 1918 are abundant in his correspondence with his intimates in Budapest, Berlin, and London, as well as with his nephew Samuel in Manchester. See also the short article by another nephew, Edward L. Bernays, "Uncle Sigi," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, XXXV (April 1980), 216–20. I have profited from an illuminating paper on the impact of war and "social reality" on Freud's thinking of these years: Louise E. Hoffman, "War, Revolution, and Psychoanalysis: Freudian Thought Begins to Grapple with Social Reality," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, XVII (1981), 251–69. Stefan Zweig, *Die Welt von Gestern. Erinnerungen eines Europäers* (1944), esp. the chapter "Heimkehr nach Österreich," has much vivid—perhaps, as usual, a little too vivid—detail. For a sober corrective to Zweig's fluent hyperbole, see again Prater, *European of Yesterday: A Biography of Stefan Zweig*, esp. ch. 4, "Salzburg and Success, 1919–1925." The autobiographical text by Richard F. Sterba, *Reminiscences of a Viennese Psychoanalyst* (1982) is slight. A[bram] Kardiner, *My Analysis with Freud: Reminiscences* (1977), though far from thorough, conveys something of what it was like to be a foreign "pupil" of Freud's after the war.

For Groddeck, see esp. Carl M. and Sylva Grossman, *The Wild Analyst: The Life and Work of Georg Groddeck* (1965), short and popular, but with a full bibliography of Groddeck's writings. Sándor Ferenczi reviewed Groddeck's novel, *Der Seelensucher*, in 1921 (see *Schriften zur Psychoanalyse*, ed. Balint, II, 94–98). The appreciation by Lawrence Durrell, "Studies in Genius: VI. Groddeck," *Horizon*, XVII (June 1948), 384–403, is interesting. Groddeck's main book on the It is available in English: *The Book of the It* (1923; tr. M. E. Collins, 1950). Margaretha Honegger has edited a small selection of his correspondence with Freud and others: *Georg Groddeck–Sigmund Freud. Briefe über das Es* (1974).



For Freud's social psychology, see esp. Sándor Ferenczi, "Freud's 'Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse.' Der individualpsychologische Fortschritt" (1922), in *Schriften zur Psychoanalyse*, ed. Balint, II, 122–26; and Philip Rieff, "The Origins of Freud's Political Psychology," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XVII (1956), 235–49. Robert Boccock suggestively treats Freud as a sociologist in *Freud and Modern Society: An Outline and Analysis of Freud's Sociology* (1976). Incidentally, there is an annotated manuscript of Freud's *Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse*, a real find, in the Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University.

#### CHAPTER NINE · *Death against Life*

For Freud's battle with cancer, Schur, *Freud, Living and Dying*, esp. chaps. 13–16, is once more authoritative, to be supplemented—and at points corrected!—by his unpublished memorandum, "The Medical Case History of Sigmund Freud," dated February 27, 1954, Max Schur papers, LC. Anna Freud's letters to Schur and Ernest Jones add both precision and poignancy. Sharon Romm, *The Unwelcome Intruder: Freud's Struggle with Cancer* (1983) has medical details and information about Freud's physicians, surgeons, and operations that are largely unobtainable elsewhere. I am indebted to a well-informed unpublished manuscript by Sanford Gifford, "Notes on Felix Deutsch as Freud's Personal Physician" (1972), which is sympathetic to Deutsch's plight, but unsentimental. Deutsch's own "Reflections on Freud's One Hundredth Birthday," *Psychosomatic Medicine*, XVIII (1956), 279–83, is also of help. Again my interview with Helen Schur, June 3, 1986, proved invaluable. On Freud's grandson Heinele, I was aided by a private communication from Hilde Braunthal, who as a young student worked in Mathilde and Robert Hollitscher's home, where Heinele lived in his last months. H. D. [Hilda Doolittle], *Tribute to Freud* has some backward glances from the 1930s to the 1920s. George Sylvester Viereck's interview of 1926, published in 1927 separately and then in *Glimpses of the Great* (1930), has characteristic quotations but must be used with caution.

There are evocative and amusing passages about the popularity of Freud in the Austria of the 1920s in Elias Canetti, *Die Fackel im Ohr. Lebensgeschichte 1921–1931* (1980), esp. 137–39. For America, the glimpses in Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century* (1980) can be supplemented by some of Lippmann's letters, skillfully edited by John Morton Blum, in *Public Philosopher: Selected Letters of Walter Lippmann* (1985). Alfred Kazin, *On Native Grounds: An Interpretation of Modern American Prose Literature* (1942; paperback ed., 1956) has passing comments on Freud's impact in the 1920s, as does Richard Weiss, *The American Myth of Success, from Horatio Alger to Norman Vincent Peale* (1969). Martin Wanh, ed., *Fruition of an Idea: Fifty Years of Psychoanalysis in New York* (1962) is thin and rather self-congratulatory; what is wanted is a fully documented history of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. An earlier study by someone who was there, C. P. Oberndorf, *A History of Psychoanalysis in America* (1953) is highly personal but useful. David Shakow and David Rapaport, *The Influence of Freud on American Psychology* (1964) takes the story beyond Hale's fine *Freud and the Americans*. A good companion to Hale is John C. Burnham, *Psychoanalysis in American Medicine, 1894–1918: Medicine, Science, and Culture* (1967). There is also good material in Burnham, *Jelliffe: American Psychoanalyst and Physician* (1983), which includes Jelliffe's correspondence with Freud and Jung, edited by William McGuire. And see John Demos, "Oedipus and America: Historical Perspectives on the Reception of Psychoanalysis in the United States," *The Annual of Psychoanalysis*, VI (1978), 23–39, which is reflective and enlightening. (For titles touching on lay analysis in the United States, see the essay for chapter 10, next.)

Uwe Henrik Peters, *Anna Freud: A Life Dedicated to Children* (1979; tr. anon., 1985) bravely but pretty ineffectually soldiers on without help from Anna Freud's papers, as have other biographical efforts; we shall have to wait until the authoritative biography by Elisabeth Young-Bruehl comes along. She shared some of her researches in a talk at the Muriel Gardiner Program in Psychoanalysis and the Humanities, Yale University, January 15, 1987; in several conversations; and in a letter to me of May 17, 1987. Some of the memorial papers devoted to Anna Freud, in *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XXXIX (1984), help to round out the portrait of a reserved and fascinating person. See esp. Joseph Goldstein, "Anna Freud in Law," 3–13; and also Peter B. Neubauer, "Anna



Freud's Concept of Developmental Lines," 15-27; Leo Rangell, "The Anna Freud Experience," 29-42; Albert J. Solnit and Lottie M. Newman, "Anna Freud: The Child Expert," 45-63; and the evocation by Robert S. Wallerstein, "Anna Freud: Radical Innovator and Staunch Conservative," 65-80. The lecture by Anna Freud's niece, Sophie Freud, *The Legacy of Anna Freud* (1987), is personal and moving. Kardiner, *My Analysis with Freud* has a few arresting comments. Anna Freud's unpublished letters, especially to Max Schur and Ernest Jones, and Freud's unpublished letters to Ernest Jones and—even more—to his indispensable friend and confidante Lou Andreas-Salomé, help the biographer along further. (For Andreas-Salomé, see her autobiographical writings, most notably her *Lebensrückblick* [1951], and Angela Livingstone, *Lou Andreas-Salomé* [1984], which depends on some unpublished materials.) The most rewarding resource for Anna Freud, however, is of course the unpublished correspondence between herself and her father, in the Freud Collection, LC.

For psychoanalysis in Berlin, see the revealing (and highly amusing) correspondence between the Stracheys: *Bloomsbury/Freud: The Letters of James and Alix Strachey, 1924-1925*, ed. Perry Meisel and Walter Kendrick (1985). In addition, see the extremely instructive Festschrift, *Zehn Jahre Berliner Psychoanalytisches Institut (Poliklinik und Lehranstalt)*, ed. Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft (1930), with informative short reports by Ernst Simmel, Otto Fenichel, Karen Horney, Hanns Sachs, Gregory Zilboorg, and others on all aspects of the institution, its rules, its students, its patients, and its program. Melanie Klein, who first made her mark in Berlin, remains extraordinarily controversial, and the life by Phyllis Grosskurth, *Melanie Klein: Her World and Her Work* (1986), though very full and based on extensive research in the Klein papers, has not stilled the debate. I have learned much from the book, but I dissent from Grosskurth's rather low estimate of Anna Freud. Hanna Segal, an eminent Kleinian, has written two very helpful brief surveys: *Introduction to the Work of Melanie Klein* (1964) and *Klein* (1979).

For Freud's impact in France, see Sherry Turkle's brief but meaty *Psychoanalytic Politics: Freud's French Revolution* (1978), which describes the emergence of a characteristically French psychoanalytic culture. The exchanges between Freud and René Laforgue, tr. into French by Pierre Cotet and ed. André Bourguignon et al., in "Mémorial," *Nouvelle Revue de Psychanalyse*, XV (April 1977), 236-314, are instructive as well. So is the very ample account in Elisabeth Roudinesco, *La bataille de cent ans. Histoire de la psychanalyse en France*, vol. I, 1885-1935 (1982) and vol. II, 1925-1985 (1986). See also Ilse and Robert Baraude, *Histoire de la Psychanalyse en France* (1975). Psychoanalysis in France is, of course, bound up with Marie Bonaparte. Celia Bertin, *Marie Bonaparte: A Life* (1982) is unfortunately fairly insubstantial, especially on Bonaparte's ideas and her work of organizing psychoanalysis in France. There is room for a better biography.

Analysands reporting on Freud include Hilda Doolittle [H. D.], Kardiner, and the late Jeanne Lampl-de Groot (in a cordial, fascinating, often moving interview with me on October 24, 1985). For H. D., see the full life by Janice S. Robinson, *H. D.: The Life and Work of an American Poet* (1982), to be supplemented by Susan Stanford Friedman, "A Most Luscious 'Vers Libre' Relationship: H. D. and Freud," *The Annual of Psychoanalysis*, XIV (1986), 319-43. The book by that "experimental" analysand Joseph Wortis, *Fragments of an Analysis with Freud* (1954), records some striking interventions by Freud but is ultimately unsatisfactory, since Wortis was not really interested in being analyzed. On Freud's acquaintances and correspondents in those years, two articles by David S. Werman in *Int. Rev. Psycho-Anal.* shed much light: "Stefan Zweig and His Relationship with Freud and Rolland: A Study of the Auxiliary Ego Ideal," VI (1979), 77-95, and "Sigmund Freud and Romain Rolland," IV (1977), 225-42. There is in addition an essay by David James Fisher, "Sigmund Freud and Romain Rolland: The Terrestrial Animal and His Great Oceanic Friend," *American Imago*, XXXIII (1976), 1-59. Mary Higgins and Chester M. Raphael, eds., *Reich Speaks of Freud: Wilhelm Reich Discusses His Work and His Relationship with Sigmund Freud* (1967) has some tantalizing (if dubiously reliable) comments on Freud's later years, including K. R. Eissler's long interview with Reich. Albrecht Hirschmüller has published a pair of revealing letters from Freud to Josef Breuer's son on the occasion of Breuer's death: "'Balsam auf eine schmerzende Wunde'—Zwei bisher unbekannte Briefe Sigmund Freuds über sein Verhältnis zu Josef Breuer," *Psyche*, XLI (1987), 55-59.

On the vexed issue of Freud's interest in the occult, more work might perhaps be done. Nandor



Fodor, *Freud, Jung, and Occultism* (1971) is far from conclusive. On the other hand, Jones III, 375-407, is very full and fair.

### CHAPTER TEN · *Flickering Lights on Dark Continents*

For Otto Rank, in addition to the lives already cited—Lieberman, *Rank* and Taft, *Otto Rank*, both biographical labors of love—see Esther Menaker, *Otto Rank: A Rediscovered Legacy* (1983), which reads Rank as an ego psychologist and responds to some of Ernest Jones's criticisms of his work and character. Rank and Ferenczi's study, *The Development of Psychoanalysis* (1924; tr. Caroline Newton, 1925) has been reprinted more than once. Rank's most popular book, *The Trauma of Birth* (1924; tr. anon., 1929) remains available. There is also a selection from his voluminous writings: Philip Freund, ed., *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero and Other Writings* (1959), mainly on art and myth. The most prominent of Rank's enthusiasts was the late sociologist Ernest Becker, as his *The Denial of Death* (1973) and *Escape from Evil* (1975) attest.

On anxiety, the "Editor's Introduction" to *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety*, SE XX, 77-86, is particularly helpful. Far more extensive is the three-part survey by Allan Compton, "A Study of the Psychoanalytic Theory of Anxiety," which appeared in *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*: "I. The Development of Freud's Theory of Anxiety," XX (1972), 3-44; "II. Developments in the Theory of Anxiety since 1926," XX (1972), 341-94; and "III. A Preliminary Formulation of the Anxiety Response," XXVIII (1980), 739-74. Otto Fenichel has, as usual, several interesting papers on the topic, notably "Organ Libidization Accompanying the Defense against Drives" (1928), *Collected Papers*, 1st Series, 128-46; "Defense against Anxiety, Particularly by Libidization" (1934), *Collected Papers*, 1st Series, 303-17; and the particularly original "The Counter-Phobic Attitude" (1939), *Collected Papers*, 2d Series, 163-73. Phyllis Greenacre's persuasive two-part paper "The Predisposition to Anxiety" (1941), in *Trauma, Growth, and Personality*, 27-82, traces the disposition back to uterine existence. See also Ishak Ramzy and Robert S. Wallerstein, "Pain, Fear, and Anxiety: A Study in Their Interrelations," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XIII (1958), 147-89; René A. Spitz, "Anxiety in Infancy," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XXXI (1965), 138-43, to be added to the fascinating material in Spitz, *The First Year of Life* (1965); Clifford Yorke and Stanley Wiseberg, "A Developmental View of Anxiety: Some Clinical and Theoretical Considerations," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XXXI (1976), 107-35; Betty Joseph, "Different Types of Anxiety and Their Handling in the Analytic Situation," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LIX (1978), 223-28; and the article directly following: Leo Rangell, "On Understanding and Treating Anxiety and Its Derivatives," 229-36. Max Schur, "The Ego in Anxiety," in *Drives, Affects, Behavior*, ed. Loewenstein, 67-103, is a minor classic. For a rather individual treatment of the theme, see the important text by Silvan Tomkins, *Affects, Imagery, Consciousness*, vol. II, *The Negative Affects* (1963), esp. 511-29. There are some revealing (at times vehement) discussions about Rank's maverick ideas in the minutes of the New York Psychoanalytic Society, in the A. A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Institute.

Theodor Reik's reminiscences (studded with quotations from Freud's letters to him) offer many interesting details: *The Search Within: The Inner Experience of a Psychoanalyst* (1956) is a vast compendium; his earlier *From Thirty Years with Freud* (tr. Richard Winston, 1940) is more economical and more pointed. Erika Freeman prompted Reik to reminisce; see her *Insights: Conversations with Theodor Reik* (1971). The great symposium on lay analysis, organized by Max Eitingon and Ernest Jones, appeared (in its English guise) in *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, VIII (1927), 174-283, 391-401. The full story of the American attitude toward lay analysts has not been written, and in view of its great historical interest, remains a desideratum. On lay analysis, the minutes of the New York Psychoanalytic Society are unfortunately very skimpy. For now, see above all, *American Psychoanalysis: Origins and Development*, ed. Jacques M. Quen and Eric T. Carlson (1978). In Oberndorf, *History of Psychoanalysis in America*, see esp. ch. 9, "Status of Psychoanalysis at the Beginning of the Third Decade," and ch. 10, "Stormy Years in Psychoanalysis under New York Leadership," which



are vigorous, subjective, and all too brief. Once again Hale, *Freud and the Americans*, though it reaches only to 1917, sets the stage very well; Burnham, *Jelliffe*, too, is helpful on this issue.

Jones III, 287-301, offers a fair-minded general conspectus covering the controversy on lay analysis, remarkably informative for all its terseness. No one can accuse K. R. Eissler of terseness; his *Medical Orthodoxy and the Future of Psychoanalysis* (1965) is expansive, crippled by self-indulgent digressions, but in parts illuminating. Some recent contributions include Lawrence S. Kubie, "Reflections on Training," *Psychoanalytic Forum*, I (1966), 95-112; Shelley Orgel, "Report from the Seventh Pre-Congress Conference on Training," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LIX (1978), 511-15; Robert S. Wallerstein, "Perspectives on Psychoanalytic Training Around the World," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, LIX (1978), 477-503; and Newell Fischer, reporting on a panel discussion of the American Psychoanalytic Association, "Beyond Lay Analysis: Pathways to a Psychoanalytic Career," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXX (1982), 701-15. Harald Leupold-Löwenthal, "Zur Geschichte der 'Frage der Laienanalyse,'" *Psyche*, XXXVIII (1984), 97-120, has some added materials.

Much, indeed most, of the literature that has gathered round Freud's views on female development, specifically sexuality, is polemical; the issue has been almost completely politicized. Fortunately, analysts, male and female, have kept their heads. There are two responsible surveys of the history of Freud's ideas by Zenia Odes Fliegel: "Feminine Psychosexual Development in Freudian Theory: A Historical Reconstruction," *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XLII (1973), 385-408, ably followed up by "Half a Century Later: Current Status of Freud's Controversial Views on Women," *Psychoanalytic Review*, LXIX (1982), 7-28; both provide excellent bibliographical information. A comprehensive anthology, *Female Psychology: Contemporary Psychoanalytic Views*, ed. Harold P. Blum (1977) contains a generous sampling of papers from *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.* Among the most rewarding, for me, are James A. Kleeman, "Freud's Views on Early Female Sexuality in the Light of Direct Child Observation," 3-27, at once critical and appreciative of Freud's ideas; Eleanor Galenson and Herman Roiphe, "Some Suggestive Revisions Concerning Early Female Development," 29-57, a very interesting paper; Samuel Ritvo, "Adolescent to Woman," 127-37, which persuasively takes up the story beyond childhood; William I. Grossman and Walter A. Stewart, "Penis Envy: From Childhood Wish to Developmental Metaphor," 193-212, another pointer toward revision within psychoanalysis; Roy Schafer, "Problems in Freud's Psychology of Women," 331-60, a perceptive analysis of some fundamental issues; Daniel S. Jaffe, "The Masculine Envy of Woman's Procreative Function," 361-92, which deals with the other side of penis envy; and Peter Barglow and Margret Schaefer, "A New Female Psychology?" 393-438, which severely examines recent non-, semi-, and pseudo-psychoanalytic literature, to excellent effect. Nearly all of these papers supply extensive bibliographies. Other significant papers by authors represented in the anthology include Kleeman, "The Establishment of Core Gender Identity in Normal Girls. (a) Introduction; (b) Development of the Ego Capacity to Differentiate," *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, I (1971), 103-29; and Galenson and Roiphe, "The Impact of Early Sexual Discovery on Mood, Defensive Organization, and Symbolization," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XXVI (1971), 195-216, which can be supplemented (and contrasted) with their "The Preoedipal Development of the Boy," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXVIII (1980), 805-28. For a clear-headed summary of material that has appeared since the 1977 anthology, see Shahla Chehrazi, "Female Psychology: A Review," *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, XXXIV (1986), 141-62. See also the highly instructive short paper by Iza S. Erlich, "What Happened to Jocasta?" *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, XLI (1977), 280-84, which pertinently asks about the mothers in Freud's case histories. And see Jean Strouse, ed., *Women and Analysis: Dialogues on Psychoanalytic Views of Femininity* (1974).

Most prominent among the classic psychoanalytic texts that follow the Freudian reading of women's sexual development, though not without some cavils, are Marie Bonaparte, *Female Sexuality* (1951; tr. John Rodker, 1953), which first appeared as three articles in *Revue Française de Psychanalyse*, in 1949; Helene Deutsch, *The Psychology of Women*, 2 vols. (1944-45); and Ruth Mack Brunswick, "The Preoedipal Phase of Libido Development" (1940), in *The Psychoanalytic Reader*, ed. Robert Fliess (1948), 261-84. Jeanne Lampl-de Groot's papers, available in her collection *The Development of the Mind: Psychoanalytic Papers on Clinical and Theoretical Problems* (1965), state



Freud's views with particular lucidity: "The Evolution of the Oedipus Complex in Women" (1927), 3-18; "Problems of Femininity" (1933), 19-46; review of Sándor Radó, "Fear of Castration in Women" (1934), 47-57; and an important contribution on the question of a very early stage—in the male—"The Preoedipal Phase in the Development of the Male Child" (1946), 104-113. See also Joan Riviere, "Womanliness as a Masquerade" (1929), in *Psychoanalysis and Female Sexuality*, ed. Hendrik M. Ruitenbeek (1966), 209-20.

For Abraham on this issue, see, in addition to his correspondence with Freud, his paper "Manifestations of the Female Castration Complex" (1920), in *Selected Papers of Karl Abraham* (1927), 338-69. Jones's most significant papers, all in *Papers on Psycho-Analysis* (4th ed., 1938), are "The Early Development of Female Sexuality" (1927), 556-70; "The Phallic Phase" (1933), 571-604; and "Early Female Sexuality" (1935), 605-16.

Karen Horney's papers are easily available in English. The ones that made her a force, collected in her *Feminine Psychology*, ed. Harold Kelman (1967), are "On the Genesis of the Castration Complex in Women" (1924), 37-53; "The Flight from Womanhood: The Masculinity-Complex in Women as Viewed by Men and Women" (1926), 54-70; "The Dread of Women: Observations on a Specific Difference in the Dread Felt by Men and by Women Respectively for the Opposite Sex" (1932), 133-46; and "The Denial of the Vagina: A Contribution to the Problem of the Genital Anxieties Specific to Women" (1933), 147-61. This collection of her papers also has some other relevant texts. *The Adolescent Diaries of Karen Horney* (1980) are touching and revealing; Marcia Westkott, *The Feminist Legacy of Karen Horney* (1986) discusses her ideas in context. The new biography by Susan Quinn (which the author let me read in manuscript), *A Mind of Her Own: The Life of Karen Horney* (1987), is a full treatment that does justice to her private life.

This is not the place to discuss the feminist protest against Freud's "phallogocentric" views, interesting as it is; the article by Barglow and Schaefer (cited above) vigorously, indeed bellicosely, defends the psychoanalytic perspective. The most rewarding and responsible contribution, which tries to take into account, but also to rise above, "sexual politics" and Freud's "male chauvinism," is a study by a trained psychotherapist and active feminist, Juliet Mitchell, *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (1974). Mary Jane Sherfey, *The Nature and Evolution of Female Sexuality* (1972) is a rational attempt to revise Freudian theory on the basis of modern biology. K. R. Eissler, "Comments on Penis Envy and Orgasm in Women," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XXXII (1977), 29-83, tries to take recent feminist and psychoanalytic literature into account. For aspects of the fascinating history of women's sexuality, and attitudes toward love in nineteenth-century Europe, far from irrelevant to Freud's views, see Gay, *The Bourgeois Experience*, vol. I, *Education of the Senses*, and vol. II, *The Tender Passion*. From a vast literature, I single out only Helene Weber, *Ehefrau und Mutter in der Rechtsentwicklung. Eine Einführung* (1907), which has a section on Austria, as does Richard J. Evans, *The Feminists: Women's Emancipation Movements in Europe, America and Australasia 1840-1920* (1977). The best brief history of Austrian women in the current age is Erika Weinzierl, *Emanzipation? Österreichische Frauen im 20. Jahrhundert* (1975), an introduction. A longer history would be welcome.

On the touchy topic of Freud and his mother, in addition to Jones, *passim*, and McGrath, *Freud's Discovery of Psychoanalysis*, see Eva M. Rosenfeld, "Dreams and Vision: Some Remarks on Freud's Egyptian Bird Dream," *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, XXXVII (1956), 97-105; and Robert D. Stolorow and George E. Atwood, "A Defensive-Restitutive Function of Freud's Theory of Psychosexual Development," *Psychoanalytic Review*, LXV (1978), 217-38, an important paper that treats Freud's relations to Amalia Freud much as I do. The authors use, profitably, Tomkins's *Affect, Imagery, Consciousness*. Donald L. Burnham has published a late letter of Freud's to the German psychoanalyst Carl Müller-Braunschweig: "Freud and Female Sexuality: A Previously Unpublished Letter," *Psychiatry*, XXXIV (1971), 328-29.

Much hitherto unpublished material is revealed for the first time in *Arnold Zweig, 1887-1968. Werk und Leben in Dokumenten und Bildern*, ed. Georg Wenzel (1978).



CHAPTER ELEVEN · *Human Nature at Work*

I have already noted that more work on Ferenczi would be most desirable. For his last years (as for the earlier ones) the Freud–Ferenczi Correspondence, Freud Collection, LC, is, of course, fundamental. Michael Balint offers some important if cursory comments in *The Basic Fault: Therapeutic Aspects of Regression* (1968), esp. ch. 23, “The Disagreement between Freud and Ferenczi, and Its Repercussions.” Ferenczi’s correspondence with the good friend of his later life Georg Groddeck, *Briefwechsel 1921–1933* (1986), is illuminating. Masson, *Assault on Truth* has a persuasive-sounding but wholly unreliable chapter, “The Strange Case of Ferenczi’s Last Paper,” on Ferenczi’s late relations with Freud. Thus Masson cites, as an instance of Freud’s strong positive feelings for Ferenczi, the way he “often addressed him as ‘dear son’” (p. 145). In fact I encountered that salutation only once, and then Freud used it in exasperation at Ferenczi’s inability to grow up. (See Freud’s letters to Ferenczi, November 30 and December 5, 1911. Freud–Ferenczi Correspondence, Freud Collection, LC.) Again, Masson’s claim that Ferenczi’s insistence on reviving the seduction theory “cost him the friendship of Freud” (p. 148) is contradicted by the facts. The clinical diary of Ferenczi’s that I quote in the text from the manuscript in the Freud Collection, LC, is in the process of being published by S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt am Main: Judith Dupont, ed., “*Ohne Sympathie keine Heilung.*” *Das klinische Tagebuch von 1932* (1988).

There is no full treatment of Freud’s anti-Americanism. Hale, *Freud and the Americans*, gives the background up to 1917. For one of Freud’s earliest and most serious American supporters, see, again, Steel, *Walter Lippmann*. (Martin J. Wiener, *Between Two Worlds: The Political Thought of Graham Wallas* [1971], has some interesting comments on Lippmann.) Burnham, *Jelliffe*, is again helpful. The most thorough biographical study of Bullitt is Will Brownell and Richard N. Billings, *So Close to Greatness: A Biography of William C. Bullitt* (1987), which I had the opportunity of reading in manuscript. It cannot, however, fully resolve the mysteries surrounding the Freud–Bullitt study of Woodrow Wilson. Trying to reconstruct the making of that book, I made use of Bullitt’s letters to Colonel House (in Colonel E. M. House papers, series I, box 21, Y-MA). Beatrice Farnsworth, *William C. Bullitt and the Soviet Union* (1967) concentrates on Bullitt’s early diplomatic missions but fortunately goes beyond its title. William Bayard Hale, *The Story of a Style* (1920), the book that Freud enjoyed but would not publicly endorse, is a dissection of Wilson by means of his stylistic devices. For an American’s review of that book, which gave its author a good chance to savage Wilson, see H. L. Mencken, “The Archangel Woodrow” (1921), in *The Vintage Mencken*, ed. Alistair Cooke (1955), 116–20.

Orville H. Bullitt, who saw the manuscript of *Thomas Woodrow Wilson* in 1932 while he was staying with his brother William, confirms that Freud and Bullitt had indeed signed each of the chapters. Around 1950, he saw it again and noticed no changes. (See Orville Bullitt to Alexander L. George, December 6, 1973, courtesy Alexander George.) Dr. Orville Horwitz, a cousin, who was also thoroughly familiar with the manuscript in the 1930s, agrees. (Telephone conversation with Dr. Horwitz, May 31, 1986.) On the other hand, the style of the book does not support these recollections: more than one reviewer has justly noted that while the introduction is unquestionably Freud’s, the text simply lacks his humor and subtlety of formulation and expression. Thus Max Schur wrote to Miss M. Legru at Houghton Mifflin on January 19, 1968, “The study of the manuscript revealed clearly that only the introduction, although not submitted in his handwriting (Freud had written *all* his manuscripts and letters in longhand) had all the unmistakable earmarks of Freud’s style and reflected his analytical point of view. We [Schur, Ernst Freud, and Anna Freud] had to conclude that this was a preserved transcript of Freud’s original contribution. As to the rest of the book, it must have been written by Mr. Bullitt who applied as well as he could (*not questioning at all his good faith*) from memory and notes he had taken during and after his meetings with Freud, the analytical formulations given to him by the latter.” (Courtesy Helen Schur.) Freud himself told Arnold Zweig in December 1930, “I am again writing an introduction for something that someone else is making; I am not allowed to say what it is, it’s also an analysis, but a highly contemporary one, almost political.” (Freud to Arnold Zweig, December 7, 1930. *Freud–Zweig*, 37 [25].)

The least awkward way of resolving these contradictions, I believe, is to assume that Bullitt revised



the manuscript after Freud's death. At one point Anna Freud took a different view. "You know how little I like Bullitt," she wrote Max Schur on October 24, 1966. "But that is not the kind of thing which he would do." (Max Schur papers, LC.) On the other hand, she wrote Schur on November 6, 1966, "I am absolutely certain that my father wrote his own Foreword. This is his style and his way of thinking and I would be ready to swear to it at any time./ I am equally certain, and equally ready to swear to it that none of the later chapters have been written by my father, neither wholly nor in part. Firstly, it is not his style; secondly, he has never in his life used repetitions which are used in this book ad nauseam; thirdly, he has never denigrated or made ridiculous any subject under analysis which is done in the book." No doubt, she added, her father had "suggested analytic interpretations to Bullitt, for him to use, never imagining that they would be used in this clumsy way." (Max Schur papers, LC.) It is plain from some of Anna Freud's letters to Jones in the mid-1950s that she did not see the manuscript of the Wilson study during her father's lifetime. (See Anna Freud to Jones, April 16 and April 25, 1955. Jones papers, Archives of the British Psycho-Analytical Society, London.) Bullitt himself wrote Jones on July 22, 1955, that the book "was the result of much combat. Both Freud and I were extremely pig-headed: somewhat convinced that each of us was God. In consequence, each chapter: indeed each sentence: was the subject of an intense debate." In June 1956, again writing to Jones, Bullitt added, "I visited London twice [in 1939] in order to discuss with him [Freud] certain changes which I considered essential. We agreed on the wording of those changes and I made them. But I have felt that his death precluded further alterations." (Both in Jones papers, Archives of the British Psycho-Analytical Society, London.) Perhaps Anna Freud had the best judgment of the matter: "There is no doubt about it that my father over-estimated Bullitt. I never did. But in matters of this kind, my father was not guided by anybody." (Anna Freud to Max Schur, November 6, 1966. Max Schur papers, LC.) But the manuscript remains inaccessible.

On the Horace Frink case, see Michael Specter, "Sigmund Freud and a Family Torn Asunder: Revelations of an Analysis Gone Awry," *Washington Post*, November 8, 1987, sec. G, 1, 5. The Frink papers, in the Alan Mason Chesney Medical Archives, The Johns Hopkins University, shed further light.

Among the studies of Freud's religiosity, Reuben M. Rainey's dissertation, *Freud as Student of Religion: Perspectives on the Background and Development of His Thought* (1975), is not without interest. On Freud's Jewishness, his son Martin's article "Who Was Freud?" in *The Jews of Austria*, ed. Fraenkel, 197-211, is indispensable. A. A. Roback, *Freudiana* (1957), which includes "unpublished letters from Freud, Havelock Ellis, Pavlov, Bernard Shaw, Romain Rolland et alii," is more irritating than informative. I have freely drawn in this chapter on my *A Godless Jew*, which canvasses the issues more fully than I had the opportunity to do here. (For titles on Freud's Jewishness, see the essay for chapter 12, next.)

Works appraising *Civilization and Its Discontents* include Paul Roazen's survey, *Freud: Political and Social Thought* (1968), which has several pages on human nature in politics. For an interesting canvass of the social (and political) implications of Freud's thought from a Freudian perspective, see J. C. Flugel, *Man, Morals and Society: A Psycho-Analytical Study* (1945). R. E. Money-Kyrle, *Psychoanalysis and Politics: A Contribution to the Psychology of Politics and Morals* (1951) is a terse but meaty essay from the same perspective. "Politics and the Individual," in Rieff, *Freud: The Mind of the Moralizer*, is a fine chapter. Heinz Hartmann's considerably expanded Freud Lecture, *Psychoanalysis and Moral Values* (1960), a sophisticated defense of the superego and (largely implicitly) of Freudian social and political theory, repays close reading. Also on the superego, see Michael Friedman, "Toward a Reconceptualization of Guilt," *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, XXI (1985), 501-47, which canvasses post-Freudian rethinking, including Melanie Klein, and such object-relations theorists as W. R. D. Fairbairn and D. W. Winnicott. The eminent American sociologist Talcott Parsons studied the social bearing of Freud's ideas in several significant papers, notably "The Superego and the Theory of Social Systems" (1952), collected, along with papers on the father taboo and the incest taboo, and on character and society, in *Social Structure and Personality* (1964). Bocock, *Freud and Modern Society* is again useful. I have attempted to give an instance of how the historian may link psychoanalytic ideas to culture in "Liberalism and Regression," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XXXVII (1982), 523-45.



CHAPTER TWELVE · *To Die in Freedom*

The great economic—eventually political—catastrophe that started in the fall of 1929 and triggered the events of the 1930s is best encapsulated in John A. Garraty, *The Great Depression* (1986), a fine comparative study including comments on Austria. For Freud's life in Austria between 1933 and 1938, see esp. the *Freud-Zweig* correspondence and some of Freud's later letters to Lou Andreas-Salomé and to Max Eitingon (in Palestine after 1933). Schur, *Freud, Living and Dying* is necessarily the indispensable eye witness for Freud's months under Hitler. Clark, *Freud*, esp. ch. 23, "An Order for Release," is based in part on diplomatic documents—neglected by other biographers—which I used independently. Dr. Josefina Stross, who was (literally) close to Freud from May 1938 to his death, kindly enlarged my knowledge of Freud in those months (esp. in letters of May 12 and June 19, 1987). Detlef Berthelsen, *Alltag bei Freud. Die Erinnerungen der Paula Fichtl* (which I saw in proof, to be published in 1988) offers many exceedingly intimate details of the Freud household that emerged from the reminiscences of a servant who worked for the Freuds from 1929 on and accompanied them to London. The "revelations" include the maidenly Fichtl's shock at a glimpse of Freud's penis; the whole, unchecked recollections of an aged servant, is not a document to be trusted implicitly. Carl Zuckmayer's autobiography, *Als wär's ein Stück von mir. Horen der Freundschaft* (1966), esp. 64–95, vividly records his experiences in Austria—Vienna and elsewhere—in March 1938. For Austria at the time of the Anschluss, I have discussed the best titles in the essay for chapter 8; see esp. contributions by Kadmoska, Goldinger, Zuckermandl, Klusacek and Stimmer, Hannak, Csendes, and Weinzierl and Skalnik. One other chapter in the volume the last two have edited, *Österreich 1918–1938*, should be mentioned: Norbert Schausberger, "Der Anschluss," 517–52. Additional helpful titles are *Dokumentation zur Österreichischen Zeitgeschichte, 1938–1945*, ed. Christine Klusacek, Herbert Steiner, and Kurt Stimmer (1971), the first two sections of which contain rich (and appalling) material on the Anschluss and on Austria as "Ostmark" to the outbreak of the Second World War; Christine Klusacek, *Österreichs Wissenschaftler und Künstler unter dem NS-Regime* (1966), a laconic, eloquent listing of persecuted scientists (including Freud) and artists and their fates; Dieter Wagner and Gerhard Tomkowitz, "*Ein Volk, Ein Reich, Ein Führer!*" *Der Anschluss Österreichs 1938* (1968), journalistic but dependable and including some telling photographs of Jews being mistreated in March 1938; see also, once again, some of the papers in *The Jews of Austria*, ed. Fraenkel, esp. Herbert Rosenkranz, "The Anschluss and the Tragedy of Austrian Jewry, 1938–1945," 479–545, with terrifying statistics and no less terrifying reminiscences. And see T. Friedmann, ed., "*Die Kristall-Nacht.*" *Dokumentarische Sammlung* (1972), which documents the barbaric attacks on synagogues, community centers—and Jews themselves—in November 1938. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (1961; 2d ed., 1981), though controversial in its general thesis of Jewish passivity, is impeccable in its scholarship. There are other relevant statistics on Austrian Jewry under Hitler in Martin Gilbert, ed., *The Macmillan Atlas of the Holocaust* (1982). As the text shows, the daily stories filed by reporters in Vienna, mainly in the *New York Times*, the *Manchester Guardian*, and the *London Daily Telegraph*, are rich evidence for events.

German psychoanalysis and psychiatry under Hitler are vividly documented in Karen Brecht et al., eds., "*Hier geht das Leben auf eine sehr merkwürdige Weise weiter. . . .*" *Zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Deutschland* (1985), a sobering, informative catalogue. It should be supplemented with Geoffrey Cocks, *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich: The Goering Institute* (1985), scholarly, and effectively revisionist, though more inclined to see a certain survival of psychoanalysis under the Nazis than, in my judgment, the evidence can fully support. In the vast literature on Nazi Germany, Karl Dietrich Bracher, *The German Dictatorship: The Origins, Structure, and Effects of National Socialism* (1969; tr. Jean Steinberg, 1970) retains most of its authority.

Freud's Jewishness continues to invite more and more comment. For my own views, see again my *A Godless Jew*. I have argued part of my case in "Six Names in Search of an Interpretation," also already cited. Justin Miller, "Interpretation of Freud's Jewishness, 1924–1974," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, XVII (1981), 357–74, comprehensively surveys the literature of half a century. An important early essay attempting to place Freud is Ernst Simon, "Sigmund Freud, the Jew," *Leo Baeck Yearbook*, II (1957), 270–305, which should be read in conjunction with Peter



Loewenberg, "Sigmund Freud as a Jew: A Study in Ambivalence and Courage," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, VII (1971), 363-69. Martin S. Bergmann, "Moses and the Evolution of Freud's Jewish Identity," *Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines*, XIV (March 1976), 3-26, to which I am indebted, exhaustively canvasses Freud's comments on the subject and has interesting observations on Freud's father's religiosity. Marthe Robert, *From Oedipus to Moses: Freud's Jewish Identity* (1974; tr. Ralph Manheim, 1976) is an impressive and subtle interpretation, though perhaps overplaying Freud's identification with Moses, the murdered prophet. Stanley Rothman and Phillip Isenberg, "Sigmund Freud and the Politics of Marginality," *Central European History*, VII (1974), 58-78, ably dispels tendentious misreadings. The same authors' "Freud and Jewish Marginality," *Encounter* (December 1974), 46-54, also helps to puncture Schorske, "Politics and Patricide in Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams*" (already cited). Henri Baruk, "La signification de la psychanalyse et le Judaïsme," *Revue d'Histoire de la Médecine Hébraïque*, XIX (1966), 15-28, 53-65, rather critical of Freud, effectively disposes of such farfetched notions as the idea that Freud was deeply influenced by the Kabbalah, as maintained (with no convincing evidence) in David Bakan, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (1958). (Among Bakan's most effective critics is Harry Trosman, in his already cited *Freud and the Imaginative World*, which in addition has interesting comments on Freud's Jewish identity.) A. A. Roback, *Jewish Influence in Modern Thought* (1929) is in the same problematic league as Bakan, but contains some letters of Freud's to the author. See also, again, Roback, *Freudiana*. Sander Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (1986), though devilishly ingenious on self-hatred, strikes me as eccentric. *Judaism and Psychoanalysis*, ed. Mortimer Ostow (1982) provides a varied menu of papers, including a chapter from Rabbi Richard Rubinstein's provocative study *The Religious Imagination* (1968). However, I prefer the sober analyses of Bergmann, Rothman and Isenberg, and even Robert. Jewish humor should not be neglected as a possible clue to Freud's Jewish identity. Kurt Schlesinger, "Jewish Humor as Jewish Identity," *Int. Rev. Psycho-Anal.*, VI (1979), 317-30, is a useful effort. Theodor Reik has made the subject his own, most prominently in *Jewish Wit* (1962). See also Elliott Oring, *The Jokes of Sigmund Freud: A Study in Humor and Jewish Identity* (1984), short, suggestive, a little humorless. "Mein Onkel Sigmund," the interview (already cited) of Richard Dyck with Freud's nephew Harry, who denies that his famous uncle was an atheist, must be used with some skepticism. Avner Falk, "Freud and Herzl," *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, XIV (1978), 357-87, examines Freud's Jewishness from the perspective of his acquaintance with Herzl's ideas.

Many of the titles just cited, principally Bergmann, "Moses and the Evolution of Freud's Jewish Identity" and Robert, *From Oedipus to Moses*, have much to say on Freud's *Moses and Monotheism*. I add Rieff, *Freud: The Mind of the Moralizer*, ch. 6, "The Authority of the Past"; and two titles by Edwin R. Wallace IV: *Freud and Anthropology* and "The Psychodynamic Determinants of *Moses and Monotheism*," *Psychiatry*, XL (1977), 79-87. See also the careful discussion in "Freud and the Religion of Moses," ch. 5 of W. W. Meissner, *Psychoanalysis and Religious Experience* (1984); and see F. M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *Harvard Theological Review*, LV (1962), 225-59. Some interesting speculations about why Freud failed to mention Abraham's early paper (1912) on Amenhotep IV, so relevant to Freud's intellectual excursion into ancient Egypt, are presented in Leonard Shengold, "A Parapraxis of Freud's in Relation to Karl Abraham," *American Imago*, XXIX (1972), 123-59.

Several eye-witness accounts give the flavor of the last year and a half of Freud's life. The Woolfs' responses to tea with Freud at 20 Maresfield Gardens early in 1939 are striking—and somewhat contrasting in tone: see Leonard Woolf, *Downhill All the Way* (1967), 95-96, 163-69; and *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*, ed. Anne Olivier Bell, assisted by Andrew McNeillie, vol. V, 1936-1941 (1984), 202, 248-52. Hanns Sachs has described his farewell to Freud in *Freud: Master and Friend*, ch. 9, "The Parting"; and Jones has also described *his* farewell, in *Jones III*, ch. 6, "London, The End."

For Freud's famous letter to an anonymous American mother on her homosexual son, see the instructive article by Henry Abelove, "Freud, Male Homosexuality and the Americans," *Dissent* (Winter 1986), 59-69.

There is, in addition to the usual obituaries, an all-too-brief retrospect on Max Schur in the *American Psychoanalytic Association Newsletter*, III (December 1969), 2.



For my treatment of Freud's last days, see the final end note to chapter 12.

A postscript: In the course of my work, I came upon an intriguing but, I thought, rather suspect account of an episode that supposedly took place at Berggasse 19 after the Anschluss. Barbara Hannah, in her adoring "biographical memoir" *Jung: His Life and Work* (already cited), reports (pp. 254-55) that not long after the Nazis invaded Austria in mid-March 1938, Franz Riklin, Jr., son of Jung's long-time associate Franz Riklin, "was chosen by some exceedingly rich Swiss Jews to go into Austria *at once*, with a very large sum of money, to do all he could to persuade leading Jews to leave the country before the Nazis had time to start persecuting them." The younger Riklin, then nearly thirty and at the start of his medical career, thought he had been chosen for this delicate mission because of his self-possession and his "exceedingly Teutonic appearance." In general, he was "exceedingly successful in carrying out his mission," but not at the Freuds'. Riklin's father had strongly urged his son to persuade Freud to leave Austria promptly "and to take advantage of the most unusual facilities which he could offer." But when the younger Riklin went to see Freud "and explained the situation to him," Freud disappointed him by saying sternly, "I refuse to be beholden to my enemies." Riklin explained the situation as well as he could and insisted that neither his father nor Jung had any animosity toward Freud. But Freud only reiterated his uncompromising stand. Still, Hannah concludes, the Freuds were very cordial with the messenger, and even asked him to dinner.

Thus far Hannah. She offers no documentation of this startling story, but since she knew the younger Riklin intimately, and often met him at the Jungs', it seems more than likely that Riklin was the source on which she drew. Yet her account has its improbable aspects: those "exceedingly rich Swiss Jews" must have known that the persecution of Jews in Austria had begun the minute the Nazis marched into the country. More important, the suggestion that Swiss Jews should have chosen as their emissary the son of one of Freud's most famous enemies does not ring true. Only Freud's sturdy and uncompromising refusal seems to be in character. So I set the report aside.

Then, last year, when the text of this biography was already in print, Dr. Robert S. McCully (now a professor of psychology, and in the mid-1960s, on the psychiatric faculty of Cornell University Medical College in New York City and in training at the local Jung Institute) partly corroborated and significantly corrected Hannah's account. When the younger Riklin lectured in New York, McCully met him and heard the story of his mission to Vienna in detail. As he remembers Riklin's account, it was not rich Swiss Jews but Jung and the older Riklin who put together \$10,000 from their own funds, and they wanted this money to go to Freud alone. When Riklin arrived at Berggasse 19, Anna Freud opened the door part way but would not let him into the apartment and told him that her father would not receive him. Then Freud came to the door and said just what Hannah quotes him as saying: "I refuse to be beholden to my enemies." The hostility of the Freuds, Riklin recalled to McCully, was such that he left and returned to Zurich, the money still in his money belt. (See Robert S. McCully, "Remarks on the Last Contact Between Freud and Jung," a letter to the editor, *Quadrant: Journal of the C. G. Jung Foundation* [New York], XX [1987], 73-74.)

Dr. McCully (whom I have consulted) has a very clear memory of Riklin's report, and his version sounds at once more plausible than Hannah's and more interesting. It would put Jung into a new light. According to his letter, Dr. McCully can only wonder "how Miss Hannah came upon her description of this event," but does feel certain Franz Riklin, Jr., (now deceased) neither saw her manuscript nor was consulted" (p. 73). As I have noted, there is little doubt in my mind that however garbled Hannah's account may be, her informant must have been Riklin himself. I have every reason to credit Dr. McCully's account of his conversations with Riklin, and (as I have also noted), Freud's curt response sounds very much like him. But in the absence of independent documentation—after all, I only had two reports on reports—I decided not to recall the last chapter from the printer to insert this fascinating tale into my text. Yet it deserves to be recorded. Perhaps, once access to the Jung papers has been granted, it may be elevated into a historical fact.



# FREUD

---

*A Life for Our Time*



*PETER GAY*

W · W · NORTON & COMPANY / NEW YORK · LONDON



Copyright © 1988 by Peter Gay

All rights reserved.

Published simultaneously in Canada by Penguin Books Canada

Ltd., 2801 John Street,

Markham, Ontario L3R 1B4

Printed in the United States of America.

---

The text of this book is composed in Avanta, with display type set in Walbaum.

Composition and manufacturing by The Haddon Craftsmen, Inc.

Book design by Antonina Krass.

---

Ornament, depicting Oedipus solving the riddle of the Sphinx, is adapted  
from an ancient Greek vase painting.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gay, Peter, 1923-

Freud: a life for our time / Peter Gay.

p. cm.

Bibliography: p.

Includes index.

1. Freud, Sigmund, 1856-1939. 2. Psychoanalysts—Austria—  
Biography. 3. Psychoanalysis—History. I. Title.

BF173.F85G377 1988

150.19'52—dc19 87-20454

**ISBN 0-393-02517-9**

W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10110  
W. W. Norton & Company Ltd., 37 Great Russell Street, London WC1B 3NU

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0



# CONTENTS

*Preface* · xv

## FOUNDATIONS: 1856–1905

ONE · *A Greed for Knowledge* · 3

FOOD FOR MEMORIES · 4      THE LURE OF RESEARCH · 22      FREUD IN  
LOVE · 37

TWO · *The Theory in the Making* · 55

A NECESSARY FRIEND—AND ENEMY · 55      HYSTERICIS, PROJECTS, AND EM-  
BARRASSMENTS · 69      SELF-ANALYSIS · 87

THREE · *Psychoanalysis* · 103

THE SECRET OF DREAMS · 104      A PSYCHOLOGY FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS · 117  
FROM ROME TO VIENNA: A PROGRESS · 132      A MAP FOR SEX-  
UALITY · 142

## ELABORATIONS: 1902–1915

FOUR · *Sketch of an Embattled Founder* · 153

AT FIFTY · 153      PLEASURES OF THE SENSES · 162      THE WEDNESDAY PSY-  
CHOLOGICAL SOCIETY · 173      THE FOREIGNERS · 179



FIVE · *Psychoanalytic Politics* · 197

JUNG: THE CROWN PRINCE · 197 AMERICAN INTERLUDE · 206 VIENNA  
VERSUS ZURICH · 213 JUNG: THE ENEMY · 225

SIX · *Therapy and Technique* · 244

A PROBLEMATIC DEBUT · 246 TWO CLASSIC LESSONS · 255 IN HIS OWN  
CAUSE: LEONARDO, SCHREBER, FLIESS · 267 IN HIS OWN CAUSE: THE POLI-  
TICS OF THE WOLF MAN · 285 A HANDBOOK FOR TECHNICIANS · 292

SEVEN · *Applications and Implications* · 306

MATTERS OF TASTE · 306 FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIETY · 324 MAPPING  
THE MIND · 335 THE END OF EUROPE · 342

REVISIONS: 1915-1939

EIGHT · *Aggressions* · 361

COMPREHENSIVE AND MOMENTOUS THINGS · 361 UNEASY PEACE · 374  
DEATH: EXPERIENCE AND THEORY · 390 EROS, EGO, AND THEIR ENE-  
MIES · 403

NINE · *Death against Life* · 417

INTIMATIONS OF MORTALITY · 417 ANNA · 428 THE PRICE OF POP-  
ULARITY · 446 VITALITY: THE BERLIN SPIRIT · 459

TEN · *Flickering Lights on Dark Continents* · 470

RANK AND THE CONSEQUENCES · 470 DOCTORS' DILEMMAS · 489  
WOMAN, THE DARK CONTINENT · 501

ELEVEN · *Human Nature at Work* · 523

AGAINST ILLUSIONS · 523 CIVILIZATION: THE HUMAN PREDICAMENT ·  
543 THE UGLY AMERICANS · 553 TROPHIES AND OBITUARIES · 571



T W E L V E . *To Die in Freedom* . 588

THE POLITICS OF DISASTER . 588    DEFIANCE AS IDENTITY . 597    FINIS  
AUSTRIAE . 611    DEATH OF A STOIC . 629

*Abbreviations* . 653

*Notes* . 655

*Bibliographical Essay* . 741

*Acknowledgments* . 781

*Index* . 787

*Photographs follow pages* . 106, 234, 394, 618