Freud, Jung, Klein the fenceless field

Essays on psychoanalysis and analytical psychology

Michael Fordham

Edited by Roger Hobdell

Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details

Freud, Jung, Klein—the fenceless field

Freud, Jung, Klein—the fenceless field

Essays on psychoanalysis and analytical psychology

Michael Fordham

Edited by Roger Hobdell

London and New York

First published 1995
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE
This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any Taylor & Francis or
Routledge's collection of thousands of e-Books please go to
www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.”

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

First published in paperback 1998

Editor’s introduction, editorial matter and selection © 1995 Roger Hobdell;
Introduction to Part I and Chapters 1, 2 and 3 © 1995 Michael Fordham;
Chapter 4 and ‘An appreciation of C.G.Jung’s *Answer to Job’* in Chapter 12
© *British Journal of Medical Psychology;*
‘Review of Jacobson’s *The Self and the Object World’* in Chapter 10
© *International Journal of Psychoanalysis;*
‘A tribute to D.W.Winnicott’ in Chapter 10 © *The Scientific Bulletin of the British Psychoanalytical Society;*
all other papers and reviews © *Journal of Analytical Psychology*

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted
or reproduced or utilized in any form or by an electronic,
mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter
invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any
information storage or retrieval system, without permission
in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0-203-38016-9 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-38633-7 Adobe e-Reader Format
ISBN 0-415-18615-3 (Print Edition)

Contents

	Editor's introduction	vi
	Acknowledgements	vii

Part I Towards a current model

	Introduction to Part I	3
3	Freud, Jung and Klein	6
2	Identification	52
3	The model	58

Part II On analytical psychology

4	The development and status of Jung's researches	67
5	Note on psychological types	88
6	Memories and thoughts about C.G.Jung	93
7	Analytical psychology in England	104
8	The emergence of child analysis	120
9	Neumann and childhood	131

Part III Reviews and short articles

10	Articles on psychoanalysis	152
11	On Donald Meltzer and the Kleinian Development	184
12	On analytical psychologists	203
	A bibliography of the writings of Michael Fordham	224
	Bibliography	233
	Index	239

Editor's introduction

When the essay on Freud, Jung and Klein was first shown to me, the significance and fascination of it was obvious, but equally it was clear that it was not long enough in itself to form a book. Michael Fordham agreed that other papers of his should be collected around the subject to form a coherent whole.

The first part of the book may be seen as the history of that area of analytic thought that led up to his own work. Parts II and III may be seen as amplifying that journey, from the chapter on Jung's researches originally published in 1945, to his 1993 review of Donald Meltzer's *The Claustrum.*

Running through the book is the interdependence of clinical experience and theory. The clinical experience in the analytic setting is a common field that allows theories from whatever school to be tested. The book therefore crosses boundaries not only between the work of Freud and Jung, but also between theorists within those schools.

In the 1930s, the young Michael Fordham visited Jung in Zurich to question him about his understanding of transference, a visit which Fordham has described as a heroic endeavour. After the Second World War, Jung for his part listened critically to Fordham's ideas without being dictatorial or heavy-handed. One of those ideas was Fordham's theory of a primary self that deintegrates and reintegrates. Fordham found Jung receptive by then to the proposition that individuation is a lifelong process, not confined to the second half of life. As the following articles were written at different times, the theory of a primary self is repeated in several places. Rather than edit most of them out, I have left several of the repetitions *in situ* so that the reader may have different ways of approaching this fundamental but complex theory. Through it, Michael Fordham has given analytical psychology a theory of development for infancy and childhood that Jung left open.

R.H.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr Fordham for allowing me such a free hand in selecting the material for this book. My work in editing it is given in gratitude for all that I have learned and benefited from him over a quarter of a century. My thanks are also due to Elizabeth Urban, whose support, clarity of thinking and belief in the book have greatly added to the form it has taken. Thanks too to June Ansell, whose competence and willingness made the preparation of the manuscript so much easier.

R.H.

Part I
Towards a current model

Introduction to Part I

Chapter 1 is based on seminars given to trainees in child analysis sponsored by the Society of Analytical Psychology in London. The seminars are designed to assess the relation between the work of the great pioneers in our discipline to some more recent developments. I will proceed in this way partly out of historical interest but also because these pioneers, starting with Freud, have made evident so much about childhood that any analyst must take into account. I shall not give primary importance to the theoretical or metapsychological considerations, but shall concentrate more on the clinical investigations of Freud, Jung and Klein as a basis for presenting my own and other analytical psychologists' work. This fitted in very well with the student's primary interest, which was of a practical nature. Although Chapters 2 and 3 were not part of the seminars, they have been added here to provide more detail about my current thinking.

I should much have preferred to make the seminars wholly descriptive of clinical work, but regretfully that was not possible since abstract ideas cannot be excluded from observations, nor from analytic experience from which theories are mostly derived. Complementarily, theoretical positions help to structure our observations. In the analytic setting, the relationship between theory and experience is therefore reciprocal. However, my ideal of a clinical, descriptive approach can be approximated to in the cases of Freud and Klein and, to some extent, in my own, but after his early experimental work, most of Jung's publications tended to give only excerpts from his case material and he worked out his line of thought without the patient present. He does, however, assure us that his more abstract constructions have all been tested against his clinical experience.

To emphasize the clinical nature of the seminars, I asked students to study Freud's case material and some relevant aspects of his metapsychology. I shall reflect this procedure here without presenting the texts, but give only the content of Freud's argument which did much to crystallize my own thoughts. The same procedure was followed with respect to Jung, Klein and myself. I would like to add here that the format I adopted took shape after reading Meltzer's book *The Kleinian Development,* because it was sympathetic to what I was attempting to achieve and I thought it desirable to have the view of a psychoanalyst when considering Freud and Klein.

Just as I shall not consider Jung's experimental work in detail as it was at the time, I shall not study Freud's pre-analytical work on hysteria, nor *The Interpretation of Dreams.* In spite of its monumental and impressive nature and its massive information on ego defences and symbolism, it does not contribute to the essential subject of the first part of this book with its emphasis on analytic practice. The omission will to some extent be made up by a study of Freud's analysis of patients' dreams in his case studies. The few points I do wish to make about Jung's and Freud's pre-analytic careers are as follows.

Freud began as a neurophysiologist and researched on aphasia, the use of cocaine, paralyses of children and the histology of the brain. On the basis of this work he was given a grant to research at the Salpetrière Hospital in Paris. There he became fascinated

by Charcot, who was working with hypnosis in his outpatient clinic. It was hysteria that engaged Freud's attention most, and he came back to Vienna to use hypnosis in his treatment of the neuroses. It was in this work that he met Breuer, with whom he combined to publish *Studies on Hysteria.* Nevertheless, Freud became progressively more dissatisfied with hypnosis, but for some time he used forced associations in his practice. He would put his hand on his patient's forehead to compel them to say what was in their minds. There were, however, persisting legacies of hypnotic practices, the use of the couch being the most important; it has lasted to the present day.

In those early days hysteria was considered to be a disease of the brain, and it was only gradually that Freud came to understand the importance of the mind. As he was doing so he developed his thinking about how mental processes could be physical. He did this in his 'Project for a scientific psychology' and in his correspondence with Fliess, both only published posthumously. Freud's early thinking was characteristic of how a neurophysiologist tried to approach mental experience in a period when great advances were being made in knowledge of the nervous system. For example, neurones had been discovered as the units through which nervous action took place, and Freud tried to relate their action to memory. He assumed that certain neurones were changed through their action and did not discharge themselves, as others did, to initiate muscular activity. The ones that could not discharge were stored and became the basis of memory. Freud's thoughts of this kind were never published during his lifetime and were only discovered after his death. He thought badly of them, but many of the ideas he developed at this time, such as cathexis, crop up later in his metapsychology.

The first truly psychoanalytic case study is the 'Fragment from the analysis of a case of hysteria', and that will be the first to be examined shortly.

Jung's introduction to psychoanalysis was by quite a different route. He was the son of a Swiss pastor and had several theologians for uncles. Early on he developed a poor opinion of theology and read widely in philosophy, in which he became knowledgeable whilst still a student (cf. the Zoffingia Lectures). He says that he became a psychiatrist mainly after reading in Kraft-Ebbing's textbook that mental diseases were disorders of the personality. That gave him a psychological perspective from the start. He never engaged in neurological research nor was he interested in the pathology of the brain. On the contrary, he developed the association tests and soon found that his discoveries were illuminated by Freud's investigations and confirmed them. It was that which brought them together. (I shall interlace their studies in the first part of this book.) My own background is closer to Freud than Jung.

Mrs Klein did not study medicine and had no 'scientific' roots: she started off with careful studies of children, at first by simple observation and then by adding the psychoanalytic method.

1
Freud, Jung and Klein

ANALYTIC BEGINNINGS: FREUD AND JUNG

Freud: 'Fragment of an analysis of a case of hysteria' (1905)

Dora's analysis was conducted in 1900 after Freud had completed *The Interpretation of Dreams,* which was the basis for his later work and development. 'Dora', as the case was called, was written as a supplement to that volume and shows us, amongst other things, Freud analysing two dreams of his patient. The case was first written up in 1901 but not published till 1905, which is the version translated in the *Standard Edition* (SE). It appears that the 'Postscript' was written some time after the main body of the text, for it contains a discussion of the transference which Freud does not refer to much in his account of Dora's analysis.

This is the first of the masterly clinical studies to be considered. They are all descriptions of Freud at work and repay reading over and over again. It starts with thoughts about the problem of case presentation and reveals Freud's sensitivity to his patient's feelings. Early on in this first part is an account of how impossible it is to obtain a coherent history of an hysterical patient, so that only at the end of treatment can a more complete account of it be constructed. There are at the beginning deliberate concealments but more gaps due to repression. In other words, the difficulty of history taking is recognized as a symptom. Freud commented that in current accounts of hysterical patients the histories were made coherent—other clinicians had not understood, or had even observed incorrectly. This is only one example of Freud's acute, indeed astonishing, capacity for observation, which converts what others might call theories or speculation into facts. It is this capacity which lends so often to conviction as to the truth of what he says.

Freud remarks that he has not gone into the technique of his work, but I think that it is sufficiently displayed in the account he gives. It is quite clear, for instance, that he has given up the use of forced association derived from the practice of hypnosis: he now lets the patient choose the subject matter to be gone into, a claim which must be thought of in relation to Freud's sophisticated questioning, translations and interpretations, which all influence the direction the analysis takes. None the less, he always records and listens to his patient's response, making his relation to Dora much more of a dialectic than the stern projection screen which pictures how psychoanalysts are supposed to behave. Whether that was ever psychoanalytic procedure I do not know, but it is not so in Dora's case nor in case material which we will examine later.

In spite of Freud's belief that a coherent history cannot be obtained, he gives one in the first section of his essay. I think he can justify the contradiction because much of the material appears to have been given by Dora's father, whom Freud knew and whom he

had treated previously. In addition, I suspect Freud had organized for presentation purposes the material obtained in the early part of the analysis.

Much of the first part of this essay is taken up with the elucidation of Dora's sexual trauma at the age of fourteen through the attention of Herr K. (and its later reinforcement by him at nineteen), with the conflicts of her parents' unhappy marriage and with the love affair of her father with the wife of Herr K. On the second occasion, Dora took violent objection and told her parents about it. It was that which prompted the referral to Freud, for whereas the young girl protested the reality of what she narrated, her father insisted that it was all a fantasy. He hoped that Freud would convince his daughter of what he believed or wanted to believe. In this part the history reveals other important material: when eight years of age Dora suffered from attacks of dyspnoea (shortness of breath); at twelve there were headaches (possibly migrainous) which stopped when she was sixteen, and bouts of nervous coughing. At this age there were changes in her character, aphonia (loss of voice), depression and unsociability. At this time also there was a first consultation with Freud, when treatment was rejected by Dora.

During the first part of her analysis Dora, with Freud's help, reveals more detail about the incidents with Herr K. On the first occasion she was embraced and kissed; Dora rushed away in disgust. That is understood by Freud as disgust at feeling Herr K's erect member combined with clitoral excitement, the subsequent pressure in her chest being a displacement upwards of the excitement felt down below.

Dora for her part shows her perceptive and enquiring intelligence: she understands the use made of illness, especially by her mother, who becomes ill when her husband returns home; she also unravels the facts of her father's love affair. Meltzer says that she was an analyst manquée, and indeed there is no doubt of her 'analytic' capacity for understanding. From his reading of the data, Freud concludes that Dora was denying her love for Herr K. and defended herself against it by retreating into her infantile love for her father—vigorously denied by Dora. And so the dialectic proceeds. As I have already mentioned, the suggestive method has been abandoned with all the authoritative implications. Freud's authority is still evident, but based on his mental grasp of what he is told and his growing experience and his own self-analysis. This change could only have been made by a man of extraordinary courage and genius.

All the material shows us Freud at work with a patient, and I find it especially inspiring because it shows that he had worked out the basis of his method starting from scratch so long ago. It also provides an opportunity to make a further reflection upon it. Freud exerts a large measure of control over the whole proceedings, organizing the important points in his mind and so in some measure controlling the direction in which associations will be or are likely to be productive. He also makes translations and interpretations when they are indicated, but he mostly leaves space for Dora to take her part in it all, including frank rejection of some of Freud's interventions.

I read it all having in mind Jung's idea that associations led to the complexes in the *personal* unconscious. Therefore psychoanalysis did only analyse the *personal* and so the technique in not reaching the *collective* had only limited value. I think that Freud's analysis certainly does reach the collective as well, but his procedure is coherent and, as I have said, really more of a dialectic than simply the flowing of free associations. Therefore the idea, which is really a common reading of what Jung said, cannot be laid at

Freud's door. Reading Dora is deeply impressive and reveals a firmness and flexibility which opens doors and does not close them.

If the association argument cannot be sustained it is necessary to look elsewhere for Jung's meaning. I suggest that he was referring to his own association test through which he discovered the complexes; yet even here his conclusions involved a considerable interpretive skill. In a methodological sense, Freud is much nearer to Jung than is usually appreciated. Their different vertices are expressed in the metapsychological or theoretical formulations, but in each case they grew out of analytic experiences and reflection upon them. Here we shall work with experiences more than theories though these cannot be left altogether out of account. I shall none the less proceed without considering Freud's theory of dreams, which, in any case, I regard as far less important than the use he makes of his *experience* of dreams and the use he makes of the dreams in *relation* to his patient. Eventually, Dora reveals that she has a repetitive dream, and Freud decides to make an 'especially careful investigation of it'. When that is finished Dora brings another one, but before its analysis is complete she terminates the analysis.

The first dream Dora reports runs as follows:

> *A house was on fire. My father was standing beside my bed and woke me up. I dressed quickly. Mother wanted to stop and save her jewel-case: but father said: I refuse to let myself and my two children be burnt for the sake of your jewel-case, and as soon as I was outside I woke up.*
>
> (SE 7:64)

The dream is short but, as the result of Dora's associations which are often in the nature of reflections, the work done on this dream covers twenty-nine pages. I will summarize some of the conclusions. It is rather clear that the house on fire refers to Dora's passion for Herr K. and the protecting role of her father; but it is not immediately clear that it also refers to bed-wetting in childhood and masturbation, both of which are most ingeniously discovered in spite of Dora's initial protest to the contrary. It is reached partly via a projection onto her brother who also wet his bed well into childhood, but another source is available. In the course of much collaboration and frequent objections and questions about Freud's conclusions, the subject of the jewel box is raised, and Freud starkly translates it as the female genital. It is this and Dora's manipulation of a reticule which she possesses that also leads to masturbation, the infantile root to the dream.

The value of the material is, to my mind, that the data were all elicited as a result of Freud's previous clinical experience, and so we witness how Freud made discoveries. His theoretical work grew primarily out of that. I do not regard such data as reversal, displacement, symbolization and projection as more than descriptive terms, in contrast to the notion of the concealed wish fulfilment or the dream as the guardian of sleep. So it is extremely impressive to follow Freud in his breath-taking adventure. But Dora is no passive agent in it all.

After much arduous work, Freud rather suddenly announces that the dream analysis is complete—both the exciting cause and the infantile root have been reached! That is clearly a theoretical conclusion, for Dora disagrees by a further feature: she suffers from a more or less constant smell of smoke and she develops Freud's statement that there is

no smoke without fire: Herr K., her father and Freud were all heavy smokers!

After this, Dora brings a second and longer dream, which is analysed in the same way but there is no point here in going into it deeply except to admire Freud's work on the symbolism of a wood with a man in it, concluding that the image is of defloration.

The analysis of the second dream is nearly completed in two sessions. At the end of the second Freud expresses his satisfaction at the work done to be met with: 'Why, has anything very remarkable come out?'—rather an ominous indication of what is to come.

At the third session of analysing the second dream Dora announces: 'Do you know that I am here for the last time today?' To which Freud replies: 'You know that you are free to stop the treatment at any time. But for today we will go on with our work' (SE 7:105). The analysis reveals that Dora had decided two weeks before to end the treatment on this day (it was 31 December) without telling Freud about her decision. Two weeks was the time also that a servant girl whom Herr K. had molested gave notice of her departure from his house! Thus there is a partial analysis of the transference though it is too late and insufficiently penetrating. Though Dora listens to it all and does, most unusually, not raise objections, it does not alter her decision. 'She said good-bye to me very warmly, with the heartiest wishes for the New Year and—came no more.' The treatment which 'hardly lasted three months' was not in fact quite ended, for fifteen months later she returned to give a follow-up interview in which she records a recurrence of aphonia from which she recovered. Freud deftly discovers that it was caused by seeing Herr K. knocked down by a carriage while he stood in bewilderment at coming across Dora in the street. That event is recorded in Freud's Postscript, in which he reflects on his work with Dora. In it he gives a large amount of space to considering the transference, recognizes his failure to pay sufficient attention to it and describes how he should have detected it much earlier than he did. He even gives details of what he should have said to Dora and when.

I find it astonishing how much Freud knew at this stage in his development, and especially in that he defines the nature of transference with great clarity: he regards it as an 'inevitable necessity…which seems ordained to be the greatest obstacle to psycho-analysis, [but] becomes its most powerful ally, if its presence can be detected each time and explained to the patient' (SE 7:116 and 117). All that was in 1901.

Freud: Three Essays on Sexuality (1905–24)

Dora's case material showed how the psychoanalytic method had rapidly reached an astonishing degree of maturity. One could almost say that, apart from transference analysis, it was in all important respects complete. In addition, it demonstrated the importance of sexuality in the genesis of a hysterical neurosis. By 1905 enough evidence had been accumulated not only from hysteria but from other neuroses as well for Freud to present a theory of sexuality which was to be central to the practice of psychoanalysis. It met with much uninformed criticism. So Freud insists in his Preface to the third edition: 'it must above all be emphasized that the exposition to be found in the following pages is based on every day medical observation; to which the findings of psychoanalytic research should lend additional depth and scientific significance' (SE 14:130). That may be so to those medical men who make such (or any) psychological observations, but the contributions of psychoanalysis are rather considerable and they are not a matter of

'every day observation' but include an understanding of the material obtained only in the analytic setting. In *Three Essays,* Freud collects his conclusions on the nature of sexual manifestations, normal and perverse, but especially on infantile sexuality and the 'importance of sexuality in all human achievements' (SE 14:134). It was to these propositions that so much criticism, incredulity and abuse were directed. Jung joined the critics, but assembled what he thought of as informed criticism on both these central propositions. His criticisms formed an important element in his departure from psychoanalysis.

I shall attempt to give the essentials of Freud's thesis, though I am not sure that it will be as he presented it in 1905. There were six editions, in which changes, small or large, were made except in the fifth and sixth versions. I shall use the final version as printed in the *Standard Edition,* and if some parts of it were added to the first I will endeavour to note them. If my historical account is dubious, it will not be my intention to discuss the subject in great detail since it is best considered in relation to the clinical material to be gone into later.

The three essays are headed 'Sexual aberrations', 'Infantile sexuality' and 'The transformations of puberty'. The first contains material which might be considered accessible to ordinary medical observation. It reviews mainly the previous investigations of others on inverts, the theory of bisexuality, sexually immature persons, dead human bodies and animals as sexual objects. It goes on to review 'Anatomical extensions' of the sexual impulse—that is, the use of lips, mouth, anus and other regions of the body, fetishism, touching and looking, and ends up with a consideration of sadism, masochism and scopophilia and exhibitionism, the last group evoking the concept of component instincts. These instincts do not enter into intimate relations with genital life until later, but are already to be observed in childhood as independent impulses, distinct in the first instance from erotogenic sexual activity (SE 14:192). In all his exposition he relates the perversions to normal sexual behaviour, noting that they are only to be classed as perversions when they replace sexual intercourse between men and women. Thus he assembles evidence from 'everyday medical observation' to introduce his theory of sexuality as an excitation-seeking discharge through a variety of objects and not just the male and female genitals. Whether this part of the essay was meant primarily as a defence against uninformed criticism or not, it is certainly a most effective way to lead on to his psychoanalytical discoveries. In 1905, when Freud's small book was first published, Jung had his reservations but he recognized his insufficient experience of psychoanalysis and, in this early period of his relation with Freud, he defended Freud in a number of scientific papers. So I think we need to be clear about what Freud said even if only to be clear about Jung's objections. The *Three Essays* help to do just that.

In the first essay it appears that Freud's theory of sexual function is simple and is rooted in biochemistry. There is astonishingly no mention of neurophysiology and nothing about neurological reflexes. Chemistry is the source of tensions which build up within the body and seek discharge. For the tension to be relieved the libido needs an object, and what object is chosen is defined by any of those listed in this essay as mentioned above. So far, the investigation does not give any explanation of why the particular object is chosen: is it secondarily sexualized—that is, essentially perverted—or is a primary characteristic of the sexual process to be polymorphous? There is no doubt

that Freud holds to the second proposition since they are to be found in normal people as part of love making: the moderation of pregenital activities being due to the senses of disgust, shame, guilt and aesthetic considerations. The sexual instinct which has the sole aim of relieving tensions by any means available, needs an object: it is the object which can vary. The variability is demonstrated in normal love making and the perversions. I think this reading of Freud makes it clear why he needed to expand the theory of sexuality beyond the field it was previously meant to cover; namely, only sexual intercourse. Besides the study of perversions and normal persons, Freud had extensive evidence from the psychoanalysis of the neuroses, especially hysteria and the obsessional neuroses, in which he discovered the so-called perversions that had become repressed. Once the defences were analysed, the sexual material emerged.

The second essay reveals the infantile sources of the object choice in the perversions and neuroses: they are choices which are natural as part of child development and are organized into the erogenous zones—the mouth, anus and genitals—where the mucous membrane is particularly sensitive and can give rise to the most pleasure and satisfaction. But it is not only these zones which can give pleasure: so, too, can the skin and the muscles. Proprioceptive experience indicates that the internal organs are also able to give pleasure; of the sense organs the eyes are especially significant in this respect. In contrast with mature sexuality, the infant obtains satisfaction from the pleasure which the erogenous zones provide, so it becomes clear that the sexual life of a small child is essentially autoerotic and only becomes object- (that is, person-) seeking when there is a firmer genital organization in the Oedipal complex, which Freud dated to three to four years. There follows a period of latency, when the energies of the sexual impulses 'are diverted, wholly or in greater part, from their sexual use which is diverted to other ends' (SE 14:178), disrupted at adolescence by the maturation of the genital organs. Then genital primacy is gradually established, and its pregenital components take part in fore pleasure and the formation of affectionate feelings.

This somewhat stark account of Freud's thesis does not give credit to the richness of his exposition, which becomes almost beautiful when he considers the mature sexual processes. There is much that I have left out, some of which does not seem relevant, such as the belief that perverts are degenerate, but other features need mention. At this period Freud was quite aware of such features as penis envy, the castration complex and the differences between male and female development. His somewhat strange attitude to female sexuality, in which he seems almost to regard females as inferior males, seeps into the exposition: female children only have a clitoris for masturbation and no vaginal awareness. One other fact may be mentioned: an epistemophilic instinct (the search for knowledge) is recognized. That important idea will be taken up later.

Freud: 'Analysis of a phobia in a five year old boy' (1909)

Having collected information from adult patients, Freud needed to get confirmation for his theory of infantile sexuality. He therefore asked his colleagues and friends to collect information from their own or other children. Hans' father did so, and Freud wrote up his findings. The result is primarily an account of Hans' complex development between about three and five years of age. But the whole essay has an extra interest because Hans

developed a phobia, and his father with Freud's assistance conducted the first psychoanalysis of a child.

The 'Introduction' is an account of Hans' development before he acquired the phobia. He was a lively, attractive, intelligent and openly erotic boy who had close relations with his mother and girls, especially when at the family's holiday resort at Gemunden. There three little girls engaged his affection and he enjoyed being watched whilst urinating in front of them. Returning home he fell in love with another small girl. It was a love which ended: Hans became sad, but not for long. Later he expressed affectionate feelings for a boy in rather a feminine fashion.

Two rather astonishing responses of Hans may be noted. At three and a half he was found by his mother touching his widdler and she threatened him as follows: 'If you do that I shall send for Dr A. to cut off your widdler and then what will you widdle with?' Hans did not seem at all abashed, and replied, 'With my bottom', and there the matter ended. This retort is astonishing, because Hans had an intense interest in widdlers and their sizes, whether in the case of his mother, his father or girls; females, including his mother, all had widdlers as did he himself. His interest expanded to animals as well as humans, to horses, giraffes, monkeys and so on.

An important event was the birth of a baby sister. Hans heard his mother groaning, calling it 'coughing'. He also observed the doctor's bag and vessels filled with blood and water standing about the room where his mother was lying in bed. All that was evidence that 'The stork's coming today for certain'. As for the blood, that was a surprise: 'But blood does not come out of my widdler' he remarked. As to the baby herself he was scornful and jealous of her at first and was suddenly taken ill. In his fever he was heard to say: 'But I don't want a baby sister.' Later on he was pleasingly reconciled to her, becoming affectionate and taking delight in her.

By the end of the introduction Hans appears to have had some doubts in his mind about the stork theory and had begun to Infer a difference between male and female genitalia.

In all this, which I have merely sketched, Freud had already accumu-lated evidence for the existence of infantile sexuality, so that his first objective had been achieved: Hans showed that a real child was a sexual being. But that is only a small part of the story. The second part is lengthier, and starts with Hans developing his phobia.

Its origin is obscure, but the father is inclined to think that his wife overstimulates his son's sexuality with too much tenderness and 'coaxing'. Be that as it may, there is a dream of mother being gone and so there will be nobody to coax with. Hans then develops a fear of going out of the house, explaining that a horse will bite him. That was reported to Freud, and the father then embarked on the (first ever) psychoanalysis of the child. Freud considered that such an event must be a rarity, as indeed it was, for not many fathers could or would do that. Today, we are so used to the idea of child analysis that we are astonished to read that Freud considered that parents are probably the only people who could do it anyway. We are especially surprised because, on the occasion when an interview with Freud took place, Hans immediately develops a transference when Freud interprets the Oedipal situation as exhibited in the behaviour of Hans. Freud started with a boast that he knew before hand that the child would feel as he does. Hans was very impressed and remarks: 'Does the professor talk to God?' (SE 14:48).

As with Anna (Jung's daughter, who will be considered later), the parents presented

adult knowledge as 'the truth'. As with Anna, it is not accepted and sometimes rejected outright. Apart from that, there was a good deal of analytic work done by Hans and his father, mostly on a question-and-answer basis, though the first real improvement came after the interview with Freud, in which he reassured Hans about his ambivalent feelings about his father. Freud showed considerable daring in his speech to Hans, but Hans' father was not without courage also. His lengthy conversations and questioning of Hans were quite penetrating, so that one wonders how Hans could put up with them. A vivid illustration comes from an occasion when Hans came into his parents' bed. He is almost literally cross-examined by both parents independently as to why he did so till in the end he tells a fantasy about two giraffes: a big one and a small one. Hans crumpled up the small one and sits on it defying the big one who 'calls out'. There is a discussion about what Hans might mean, and father comes to the conclusion that it reflects his son's wish to take possession of his mother's genital and defy his father's protest. That conclusion is definite, but it is not clear whether he conveyed his meaning to his son. On the whole he was cautious about interpretation, and that may be why he proceeded so much by question and answer.

At first father is very much the initiator in the work but soon Hans takes the lead. Conclusions are quite often arrived at by Hans: thus he differentiated between his good sense, his fears and some of his irrational beliefs, calling them 'my nonsense', a word suggested by Freud. Hans concluded that his nonsense was due to masturbation which he makes strident efforts to overcome, with, however, only partial success.

The neurosis does not end with Hans overcoming his fear of horses biting. Other fears take their place, such as a fear of horses falling down and kicking their legs, fears of carts, buses and so on. These are worked through and eventually the symptoms disappear and the analysis is terminated. Towards the end of the essay Freud remarks that he learned nothing from the analytic work since the characteristics displayed by Hans were the same as Freud had found in adult patients: it is just a confirmation of his theories. That is true, but it is a sad statement in view of the rich and stimulating nature of the material: we find Hans masturbating, displaying sexual love for his father, displaying castration anxiety (not very convincingly), Oedipal conflicts and an intense searching for knowledge, which is surprising at this early stage. It is called an instinct.

Looked at from Jung's position at this time, which I will develop later, it is possible to see more: Hans' femininity is very apparent (though it is called homosexuality), his struggles to differentiate lying from truth and his developing an inner world with a family and 'his children', some of whom were his friends, others purely imaginary. That was easy to believe in because of the equation of children with faeces and of anal birth—there had been a heated exchange on the subject of whether males as well as women could have children. Freud makes room for this cognitive process, but does not give it equal status with the sexual instinct as Jung does. For these reasons, with hindsight, the account is even richer than Freud makes it seem.

It is interesting to compare Hans' tenacious adherence to the notion that the stork brought babies with a similar supposed conviction of Anna (Jung's daughter). Hans adhered to it long after he had been told the 'truth', but developed it so that it reached out towards the adult truth which he could not digest all at once. Hans conceived of a 'stork box'; in it babies were carried. That box was taken to Gemunden some time before Hanna

was born, and on the basis of that fantasy Hans could contradict his father who maintained that during the period under consideration Hans and Hanna had only been together at Gemunden once. Hans maintained, on the contrary, that they had both been together in the stork box. Once it was established that Hanna was in the box, it was a short step to understand that the stork box was mother with baby Hanna inside her. It was not grasped that Hans' fantasy about what was inside mother was a basis for his inner world of psychic reality.

In this context a lively exchange developed between Hans and his father on the subject of fact and fantasy. Hans' fantasy and thought began to become extravagant, and a vigorous contest evolved, with father becoming the exponent of reality. It is an interesting study of Hans' developing thought processes and his capacity to think. He is not always ready to accept the correctness of his father's case and seldom without a contest. In this episode father takes a dominant role as he tends to do, but as the work proceeds he changes from being the initiator in it all to becoming the follower in Hans' explorations. Hans had previously objected to his father's questioning with 'Can't you let me alone?', but now he pleads for his fantasy as 'a little bit true', and this is not contested.

It is well known that Jung reacted against Freud's sexual theory because it was becoming a dogma. I think that we can begin to see what he meant, for Freud seems unable to enter into Hans' inner world: that would have made following up Hans' interests in his mother's body and what went on inside her, and it is probably Freud's theory that prevents him. At the same time, it was his theory that was largely responsible for stimulating the first child analysis and gave us this beautiful and pioneering picture of one. It is I think a matter of surprise that psychoanalysts did not at once embark on the practice of child analysis as a practical and prophylactic measure. They had to wait for Melanie Klein and Anna Freud for that.

These considerations lead to reflections and thoughts about the place and function of theory. It was the sexual theory and the struggle with sexual drives, together with the psychoanalytic method, which drove Freud on. To have discarded either at this stage would have been impossible. Jung wanted him to produce modifications, but to my mind Freud was correct not to follow him since he did not have the evidence for so doing. Only many years later was he in a position to move nearer Jung, when he modified his sexual theory, substituting Eros for sexuality (Freud 1920).

Jung: 'Psychic conflicts in a child' (1910b (1946))

This delightful essay was first read by Jung to an American audience. It was part of a symposium delivered with Freud at Clark University in 1909, and first published in 1910. It was revised in later editions (1915 and 1938). It is a companion piece to 'Little Hans', to which Jung makes appreciative references from time to time. Probably it was Jung's response to Freud's request that his friends and colleagues collect information about the sexual behaviour of children, and so becomes an example of the pairing of publications which we find repeated on other occasions. In the first edition it is clear that Jung was under Freud's influence, and so there are some psychoanalytic interpretations which are deleted in the third edition. In spite of those alterations in the text, the account of Anna's

development and her relation with her parents remains intact, and it is on that material that my study depends. It is clear that in one respect there is a marked difference from the case of Hans: no analysis of Anna was attempted.

There are interesting Forewords to the second and third editions which show how much Jung had moved away from Freud. Without contradicting the relative truth of the sexual theory, Jung makes it clear that he lays more emphasis on the importance of thought and concept building in Anna's sexual development.

The 'story', as Jung rightly describes it, begins when Anna visits her grandmother and there she holds a conversation about dying. In it Anna develops a rebirth theory: Granny will die and join the angels and then will become a baby. The conception stays firm for some time and combines well with the stork story which she has been told, for the stork can bring the grandmother-baby to mother, a synthesis which occurs later.

After this preliminary episode, the story is taken up when Anna is four and a baby brother is on the way (there has been a previous birth of a younger sister, Sophie, which we are left to believe passed off without conflict). Father, who is known to be Jung himself, introduces Anna to the idea of having a new baby brother: how would she feel about it, he asks her? Anna does not like the idea at all, and replies 'I would kill him'. Jung explains away this violent retort on the basis that the evident wish is not real, and he perseveres in this belief even though the younger sister, much later on, it is true, tries to tip the baby out of the perambulator. Was that an innocent act? Jung does not comment and does not revise his opinion! I think that this is an example of how Jung tends to veer away from the intensity of his children's emotions and therefore to focus on their thought processes.

How intense Anna's emotions were is shown up in her searching for an answer to the question of how you get a baby. Her parents have prevaricated and fobbed her off with the stork story. Anna is not satisfied and concludes that something is being concealed. It is not clear whether it is Jung or Anna who comes up with the idea that there must be something dangerous about it all. Following this there is a recurrence of night fears which Anna, who was four years old, had first exhibited before when one year of age. This time the fears centre on earthquakes and volcanoes, which also become the subject of day-time discourse. A period of intense questioning results, and 'an unnatural craving for knowledge', as Jung calls it, takes place till eventually mother tells her the truth about where babies come from. Anna listens carefully but without surprise, though she reverts to the stork story and one cannot help suspecting that Anna is chiding her mother: you have told me lies before, so now are you going to tell me another? Such a conclusion would help to explain what happened. Fears of earthquakes returned, followed by a fantasy of 'big brother' who does not fall down (in earthquakes houses and people do fall down).

Gradually Anna seems to accept the idea that babies grow inside mother, but there remained the problem of how they get in and how they get out. It is significant that now Anna became noticeably more affectionate with her father, perhaps surmising that he had something to do with it all. Be that as it may, the subject of how babies get out led to oral and then anal theories, that they came out down below seems decided by a dream of Noah's Ark which had a lid underneath through which 'all the little animals fall out'. Thus it seems that Anna has taken a new step forward, for it is suggested that babies not

only grow inside mother but come out through a hole. At one point Anna reached the conscious realization that they come out through the genital, though alternatives are considered, namely, the mouth or anus.

But the question of how they get inside in the first place is not solved yet. Anna toys with the notion that they enter through the mouth. She then becomes preoccupied with the gardener sowing grass seeds, and this must have become related to her earlier idea that father has something to do with it. That subject was broached long ago by her lying on the bed face down. She flailed her legs 'crying out: "Look is that what Papa does?"' It was not, however, till her knowledge increased that the father's part in the matter became of serious import. That came to the surface after a 'standstill' of five months. The new development seems to have begun with the gardener and the surprising question 'How do the eyes grow into the head?' That question was all too much for her mother, who referred her daughter to her father. An animated conversation took place, leading on so clearly to the conclusion that Daddy planted the seed in Mummy that Jung virtually told her that her conclusion was correct, though without giving any more detailed information.

The 'story' ends with an increased interest in boys, erotic wishes for her father and a clear primal scene dream: 'I dreamed I was in the bedroom of Uncle and Auntie. Both of them were in bed. I pulled the bed clothes off Uncle. He lay on his stomach and jogged up and down on it.' It seems surprising to us today that Jung (and Hans' father also) never goes so far as to inform their children as to the part of sexual intercourse in conception.

My brief summary of the 'story' is sufficient for our purposes. It is only possible to get the fascination of it by reading the original text right through. Then I think it is possible to understand why Jung lays so much stress on the cognitive achievement expressed in his idea of concept building. Anna struggles with her thoughts and tentative conclusions, and one is impressed by the violence with which she struggles to arrive at the truth through her thoughts and thinking. Fantasy only plays its part with any force when she retires under the table to make up poems. Jung left her alone—an act of respect for private fantasy and respect for her inner world, by contrast with Hans' father: that was developed in conversation whilst Anna kept hers private. The overriding form of the story and the focus of study is the progress of thought which sexuality, as it were, demands, and Jung came to hold that sexuality was a powerful element in the development of the mind. A difference in emphasis between him and Freud is clearly apparent even though Freud had recognized an epistemophilic instinct.

Freud: 'Notes upon a case of obsessional neurosis' (1909)

This is a long and complex essay, for which Freud almost apologizes since he has left so much out for purposes of discretion. But it is important and is the first psychoanalysis ever published, lasting one year, of an obsessional patient. Freud claims a brilliant result even though much had not been analysed. By this time it appears that there is no further need to gain more evidence for the theory of infantile sexuality, and consequently there is far more learning from experience—Freud is here learning from his patient.

To give an idea of the nature of the case, here are some presenting symptoms communicated in the first interview: something might happen to the people of whom the

patient was very fond, in particular his father and the lady whom he admired; also compulsive impulses to cut his throat and prohibitions often in connection with quite unimportant things. A surprising feature of this first interview is that the patient gives details of his sexual life. On questioning, it transpires that he did so because he knew of Freud's theories.

At the second interview Freud conveys the essential, famous and only rule of the treatment: 'I made him pledge himself to submit to the one and only condition of the treatment—namely to say everything that came into his head, even if it was unpleasant to him, or seemed unimportant or irrelevant or senseless' (SE 10:159). One is immediately struck by the great importance attributed to this instruction. It is a rule that cannot be complied with, but it is through this requirement and failures to comply with it that resistances can be defined, and Freud actively urges his patient to overcome them, with considerable success.

Following the communication of the rule, the patient proceeds to describe the development of an obsessional neurosis when he was about six or seven: then he developed lascivious wishes to see women naked following investigations of the lower part of a governess' body and her genital. He related this to erections of which he complained to his mother and to 'a morbid idea that my parents knew my thoughts…and I had an uncanny feeling, as though something must happen if I thought such things, and as though I must do all sorts of things to prevent it' (SE 10:162). On enquiry, it was revealed that one event that might happen was that his father might die. Thus as a child, there was already a fully developed obsessional neurosis. 'It was a complete obsessional neurosis, wanting in no essential element, at once the nucleus and the prototype of the later disorder' (SE 10:152).

There follows an account of 'The great obsessive fear'. That is most impressive: Freud's persistence is extraordinary, and reveals his great capacity to elucidate a confused and often fragmentary recitation of the activities designed to ward off and protect the patient's mistress and his father (long since dead) from the dreadful punishment that he had learned of during manoeuvres with the army. The punishment that came to obsess him was told by an army captain. It was of a punishment meted out in the East: the criminal was tied up and a pot was placed on his buttocks: inside it were rats who bored into the criminal's anus. That is an expression of the anal sadism which came to be conceived as the libidinal root of the obsessional neuroses.

All this up to now seems to be classed as an elucidation of the neurosis, for the next heading reads 'Initiation into the nature of the treatment', and Freud says: 'The true technique of psychoanalysis requires the physician to suppress his curiosity and leave the patient complete freedom in choosing the order in which topics shall succeed each other during the treatment.' At the fourth session, accordingly, he received the patient with the question: 'And how do you intend to proceed today?' (SE 10:174). There follows an account of the father's death, his self-reproaches at not having been sufficiently attentive and the consequent fantasies which developed. This was a period of great stress during which the patient could not work, and 'the only thing that kept him going at that time had been the consolation given him by his mistress [who had previously helped him] who had always brushed his self-reproaches aside on the grounds that they were grossly exaggerated' (SE 10:75). And Freud continues: 'Hearing this, I took the opportunity of

giving him a first glance at the underlying principles of psycho-analytic treatment' (ibid.). He starts from considering the analytic attitude towards a misalliance between affect and ideational content and defines the aim of the procedure, expounding it in some detail. He insists on the infantile nature of the unconscious and its relative indestructibility, on the relation between love and hate and the need to repress hatred for the persons most loved, and a good deal more in this vein.

These explanations are all made early on in the treatment, and depict Freud indicating the course which the treatment should optimally take. At the same time, the timing of this procedure is interesting, for he seems to build himself into the reassuring account given by the mistress, only the reassurance is far more sophisticated. These excerpts indicate the clarity of Freud's description of what he does. Amongst Jungians, though not, I am glad to say, in the London Society, we still hear the question raised: what do (Jungian) analysts do? I don't think there need be any doubt about how Freud proceeded within the analytic frame. It is striking and interesting that Freud behaved with remarkable humanity with his patient on at least one occasion recorded in his written case notes, when he tells us: 'Dec 28th. He was hungry and was fed.' If he had focused on transference analysis he would not have done that. I mention the incident because it seems that in focusing on the method of psychoanalysis Freud might be conceived as a ruthless person, which he was not: he had great feeling for his patients.

That raises the question of what Freud knew so far about transference and how he related to transference manifestations. He did, of course, know about them and records their existence, but there are other indications which Freud noticed and comments on them in his last, 'Theoretical' part. As to the manifest evidence, of transference in the present case, there is the occasion on which the patient heaped abuse on Freud and his family, towards whom Freud showed remarkable tolerance though it must have been very painful to him. He also records the fantasy of Freud being rich and wanting the patient to marry his daughter; on more than one occasion the patient addressed Freud as 'captain', the officer who was thought to be sadistic. There were dreams that Freud's mother was dead and of his daughter having faeces on her eyes. But I think there is more to be noted if the plunging into sexual material right at the start was due to the patient's knowing of Freud's interest in sexuality and his having looked into one of Freud's books and found references to thoughts like those which persecuted him. It would therefore seem as a transference manifestation that the patient started off with an account of how, as a child, he had sexual relations with a pretty governess, exploring her genitals which he found queer, and how there was also another governess with whom he was allowed to take liberties and who appeared not to think his activities were adequate, thus causing him to mortify himself. These incidents lay at the root of his compulsive wish to see women naked.

Before considering other aspects of the case, there is a sequence worth paying attention to whilst we are studying method. At one point Freud came up against a strong resistance, and no progress could be made. Eventually, he made a speculative construction that as a child the patient had been beaten by his father for some misdemeanour. This led to a fact told to the patient by his mother and corroborated from other sources: he had indeed been beaten for some reason which was not known with certainty, and the patient had turned on his father with a torrent of abuse, to his father's astonishment—he never beat his son

again. That incident was not remembered by the patient, and it was not until he poured out the torrent of abuse on Freud that the way was opened for the further analysis of the rat obsession. This was not a deliberate use of transference as a therapeutic instrument, but we do here find Freud, in effect, discovering that it was.

There can be doubt, however, that at this time Freud was mainly regarding transference as a form of resistance to the work of penetrating into the historical roots of the neurosis. In line with this position, he did not consider counter-transference as important, though here again he noticed it in the mention that there was a doubt about whether or not he had attributed to his patient characteristics of a different patient. Looked at in retrospect, I think we may suspect a counter-transference when Freud started explaining the nature of psychoanalytic treatment. So, mainly disregarding any transference, the work on the obsessions continued apace.

The obsessions were numerous and worked on meticulously by Freud and his patient. I will not go into them all but only make a few remarks on the 'Great obsessive fear' which brought the patient to see Freud.

Just before hearing the story of the rat punishment the patient had lost his pince-nez. He accordingly sent a telegram to his oculist in Vienna, who immediately sent a new pair by post. The package was delivered by the captain who informed the patient that Lieutenant A. had paid 3.80 kronnen for them at the post office. Then the obsessional system got to work. In his mind the command was issued that he repay Lieutenant A. But if he did that he knew that his mistress and his dead father would be submitted to the rat punishment. There follows an elaborate sequence of confused thoughts and actions trying to avoid the consequences of the command. Freud's elucidation is masterly, especially because we have his case notes (published in the *Standard Edition*) to compare with the exposition and they are full of confusions, resistances and so on which it seems quite impossible to unravel: Freud does so. The end of the episode takes place when it is discovered that it was the young lady who had paid the sum and not Lieutenant A. at all!

It was this obsession that led Freud to the anal erotic root of the obsessional neurosis. Study of the complex established the following equations: Rats=worms in his faeces: they are sadistic and cruel and are therefore to be destroyed. They are carriers of disease (syphilitic infection). Therefore rats=penis leads to the idea of anal penetration. Faeces=money, and so association is made to prostitutes who collect money and penises. Next, rats=children. That equation is especially important because the patient is fond of children and the lady of his love is sterile. Next, Freud identified a number of defences characteristic of the disease, comparing them with those of hysteria: first *isolation,* which means that the affect is isolated from the problem, which is conscious. That was especially well illustrated when the exciting cause of the disorder is gone into. Thus it was recognized that he was in a difficult situation in his love life. His mother wished to arrange marriage with a desirable relative who was rich, and moreover, should he follow her wishes he would, when the marriage was agreed to, be invited to join his father-in-law's staff in his business. A successful career was thereby opened up to him. The problem was that he did not wish to marry the lady but his mistress, even though she was sterile owing to an operation which she had been forced to undergo. Now, so long as he did not take his degree he would not have to make up his mind. The neurosis played into his indecision, for it prevented him doing the necessary work to pass his examination. All

that was easy to recognize but its emotional significance was not appreciated.

The second was *undoing*. ‘If the impulse of love achieves any success by displacing itself into some trivial act, the impulse of hostility will soon follow it onto its new ground and once more proceed to undo anything it has done’ (SE 10:243).

There are other significant matters—I will make a list of them: the importance of rationalization and distortion; also primary and secondary defences; beliefs in premonitions and prophetic dreams; the need for uncertainty in life; and the omnipotence of wishes which relates to the patient’s position with regard to death, for Freud states that he ‘constantly makes away with people so as to show heartfelt sympathy for bereaved relatives’.

These matters are discussed in Part Two, headed in 1924 ‘Theoretical’ but before that ‘Some general characteristics of obsessional structures’—a more appropriate title, for there is much generalization but very little theoretical explanation. Freud observes, for instance, that obsessional ideas make use of ‘wishes, temptations, impulses, reflections, doubts, commands or prohibitions…deprived of their affective index’ (SE 10:222). The thought processes reach such a degree of confusion and intensity that the term ‘obsessional deliria’ is proposed. Amongst the defences there is ‘distortion by ellipsis’, in which the affective content is entirely eliminated by an apparently senseless notion. Then there are superstitions especially expressed by coincidences and an especial need for uncertainty and doubt. The omnipotence of thought is given emphasis. Freud also considers the management of death wishes, especially towards those who are loved.

I have already said enough to indicate the richness of this paper but I cannot forbear from mentioning that in it Freud, who was working mainly with his dual-instinct theory (the sexual and ego instincts), develops an idea of parts of the mind: one part is kind, cheerful, sensible and enlightened; a second part is passionate and evil; a third part is superstitious. Is that a beginning of the much later structural theory?

Freud: ‘Psycho-analytic notes on an autobiographic account of a case of paranoia’ (1911)

One might say that if Little Hans was a companion piece to Jung’s Anna, the Schreber case was a companion piece to Jung’s ‘The psychology of dementia praecox’. I think it may be significant that in each case Freud chose a male as his ‘patient’ whilst Jung chose a female, for Freud consistently laid far more emphasis on the father whereas Jung introduced the mother into the centre of his researches, as *The Psychology of the Unconscious* demonstrates convincingly. That did not lead to conflict in 1911, and it is pleasing to find Freud giving warm appreciation to Jung for his researches into dementia praecox.

Another difference between the two: Freud was keener to prove his theories by using the psychoanalytic method than Jung, who was, at first, more content to make discoveries with his association method. The only important theory Jung introduced was that of the complexes. In his study of Schreber’s autobiography Freud does not, however, seek to prove his theory of infantile sexuality, for he has already done that sufficiently: he seems to feel he can now apply what he has developed to the understanding of a paranoid case. That he does richly, using such concepts as frustration, splitting, projection, narcissism

and the ‘inner world’, though the latter is not developed anywhere so effectively as Jung was to do.

The Schreber case is an analysis of an autobiography by a prestigious Senatspräsident in the Oberlandesgericht in Dresden. He had suffered from a less severe neurosis before the paranoid breakdown which is the main subject of Freud’s essay. The first disease was predominantly a hypochondriacal neurosis which required institutional treatment. His physician was a Dr Flechsig, under whose care he made a good recovery and to whom he and his wife subsequently felt much warmth and gratitude. In the case of Dr Schreber, it seems certain that the warmth had a strong homosexual undercurrent.

So much for the introduction of the study, and Freud goes on to describe and discuss the paranoid episode to which the patient made a good adaptation so that he was eventually allowed to leave the hospital and return home. Freud understands the sequence as follows. During the first breakdown Schreber fell in love with Flechsig—a father figure. The recovery depended upon his successful repression of the homosexuality. That continued for eight years, though we hear of thoughts such as ‘it would be nice to become a woman’. There were eventually dreams indicating that his illness had returned. It eventually did so, and a paranoid system gradually developed. Again, there were hypochondriacal elements, but this time they had delusional characteristics: Schreber’s internal organs were systematically destroyed so that any ordinary man would have died but they were miraculously restored by God’s rays. He developed female characteristics for which he was first jeered at and then persecuted.

At first Flechsig was an ally against the persecuting voices, though there were also beautiful and uplifting visions. Both presumably emanated from God, who already was characterized as non-understanding, but he switches over to become God-Flechsig and so allies himself with the enemy—God, who then becomes the primary persecutor. Schreber does not take this lying down and retorts with frequent abuse of the couple. In consequence he becomes ‘a very exceptional person’, one of those to whom God paid attention together with other great men of all time—the persecution being a sign of attention even though it is negative. In his delusion he soon became the only human being alive, since at the height of his illness a world catastrophe took place and all men were destroyed. To account for the visual contradiction of that fact, men are considered to be ‘cursorily improvised’.

The cosmology that is built up may be sketched as follows: God was and continued to be made up only of nerves. It was His rays that created the world and man who was given a body and a soul. On account of that, God showed total inability to understand man, believing, for instance, that Schreber was an idiot, and therefore submitted him to all sorts of ordeals—it was that which caused Schreber to heap abuse on Him. After the Creation, God retired to an immense distance, communicating through occasional miracles and dreams, though exceptional persons had more direct access to Him; Schreber was such a person. Dead human beings, however, were important, and after their souls had been purified they lived in a state of bliss in the ‘Forecourts of Heaven’: thus God replenished Himself from the loss of nerves which He suffered at the Creation. Later, divisions take place in the Godhead. Besides the Forecourts of Heaven there were anterior and posterior realms of the deity which lay behind the Forecourts. A further division of the God had taken in the posterior realm: there was an upper one called

Ahriman and a lower one called Ormuzd. Finally there was a devil not divorced from God so that devil souls were redeemable.

There is one aspect of God's activities to which, surprisingly, Freud pays little attention. It concerns 'sh—ing': Schreber's faeces are moved about inside him, or smeared over his anus by divine miracles, whilst he is prevented from 'sh—ing' by somebody else occupying the lavatory. Schreber, not to be defeated, uses a pail for his purposes and experiences a special sense of voluptuousness. The object of these miracles is to prevent evacuation so that God can establish the final stupidity of His victim—He cannot even do what the animals do. Then God can withdraw His rays.

It was Schreber's mission to be the source of a new Creation. To perform that act he had to become a voluptuous woman—considerable importance was laid on his so being since that would make him desirable to God's rays. Schreber did not want to suffer this transformation nor was it God's intention. It was just the Order of Things which appears as an ultimate power superior even to the Deity, that required it, for the feminization of Schreber was necessary so that he could be impregnated by God's rays and so re-create humanity into the original state of bliss once again. God does not want it that way either, but He needs Schreber's voluptuousness since it is In the Order of Things.

Gradually—it is not clear how—the strength of the delusions wanes and the feminization of Schreber becomes deferred into the future: it gives space for him almost to recognize the cosmology as an inner world giving meaning to his existence. That is not fully recognized, but it becomes so sufficiently for Schreber to adapt himself to everyday life. He took active steps to gain his release from the institution in which he had been incarcerated and he was successful in his aim in spite of considerable opposition. In the case he makes for himself he shows that, though he has delusions and hallucinations, these are part of his spiritual life and do not interfere with his competence to adapt to social reality. How that development took place is obscure, but one is reminded of Hans' struggle to differentiate reality from 'truth'.

Freud's thesis is that the second breakdown was a resurgence of the homosexual component in a persecutory form with a further regression to narcissism to account for the grandiosity. With that one could hardly disagree if one is prepared to accept that feminization is a manifestation of that condition. The ingenuity and strength of the analysis is impressive, and there is evidence of homosexuality in the material, but I do not think that the importance of the castration complex is convincing as a source of the feminization. That seems to demean the feminine component in Schreber and his feminine identifications. Such thinking stands in the way of valuing adequately the anima and the inner world which is recognized but its significance passed over.

Freud's 'Attempt at an interpretation' centres first on the father, and indeed Schreber's own father was a very considerable personality—a famous physician who developed a practice of education sometimes employing mechanical instruments to ensure good bodily posture. These practices would seem to have been both stupid and cruel, but Freud does not seem to have known of them. It was his love and admiration of his father that decides Schreber's transference to Flechsig. An additional element is introduced when Schreber conceives how agreeable it would be to become a woman. Freud takes this as evidence of a castration complex. He persists in this proposition even when the subject of voluptuousness takes a central position in Schreber's relation to God and even when the

delusion develops so that the female Schreber will become the instrument in God's re-creation of the world of humanity. This is surely an example of how Freud's theory of sexuality interferes with the conclusion that masculinity and femininity are components of the personality of which the possession or absence of a penis is an essential aspect. That conclusion appears to derive from pursuing his study of sexuality as a drive seeking satisfaction and finding a spectrum of physical objects towards which it is directed.

It is curious that in his account there is virtually no mention of the mother and so, as we shall see, of an inner world, though Freud did not conceptualize it as such. It is none the less the collapse of that inner world—the fantasy of world catastrophe—which stimulates the delusions of persecution and megalomania. They are an attempt at repairing the damage which, it is important to recognize, is how Freud himself understands them.

In the last section of this essay headed 'Theoretical' there are a number of important reflections. He develops his theory of repression, relating it to that of fixation and the return of the repressed. More important is his conclusion that the cause of the disorder lies in the detachment from reality: the 'altered relation to the world is to be explained entirely or in the main by the loss of libidinal interest' (SE 12:75).

But he is not at all satisfied with his conclusions and makes the astonishing statement:

> It remains for the future to decide whether there is more delusion in my theory than I should like to admit, or there is more truth in Schreber's delusions than other people are as yet prepared to believe.
>
> (SE 12:79)

This work on paranoia was a considerable step forward even though it did not explain why a patient developed that disorder in response to the understandable human problem, as both Freud and Jung recognized. It appears that Freud was prevented from further understanding by his libido theory, and it was on that subject that Jung's critique was largely based. Nevertheless, this classical paper was taken as a final statement by psychoanalysts, so that no further developments of significance took place till Klein. It was not as important as it was made out to be, for it was Jung who did much pioneering work. So let us briefly look at where he had got to at this time.

Jung's major research was published in 1905 as 'The psychology of dementia praecox'. In that essay he reported his extensive researches into the disorder, comparing it with hysteria. His analysis of a chronic case of dementia is especially important because he showed that the fragmentary delusions of grandeur could, with the aid of association tests, all reveal their meaning. It was a great pioneering achievement.

In 1908 he published a relatively short essay, 'The content of the psychoses'. It was revised in its second edition (1914), and combined with another one entitled 'On psychological understanding'. I shall use the 1914 revision (translated in Jung 1916b).

'The content of the psychoses' is especially useful because it gives a number of examples of Jung's approach to and understanding of schizophrenia: he lucidly develops his discovery that the delusions, hallucinations and other manifestation of the disorders are not senseless and the result of brain disease but are understandable manifestations.

There are four main cases that he describes and which I will sketch. The first is of a

cook aged thirty-two who, some years back, had given birth to an illegitimate baby—it had been kept a secret and the baby was adopted. She later became engaged and feared to tell her fiancé about it, so she made herself more attractive by wearing bright-coloured feathers in her Sunday hat; she also started to wear pince-nez when going out for walks with her fiancé since she believed they made her more important. But these were not sufficient and she had all her teeth removed, and thereafter developed the delusion that she had committed a great sin for which God would never forgive her. Nothing would dissuade her from her conviction. Her personality deteriorated and she was admitted to hospital. Jung understands the delusion as a displacement away from the 'crime' of having had her illegitimate child which was thereby finally concealed.

The second case is of a brilliant 'foreign anthropologist' aged thirty to forty, his excellent mind contrasted with his small, deformed body. Whilst a student he had met a female student at the university and had become deeply attached to her. When their training ended the love affair did also, and he plunged himself into research with such intensity that he almost lived the life of a hermit.

His university had been at B, and one day he returned there: he went for a walk in the woods where he had been with his love and, shortly after that, at first became excited and then worked himself up into a frenzy which necessitated his being hospitalized, where he was diagnosed as a schizophrenic. Jung elucidated his disorder: the patient recovered and returned to his previously deeply introverted state.

Six years later he relapsed, became excited, seemed to extol his wonderful muscles and worked himself up into a catatonic state. When he became more accessible, with Jung's help, he gave a remarkable account of his experiences in which, after tremendous battles in which he becomes a leader, victory was achieved and, 'As the victor's prize he gained his loved one. As he drew near her the illness ceased, and he awoke from a long dream.' There was a further relapse, but this time the patient worked through his experiences, maintaining a relationship with reality and so did not need to enter hospital. That achievement was no doubt facilitated by Jung helping him to construct a coherent account of his entry into his inner world.

The third main case is a shortened version of the dressmaker who fell ill in her thirty-ninth year. She had resided in the hospital for twenty years and was a puzzle to the doctors, 'for the absurdity of her delusions, exceeding anything the boldest imagination could devise' (*Collected Works,* 3:173). None the less, with apparently endless patience and much ingenuity Jung made sense of the lot.

There is other case material which, for my present purposes, though quite fascinating, I will not go into but content myself with a general comment. I do not think it necessary to do more than point out what a great revolution had been started by Jung and his colleagues and how much it was appreciated by Freud. There were, however, certain features to which I wish to draw attention. Jung increasingly finds that the basic conflicts of insane persons are general and characteristic of humanity as a whole. He also, in illustration of this, quotes from Nietzsche and draws a parallel with Hauptman's *Hannele,* where he states 'that once again the poet has pointed the way, freely drawing on his own fantasy', and so we may conclude that what the artist and the insane have in common is common also to every human being—a restless creative fantasy which is constantly engaged in smoothing away the hard edges of reality.

Ending this essay he writes:

> we can maintain with complete assurance that in dementia praecox there is no symptom which could be described as psychologically groundless and meaningless. Even the most absurd things are nothing other than symbols for thoughts which are not only understandable in human terms but dwell in every human breast. In insanity we do not discover anything new and unknown; we are looking at the foundations of our own being, the matrix of those vital problems on which we are all engaged.

In this essay there is little discussion of Jung's method of procedure; indeed, apart from the use of association tests which are not relevant to my thesis, he seems to have proceeded as would a very able and perceptive physician inspired by psychological understanding and influenced by Freud.

The companion piece to 'The content of the psychoses' is 'On psychological understanding'. It argues the case for relativization of the causal method and the case for introducing the synthetic method which works with complex structures and only to a limited extent analyses critical or other material. It makes a well-argued case for the essentially comparative method being developed by the Zurich school.

There is only one clinical case arguing for the importance of will-power which I do not find particularly interesting. He is much more convincing when he points to the limits of the causal reductive method by showing how impossible it is to evaluate such major works as Goethe's *Faust* or the Cologne cathedral in terms of their constituent parts—bricks and mortar, for instance. We shall be considering Jung's original departure from psychoanalysis later, so I will not consume further space by considering this essay in more detail.

NARCISSISM: FREUD AND JUNG

We have seen that Freud seems to veer away from giving the inner world a basic reality, as Jung asserted was the case, contributing a theory of psychic reality equal in status with external material reality. Freud, however, was forced by his experience to recognize the existence of an internal world, and he set about developing thoughts about it. These are not difficult to describe but difficult for some Jungians to assimilate for a variety of reasons. Amongst them is that the most important of Jung's discoveries would be classed as derivatives of narcissism if not actually narcissistic in themselves. Furthermore, what psychoanalysts class as narcissistic disorders, not then accessible according to Freud to treatment by psychoanalysis, are understood by analytical psychologists as introversion neuroses sometimes accessible to psychotherapy.

Another difficulty is that narcissism appears to cover the same ground as introversion. It was, indeed, designed by Freud to replace it so that the modification of libido theory, advocated by Jung, need not be introduced. So we find ourselves in the middle of a rather stark conflict so that it is not surprising to find that there is no heading for our subject in Jung's 'Definitions' to be found in *Psychological Types,* and only five references in the *General Index* of the *Collected Works.* In none of his citations does he make much use of

the idea and is indeed dismissive:

> Introversion, if one may so express it, is the 'style' of the East, an habitual and collective attitude, just as extroversion is the 'style' of the West. Introversion is felt here as something abnormal, morbid or otherwise objectionable. Freud identifies it with an autoerotic 'narcissistic' attitude of mind. He shares his negative position with the National Socialist philosophy of Germany, which accuses introversion of being an offence against the community of feeling.
>
> (*Collected Works,* 11:770)

The subject is, I believe, central in Jung's separation from Freud. His discovery of the 'inner world' of archetypes was not brought about by application of libido onto the ego; indeed, over and over again Jung insisted that the archetypal images were not part of the ego but part of the objective psyche from which the ego was to be distinguished and which it was to confront. That had practical application especially in active imagination, when various means—writing, painting, sculpture—were used to objectify material emerging out of the unconscious. One feature of the conflict between the ego and the objective psyche was dangerous: identification with an archetype because it led to inflation, or what would now be called the 'grandiose self'—that would produce a state which is clinically narcissistic. Of course Freud's concept did derive from his study of pathological material as exhibited in the Schreber case especially, though Little Hans can scarcely be classed as pathological in that sense.

The method of studying pathological cases to reveal, in distorted form, what is normal is a well-attested method, but care has to be taken lest the pathological features are not classed as normal, and that is what psychoanalysis is inclined to do if only in its terminology. It may be said that there is not a better one to use and that is often the case, but I suspect that Freud became the victim of his method and that would account, at least to some extent, for his pessimism.

These preliminary reflections open the way to assessing Freud's theory of narcissism. The first article I will now consider is that on Leonardo da Vinci. I find the opening construction of Leonardo refreshing and I think important, for it seems to depict Freud breaking out of his psychopathological orientation and considering a person as a whole. Leonardo was the illegitimate son of a mother who devoted herself exclusively to her son. It was excessive devotion making up for the absence of a husband and, for Leonardo himself, a father. At the age of five his mother acquiesced in the desire of the father and his wife, who were childless, to adopt the illegitimate boy. These conditions, according to Freud, were favourable for the development of Leonardo's genius as an artist and a scientist. Freud expands on the character and the influences that bore upon him, in a beautiful way consistent with his theory. Therefore he can say that Leonardo, whom Freud, on very slender grounds, supposed to have been celibate, 'had merely converted his passion into a thirst for knowledge'.

In the course of his subsequent discourse he goes into the meaning of a 'vulture' fantasy, in which a vulture is held to descend and use its tail to penetrate into the infant Leonardo's mouth. Here Freud interestingly draws on mythology to prove that the vulture is a symbol of the mother—it is unfortunate that the belief that the bird was a vulture is

almost certainly not what Leonardo intended and is due to faults in the texts Freud examined, but that need not deter us here because I only want to draw attention to Freud's use of amplifications, with which we are familiar in Jung's writings.

Another feature of this paper, which is relevant to the Freud-Jung controversy, is Freud's analysis of the two-mother theme found in the picture of 'Madonna and Child with St Anne'. The inspiration for this derives, according to Freud, from the fact of Leonardo having two mothers. It was this view that Jung vigorously attacked in his paper 'The concept of the collective unconscious' many years later (1936), on the grounds that the theme of the two mothers is a world-wide mythological theme, and whether Leonardo had one or two mothers, in reality, was essentially Irrelevant to the creative achievement.

The most important part of the Leonardo paper is, I think, of a different order: the introduction of the concept of narcissism, which we will now consider. There seems no doubt that Leonardo was homosexual, for he collected a number of beautiful boys or young men whom he taught to paint though none of them was especially gifted. He was kind and generous to all of them, even to one who was in effect delinquent and regularly stole from his master. Freud's argument is this: the boys represented himself as a child who had been pampered and indulged by his devoted real mother. He loved those boys as his mother had loved him. That is a very early, if not the first, mention of an idea which Freud was to develop at length and which was to transform the psychoanalytic scene. It will be noted that the self-love is arrived at through an identification with his mother.

Why was this concept so important? Up to the introduction of narciss-ism Freud had been working on the conflict of two instincts, the ego instinct and that of sexuality, though he had found it necessary to introduce a censor to account for the distortion which he believed was an essential part in forming the dream façade. He had tried to account for the delusion and other structures developed by schizophrenic, hypochondriacal and other non-transference psychoses by the libido turning away and detaching itself from reality. That does not seem an especially radical idea, but when he asked the question, if it is not attached to external objects where has it gone?, then a new field opened up, which his essay 'On narcissism: an introduction' reveals. The question was answered by assuming that it was attached to the ego, and from that assumption we are led to the idea of the ego ideal, derived most ingeniously from primary narcissism. Later it became the superego. Thus a structure of the mind began to develop and grow into the tripartite formulation of ego, superego and id (1923). With this transformation all kinds of studies are initiated: there is a beginning of a psychology of love, which strikes me as unduly pessimistic, though relating it to libido distribution is interesting. Then there is a group psychology beginning to emerge, comments on the mechanisms behind philosophy, and so forth. It is a most remarkable development and in line with his libido theory: all these manifestations of mental life are derived from the sexual drives applied to the ego with the aid of sublimation.

There is much of interest in this publication and, for anybody wanting to get a grasp of the origins of Freud's later work, it is essential reading. There is one other element in the wealth of material which is provided, that I would like to note: it is his description of female narcissism. Freud has been much criticized for his attitude and conclusions about the female sex, and I think correctly, but his description of the need for a certain type of woman and perhaps women as a whole, to be loved, seems to me most important.

I have all too briefly extracted from my reading of Freud's works an estimate of the importance to psychoanalysis of the concept of narcissism. In a sense this has not been of any importance to analytical psychologists and till recently they have ignored it. I want to consider, however, whether they were correct to do so. I think that they have lost something by being so dismissive, and I am not at all sure that the revival of the subject, largely due to the work of the psychoanalyst Kohut, has been satisfactory. They seem to have accepted much that does not accord with Jung's thesis in which the self is the whole personality transcending the opposites love and hate, and is as destructive as it is creative. None the less, there is much in it all that facilitates description, and what can be described about the human personality must be accepted and not discarded for theoretical reasons, nor from bigotry.

Freud: 'Mourning and melancholia' (1917)

Freud had worked out the formula that the quantity of libido is constant and therefore, if a quantity of it is missing it was inevitable to seek for the place in which it had become located. In both mourning and melancholia there is a loss. In mourning it is the death of a loved person, but it can be an ideal or, for instance, the loss of one's country but in each case the loss is quite clear. In the case of melancholia the loss is not so easy to identify; sometimes it is a person but it need not be a death and can even be quite mild, like a slight by somebody important to the subject. Sometimes what is lost cannot be determined, but since the syndrome is so like mourning it is possible to infer a loss whose nature is removed to the unconscious.

So how is the syndrome to be described? In both conditions there is a painful dejection, cessation of interest in the outside world, inability to live, inhibition of activity, and self-revilings leading to delusional expectations of punishment (especially in melancholia). There can be a hallucinatory denial of the loved person's death. There can also be sleeplessness and constipation. Finally, in spite of the self-revilings, there is no shame, submissiveness or humility. Indeed, Freud remarks, the picture is more one of self-exposure, though there is no lowering of self-esteem in mourning, whereas in melancholia it is a marked feature of the condition.

Freud's interpretation of the two states is as follows. The libido having lost its loved object turns inward and applies itself to the ego. Then the ego splits or is split. One part becomes identified with the cannibalistically incorporated loved object; the other part becomes formed into a conscience, which takes on cruel and sadistic characteristics. Freud's discovery of the identification is impressive: listening to the revilings of the conscience he shows how some of them are apt but many of them are not and refer to the lost love object, which is why there is no shame or humility. It is not the ego that is being criticized but the lost object that is being reviled for the pain it has caused.

Freud speculates about the way in which what might have been mourning has changed into melancholia. He thinks that the original object is vulnerable because it was in the first place a 'narcissistic object-choice' and, in consequence, the identification promotes a deep regression to primary narcissism (cf. SE 14:249–50). That does not take place in mourning.

There remains the question of how recovery takes place. In mourning it is much more

rapid and comes about through internal work mainly of reviving and reassessing memories and fantasies of the loved object. These are tested against reality, and gradually detachment takes place so that when sufficient work has been completed the libido becomes free to attach itself to a new object. In melancholia that is not the case, and the conscience may become ground into the dust and then triumphed over. A manic alteration follows. That is not, however, a true recovery, and it is not clear how recovery takes place but presumably by a process analogous to that in mourning.

There are other interesting comparisons of these depressed states with those that occur in hysteria and especially in the compulsion neuroses, that we have studied in the 'Rat man', in whom sadism is especially evident.

Reflections

I have spent time on these papers because they are the start of Freud's building up of a structure of the mind—it appears to be a narcissistic product. There is also a much clearer picture of an inner world which needs the pain of the loss to bring it about. Subjects are opened up which are going to be struggled with, especially sadism and masochism: they will eventually lead to a radical revision of libido theory, published in 'Beyond the pleasure principle' (1920) and culminating in 'The ego and the id' (1923).

Freud: 'From the history of an infantile neurosis' (1918/25)

The case was begun in February 1910 and lasted for nearly five years, ending in November 1914. It was not published, however, until 1918; minor revisions were made in 1924 and 1925. I mention these details because the case has features that refer to the differences with Jung, to which I shall refer here and subsequently from time to time. The dates show it was written after Jung had departed from psychoanalysis, with the publication of the *Psychology of the Unconscious* (1912).

Meltzer writes (1978:89): 'The case of the Wolf Man is to my mind the most important case history in the whole of psychoanalytic literature and in all of Freud's works; for the Wolf Man was what might be called an encyclopaedia of psychopathology.' That is indeed the case, for 'the infantile neurosis' contains a phobia, bowel movements characteristic of a perversion (or hysteria?), an obsessional neurosis, depressive features and hints of paranoia, and so on. There is evidence of narcissistic traumata in the Wolf Man's complete breakdown when he returned for further treatment, ten years after the completion of his first analysis. All of these features are carefully analysed and discussed with relation to the patient's sexual life, especially in childhood, the primal scene, castration and anal erotism.

An important innovation is introduced by Freud: he decides on a somewhat dubious action by setting a date for termination of the analysis. That he did because, though the analysis had proceeded quite well, there was no significant change in the patient's condition. Therefore when Freud was sure that the transference was strong enough, he decided to set a date (six months ahead) when the analysis would be terminated. It was an innovation that ran counter to the recommendation that a psychoanalysis should proceed timelessly to match the timelessness of the unconscious processes. The decision was

successful in that it got the analysis going in a way that had not previously been possible. The material used in this essay comes from the last six months. Besides all this there is once again Freud at work with his patient and once again one can admire the persistence, ingenuity and penetration of his labours. To cap it all, there is a follow-up because the patient came back for further analysis.

The centre-piece of the analysis is the work done on the dream of five little white wolves seated passively on a tree.

> *I dreamt that it was night and I was lying in my bed. (My bed stood with its foot toward the window: in front of the window there was a row of old walnut trees, I know it was winter when I had the dream, and night time.) Suddenly the window opened of its own accord, and I was terrified to see that some white wolves were sitting on the big walnut tree in front of the window. There were six or seven of them. The wolves were quite white, and looked more like foxes or sheep-dogs, for they had big tails like foxes and they had their ears pricked like dogs when they pay attention to something. In great terror, evidently of being eaten up by the wolves, I screamed and woke up.*
>
> (SE 17:29)

The associations led to a wolf phobia in childhood. There was a picture book of fairy tales and in it was a picture of a wolf—he was terrified of that picture, and his sister teased him with it by holding it up in front of him. The patient thought the fairy tale in the book with the picture was ‘Little Red Riding-Hood’. Considering that tale, Freud thought there must be another one which would provide more material: the patient produced ‘The wolf and the seven little goats’, which is indeed more suggestive. In what may be thought of as the preliminary part of the analysis there is also a story told him by his grandfather of a wolf getting his tail pulled off by a tailor (a reference to castration).

After collecting more material, Freud introduces his knowledge that the sense of reality in a dream (and our dream had that sense) referred to some real experience. A summary is produced as to how far the ‘provisional analysis’ had got: *‘A real occurrence—dating from a very early period—looking—immobility—sexual problems—castration—his father—something terrible.’* Again Freud brings in his experience to suggest that the immobility covers intense and violent motion. It is a short step to constructing a real scene in which the infant witnesses his parents having sexual intercourse *a tergo* and interrupts the events by passing a stool and screaming. All this occurs at the intermediate age of n + 1.5 years where n is a variable because the dating cannot be decided with precision, the earliest possible date being two and a half. Freud also works out, whatever the date, its influence on the Wolf Man in later years, especially at four years, but subsequently in adult life. It lies at the centre of the ‘infantile neurosis’. That is the first description of the primal scene by Freud, though many years previously Jung had come across it in his first attempt at psychoanalysis in 1906. Freud does not mention that, but he does say that he and others have come across it in other cases.

The section entitled ‘A few discussions’ is interesting historically because here Freud goes into, at some length, a number of issues which bear on scientific thinking at that time. In this section he also considers some of the reasons why he opposed Jung so

vigorously. One argument runs that we must not assume the influence of heredity till all possible features of mental life that have been acquired during the patient's life time have been exhausted. Freud is therefore at great pains to consider all possibilities or a combination of possibilities which could have led to a memory of the primal scene. He concludes that it is not possible to decide whether there were or were not hereditary factors entering into the composition of what became a complex structure. Amongst the possibilities is that the 'memory' is composite: the Wolf Man witnessed the scene when he was two and a half years old but only realized what he had seen when he had his dream at the age of four. Alternatively, it all could be a construction arrived at much later in life involving a regression as an evasion of 'the tasks of life'. That was approximately Jung's position about the infantile neurosis, and in 'The theory of psychoanalysis' (1913) he works out that hypothesis in the case of two children. The essay was written before the case of the Wolf Man was published.

It is not very clear from reading Freud's essay on the Wolf Man why it was so important to consider the above alternatives, but there were two propositions that I surmise were current at the time and may have influenced him. The first asserted that an alternative method which searched for inherited characteristics would result in overlooking important acquired elements which could be more easily altered so that therapeutic possibilities could be missed. It may be remarked here that later on Freud thought that both the Oedipal conflicts and the castration complex contained inherited predispositions, and he also thought it necessary to accept the inheritance of acquired characteristics, which, if not then, was soon to become a discredited proposition. The second concept to be considered was that of the *tabula rasa*—'the blank slate'. It comprised a view of man's mental capacities: they are all learned, because only physical characteristics are inherited, thus providing an impetus to those who wanted to investigate the details of mental development. I assume that because Freud was influenced by both the ideas I have outlined, he insisted on investigating just those facts of a patient's data which lead to more and more elemental data until he hoped to have reached the physical basis of all mental activity. He claimed to have gone far to reach that level only to find there was no adequate theory of instinct to which he could refer. Therefore he constructed his own theory of sexuality and the libido.

Freud's achievement in analysing the primal scene and working out its effects on his patient's development is considerable. It had been known that patients under analytic scrutiny regularly produced evidence of interest in and knowledge of their parent's sexual relations, either in the form of a witnessed event or deduced from a great number of other sources. Furthermore, as we have noted, one of Jung's cases, published in 1905, produced a primal scene, and Freud refers to his having found it in other of his cases but this is the first one in which the material had been worked out so thoroughly.

Freud's procedure was analytic and reductive, as any analytic procedure must be, as was Jung's, when he analysed material in terms of its archetypal foundations. I say this because the epithet 'reductive' has been used to denigrate the psychoanalytic method, especially by many Jungians who seem incapable of appreciating its beauty. But even if the method is not appreciated, we need to recognize that there is another aspect to psychoanalysis which is equally important: it is also a labour of reclamation. Indeed, Freud did compare his work to an archaeologist digging amongst ruins and piecing

together the remains of buildings so as to reconstruct a picture of the building that was once there complete. The case of the Wolf Man illustrates the *synthetic* function of psychoanalysis for, when the work was finished, the patient had lost his neurosis and became a viable person for ten years.

After that time he returned to Freud. He had been a millionaire who had lost all his money in the Russian Revolution and came now to Vienna impoverished. In recognition of the contribution his analysis had made to psychoanalysis, Freud made a collection of money to supplement the meagre earnings of an insurance agent, which the erstwhile millionaire had become. Freud sent him to Ruth Mack Brunswick for further psychoanalysis because of persecutory and hypochondriacal delusions. With her help he negotiated these and returned to normal. Mack Brunswick attributes his accessibility, which would not have been expected, to his analysis with Freud, who was none the less included as a figure in the delusions. A book, *The Wolf-Man and Sigmund Freud* (Gardiner 1972), was published on these developments. It also contains memoirs of the Wolf Man written by himself.

However, to return to Freud's view of Jung's defection. He claims that Jung's methods were faulty and could no longer be called psychoanalysis. In addition, he claimed that there was nothing new in Jung's conceptions. Freud had long since thought of them and placed them in their proper psychoanalytic perspective. Thus Jung's 'developments' were one-sided and for this reason wrong. The main part of the polemic was deputed to his followers: Ferenczi tore *The Psychology of the Unconscious* to pieces, and Abraham did the same for *The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* It is a sad comment on the incapacity of psychoanalysis to assimilate Jung's creative thinking but it was almost inevitable, for Jung challenged too many of Freud's most cherished conceptions and altered the practice of psychoanalysis in significant ways.

JUNG

The Psychology of the Unconscious (1912)

Freud's 'Infantile neurosis' was written in 1914. Where had Jung got to by then? He had come to life with a vengeance. He had completed his momentous *Psychology of the Unconscious* in 1912, later to become *Symbols of Transformation.* Following that he went to the United States and delivered 'The theory of psychoanalysis' (1913). Then there was an apparently fallow period in which he turned inwards. He had studied the myths of the world, but he had no myth of his own: 'So, in the most natural way, I took it upon myself to get to know "my" myth, and I regarded this as the task of tasks' (*Collected Works,* 5:xxv). There followed a 'confrontation' with the unconscious which absorbed him for several years (cf. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*). By 1921, however, he had produced another classical volume, *Psychological Types.* I will include in this group of researches *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* using the much-revised versions. Each has a complex history, but they are taken by Jung as definitive even as late as the *Mysterium Coniunctionis* (1955/ 56).

The single volume, the *Two Essays,* began under different titles: 'New paths in

psychology' (1912) which subsequently became 'The psychology of the unconscious processes' (1917) in a much-revised form, and 'The structure of the unconscious' (1917) which became 'The relations between the ego and the unconscious' (1928) also in a much revised form. The earliest and latest versions of the essays are included in the *Collected Works.* It is a matter for regret that there is no analytical material of the kind that Freud and, as we shall see, Klein also provided. And because of this my exposition of his later researches does not have the same explicit clinical foundation that the other two pioneers provided. Jung reassures us, however, that all his conclusions have been rigorously checked against clinical data:

> My habit in my daily practical work is to confine myself for some time to studying my human material. I then abstract as general a formula as possible from the data collected, obtaining from it a point of view and applying it in my practical work until it has either been confirmed, modified or else abandoned. If it has been confirmed, I publish it as a general view-point without giving the empirical material. I introduce the material amassed in the course of my practice only in the form of example or illustration.
>
> (*Collected Works,* 4:294)

It is a method widely followed by psychoanalysts and sometimes by analytical psychologists ever since.

T*he Psychology of the Unconscious* was written before Jung's own practical 'Confrontation with the unconscious', and so differs from his later publications and the extensive revision of that volume, whose title was changed to *Symbols of Transformation.* By 1912, when it was published, he was openly critical of the libido theory, partly because of its inadequacy in explaining the psychology of dementia praecox and some cases of hysteria, and also because he did not think that the sexual libido could be understood as the source of cultural achievements and spiritual life even with the aid of a theory of sublimation. Further than this there was a subjective element: Jung found the sexualism of Freud's approach unbearably restrictive. Freud, he claimed, was obsessed by the sexual theory and closed to other understanding. Perhaps Jung was right, but I think that, at the time, Freud did not have the data that could alter his 'dogma'. Later he did. His meticulous attention to data and his theoretical ingenuity led him much nearer to Jung with a theory of opposites in the life and death instincts.

Here I think we need to remember that Freud had explicitly stated that the delusions of paraphrenia were attempts at renewing relationships with the external world (see p. 27). Whether he took this daring belief from Jung we do not know, but it was Jung and his Zurich colleagues who found ethnological parallels with the delusions of psychotic patients and subsequently the dreams and fantasies of their patients. Thus Jung introduced a social and cultural dimension into the 'analytic field' without developing it then, but he did so later in introducing his concept of the collective unconscious. The cultural issue was influential in making Jung expand libido theory. His theory rendered sublimation much less important because the unconscious could readily generate symbols which made lines of development not so much predictable as possible. But his most important innovation was to open up a vast imagery emerging from somewhere. He later

called this 'somewhere' the collective unconscious, which is experienced through its organs, the archetypes. Though Jung had not reached that formulation in 1912 it was already implied. At that time it was only clear that he had become fascinated by an unconscious that was not the consequence of repression. Freud had not made room for that, but it was Jung who developed it into a new field of study.

T*he Psychology of the Unconscious,* introducing modifications of psychoanalysis, was written with an emotional drive which made it more difficult to read but more moving than its revision, into which he had injected all his theorizing. References are now made to archetypes, the collective unconscious, the anima, the animus, the wise old man and the self. In this way the book was made more tidy. None the less, the frame of the book remained essentially the same, and I shall be using the revised version, published in the *Collected Works,* as a basis for my remarks.

The text is enormously erudite, containing Jung's extensive researches into myth, legend and religious forms of expression and practices. All of this material he assembles with great skill but in it he employs undirected thought: he accumulates material on one theme and then switches on the basis of analogy to another without enough notice, and one is easily left unable to follow him and more or less bewildered. That need not happen if one understands that Jung is constructing, as it were, a geography of the psyche. He starts off in one country and gets to its border where there is a passage to the next one. You go through it and find yourself in an entirely different environment to which you have to adapt. In doing so you easily forget that the two countries are part of one continent of one world. A psychological geography of this kind is not physical geography for we find Jung collecting analogies from all over the world to elucidate one theme ('country' number one) and then the same method is used to describe a second theme ('country' number two) and so on.

Another feature of the subject matter is its consistent ruthlessness and the absence of real people. It is true that the subject matter is focused on the literary product of a Miss Miller, but she scarcely appears as a person. That fact can be justified by pointing out that this is a book about the unconscious and not about real human beings.

Turning now to some of the imagery, we find a central feature of it all is the importance given to the mother. That is well illustrated by the chapter headings: 'Symbols of the mother and rebirth', 'The battle for deliverance from the mother' and 'The dual mother role'. In these chapters, without doubt, he penetrates behind the Oedipal conflicts and enters into the deeper roots of the conflict: the battle of the hero with the mother. In doing this he touches on pre-Oedipal positions with some certainty; I would particularly mention the good (bliss producing) and the bad (terrible) mother, the theme of overcoming her (manic defence) and evidence of persecution and depression to which Jung attributes a positive value under some circumstances—namely, when a descent into the unconscious is indicated. I wish briefly to draw attention to that interesting if rather too general statement. It does not tell us as much as we would like to hear because depression is more complex than that. It does, however, suggest a sort of premonition of the depressive position as envisaged by Klein many years later.

My idea in picking out of *The Psychology of the Unconscious* a number of central features is to indicate my belief that in this volume Jung is laying the ground-work for much that has been learned since that time.

I cannot leave these reflections without mention of the beautiful chapter, 'The transformation of libido'. I like it especially because it shows that he has not forgotten entirely about early infantile states, and shows how he thinks about them from a developmental perspective. The chapter traces the way in which libido can transform. Starting from oral sucking, the rhythmic activity leads to masturbation. Rhythmic activities then expand to cover bodily openings (the erogenous zones) that become the main centres of 'interest'. Then it is the skin, or special parts of it, and finally rhythmic movements of all kinds expressed in the forms of rubbing, boring, picking and so forth. It is evident that Jung is linking sexuality with what he called 'pre-sexual libido', but the various activities are subsumed under the heading of rhythmic activities which facilitate transformations. For example, fire making depends upon rhythmic activities in which the rhythmic theme participates. Jung then develops the meanings of fire and its symbolism, relating it to sexual (genital) frustration in the Oedipal conflict—that is what I am supposing, although Jung is not so explicit. Another content of this chapter is the association between fire making and speech, but that is too elaborate to enter into here.

T*he Psychology of the Unconscious* marked the end of an epoch. Jung had found the primordial images amongst the psychotic patients and he here expanded them to a basis for normal life. He noted how like these were to the experience of mystics and the records of strange and sometimes heretical texts. He had plunged into the study of myths, legends and religious practices. The writings of Miss Miller had proved a focal point round which all his knowledge could gel. The result: a gigantic work using his version of psychoanalysis—offensive to Freud—as a means of interpretation. At the end of his achievement he retired from psychoanalysis and developed his own position. That began with the intense introversion which led to his 'confrontation with the unconscious' (cf. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*).

Some consideration must now be given to *The Theory of Psychoanalysis.* It is a volume which is critical of Freud's discoveries but mainly by omission or by giving parts of them a different emphasis. For instance, he emphasizes the importance of the actual (or present) situation in the aetiology of a neurosis, and regards the supposedly infantile roots of it as a regressive reaction often to relatively normal infantile states of mind: so he wants to drop the perverse from the phrase 'polymorphous perverse' sexuality of childhood. Further, repression is not given the importance that Freud gave to it, and finally the Oedipus conflict is looked on as a myth. It seems to me that Jung was finding a way of introducing the inner world of man and the non-repressed unconscious. At the end of the volume Jung details the treatment of an eleven-year-old girl, failing at school because of guilt over a 'crush' on a male teacher. The method is confession, questioning, some reassurance and sexual education: it illustrates the method of emphasizing the actual situation in order to counter-act possible regression to the infantile neurosis of which the girl or her parents informed him. The whole procedure is therapeutic but advisedly superficial. During his discussion of the case Jung draws parallels between infantile sexual theories and myths of birth, some well-known, others not so. I shall not consider this volume further because I find it unsatisfactory and I am ambivalent about it, but will proceed to reflect on *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* whose historical development has already been outlined.

The two works show Jung in the process of formulating concisely the viewpoint of

what became known as the Zurich school. Both essays give, I think, the clearest account of Jung's basic concepts that we have, and contain quite extensive clinical extracts from a number of cases.

The first essay has little resemblance to *New Paths in Psychology* except that the first chapter is on the subject of psychoanalysis. The bulk of it is devoted to the subject of types. Subsequent chapters develop his distinction between the personal and the collective unconscious and its archetypal imagery. He also gives an account of how to proceed when personal analysis reaches a layer indicating archetypal imagery. This consists in making plain interpretations upon the subjective plane:

> I call every interpretation that equates the dream images with real objects an Interpretation on the objective level. In contrast to this is the interpretation which refers every part of the dream and all the actors in it back to the dreamer himself. This I call interpretation on the subjective level. Interpretation on the objective level is analytic because it breaks down the dream contents into memory complexes that refer to external situations. Interpretation on the subjective level is synthetic because it detaches the underlying memory-complexes from their external causes, regards them as tendencies or components of the subject, and reunites them with that subject. In this case, therefore, all the contents are treated as symbols for subjective contents.
>
> (*Collected Works,* 7:84)

Once that has become possible, the techniques of amplification and active imagination can be applied.

To elucidate further the change in Jung's procedure we will glance at the study of a case Jung records in his chapter 'The personal and the collective unconscious'. It is of a woman with a father complex who duly develops a father transference which does not resolve itself after she gains insight based on interpretation of it in personal terms—that is, on the objective level. Turning to her dreams Jung found that they contained mainly themes relating to the dreamer herself and 'the person of the doctor' (presumably Jung himself) distorted in 'a remarkable way'. One such dream which particularly impressed Jung was as follows. I will quote it because Jung does so and I agree that it is particularly revealing even though it does not refer overtly to the transference:

> *Her father (who in reality was of small stature) was standing with her on a hill that was covered with wheat-fields. She was quite tiny beside him, and he seemed quite like a giant. He lifted her up from the ground and held her up in his arms like a little child. The wind swept over the wheat-fields, and as the wheat swayed in the wind, he rocked her in his arms.*
>
> (*Collected Works,* 7:132)

Jung says that

> Meanwhile the dreams of this kind continued to disintegrate the person of the doctor and swell him to ever vaster proportions. Concurrently with this there now occurred something which at first only I perceived, and with the utmost

> astonishment, namely, a kind of subterranean undermining of the transference. Her relations with a certain friend deepened perceptibly, not withstanding the fact that consciously she still clung to the transference. So that when the time came for leaving me, it was no catastrophe but a perfectly reasonable parting. I had the privilege of being the only witness during the process of severance. I saw how the transpersonal control-point developed—I cannot call it anything else—*a guiding function*—that step by step gathered to itself all the personal over-valuations; how, with this efflux of energy, it gained influence over the resisting conscious mind without the patient consciously noticing what was happening.
>
> (*Collected Works,* 7:134)

Jung discusses the above material at some length so as to exclude a number of alternative theories. I shall not go into these but only extract the rather beautiful amplification to the wind god: a sort of 'nature-daemon, something like Wotan… "God is spirit" is here translated back into its original form where *pneuma* means "wind": God is the wind, stronger and mightier than man, an invisible breath spirit' (*Collected Works,* 7:135).

It is clear from this essay, I think, that Jung was handling the psychotic-like underlay of the human personality, first in manifestly psychotic patients, then in himself and finally in the kind of patient he attracted. The material could be amplified with ethnological material as he had already done, and thus he initiated access to the psychological study of religion, to history and to the seemingly obscure discipline of alchemy. The example we have studied was found in a dream sequence of which a more extended example is to be found in his book *Psychology and Alchemy.* But there is another source of material resulting from the technique of active imagination which Jung himself had used when he confronted the unconscious in the *Two Essays* (*Collected Works,* 7:222). It is visionary in character.

It was, Jung writes:

> a fantasy of intensely visual character, something which in the language of the ancients would be called a 'vision'. Not a 'vision seen in a dream', but a vision perceived by intense concentration on the background of consciousness, a technique that is perfected only after long practice. Told in her own words, this is what the patient saw:
>
> 'I climbed the mountain and came to a place where I saw seven red stones in front of me, seven on either side, and seven behind me. I stood in the middle of this quadrangle. The stones were flat like steps. I tried to lift the four stones nearest me. In doing so I discovered that these stones were the pedestals of four statues of gods buried upside down in the earth. I dug them up and arranged them about me so that I was standing in the middle of them. Suddenly they leaned towards one another until their heads touched, forming something like a tent over me. I myself fell to the ground and said, "fall upon me if you must! I am tired." Then I saw that beyond, encircling the four gods, a ring of flame had formed. After a time I got up from the ground and overthrew the statues of the gods. Where they fell, four trees shot up. At that blue flames leaped up from the

> ring of fire and began to burn the foliage of the trees. Seeing this I said, "This must stop, I must go into the fire myself so that the leaves shall not be burned." Then I stepped into the fire. The trees vanished and the fiery ring drew together to one immense flame that carried me up from the earth.'
>
> (*Collected Works,* 7:222)

In both these citations Jung is depicted as a passive observer of remarkable material produced by his patients, but I do not think that it was always like that and perhaps it was only when he was learning from patients. Indeed, from what one hears, he was often an extremely active therapist, teaching and making confessions about himself. I believe what he says when he conducted analysis according to Freudian or Adlerian principles, but that was not his unique contribution to the conduct of psychotherapy—it will be noted that almost all the essays in volume sixteen of the *Collected Works* are on psychotherapy; psychoanalysis is classed as one amongst other methods. His own 'method' was presented as a sort of non-method, for he would claim that he aimed not 'to know beforehand', as doctors did, or of 'being unsystematic by intention', both of which are important formulations. But this attitude was somewhat blurred by a more humble statement that he had not found a way of presenting what he did in relation to patients, other than analyse them within the reductive method. He could not yet describe what he was actually doing within the synthetic method. I believe that he could not present it because it seemed so irrational and there was then no apparatus for understanding *action* via the unconscious. Some of his patients bear witness to this, and I believe that Jung was timid about revealing what happened. For instance, he would talk for a whole interview without giving space for the patient to say anything, and afterwards we hear that the patient, upon reflection, would realize that Jung had been talking about his or her conflicts albeit indirectly.

There are other accounts of how Jung would have a vision about his patient which opened up the patient's conflicts, or he would display the most astonishing intuition, which would amaze his patient. If we are to believe him, Jung wanted to bring a measure of order about what he did over and above psychoanalysis. Amplification which he wrote about as a largely intellectual operation was certainly used inside the dialectic procedure which he conducted with his patients, but we are not told how. It appears to be an essentially educative procedure, and many if not all his patients went to his vivid and inspiring seminars on dreams and visions especially. There was certainly an idea that these were partly, at least, designed to influence consciousness, so that it became receptive to unconscious processes, besides their educative aim. I believe that his difficulty In organizing the apparently arbitrary activities which he valued so highly was due to his inability to classify the primitive mode of gaining information when the psychotherapist discovered how to become open to his own and his patients' unconscious processes. Though he sometimes described it, he did not abstract sufficiently to recognize its general significance. Today we have the concept of projective identification, to which I shall refer later.

SOME REFLECTIONS

That is where I stop further consideration of Jung's enormous labours, which have their essential place in the development of analysis in its wider sense. His contribution to the analysis of childhood or real knowledge of children was minimal. Indeed, he actively discouraged the analysis of children, and his case material, except for Anna, comes from latency or pre-adolescents only. It is true, however, that he gave seminars on children's dreams presented to him by members of his seminars on the subject, and they showed that archetypal material could be found in them. That was a welcome confirmation of my own findings when I started conducting psychotherapy with children, but besides that I was looking for an instrument to use in communicating with unconscious processes in small children. That neither Jung nor any of his pupils provided: Melanie Klein did so, and we will consider her method and some of her metapsychological constructions in the next section.

One, and perhaps the main, contribution was to the 'second half of life'. Then Jung thought that the demands of adaptation had been met and patients began to feel at a loss—what next? Jung's answer was that the next demand from the unconscious was that of a serious investigation of the patient's own nature. If that position proved meaningful to the patient, then the process of individuation could take place. Through concentration on dreams and fantasies, especially in the form of active imagination, the patient could initiate a process which led to self-realization. It was a great achievement, in that it led to a deep psychotherapy of an age group which was held to be beyond the reach of psychoanalysis. I recognize that the people he describes could nowadays be considered as suffering from a narcissistic neurosis—that is, people who need achievement to evoke praise (narcissistic supplies), without which their self-esteem is shattered. However, Jung, as we have seen, did not consider that his discoveries could be expressed as merely narcissistic (p. 30–1 *supra*).

MELANIE KLEIN

Melanie Klein: 'Narrative of a child analysis' (1961)

It was Melanie Klein who first listened to small children and developed a method of elucidating their communications. She took play as the equivalent of free association and made 'deep' interpretations right at the start of her psychoanalyses.

Study of *The Narrative of a Child Analysis* (1961) gives a day-to-day account of Mrs Klein analysing the child Richard, aged ten, over a period of four months. There is comparatively little theoretical work, and where it is introduced it is closely related to the analytical material. The result is a detailed account of her method, and her great descriptive capacity makes the analytic process stand out with great clarity.

It is difficult to convey in a short space the brilliance of her interpretative skills, and to someone untrained in her method the effect can, at first, be both bewildering and emotionally disturbing. Fortunately Donald Meltzer (1978) has written a useful

commentary, in which he is admiring and yet critical. That helps to orientate one and see that Klein is not always right.

The *Narrative* is a valuable addition to Klein's *Psychoanalysis of Children,* first published in 1932. I was at the time looking round for help in conducting psychotherapy with children. I thought I found in the children I was treating some of the 'symbolism' she so perceptively described (I am using the term symbolism in a loose way here). That meant that the symbolic life of infants and small children was basically shaped by physical bodily experience combined with their enquiring minds (epistemophilic instinct).

Their enquiries focused especially on what it is like inside parts of their own and their mothers' bodies which are not accessible to direct sensory experience. Some of these could be conjectures arising from visual and auditory observations, but most of them could not. For instance, it is most unlikely that Richard could, as we shall see when studying the case material, infer that mother has four 'daddy penises' inside her, that a good 'light blue mother' could turn into a 'brute mother', made so by having a bad 'Hitler penis' inside her. Then there is the combined object the breast-penis, the combination of parents, upon which Klein rests the greatest importance for future stability and character formation.

The exploration of insides, both of the child's own and his mother's body, is most important, for here is a means for understanding how an infant creates an inner world which really is inner, either inside himself or outside him, but inside his mother. Without this insight the inner world remains obstinately ambiguous, for usually that 'inner world' is not presented as inner at all but is found projected to form what Klein calls the paranoid-schizoid position. I must add here that, apart from the instinctual components of the position, Klein gives great Importance to the infant's desire to know and learn, to which both Freud and Jung had drawn attention before her. It led her to the need for a concept of psychic reality in a very concrete sense.

It is fascinating to experience the way Klein skilfully understands Richard's material, translating it into her own language and explaining how Richard feels and why he does so. She follows the changes in his emotion, which are sometimes extremely rapid, sometimes so condensed that she gives several interpretations of the same symbolic sequence in a single interview. Sometimes that seems to be making approximations, reaching out for the correct interpretation; at others all the interpretations can be relevant owing to the condensation. I think there is a high degree of objectivity in Klein's communications, but it seems much more like Jung's dialectical process with Klein's understanding going along hand in hand with Richard's.

For much of the time there are two languages being talked with periodic acceptance, vigorous objections, corrections or periods of reflection when Richard is thinking about what his analyst says and digesting it. He is explicit that he especially likes thinking, and though he sometimes says he does not want to hear what Mrs Klein says, he none the less does so. Yet many of the interpretations are so long that it may be doubted how much of them Richard really takes in. Klein comments on the writing up that the length is often deceptive because the description does not include Richard's actions whilst she is talking—these presumably interrupting her and making her ideas less coherent and so are delivered in a more piecemeal fashion.

The use of materials is instructive and unusual because at that time, during the war and the consequent evacuation of children and therapists from London to the country, it was necessary to improvise. The room in which the analysis took place was not much like a treatment room: it abutted on other rooms to which there was access, and there were domestic appliances and a large map on the wall which Richard used extensively in his discussions of the progress of the war. There was also a glass door into a garden, and excursions were repeatedly made into it. In addition to the toys provided by Klein (small houses, railway trains and carriages, small figures and animals, and so on), Richard made his own contribution in the form of a fleet containing battleships, cruisers, destroyers and submarines. The fleet represented Richard's 'family' on most occasions that he brought it along.

The analysis was by no means dependent upon the uses to which he put his toys, some of which became damaged and so were tainted with catastrophe and used sparingly, for he was a highly verbal child who gave Mrs Klein a great deal of information about his home life and his feelings about it. He deployed his charm and his deceitfulness to good effect. In addition, he was unduly suspicious, and at one time revealed his conviction that Cook and Bessy were systematically poisoning him—a real paranoid delusion.

The main theme of the earlier part of Richard's analysis centres on the primal scene, at first couched very much in terms of the war and its ebb and flow. It is a complex one in which the penises of good and bad fathers, loving or angry and greedy babies, children and himself participate. But as the analysis proceeds it leads to other areas and reaches deep into Richard's fundamental dependence and helplessness. It is, I think, note-worthy that, though the transference is given much attention, it is not the central feature of analysis where some present-day Kleinian analysts place it. In this account the transference is mentioned but tends to be pushed away from her and identified with his history or his family life.

Richard's first session illustrates Klein's use of so-called deep interpretations to get the analysis going and to foster the transference early on. It also shows how she managed the resistance which they evoke.

Before seeing Richard, Klein collects from Richard's mother a rather detailed history and account of the symptoms for which he has been referred. It is not clear why she does this, for it gives much information which is not used in the analysis or which Richard provides himself. Moreover, it is good technique only to use material provided by the child and not use extraneous information—a rule which Klein does not always follow.

After the two had sat down at the table on which there were some little toys, a writing pad, pencils and chalks, Mrs Klein suggested that he (Richard) knew why he was coming to see her: he had some difficulties with which he wanted help. 'Richard agreed and at once began to talk about his worries' (1961:79). They comprised fears of boys in the street, hatred of school, thoughts about the war, especially the horrible things Hitler did to countries and people. He mentioned especially the Poles and the Austrians—the latter being especially important because he knew Mrs Klein came from that country. He mentions a bomb which fell near poor Cook; she was frightened out of her life and the canaries in their cage must have been frightened too; he was also worried about the insides of himself and others and 'if one stood for a long time on one's head and all the blood flowed down into it, wouldn't one die?'

At this point Mrs Klein intervenes with a question based on information she has obtained from Richard's mother: 'was he not worried about his mother sometimes?'—she had not followed her rule. I think she was correct in aiming to use only the material produced by the child, since, especially when a child is suspicious of the analyst's relation to his parents, it becomes important not to give grounds for the suspicion that his analyst is going behind the child's back and getting information that he wants or needs to conceal. It is especially damaging if the child finds out where his analyst has got the information from.

It is none the less inevitable and necessary for progress that the analyst and parent meet without the child present, and Klein both meets and corresponds with Richard's mother, but she always gives full information as to what the meeting is about and the results from that meeting and Richard can check its accuracy with his mother. Thus she mitigated and prevented what might have become a possibly unwarranted intrusion. Nevertheless, in this case a transference interpretation would have seemed to have been more apt since Mrs Klein was an Austrian and so had been threatened and possibly damaged by Hitler. In this interview Richard had given more information which could be used with relation to his mother since he imagined that there was a nasty tramp who would come in through a window. He might hurt Mummy and would try to kidnap her. However, he, Richard, would bravely go to her aid. It did not occur to him that Daddy might be with Mummy and be able to protect her.

At this point Mrs Klein drew the material together, ending with 'At night he might have been afraid that when his parents went to bed something could happen between them with their genitals which could injure mummy'. At this Richard seemed to listen with mixed feelings and was uncertain about what the word 'genital' meant, and gave his version of conception ending by saying that 'Daddy was very nice, very kind, he would not do anything to Mummy'.

I find it impressive how Mrs Klein manages the resistance. She is by no means daunted but fills out her short interpretation at some length introducing the concept of ambivalence and the splitting of the father image. It appears that Richard accepted the longer interpretation, and the tension that had previously been in the interview was relieved so that Richard 'was very friendly and satisfied when he left Mrs K., and said he was glad to come again next day'. His keenness was further confirmed by his coming early to the next interview (1961:22).

By the end of the first week, Mrs Klein had introduced much more than the primal scene and the 'splitting' of the parent images into good and bad. She demonstrated Richard's omnipotence of thought, which made him think that the bad parents were dangerous in reality so that if he wanted to kill his father or turn him out of bed that would damage his father in reality. There was also a hint of his coprophagic inclinations, his quite severe castration anxieties and his memories of the operation for circumcision when he was told a lie that nothing would happen to him. That introduced his suspicions of grown-ups, leading on to questions about what Mummy had told Mrs Klein when they met before his treatment began. Again she (mistakenly?) gave him information because he doubted her capacity to tell him the truth. In addition, Richard showed interest in Mrs Klein and her family and what she might be secreting inside her. His suspicion was related to his own unreliability and trickiness and what he himself concealed.

There is an example of a primal scene which I found especially valuable in showing the confidence and precision of Mrs Klein's interpretations. At the start of the third session she records: 'Richard was on time. He soon turned to the map and expressed his fears about the British battleships being blockaded in the Mediterranean if Gibraltar were taken by the Germans. They could not get through Suez.' Mrs Klein took this up (after he had developed his fears further), saying: 'he also worried unconsciously about what might happen to Daddy when he put his genital into Mummy. Daddy might not be able to get out of Mummy's inside and be caught there, like the ships in the Mediterranean' (1961:28). That seems to me a good example with which to consider the nature of Mrs Klein's interventions.

The first thing to notice is that they are not so much interpretations as translations into a different language. Secondly, the fantasies about the war are assumed to be signs of the underlying conflict expressed in sexual symbolic imagery contained in the unconscious: they are conceived to be basic elements in infant and child development—the best possible expressions of a child's feelings, thoughts and impulses. Thirdly, she apparently disregards the defence systems which make the projections necessary for Richard; she waits until the defences become intense and then interprets so that they are modified enough to proceed.

And what does Richard make of all this? He is being introduced to a person who talks to him openly about his basic conflicts—that has surely never happened before. It is clear that he appreciates and perhaps likes it, for he would not have been so keen to come to the second interview and subsequently. As she is bypassing defences we would not expect to get direct acceptance, and, indeed, sometimes Richard openly refutes the ideas with which he is confronted: when the matter of possible coprophagic tendencies arose, he 'would do no such thing', then admitting that he 'might have thought of it when he was little'. He sometimes appeared not to be listening to Mrs Klein but occupied himself with his own activities, but when taxed with doing so he was clear that he always listened even if he did not appear to be doing so but from time to time he would assert that he 'did not want to hear such things'. Nevertheless, he is persistently appreciative of the 'work' that he and Klein are doing together and says how much good it is doing him.

As the analysis proceeds it becomes overshadowed by the ending, and both Richard and Klein are acutely distressed by the inevitability of it. Richard thinks hard about whether he could not go up to London with Klein or could not another analyst be found for him? Indeed, he considers the matter in an astonishingly mature fashion. That is, however, only one side of the picture, for there are powerful dependent needs which are not at first grasped by Klein and she continues to interpret in genital and anal terms perhaps because she cannot bear the impending separation. However, that is soon corrected with Richard guiding her to the importance of the breast and the depressive position with which he is struggling.

SOME CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

My extracts cannot give more than the impression of the genius that informed Mrs Klein's work. Close study of almost any session is enriching. I cannot claim to have

made an exhaustive study, but in reading the book several times I have become increasingly impressed by what a strong analogy there is between Jung's more abstract work and hers. I know that such a statement sounds outrageous to many Jungian colleagues, and I have already noted how Jung's work drove him away from analytic work with children into the study of religion and alchemy and analogous material produced by his patients. Jung would never have written in a Kleinian idiom, but I find it striking that, using his comparative methods to study highly complex material, he came to conclusions which can usefully be compared with those of Klein and her co-workers. I consider these comparisons are important because they shed light on my contention that they indicate how the same basic patterns are at work throughout life, expressing themselves in ways appropriate to the age group in which they appear. Therefore I will seek out similar features in their conceptual formulations. In doing this I shall pay scant attention to differences which I believe stem from difference in vertex from which they proceeded.

'Vertex' is a concept I have adopted from Bion, who introduced the idea. It is a term which is deeper and more comprehensive than the phrase 'point of view', in that it includes the emotional and cognitive processes on which a point of view is based. I have applied that proposition in some detail in comparing my own vertex with that of a mystic St John of the Cross under the assumption that both of us were looking basically at the same material (cf. Fordham 1985).

There is one argument which I must consider before I take a glance at the correspondences which influenced me in digesting both authorities. It is claimed that the two are working with quite different material, in that Jung's material is superficial when compared with that studied by Klein, who delves into the depths of the psyche and in consequence is much more profound. This is not the place to enter into that proposition, so I will leave the reader to judge from the material already provided whether such a dismissive proposition is useful or not. Here, then, are the correspondences which impressed me.

Jung	*Klein*
Archetypes	Unconscious phantasies
Concept of an inner world	Concept of an inner world
Concept of psychic reality	Concept of psychic reality
Importance of the symbol for development of personal and cultural life	Symbols as the basis for the development of the mind
The urge for knowledge and spiritual life	The epistemophilic instinct
The ruthlessness of the unconscious	Paranoid-schizoid position
The two mothers, nurturing and terrible	Good and bad breast mothers
Battle with and triumph over the mother	Manic defence
The uniting symbol	The breast-penis
Conjunctio	Primal scene

To develop the analogical method I will now consider one of Richard's dreams. It was told in the eighty-fifth session (1961:430 f.), and there were eight sessions more before the end of the analysis.

> Richard said he had had a dream which was frightening but thrilling at the same time. A few nights before he also had a dream about two people putting their genitals together. He greatly enjoyed reporting the more recent dream and described it vividly and dramatically, sounding sinister at the beginning points, while at the climax his eyes were shining, and happiness and hope were expressed on his face. *He saw Mrs K. standing at the bus stop in the village where the bus leaves for 'Y'. But the bus was going to some other place; in the dream it went to 'Y' only once every fortnight. It passed by without stopping. (Here Richard made vivid noises like the bus passing by.) Richard ran after it to catch it, but the bus had gone. He went after all in a caravan. With him travelled a very happy family. The father and mother were middle-aged; there were quite a lot of children, and all of them were nice. They passed an island. With them also was a very big cat. The first cat bit his dog, but they got on well together. Then the new cat chased their actual cat, but they also got to like each other. This new cat was not an ordinary one but it was very nice. It had teeth like pearls and it was more like a human being.*
>
> M*rs K. asked whether it was more like a man or a woman.*
>
> R*ichard replied it was both like a gentleman and a nice woman. He said the island was on a river. On the bank of the river the sky was quite black, but the people were also black. There were all sorts of creatures, birds, animals, scorpions, all black; and all of them, people and creatures, were quite still. It was terrifying. Richard's face expressed horror and anxiety. Mrs K. asked what the island was like.*
>
> R*ichard said the island was not quite black, but the water and sky around were. There was a patch of green on the island and the sky over the island showed a little blue. The stillness was terrible. Suddenly Richard called out, 'Ahoy there', and at that moment everybody and everything became alive. He had broken the spell. They must have been enchanted. People began to sing; the scorpions and other creatures jumped back into the water, everybody was overjoyed, everything turned light, the sky became all blue.*

After a few questions about what happened to Mrs K at the bus stop the text continues:

> When he [Richard] began to explain the situation in the dream, he started to draw. The picture represented the 'human' cat, Richard's dog, his actual cat, the still black people, the black trees, the island, and the road along which the caravan travelled. While Richard was telling Mrs K. about the people on the island becoming alive, he asked her to pass him the bag with the toys, opened it, and took out of it first of all the electric train. He looked at the two carriages, turned them round and fixed them together. Then he took the swing out and set it going; he put the swing on top of the train and moved the train, took the swing off again and kept on moving it. He put the goods train together with all the

> carriages he could find…. Richard asked whether Mrs K. would not, after all, come to see him and his family in 'Y'. She must come and see the place. He wished she were going with him at least part of the way; then he could show her where he changed buses. Wasn't she coming to see them at all? Why not? It would be nice if she came and also met Daddy. He said this with strong feeling.
>
> Mrs Klein interpreted that the train, to which he had added all the carriages he could find (something he had never done before) meant that Mrs K. and her children became part of his family. This was represented in the dream by the happy family in the caravan with whom he was travelling; it also meant that he had all his loved people in harmony with each other inside him. This included Nurse who had until her marriage been a member of his family. That was why he wanted Mrs K. at least to go as far as the village on the way to 'Y' where Nurse lived so that they could see each other before Mrs K. left for London. In the dream there was a happy united family in one part of his mind—there were the black people and animals, the black scorpions, standing for poisonous 'big job' and genitals. That meant he kept the good and bad people separate from each other in his inside, and felt that Mrs K. too had had such bad people inside her because he had put his 'big job' inside her…. but in his dream he also brought to life all these bad and dead creatures: they became light and the sky became all blue—the light blue Mummy.

After drawing on previous material Mrs K. continues: 'In his play, as often before, the two carriages of the electric train stood for Mummy's breasts, and when the child on the swing was on top of the train, this meant that the baby was being fed.'

It is evident that Jung would never have conducted the analysis of a child's dream as Klein did, but many of her interpretations and methods are in line with his method: not only the analytic understandings but also the many interpretations made on the subjective plane. It is also interesting that Richard, when talking about his dream, began to draw parts of it and also introduced toys to play with, for Jung used both techniques himself and recommended drawing and painting to his patients. With parts of an impressive dream such as Richard's he would add ethnological material in the way I will do now.

The first piece of the dream is concerned with the subject of harmony and he goes along the way to find it. There is one part where there may be a lack of it, but it is of a special kind in that, amongst the predominant blackness there was a patch of green and a little blue in the sky. This state of affairs changes when Richard called out 'Ahoy there'. Now, that brings to mind a Chinese sign of yin and yang, which is depicted as two fishes, one black, the other white, combined together in a unit. In the white fish there is a black eye and in the black fish there is a white eye. The picture depicts the harmony of Tao; when that is established everything falls into place, as happens when Richard calls out. Tao is a representation of the transcendent self: it transcends opposites; for instance, the good and the bad in Richard's case. Is there more that this amplification sheds light on? I think that the journey to 'Y' can now be compared as the way to find Tao, which is itself also called 'the Way'; in addition there is the 'new cat' which has teeth like pearls. I think there is probably some reference to Tao as a pearl, but my own association is to the pearl of great price that is found in alchemy, which was highly developed in China.

Now these associations give great weight to the importance of the dream and account for Richard's feelings of achievement in having brought harmony into nature which has more than personal significance. Hence, his wish to tell everybody about it again indicates its transpersonal significance, though it excites Richard and promotes a vulnerable manic exaltation which soon collapses (1961:432).

Now the transcendent is not something that can be defined, though it can be indirectly indicated in symbols and other forms of expression. I think its action may be indicated when, during the eighty-fourth session, Richard appeared to be deep in thought and then expressed his wish to come up to London and continue his analysis. If he did so, would there be someone who could continue his analysis should Mrs K. be killed? He showed a similarly mature way of talking about his future education (cf. 1961:444).

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 1945: LONDON AND FORDHAM

The period after the Second World War ended was exciting. Jung was being remarkably creative, producing books mostly on religion and his great work on alchemy. There was not much on analytic practice or directly on psychotherapy, though his essay on the transference aimed to make a framework for understanding it as a manifestation of the individuation process. That was important, but it required a considerable knowledge of alchemy and so was difficult to translate into everyday clinical practice. In England the impact of Klein permeated the scene. She also was very productive, especially in promoting child psychoanalysis and opening the way for treating the psychoses. That had been taken up by a number of her followers, amongst the most influential of whom has been Bion. He also did pioneering work on the investigation of groups, which was then developed by a number of investigators, not only psychoanalysts, into a proliferation of group and family therapies.

In addition, some of the psychoanalysts were engaged in applying their knowledge and techniques to a variety of fields; indeed, that had been so before the war, especially in the field of child guidance, whilst after the war they worked in psychiatry and community therapy. Their well-worked-out training still combined psychoanalysis five times a week with the taking of both cases under supervision and seminars. During or after that, modifications in clinical practice would take place—the main exponents of such changes in practice were the members of the Tavistock Clinic.

The position of analytical psychologists was different in that it was much less organized. Training began only after the armistice ended the fighting so that psychiatrists could be released from military service. Training in Jung's methods of dream analysis and the use of active imagination were clear enough. But that meant acquiring considerable knowledge of myth, legend and religious practices so that amplification could be used. There was no analyst who was able to do enough of that. Jung's publications on psychotherapy included, it is true, the application of psychoanalysis and individual (Adlerian) psychology to suitable cases as indicated by Jung's type system, but that was not much used. That may seem quite a comprehensive programme when combined, as it was, with the analysis of the candidate, but the methods used by Jung, and more so by his followers, were not applicable often in the rough and tumble of

everyday psychotherapy when the careful analysis of sexuality and childhood was often needed but neglected. A further element in 'training' as prescribed by Jung and later adopted by the Institute in Zurich was that the 'candidate' was expected to go to two analysts sometimes concurrently and usually not more than twice a week. There was no instruction in the treatment of patients, and because of this the whole idea of training was a sort of non-training in that respect. That idea had a logic: it aimed not to interfere with but to further the individuation of the candidate and prevent the practice of psychotherapy becoming stereotyped—it led to some bizarre practices having little relation to analytic work. Consequently, to become an analyst was a matter of vocation revealed in the course of analysis and especially through dreams and experience of archetypes. Taking patients under supervision, if not proscribed, was frowned upon in the belief that analysis was an essentially private matter and what is revealed in it must be kept private and not revealed to anyone else—here an analogy was drawn from the closed vessel of alchemy.

There was much discussion on these subjects in the newly formed Society of Analytical Psychology. Eventually, many of the ideas and practices I have just outlined were discarded: the candidate's analysis was to be with one person, cases were to be taken under supervision, and seminars on theory were to be conducted weekly over two years. Further than this, whether a candidate was ready to be recognized as a competent analyst was decided by a committee called the Professional Committee. These changes were influenced by the psychoanalyst's training and by increasing recognition of transference, which could not be adequately elucidated if a patient went to two analysts and only attended once or twice a week.

What developed out of this change in the training framework? A great deal of progress was made on the subject of counter-transference. It came to be thought that counter-transference could be considered as part of the dialectical processes that went on between analyst and patient, and Robert Moody (1955) published a delightful paper on how relying on unconscious processes in himself led to a therapeutic process in the child he was treating. Considering processes of this kind led to my defining a syntonic counter-transference in which the analyst introjected unconscious processes which the patient projected into him. I differentiated that process from the counter-transference illusion usually thought of as the counter-transference neurosis. How that distinction was made was quite clear to me at first: it developed from interpreting some of Jung's clinical observations. For instance, in *The Psychology of the Transference* where he writes, 'It is inevitable that the doctor should be influenced by his patient…. He quite literally "takes over" the sufferings of his patient and shares them with him,' and in a footnote he continues:

> I know of cases where, in dealing with borderline schizophrenics, short psychotic attacks were actually 'taken over' and during these moments it happened that the patients were feeling more than ordinarily well. I have even met a case of induced paranoia in a doctor who was analysing a woman patient in the early stages of latent persecution mania.
>
> (*Collected Works,* 16:171–2)

It was that, plus the discussions within the Society, that gave me the idea of syntonic

counter-transference. It was well received. Jung himself praised my work in a preface to my book *New Developments in Analytical Psychology* (1955).

But there was, I suspect, more to it. Some years before I published my material, a psychoanalyst, Paula Heimann, had put forward an almost identical view of counter-transference which became current in psychoanalytic circles. Since some of our members worked with psychoanalysts they would have picked up a version of what they were talking about, thus fertilizing thought in the Society, myself included. If so, it was an interesting indication of the value of dissolving the hard-and-fast barriers which had grown up (with the exception of San Francisco) between Freudian and Jungian discipline in Zurich, New York and Los Angeles.

Then there was the matter of technique. Owing to the belief in the irrationality of the unconscious it was considered by some Jungians a merit not to have technique but to let the psychotherapist develop his own method, or non-method. The result has been curious, as a book edited by Spiegelman (1988) illustrates: a great variety of behaviours developed, many having no relationship to analysis. For my part, I thought it possible to make a contribution which brought some order into this chaos by developing the idea of the positive element in counter-transference. That, I came to understand, was part of the unconscious relation between analyst and patient. A rather continuing set of projections and counter-projections went on, which could be detected if the analyst was open to the patient and he was attentive to these processes. They would form the basis for his more important interventions. Therefore I proposed that at the start of any interview the analyst should empty himself as far as possible of any previous knowledge of his patient. There were precedents for this: Jung thought that an attitude of 'not knowing beforehand' was helpful. Freud had defined free-floating attention, and Bion recommended emptying the mind of knowledge, memory and desire so that emotional engagement could be established. Paying close attention to what went on in any particular interview would, it was hoped, result in an understanding which was not devoid of intellectual contact but which prevented deploying that rigidity which can come from loss of contact with the emotional content between analyst and patient. The process I endeavoured to outline is not easy to achieve but can gradually be acquired. But it is something of an ideal requirement. In any case, however, it checks the analyst 'knowing beforehand' against which the criticisms of 'technique' were directed. In the course of time I used the Kleinian notion of projective identification, which I conceived was in line with Jung's idea of the analytic process being an 'alchemical process', and making it more understandable why he used alchemical analogies to make a framework for understanding the transference dialectic.

Another development in London was an increased interest in children and psychotherapy. A number of analysts were already working in child guidance or in departments devoted to child psychiatry or psychotherapy. But it took many years for a working party to form with the idea of studying what contributions Jungians could make to the variety of disciplines practised in these clinics, let alone starting a training in child analysis, the nature of which may not be defined.

It was in this field that the study of the self was important, for that concept was specifically Jungian and was not conceived as part of the ego. Rather, it was the other way round: the ego was part of the self. I must take the credit for having introduced that

concept into the psychology of childhood and added the notion that individuation started in infancy; it was not only the achievement of later life where Jung had found it operating. I may say that, according to Jolande Jacoby, Jung came over to that view later and considered individuation a process that was continued throughout life. My distinctive contribution, however, goes further. I accepted Jung's notion that there was room for a concept of the self, based on indirect experience, which encompassed the whole person. According to my idea it was outside or before the development of the conscious-unconscious dichotomy, though by what means and how soon it came in relation to the environment-mother was not clear. I assumed a self of that kind in infancy as primary but, since it was heavily loaded with the idea of integration within itself, how could such a relationship come about? I therefore introduced the idea that it deintegrated, and that meant a new and revolutionary concept of the self as a dynamic, psychosomatic system from which development and growth proceeded.

The concept should have led immediately to an intensive investigation of infancy in which the whole personality of the infant and his mother was studied over time, but I had no method to employ. Eventually I heard of the mother-infant observations being conducted at the Tavistock Clinic initiated by Esther Bick and then continued under the direction of Martha Harris. She, at my request, deputed Gianna Henry to initiate the Society of Analytical Psychology into the method. It was done by requiring our trainees in child analysis to conduct observations in the infant's home for one hour once a week for two years. In addition, they were to attend seminars once a week over that period. At last there was a way of studying how real babies and mothers interacted.

The observations were of such a good standard that they seemed more like a research project than part of a training. Moreover, the project was admirably fitted to my conception. The study of infancy had for many years been intensive and voluminous. One thinks of the monumental work of Gessel, whilst Piaget studied his infants out of relation with their mothers. Spitts studied specific characteristics of infants, such as anaclitic depression and many other features with fascinating skill, but they had almost all been conducted with the infant on his own. My conception required study of the infant's capacity to relate to his mother right from the start.

Many of the observations, to my great delight, showed how much an infant was able to contribute to the interactional process between him and his mother. Once again, that had been observed by others, especially Melanie Klein and later such psychologists as Bowze, whilst Bowlby had worked on attachment and loss, but the Tavistock method was unique in describing continuous features over a relatively prolonged period. My conception provided a framework for such observations, and largely because it was so empty it did that very well, whilst the observations provided, as it were, the human flesh to what had previously been a mere skeleton.

There was fierce resistance to this development, mainly from within the SAP, because many cherished ideas about infancy and childhood could no longer be maintained or needed quite drastic modification: the chapter on early development in *Children as Individuals* would have to be almost entirely rewritten because I had constructed it on the basis of speculations derived from current theory and experimental approaches which seemed to fit in with what I wished to say. At first I thought that all current theory as well as the constructions about infancy built up by child analysts, including Melanie Klein,

had to be abandoned. The notion that an infant lived at first in a state of primitive identity or 'participation mystique' was almost useless; that had been modified to talk of a 'state of fusion' between mother and her baby owing to the notion that babies had no boundaries, but this was contradicted inasmuch as so many of the complex actions of an infant showed that he was reacting to an object 'out there'. It did not seem possible to envisage clear-cut states such as the paranoid-schizoid and depressive positions, as many analysts rather inaccurately used Klein's propositions, and so on. The infant seemed much more of a complex whole reacting to his environment in his own individual way. As that was what my own theory presupposed, here was an idea that could begin to orientate me in an apparently devastated theoretical position.

Gradually I came to realize that a completely new theory was not required, and that though much that had been speculated was wrong, much of it could be made use of if the generalizations were dropped and the concepts were taken to be attempts at describing possible and often transitory states of mind of an infant: thus if pure paranoid-schizoid and depressive positions could sometimes be observed, it was much more frequent to find each position mixed up with the other.

In developing my own views I found much in common with Klein. For instance, her idea of positions instead of stages was very much like my idea that growth and development was strongly influenced by the self, especially in its deintegrated form, because the achievement of positions indicated states of mind (rather than feelings clustered around the erogenous zones) which continued and developed throughout life. With some other concepts I was not so happy. For example, though it is true she differentiated normal from pathological splitting I thought some very distressing states of an infant never lost touch with the self as a whole and could thus be reintegrated and not split off.

I have reported developments which took place in the London Society though they may not seem immediately relevant to the interrelation between the researches of Freud, Jung and Klein. Yet they will give some idea of the consequences of reflections about how analysts worked on the rich heritage of which they are the heirs. I also hope that they will be an introduction to the following, more abstract chapters on identification and on 'the model' which I have endeavoured to construct.

2
Identification

When studying the relation between Freud and Jung, paying most attention to their case material, I came across a theoretical contrast which has not, as far as I know, received the attention it deserves. In these days, when Jungians are assimilating psychoanalysis, it is important to know what is being ingested, what is of clinical and what of theoretical importance, how the two interact, what is congruent with our tradition and what is not.

The main texts that I have used are: (1) *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego,* published in 1921, where Freud devotes a whole chapter to the subject; and (2) two important papers in which he developed his ideas previously: 'Leonardo da Vinci' and 'Mourning and melancholia'. I have mainly relied on Jung's 'Definitions' in *Psychological Types* (1923a) and other writings, especially his essays on primitive psychology in volume 10 of the *Collected Works.*

In his *Group Psychology* Freud summarizes:

> identification is the original form of emotional tie with an object [and] …it may arise with any new perception of a common quality shared with some person who is not the subject of the sexual instinct. The more important this common quality is, the more successful may this partial identity become, and it may thus represent the beginning of a new tie.
>
> (1921:107–8)

Here Freud makes it clear that he presupposes two persons or objects between whom the identification takes place and he thinks of it as mainly a constructive process.

That was in 1921, and since then much thought has been given to it by psychoanalysts. Their position on the subject is well stated in *The Language of Psychoanalysis* by Laplanche and Pontalis. They write that identification is the

> Psychological process whereby the subject assimilates an aspect, property or attribute of the other and is transformed wholly or partially, after the model the other provides. It is by means of a series of identifications that the personality is constituted and specified.

That is, I think, implied in Freud's statement, but not explicitly stated. Later on they differentiate two kinds of identification, centripetal or heteropathic, 'where the subject identifies his own self with the other and an idiopathic and centrifugal variety in which the subject identifies the other with himself'. That, they consider, is a better formulation than projective and introjective identification. Why they think so is not at all clear to me, even though they assert that it 'results in an erosion of the psycho-analytic concept of projection'.

Now let us turn to Jung. In his definition of identification (cf. *Psychological Types,* 1923a), he distinguishes, as Freud did also, identification from imitation especially in being an unconscious process. He concedes, with qualifications, that it is a normal process in childhood but is then best considered in terms of identity. That may be why he hardly mentions the subject in either 'The theory of psychoanalysis' (*Collected Works,* 4:9) or 'The significance of the father in the destiny of the individual' (*Collected Works,* 4). He develops his theme as follows:

> Identification always has a purpose, namely, to obtain an advantage, to push aside an obstacle, or to solve a task in a way another individual would.
>
> Identification does not always apply to persons but also to things (e.g., a movement of some kind, a business, etc.) and to psychological functions. The latter kind is, in fact, particularly important. Identification then leads to the formation of a secondary character, the individual identifying with his best developed function to such an extent that he alienates himself very largely or even entirely from his original character with the result that his true individuality falls into the unconscious.
>
> identification can be beneficial so long as the individual cannot get his own way. But when a better possibility presents itself, identification shows its morbid character by becoming just as great a hindrance as it was an unconscious help and support before. It now has a dissociative effect, splitting the individual into two mutually estranged personalities.
>
> (*Collected Works,* 6:440–1)

I think that these quotations are sufficient to show the difference: Freud, following, with a few exceptions, the other current notion that nothing of a mental kind is inherited, builds up the psyche largely out of identifications which can he says at one point undergo transformation; Jung, on the other hand, holds that there is a given inner source (I leave aside the question of its possible hereditary nature) which is much more important to realize through individuation. It is from this vantage point that Jung sees identification as a support for those, especially children, who cannot go the way of individuation but as a positive hindrance to those who can. Freud exalts the process, Jung demotes it. So far it seems quite simple in principle, but the psychoanalysts have recognized and worked on their proposition extensively. It has become understood that identification is related to projection and introjection, which appear to be preliminary processes for an identification to take place, but what of empathy, incorporation and internalization?

All these are concerned essentially with 'others'—that is, external objects which can be identified with. Jung, however, had discovered that there were 'internal' objects, especially archetypes, which he differentiated from the ego and which were just as much objects as objects in the external world. They comprised the objective psyche (cf. Fordham 1951), and with it went the concept of psychic reality. Both of these kinds of identification were derived from experiences in which the ego distinguished itself from the archetypal figures emanating from the unconscious. The ego could identify with these figures (as well as external ones) resulting in an inflation of the ego, usually considered dangerous and liable to result in omnipotent states, sometimes becoming psychotic.

I will now turn to some illuminating things Jung has to say in chapter 7 of *Psychological Types*—'The type problem in aesthetics'. There he differentiates the abstracting from the empathic type. The former projects his 'potent and dangerous objects' into the world whilst the latter does the opposite:

> his life is empathized into the object, he himself gets into the object because the empathized content is an essential part of himself. He becomes the object. He identifies himself with it and in this way gets outside himself. By turning himself into an object he desubjectivizes himself.
>
> (1923a:197)

That is surely a description of projective identification as we now know it.

He did not use that term, but he implied it in his notion of *participation mystique* or *identity* to which he gave far more importance than identification as a mode of functioning. Furthermore, he chose alchemy to investigate—a discipline in which extensive projections took place. He emphasized its positive characteristics in providing a philosophy which Dorn discerned and which could grow, in Jung's hands, into the raw material for a psychology of individuation. He did not pay attention to the other important fount of knowledge: alchemy also provided a basis from which chemistry could develop. Indeed, alchemy lay at the root of chemistry. With this consideration in mind, it has occurred to me that the frequent assertion that the philosopher's stone was *'non aurum vulgi'* may have meant to refer to the beautiful alloys that they made out of (for instance) copper and aluminium. That would account for their convic-tion that they could make a gold in their retorts which had not been dug out of the ground *(aurum vulgi).* Thus alchemy provided information about the external object as well as the inner world of 'philosophy'. According to some, especially Bion and Rosenfeld, there is a positive feature of projective identification which does just that too.

IDENTITY

Whilst Freud regards identification as the most primitive form of relating, Jung has a special term involving a different idea of the primitive condition: 'identity'.

> Psychological identity presupposes that it is unconscious. It is a characteristic of the primitive mentality and the real foundation of *participation mystique* (q.v.) which is nothing but a relic of the original non-differentiation of subject and object and hence of the primordial unconscious state. It is also a characteristic of the mental state of early infancy and finally of the unconscious of the civilised adult…. Identity with the parents provides the basis for subsequent *identification* (q.v.) with them; on it also depends the possibility of *projection* (q.v.) and *introjection* (q.v.).
>
> (1923a:441)

Here Jung makes an important distinction, and seems to recognize the significance of identification by children with their parents. It will be noted that he does not consider

projective identification, and thinks of identity as a basic property of unconscious functioning in which there is no, or an inadequate, boundary between subject and object. It is not clear on what this proposition is founded and I do not think it can be generalized in relation to children or infants, as recent researches have shown. My own views on the primal self would suppose that such a state, if it exists, must develop and be periodic.

It would appear that the state of identity could be produced by projective identification. Whether that is so depends on how much the infant psyche is structured and if it is enough for such a complex process to take place. According to my self theory it would be possible because the self has boundaries and potential structure, though not conscious to the infant. According to Jung’s theory of the ego, it would not be possible because there is in childhood no organized ego to form well-defined boundaries. Only in his later years did he recognize that individuation was a lifelong process which presupposes that the self is active in childhood.

Turning back to Freud, he seems at first sight to be close to Jung when he asserts, speculatively, ‘identification is the original form of emotional tie with an object’, though he presupposes two persons or objects between whom the identification takes place and does not, like Jung, postulate a primary state of non-differentiation, though other psychoanalysts have done so. Furthermore, he has a more positive view of identification than Jung, though he considers that it may act ‘in a regressive way [to become] a substitute for a libidinal object-tie’ (SE 12:108), referring in a more qualified way to Jung’s negative view of it.

There is a similar difference in the two men’s attitude to group psychology, which I may characterize by saying that the members of a group identify with one another (Freud) or evoke a state of identity (Jung).

There has been considerable controversy, especially amongst psychoanalysts, over the question of how early an infant can distinguish the difference between two objects so that introjections, projections and identifications could take place. It was Bick who, as the result of her studies of infants, concluded that there was a primary identity of subject and object, but that soon the infant discovered the skin and that made an interface and a space both inside and outside in which the mechanisms under consideration could operate. Should the experience of the skin be inadequate, the pathological condition of adhesive identification arises. That was an important proposition, for it suggests that there was a place for Jung’s condition of identity before the more sophisticated processes developed. I should add that theoretically, if the idea of the primary self be correct, the self contributes to infant experience of organizing the emotional and perceptive data to which Bick refers, and possibly Freud also when he refers to an identification being transformed.

Something more needs to be said about projective identification. It is theoretically convenient to assume that the mechanism arises out of states of identity in the first place. But the concept of the primary self involves boundaries to the self, and deintegration would have to take place before undifferentiation of subject and object could take place. Bick’s proposition arose out of infant observation, but other observations tend to show that an infant has much more capacity to relate to objects separate from the self than had previously been thought possible.

A CLINICAL REFLECTION

Does the above analysis relate to further clinical insights? I believe it does, especially as the analysis has grown out of clinical experience and not just the study of Jung and Freud. There is not much difficulty in detecting identifications In the simpler way in which they were first described: for instance, when two people are close together in marriage they tend to become like each other; in childhood, children can resemble their parents; or a patient can identify with his or her analyst. But there are other occasions in which projective identification may be assumed when it seems necessary for the analyst to carry or contain the projection, when insight cannot be reached over prolonged periods, even though the analyst, or sometimes the patient, is penetrated by the other. Is that not when the analysis is reaching down to states of identity? Then it is not so much a matter of resolving the condition by interpretation as getting it recognized and taken into account.

One male patient of mine had been working on the way he felt trapped in himself and could not get out into the world. There was a sequence of dreams of making journeys to countries far away, some of which were dominated by dictators. Then the theme became nearer home and he was escaping from a dictator, especially Saddam Hussein. There was some progress in the theme till he dreamed that he went to Russia and embraced Gorbachev, that was after the attempted *coup.* As usual, he could not see any point in his dream, even though he recognized that Gorbachev had liberated the Russians from the communist dictatorship—'but that is far away from my state here', he said. Interpretations of Gorbachev as myself and his love of me which he had recognized did not go further than tentative recognition, and he more frequently expressed appreciation of and gratitude for my capacity to survive his annihilating attacks on 'analysis' over the years—he could not imagine how I did it. (The envy in this was important and not to be overlooked.)

I had approached the question of whether 'analysis' itself was not a claustrum in which he was trapped and could not get out of and which made him regress in ways that alienated him from his environment. He saw this but could not make use of it. Pursuing this idea we reconsidered previous analysis of his very traumatized early childhood and infancy, and speculated about his intra-uterine life as a metaphor for the claustrum, which was best represented at one time in a dream of being in prison hearing the screams of prisoners being tortured and a terrible eye looking in at him through a spy-hole in the door. Then, shortly after the dream of Gorbachev, there was a whole session of silence in which neither he nor I said anything—he had gone out looking sheepish. In the next session he told me that he had woken up in that night, later amended to 'in the evening', and written down a criticism of my paper 'Defences of the self which he had always appreciated. I believe this is especially significant, because he wrote it down during a period of the day when contemplating the unproductive day-time. He made an effort to make sense of it, but all that happened was that either ideas raced through his mind at such a rate that he could not remember them or there were something like fragments of ideas of no particular value anyway so he did not tell me about them. I concluded that in the silent interview he was near to bringing his state (trying to make sense but being

unproductive) into relation with me.

His criticism centred on how I did not acknowledge my omnipotence and assumption that I was right and that I did not acknowledge the correctness of my patient's insight into me. He linked this up with the lie (my word) which analysts promulgated that their work was always therapeutic and that they were only interested in the patient's 'inner world' especially as invented by analysts, and not his environment. There was no connection with the Gorbachev dream, though I thought it rather obvious, but his hard analytic thinking was cogent, though not a fair account. He ended up with the final statement: 'I do not know', a recurrent phrase in his work (obsessional undoing), but his thinking was a considerable achievement.

Now a recurrent theme had been that, though he often appreciated my efforts, he consistently claimed that they did nothing to alleviate his basic struggle which gave rise to so much pain, suffering and despair—none the less the intensity of his pain was much reduced by the time of his dream.

I am deliberately compressing what was really an immensely complex situation because I want to make the following point: though I had a very good idea of what it was all about and was able to provide some understanding of material brought to any particular session, I did not understand basically why I could not address his basic pain. In effect, my understanding was unproductive. It only became clear when I grasped that the problem centred at the level in which identity was active and so we were in an area in which understanding or insight in the ordinary sense of the word did not operate effectively. We were in fact in a state where consciousness (and unconsciousness) were not relevant. I think Jung may have been referring to this when he writes 'Doctor and patient thus find themselves in a relationship founded on mutual unconsciousness' (*Collected Works,* 16:176), though he explains this as the consequence of unconscious interactions resulting from the archetypal transference: 'The patient by bringing an active unconscious content to bear upon the doctor, constellates the corresponding unconscious material in him, owing to the inductive effect which always emanates from projections in greater or lesser degree' (ibid.). That, if my proposition be correct, would be a more structured proposition than is appropriate. That understanding would lead into the *mundus imaginalis* and bypass the state of identity on which I am claiming it is based.

I believe that my conveying to the patient my sense of inability to address his pain had an effect. It would go far to check his unconscious belief that I believed myself to be omnipotent. I had expressed my inability in a different way in my silence than heretofore so that my communication was not made so much with my analytic mind as with emotional conviction.

3
The model

I will attempt now to outline a possible model to represent my current thinking. I have tended to resist model building on the grounds of there being insufficient evidence to build on and too many inadequate models already which have the disagreeable tendency to become dogmatized or made use of for purposes of propaganda.

Since the evidence from mother-infant observation has accumulated I have felt differently, but I do not think I am able to present a coherent statement and I regard what I shall say as notes for beginning to construct a model. It may be said that I have already defined a model using Jung's concepts of the ego, the archetypes and the self. Reading through that now, there is not much that I would go back on, but I was then, and continue to be, aware that it needed filling out, and that may now be possible.

I should state once again why I found Klein's work especially helpful. It was not only that she adopted the concept of unconscious phantasy, not only the facts of experience which she discovered, not only how she invented a method of analysing children, but also that she introduced the idea of 'positions'. In doing that she recognized that the patterns attained in infancy and childhood were not just states to be left behind and superseded by more mature structures, but were meaningful patterns which could themselves mature and form the basis for experiences throughout the life of an individual (Klein 1957).

Now, that is a concept which not only fits in with the idea of maturation but is also in line with Jung's thinking about meaning and the importance of ongoing processes outlined in his concept of individuation.

I will now consider the ideas which I first introduced in 1947. The first of these, which causes difficulty to others as well as to myself, is that of primal self. At first I called it 'the original self', but the self is, by definition, always original in that it represents the basic nature of the individual, and what I was seeking to define was the primary state of the self. When I did so I had to recognize that it cannot be experienced—it has no features that can be experienced; but like DNA it unfolds when brought into relation with a suitable environment, producing matter which can be perceived and experienced emotionally and mentally—the two classes of experience are not to be separated in the first place. It is from these subjective and objective data that the self is inferred; I conceived it to be a psychosomatic entity containing within it the inherited potential for forming the experience of a body and a psyche. This entity is bounded at first by a cell membrane and later by a skin. I have further postulated, rather daringly, that it is completely self-contained in the same sense as the fertilized ovum is contained, but that in response to environmental conditions it responds in predetermined ways. This idea is derived from Jung, who laid emphasis on the self as an integrate. I transferred this to the primary self and assumed that such an integrate had no significant relation to the environment and that it was indestructible, since it had no characteristics to destroy,

although some forms of contraception do by preventing the fertilized ovum from being planted in the uterus.

The idea of deintegration grew out of the fact that the self comes into relation with the environmental mother and so a part of the self must react and act: it must deintegrate.

While the concept of the primary self roused scepticism, that of deintegration was taken on without its implication being grasped. That the self could play a part in forming the archetypes and the ego seemed not so difficult as that it also took a part in forming the environment; it was quite overlooked that I was proposing a revolutionary concept, since the self had previously been widely conceived of as only an integrator organizing the psyche, and I was proposing that it was, or gave rise to, a dynamic system which not only integrated but deintegrated as well. It was, at first, an abstract proposition. Its justification was its usefulness in focusing attention on the infant and a child as a person and an individual. Furthermore, its derivation, the deintegrates, could be observed and experienced. From them the postulate of a primary self could be inferred.

I incorporated Jung's idea that the self is transcendent. That meant that it was beyond the conflict of opposites such as the emotions: love and hate, or creative acts and destructive ones, consciousness and unconsciousness. Its energies were neutral, as Jung implied in his article 'On psychic energy' (Jung 1928a).

I have referred to the hypothesis being useful—doing a job, to adopt Stein's penetrating phrase (1958). One job it did was historical: it contradicted the group of ideas stating that an infant or small child was only a part of its mother. According to my idea, an infant is significantly separate from its parent and it needs, if it is to survive, to make a relation with her by taking an active part in bonding with her. Deintegration is the dynamic which brings this about. The question that arises is: when can deintegration first be observed? The answer is certain: *in utero,* when the foetus is active in a number of ways, kicking, moving around, swallowing amniotic fluid, performing 'breathing exercises', thumb sucking, responding to sounds, even music, and so on.

The momentous event of birth has often been considered traumatic and the source of prototype anxiety. I have never been happy with this idea and the theory of the self can provide an alternative. Suppose that when a new adaptation is required the self responds by deintegrating optimally, this being followed by a new integration; birth is such an experience. A massive deintegration would occur, causing fears of a very primitive kind, recorded later on, as catastrophic chaos, nameless dread, dropping into a black hole, and so on; a reintegration would follow, provided the suitable environment were made available. Good conditions can be defined, such as giving the baby to the mother immediately after birth for three-quarters of an hour, and so forth. Then the adaptation can be made and so birth need not be termed traumatic. My theory criticizes the Le Boyer method because it underestimates the baby's capacity for adaptation to its new environment, depriving it of the experience which nature has provided.

On this model it would be expected that an infant will take an active part in establishing bonding with its mother, and that is found to be the case. The way in which infants start, or do not start, breast feeding varies within wide margins that are only partly accounted for by their mothers' behaviour.

As to the nature of its first objects, I postulate that its first experiences are of whole objects. This is partly because of its very restricted experience of objects, so that an

experience of the breast is of its whole world. But, in addition, the nature of the self suggests that such must be the case since early deintegrates are very close to the self integrate, later giving rise to the infant's sense of omnipotence.

As the infant's perceptual experience widens, the breast can be conceived as a part of its mother, who becomes much more than a breast, which becomes a part of her. The later sophistication that there are two breasts is therefore a step in development and probably runs concurrently with the distinction between a good and bad breast, thus expressing the nature of the self to contain and form opposites.

As to the nature of early object relations, I cannot improve on Bion's beta elements transformed into alpha elements by alpha function (Bion 1962). That may seem excessively abstract, but it makes a container for inferences of two kinds, one of which is expressed in physical action and the other in mental functioning. The next step, according to Bion, is to form fantasies, dreams and myths. My only criticism is that it leaves no space for thought, which it seems likely is a very early development. I would distinguish a thought from thinking, which comes later.

I will now consider some parts of Kleinian thinking which have been influential in the development of my ideas. Some modification is needed: for instance, I do not think that the rather clear distinction between the paranoid-schizoid and depressive positions can be sustained. I have been very struck by the importance of the depressive position in analytic work both with adults and children, but infant observation does not often reveal clear-cut patterns of behaviour. Even though they have been described convincingly, they do not appear in a clear-cut form during the infant observations I have studied; so I think more work has to be done in this area. Many years ago I described the case of a little girl who illustrated the remarkable transformation described by Kleinians, but there was no pining or even misery, only fear. The working through of destructive attacks on mother and her baby, distinguishing fantasy from reality, lead to a remarkable increase in her capacity for independent functioning.

None the less, the depressive position as described seems to me, when it occurs, to indicate a first step in individuation—I doubt whether it can be the only one.

The subject of splitting has occupied my attention, and I have described one infant in whom I considered splitting took place and another one in whom there was much distress due to an interrupted feed, but in which the violence was successfully negotiated and the feed resumed. That case illustrated deintegration and subsequent reintegration. I thought the example was useful because it made the point that violence, pain and suffering could take place in the course of normal, healthy deintegration-reintegration sequences, so furthering development. Only when the pain is excessive and intolerably prolonged does splitting take place.

I now come to projective identification. I have found that there is sometimes confusion about its relation to deintegration: I will attempt to clarify this because the two processes are not the same because deintegration must have taken place for projective identification to occur. In projective identification a part of the self is experienced as entering into another self and identifying with the part of that other containing self. There it can destroy more or less of the containing self or it can provide information about it which can be integrated when the projection is withdrawn. It can therefore be a primitive form of perception, and because the process can be experienced by both parties, it is also a

primitive form of communication, especially when ego boundaries are weak, as we assume is the case in an infant and its mother when she regresses in caring for her baby. I consider that projective identification gives rise to states described as primitive identity and fusion.

I also assume that projective identification is a powerful method of forming archetypal images. Indeed, the process occurs in such mythological themes as the entry into the mother monster with the aim of destroying her from within, or the theme of the dual mother with her ideal and terrible characteristics. I called the underlying objects behind these archetypal images self objects, to include the period before definable fantasy images are formed.

In studying these very primitive states it is important not to overlook the enormous amount of work that has gone into cognitive development during infancy and early childhood. In infant and childhood observations that can easily be done, though we lay emphasis on the infant's emotional life in relation to his mother. In these studies little emphasis is laid on the dichotomy conscious-unconscious; indeed, there seems to be little place for concepts that are so useful later on.

I hold that their uselessness is indicative of the fluid state of infant experience; there are such quick changes in interest and intention and emotional changes between love and hate for much of the time that it seems a positive interference to start thinking in those terms. Yet the infant does show evidence of structured behaviour, and certainly the witnessing of persecuted and depressive conditions, or of his behaviour at the breast and other nuclear situations, gives evidence of mental and emotional structures at work. Therefore we cannot say that there is no ego, though we have evidence that many of the structures are archetypal and result from deintegration. However, as the infant is brought into relation with his environmental mother he gains experience which makes the formation of images inevitable, and it seems also inevitable that these give rise to a form of consciousness which gradually integrates to form a more and more coherent ego. The building up of a definable distinction between consciousness and unconscious states does happen later, and Bion thinks of them as being due to the formation of a barrier of alpha elements.

Here the topic of symbols presents itself, since the foundation of thinking especially rests on them: symbolic thought, however, differs from directed, organized thinking, and, though the latter is present from very early on, yet the former predominates in infancy and childhood. I have no original idea about how these two forms of essentially mental activity arise and only wish that I could follow Segal (1957), who distinguished between symbolic equations and true symbolization. She related the two forms of expression to the paranoid-schizoid and the depressive positions but, as I do not think these positions are as clear-cut as is often pro-claimed, the proposition cannot be accepted as such. Nevertheless, the idea that a symbol is the consequence of the destruction of a good object is important, especially as the formation of symbols ends the period when projective identification predominates and becomes the basis for developing the infant's inner world and contributes to defining fantasy as distinct from reality. However, I suspect this use of Segal's formulation because the concept of a symbol in psychoanalysis differs importantly from our usage based on Jung's. I think that much of an infant's experience comes under the heading of being the best possible expression for

an otherwise unknown entity, namely the archetype, but the concreteness of the experience is very unlike the symbolic experiences to which Jung mostly referred.

The matter is relevant to the experience of erogenous zones because they are not clearly distinguished in infancy, and certainly the mouth, anus, penis and vagina are all parts of the body which give rise to complex systems of fantasy and exploration. Moreover, they are equated with one another on the basis of what seems to be not only simultaneous experience but even of logical thoughts. The nipple can be equated with the penis, the mouth with the anus or vagina, on the basis that each is a protuberance or a hole and so on. These objects can be brought into close relation with one another in intimate ways. Later on, these behaviours become related to fantasies and thoughts, so that, for instance, words can become equated with feeds or milk. That very concrete physical form of expression is used in interpreting to small children, who readily understand what is meant.

Play is another important activity. As we know, it expresses a child's most intimate feelings and reflections. It facilitates discovery and is helpful in working out and resolving conflicts. It starts very early on, beginning at the breast. It extends to the other erogenous zones where the objects become symbolized and in this extension toys are of the greatest value. Play is incorporated into personal interactions but is often autoerotic or develops an objective character. I think that the transitional object comes in here. I agree with Winnicott (1951) that it is a not me object and does not represent anybody else; it is a possession and can take on all sorts of significances. It struck me that, apart from my own observations, when Jung carved a figure which he put in a pencil box, gave it a library, and put it up in the attic where only he could find it, he constructed a transitional object (Jung 1963). When in a state of conflict he visited it. Then his dream of the underground phallus seems to correspond to a transitional phenomenon, for he conceives that it contains the basis for all his later discoveries, just as Winnicott considers the transitional phenomenon to lie at the root of cultural experience. So the transitional phenomenon could lie at the root of the objective inner world. Attractive as this proposition appears to be, I do not think, once again, that the proposition can be generalized, for, though transitional objects can be observed in infancy, they are infrequent. Possibly they occur only in gifted people—but that is not borne out by experience.

I have not so far paid much attention to the question of the so-called destructive instinct which is very much in evidence in childhood and after. I am increasingly sceptical of the tendency to think of it as a drive in its own right because it often appears to be generated by the operation of archetypal factors and ego configurations, especially when they take on any life-and-death issues: that is clear when the infant struggles to preserve his good and destroy his bad objects.

Finally, there is individuation, of which I have already said that the depressive position is an early sign. To expand that conclusion: before individuation can start, there needs to be a degree of primitive identity which develops early on when projective and introjective identifications predominate in the infant's relation to its mother. Individuation begins when the infant consciously differentiates himself from his mother, as happens through the processes involved in the depressive position (keep in mind my remarks on its probable rarity in pure culture). After that there can be a consciousness of

the self as represented in the ego. The formulation leaves room for the extensive studies of the self as a conscious experience leading to the sense of self-esteem, continuity of existence in space and time, and so on. I refer here to the work of Stern (1985), who differentiates a core self, a subjective self, and a verbal self.

Factors influencing individuation are the development of motor skills (crawling and walking), control over feeding and excreting, and the acquisition of speech. All these increase the infant's capacity for independence from his mother and experience of himself as an individual.

That is all I have to say about our model. It will be observed that I have left out the subject of types, which can sometimes be useful. In addition, I have not said much about instincts, a concept which I considered grows increasingly unnecessary as infant and child behaviour is comprehended in more detail.

Part II
On analytical psychology

4
The development and status of Jung's researches[1]

Source: British Journal of Medical Psychology, 20(3) (1945)

INTRODUCTION

Carl Gustav Jung was born on 26 July 1875, the son of a Swiss pastor and philologist of Basel, Switzerland; he is one of a select number of pioneers who have, in the last half-century, laid the foundations of a scientific psychology of the unconscious. His path has taken him into regions where science had not previously been applied with success,[2] and again and again many have supposed him lost to its disciplines. I believe that their view is mistaken. His grasp of scientific method has always formed the basis of his researches and they have an inner consistency which it is the object of this paper to reveal.

Jung is first and foremost an investigator, and therefore many of his theories have been altered or abandoned as they proved inadequate to the phenomena under consideration. This appears to bewilder some of his readers, who mistakenly expect a logically coherent structure, but in a germinating science this could not be attained. In any case Jung is no system builder, as he realizes when he says

> it is my firm conviction that the time for an all-inclusive theory, taking in and presenting all the contents, processes and phenomena of the psyche from one central viewpoint, has not yet come by a long way. I regard my theories as suggestions and attempts at the formulation of a new scientific concept of psychology based, in the first place, upon immediate experience with human beings.[3]

Jung's first idea was to become an archaeologist, but this was stillborn; its occurrence is interesting, however, because of its symbolic reference. Evidently this is the first intimation, in a different form, of his later psychological 'excavations' into the collective unconscious.

His first realized professional aim was to study medicine and he qualified as a doctor in 1900. Psychiatry had not attracted him; on the contrary, it was assumed that he would take up physiological chemistry for which he had shown a special aptitude. One day, however, he picked up Krafft-Ebing's *Text-Book of Psychiatry,* reading it, with scarcely any break, from cover to cover. This book exercised a determining influence on his career, and led him to take a post as second assistant at the Burghölzli Asylum at Zurich, where he was at first the student and then the collaborator of Eugen Bleuler. This association lasted until 1909, two years after his meeting with Freud.

1902–7

Jung's first published work was *On the Psychology and Pathology of Socalled Occult Phenomena,*[4] which appeared in 1902;[5] it is the study of an adolescent girl, S.W., fifteen and a half years of age. There was a history of instability in her family but her development appears to have been relatively normal until she discovered her 'mediumistic' powers at a table-turning session. She developed hysterical trances during which various 'spirits' appeared. Amongst them were 'Ulrich Gerbenstein', a witty, idle gambler, whose outstanding characteristic was his superficiality, and 'Ivenes', a serious, mature, sexually prolific and dignified woman, who was specially related to the 'other side' or spirit world from which she received messages. The mediumistic sessions, which went on for about a year, culminated in the revelation of a system of 'world forces' of which S.W. made a diagram of special interest in view of Jung's later researches: 'In the centre stands the Primary Force; this is the original cause of creation and is a spiritual force.'[6] Around it were seven circles depicting natural forces. There were three other circles whose contents were not sufficiently definite to be clearly represented. The figure was divided into four equal parts by two diagonal lines; it is what we now know as a mandala. Following her revelation, the trances gradually diminished in frequency and 'Ulrich Gerbenstein' came more and more to the fore. Eventually, S.W. was found to be cheating and so appeared valueless for scientific purposes, but her later development was particularly satisfactory inasmuch as she became a capable and industrious business woman. In short, the process begun by the table-turning reached a climax which occurred at the same time as the appearance of the 'revelation'.

In his theoretical discussion, which clearly shows the influence of Pierre Janet,[7] whom he visited in 1902 and 1903, Jung starts from the idea that 'Ivenes' is the 'extension' of S.W.'s personality whose emergence into consciousness made possible the satisfactory adaptation in later life. He says: 'It is, therefore, conceivable that the phenomena of double consciousness are simply new character formations, or attempts of the future personality to break through.'[8] Thus in 1902 two concepts were formulated which became the basis for his later studies: first, the essential importance of consciousness, and second, the synthetic or prospective nature of the unconscious contents. It is apparent that neurotic phenomena were regarded by Jung in his first publication as positive, emergent events, an idea which he subsequently developed and expressed as follows:

> The symptoms of a neurosis are not simply the effects of long-past causes, whether 'infantile sexuality' or the infantile urge to power; they are also attempts at a new synthesis of life—unsuccessful attempts, let it be added in the same breath, yet attempts nevertheless, with a core of value and meaning. They are seeds that fail to sprout owing to the inclement conditions of an inner and outer nature.[9]

These interesting conclusions are not, however, the most important consequences of the first research, which gave Jung an aim that he never relinquished. He saw that the case material could not be understood in terms of current psychiatric theories; his reading had

already led him to philosophy, to Schopenhauer and von Hartmann, and it was from these sources that he derived the concept of the unconscious which provided him with what he needed. He set himself the aim of converting the idea from a philosophical to a scientific concept.

A thoroughgoing empiricist, Jung could never rest content with an abstract discipline; he needed facts upon which to ground and test his hypotheses. Thus it was the study of his first case which awoke his interest in the occult as a whole, but also, and far more important, it led him on to use the experimental method in order to test the hypothesis of unconscious complexes which he had formulated as an explanation of the mediumistic phenomena.

The instrument he needed, the association tests, had already been constructed by Gallon in England and refined in the Kraepelinian school by Aschaffenberg, who had devised a classification of associations of which Jung made use. The classification had been rendered necessary by the great variation in response to stimulus words, but no conclusions had been drawn from the study of those peculiarities which could not be classified. It took Jung to grasp their significance and to discover that they were the consequences, not of meaningless activity but of an affect hidden from the investigator though capable of being deduced by him and confirmed by the subject. The confirmation, however, was not always easy. Sometimes it could be arrived at by questioning, sometimes by confronting the patient with the conclusion; where it could not be confirmed in this way, Jung found the solution by using Freud's method of free association.[10] Thus he was not only the first to gain access to the unconscious experimentally, but also the first to attempt validation of the findings of psychoanalysis by using test procedures. In a later paper[11] he discusses illuminatingly the limits of experiment in the investigation of unconscious processes.

The completion of these investigations represents the fulfilment of Jung's first aim; he had succeeded in demonstrating the existence of unconscious complexes. The association studies also contained the germs of his type theory, which is hinted at in the analysis of Aschaffenberg's classification.

Besides the use of association experiments to establish the theory of complexes, mention may here be made of Jung's early studies in psychopathology, which give rise to papers on such subjects as simulated insanity in criminals, hysteria, chronic mania, epilepsy and, far the most important, the study of dementia praecox,[12] in which he used the association tests to penetrate into the meaning of the psychotic phenomena; this now standard work became, together with Freud's later researches, the foundation for all psychodynamic understanding of schizophrenia.[13]

1907–14

It was inevitable that Jung's researches should lead him to a closer association with Freud, and he began the second fateful period in his development by becoming an enthusiastic advocate of psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis could provide him with just the wealth of factual material for which he was looking, and in its advocacy he risked his good name and ruined his professional prospects. In 1907 he went to Vienna; he was at

once deeply impressed by Freud, and an intimate relationship, founded on mutual respect, began.[14] In 1909 he went with him to the United States and lectured at Clark University on his association experiments conducted on normal and pathological individuals; in the same year, together with Freud and Bleuler, he founded the *Jahrbuch für Psychoanalytische und Psychopathologische Forschungen,* and in 1910 he became the first president of the International Psycho-Analytical Association. During this time his proposal that analysts should themselves be analysed, before undertaking the treatment of patients, was seconded by Freud and adopted by the Psycho-Analytical Association; it has been adhered to ever since, and has become the basis of all analytical training.

Jung's published contributions to psychoanalysis, apart from his critical estimation of it, and of course *The Psychology of the Unconscious,* to be considered separately, show germs of new developments running alongside experimental studies. His more significant publications were as follows: 'The association method',[15] being the lectures delivered at Clark University in 1909, mainly noteworthy for a study of sexual development in a little girl, Anna (see pp. 17–20 above); 'The significance of the father in the destiny of the individual' (1909),[16] introducing the idea of fate and inevitability which later became more clearly defined as a transpersonal phenomenon; 'On the significance of number dreams' (1911),[17] which is of particular interest because number symbolism later became a central feature of self images and has been revived again in a new form in the recently published essay on synchronicity;[18] there was also 'The psychology of rumour' (1910),[19] 'The content of the psychoses' (1914)[20] and a number of other short essays and critical works. The correspon-dence with Dr Loy entitled 'Some crucial points in psychoanalysis' (1913)[21] needs special mention. It is of interest because it discusses the relation between hypnotism, suggestion therapy and the transference.

In 1914, four years after the International Association was founded, Jung gave up the title of psychoanalyst to form his own school of analytical psychology. The break with Freud marks the end of the second period. Viewed in retrospect it seems inevitable that Freud and Jung should separate, especially if we consider the occultist background of it all to which, Jones[22] claims, Jung and Ferenczi were heartily committed and in which Freud participated; I cannot believe it was not the conditions in those early days of psychoanalysis[23] that determined the break, perhaps more than ever the clash of personalities holding incompatible scientific theories.[24]

The effect of psychoanalysis upon Jung may be summed up by saying that it changed him from a psychiatrist into an analyst. It gave him tools with which to make the discoveries especially associated with his name. Considering this period in his development carefully, it can be seen that his writings before, during and while he was a leading psychoanalyst, contain essential disagreements with Freud, of which the theory of psychic energy was perhaps the most important. It should be remembered that its first formulation was completed not after, but before his meeting with Freud in 1907; from the beginning he doubted the value of extending the sexual theory so far as Freud insisted on doing.

It is sometimes said that Jung's researches of the early period are unimportant. I can only say that, to me, they are essential, at least if his method of approach and attitude to analytic practice is to be understood; and it is there, after all, that the foundations of analytical psychology lie. It may be claimed that neither psychoanalysis nor analytical

psychology are what they were then, but the present state of affairs carries with it a historical development throwing the essential features of each discipline into relief. If the basic trends in Jung's works are to be understood, a longitudinal study of his writings is of the greatest help; but it may be added that his earlier views, which he refers to later from time to time, contain valuable clues for his followers, particularly those studying psychopathology or seeking to develop analytical techniques, which Jung left on the way as suggestions. If, therefore, more time is spent on the early periods than to some would seem warrantable, I consider that this needs no apology.

In 1913 Jung set out his view of the origin and nature of neurosis in *The Theory of Psycho-analysis.*[25] This volume, consisting of lectures delivered in New York in September 1912, contains the first presentation of the analytical theories and practices which he had developed; since then they have changed, but much is still relevant and stimulating even though the book also contains a number of ambiguities, probably arising from an attempt to conform to psychoanalytic thinking which really violated the trends of thought developing in him.

Jung's researches with the association experiments had impressed him with the importance of what he termed the 'actual situation'. This term covers the present life situation of the patient; it contains the determining causal factor of neuroses and defines the part he believes infantile memories to play in them. A failure to adapt in the 'actual situation' can result in a regression in which memories and fantasies, not part of that situation, are regressively reactivated, and so are not a cause of the disorder. Under these circumstances they are an arrangement, a means of avoiding the actual situation of which they are not a necessary part—in this he follows Alfred Adler. On the other hand, if the infantile material is part of the actual situation, it is one of the causes of the neurosis originating in infancy, to which it must be reduced, otherwise it is lived unconsciously in the present as the unadapted part of the actual situation.

But the actual situation contains more than past and present conflicts; some of it is prospective, and so Jung also focused attention on the potentialities lying hidden within the neurotic patterns; he was beginning to feel more certain of the existence of 'new character formulations' and a 'future personality' within the actual situation. It was his concentration on these which gave him less and less interest in what he terms 'reductive analysis'.

A significant part of Jung's criticism of Freud was terminological. He wanted, for instance, to change the phrase 'polymorphous perverse' to 'polymorphous predisposition' on the grounds of the generality and symbolic content of infantile sexuality of which the Oedipus pattern is a part. In doing this he radically changed Freud's meaning, bringing it more into line with general biological theory and making it conform with his theory of psychic energy. It may also be remarked that he removed the apparent negative evaluation of infantile sexuality and reserved the term 'perverse' for the form it took when regressively reactivated. This terminological change reflects the earlier attitude of maintaining a distinction between what is normal or healthy and what abnormal or pathological. It is not a rejection of infantile sexuality as such, but a theoretical revaluation of its dual significance.

For some time Jung had been embarking upon extensive comparative studies in mythology and folklore, of which he said:

> From the present position of this work, we can scarcely conceive what a vast perspective may result from this comparative ethnopsychology. Through the study of mythology, we may expect the psycho-analytic knowledge of the nature of the unconscious process to be enormously enriched and deepened.[26]

He had already written the Swiss version of *Psychology of the Unconscious* (in 1912), of which he said: 'The whole thing came upon me like a landslide that cannot be stopped. The urgency that lay behind it became clear to me only later.'[27] He had taken a case of incipient schizophrenia and, analysing the material, using his newly developed comparative method, he concluded that the origin of the disorder was to be traced to a presexual fixation in the mother-child relationship and in the failure of what he called 'the Battle for Deliverance'.

This leads to a further point of difference from Freud. In the discussion of cases involving a mother fixation, Jung held that the imagery could not possibly be accounted for on the basis of the interaction between the patient himself, as a real child, and the real mother, as Freud had maintained.[28] He therefore postulated an inherited mother imago within the psyche of the patient, having its roots in a function which he subsequently called 'the mother archetype'. This opened the door to myth as an irreducible fact in the psyche, and Freud could not allow this because of the mystical elements to which the idea opened a door. Out of this conflict came Jung's concepts of the personal or repressed unconscious, to which, somewhat unjustly even then, he relegated Freud's investigations, and the collective unconscious, which he thought of as the layer beneath the level of Freud's discoveries.[29] With the formulation of the latter concept he had embarked upon widening the basis of psychoanalysis beyond the limits its founder considered valid, at the same time reasserting and expanding his earlier theory of psychic energy and adding to it the concept of libido symbols.

The *Psychology of the Unconscious*[30] contains the results of those researches which led to the rift with Freud. It is deeply imbued with psychoanalytic theory, but it also challenges and distorts it. Jung there penetrates into the mother archetype, where he found the libido divided into two;[31] the one harking backward regressively in search of the mother, the other striving forward to the future.

There is no doubt that Jung considered his views a justifiable extension of Freud's work and his criticisms as legitimate theoretical statements; he has often said that he only wishes to criticize in so far as Freud claims too general a validity for his theoretical framework, and he claims that he himself uses the technique of psychoanalysis in his practice with suitable patients. He also claims to use Adler's method when he considers it indicated.[32]

1915 TO THE PRESENT

After the early periods, he gradually ceased to be a specialist, becoming a centre round which not only medical but a number of other specialities could revolve.

His extensive research into mythology convinced him that it was necessary to distinguish a spiritual principle which could not be reduced to anything else; this

principle is an opposite to instinct. In his assertion there is no justification for neglect, which is so frequently attributed to him, of the sexual and ego instincts to which Freud and Adler respectively had then given so much attention; indeed, if there were, it would not be possible for the individuation process, the main subject of all Jung's later researches, to take place at all, if only because the transcendent function of the symbol appears only if the opposites be given equal value. The criticism that his postulate has led him to abandon genetic or reductive analysis misses the point: he limits its validity by taking it to be the more important process for the analysis of young people who have difficulties in establishing themselves in the world because their egos fail to mature; but for those whose problems do not come in this class, especially those near-normal people in the latter half of life, for whom life has lost its meaning and purpose, or borderline cases of schizophrenia, or some cases of schizophrenia proper, the synthetic approach is the more important.[33]

These considerations throw a feature of the development of Jung's ideas into relief; his position was becoming increasingly relative and he went on to develop instruments, of which the theory of types[34] is a good example, for defining the spheres in which each of the relatively valid methods of investigation can usefully be applied. In principle this position is unexceptionable, his demotion of causality to the status of a relative postulate was revolutionary, for science then operated on the principle that causality was its foundation stone.

In 1917 Jung published 'The psychology of the unconscious processes'[35] which is a summary of his position. In this paper he discusses the causal viewpoint of Freud alongside of Adler's final and Ideological theory, conceiving the differences between them in terms of psychological types. He then goes on to elaborate his own position, taking a dream to show the method from which his attitude derived. He analyses the dream in relation to the history of the patient and thus from the causal point of view. This analysis leads him to conclude that a content of the patient's psychology is missing from the environment; only when he investigates the transference is the missing element found—the patient reveals that she experiences Jung as seeming 'sometimes…rather dangerous, sinister, like an evil magician.'[36]

It is on the question of how to handle the class of phenomena, collectively termed 'primordial' or 'archetypal images', of which the magician is an example, that Jung made his new departure. He did not attempt to explain them, but instead regarded them as irrational data which could be dealt with adequately only by a new technique which consisted in an act of discrimination, in separating subjective personal from objective psychological facts, of which the magician is a representative. The archetypal image was then investigated on the 'inner' plane. Thus did Jung uncover what he later termed 'the objective psyche', and in so doing enormously enriched the possibilities of his synthetic method.

There could surely be no better example with which to refute the belief that Jung's discoveries are speculative theories—just the reverse; it was by clearing away a type of theoretical structure, by removing explanations and speculations that he arrived at a new set of phenomena on which his hypotheses of the collective unconscious and the archetypes, so regularly mistaken for rank mysticism, are largely based.

The concepts of the archetypes, the archetypal images, and the collective unconscious

have become of such importance for analytical psychology that they need a brief definition here. An archetype is conceived as an unconscious 'X' behind a set of behavioural phenomena of which the primordial image is the most discussed, though not the only representative. There is unfortunately some confusion in terminology here, both in Jung's writings and in those of other analysts, but the distinction between the archetype and its phenomena is essential if confusion is not to follow. The archetypal images have a mythological character, they tend to fascinate, they have 'numen' or mysterious power, and each of them has a positive as well as a negative aspect. Though they appear at times in a discrete form, they merge into each other and so reveal themselves as parts of an essential unity. Jung contends that their content has never been, and probably never will be, exhausted; that is to say, all attempts to raise them to consciousness will inevitably fail, as they have so far done. It will be generally conceded that myths, religions and folklore are world-wide in their distribution, and that they are collective, group or social phenomena. This fact was one of those which led Jung to call the part of the unconscious from which they emerge 'the collective unconscious'.[37]

At the same time as his discovery of the first archetypal images, Jung began to elaborate a new method for exploring the collective unconscious which he termed 'amplification'. This is a comparative method by which an obscure fantasy can be thrown into relief by being compared with other, usually mythological, material.[38] In addition, he developed introverting techniques of eliciting fantasy material, to which reference is made in more detail later.[39]

The technique of eliciting active fantasies, of which active imagination is a part, resulted in further confirmation of his theoretical position, for he says: 'I can only say that there is probably no motif in any known mythology that does not at some time appear in these configurations.'[40]

The two introverting techniques led to the definition of a development to which Jung gave the name 'individuation', and of which he gave an account in 'The relation between the ego and the unconscious' (1928).[41]

So far we have considered the unconscious forms alone, but alongside his study of these Jung developed a psychology of consciousness and the conscious mind which is linked with an ego concept derived in part from the association theories of the period, in part from the association experiments. A large number of the associations could be easily elicited and recalled, they were coherent and easily comprehensible, and could be conceived as centring on an organized nucleus—the ego complex.[42] It is important that in *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox,* Jung asserts that, since the conscious is linked with perception, the ego must be a body ego. He says (p. 35): 'The ego is the psychological expression for the firmly associated union of all general bodily sensations.'

The firm unity of the ego runs through all Jung's work, and in the course of years the psychology of the conscious became greatly elaborated and linked up with the notion of attitude. He developed a distinction between the conscious mind and consciousness,[43] the latter being the quality of psychic activity in the sense that the activity can be perceived. The conscious mind, however, refers to a class of psychic activities having the capacity to reach clear definition in consciousness and therefore which are also capable of being manipulated plastically. They can be in the field of consciousness or they can be unconscious, and, when repressed, cannot reach the condition of consciousness. It would

therefore be logical if these repressed contents were referred to as the repressed conscious, and not the repressed unconscious, as is usually done. The functions and attitudes of the types make up the main contents of the conscious mind as a whole, which can therefore be completely defined only when no part of them is repressed.

It has already been noted that in 'The psychology of the unconscious processes' Jung developed his view of psychological types and used it to account for the divergences of viewpoint in psychoanalysis. His theory[44] is a flexible and complex system, but it is essentially a theory of conscious processes though, at the same time, it is related to his whole view of the unconscious and to the process of individuation. There is no introverted conscious mind without an extraverted unconscious, no extraverted conscious without an introverted unconscious, and so, within wide limits, the type can be modified by raising the 'counter-type' to consciousness; while through the symbolic realization of the self, the two opposing tendencies, on the one hand the conscious mind and on the other the unconscious, on the one hand introversion and on the other extraversion, can be brought into reasonable harmony.[45] Each type, therefore, represents a one-sided picture of the whole psychic organism. It is a picture of the conscious mind.

Jung's large book, *Psychological Types* (1921), is more than its title suggests; it marks a further development of his effort to relate clinical researches to other of the various disciplines sometimes called the humanities.[46] In it he applies the theory of types to religious controversy, philosophy, aesthetics, psychiatry, history, and so on. Of special interest is his work on the psychological processes behind the development of Christianity, his comparison of Christianity with some aspects of Oriental religions, and his welding of these together, using the images in Spitteler's *Prometheus and Epimetheus* as a basis for his interpretation. The book is one that repays close attention; here we can discover Jung as the interpreter of history and of human thought and feeling; here is the basis for a new orientation, not only towards normal psychology and psychopathology,[47] but also towards civilization as a whole. It is informed scientific speculation opening up new fields for investigation.

In the chapter entitled 'The problem of types in poetry' is a long discussion of the reconciling symbol, the *self.* If we turn back to the 1902 case it will be found that the patient became introverted during the period of her 'revelations' and yet she subsequently adapted as an extraverted personality. The introverted development culminated in the production of a mandala, and though Jung did not then know it, this was an image of what he later termed the *self,* an inner principle of order foreshadowing the later integration of the patient's complexes into a working unity.

When Jung recommended his patients to study the processes going on within themselves by employing active imagination he found mandalas were a regular feature of their pictures; these seemed to appear when the final synthesis between the conscious and unconscious processes began to take place. Starting to observe them in 1916, he watched their development and also discovered that they occurred in medieval Christian mysticism. He then met Richard Wilhelm,[48] and the two found common ground; mandala images were part of it. Starting from different viewpoints, their lines of research met; the result was a book, *The Secret of the Golden Flower,*[49] first published in 1929. In this work Wilhelm translated a Taoist text describing the process of development which results from meditation, and Jung contributed a psychological commentary showing how

Chinese mysticism can be approached with the aid of analytical psychology, and how the imagery occurs in the East just as much as in the West, though the conscious attitude from which it is viewed is radically different. This Jung attributes to cultural factors. The East, he says, starts its meditation techniques from a balance of intuitively apprehended opposites, yang and yin, from which man frees himself through a process of inner growth analogous to but not identical with our individuation. On the contrary, the West starts from a one-sided position, it starts from a conscious attitude which has as its best tool the scientific intellect. In order to approach the position of the East, Western man cannot abandon his science without suffering a serious loss and, in consequence, he cannot take over the Eastern standpoint without applying his scientific instrument to the task. It is Jung's achievement that he succeeded in bringing Eastern mysticism and Western science closer together: he finds that if science is used to study the psyche, we arrive at the position of conflict between the opposites comprising spirit and instinct. If we are able to balance these and maintain an equilibrium, a synthesis gradually occurs. It is the synthetic process which is the same in the East as in the West.

The methods which culminated in *Psychological Types* and *The Secret of the Golden Flower* are repeated over and over again in different spheres. Jung starts in each case from clinical material and finds new territories opening before him. Just as he gained access to Oriental philo-sophy from his observations in Zurich, so also did he gain an understanding of Gnosticism, early and medieval Christianity,[50] alchemy,[51] Yoga,[52] and each time he kept to his scientific roots, though there was not always a Wilhelm to spring up as a collaborator. By extending his clinical findings to the general field of human experience, Jung increased the significance of his work.

The intimate relationship between the phenomena he observed in his patients and the myths of civilization leads to four kinds of knowledge which are closely interrelated. In the first place it leads to a knowledge about the nature of symbolical experience,[53] in the second it investigates the antecedents of individuation and in so doing demonstrates the generality of the symbolic development essential for its realization, in the third place it gives material which will help in understanding the historical development of consciousness, and so leads to the fourth kind of knowledge, the speculative evaluation of essentially modern problems.

Jung's astonishing ability to orientate himself amongst the mass of material derives in a large measure from the concept of history. 'Without the historical connection, they [his psychological observations] would remain suspended in mid-air, a mere curiosity.'[54] By reviewing his material in relation to history he has arrived at the conclusion that the main problem of our era is spiritual (or, more accurately, psychological); he bases this partly on the historical argument that the age-old projections of the archetypal images have been progressively withdrawn because the discoveries of the natural sciences have proved their irrelevance in the physical world. Psychology has continued the analysis of the old projection systems such as alchemy,[55] and has gone further to reveal the projections which individuals and groups make on each other.

As a result all the psychic energy which flowed into the projections has not been lost, but has been freed to appear from its true, though previously unrealized, source within the individual, disturbing the conscious mind if it tries to meet the afflux of libido with an inadequate attitude. From this arises consciousness of innumerable problems which are

expressed in the individual sphere as neuroses, psychoses and personal problems; in the collective sphere in the deification of leaders, wars, economic depressions and so forth.[56]

Since these conclusions are not based upon historical research alone, but are linked up with contemporary processes through the material produced by patients, it becomes apparent that there are avowed patients, and countless others, who live as if they were still, for instance, living in the Middle Ages, or whose psychology belongs to early or even pre-Christian times. Jung has shown that the psychic life of many people now living is by no means contemporary but corresponds to many earlier phases of human development. The past is alive in the present; to this the Nazi and Fascist movements have recently given eloquent testimony, and contemporary events show a scarcely less barbaric pattern. Jung's speculation thus appears to have alarming confirmation in being a piece of living history.

But 'modern man', according to Jung's definition, is different: he has torn himself away from the unconscious and is isolated, standing between the past and the future which he consequently approaches without prejudice:

> he has become 'unhistorical' in the deepest sense and has estranged himself from the mass of men who live entirely within the bounds of tradition. Indeed, he is completely modern only when he has come to the very edge of the world, leaving behind him all that has been discarded and outgrown and acknowledging that he stands before a void out of which all things may grow.[57]
> …To me (Jung continues) the crux of the spiritual problem of today is to be found in the fascination which psychic life exerts upon modern man. If we are pessimists, we shall call it a sign of decadence; if we are optimistically inclined, we shall see in it the promise of a far-reaching spiritual change in the Western world.[58]

Clearly Jung believes that analytical psychology is in a position to foster a development of far-reaching individual and social significance.

> Modern psychological development, he says, leads to a much better understanding as to what man really consists of. The gods at first lived in superhuman power and beauty on the top of snow-clad mountains or in the darkness of caves, woods, and seas. Later on they drew together into one god, and then that god became man. But in our day even the God-man seems to have descended from his throne and to be dissolving himself in the common man. That is probably why his seat is empty.[59]

In a sense we are confronted with the same old religious problem, but in a different guise.

> Religious experience is absolute; it cannot be disputed. You can only say that you have never had such an experience, whereupon your opponent will reply: 'Sorry, I have.' And there your discussion will come to an end.[60]

This is distasteful to those who like to discuss everything, and it is uncongenial to rationalists.

The final experience of the individuation process, which is to be conceived as the culmination of a long historical development, is likewise overwhelming; it cannot be refuted, but it can be studied. We are beginning to know something about it, but empirically it is a final and conclusive statement in which the psychic energy moves from the ego to a non-ego centre, depicted in the 'centre' of the mandalas of Jung's patients. In historical mandalas there is always a god, in the modern ones there is none; in Jung's early case the centre contained a 'spiritual force', in his later ones a diamond or other symbol emphasizes its importance. The absence of a god is interpreted to mean that the centring process refers to the personality; it is an intuition of the possibility of being whole or points symbolically to the direction in which wholeness lies. The interpretation as well as the significant difference in symbolic form is modern.

Jung's contribution towards the postulated spiritual crisis is, therefore, to provide a means of experiencing spiritual 'numina' as facts so that they cannot be denied and at the same time their experience need not offend the rational intellect, whose activity is enhanced and directed into a new and positive channel by a change in its use. He turns it inwards, using it as a tool with which to study the inner world of primordial images as they emerge from the collective unconscious: this is how he has attempted to treat spiritual values by empirical scientific methods.

For many of us his method has not only solved an intellectual quandary, it has also circumvented a danger: in approaching the objective psyche we risk being destroyed by it, and indeed we cannot help a considerable destruction of supposedly well-established values. If we have no dogma and no solution, what is there to help us through the crisis except the objective and impartial scientific standpoint? In practice, it is the attitude of empirical science which provides the check and avoids the psychoticlike disintegration which threatens those who, like Jung's modern man, stand before a void containing the titanic forces of the unconscious.

The emergence of the *self* presents us with a paradox; if we try to grasp what happens when the conscious functions, of which the objective scientific intelligence is the main representative, fuse with the unconscious functions, the archetypes, we get something which is at once science and religion but which is at the same time neither the one nor the other. It contains the essential core of Jung's work to which it gives extraordinary and fascinating originality because it is revealed as depending ultimately upon a symbol.[61]

It is at this point that Jung might have become a mystic, or gone off into metaphysical speculation. Both of these alternatives he rejects when he says:

> I trust I have given no cause for the misunderstanding that I know anything about the nature of the 'centre'—for it is simply unknowable and can only be expressed symbolically through its own phenomenology, as is the case, incidentally, with every object of experience.[62]

THE STATUS OF JUNG'S RESEARCHES

The fact that Jung regards the principle of causality as holding a relative position in the totality of the psyche,[63] as well as the problematic nature of the self and his much-

advertised though little-understood interest in occultism, has given rise to the question whether his work can be regarded as scientific. Those who believe it is not try to find some other category into which they can fit his labours. He must be either a mystic or a philosopher. The issue appears to turn on frames of reference: to Jung the phenomena of mysticism are expressions of the collective unconscious and consequently take a relative position within the totality of psychic functions; his whole conception of mysticism is psychological and relative. Mystics, on the other hand, usually assert that their experiences are of absolute transcendental realities and even essentially different from any experiences encountered in such a psychological process as individuation.

The question whether Jung is a philosopher is in one sense scarcely less difficult to answer. There can be little doubt that contemporary philosophers reject him out of hand. Individuation is, however, bound up with forming an individual philosophy of life. It is not explicitly so defined by Jung, but one of its salient features is, in my view, the gradual formation of a relatively stable attitude by the whole man to his whole life. Jung says of a philosophy of life:[64]

> As the most complex of psychic structures, a man's philosophy of life forms the counterpole to the physiologically conditioned psyche, and, as the highest psychic dominant it ultimately determines the latter's fate. It guides the life of the therapist and shapes the spirit of his therapy. Since it is an essentially subjective system, despite the most rigorous objectivity, it may, and very likely will, be shattered time after time colliding with the truth of the patient, but it rises again, rejuvenated by the experience. Conviction easily turns into self-defence and is seduced into rigidity, and this is inimical to life. The test of a firm conviction is its elasticity and flexibility; like every other exalted truth, it thrives best on the admission of its errors.[65]

Further he goes on to say:

> I can hardly draw a veil over the fact that we psychotherapists ought really to be philosophers or philosophic doctors—or rather that we already are so, though we are unwilling to admit it because of the glaring contrast between our work and what passes for philosophy in the universities. We could also call it religion *in statu nascendi,* for in the vast confusion that reigns at the roots of life there is no line of division between philosophy and religion. Nor does the unrelieved strain of the psychotherapeutic situation, with its host of impressions and emotional disturbances, leave us much leisure for the systematization of thought. Thus we have no clear exposition of guiding principles drawn from life to offer either to the philosophers or to the theologians.[66]

Inasmuch as Jung is a psychotherapist it may be assumed that he has formed a philosophy of life as here defined.

Not being a philosopher myself, I must conclude by adding Jung's view:

> Psychology takes the psyche for its subject matter, and philosophy—to put it briefly—takes the world…. Neither discipline can do without the other, and the

> one always furnishes the implicit—and frequently even unconscious—primary assumptions of the other.[67]

We may now turn to the claim of analytical psychology to be a science. If it does not rise to the precision of the exact natural sciences and is sometimes classed as one of the human sciences, this is because of the general problem presented by psychology as a whole. Is it or is it not true that human beings are dreadfully irrational? Is not the psyche at once the subject and object of study? It is these questions which have to be answered in connection with a definition of what is meant by 'science', a word whose meaning is by no means stable. Analytical psychology aims at discovering how the psyche works and accumulates records which can be subjected to a comparative study and theoretical treatment.[68] This comparative study can extend to philosophies of life as well; it stops short only where the whole man is integrated.

Without doubt Jung's positive estimation of higher spiritual values has made scientists doubt his credentials, and causes many of them to fear that he is somehow smuggling in non-scientific material. His early work is usually recognized for some reason as beyond criticism, but his later researches, the real mark of his genius, are too often smirched by much faint-heartedness. Spiritual values are irreducible functions of the psyche, that is Jung's contention; viewed as facts no scientist can fail to take them into account without betraying his calling, even if they be too arbitrary in their functioning for logical treatment. This has been recognized by Jung just as much as by his critics; he devised his comparative method to meet just this difficulty. The reproach of smuggling in non-rational facts in rational guise is beside the point.

It is often said that Jung speculates; why not, pray? Is not this a necessary part of science? To do so would be illegitimate only if the facts were not distinguished from the speculations and theories. Jung is a prodigious collector of facts and theories; both are essential parts of the scientific discipline.

The best basis for the criticism that he is unscientific is the methods of investigation Jung employs. These cannot be put in their proper perspective without going back to the beginning, for right from the start Jung realized the weak point of his experimental technique. He understood that the sex and personality of the investigator influenced the test result to an unspecified extent;[69] the tendency to exclude this early work from criticism because subjective personality factors were unimportant, puts Jung's critics fifty years behind him in their estimation of his research.

The next step made the personality of the investigator not less but more important. The use of free association to confirm test interpretations was valid enough to be accepted, though under protest from some; the use of interpretations to overcome postulated resistances with a view to stimulating the emergence of ideas from the postulated unconscious psyche produced a chorus of often abusive criticism, still very much alive today. It is true that when the experimental framework was relaxed and replaced by free associations, combined with interpretations, in fact with psychoanalysis, the whole field of operations clearly became vastly more complex; the analyst could not hope to be free from error due to the intrusion of his own personality. Classical science has always sought to eliminate this, and the criticism of subjectivity needs the closest consideration. It may be remarked, however, that if analysts had been discouraged, their whole investigation

would have had to cease. Another alternative, however, presented itself: the subjective factor could be taken as part of the whole procedure.

This is exactly what Jung did when he decided to take the personality of the experimenter, and later of the analyst, fully into account by proposing the analysis of the analyst. Attempts were made to uncover the source of personal bias by analysing the analysts before they started investigating the unconscious of patients. Though it was a very substantial advance, this development was only partially successful. It did not, according to Jung at least, eliminate the influence of the analyst's personality, it only revealed its extent; his own personality came to be seen as very much more part of an analyst's descriptions than was assumed to be the case in the physical or natural sciences. The question whether the analyst's personality need be a source of error was not then considered seriously; only later did it seem likely to turn into an asset.

Without coming to any conclusion about the validity of their method, analysts continued to study the associations produced by patients. As this proceeded, it became clear that imagination played a large part in them. So-called memories came to light; some of them could be confirmed, but many could not, and were highly fantastic and improbable. Jung, as we have seen, became particularly interested in these 'memories', and in agreement with Freud he held that they were not memories at all but fantasies—fantasies which had the same psychological reality as memories. But as we have also seen Jung went further than Freud; he concluded that in the unconscious there must be special archetypal determinants. These he confirmed by the following technique:

> I…took up a dream image or an association of the patient's and, with this as a point of departure, set him the task of elaborating or developing his theme by giving free rein to his fantasy.[70]

It is most important to realize first that archetypal images are general: they occur everywhere; secondly that, because they are psychologically objective, they can evidently be considered as the correlate of matter in other natural sciences. The concept of the objectivity of the archetypal forms was methodologically crucial. It led to changes in analytic techniques and to the realization that when the analyst meets his patient in a transference, and then describes the archetypal forms arising in the patient, he becomes part of these phenomena, no longer in a subjective but in an objective sense, the archetypes in the patient being the same as those in the analyst—the only difference being individual variations in the form of their expression. The theory of archetypes thus gives a new basis for the analyst's earlier realization that he is part of his descriptive accounts, but he need no longer fear so much the reproach of subjective error, which is theoretically eliminated. Ideally it means that, at the archetypal level, an analyst cannot go wrong if sufficiently analysed.[71]

This theory has been extended to science as a whole by the Swiss physicist Professor Pauli, who has pointed out the relevance of the idea of archetypes for the theory of scientific knowledge; he has suggested that natural scientists are not different from psychologists in being outside their description, though the objects to be described fall into a different class. Pauli says that 'many physicists have recently emphasized anew that intuition and the direction of attention play a considerable role in the development of

concepts'.[72] He goes on to contend that up to now there has been no means of defining the relation between the order perceived in nature through sense data and the theoretical formulations within the psyche. And then he says:

> As *ordering* operators and image-formers…the archetypes…function as the sought-for bridge between sense perception and the ideas and are, accordingly, a necessary presupposition even for evolving a scientific theory of nature.[73]

Jung's thesis changes a concept of science which has never corresponded to the experience of scientists. The supposedly cold intellectual exercise which has led to the erection of more and more expensive and more and more complicated pieces of apparatus, always an illusion, is changed to a new one: science becomes a discipline in which both the intellect and the apparatus are the end products of a more emotional and elementary process represented by the dynamic, affective archetypal forms.

Scientists have always engaged in controversies and displayed considerable heat in them; by way of illustration it may be remarked that in my own lifetime there have been vigorous and not very rational public discussions in biology and physiology, not to mention the conflicts which have reft the various schools of dynamic psychology. But all these have previously been viewed as by-products not belonging to the essence of science. The view that archetypes he at the root of scientific discovery puts these conflicts in a very different light; it means that they are to be considered part of the whole process of discovery.

Professor Polanyi has recently taken up a comparable position. He says: 'The outbreak of emotions in the course of discovery is well known';[74] and he gives many striking instances. Then he continues:

> Science is regarded as objectively established in spite of its passionate origins… but… I do actually want to show that scientific passions are no mere psychological by-play, but have a logical function which contributes an indispensable element to science.[75]

One may object to Polanyi's use of the term 'psychological', but if the essential idea be correct, it follows that analytical psychology is not only scientific but a basic science because it can reveal the nature of the natural sciences themselves.

NOTES

1 Originally 'C.G.Jung', *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 20(3) (1945): 221 ff. First published in honour of Professor Jung's seventieth birthday, this paper has been altered and adapted to the needs of the present volume, though its framework has been retained.

2 Particularly occultism.

3 Foreword to J.Jacobi, *The Psychology of C.G.Jung,* trans. by K.W.Bash, London, 1942.

4 Cf. *Psychiatric Studies* (*Collected Works,* 1), London and New York, 1957.

5 Dates of Jung's works given in the text usually refer to publication of the first edition in German.

6 Ibid., pp. 40–41.

7 This can be recognized in the concept of suggestion and the use of hypnotism, which were soon abandoned in favour of psychoanalysis, whilst such phrases adopted from Janet as 'abaissement du niveau mental' and 'les parties supérieure et inférieure' are used by Jung even in his latest publications.

8 Ibid., p. 79.

9 'The problem of the attitude-type', *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* (*Collected Works,* 7), London and New York, 1953, p. 45.

10 'Psycho-analysis and association experiments', *Studies in Word Association* (*Collected Works,* 2), London, 1918; New York, 1919.

11 'Allgemeines zur Komplextheorie', *Über psychische Energetik und das Wesen der Träume* (*Collected Works,* 8), Zurich, 1948.

12 The background of Jung's early psychiatric studies has been interestingly discussed by Professor Aubrey Lewis in relation to current trends in psychiatry. Cf. 'Jung's early work', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 2(2) (1957):119 ff. The papers he there refers to are mostly to be found in *Psychiatric Studies* (*Collected Works,* 1), London and New York, 1957.

13 *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox* (*Collected Works,* 3), London, 1909. This early work on the psychoses undoubtedly influenced the course of Jung's development and assisted him towards his subsequent discoveries. In *The Integration of the Personality* (*Collected Works,* 9, Part I), London, 1940, when discussing the theories of Freud and Adler, he writes (p. 6):

> Both theories are based chiefly upon experience with cases of neurosis. Neither of the authors had any psychiatric experience. If they had, they would certainly have been impressed with the fact that the unconscious displays certain contents that are utterly different from those of conscious ness; such strange ones, indeed, that nobody can understand them, neither the patient himself nor his doctors.

14 Cf. E.Jones, *Sigmund Freud, Life and Work,* vol. II, London, 1955.

15 In *Collected Papers on Analytical Psychology (Collected Works,* 17), edited by Constance Long, 2nd edn, London, 1917; New York, 1920.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid.

18 Jung, 'Synchronicity: an acausal connecting principle', in C.G.Jung and W. Pauli, *The Interpretation of Nature and the Psyche* (*Collected Works,* 8), London and New York, 1955.

19 In *Collected Papers* (see note 15).

20 Ibid.

21 Ibid.

22 Cf. Jones, 'Occultism', *Sigmund Freud, Life and Work,* vol. III, London, 1957.

23 Cf. E.Neumann, 'In honour of the centenary of Freud's birth', *Journal of Analytical*

Psychology, 1(2):1956.

24 I have refrained from commenting upon the affective content of Jung's break with Freud, since all I could say would be the rankest speculation, of which there has already been enough. Jones has given an authoritative account of it from the psychoanalytic side; it is to be hoped that one day a comparable assessment will be made from Jung's standpoint.

25 New York, 1915 (Swiss version, 1913). This essay was attacked with evident animosity by Karl Abraham in 'Review of C.G.Jung's "Versuch einer Darstellung der Psychoanalytischen Theorie"' (Attempt at a representation of the psychoanalytic theory), *Clinical Papers and Essays on Psycho-analysis,* London, 1955.

26 *The Theory of Psychoanalysis, Collected Works,* 4:112.

27 'Foreword to the fourth Swiss edition', *Symbols of Transformation (Collected Works,* 5), London and New York, 1956, p. i.

28 This argument is concisely summarized in 'The concept of the collective unconscious', *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (*Collected Works,* 9, Part I), London and New York, 1959. It must be remarked that here his criticism of Freud does not appear quite fair. Freud agreed much more with Jung's view than is made apparent.

29 Thus before the synthetic processes begin it is necessary to analyse the personal unconscious to a considerable degree, and once synthetic images start to appear analysis is not the straightforward process which some of Jung's work would seem to indicate; though it must be said in his defence that he does not really pretend that it is. The impact of the unconscious continually brings up personal problems together with the collective imagery, and these two classes of material constantly interact intimately upon each other. Cf. Fordham, 'Notes on the transference', *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* London, 1957.

30 *Collected Works,* 5, New York, 1916; London, 1917.

31 Cf. ch. 7, Part II, *Collected Works,* 5, 'The dual mother role'.

32 This attitude is possible for Jung because of his work on types, which makes it feasible for him to regard a psychological theory as the expression of a particular predisposition. Inasmuch as people differ from one another, there are different ways of dealing with the psyche. Jung includes himself in this relative position. His theories and his method are the expression of his own particular predisposition. This notion can clearly be misused and is open to all sorts of abuses, but it has the value of avoiding theoretical rigidity. Moreover, Jung has worked out his conclusion in considerable detail, so that his standpoint is fundamentally different from the eclectic position. It is inevitable that he should use psychoanalytic methods in relation to his whole position. It is therefore unlikely that he would use them as a strict Freudian would. The same must apply to Adler's techniques.

33 It may seem paradoxical that Jung's contribution should apply particularly to 'normal' people of middle age and to schizophrenics. The difference between the two classes apparently so opposed does not lie, however, in the actual phenomena themselves so much as in the attitude of the consciousness towards them. The 'normal' person has a well-established ego which is able to withstand, and in some degree regulate, the activity of the unconscious. On the contrary, the schizophrenic

ego is, to all intents, non-existent, having been replaced by the archetypal images which have as it were, swallowed it up.

34 Jung's first publication on typology appeared in 1913 and is translated as 'A contribution to the study of psychological types', in *Collected Papers on Analytical Psychology* (*Collected Works,* 6). It was delivered to the Psychoanalytic Congress in Munich in 1913.

35 In *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* (*Collected Works,* 7), London and New York, 1953.

36 Ibid., p. 89.

37 These definitions are those to which I adhere. I have elaborated the subject at greater length in 'Biological theory and the concept of archetypes', *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* London, 1957. It will be observed that the concept of heredity is not included in my definition; I regard it as unnecessary, in view of the developments in biology since Jung first defined the archetypes.

38 Jung's use of mythology to throw light on his patients' material has been criticized because it can lead to imposing conclusions on patients. This can, but need not, be the case.

39 Cf. infra, pp. 67 ff.

40 'The spirit of psychology', *Spirit and Nature: Papers from the Eranos Year-books,* New York, 1954; London, 1955, p. 414. 'On the nature of the psyche', *Collected Works,* 8.

41 Cf. *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* (*Collected Works,* 7), London and New York, 1953.

42 The term 'complex' was first introduced by Theodor Ziehen of Berlin. Cf. Jones, *Sigmund Freud, Life and Work,* vol. II, London and Toronto, 1955, p. 127.

43 The German word *'bewusstheit'* is translated in the *Collected Works* as 'conscious' or 'conscious mind'; *'Bewusstsein'* is translated as 'consciousness'. This distinction is clarified in the *Collected Works,* though Jung himself uses the term *'Bewusstsein'* in the sense of conscious mind or consciousness.

44 *Psychological Types* (*Collected Works,* 6), London, 1923.

45 Exactly the same applies to the theory of 'function types', of which there are two pairs: two rational, thinking and feeling; two irrational, sensation and intuition.

46 As a book, *Psychological Types* is much clearer than *The Psychology of the Unconscious,* which began the process though in a different way.

47 Comparatively little is said on this topic in the volume, but in the description of the types each section contains a statement of the pathological symptoms each type is likely to produce. Elsewhere Jung remarks that his theory of types grew out of the problem of which direction regression was likely to take if the conscious attitude failed.

48 Richard Wilhelm was a sinologist who went to China as a Christian missionary. He was, however, so much impressed by Chinese philosophy that he gave up his missionary purpose and made a detailed study of Chinese religions. He wrote a history of the Chinese people and made several translations of Chinese texts and books. The most famous of these is perhaps his translation of the *I Ching* (London, 2 vols, 1951).

49 English edition, London, 1931. Jung appears to have been concerned lest, if he published these pictures too early, their magical effect would lead to the invalidation of many of those subsequently produced by his patients.

50 Cf. *Aion* (*Collected Works,* 9, Part II), London and New York, 1958.

51 Cf. *Psychology and Alchemy* (*Collected Works,* 12), London and New York, 1953; *Mysterium Coniunctionis,* Zurich, 1955, *et al.*

52 Cf. Essays in *Psychology and Religion: West and East* (*Collected Works,* 11), London and New York, 1958.

53 Cf. my 'Reflections on image and symbol', *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* London, 1957, for a discussion of Jung's theory of symbolic forms.

54 *Psychology and Religion: West and East* (*Collected Works,* 11), London and New York, 1958, p. 102.

55 When this paper was originally written *Psychology and Alchemy* had not been translated. To have inserted a review of these researches would have expanded this essay too greatly. The reader is referred to the following: *Psychology and Alchemy* (*Collected Works,* 12), London and New York, 1953; 'The psychology of the transference', *The Practice of Psychotherapy* (*Collected Works,* 16), London and New York, 1954; *Aion* (*Collected Works,* 9, Part II), London and New York, 1958; *Mysterium Coniunctionis* (*Collected Works,* 14), Zurich, 1955.

56 This argument does not depend upon whether these events are more or less frequent than they were before. It explains why man now tends to believe that he is the cause of them.

57 'The spiritual problem of modern man', *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (*Collected Works,* 10), London, 1933, p. 228.

58 Ibid., p. 251.

59 'Psychology and religion', in *Psychology and Religion: West and East* (*Collected Works,* 11), London and New York, 1958, p. 84.

60 Ibid., pp. 104–5.

61 Cf. Fordham, 'Reflections on image and symbol', *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* London, 1957.

62 *Psychology and Alchemy* (*Collected Works,* 12), London and New York, 1953, p. 208.

63 Cf. particularly his concept of synchronicity, 'Synchronicity: an acausal connecting principle', C.G.Jung and W.Pauli, *The Interpretation of Nature and the Psyche,* London and New York, 1955.

64 The German word *Weltanschauung* is the term Jung uses.

65 'Psychotherapy and a philosophy of life', *The Practice of Psychotherapy* (*Collected Works,* 16), London and New York, 1954, p. 79.

66 Ibid.

67 'The basic postulates of analytical psychology', *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (*Collected Works,* 8), London, 1933, p. 207. R.Hostie (*Religion and the Psychology of Jung,* London and New York, 1957) and Victor White (*God and the Unconscious,* London, 1952) both agree that from the Catholic position Jung does not show much sign of fitting into Roman philosophy. It may here be added that Hostie consistently accepts Jung as a scientist. As, however, he wishes to separate psychology and

theology, with a view to discrediting most of what Jung means, one can scarcely feel much confidence in his motivation.

68 Woodger, in his excellent essay, *Physics, Psychology and Medicine* (Cambridge, 1957), bases his argument on the following three requirements of science: bright ideas, observations and apparatus. The bright ideas must be related to the observations but can reach from inspiration to logically constructed explanatory theories and mathematics; the apparatus can be anything from a notebook to atom-splitting machines.

69 Cf. Baynes, 'Freud versus Jung', *Analytical Psychology and the English Mind,* London, 1950, p. 108.

70 'The spirit of psychology' (*Collected Works,* 8), *Spirit and Nature,* p. 412.

71 Analysts only live approximately up to this criterion because their psyches are not constructed of archetypes alone. In the *Psychology of the Unconscious,* London (1917:232) Jung first showed the relation of scientific theory to mythology. He takes two of Freud's theories and traces the mythological parallels to them. He does the same with his own theory of psychical energy in 'On psychical energy' (*On Psychic Energy* (*Collected Works,* 8), London and New York, 1959), while in *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* (*Collected Works,* 7, London and New York, 1953), he shows (pp. 66 ff.) that Mayer's concept of the conservation of energy has extraordinarily primitive roots.

72 'The influence of archetypal ideas on the scientific theories of Kepler', in C. G.Jung and W.Pauli, *The Interpretation of Nature and the Psyche* (*Collected Works,* 8), London and New York, 1955, p. 151.

73 Ibid., p. 153.

74 'Passion and controversy in science', *Lancet,* 1 (1956):921.

75 Ibid.

5
Note on psychological types

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 17(2) (1972)

The publication of *Psychological Types* in the *Collected Works* prompts some reflections on a theory that has stimulated longer if not more sustained interest than any other of Jung's formulations.

PRESENTATION OF THEORY

My first reflection is this: in his classical presentation there is, by intention, no single case study; Jung says (1921:xi):

> It is not my intention to burden the reader with case material; my concern is rather to show how the ideas I have abstracted from my practical work can be linked up, both historically and terminologically with an existing body of knowledge. I have done this…from a desire to bring the experiences of the medical specialist out of their narrow professional setting into a more general context, a context that will enable the educated layman to derive some profit from them. [Ibid: xiii] Yet what I have to say in this book…has, sentence by sentence, been tested a hundredfold in the practical treatment of the sick and originated from them in the first place.

DEVELOPMENT OF THEORY

It is commonly believed that Jung developed his theory during conflicts in the psychoanalytic movement; indeed in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* he says, 'This work sprang originally from my need to define the ways in which my outlook differed from Freud's and Adler's' (p. 198). There is, however, reason to believe that though the introversion-extraversion contrast crystallized then, he had laid its foundation some time before especially in his experimental work. Besides individual differences in responses to stimulus words there were also types of reaction which transcended the individual. In 'The associations of normal subjects' (1904) he, with Riklin, classified responses into two main types: the objective and egocentric adjustment types of which Eder remarks, 'There are cer-tain obvious relationships between the "objective" type, …and his [Jung's] later "introversion" type…of the experiments and the "extra-version" type of the later view' (1918:vi).

As Jung's researches developed he started to link the two types with psychopathology.

The objective type could develop schizophrenia and one of the egocentric types, the predicate sub-type, could develop hysteria. It was no doubt the current interest in the relation between hysteria and schizophrenia that led to intensive comparative study of the two disorders; it culminated in his classical volume, 'The psychology of dementia praecox' (1907).

Gradually other distinctions were made. The objective type used thinking and the predicate type used values, and so when he introduced the theory of attitude types, thinking was linked with introversion and feeling with extraversion. Documented evidence of how the next steps occurred is lacking except for Jung's own recognition of the help he received from Schmidt-Guisan and some interesting details provided by Meier (1970).

The first paper specifically on typology appeared in 1913, having been delivered at the International Congress for Psychoanalysis held in the same year. It is an outline of what was to come, but it was only in the final paragraph that he drew attention to the possibility that the acute conflicts in psychoanalysis, especially that between Freud and Adler, might be understood in terms of type theory. It was never made use of by the members of the conflicting groups and the theory was much criticized. Yet though Freud rejected Jung's formulations he was to develop the theory of narcissism partly, at least, in refutation of Jung's thesis.

Jung continued working on his conceptions, testing them all the time in his practice and, according to Meier (1970:8), also by using the association tests. He dissociated feeling from extraversion and thinking from introversion, and opened the way for organizing the types into two groups: attitude and function types. How it came about that he added sensation and intuition is obscure, but Meier states, 'Toni Wolff was particularly helpful in the addition to the functions of intuition and sensation.'

TYPES AND INDIVIDUATION

The sub-title of the first English translation of *Psychological Types* reads *or the Psychology of Individuation,* an addition to the first Swiss edition and not added to later ones in German; it is omitted from the recent edition in the *Collected Works.* The addition is curious because there is no mention of individuation in the text until its definition at the end of the book. The first exposition on individuation appears in 1928 in 'The relations between the ego and the unconscious', so it might be supposed that Jung had not crystallized his idea till after writing the main body of *Types* even though individuation is clearly implied, especially in chapter 5. Turning to *Memories, Dreams, Reflections,* Jung states that it was not until his intense preoccupation with the stream of images, that he began to experience in 1913, had ebbed away in about 1920 and when his work on alchemy had progressed far enough, that he understood that in the unconscious there is a *process* which develops; it was only then that he called it 'individuation'. The steps seem to have been first to develop a concept of the self and then to understand its realization as a process.

This much is clear, but the chronological details are still confused. For instance, Jung asserts that his study of alchemy only began in 1928 (*Memories,* p. 195) after receiving a

Taoist text from Richard Wilhelm published in *The Secret of the Golden Flower* (1931). Yet in 1928 he published 'The relations between the ego and the unconscious' and 'Part two' is headed 'Individuation'. In his chapter 'The technique' there is to be found a compact account of alchemy (pp. 243–4 and 247) that shows a rather good grasp of the subject long before 1936 when he organized the result of his alchemical researches in an essay delivered to the Eranos Tagung.

It seems, therefore, that the ideas of individuation contained in the 'Definitions' were in his mind before the serious researches into alchemy began and the sub-title to the first English translation of the *Types* may be the first indication of the importance he was to attach to it. However, Meier (1970) is very emphatic that 'the types must be the beginning of individuation' (p. 8), and he records an interview with Jung in which he said that in his view he (Jung) had done 'nothing less than demonstrate the clearest dynamic model of the entire human psyche' (ibid.: 8) to which Jung agreed. Baynes (1923) also provides some illumination: he was close to Jung at the time and would have been conversant with ideas that were hatching in Jung's mind. His comments on the sub-title make no reference to the idea of individuation as a process; it is rather conceived as the 'central coordinating principle' (ibid.: xii). This would make it refer to the self rather than to the conception of individuation as a process; the first view of it seems to have been structural, the second dynamic and teleological.

NATURE OF TYPE THEORY

The concept of types as used by Jung is subtle and stimulates reflection on his conception of conscious and unconscious structures. A type can be understood as eternal in the sense that it does not change structurally and so it is usually linked with such qualifying substantives as hereditary or constitutional. But Jung did not lay much stress on these biological and medical conceptions; his primary aim was more limited: he simply grouped his evidence together into regularities which he called 'types' and left mainly to others speculation on their nature. The regularly recurring conscious attitudes were classed as attitude and function types, the unconscious ones as archetypes. His method was comparative and he aimed to elaborate a 'critical' system that could first and foremost be used to orientate the observer in the complex field of experience. But thinking of the type theory also as a psychology of individuation introduces an aspect of it that is not always recognized: types may be thought of as attitudes and functions of the human psyche as a whole and, as Meier insists, they can be integrated together within the individual. Thus there is an ambiguity in the type concept, for this view contains much more room for dynamic modification than the more usual static one. The difference highlights the importance Jung attributed to consciousness and to the nature of the self. The unalterable nature of dynamic structures was indeed applied more to the archetypes, which are conceived as finally incapable of integration into the ego: it is they that carry with them the eternal attribute of types more than the functions and attitudes of consciousness. It was therefore to the former that Jung applied the theories of instinct and heredity.

SUPPOSED NEGLECT OF THE TYPE THEORY

In *Psychological Types* Jung seems to have put down most of what he knew of this subject, for he never returned to it at any length and only published two papers, specific to this theme, the one in 1923, the other in 1931. There is little mention of it in the volumes on alchemy, and in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* he only makes passing reference to it. This has given rise to the belief that he ceased to interest himself in the subject of attitude and function types and concentrated on archetypes. This is perhaps true in a research sense, but he made use of the type system in 'The psychology of the transference' (1946), a study of the transference as it appears in the process of individuation; thus contradicting the idea that he had dropped his earlier convictions.

CONCLUSION

If it be true that the types and individuation are closely related, is it not rather astonishing that so little has been published on their clinical application? There is indeed only one paper that has come to my notice that takes up the subject in the way that seems indicated (cf. Aigrisse 1962). There are, of course, many brief references to typology in numerous books and articles, but they usually assign the patient to a class and leave it at that. Is this not because the essence of Jung's thesis has been ignored and the stable (eternal) view of types has replaced the dynamic one altogether? This at least would seem to be why experimental investigations have dominated the scene. So in conclusion I find myself in agreement with Meier when he says (1970:16), 'The dynamic relation between attitude types and the four functions has not yet received sufficiently a thorough clinical description.'

REFERENCES

Aigrisse, G. (1962) 'Character re-education and profession re-adaptation in a man aged forty-five', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 7, 2.
Baynes, H.G. (1923) 'Translator's preface' to *Psychological Types,* London: Routledge.
Eder, M.D. (1918) 'Translator's preface' to *Studies in Word Association,* London: reprinted by Routledge, 1969.
Jung, C.G. (1907) 'The psychology of dementia praecox', in *Collected Works,* 3.
——(1913) 'A contribution to the study of psychological types', in *Collected Works,* 6.
——(1921) *Psychological Types* in *Collected Works,* 6.
——(1923) 'Psychological types', in appendix to *Collected Works,* 6.
——(1928) 'The relations between the ego and the unconscious', in *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* (*Collected Works,* 7), trans. H.G.Baynes, London: Baillière, Tindall & Cox.
——(1931) 'A psychological theory of types', in appendix to *Collected Works,* 6.
——(1946) 'The psychology of the transference', in *Collected Works,* 16.
——(1963) *Memories, Dreams, Reflections.* London: Collins & Routledge & Kegan

Paul.
Jung, C.G. and Riklin, F. (1904) 'Associations of normal subjects', in *Studies in Word Association,* trans. M.D.Eder, London: Heinemann, 1918; reprinted Routledge, 1969.
Meier, C.A. (1970) 'Individuation und Psychologische Typen', in *Zeitschrift für analytische Psychologie* , 1(2).
Wilhelm, Richard (1931) *The Secret of the Golden Flower,* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.

6
Memories and thoughts about C.G. Jung

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 20(2) (1975)

INTRODUCTION

The editor has asked me to write about Jung, with the facts in mind that this is the centenary of his birth and that I am one among the dwindling group of persons who knew him at all well.

A growing number of vignettes of Jung have been published—reports of interviews with him or short accounts of what he was like—and there are archives at the Wickes Foundation in the United States which contain many more such contributions. My reflections will contribute to the continuing collection of data. They will be personal and have an analytic tinge. They will not, indeed could not, constitute an analysis of Jung as a man—an investigation which he himself began in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* and will be further developed only when a biography of him comes to be written.

BEFORE THE SECOND WORLD WAR

First meeting

In 1932 I met H.G.Baynes, a friend of my parents when I was a child. He had come back to England after many years of working in Zurich as Jung's assistant, and talked at length about his experiences, giving me a striking impression of Jung as a most remarkable man—a 'giant', he once remarked. Eventually he suggested that I might go out to Zurich with a view to being analysed by the master; accordingly I wrote to Jung telling him of Baynes' suggestion and stating that it would be necessary to find work in Switzerland because I had no money. Jung replied that I should go out to see him.

It was in 1933 when I went to Zurich, and in the railway carriage, as my sole companion, was a young Jew who was making arrangements to leave Germany. He talked at length about what was going on there: I was shocked and fascinated.

The next afternoon I went to see Jung, and to open the conversation I remarked on how interesting it had been to meet the Jew. It was like the stimulus word in an association test that had hit a complex, and for about three-quarters of an hour Jung delivered a long discourse on the Jews, their history and their differences from Christians and Europeans. It was stimulating and thought-provoking, and I listened entranced. As the time for the interview began to run out I was eventually compelled to cut him short and ask about the object of my visit. He replied that my proposition was quite impossible to realize, for no foreigner could work in Switzerland and only recently the police had been making

enquiries about one of his assistants. He trundled out of the room after inviting me to a seminar that he was to give the next morning. Then I had the opportunity of listening to a discussion of the 'Visions' with detailed amplification of one of them. Afterwards there was a break for coffee and I was much flattered when Jung picked out this visiting member to his seminar, talking in a friendly and hospitable way. Perhaps he knew how much I was smarting under his rejection of me as a possible patient.

There are characteristic features of this meeting that were to recur. It was most inconsiderate to bring out to Zurich a young man who had no money, and to tell him that what he wanted was out of the question; could he not have written that my wishes were impossible to realize but, if I wanted to come out and meet him, he would be glad to provide time? Then, though taken aback, I did not see it this way. I thought that what Jung said was stimulating and might be a kind of indirect personal hint about my shadow (the Jew). This was, I now recognize, a way of assimilating the shock of that meeting; the method I used derived from analytic interviews I had begun with Baynes, who focused immediately on dreams. I had by then begun some active imagination, and had formed a transference so that everything he or Jung said had become significant. It would never have occurred to me that Jung was possessed and became unrelated to the person he talked to, nor that perhaps he thought it a suitable occasion to drive home to an Englishman what was afoot in Germany. Subsequently, when Jung talked compulsively I concluded that he was not well, and I often learned that my inference had been correct, but he had not been ill this time.

What of the other aspect of him that was so personally considerate and friendly? It seemed like quite a different person. I was to come across it often in casual meetings, at dinner parties, or especially when my wife was present and, with Mrs Jung, there were just the four of us.

Jung in London

In 1935 Jung came over to England and gave a lecture sponsored by the Analytical Psychology Club, of which I was chairman. He had written that he wanted it to be given to a small audience, but the club thought differently and arranged a large one. Jung was put out and delivered his lecture in a dull and sometimes scarcely audible voice. But there were entertaining dinner parties and meetings of a less formal kind. One of them was personally important to me; he conducted it as follows. I was shown up to his hotel bedroom while he was dressing for dinner, and I remembered that he was changing his trousers. This did not seem at all inappropriate, but rather like being treated as one of the family. I had come to ask him about a delicate and to me important subject: my relationship to Baynes had reached such a point that I could find no solution. That was no surprise to Jung, and he immediately told me why I could not get anywhere with him; I had to find a new analyst, he said. Could I think of anybody else? I had no difficulty in giving a name, but he seemed hesitant and pressed me to think again, so I did so but without success, and he left it at that. I learned later that I was the first patient of the analyst that I had thought of, and no doubt that accounted for Jung's hesitation. However, he must have concluded that I had formed a positive transference, and he did not interfere with what might have been a favourable sign.

This interview took about twenty minutes. It illustrated Jung's openness to real distress and to real questions on which he could help with a simple and therapeutic directness. Later, I heard about it in other contexts: students would turn up at his house and, if he liked them, he would see them at once; he was quite delighted when the village postmaster wanted to ask him something about *Psychology and Alchemy,* which he had read. It happened once when I was there. A young journalist turned up: he was vetted by Miss Bailey, pronounced sincere, and off Jung went to see what it was all about.

There is another aspect of my hotel bedroom interview which struck me in retrospect. It hinted at Jung's views on how to become an analyst. He thought that the essential core of training was the analysis of the analyst, and so becoming an analyst of others could best grow out of being analysed. Before arriving at this conclusion he had been impressed by how often apparently technical problems would evaporate when the therapist developed, so he never instituted a formal training. It is true that his seminars provided essential teaching, but he did not confine these to those who wanted to become analysts and he never provided formal case discussions, while any supervision that occurred took place as part of analysis. Becoming a Jungian psychotherapist was, therefore, very much a matter of vocation. This policy, if so it may be called, was pursued when I was starting in London. There was no training provided except analysis, which meant a considerable amount of story-telling about Jung and my own analyst, and about case material. There was much that I was told to read, and fairly soon I was given permission to study the Seminars on Dreams and Visions. If case material came up for discussion there was no systematic study of it, but rather the bits of it were treated in relation to myself, though a few suggestions as to what might be done were added.

An international congress

In 1938 the tenth International Medical Congress for Psychotherapy was held in Oxford. It was not a happy time for Jung. He was President of the Congress and the Germans kept trying to introduce Nazi propaganda. Furthermore, he was being criticized for his relation to the German Society for Psychotherapy and was suspected of having Nazi sympathies. Under stress he was mostly tactful and diplomatic, but not always. At this congress he was honoured by receiving the first D.Sc. at Oxford University that had ever been given to a psychotherapist, or for that matter to any psychologist. His reply of thanks was flowery and unusual to English tastes, and I found it embarrassing. But worse was to follow. As he came down with the university dignatories, walking through the assembly, Jung gave his close assistant C.A.Meier an enormous wink, which convulsed Meier and several others besides; not the behaviour to endear him to most of those present, for it seemed like a calculated insult to the university. I don't think so, however; it was just Jung unable to resist being a *gamin,* and showing his humorous disrespect for ceremony, a characteristic to which I shall refer later.

AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

I did not meet Jung again until after the war. I was made a member of the Committee of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy of which Jung had been President but, under pressure, had resigned. The position had been filled by J.R.Rees in England. Jung was still being attacked for Nazi sympathies and anti-Semitism. I corresponded with him over this and went and talked the subject over in Switzerland. My first meeting with him, when he had talked about the Jews, was of course relevant, but I remembered that in his discussion he had not said anything that could be construed as anti-Semitic, though he made it clear that there were important differences between Jews and non-Jews. In addition, I knew how many Jews he had befriended and helped to escape from Nazi persecution. So when I heard how he had behaved during the war in standing up to the Germans and was told that his name was on the German black list, that his books had been burned in France and much more besides, it all fitted together and I was in a strong position to defend him.

The *Collected Works*

The period after the war was germinative. Herbert Read at Routledge & Kegan Paul had proposed to publish Jung's *Collected Works,* and had gained the support of the Bollingen Foundation. He asked me whether I would be the English editor. Adler and himself were added later at Jung's request.

As an author Jung was unusually pleasant and helpful. Once the basic conceptions and framework in which we were to work was established, he left us to get on with what we had to do and we could refer back to him over difficult points. He was especially fond of his work on alchemy and, perhaps not very wisely, wanted to have *Psychology and Alchemy* as the first volume. It was a difficult document to start on and a good deal of work had to be done in making it more understandable to the increasing number of readers (especially in the States) who knew no Latin or Greek, by inserting translations of the ancient texts. Then there were other questions like how to handle the bibliographical matter and check the often abstruse references. Finally, the format of the works as a whole had to be decided upon. This and the growing pains of the editorial apparatus, which involved the Bollingen Foundation and its expert team, delayed publications and led to grumbles and protests from Jung; but when the volume came out he was delighted with it and warm in his appreciation of what had been done.

One feature of his writing that is interesting, and about which I asked him, was the periodic looseness in his arguments. There sometimes seemed no rhyme or reason in what he put down, and I thought some of his footnotes might with benefit be removed. But he would have none of it. It was enough that he had thought of the idea in a particular context and had put it down—he wanted it left in. Thus there is an element of free association in what he wrote, and he stood by it.

There was only one major problem in which I was closely involved with him: the long article on 'Synchronicity'. It had been referred byA. S.B.Glover to a statistician who wrote a criticism which said that there was nothing in it from beginning to end; it should

not be published. This produced consternation, and Jung threatened to scrap the article; he even wrote a draft of another one in which he said that if statisticians could not prove what he said they had better invent a new mathematics that would do so!

This was hardly encouraging, and since Jung had already published the essay, we could not leave it out of the *Collected Works* if they were to be definitive. So Jung was approached with a number of suggested modifications in the presentation and a request for more information about the mathematics. Jung accepted these propositions but they involved considerable correspondence on matters of detail and a journey to Zurich. There I found that Professor Fierz refused to discuss the 'astrological experiment' at all, possibly because, though I did not broach it, Jung had suggested that some of the changes he made in his mathematics were motivated by unconscious elements, and so not part of the ordinary work of a mathematician exploring different approaches. Also nobody, not even Jung, seemed to understand that if the results of the experiment had proved statistically significant then, as an example of synchronicity, the experiment would be useless: it would have revealed a cause for the emergence of the patterns which Jung selected from the horoscopes. Jung put up with all this and answered my questions until eventually he wrote: 'I shall be glad when all this to-ing and fro-ing can end.' He had reached the end of his tolerance and I did not press him further. I must say that, looking back, I do not suppose much had been gained from all this except that the article had been retained in its original form, and clarified somewhat so that if Jung had got it wrong then it was clear for all to see what had happened.

The Society of Analytical Psychology

It was also after the war that I came across, albeit remotely, Jung's attitude towards forming a school of analytical psychology and towards 'disciples'. The Society of Analytical Psychology was being formed in London and was the first of its kind. It had started before the war when the London analysts wanted to meet together outside the Analytical Psychology Club, and it was then that the idea of starting a more formal training was broached. No doubt Jung knew what was going on, but I was then a junior member of the group and lost touch with it during the war. In 1944 I was asked to become Chairman of this group when Baynes died. At that time there was considerable uncertainty how Jung would take our efforts, but some of the analysts who had been trained in Zurich undertook to discuss our project with Jung, hoping for his approval. They did this at the Ascona meeting, discussing the subject first with Toni Wolff, who made some suggestions.

Jung, rather surprisingly, agreed with what we were doing. So it fell to me as Chairman to write and ask him to become our President, which he did after protesting that his age precluded his taking an active part in our Society's deliberations. He was subsequently kept informed of what we were doing, but he never showed much interest. Only when he was told that we were starting a clinic did he react vigorously by writing that he hoped that we would not succeed in raising the money to do so. But, even then, when he was informed that far from needing money to start it, we hoped that the clinic would be a source of income, he agreed that we might call the clinic by his name.

There was one interesting facet to his ideas about groups of Jungians. Once, when

particularly difficult negotiations were going on between the Analytical Psychology Club and what was to become the Society of Analytical Psychology, one person, who was supporting the formation of the Society and was against inclusion of the Club in it, referred openly to its members as 'the patients', which was badly taken. I suspected that this announcement was somehow supported by Jung, and later, on a suitable occasion, I asked him why he made trouble in this way, for I had come across it before: if he was told of something which would lead to conflict between two members he would tell the person who brought him a bit of inflammatory information to go and tell it to the person to whom it referred. He was quite unabashed and explained that the clubs were a kind of family of which he was the 'father'. It was not healthy if the family had no quarrels, so if he thought that there was calm he would take steps to upset it: a family quarrel would ensue and everything would then come to life.

Jung was certainly ambivalent about the formation of any Society or Institute of Analysis, but he, almost on principle, let others do what they felt was right or necessary, and would even support them though disagreeing internally. The Society in London was the first of its kind and so had political implications: if this one started, almost inevitably others would follow and he would have to agree to them. Jung's behaviour was characteristic of Swiss democracy, which works through a referendum on important issues—in this way single persons or pressure groups could override the 'will of the people'. His respect for individuals and small groups of them also made him lean over backwards to let them develop in their own way. It is an attitude that expresses his concept of individuation, and it is especially striking in that our training programme came to include a number of practices, like separating the supervision of cases from a candidate's analysis, which were not in line with Jung's thinking.

The principle applied also in his relation to my own work on children, to which he was also ambivalent. Whenever I published anything I always sent him an offprint to let him know what I was doing. I did not expect a reply, but would have liked one. Apparently in return I received off-prints of any articles that he wrote and this is usually regarded as mutual recognition between authors, but there was a doubt: they would have been sent anyway because I was the co-editor of his *Collected Works,* and this complicated a usually clear pattern of agreed behaviour. He did on different occasions make two comments: once to correct a mistake in an essay on St John of the Cross, and once he reported that his grandchildren had been furious because, in an *Observer* 'Profile', I had said that they 'infested' Jung's house and garden—it amused him!

Later on, I thought I would ask him to write a 'Foreword' to *New Developments in Analytical Psychology.* I accordingly wrote to him—no reply, so when I next went out to Zurich I badgered him about it. He said, in effect, that he was tired of writing forewords: he was always being asked for them and he thought it was time that he stopped responding. I think it was Mrs Jung who then told me that she thought he was going to do it, and sure enough it was handed to me a day or two later. It was far longer than I had expected, generous, appreciative and contained an interesting statement of his own views on the transference. Having read it, I tried to express my appreciation and thanks. He said: 'You know, I don't think you differ from me over the transference as much as you think you do.' I did not quite know what to make out of this and was taken aback. I had been struck by his making no reference to a long essay on the self and ego in childhood,

which I had thought the most important part of the book, nor to chapters on child psychotherapy, but there was, I now think, more in it than that.

Jung and childhood

I still wonder whether Jung ever assimilated the significance of applying his ideas to child development. Though he had seminars on children's dreams he was against child analysis, and it is still a matter for regret that I could never persuade him to see its possibilities. I was more than once impressed by how easily Jung could make relationships with children if he wanted to, so it did not seem to me that his objections were personal. In my struggle with him Mrs Jung was a staunch ally. She told me her husband knew nothing about children and once she openly challenged him. The following incident is valuable because showing his attitude to child analysis, it also showed that Mrs Jung was no down-trodden wife, but could be very outspoken and hold her own against him. In addition, she had a considerable hand in much of what he wrote.

At a dinner party I tried to start a discussion of child therapy, and Jung conceded that children's dreams could be of scientific interest because they showed so much evidence in favour of this theory of the collective unconscious. He was starting on a monologue when Mrs Jung intervened: 'You know very well that you are not interested in people, but your theory of the collective unconscious.' That was the end of Jung for quite a time, and he sat reflectively eating his meal while the conversation continued between the rest of us!

Jung idealized children—they will be all right if the parents do not interfere—and this seems to have been determined by personal factors. Indeed in one chapter of *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* there are two screen 'memories' of his infancy, both of which are highly idealized. After reading the first version of the chapters on childhood in that volume, he asked me what I thought, so I said he had been a schizophrenic child, with strong obsessional defences, and that had he been brought to me I should have said that the prognosis was good, but that I should have recommended analysis—he did not contest my blunt statement. The idealization of childhood is not so evident in 'The child archetype', where he says that thinking the condition of a child is the fault of parents is only one stage in realization of the self.

That essay contains the ruthlessness of the child; Jung could be both childlike and ruthless, and this characteristic showed up in outspoken or angry comments. 'They are always getting me into trouble,' he once meditatively remarked after telling me how he had caused consternation at a banquet in Germany by saying at a ceremonial dinner that the Nazi swastika went the wrong way round!

Once, at Ascona, Herbert Read read a paper on Picasso. During dinner he was rude and bad-tempered with Read for reading such a paper at all, and afterwards in the meeting Read did not always make it clear when he was quoting Jung, and when he was not. Jung interrupted by stating which was a quotation from his writings and which was not. The papers were read in two parts and he did not attend the second, but went out to the flat that he used above the meeting hall. Then he found that he did not have the key to it, and he fell into a rage accusing his wife of having omitted to give it to him. I came upon him in this state, but he was soon chatting and joking as though nothing had happened. He

seemed not to take rages of this kind at all seriously, expecting others to remain friendly or at least tolerant afterwards. When this was not understood, serious offence would be taken; it made him a number of enemies, mostly among men, and may have given rise to the false belief that he could not sustain relationships with them. This, I have heard it said, was due to unassimilated homosexuality, but that was not my impression. On the contrary, he could not only tolerate, but enjoy many sublimated forms of it, but he would not tolerate the false admiration of 'disciples' to whom he could be ruthless and about whom he could be paranoid.

Freud and psychoanalysts

Freud was a special case of Jung's relation to a man, and he never got over the trauma of Freud's rejection of him, for he had wanted to continue that relationship. If asked about Freud he would talk in warm, appreciative tones and refer to him as 'the master'. Gradually, as he went on, he would start to complain about the treatment he had received from him and from other psychoanalysts. Some of it sounded fantastic but, on those occasions when I could check what he said, it was quite correct, and even more venomous than he asserted. On the whole he was not keen to defend himself, rather taking the line—'It will all turn against them in the end, so why should I bother?' However, his associates in Zurich could not take such a detached view and would press him to do something about it. When he stirred himself he could be remarkably good—his broadcast on the BBC 'The fight with the shadow', subsequently published in *Essays on Contemporary Events,* is an excellent example of how he went about refuting his detractors.

Jung and the transference

After I had published my ideas about transference I went on studying how it could be analysed. As I worked on this subject I started to realize that what I regarded as a neglect of this central topic among colleagues must originate from Jung himself I became more and more afraid that this horrid idea was true, and he seemed to become a threat, in my mind, to what I was discovering. I then became angry, because it meant that what he wrote and had said to me was one thing, what he practised was another. He was a trickster and so perhaps a negative form of Mercurius. All this explained my inability to respond to his approach after writing his introduction to my book. So I decided to go out to Zurich and see him about it.

This was the first and only time that I confronted him in a hostile mood, and I already knew a lot about the pain he could suffer at criticism, especially if it were poisonous as mine was becoming. I also knew, with some trepidation, of his tendency to become angry when estimating criticism; so I wondered how I was going to say what I had to. Then I dreamed a long dream in which he featured, and that gave me some relief. I knew that he would take a great deal from dreams, perhaps more than from direct confrontation, but I was not conscious of that at the time. Today it seems that dreaming this dream was an unconscious piece of diplomacy on my part. It was just the sort of dream that he would like, especially as it contained the figure of Herakles. I thought that if I told it to Jung a

situation would be created in which my bit of transference, if so it were, would come out into the open. As I could only stay in Zurich for a few days, I could not, however, hope to go very far into all this with him.

Progress in telling the dream was slow because Jung took control of the situation, asking for associations and making comments as I told it to him. Sitting in front of him I could watch him all the time. He reacted quite openly with his affects and this, combined with his talk, led to my being able to sort out what was relevant to him and what was not. Gradually it became clear to me that he knew how to create a situation in which I could start sorting out and resolving the content of my bit of transference though without communicating much of it verbally to him, or he with me. Analysis of the dream proceeded until we reached Herakles; then the time ran out. At this point Jung became excited: he seemed to leap out of his chair, insisting that I came to see him on the following day to make ‘a systematic analysis of the dream’. He went out of the room and arranged a time with his secretary and I complied. The next interview, however, was relatively useless because my libido had gone out of the subject. Jung had already reacted quite differently from my analysts, and from the way his followers behaved, so I had become convinced that he knew about the transference and that, though he did not manage it in the way I was interested in, his way was effective. He had helped me to sort out my transference from reality. I felt grateful for his emotion and for an opportunity to continue a relation which I should have been loath to lose.

This interview reminded me of my first meeting with him in one respect. He became fascinated and, indeed, even possessed by the dream just as he had been possessed about the Jews, and again he omitted to take my personal situation sufficiently into account. On this occasion it did not matter to me as I had received much food for thought: it made me see that how a therapist reacted could do much of what was necessary, but I still find it curious that Jung did not discover what made the second interview so empty, for he surely must have known that Herakles contained a fantasy of myself confronting him as the monstrous Mercurius, and that this part of the dream had already been enacted.

Jung’s interviews

Jung’s interviews became famous, though they did not always work out favourably. But they, like his letters, remain as treasured memories for people from all over the world. How did he do it? Very often the interviews were prepared, like the one I have just described; a dream would be brought to the master, or a problem in which it was virtually certain he would be interested. Again, as I have recorded, there might be an acute personal conflict to which he could respond. He did not like those who came to see what this ‘great man’ was like, and many of the interviews that failed may have been of this order. Sometimes he was ill or possessed by a particular problem, and then, as I have suggested at the start, you would have had it.

There are those who admired his phenomenal intuition, but my impression was different. I am not surprised that he could create this impression, but I thought that besides guessing he used his knowledge, his theory of types, and then looked for the compensating unconscious content. Type theory is admirably suited to short interview methods, and I have no doubt that this stood Jung in very good stead. So it was not all

that difficult to create an astonishing impression when there was not time to go into the transference implications of the interview.

In assessing Jung's capacity to conduct therapeutic consultations, there is another factor that needs taking into account. Many of those who went to see him had been through an often long analysis, and meeting Jung was felt as the culmination to their work. Such people knew how to present their material, consciously or unconsciously, so that it is easy for a skilled analyst to pick up the threads and reveal the roots of a particular problem or provide the necessary interpretation which will, as in my case, set further self-analysis going.

But over and above these technical factors there was, in Jung's interviews, a kind of sophisticated informality, of which I have already given sufficient evidence. When it was in the open, it could not be missed, but it was also there even when he was making the analysis of my dream: it left room for something to happen and created a therapeutic atmosphere. Behind this and perhaps even part of it, one knew there was a person with great and unique emotional and intellectual knowledge who evoked trust by reason partly of his reputation and partly of his unusual gifts and outstanding personality.

The informality was very evident at Bollingen, for there Jung was easy, and, as he said, there he was much more his true self, with his sculptures around, talking freely about what he was interested in, sitting by the lake on the stone seat near the water, or showing his house. I remember once passing through a group of grandchildren and finding him cutting up wood. As was usual on informal occasions, they were locked out. Visits to Jung for them, I imagine, must have been 'state' occasions.

The end

My last meeting with Jung was a sad one. Shortly before his death a mutual friend brought me a letter from Jung over which he was very much upset. It was written in a shaky hand and was full of complaining despair: nobody understood him and his work had been a failure—that was the substance of it. I also was very much concerned. It was a depressed, agitated product, as if Jung had fallen into a fantasy of his being a world saviour and had become disillusioned. This was very unlike Jung, though it was something that might have been lurking in his unconscious. Ordinarily there was no false humility about the importance he attributed to his work. He was acutely aware of the need for people who could develop in consciousness and self-awareness. His ideas, he knew, could be used to further this process and at the same time sustain the link between the march of history, traditional values and the new step forward that was so necessary.

I decided, therefore, to go out to Zurich and see him in the hope of being able to relieve his distress by telling him something of the extent that he had been studied in England. He was ill when I arrived, but Miss Bailey told me to come out to Seestrasse, 'It would do him good to see you,' she said. Encouraged, I arrived and Jung was there in his dressing-gown and a skull cap. I told him about the letter and delivered my message. He looked at me as though I were a poor fool and did not know a thing. Then he started to talk about LSD, and the *abaissement du niveau mental* that it produced so that the archetypes could come into the field of consciousness. I had heard this dissertation more than once and it had always been a bad sign. This time he looked quite different from the

usual Jung, even when he had been ill, and I got the impression that he was dying. He eventually became confused and distressed, and I asked him what was the matter. He did not speak for a minute or two and then he said, 'You had better go', and regretfully I did so. In a few days he was dead. I found this ending sad. How could so great a man end in this way? It was a severe blow to any residual fantasy that he was a sort of Mahatma who could determine his death. On the contrary, he died like an ordinary man might die who had developed arteriosclerosis and whose brain cells had suffered, giving rise to the tremor I had seen in the letter. I do not know what he really died of.

7
Analytical psychology in England

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 24(4) (1979)

INTRODUCTION

To understand the development of analytical psychology in Great Britain it is necessary to look at its background and to glance briefly at Jung's attitude towards forming a school of his own to promulgate his ideas and practices.

After he departed from psychoanalysis in 1914, there was a long period in which Jung absorbed himself in his own form of 'analysis'. At this time his literary productivity was low, for although he had published the *Psychology of the Unconscious* in 1912 (Jung 1912a), only a short essay, 'The structure of the unconscious' (Jung 1916a) indicated the direction his researches were taking until *Psychological Types* was published in 1921 (Jung 1921). During this fallow period a small group of analysts interested in his work collected together, but it had little formal structure, and there was no means other than personal contact with Jung whereby another person could be trained in the methods which he was developing.

As his investigations began to mature, however, and as patients accumulated, the Psychological Club was formed at the instigation of Antonia Wolff. It was made up of persons who had undergone sufficient development in their analyses for them to benefit from meeting regularly to discuss matters of common interest. The Club made it very clear that it was to have no professional status, and membership was not a qualification to practise psychotherapy.

In 1925 Jung started to give seminars in Zurich, at first to a rather closed circle, but subsequently to an expanding audience which included people from a wide variety of disciplines. Because he had stimulated particular interest in the English-speaking countries, Great Britain and the United States, he gave three lengthy seminars in English: on 'Dream analysis', which lasted for two years, between 1928 and 1930; on the 'Interpretation of visions', also of two years' duration; and on 'Psychological aspects of Nietzsche's "Zarathustra"', given between 1933 and 1939. There was thus a considerable literature which covered a wide-ranging study of ethnological material as well as the dreams and visions them-selves. The seminars were recorded and became available to Club members and others who were deemed suitable.

In these seminars Jung expressed himself with considerable freedom, and much of their content did not, and was not intended to, stand up to critical examination. Furthermore, they were not written by him but were transcripts compiled by students and became available to those who formed an inner circle which was not, however, confined to analysts.

How anyone became an analytic therapist in those days is vague and must be regarded

largely as a matter of vocation, though there was an unwritten law that any person who wanted to be called a Jungian analyst was expected to go out to Zurich, make a relation with Jung himself, and undergo analysis with either himself or one or more of his close colleagues. These prospective analysts would, of course, be eligible to attend the erudite and often inspiring seminars. It must be made clear once again that there was no formal training as it is known today, and no qualification was attached to having been to Zurich; but since the idea of forming clubs had caught on, it became usual for clubs to start up in countries other than Switzerland wherever there was a sufficient number of interested people. Those who had been to Zurich would automatically join the club in the country of their domicile and would take a leading part in its activities. In this way they would become known and, as club members would want further analysis from time to time, they were provided with a small source of patients with whose help they could begin to build up a practice. It must be underlined here that the subject matter of club meetings was seldom clinical, and it tended to cover matter relevant to Jung's concept of the collective unconscious, the relation between the sexes and the so-called problems of our times. The lectures and discussions were often of a high intellectual standard, and members of learned but non-psychological professions were also invited to deliver papers from time to time.

It is clear that Jung did not want to form a school of Jungian analysts, and, indeed, no formal training was ever instituted by him. He had witnessed that particular development in psychoanalysis; he did not like it and did not want to repeat it. More than once he asserted that he objected to disciples and he spoke firmly against them. For this reason he tended to address himself to a wider audience, and later on sponsored the formation of national bodies of psychotherapists when he was president of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy. The groups were not made up of Jungians, but of persons interested in, and practising, one form of psychotherapy or another. All the same, in spite of his efforts, there grew up an inner circle, and it was out of this that the Society of Analytical Psychology was eventually to be formed in England.

JUNG'S VISITS TO ENGLAND

Analytical psychology had developed slowly in this country, though the high esteem in which Jung was held is borne out by the periodic invitations to lecture extended to him by learned societies. In 1914 he addressed the British Medical Association with a paper, 'On the importance of the unconscious in psychopathology' (Jung 1914b). In 1919 he read a paper to the section of Psychiatry of the Royal Society of Medicine, 'On the problems of psychogenesis in mental disease' (Jung 1919). In 1935 he delivered five seminars at the Tavistock Clinic in London, and in 1936 he was invited to lecture to the Abernethian Society at St Bartholomew's Hospital where he talked on 'The concept of the collective unconscious' (Jung 1936). A year later he was in Oxford as president of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, when he was accorded the first D.Sc. in psychology ever to be bestowed in that subject by the university. In 1939 he was again at the Psychiatry Section of the RSM when he spoke 'On the psychogenesis of schizophrenia' (Jung 1939). In 1960 he was awarded a Fellowship of the Royal Society,

but because of his age he was unable to deliver an address to the Royal Society at its Tercentenary Celebration in the same year. Besides these formal occasions, Jung had held seminars at Polzeath in Cornwall in 1923, and at Swanage in 1925 to more intimate circles.

THE STATE OF ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY BEFORE 1944

In spite of all this activity, and though there was much interest, and also an Analytical Psychology Club, only a handful of psychotherapists had assimilated more than a smattering of the rich ideas that were coming out of Zurich. This might be taken as an indication of the success of Jung's avowed aim of not forming a school of his own, but, as events proved, this state of affairs could not continue for ever. Before considering professional developments in detail, it must be added here, for the sake of completion, that Jung's ideas had taken root in a different direction. Between the First and Second World Wars, a society had been formed, devoted to furthering his ideas about religion. This was the Guild of Pastoral Psychology founded by Dr Kathleen Kitchen. It was less esoteric than the Club, a personal analysis was not required, and so its membership increased quickly, especially among clerics and priests.

Though the number of informed analysts in England was small, some of them were of good standing, but in the early years they tended to migrate. H.G.Baynes went to Zurich, where he became Jung's assistant, Doctors Esther Harding and Eleanor Bertine went to the United States. Dr Maurice Nicoll migrated in a different sense to the doctrines of Gurdjieff. It was not until the early part of the third decade of this century that H.G.Baynes settled in England for a long enough time to make a focus around which analysts could form. Even so it was slow going until refugees from Germany came over to make up a sufficient number to form a professional group.

Shortly before the Second World War two groups were formed with this purpose in mind. One was composed of medical men and women and called 'The Medical Society of Analytical Psychology'. Lay analysts were excluded and so they formed another group. After some heated negotiations the two eventually amalgamated, pooled ideas and drew up proposals for a training scheme which was given Jung's approval. This was then publicized at a meeting on lay analysis held at the Medical Section of the British Psychological Society.

Tentative attempts at implementing the training programme were made during the war, but developments hung fire until the war ended, when Dr Baynes tragically died. Nevertheless, the group of analysts that had formed held together, and eventually became the Society of Analytical Psychology—not, however, without further discussion about the role of the Analytical Psychology Club (cf. Fordham 1958). Though avowedly a non-professional body, the Club tended to keep alive the wider implications of Jung's work, and it was hoped that its members might continue doing so while professional matters were being handled by the analysts themselves. Jealous of its integrity, however, the Club raised objections to becoming part of the proposed Society, and after some time it was decided that the analysts should devote themselves to clinical study and to the training of analysts alone. This policy has been followed in other countries when analysts began to

organize themselves, and the London group takes pride in being the first to initiate this pattern of organization. The Society of Analytical Psychology was formally constituted in 1944 at the house of Mrs Marged Welch in St John's Wood in London, who lent part of it, together with a sum of money to defray initial expenses. The eight founder members, Gerhard Adler, Culver Barker, Frieda Fordham, Michael Fordham, Robert Moody, Philip Metman, Lola Paulsen and Erna Rosenbaum, came from different fields—medicine, psychiatry, psychiatric social work, while two were without any qualification other than that of having practised analytical psychology for some years. In this way the Society pursued the early policy of including lay analysts among its membership.

CLINICAL ORIENTATION

None the less, it was decided that the Society should maintain a majority of medical members from whom the chairman should be elected. In this way the medical lead would be firmly established and the clinical orientation of the members underscored. It has been claimed that the traditions of English empirical philosophy are responsible for the developments within the Society, and that its clinical orientation is a manifestation of this tradition. This may have been a contributing factor since the romantic and idealistic elements in Jung's writings proved less attractive in this country than his scientific attitude. It certainly was not, however, philosophic considerations that gave rise to the interest in psychopathology, but hard-headed, down-to-earth acceptance of the needs of patients in distress. It would not, of course, be correct to say that Jung had not worked in this field, especially in his formative years when he was a psychiatrist. He had studied the relation between hysteria and schizophrenia, and there are indications that many of his patients were of a schizoid depressive type. There are also descriptions of obsessional cases in his writings and he was interested in psychosomatic disorders. In *Psychological Types* he also assigns a psychopathology to each type, but the classification he used was not always in line with psychiatric nosology in England. Nor did he relate psychopathological types to their origins in childhood. He seems to have recognized the need, but assigned that study to psychoanalysts, and so passed it by. To some of the founder members this situation had never seemed satisfactory, and they also experienced a need for the theory of archetypes to be applied to childhood, a study that had begun even before the formation of the Society.

JUNG'S ATTITUDE

By the end of the war plans for forming a society of analysts were well under way and Jung could again be consulted. He had known of the efforts being made between 1936 and 1939, but his unqualified approval was not expected. In many ways the London analysts were doing just what Jung had sought to avoid; they were forming a school of analytical psychology. His agreement to what was being done was, however, gained and he became the first president, protesting, however, that he would not be able to take an active part in the proceedings of the Society. No doubt he was ambivalent, and when he

was written to about the starting of a clinic, he registered a vigorous protest, but here again was persuaded to let his name be used when the Society's intentions were explained to him. The C.G.Jung Clinic was thus started with the master's approval.

EARLY DEVELOPMENTS

The plans for a society soon bore fruit. After the war, as after the First World War, there was a spurt of interest in dynamic psychology as a whole. Dr E.A.Bennett, a close friend and collaborator of Jung, became lecturer at the Maudsley Hospital, the centre for the teaching of psychiatry in Great Britain, and several gifted young doctors from that institution, the Tavistock Clinic, Napsbury Mental Hospital and so on joined the training, among them Alan Edwards, Robert Hobson, Murray Jackson, Alfred Plaut, Gordon Prince, Joseph Redfearn, Dennis Scott, Leopold Stein and Anthony Storr. This large first-year contingent provided so many candidates that the Society's scant resources could cope only with difficulty.

At that time the available literature on the practice of Jungian methods was small because many of Jung's papers on psychotherapy were not then translated. There was ample material for demonstrating the results of therapy, but almost none to state how these results were obtained, and that was what the candidates wanted to know. For this reason the first trainees produced a considerable impact since many of them came with extensive clinical experience and often challenged the knowledge and expertise of the founder members. Nevertheless, the framework of training that was laid down at the start has stood the test of time, though modifications have taken place.

The attitude of these trainees has been well stated by Gordon Prince, who was one of them:

> The psychiatrically-trained candidates brought with them in many cases—in addition to biological background, medical experience, and their groundwork in clinical psychiatry—considerable knowledge of psychopathology. Moreover, many had been taught by, or had treated cases under supervision with, psychoanalysts of standing. Although attracted by analytical psychology, few had failed to be convinced of the essential values of the psychoanalytic orientation and few had the inclination to abandon it in their thinking or practice. Some, misguidedly expecting comprehensive psychopathological theory in Jung's work, were disappointed, and some were critical of the lack of clinical psychiatric orientation in some of their teachers.
>
> (Prince 1963:50)

TRAINING POLICY

The principle that analysis of the candidate was to be the central core of training was taken over direct from Jung, but one important revision was to be made from the start; teaching and supervision of two cases to be treated by candidates was separated from

analysis. This was a first deviation from the practice in Zurich where the two were run in together. Not all members agreed to the arrangement, but they complied.

The importance of this decision may not at first be apparent, though it clearly diverged from Jung's practice; he and his collaborators provided knowledge about the archetypal forms, as the seminars demonstrated, but if an analyst was in difficulties for which he wanted help he would take this up with his analyst, from whom he would receive instruction, or further personal analysis if he were undesirably involved with the patient. Thus education and analysis were interlaced. It was a method in line with Jung's view that in psychotherapy there were four stages—catharsis, elucidation (by which he meant analysis), education and transformation—while the therapeutic effect derived from the personal influence of the therapist. It was generally held that to separate teaching from the personal therapy of the trainee violated Jung's thesis. While this has subsequently been shown to be untrue, at the same time the division of the two disciplines indicates the stress that members of the London Society, then half-consciously, and later with increasing conviction, laid on the importance of analysis (elucidation) and also, be it added in parenthesis, on transformation rather than education in the treatment of patients.

This focus, combined with the Society's clinical orientation, led increasingly to leaving on one side much that other, or earlier, Jungians had held dear. In part this was due to the absence of translated versions of Jung's later contributions, translations which only became available slowly in the *Collected Works,* and also because the cases that were available for trainees to study were not often of the kind which Jung had collected in Zurich, people who dreamed rich archetypal dreams and conducted active imagination. It should also be noted that besides being applicable to the case material under consideration, Jung's seminar reports were in short supply and so could not conveniently be referred to where it seemed desirable.

SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS

Early on in the development of the Society a special Analytical Section was formed to bring the scientific work of its members into focus. At first its deliberations were rather informal because of the small number of members, but they increasingly gained in weight and substance. At the meetings trends within the Society were recorded, and it soon became clear that they were those enumerated above. Members were interested in the analysis of patients and how to conduct analysis; they were also interested in adapting Jung's ideas to their discoveries and, if necessary, in developing them.

GENETIC INTEREST

The genetic (developmental) interest shown by some members of the Society dove-tailed conveniently with the interest in childhood and child therapy being shown by other members, and here again Jung had recognized the relevance of childhood in a series of essays which gave outlines of a theory which needed filling in. He was, however, unsympathetic to child therapy, and in this attitude he had received much support from

his colleague, Frances G.Wickes. She studied the influence of parents upon children, and by and large considered the investigation of the archetypal forms in childhood positively dangerous. When it was proved, however, that the analysis and psychotherapy of children was possible and beneficial, and that the archetypal forms functioned positively as well as negatively in childhood, it became easier to see how a Jungian theory of maturation from infancy onwards could be developed. It will be shown that psychoanalysts, who know so much about this field, have proved helpful.

WHAT DO ANALYSTS DO?

Another hiatus in the literature was the lack of information about what Jungian therapists actually did in their treatment of patients. Here again there were outlines and suggestions but few details. It could be noted that all Jung's essays in the *Collected Works* described the field of psychotherapy, and in one essay he listed stages in its development—catharsis, elucidation, education and transformation (Jung 1929)—and there are many hints about what went on; but the propositions wanted filling out if they were to be of practical use, if only for training purposes. Furthermore, though in 1946 Jung produced an erudite essay on the transference, he did not enter into personal details of the analyst-patient relation, but gave an account of the cultural and historical aspects of a subject which entered into the therapy of patients concerned with the problem of individuation in later life (Jung 1946). This was helpful, but it became apparent that it said very little about the personal transference conflicts which faced analysts working with different types of patients, and particularly with those who became dependent. It was not that Jung was ignorant on this subject, but he seems not to have been 'interested', and to have relied rather heavily on the analyst's native intelligence. He furthermore agreed to the application of analytic method only with considerable qualification. Methods, he contended, must be used with circumspection so that they did not obscure the individuality of patients and the unique elements in any psychotherapeutic enterprise. He thought, however, that it was necessary for the therapist to acquire a detailed knowledge of mythology, and this he taught in his seminars. Without denying this, many members of the London Society wanted to investigate the relation between analyst and patient in more detail, and as a result the study of myth and legend came to occupy less importance.

TRANSFERENCE AND COUNTER-TRANSFERENCE

Jung had repeatedly considered that the relation between patient and therapist was reciprocal. This conception was enshrined in a number of graphic phrases: 'The analyst is just as much in analysis as the patient', and 'No analysis can take a patient further than he has gone himself'. However global and subject to criticism such utterances might be, they were not encouraging to those who thought that an analyst was sometimes required to be a projection screen for the patient so as to detect the transference neurosis, or that a therapist's main task was to refine his interpretative skills. As these conceptions were backed up by Jung saying that the relation between therapist and patient was essentially a

two-way dialectic, and as this gave essential importance to the therapist's analysis, it seemed natural to start from the analyst's part in the therapeutic work.

Robert Moody was the first to publish a paper describing how he was influenced by the unconscious processes of a child (Moody 1955), and this was followed by another which was a discussion on transference as a whole (Fordham 1957) and defined two aspects of the counter-transference: one comprised the illusions which a therapist could develop about a patient, the other in which the patient influenced the analyst in such a way that the therapist tended to become 'syntonic' to the unconscious processes of the patient. In this second situation he acted like the receiving set of a wireless, and if he could define what was taking place this could be used as a basis for making interpretation of the patient's material.

Interest in this approach led to analysts' paying increased attention to their own reactions, so much so that at times it seemed as if objectivity could not be achieved by them at all. That trend is gradually wearing itself out, and the kinds of transference that a patient makes have now become easier to define. With this recognition, interest in infancy increased out of all recognition, and it came to be generally accepted that if the transference is to be understood its infantile nature must be recognized. It was here that the interest in child psychology and genetic studies of the childhood of adult patients bore fruit.

CHANGES IN TRAINING PROCEDURES

With these developments going on it became inevitable that the shape of the training should change as follows:

1 Whereas at first the seminars had centred on such topics as typology, the personal and collective unconscious, the study of dreams and active imagination, it became clear that space was needed to focus on transference, regression and the emergence and interpretation of infantile material.

2 In addition, since patients in regression needed a close relation with their analyst, and since it was often difficult for them to bear the rather long intervals that classical Jungian therapy prescribed (interviews once or twice a week), training analysts began to want to see their candidates and patients four or even five times a week. As the emphasis had traditionally been given to the analysis of trainees, this increase in interview frequency led to the extension of the pre-training analysis to 400 hours, the longest requirement of any training institute.

   As might have been expected, not all members agreed or could go along with these developments and they started to object, particularly when it came to making the pre-training requirements so onerous. So the analysts who had been trained in Zurich virtually withdrew from activity in the training.

3 Besides the length of the pre-training analysis, a subject that was discussed on the training committee at some length was how it might be possible to assess the merits of candidates more closely. This arose partly out of the conflict among training analysts, for it seemed desirable to try to work out the merits of each form of 'training analysis'. So the committee, in conjunction with the training analysts, formulated what it wanted

to know about the candidate's analysis from the training analyst. The aim of finding out more about the merits of the two approaches was not successful, because of the closed-vessel doctrine of analysis which prohibited communication by the training analyst of personal details about the patient-candidate. Reporting what had gone on in the analysis was likewise proscribed. This was the view of the analysts trained at Zurich; others co-operated, however, and so the committee was placed in a better position to arrive at a good judgement as to whether a candidate would make a satisfactory trainee or not.

4 The reliability and relevance of the training analyst's judgement of his candidate began to be questioned. It was observed that some training analysts tended to find their candidates almost inevitably acceptable, and to become disturbed if their view was not agreed to by other members of the training, or members of the training (professional) committee. In other words, a training analyst tended to develop a positive counter-transference to his candidate. Occasionally the reverse could be observed. This critique of the analyst's judgement proved valuable, and it became possible to accept and reject candidates with increasing conviction that a good assessment had been made by the committee. These changes in procedure were not always received with enthusiasm; but they proved useful for the training analyst who could, in the course of the discussion, become aware of aspects of his counter-transference for the first time.

5 Another consideration proved important. As a result of conflicts within the Society, there seemed to be a difference between the two groups which came to be thought of as the difference between an analyst and a therapist. Definition of the difference did not at first seem very clear, but it led on to attempts to elucidate the nature of analysis, a technical subject which lies outside the scope of this chapter. No very satisfactory conclusion was reached about the differences. Nevertheless, sufficient clarity was achieved for it to be asked whether it was the aim of the Society to train 'analysts' or 'therapists'. A majority of the Professional Committee opted for training 'analysts', and this meant in effect that its members wanted to take into account the infancy of their candidates and patients, and to abstain from educating them. It was as a result of these developments that the Zurich-trained analysts gradually withdrew even from giving seminars, and eventually formed a society of their own.

PSYCHOTHERAPY SECTION

The increasingly rigorous view of analysis which developed within the Society highlighted the difficulties of applying it, and the need to research the application of knowledge gained in the longer detailed procedure to shorter methods. The great demand for psychotherapy on the part of the community, the large number of cases met with in Health Service work, heavy taxation and the increased inflation rates which were impoverishing many people, were making a thorough analysis more and more difficult to finance. Social factors, therefore, entered powerfully into the formation of a Psychotherapy Section, and this was conceived and organized by A. Plaut.

It was furthermore felt that those with analytic training who were aware of transference and its implications, and who knew what could and what could not be done, should make

closer contacts with the so-called ‘helping professions’ (marriage guidance, counselling, and other similar efforts to bring assistance to those in need).

The formation of this section, apparently a new departure, had, in reality, been foreshadowed from the start. There had always been those who, while taking their analytic training, had tended to practise shorter methods of psychotherapy. They have now a formal meeting place.

CHILDREN’S SECTION AND CHILD ANALYTIC TRAINING

A further development was the formation, first of a Children’s Section, and then a training in child analysis and psychotherapy, which began in 1974.

This departure is unique in the field of analytical psychology, and a good deal of care was taken to justify such a departure. An increasing number of members had taken posts as child psychiatrists in clinics, and a considerable wealth of experience had been accumulating. A few had gone on to develop analytic skills with children, and it was these who formed the basis for training others. In addition, however, as a result of members’ work, and especially that of the author of this chapter, there had developed a theory of child maturation whose essential characteristics may be outlined as follows.

As the result of observations on archetypal images and also the occurrence of self images in childhood, it was postulated that there was a primary state of the self which expressed the infant’s individuality and was a blueprint of future development. This technical statement may be translated to mean that an infant, when born, is separate from its mother and has within it individual characteristics and means of reacting to the new situation imposed upon it by its absolute need to relate to the mother, and thus obtain nourishment and all the care which this exposed state requires. While the existence of a providing mother is essential, it is held that the infant is active in relation to her and can play on her emotions in such a way as almost to compel her to meet its needs. If this is true, it becomes apparent that this contribution to the mother-infant situation is considerable. The infant’s part in the relation with his mother then leads on to the development of the state which Jung had described for adults as primary identity or *participation mystique* out of which the infant gradually individuates. It is a conception which extends Jung’s thesis to childhood and infancy, and forms the justification for the application of analytic method to small children.

Jung’s emphasis upon the importance of parents is represented in training, which takes three years apart from the pre-training analysis. Each candidate is required to analyse a mother, preferably one whose presenting symptom of her neurosis is difficulties in bringing up her children. In addition, knowledge of normal and abnormal children is required before training starts, and an infant observation seminar is provided which has been much appreciated, and is attended by some accepted members of the Society at their own request.

PUBLICATIONS

By 1955 the vitality of the Society and the activity of its members demanded that a journal be published. Financial assistance was generously provided by the Bollingen Foundation of New York, and the first number of *The Journal of Analytical Psychology* appeared, in the same year, under the editorship of Michael Fordham. A bound copy was presented to Jung at his eightieth birthday celebrations in Zurich. It had appeared two years after the first volume of the *Collected Works of C.G.Jung,* excellently translated by R.F.C.Hull. These two publications reinforced each other and gave recognition to the Society's increasing maturity.

The editorial in the first number of the *Journal* emphasized its clinical orientation and its aim to foster the reporting of case material illustrating and developing the concepts and practices of analytical psychologists. It has done just that, though not to the exclusion of other lines of enquiry, and a wide-ranging sequence of papers has covered less down-to-earth topics, so long as they have scientific relevance. The first issue indicated lines of interest. It opened with an anthropological essay by John Layard on 'Boar sacrifices in Malekula', followed by four clinical papers: 'Archetypal themes in depression', by R.F.Hobson; 'On the functions of counter-transference', by Robert Moody; an essay by Leopold Stein on 'Loathsome women'; and on 'The father archetype' by Amy Allenby. The main body of the *Journal* concluded with a 'short communication' by Anthony Storr, 'A note on cybernetics and analytical psychology'. Finally, there were long reviews of the first four volumes of the *Collected Works,* and of *Answer to Job.* The Society can once again take pride in having pioneered the first *Journal of Analytical Psychology.* It has gained international status and has flourished ever since. After my term as editor, A. Plaut took over in 1971, and in 1979 the editorship passed to Judith Hubback, who had collaborated for the two previous years.

This is a suitable place to add that in 1973 another venture was launched—the Library of Analytical Psychology. Its first two volumes aimed to explain the scientific work of the Society by collecting together a number of seminal essays that had previously appeared in scientific journals, mainly in *The Journal of Analytical Psychology.* Two more volumes have since been published, *The Self and Autism* by Michael Fordham, and *Dying and Creating: a Search for Meaning,* by Rosemary Gordon.

RELATIONS WITH THE C.G.JUNG INSTITUTE

Before going on to discuss further developments in the Society, it is relevant to consider its relation with the Zurich Institute which formed itself some years after the London Society. At first it was hoped that the Institute would provide an authoritative centre for analytical psychology. Many of its members had been close to Jung, and while he was alive he was there for consultation about the way it should develop. In fact, the Zurich Institute has emphasized, some would think over-emphasized, the cultural and educational aspects of Jung's work, and its efforts to give clinical analytical training have lagged behind. Attempts to discuss differences between the London Society and the

Institute were made in the Congress of the International Association for Analytical Psychology with little success, and no doubt more time will be necessary before an accommodation can be reached. It cannot be disputed that the London Society, in pursuing its own lines of interest has not, in recent years, researched much into those cultural and spiritual aspects of the psyche to which Jung gave so much attention in his later years. All the same, Jung recurrently claimed that his sources were clinical, and in this the members of the London Society are following in his footsteps. In practical terms it is difficult to say how the gap in Jung's work, and in the Society's training, could be rectified except by prolonging the training to four years at least. At present it seems that those of the London School, for such it has become, who want to, will pursue Jung's inspiration in the individual way that perhaps he always hoped for, and there is evidence that they do. But there is a very real difficulty in the way of making their study more formal. Scientifically speaking, the disciplines which Jung invaded have developed greatly since his time, and it is difficult enough to keep up with this development, let alone when practising analysis and psychotherapy during the daytime. In short, there does not seem to be a serious difference in principle in the two approaches of London and Zurich, but rather one of emphasis.

ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

In the theoretical field the psychoanalysts, particularly those who followed Melanie Klein, had formed concepts significantly nearer to those of Jung than heretofore. They had developed the concepts of phantastic parent images and of unconscious phantasy operative even in the first months of life, these coming very close to the concept of archetypes as put forward by Jung in *Symbols of Transformation,* and later applied to childhood and infancy as I have indicated. This suggested that discussion might be valuable, and marathon debates such as those held in the past, and as Edward Glover sought to perpetuate in his book *Freud or Jung* (published in 1950), might no longer be necessary.

There was, and still is, a unique forum for these discussions to take place: the Medical Section of the British Psychological Society. This had long been a meeting place for interdisciplinary interchanges between psychotherapists. Among psychoanalysts like John Rickman, for example, there was a desire to compare notes with analytical psychologists; but how to do it without a clash? Avoidance of a prestige debate seemed most likely to be achieved if each side simply presented its knowledge about comparable topics. The first that were chosen were on 'Archetypes and internal objects', in which Paula Heimann and Clifford Scott spoke on internal objects, Gerhard Adler and Michael Fordham on archetypes. This meeting produced an interesting discussion in which a large audience participated. The symposium method was to be followed in 1959 by another on a common subject, 'Counter-transference'. In this case there was even more overlapping of views both between the participants (Michael Fordham, Paula Heimann, Margaret Little, Ruth Strauss and D. W.Winnicott) and from the floor of the meeting. These two symposia were published in the *British Journal of Medical Psychology.*

The activity of the Society members in the Medical Section of the British

Psychological Society may be gauged further by individual members, and by the symposia delivered on the occasion of Jung's seventieth and eightieth birthdays. It may be noted that the Jungian contributors all showed a much greater appreciation and understanding of Jung's later work than the Society's research deliberations would seem to indicate.

The importance of these discussions as part of the increasingly close relation between analytical psychology and psychoanalysis cannot be in doubt. In them it began to appear that the old divisions between the two disciplines were in the process of dissolving because of the new thinking that was going on on both sides. Thus, though the divisions are maintained formally, their scientific basis is less meaningful.

STATUS OF ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY

There remains to consider the effect of the Society's work on influential societies and important disciplines. If public pronouncements are any indication of Jung's own influence, it is witnessed by the frequent use of such words as 'complex', 'archetype', 'extraversion', 'introversion' or even 'animus' and 'anima'. But as this does not prove that these terms are actually understood, it becomes necessary to look in other directions to assess what has gone on.

Psychiatry

It cannot be said that the effect of analytical psychology of psychiatry has been very obvious. Nevertheless, analytical psychologists have been chairmen of the Psychotherapy Section of the Royal Medico-Psychological Association (now the Royal College of Psychiatry), and many analysts have been working in the Health Service and in private practice who have made their 'silent' impact. There have been two evident influences, the one at Napsbury Hospital, where a team of analytically-trained psychiatrists, Doctors Edwards, Gladstone and Scott, have made a significant contribution to the treatment of severe mental disorders. The second notable influence has been Dr Robert Hobson, who pioneered group therapy at the Bethlem Royal Hospital and is now reader in psychotherapy at Manchester University.

Hobson's work needs further comment. It is at first sight surprising that so little research has been done in group analysis and therapy by analytical psychologists, for it would seem that the notion of the archetypes and the collective unconscious are admirably suited to the subject. No doubt this has been due in large measure to Jung's own opposition, for Hobson wrote a critical assessment of the matter before presenting the results of his investigations. He considers that the members of a group function on the basis that they constellate the self, and so the participants tend to function as parts of the self. It is a provocative and interesting thesis.

Apart from Hobson, too little has been published about the work of the late Harold Kaye at the Group Analytic Practice, started by the psychoanalyst, Foulkes. In particular he introduced to England the practice of seeing patients concurrently in individual and group therapy. Since then several members and trainees have become associated with

group analytic practice.

In the sphere of psychotherapy there is an eclectic organization, the British Association of Psychotherapy, and in it there is a Jungian training largely, and until recently, organized by Mrs Marianne Jacoby. At Stanton, near Broadway in Worcestershire, Mrs Irene Champernowne, a member of the Society, ran a small psychotherapeutic centre (the heir of Withy-mead, which had to be closed down for financial reasons), which could be attended by a number of patients resident in the locality for treatment. Recently a separate group of Zurich-orientated analysts has set up its own organization, while a Guild of Psychotherapy has been started by two members of the Society, Camilla Bosanquet and Joseph Redfearn.

Psychology

I have already mentioned the important part that the British Psychological Society played in furthering the interchange between psychoanalysts and analytical psychologists; a number of members of the Society of Analytical Psychology have, in fact, been chairmen and chairwomen of its Medical Section.

As might be expected, the subject of types has influenced psychologists most because it lends itself to statistical evaluation, and it is well known that the redoubtable controversialist Eysenck has made use of the introversion/extraversion concept to investigate and construct a novel scheme of psychopathology. It cannot be said, however, that analytical psychology has been introduced into the psychological courses at the universities in Britain, except in a very insignificant manner.

Psychoanalysis

It is worthy of note that a number of concepts that Jung instigated have infiltrated into psychoanalysis. Amonst these it is perhaps that of the self which is most striking, and this has even percolated into the literature of classical psychoanalysis. There is little difference between D.W.Winnicott's true and false selves, and Jung's self and persona. I have already noted the similarities of Kleinian and Jungian concepts, but I doubt whether these derived from any cross-fertilization from Jungian sources. Likewise, the inclusion of individuation as a feature in child maturation can scarcely have failed to draw on Jung's thesis.

Religion

Mention has already been made of the Guild of Pastoral Psychology, which is now a sizeable body publishing a regular library of pamphlets and has quite a wide influence. I must add here, for the sake of completion, the Oxford Psychology and Religion Society formed by John Layard during the Second World War. It unfortunately did not survive his departure to Cornwall.

As part of the assimilation of Jung's ideas into religion there has grown up a considerable literature, and from among numerous others may be singled out Father Victor White, a Roman Catholic theologian, for his courageous, outspoken and

penetrating assessments, both appreciative and critical. For the Church of England there has been David Cox, who contributed a weighty study, *Jung and St Paul,* while Howard Philp has been a painstaking critic.

THE PRESENT QUESTION CONFERENCE

In Switzerland many years back, Jung had combined with others to institute an annual conference convened by Frau Fröbe-Kapteyn at Ascona. These Eranos meetings were attended by eminent scholars who gave learned papers centring on a relevant theme. For some years Jung held a dominating influence and provided much of the spiritual dynamism which pervaded the meetings. They none the less survived his eventual retirement and death, and continue today. It was these meetings that inspired one of the members of the Society, Heinz Westmann, in collaboration with a well-known psychotherapist, Graham Howe, and other eminent men like Herbert Read, to institute the Present Question Conference which met annually in England, and flourished for a time. It began in 1946 but terminated in 1954. It followed the Eranos pattern in important respects in that it assembled members from a wide variety of disciplines to speak on an agreed topic. Since that time this aspect of Jung's 'spirit' has not found a significant group in England.

LITERATURE

In literature and the arts the influence of Jung is reflected in the names of J.B.Priestley, Herbert Read and Kathleen Raine, while there can be no doubt that Jung's conceptions contributed a considerable part to Arnold Toynbee's monumental *Study of History.* Finally, I am informed that his work on alchemy has achieved a wide measure of acceptance among those devoted to this passage in world history.

CONCLUSION

The thesis that I have put forward in this chapter has been this: important developments in analytical psychology have taken place as the result of the formation of the Society of Analytical Psychology. By collecting together a now sizeable number of well-trained analysts and psychotherapists, it has been possible to develop both the theory and practice of analytical psychology. The application of Jung's germinal ideas about genetic psychology has produced a revision of analytic practice in that the patient's personal history is taken into account far more than it used to be. It is a development that has required modification in technique, focusing especially on the transference and counter-transference, considered as aspects of the dialectical procedure, as defined by Jung. The investigations of the Society's members have, however, led to apparent neglect of such pillars of Jungian therapy as dream analysis and active imagination. Though this is more apparent than real, it has provoked brisk objections. It is, however, possible that classical

practices stressed particular features of mental life, and that if analysis and psychotherapy are going to progress they must take into account the whole span of life and not only one segment. There is some truth in the reproach of one-sidedness on the part of some Society members, but this is probably inevitable when a field is opened up which calls out for study, and which has been productive. After all, any research must appear essentially one-sided. However, if the activities of the Society's members are carefully reviewed, it can be seen that they have studied Jung's ideas and applied them to a wide variety of disciplines. Over the years it has gradually been understood that there has grown up a body of knowledge sufficiently characteristic of the Society's members for a London school of analytical psychology to be defined. This designation should not, however, be taken to mean either that a body of doctrine has grown up or that there is not a lively diversity of thinking among the Society's membership.

8
The emergence of child analysis[1]

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 25(4) (1980)

INTRODUCTION

I have heard it said that analytical psychology is a static science: it does not develop because the great innovators have said all there is to say; so nothing essential could take place and no new discovery could be made. I want to examine that view: it depends upon how the word 'essential' is understood. It is true that some elements of theory and practice have remained the same, but I shall show that significant changes and developments have taken place over the years, especially in the field of child analysis. To do this I select 1935 as a time base suitable for the purpose. In that year, Jung delivered his Tavistock lecture-seminars. In them he put forward a concise statement of his position before a large and fascinated audience who had the opportunity of discussing with him under conditions that he particularly liked. There he could react rather freely and show his virtuosity as a speaker, his enormous erudition, his subtlety and his originality.

JUNG'S POSITION IN 1935

The audience was composed of psychotherapists and some psychoanalysts. Some of the members tried to make him say what he thought about childhood and what his views had to contribute to the preoccupation of the audience with the childhood of their patients. Jung was not helpful, though he said that a child of about ten years old could exhibit interesting dreams containing archetypal material. When it came to psychotherapy of children's disorders, he thought that the analysis of the parents was usually indicated. That was the position taken by nearly all analytical psychologists at the time; indeed I was, I believe, the only one who was beginning to think differently.

Today I need not argue Jung's position much, for it is no more than a half-truth embodied in the practice of family therapy. Yet, however much a child may be an expression of family pathology, it must not be overlooked that he is the one who is able to be that expression. So when a child becomes the presenting symptom, it cannot be assumed that there is no reason within himself why he has become the focus of family pathology. It is a matter for careful assessment, not theoretical assumption (cf. Fordham 1957d).

To return to why Jung paid so little attention to children. The matter needs relating to his general philosophy. He considered that the most interesting aspect of his cases was what the unconscious did with normal and pathological conflicts, and not their origins. He thus focused his attention on the prospective functions of the psyche which lead to

individuation, to increasing complexity, integrative trends and self-realization that make life meaningful. He developed an elaborate method of dream interpretation, and laid stress on his patient's imaginative capacities because it was from these that new life sprang.

In the Tavistock lectures he attempted to demonstrate his erudite method of amplification to the audience (Jung 1935) without much success: his demonstration was interrupted by a request that he provide the members of that assembly with an account of his views on the transference: he did so, and in a recent paper Judith Hubback has made an assessment of what he said (Hubback 1980; cf. also Fordham 1974).

Jung's ongoing interests, which led to his investigating patients in the second half of life, did not lead him, and so analytical psychologists as a whole, to study children analytically; such study was relegated to limbo by being dubbed, quite wrongly, as 'reductive'. In reality, an aspect of the self as Jung (1951) himself emphasized in 'The child archetype' is virtually excluded (cf. also Fordham 1964 and Fordham 1965). Be that as it may, a child was thought of as being largely unconscious; there were islands of ego consciousness, but these were not considered to be very significant, and Jung did not seem to have thought that an ego nucleus formed much before four or five years of age (here he seems to have taken over Freud's earlier view of the matter). Because of this, emphasis was laid on an infant's passivity in relation to ins mother, on a child's mental plasticity and on his as yet unrealized maturational potential. He had no effective ego and so could do nothing much in relation to her. Even later identifications with parents were thought of as by far the most important factor in a child's emotional development. In this view Jung seems to have been strongly influenced by his early researches published in such papers as 'The significance of the father in the destiny of the individual' (Jung 1969b), and in his demonstration of parental influences in 'The family constellation' (Jung 1910), a lecture delivered at Clark University in the United States, where he went with Freud.

The view that a child was unconscious had other implications. The term was not only negative—it did not mean only that consciousness was absent—but that there was also a special aspect of mental life, the unconscious, which was a system of mental action determined by inherited archetypal forms. Inasmuch as these were considered to be overwhelming powers, a child had to be protected from them. It was the function of parents, and especially the mother, to do just that. Therefore, the investigation of children by analytic means might be positively dangerous because it would activate the very powers from which a child needed protection. That view was explicitly stated by Frances Wickes in her book *The Inner World of Childhood* (Wickes 1966) though Jung never went as far as she did; nevertheless, there are examples in his published works of child cases, and he used methods which are much more educational than analytic (cf. Jung 1954). I may refer to the cases he cites towards the end of *The Theory of Psychoanalysis* (Jung 1913b), in which his methods resemble more those of Alfred Adler's individual psychology than of psychoanalysis. In this he was consistent, for that discipline emphasized ongoing tasks of life rather than the influence of past conflicts.

I have said enough to indicate why, in 1935, there was little impetus amongst analytical psychologists to study children, let alone analyse them. It must be said that though by 1935 Jung had written a number of essays about childhood, mostly assembled

in volume 17 of the *Collected Works,* about five years later he started giving a series of seminars on children's dreams submitted to him by members of the seminar. In these he elaborated perceptively about child psychology, acknowledged a symbol of the self and expanded sometimes at enormous length about the archetypal contents of the dream material (Jung 1936–7). In all this, however, Jung remained detached and there was no question of any of the children who provided their dreams being either analysed or needing to undergo analysis—one of them showed quite severe disturbances (ibid.).

CHILD ANALYTIC PSYCHOTHERAPY IN ENGLAND

At the time that Jung was delivering his Tavistock seminars, the practice of child analysis was dominated in England by Melanie Klein (1932), and the practice of child psychotherapy was largely confined to the few child guidance clinics in existence. There was little idea of what was to be done when psychiatrists treated children in the clinics. There was very little training for psychiatrists in child psychotherapy and, of course, no profession of child psychotherapists. Some psychoanalysts joined the staff and had ideas about it, but it was difficult for them because the conditions of child guidance made it impossible to practise what they understood as psychoanalysis.

In 1935 the culture pattern did not include child psychotherapy. Parents had accepted child education, but had to be introduced to the idea of child psychotherapy with circumspection. Psychoanalysis was conducted only at the Institute of Psychoanalysis or in private practice.

TESTING JUNG'S THEORIES

When I joined the staff of the London Child Guidance Clinic as child psychiatrist, I also was in a difficult position. The set-up, which included what was in effect psychotherapy of parents conducted by psychiatric social workers, accorded in principle with Jungian ideas though it did not go so far as analysis of unconscious processes as exhibited in dreams and imagination. A child psychiatrist was excluded from taking a hand in parent therapy: he was expected to conduct psychotherapy with the children, but that was virtually proscribed by my Jungian mentors. What could I do except make observations? Three of those proved crucial: (1) children recovered from their disorders, some of them quite severe, whatever was done; all that was necessary was to leave them on a waiting list, as I discovered later. Also, the children who were treated in rather simple and tolerant ways recovered without the changes in parents that Jungian theory then required. (2) Archetypal material was not difficult to collect and did not have the dangerous effects which I had been led to expect. Indeed, it seemed to have a place in maturation of children not unlike archetypal action in adult life (Fordham 1944). (3) Symbolic material which Jung had defined as referring to the self was to be found, and, furthermore, it was sometimes related to a process of ego growth comparable to individuation in later life, to which self-realization had previously been exclusively allocated (Fordham 1955, 1957c and 1969).

As time went on these observations began to hang together. They meant considering children as far more sophisticated and complex people than had been previously thought: they had individuality and a considerable capacity for dealing with intrapsychic conflicts almost irrespective of their parents, much as Melanie Klein was claiming, so I gained considerable support and inspiration from her writings. The following ideas of hers were in line with conclusions that I was drawing: that of unconscious phantasies, fantastic parent images, good and bad objects, good and bad parent images. All these fitted in with Jungian ideas, many of which had been defined by Jung in a mythological context, especially in his book *The Psychology of the Unconscious* (later revised, cf. Jung 1962). In addition, the observation that children developed a transference to their therapist was theoretically congruent with the idea that a child was born with an archetypal potential though not with ego functions (Fordham 1955).

THE PRIMARY SELF

It is here that the idea of there being a primary child self became significant (Fordham 1957c and 1976). It meant that a child could develop quite complex archetypal processes interacting as parts of himself without having recourse to ego functioning.

While the nature of the self, according to Jung, was not all that clear, its action was usually thought of as essentially integrative. The mandala, for instance, tended to appear when the psyche was disorganized in one way or another. Thus the self seemed to introduce an organizing process that centralized the personality. It could be defined as a totality, a system which combined in itself both the conscious and unconscious structures and processes. It followed that descriptions of the self involving the idea of its being an archetype are inappropriate, and I found it better to think of the self as beyond archetypes and the ego. In its original state the self was thus before consciousness, in the way analytical psychologists conceive it, and so before the psyche becomes structured into conscious and unconscious elements (Fordham 1976). The consequences of such thinking were, at the time, alarmingly heterodox, for the theory then held by analytical psychologists did not include the notion that an infant was a whole individual. He was, rather, thought of as a part of his mother, and what consciousness he developed was analogous to *participation mystique,* a state of fusion with his mother out of which he would emerge through conflict, as Jung had outlined in 'The battle for deliverance' (Jung 1962).

The idea that the self was primary meant that the state of *participation mystique* would have to be developed and required activity on the part of the infant.

Adhering to the language of integration, the self must therefore become active; it must deintegrate. On the principle that an infant grew from unconsciousness to consciousness, the deintegrates would first acquire archetypal characteristics.

Obviously these characteristics would not be those of myths but would be much more primitive; they would be in the nature of good and bad objects and there would be fusion of archetypal and real objects which the infant ego was not sufficiently developed to differentiate.

At the time that these ideas were developing, biologists such as Tinbergen (1951) were

developing instinct theory and introduced the concept of innate release mechanisms, which had patterned responses to small perceptual stimuli (cf. Fordham 1957a). These could be thought of as the basis upon which archetypal forms developed, or matured, to find germinal expression in imagery having experimental characteristics derived not so much from reality as from an infant's inner needs: they would be more hallucinatory than realistic. Another authority whose work seemed significant was Piaget (1953), whose notion of a perceptual schema was encouraging. The notion of drives was also relevant, but many of the formulations about them were too unorganized for my purpose.

Developing self theory, it could be assumed that deintegration maintained whilst a baby was awake, and relating to his mother, or pursuing his own activities in bed or in a cot. When he went to sleep, integrative factors took over.

There are certain features of these ideas that I want to emphasize. An infant is, in the first place, a separate self from his mother and maintains a degree of that separation through his development; consequently, it will be of interest to investigate a baby as a person in relation to and interacting with his mother. It will be of interest to know more about sleep and what goes on during it. It will be of interest to know more about intra-uterine life and consider whether a baby can be thought of as a separate being during that period in his development.

THE FUSION HYPOTHESIS

But before going on to pursue these interests, I must consider further the view of infancy which states that mother and foetus, and mother and infant, are either all the time or periodically in a state of fusion, that is, one cannot be distinguished from the other; the state is sometimes described as paradisal or blissful. In England, Kathleen Newton (1965) has developed this idea and illustrated it with analytical material so one knows it is rooted in experience which can be checked and studied, but this is not always so (cf. Neumann 1973). In mythology there has always been an idea that there is an ideal state to which characteristics of paradise and bliss can be attributed. Amongst analysts it is a state to which it is supposed regression aims to reach. It has been conceived not only as desirable but also as a danger, especially by the hero, symbolizing the ego, whose achievements can be undermined by his longing for the mother.

Neumann (1973) has been attracted by this idea and assumes that there is a period during the first year of life—named the primal relationship—in which fusion takes place to such an extent that the baby's mother actually is the infant's self. I find it necessary to mention this because his book *The Child* has attracted considerable interest. As I intend to consider this thesis in detail in the following chapter, I will only give my conclusion. I consider his writing attractive, poetic and sometimes illuminating, but obscured by the application of a system derived from studies in mythology to such an extent that there is no reference to a real child from start to finish of his book; so the whole construction lacks reality.

In view of the amount of evidence that has now accumulated, the thought and theoretical labour that went into reversing the view about infancy and childhood current in analytical psychology and so finding out what a child, and especially an infant, was

like seems slightly ridiculous. It is absurd to have to theorize so much before noticing what is obvious.

INTRA-UTERINE LIFE AND ATTACHMENT TO MOTHER

I can best show what I mean by starting from intra-uterine life. There is no doubt that an embryo is separate from the mother from the start. The fertilized egg contains genes derived as much from the father as from the mother and it is surrounded by a cell membrane. Later, the foetus is covered by its skin: again there is a boundary round the embryo which develops a system of chemical relationship by growing an umbilical cord and a placenta through which the raw materials for growth are transmitted. It has been discovered that during its life, in an essentially aquatic environment, the foetus develops motor skills and sensory capacities far in advance of what used to be believed. It is concerned to maintain comfort by moving around in the amniotic fluid as it grows in size and the uterine walls restrict it. Though in a way it seems that at birth it separates from its mother in the sense that its environment changes radically, the real separation is from a part of itself, the placenta. It must also be noted that intra-uterine life is no paradise, not only because of the physical restrictions that it suffers later on, but also because the uterus is a noisy place.

Knowing about the degree of sophistication that develops *in utero,* it is really no surprise to learn that studies of new-born infants reveal much that had been altogether overlooked. A new-born baby's perceptual capacities are far in advance of what used to be conceived possible (Bower 1977); he is, for instance, capable of complex imitative actions without any learning taking place. In addition, he is equipped with a number of actions, approach behaviours that are not just reflex, and which can be understood best by considering their effect on his mother (cf. Schaffer 1977). Thus it seems that his looks, his cries, his movements are so constructed as to play on his mother's affects and attach her to him. In summary, he is born with means of adaptation to his new environment.

THE MOTHER

The traditional account of mothering made a mother omnipotent: she virtually created her infant's emotional and mental life—everything depended upon her. How have the researches I am referring to altered the conception of her many-faceted activities? The approach to infancy has been changed—it is no longer negative in the sense that a baby can do nothing about his mother's failures and inadequacies, nothing about her destructive intrusions nor about her being out of touch with her baby's signals. In the light of modern research, a mother can no longer be expected to be the sole cause of her infant's distress; she just has to be a 'good enough mother' for her baby to thrive. And further, 'a good enough mother' is no longer considered in isolation with a passive baby, but what she does depends significantly on her baby as well. She can be seen as one who facilitates growth and in this, containment is important. Containment of her baby *in utero* continues in containment in her arms, in her looks, in her talk and in all acts of physical

caring. Her physical acts are accompanied by mental ones resulting at first from primary maternal preoccupation: reflections, thoughts and feelings that her baby does not so much understand as experience. Her empathic capacities involve being affected by her baby and taking his affects into herself, understanding them and transforming them. Thus she can facilitate mental growth and contribute to changing crude affect into mental acts, feeding them back to her baby in 'digestible' form. These functions of a mother—a few amongst many—are selected because they are some of the ones on which a child analyst will also rely.

These all too brief statements are drawn from the findings of obstetricians and psychologists studying infants under controlled conditions and the findings of students observing mothers and infants under home conditions, reported in seminars held by Mrs Henry for the child analysis students of the Society of Analytical Psychology (they observe a mother and her infant for a period of two years). These direct observations have their difficulties, but an important result of them is to bring home the realities of mother-infant interactions. I may interpolate here that I have felt very satisfied that I had kept my speculations as empty and abstract as possible; they have been given substance through these recent researches and direct observation, not by further speculation.

Of the many fascinating observations that have been made I want to emphasize one conclusion that is forced upon one: the relation between a mother and her baby is not only interactional but to a large extent individual. Any ideas about fusion as a general state maintaining over periods must be discarded. The origin of the ideas inherent in speculations and myths must also be reassessed. Babies experience good feelings—satisfaction, happiness, joy—and there need to be enough of them, but to infer fusion or paradisal bliss as a continuing state is an idealized phantasy.

THE ANALYSIS OF CHILDREN

My object in spending this time on intra-uterine life and the psychology of infancy is not to say anything comprehensive about it, but to examine ideas that have stood in the way of child analysis. My proposition is this: if a baby is so much of a person and an individual, this state of affairs will steadily increase over the months and years, and so a theory of child analysis based on the self can develop. But this argument is only one aspect of developments that have taken place.

It is well known that analytic methods can be applied to children; the earliest age I have read about one was 13 months, though the analysis was behavioural and hardly at all verbal (Lefort 1978). It showed that an analyst could use his knowledge to create conditions for a development which had been arrested to take place. That is not surprising, for non-verbal communication takes a much larger part in child analysis than in its adult equivalent, so that a child's actions in play can be taken as direct communications. It took a long time for this to be accepted amongst analytical psychologists.

It took a long time, too, though, as time went on, quite a number of analysts were working in child guidance clinics for a training in child analysis to start at the Society of Analytical Psychology. The reasons for this were partly rational, partly irrational. The

irrational ones were dependent upon the attitudes that I have described (Fordham 1976a); they persisted even though members of the Society were increasingly investigating more carefully the childhood of their adult parents. They were ready to engage in child psychotherapy, as it was called, but not child analysis. That distinction is often made, so what is the difference? It is a difficult, even loaded subject, and I want to approach it indirectly.

For purposes of training, and of course for subsequent practice, the following interviewing technique is recommended. After a preliminary conversation with parents, it is arranged that the child shall be seen on his own first, and that parents shall be seen later, but not when the child is there. This has several advantages: from the child's point of view he is not kept waiting, wondering what his parents are saying about him. It also establishes in action that the analyst considers the child as the patient and intends to find out whether the child considers himself as such or not and what is his motivation in seeking help. This we aim to ascertain without the analyst having extraneous information from the child's parents. That information can be collected later if parents give it, or if the analyst wants it.

I have said, 'if the parents give it'. This qualifying statement is necessary because both interviews with the child and with his parents are conducted psychodynamically and so are relatively unstructured. The aim is to ascertain three elements in the interview: the motivation of the persons being interviewed, the capacity for co-operation (therapeutic alliance), and the transference formations that take place. Thus such features as the child's symptomatic behaviour or his history are not primarily important. It is an approach which is not easy and some students feel very much at sea, but this essentially analytic method can be learned and its value has been appreciated.

THE ANALYTIC ATTITUDE

A great deal of confusion has been made by identifying analysis not only with a technique but with interview frequency. It is true that there is a technique. It may be defined by laying emphasis on providing conditions under which a patient can express himself rather freely while the analyst lays emphasis on interpretative rather than directive methods. But the essential feature of analysis is an attitude of mind; it is impartial and seeks to elucidate the patient's conflicts with a view to helping him to resolve them. In doing so he seeks to resolve complex data into their simplest components (Fordham 1978). This attitude has to be sustained for analysis to take place. It will involve taking the transference fully into account and also the analyst's counter-transference and other interactions with his patients. Once the analytical attitude is grasped, it becomes apparent that interview frequency is not the essence of analysis. Thus analysis can take place in a single interview or in meetings once a week, once a month or even occasionally (cf. Fordham 1976a and Winnicott 1977). That does not mean that frequent daily interviews with breaks at weekends and holidays is not a condition that is to be preferred and is sometimes essential. All trainees need to learn its value, but it is not an essential ingredient of analysis.

THE PARENT'S ROLE IN CHILD ANALYSIS

I hope that I have given an impression of the steps that were necessary for analytic method to be practised by Jungian analysts. But what has happened to parents, and what of the emphasis on their influence to which the Jungian tradition laid such stress? What of those cases in which the child has become the symptom of a family neurosis, the indicator of a complex situation which he cannot be expected to resolve but which he may facilitate? I shall not answer this question directly. It is possible to be aware that parental influence is important and often decisive and that a child's symptoms may consequently be comparatively superficial, so that when the root of them in the family is resolved, or at least the impact of them taken away, a child will truly recover. It needs bearing in mind, however, that if a child's conflicts have become intrapsychic, then recovery will not inevitably take place though it may disappear to return later on in development (cf. Fordham 1957d). All those and other complex matters are ones that we are trying to understand. They are the ones in the field of psychotherapy that are still subject to the vagaries of fashion.

The subject can be approached as follows: start from the assumption that any analysis of a child leads concurrently to some kind of change in the members of the family. Sometimes these changes may be called family therapy. It takes place without the child analyst having to do very much at all by way of active intervention.

Returning to the first interviews that have been considered: it may happen, if the analyst does not interfere, that the parents will not talk much about the child that they have brought, and it may be that the child has given indications that he thinks he is not in need of treatment but that his parents are. When the parents start talking about their own conflicts, the way is open for treatment of them. It is not unusual for this to happen: often parents may not be ready to consider their distress yet. Then they may clearly exhibit transference manifestations to the analyst and this is why he needs to develop skills in detecting them, without going into them—that would be an unjustified impingement.

It is a question of motivation and getting that right. The formula that has been developed is that the child analyst needs to know what sort of transference is present and what is likely to develop in parents. That he must handle rather than analyse. This point is important, for the child analyst will need the co-operation of parents, and so to get hold of their health and not their psychopathology: he aims to treat them as collaborators in the enterprise that is being undertaken, and so he will need all the consciousness that they can muster; he will need parents to continue functioning as parents and rely on them to manage any transitory regressions that may take place in their child. Once this is successfully done, and it is not easy nor is it always as successful as could be wished, the parents can be given to understand that they can have relatively free access to their child's analyst by letter, telephone or, if desirable, they can make arrangements for an interview. For his part the analyst may want to obtain information from parents, and so a two-way relationship develops in which it is valuable to arrange regular interviews, say at holiday periods. Child 'therapists' will know that there are conditions under which a child cannot bear his therapist to see his parents, so the analyst has to have this in mind and, if necessary, explain why he cannot see them.

Applying these methods, it has been a matter of some astonishment to me how few parents come to seek help for themselves and how much benefit to the family child analysis can be. It is relevant here to remark that parents who have been in therapy, analytic or otherwise, or who are still in it, refer their children for analysis and report beneficial results.

I hope this will be enough to indicate that the original Jungian point of view has not been lost sight of, but is being refined and approached from a different angle. As a result, the problems involved have become more complex and interesting. One factor has been influential: if a parent or parents are motivated for the treatment of their child and it seems to be justified, then the treatment of the child should be given even if parental psychopathology is evident. Only treat the parent when he or she becomes motivated for it, and so start with good conditions for success. It needs to be recognized that there is no parent without some psychopathology with which he may very well be able to cope, so it is not necessary to look for it. If parents cannot deal with it, they will bring it to the attention of their child's analyst—a formula I use with students.

THE SOCIAL FACTOR

I will end my essay with a comment on the social factor. This has changed over the years. What is called 'child psychotherapy' has become partly accepted, and there is the Association of Child Psychotherapists that is influential in ensuring that good standards are maintained. In child guidance and other clinics, child psychotherapy is increasingly practised. The orientation is analytic in the sense that I have defined it, but it is still extremely difficult to arrange more than relatively few interviews a week, and it is rare for the parents of small children, below the age of three, to bring their children for assessment, let alone analysis. Thus a lot of skills that have been developed are not being made use of. I think that this is not so much a matter of time and money as the difficulty parents, and those they come across, such as nursery-school teachers, doctors and the like, have in conceiving that analysis benefits small children. It has yet to be understood that small children develop intrapsychic conflicts which can have long-term effects if help is not provided.

CONCLUSION

I hope that I have given a clear idea of the changes and developments that have taken place among analytical psychologists, and that they can easily be discerned. At the start of this chapter I introduced the notion that analytical theory and practice change, and develop, and that it is difficult to know when a discovery has been made. It is true that progress is cumulative, so it is rare for a discovery to have the precision that is found in the natural sciences, but the accumulation of experience is none the less impressive.

The introduction of child analysis has been nothing short of revolutionary. Before it there were plenty of theories about a child's emotional development and there were plenty of constructions about periods of childhood. Child analysis has introduced real

children who can be listened to and learned from: theories and constructions have been replaced by emotional and mental realities.

SUMMARY

The emergence of child analysis as a special discipline is outlined, taking as a starting point Jung's Tavistock lectures delivered in 1935. The state of child analysis and therapy at that time is then reviewed.

Investigations into archetypal functioning in childhood have shown that it is not essentially different from that in adults. A theory of the self in childhood has led to investigating more closely early infancy and intra-uterine life.

As a result, child development has taken on new perspectives, and a theory of child analysis has been developed which also takes into account the role that parents play in it.

NOTE

1 This chapter is an adapted version of a lecture given on 22 January 1980 under the auspices of the Society of Analytical Psychology.

9
Neumann and childhood

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 26(2) (1981)

PART I

Introduction

Neumann was a man with a vision. It was first expressed in his *Origins and History of Consciousness* and later continued in other volumes, among which is *The Child.* The two significant books are complementary and round out a system of thought inasmuch as the first volume claimed to deal with phylogeny and the second with ontology. In this chapter I shall consider only *The Child* and an earlier essay (Neumann 1973).

Neumann's thesis has been critically assessed by Geigerich (1975), and *The Child* has been sympathetically reviewed by Lyard (1969) in the *Cahiers de Psychologie Jungienne,* and in the same issue of that journal there are clinical illustrations of the way Neumann's ideas can be used. I shall refer to these publications as occasions arise.

Neumann's writings on childhood have appealed to those with Jungian training who have felt the lack of a theory of child development in the Jungian scheme of things—it was a hiatus that I myself also started to fill (Fordham 1944, 1947, 1957, 1957b, 1957d, 1960, 1971, 1979, 1979a). Neumann has interested Jungians in childhood and has contributed to altering a bias that has been very difficult to change. That is a merit of his work.

Neumann's style

Neumann's undoubtedly strong appeal is partly due to his style of writing: it is often poetic and colourful, while his use of mythology touches on and stimulates preconscious processes in the reader. To enjoy him it is, however, necessary to keep one's critical faculties in abeyance, for he often writes ambiguously, contradicts himself, and it is frequently unclear whether he is writing abstractly, metaphorically or symbolically. It is stated, for instance, in one place that the self is a psychobiological unity but in others the 'mother *is* the child's self', the child has a 'body self' and there is a 'patriarchal self' as well. Those statements are symbolic, and suggest a trinitarian myth at work.

Then there is his dogmatic style which, combined with his repetitiveness, gives the impression that if statements are made vigorously and repeatedly that is enough evidence of their truth.

Next there is what appears to be his system, though in one place he denies any intention of building such a structure (cf. *infra*). His book is, however, constructed as if it were a system, if the word has any meaning, even though he is more inconsistent than is

usual amongst system builders.

These reflections are necessary because many of my statements will be based, inevitably, on an interpretation of Neumann's thesis, since I shall study mainly what seems to me systematic. I shall probably be told that in doing this I do not sufficiently appreciate the poetic, evocative nature of Neumann's work, which makes some believe that empathic statements are being made about infants and small children. I can enjoy the experience of his 'poetry', especially when he interprets myth and legend; that, however, no longer justifies using vague, contradictory metaphor with which to capture states of consciousness in infancy and childhood. It was a device which used to pass muster, but today research has made that approach inappropriate. Both Jungians and psychoanalysts have constructed theories of childhood, and I will now consider Neumann's relation to these.

Neumann and the schools of analytical psychology

Neumann and Jung

It is claimed that Neumann has developed an essentially Jungian thesis (Adler 1961; Lyard 1969), and that this applies to what he has to say about childhood, as Lyard claims. Superficially it looks as if he has indeed done just that.

In support of that view, it may be claimed that his work was largely inspired by Jung and that some, though not all, of his theories can be related to what Jung thought. That he develops or departs from Jung's thesis does not alter his source of inspiration. There are, however, differences: he proceeds in just the way that Jung did not and in a way that makes one think he had little respect for Jung's claim that he had constructed a science of analytical psychology based on clinical observations. It appears from Neumann's presentation that he, in opposition to Jung, constructed a poetic-like conceptual system which he then applies to children. Jung surely warned against this procedure (Jung 1946a:7).

Compare Neumann's approach with what Jung says in *Psychological Types:* 'This book is the fruit of nearly twenty years' experience in the domain of practical psychology. It grew gradually in my thoughts, taking shape from countless impressions in the treatment of nervous and mental diseases, from intercourse with men and women of all social levels, with my personal dealings with friend and foe alike' (Jung 1921:ix). Neumann's book is written without any experience with children, let alone with infants and mothers.

Then there is the monistic theory of the libido which is strongly emphasized and manifested in the primary relationship. Jung held that though psychic energy was to be conceived as a single but abstract entity, in its manifestations it was dualistic. Neumann emphasizes the monism because of the 'unitary nature' of the primary relationship, not out of adherence to Jung's position. Jung's emphasis on opposites does not accord with Neumann's understanding of the libido theory, as Geigerich (1975) also noticed.

And is his thesis Jungian in detail? I think that cannot be sustained. Take the symbol of the Great Mother with which Neumann makes considerable play, as though she were a central feature of childhood. In his introduction to 'The mother archetype' Jung says:

'The concept of The Great Mother belongs to the field of comparative religion and embraces widely different types of mother goddesses. The concept itself is of no immediate concern to psychology because the image of a Great Mother in this form is rarely encountered in practice and then only under very special conditions' (Jung 1954a:75). Neither is that concept of any use in infancy or childhood. If it were, it would be in a non-symbolic form resting on the infant's perception of the relative sizes of his mother's and his own bodies.

Finally, though Neumann contends that myths reveal the psychic states of persons inasmuch as they are archetypal, he makes no reference to 'The psychology of the child archetype' (Jung 1951). Surely that might have been the most revealing of all Jung's works. Even though Jung states explicitly that the myths of the child do not refer to real children nor to childhood, according to Neumann's thesis they should do so. Neumann is not all that Jungian! So his thesis must stand on its own and not be supported by dubious rhetoric.

Neumann and psychoanalysis

Neumann wants to distinguish his thinking from that of psychoanalysis, but if analytical psychology is to be considered as a part of the stream of scientific studies, as Jung consistently maintained till the end of his life, this assertion must be well supported: Neumann did not do this. He used statements by psychoanalysts out of context, misstated them and had not brought himself up to date with psychoanalytic metapsychology. So it is not at all clear whether he knows what he was talking about when he made attacks on psychoanalytic thought. He seems to be under the impression, for instance, that the castration complex is held by psychoanalysts to be the result of threats by parents to cut off a child's penis. Yet Freud (1918:97) had given up this idea by 1918 and indeed used the castration complex as a basis for rashly postulating inherited phantasies. In addition, Neumann seems unaware how far many of his ideas had already been worked out by psychoanalysts. He used the concept of fusion which Searles introduced in relation to his work on schizophrenia (Searles 1965). Mahler (1975) expanded it and, undesirably, added the word 'symbiotic' (cf. Fordham 1977); she even introduced the idea that an infant felt that he and his mother had a common boundary: the pair being a dual unity. Jacobson introduced the primal self whose energy was neutral, thus using the monistic theory of libido which Neumann follows (Jacobson 1964:31). Fairbairn developed a dualistic theory of the ego, libidinal and antilibidinal corresponding to Neumann's positive and negative egos (Fairbairn 1952). Then there is the notion that the erogenous zones are centres for cognitive development (ego nuclei) which I had put forward, and which had been previously developed at length by Edward Glover (1968); there is little difference between the idea of automorphism and maturational potential. Neumann used the alimentary model, given the ornamental epithet 'uroboric', which was introduced by Rado (n.d.) in the 1920s; he also used the idea of projective identification without giving it that name. In short, having it seems, set out to refute psychoanalysis, we find his book riddled with psychoanalytic matter in a new guise.

This evidence has caused me puzzlement and concern. I can scarcely believe that so scholarly a person could not have known about the sources of his propositions and yet he

proceeds as if he knew nothing of them. I prefer to think that he knew of them and was digesting them, rather than that he was deliberately concealing his indebtedness to psychoanalysis.

Methodology

Child analysis and infant-mother observations

This chapter depends upon the importance I attribute to child analysis and mother-infant observation, both of which have introduced reality into a field previously dominated by speculation and phantasy. A preliminary statement on these subjects will, I hope, orientate the reader.

Unfortunately, I cannot document my sources for mother-infant observations, which rest on reports made by students in seminars held weekly at the Society of Analytical Psychology. The reports cover weekly visits to the home of a baby during the first two years of extra-uterine life. There is a growing literature on this subject (cf. Bick 1946; Harris 1975; Klaus and Kennell 1976), but that is not what I have mainly drawn from. It is not yet fully recognized what a revolution took place when analysts started to apply their methods to children. Before they did so, inferences were made about children, and there grew up a number of theories about how they felt and behaved. The theories were almost entirely constructed from material produced by adult patients during their analyses or, in the case of Neumann, mainly from myths and other ethnological material—or so it would appear from his exposition. When children were studied analytically a new dimension was added. Instead of theories, real children came into the picture: they can be observed and listened to in detail. An analyst can relate to, interpret and define a child's responses to his interventions, which no longer depend upon theories but upon the analyst's ability to observe and listen empathically, letting his projective and introjective processes form the basis for developing a language understandable to the child (cf. Fordham 1969a). Interpretations can be developed which are appropriate to the relationship. They can be communicated, and the children can react to them: their responses can be studied, and thus the correctness, or otherwise, of the analyst's interventions can be checked (cf. Fordham 1976; Klein 1961). It is that situation which forms the basis for good theoretical constructions, closely related to the mental life of the child.

Neumann's thesis contains no material from child analyses; he does not even appear to recognize that those are relevant. His book consequently contains little matter that can be communicated to children, and he gives no help to those who wish to know how his theories could be translated into a suitable language to talk to them. This state of affairs suggests divorce from the realities of infancy and childhood.

It might be thought that the only fruitful way to approach infant and child psychology is actually to use infant sounds (vocalizations) or a child's own language, and that the terms we use ('love', 'hate', 'tenderness', 'aggression', 'cruelty' (sadism), 'parent images', 'phantasy', and so on) are equally inappropriate. They are indeed primarily designed for talking amongst adults, but they are rather easily translated into childhood terms to describe and interpret infantile behaviour.

The value of abstract propositions

It is not easy to estimate the abstract aspect of Neumann's thesis. Inasmuch as he aims to give an account of history and child development there is, in principle, no difficulty, but when confronted with the evidence of historians and anthropologists who could not confirm his stages (cf. Geigerich 1975) he took up the following defensive position: he asserted that he was not considering history as revealed by those disciplines but was giving an account of 'psycho-history'. This does away with the explanatory part of his thesis with respect to history and makes his constructions depend upon his personal interpretation of myths—there is no other referent.

I regard this development as unfortunate, to say the least, for history is not only composed of psychology. It would have been possible for Neumann to say in reply that his sequences contribute to history even though history is not like that because of non-psychological factors. Furthermore, historians are vulnerable in as much as they cannot repeat the history that they study. By contrast, child development can be studied again and again in different children, even though in each case there are essential individual characteristics. When that is done it becomes clear that many of Neumann's stages correspond roughly with states of mind through which children pass in the course of their development. Thus, his views can be checked against data of experience. Was it because of this defensive idea of psycho-history that he gave no clinical data which might, once again, have made him vulnerable to damaging criticism? Maybe, but there is another possible reason for his procedure. Clinical data, it may be held, obscure the effort at generalization by introducing too much detail; by excluding that, valuable propositions may be developed which can later be used to explain or contain data of experience. In addition, it may be possible to arrive at conclusions which act as a stimulus to search for new data of experience. The theory of the primary self which I put forward first in 1947 (Fordham 1947) and which was taken over in part by Neumann, developed independently by Jacobson (1964), and lately by Kohut (1971), was of this kind. It was a speculation about a state which seemed logically possible but which could not be identified. It led, in an effort to test the idea, to analysis of small children (Fordham 1957c), to an interest in infant-mother observation and a study of what is known about intra-uterine life (Fordham 1980). Much of Neumann's theorizing is of that abstract order.

But to be useful the abstract conclusion must not contradict experience, and here Neumann's work often runs counter to what is known: I shall illustrate this with reference to the 'primary relationship'. Nevertheless, if an abstract proposition cannot be substantiated and cannot be contradicted, it may still be useful; so if Neumann's propositions appear logical or otherwise stimulating, in areas where knowledge is not available, it would be a mistake to discard them because there is no evidence in their favour. I thought the ego-self axis worth consideration when it first came to my notice (Fordham 1957c), though later the notion of self representations seemed more fruitful (Fordham 1976).

I must interpolate here that it is not necessary for a system to be explanatory. A system can be designed as a container for data of experience, thereby orientating the observer (cf. Kalff 1964). It is probably in this sense that Lyard (1969) can claim that Neumann's

system is ‘passionately clinical’, though there is no clinical matter in his book.

Many theories about childhood as a whole have been developed over the years (cf., for instance, Jacobson 1964 or Fordham 1969)—and data of various kinds have been collected to support or refute them. Their fate is revealing—especially those relating to infancy. Until recently it has been difficult to ascertain much about the effective life of babies—for purposes of definition infancy is usually considered to cover the first two years of extra-uterine life (no reliance should be placed on this figure as it is only used to point out that an infant is markedly different from a child). Because psychodynamic data were lacking about this period (there has been a great deal from other sources such as those collected by Charlotte Bühler (1930), Gesell (n.d.; Gesell and Frances 1943), Piaget (1928, 1929) and others—cf. the bibliography of Escalona’s book (Escalona 1968)) analysts of whatever school have been happy, like Neumann, to advance more or less detailed propositions without observing infants. Had they started by doing so they would soon have found out that what they were proposing was often improbable or otherwise inadequate. It would not, however, be true to say that all of their generalized propositions proved useless; indeed if they be considered as possible states of mind experienced by infants they can become enlightening.

The state of theories about infancy thoroughly warrant Jung’s caveat about them (Jung 1946a:7), and it is probably because of inadequate knowledge that most theories have tended to be too easily accepted. As I have noted above, Neumann’s writing gives ground for concern in this respect because of its dogmatic character.

Adultomorphic speculation

In drawing on myths and other ethnological material, Neumann shapes his thesis almost entirely in adult terms. It is adultomorphic and, since his thesis is speculative, he uses what is usually called ‘adultomorphic speculation’ extensively. Scholars, biologists and philosophers have come to the most amazing conclusions about infancy, especially, but also about childhood, by thinking about what an infant’s consciousness was like: thus, as it could not be like that of an adult, it hardly existed at all—the *tabula rasa* notion was derived in this way—adult standards being applied to infants.

Amongst analytical psychologists, the notion that a child or infant thinks mythologically is an addition. That a myth is far more complex than anything that a small child can produce is overlooked. It is interesting to draw analogies between myths and children’s phantasies, and from them, by abstraction, a common core of meaning can be defined. So long as the differences are kept clearly in mind, that is in order: examples of it can be found in my book *Children as Individuals* and other essays (cf. Fordham 1957c and 1969). But if comparative material is collected without adequate care or unduly multiplied, then it can lead to generalized con-structions which stand in the way of understanding individual children. That is why I have largely abandoned it and only introduce it sparingly.

Let me illustrate: there is a creation myth in which the conflict between Marduk and Tiamat is dramatically expressed. In this magnificent, violent, terrible and awe-inspiring story, the mother (Tiamat) is overcome by the hero (Marduk) (cf. Jung 1952). Her dead body is then split into two parts, and thus the earth and the sky are created. Now small

children develop phantasies of attacking their mother's bodies, and these can be the source of fears and violent conflicts between the two. But it is no use talking to a child of, say, two years of age in terms of the myth because it is far beyond his comprehension. Quite another language has to be used in order to give the child understanding of what it all means and so bring relief to him (cf. Fordham 1957c:148). It may be interesting to trace out analogies which can be startling, but that is an adult's, not a child's, interest. Neumann, having developed a system derived from a study of collective ethnological data, then assumes that he can apply not only his conclusions, but also his terminology, directly to infancy and childhood: that is a radical mistake.

The study of myths has been so productive in providing insight into and understanding of the human psyche that it may seem somewhat shocking if I say that its use is full of pitfalls when it comes to understanding small children. It must be understood however that, fruitful as it has been and continues to be in analytical research, a myth is a product of a developed mind and has social as well as individual meaning. When such terminology is introduced into child analysis the analyst's counter-transference must come under review. It was partly with that understanding in mind that I embarked on a study of that subject and its relation to the analyst's technique (Fordham 1969a).

The identity of the child's and early man's mentality

I will not labour the now out-of-date theory of the relations between ontology and phylogeny raised by Neumann; nevertheless, something must be said about it. His statements are ambiguous: at times he thinks that the features of individual development recapitulate the history of man, a thesis that cannot be sustained (cf. Fordham 1957), but there is another aspect to his exposition.

Neumann was very much impressed by the supposed identity between how a child experiences the world and the way 'early man' does so. He says, for instance:

> We have said that the child psyche apprehends mythologically, that it apprehends the world in categories known to us from myth. The child-like and mythological views of the world are so similar as to be almost identical and this applies especially to their conceptions of creation, generation, and birth, to the kinship between child-like theories of birth and creation mythology.
>
> (Neumann 1973:35)

And again: 'The correspondence between the animistic, magical view of early man and the child's world is well known' (ibid., p. 53). As it stands, that proposition is subject to the following criticism: if the child's mental life was truly identical, or even so similar as to be almost identical, with that of early man, then, in the case of early man's children no, or scarcely any, mental development would take place. I do not wish to deny that children can sometimes think magically but, and this is important, not all the time and in very different amounts in different age groups. Direct study of infants shows, moreover, that they do not live in a mythological world, though they sometimes exercise their minds in a way that, later on, will result in their developing phantasies that are reminiscent of myths. Then, later on, they may enjoy fairy tales being read to them, thus enriching their

imagination. For a great deal of the time, however, other forms of mental functioning operate: making observations, thinking and arriving at conclusions, for instance.

What Neumann says on this theme is not only his view, though he is somewhat extreme, so it may be relevant to consider shortly how the idea grew up. It was powerfully influenced by Freud's formulation that there were two kinds of mental functioning (Freud 1911a). The one was logical and realistic (secondary process thinking) and the other depended upon hallucinatory capacities and the ability to condense and displace mental elements (primary process). The distinction was taken up by Jung in a rather different way, as directed and undirected thinking: directed thinking was conceived to be a property of consciousness, and the undirected kind was designed to express unconscious archetypal contents of the psyche (Jung 1952).

Now there is an argument which runs as follows. Children, as compared with adults, seem to be relatively unconscious since they know so much less (about adult living) than adults: therefore, they must express themselves in primary process (Freud), alternatively called undirected thinking (Jung), or matriarchal consciousness (Neumann). It is true that children were allowed small islets of consciousness, but that was not supposed to amount to much. I shall take this up later.

Considerable work has been done to try to substantiate this thesis, to which I have contributed in *The Life of Childhood,* and elsewhere. There is the extensive work of Piaget (1928, 1929), and the discoveries of Melanie Klein (1937) may be included, in as much as she records how young children develop fantastic images of their parents and that phantasies about their doings often have little bearing on reality. These phantasies may have mythological analogies (cf. Fordham 1969 and elsewhere), but they are not true myths in the sense that we know them.

Then there was Margaret Lowenfeld in London, who developed a sand-tray technique for investigating children's phantasies. It has had considerable influence among Jungians, thanks to Dora Kalff (1964). A sand-tray is provided and a host of toys designed to cover the child's experience both of reality and phantasy. The result of these investigations, and others as well, has been to show that children sometimes imagine and think in the way that was supposed.

Terminology

Since Neumann aimed to develop a system of his own, as distinct from that of anyone else, and especially psychoanalysts, he wants to have a new terminology. Is it a desirable addition? The new terms are as follows; they are the same as those used in his *Origins and History of Consciousness* (Neumann 1949):

1 Those which refer to postulated dynamic structures and processes within the child's psyche: automorphism to indicate the child's drive to individual development; centroversion, which also furthers the growth of individuality; the ego-self axis indicating the relation of the ego to the self.
2 The primary relationship to indicate the 'unitary state' of mother and infant during the first year of life.
3 A number of stages as follows: urobolic, matriarchal and patriarchal. The terms 'matriarchal' and 'patriarchal consciousness' are said to indicate the kinds of

consciousness which dominate the stages.

4 A number of ego states to which reference will be made later. It appears that (3) intends to refer also to states of society, for Neumann emphasizes the impact of social and cultural influences together with the inherited collective unconscious from the start as essential components in the development of a child's consciousness. Since myths are essentially social in character, he is consistent.

Does the new terminology add anything to the understanding of, or insight into, a child's mental life? If it be said that an infant starts from being an individual person or self, and that his first relation is to his mother, then to his father and finally to his outside and inside worlds, is not that enough as a rough orientating system? What does it add to call these uroboric, matriarchal and patriarchal stages? Of course, Neumann wants it to mean a lot more—he wants to compound supposed cultural influences with infancy and childhood. But in doing just that, he creates confusion by attributing a whole number of characteristics to infancy and childhood which belong to a different context. This extrapolation thus appears in the terminology. I have already quoted Jung on the subject of the Great Mother, and the same applies to the rest and especially the Uroborus and the Great Round.

As to centroversion and the ego-self axis, both terms are unnecessary additions to already existing and more illuminating terminology. That a child becomes interested in himself and parts of his body is sufficient. The term 'ego-self axis' interested me at one time (cf. Fordham 1957c), but I later found that it obscured understanding of the material that I was studying. I now consider that the concepts of self representation is more useful in being closer to the data of experience (Fordham 1976).

PART II

The substance of Neumann's thesis

The archetypal matrix

Neumann maintains that mother and child are immersed in an archetypal matrix that controls them and determines the stages of the child's development. In some respects the thesis is more clearly outlined in his shorter contributions (Neumann 1959), in which he expounds the theory in such a way as to give a better impression of its remorselessness. The archetypal forces are impersonal; they originate neither in the child nor in the mother—that is, they are social or mystically collective. Sometimes they are likened to genetic influence and are said to be the source of psychic growth just as DNA determines physical growth, though in Neumann it does not seem that environmental modification has much place (Fordham 1957). Thus he sometimes implies that there is no consciousness and no choice in what proceeds: the archetypal stages are predetermined and have to be fulfilled. Powerful collective influences control mother and child: they express not only social consciousness, but also a dissociated collective unconscious.

This thesis, in its remorselessness, exceeds that of the inherited potential of DNA. The

biological potential is conditional upon a suitable environment in varying proportions (cf. Fordham 1957). If this is so in physical development, it is surely much more so in its emotional, psychic, equivalent in which it is usually maintained that the environment is more significant than genetic influence. Yet according to Neumann, neither mother nor child has much consciousness or much choice in how they behave.

The evidence adduced for the effect of these collective forces is scanty. There is some discussion of culturally conditioned neuroses; there is consideration of false attitudes towards spoiling and attitudes towards sex. Many others might have been added such as feeding regimes, attitudes towards breast-feeding, the roles of the father during pregnancy and labour—I select matters of recent interest.

But whatever the evidence, Neumann emphasizes the impersonal arche-typal influences that are supposed to transcend the 'personal' mother and her baby. Consequently, there is nothing about how a good-enough mother can exert control over most social influences and so can be primarily concerned with the care of her baby. There is no understanding that in reality the impact of collective influence comes later in child development when children extend their activities into society (cf. Fordham 1969).

Cultural influences can, of course, support or undermine a mother, but they need not be overriding. Indeed, when they so become, it is necessary to focus attention on a mother's personal relationships, especially with her husband and her own childhood. But in Neumann's thesis personal relationships are depreciated and thus he aligns himself with those who have extended the word 'personal', which Jung applied for a special purpose; in doing so it is misused. That subject is important and is a matter which has come under scrutiny recently (cf. Zinkin 1979).

The theory of stages

An essential element of Neumann's work is his theory of stages: uroboric, matriarchal and patriarchal. They correspond to phases of consciousness, the first two being plastic, analogic, symbolic, lunar; the third clear, concise, rational and solar. There are also phases of ego development (*The Child,* 1973, p. 139) which all have phallic characteristics and are related to the matriarchal and patriarchal phases (phases and stages are used alternatively). He asserts that the stages (or phases) are 'fixed' (p. 134) and development is determined by the 'intrapsychic structure of the archetype' (1959:133). One would never think from the vigorous, assertive and dogmatic way this statement is made that he is making a controversial statement; yet whether the archetypes develop in themselves has been debated without anybody arriving at a satisfactory conclusion (cf. Fordham 1957). Neumann writes as if his view were true without considering the more likely proposition that consciousness is essential for development to take place at all and that growth takes place through the interaction of the ego with the 'inner' archetypes and outer reality. Some concept of stages is required by anybody studying children, since development is so great that a means of classifying its features is needed. The differences between children of different age groups, for instance, makes it clinically important not to confuse them as is often done. Various authors have defined the stages in different ways. Neumann's stages are not so much novel as expressed in a peculiar way. Leaving aside the bisexuality of the infant self which provides a rather different picture at the start,

since there can be little difference between essentially male and female characteristics, it is rather obvious that a mother is more important earlier on and that a father takes over from her more and more as development proceeds. A good many have thought that there was a preliminary period in which a baby was a self, was uroboric, autistic or autoerotic. Neumann makes no use of the rather more revealing idea that subsequently the important development is from a two-person to a three-person relating (also referred to as pre-Oedipal and Oedipal), nor does he use the idea that there are oral, anal and genital stages, though they are referred to, especially the anal one, but not as stages because, presumably, those are too psychoanalytic.

In considering these ideas I want to point out that stages do not exist, they are simply a convenient framework to orientate us (cf. Gesell and Frances 1943; Erikson 1963 or Piaget 1929, and so on). If, however, they are posited they inevitably lead on to studying their antecedents and their consequences, and for this a time scale is needed. Neumann defines stages but, except for the primary relationship, they are given no place in time. This is deliberate, for he says: ‘Here it should be stressed that the phases of ego development that we distinguish are structural phases of the personality and are not distinct stages in time’ (1959:212, fn 1), and so he can assert: ‘all the stages we have mentioned merge and overlap and can only be clearly distinguished in the abstract’ (ibid., fn 3). Those statements are curious. It is not possible to any ordinary mind to dissociate stages from time: it is not possible to think of stages without a temporal sequence to which they can be referred. Consequently the definition of stages becomes obscure: why make them if they do not exist and all run into one another? The idea of continuous growth would seem far more appropriate and nearer to reality.

I shall now go on to consider the exception: the primary relationship which lasts for the first years of extra-uterine life.

The primary relationship

During the first year of extra-uterine life we are told, on the authority of the biologist Portman (*cit.,* Neumann 1973), there is an extended ‘uterine’ period which is unique to human beings. During it the infant is ‘contained within its mother’s body’ (1973:7). After birth, mother and child live ‘in an archetypally conditioned unitary reality’ in which there is no distinction made between external and internal objects, so the phrase ‘fusion of mother and child’ (1973:17) can be used for it. This is the pre-ego uroboric stage, and ‘because it is characterised by a minimum of discomfort and tension and maximum of well-being and security [due to the ministering mother] as well as the unity of I and thou, Self and world, it is known to myth as paradisal’ (1973:14). Thus, in it, one is led to believe, there is no conflict and no consciousness worth mentioning and therefore no experience (1973:10), though ‘the ego nucleus is present from the start’ (ibid.) and ‘In the unitary world experienced by the magical ego there is a universal relatedness; everything is connected with everything else and one thing can and must stand for everything else’ (1973:153). This is the state of identity or *participation mystique* in which, it seems, persons do not exist and all acts depend on the transpersonal ‘archetypal matrix’ in which mother and baby are immersed. In consequence, it is an essentially ‘passive state’ (1973:15).

Behind all this stands the self which creates the state, I assume, with a view to realizing itself. The baby does not express himself (the self); on the contrary 'the mother not only plays the role of the child's self, but actually *is* that self' (1973:13).

My account is short compared with Neumann's lengthy discussion. Nevertheless, I believe that it represents the essentials of what he says with the contradictions which I have included in my account and have not attempted to resolve. I have left out the ongoing drives of automorphism and centroversion leading to the formation of the ego-self axis, as these do not seem to act much during the dominant primary relationship. It may be noted in passing, however, that Neumann agrees with those who maintain that there is an ego nucleus at birth in spite of the contradictory assertion that the primary relation is pre-ego and uroboric. I do not think the confusion in all this misrepresents the author; it comes, I infer, from the fusion of amplificatory metaphor with abstraction.

There can be no doubt about the importance Neumann attributes to this phase of primary relationship. He returns to it again and again: it is conceived to be central in all stages of development. We are given to understand that the maintenance of this state is essential to the well-being of the infant and its future development depends upon it. It is the prototype of all later love relationships and for subsequent relating to society and the world; on it depends healthy growth of the ego, the self and the ego-self axis, expressed in the sense of self-confidence, and what is usually called 'self-esteem'. Because of it the mother can introduce society to her child, allowing for automorphic and anthropomorphic trends.

To anybody who has experience of small children or of the realities of the mother-infant relationship, Neumann's account is idealized and unreal.

Primary relationship and fusion

The idea of fusion which Neumann uses has antecedents: studies on schizophrenia (Searles 1965), reconstructions in adult analyses and the study of myths which relate to primal states of paradisal bliss. Nobody studying mothers and infants has noticed it as characteristic of the very early stages of development. Mahler comes nearest to postulating something like it, but she requires a primary autistic period out of which symbiotic fusion develops (Mahler 1975).

The paradisal state, at one time widely supposed to be characteristic of infancy, is sometimes thought to refer to intra-uterine life as well, and to this Neumann agrees, for he writes: 'As in the uterine phase child and mother are so intermeshed as to be one; they form a dual union' (Neumann 1973:12), and on pp. 112–13 he expands rather beautifully on the relation between the two.

There have been a number of researches that have combined to give credence to the fusion hypothesis, which I have reviewed on another occasion in more detail (Fordham 1969). On neurological grounds it was assumed that nerve fibres were insufficiently myelinated to conduct perceptual impulses very well so sense impressions were believed to be blurred, and it could be that an infant was unable to distinguish between its affectively controlled images and reality. It was concurrently believed, not very logically, that what a child knew was largely controlled by his mother's actions in relation to him, and there was a resulting primary identification of the child with her. These

considerations combined with the need to find a place in development for the paradisal myths and for the 'longing for the mother' on which Jung, for instance, laid much emphasis (Jung 1952). Two lines of study thus converged. Today the perceptual argument has been demolished (Bower 1977). In addition, more has been learned about intra-uterine life. It is a period in which the foetus develops quite sophisticated skills and interacts with his containing aquatic environment. It is quite unsuitable to think of his life as paradisal or blissful, unless paradise be thought of as a noisy and periodically uncomfortable place.

Intra-uterine development provides the means for survival after birth. During it the foetus has refined a number of actions which lead him into relationship with his mother. There are behaviours designed not only to attach him to her, but also to attach his mother to him (Schaffer 1975). Together they set the stage for complex interactional processes in which he takes a considerable part. Though some rare states of mind that develop can be understood by assuming something like primitive identity or *participation mystique,* there is much more in a baby's relation to his mother than that.

Today it seems curious that the paradisal fusion hypothesis of intra-uterine life and early infancy can survive. In its demise the conception of a primary self has proved helpful, for if body and psyche are not separated out into different categories, then it is easier to look at an infant as a single unit and the condition of the foetus can be thought of in a more sensible way. During intra-uterine life, a foetus is living in a special kind of environment, not different in principle from later on.

As I have noted above, Neumann is emphatic that all later development depends upon a good primary relationship. Nobody would disagree that enough good experiences of happiness, satisfaction and joy are important, even essential, but given these it is quite astonishing how much an infant can cope with none-too-good mothering. So much so that, according to Neumann's standards, I would judge that much normal interaction between a mother and her baby would be catastrophic. Not only this: even a good so-called symbiotic period, as defined by Mahler (1975) may not turn out well. She reports, for instance, on Donna and her mother: 'For a long time all the observers of the [research] project considered Mrs D the perfect mother. The babies at the Centre also picked her out as their favourite mother substitute' (p. 138). But Donna, a child with superior endowment, had considerable difficulties in separating, and became aggressive and even violent. Furthermore, 'by the end of the third year, Donna still fluctuated between rather mature independent behaviour in many areas and behaviours in which she clung to her baby-hood' (p. 151). It does not alter the significance of this description, with relation to Donna's problem, for Neumann has nothing to say about such complications.

Disturbances in the primary relationship

Neumann defines disturbances in the primal relationship as follows:

1 Mother's wrong attitude to the sex of her child.
2 Loss of mother due to her psychic inadequacy or death, sickness, or separation for other reasons.
3 The child's negative experience due to 'alimentary insufficiency'. This concept,

Introduced by Rado (n.d.) and developed by others, is concerned with an infant's capacity to assimilate (digest) experience made in relation with his mother.

4 Sickness of the child in which a good mother is converted into a bad one. In this case the decisive factor is said to be the child's archetypal perception of his mother and not the objective occurrences.

5 Hunger.

6 Inability of the other to soothe her child in his aggressive outbursts.

This list contains features which, except for death, are normal characteristics of infant life, and even that can be coped with by a good mother substitute. It is only when they are quantitatively excessive that a child suffers in a way that he cannot cope with. To separate them out, as Neumann does, can only be to sustain an idealized primary relationship and so conform the mother-infant relation to the system.

Mother as the child's self

It is not at all clear how Neumann concludes that a mother *'is'* her child's self, but it seems bound up with his theory of a 'unitary reality'. Once he has said that it is so, it becomes one of his oft-repeated and unsupported assertions. There are references to primitive communities in which he says that the self is located in the community, but that is all I have been able to find in his book by way of evidence. It may be that he was influenced by Jung in such passages as the following: 'The carrier of the [mother] archetype is in the first place the personal mother, because the child lives at first in complete participation with her, in a state of unconscious identity with her. She is the psychic as well as the physical precondition of the child' (Jung 1954a:102). Such a statement could easily lead to considering the infant as actually his mother or vice versa, but Jung's assertion refers to an archetype and so not to the self.

I propose, therefore, to treat the idea as purely theoretical and part of his doctrine of the unitary reality. I will interpret his thesis as follows. In development an ego-self axis appears in which the ego is the 'I' and the self a 'thou'. How can this come about? Assume that the ego is not able to construct such a system alone but needs a mother to be recognized as the first 'thou'. The infant projects parts of the self into his mother by projective identification. That unburdens his ego which is then left free to develop far enough to recognize himself as an 'I' and his mother as 'thou'. Later he begins to recognize his mother as she is in reality and concurrently the part of the self that he projected into her can be more easily withdrawn. This is the only way in which I can make some sense of what Neumann says.

The oddity of Neumann's argument would appear to arise from sloppy thinking. If the self is conceived by him as the totality of the infant, then it cannot be projected, exteriorized or anything of a like kind. Nobody other than the infant can be the self. So a mother cannot be her infant's self because, if that were so, there would be no infant, or no mother. Neumann deals with this quandary by stating that it is a paradox and then introduces a body self in addition to the whole self. Apart from the logical nonsense of his thesis, it makes no sense in terms of what is known of the mother-infant relation.

There is no need for the paradox, provided the self be conceived as more than an archetype which can divide up or deintegrate, as I have suggested. That term may be

translated as sending out 'feelers', messages or taking actions which facilitate relating to the mother's body and her states of mind. This conception is in line with observations showing that a baby actively comes into relation with his mother, relates to her and interacts with her. In doing so he may project into her parts of the self; later, if conditions are good enough, he can introject them back into himself.

Once projections on to and projective identifications (cf. Klein 1955) into his mother are established, she can do something about them. She can act as a container for the affects associated with her infant's state of mind, then she can provide a holding situation within which her baby can work through distressing and painful affects and provide a place where joy and satisfaction can be mutually enjoyed.

While enough good experiences are essential, it is the alleviation of psychic pain which is most important for an infant's development. Fortunately his mother can help decisively in states of anxiety, depression or despair. For his part an infant can contribute to their solution by using projective identification and then his mother can contain and transform them into new states of mind; if she cannot go so far she can start a process which her baby can continue and hopefully assimilate the painful experience. Not enough records of such experiences have been made but Harris has described some of them very beautifully (Harris 1975). Where a mother fails, or is in danger of failing in her good-enough functioning, a baby can be helpful in the sense that he may have the capacity to give out especially clear signals as to his needs and this will support his mother. Alternatively, where she does not take up his signals, he may continue to grumble and complain till, in the end, she finds out what it is about.

This way of thinking about the relation between a mother and her infant gives a very different picture from the one Neumann develops. It is sufficiently detailed to make study of the relationship fruitful. By contrast, there is an aspect of Neumann's theory that a mother *is* the child's self which easily gets overlooked: it implies that a mother is annihilated by being replaced by the infant self, and concurrently, when the remaining ego fragments are depreciated as pre-ego, there is very little of the baby left at all.

Consciousness of an infant—islands of consciousness

Neumann adopts the idea that there are islands of consciousness (ego nuclei) from the start of extra-uterine life. This thesis is usually combined with the idea that an infant is unconscious. The value of thinking of a baby as unconscious is to underline his innate archetypal capacities for relating to objects, whether internal or external to himself.

What use can be made of the theory of ego nuclei? It depends very much on how it is spelt out. A small baby spends most of its time asleep. There are also periods during which it is very difficult to tell whether he is asleep or not. Then there are periods during which the baby is very much awake; these occur, for instance, when he is experiencing his mother as she attends to his needs, namely, feeding him, playing with him, talking to him, diapering him, bathing him, and so forth. Looked at in this way, the 'islands of consciousness' appear considerable. Later on they are extended by periods of play activity in his cot, on the floor, and so on. What sort of consciousness does a baby have during these periods? Visual, auditory and tactile perceptions are quite well developed at birth, and in addition complex imitative actions are possible (cf. Bower 1977). Indeed, in

some respects a baby's reality perceptions are more differentiated than an adult's (ibid.). This information, derived from experimental investigations, is in line with observations on individual babies. It is in line with these observations to assume that a baby can distinguish his mother from himself quite soon.

Neumann differentiates two kinds of consciousness: matriarchal and patriarchal. The matriarchal kind is said to dominate the primal relationship. In it there is much flexibility, everything can represent anything else, it is consequently moon-like, and so on, and the emotional content of it is unitary and paradisal. All the studies that I have referred to indicate that, as a general state, that is not so.

Infancy is a period with variable limits in time during which a spectrum of experience is undergone. During it a baby has experiences both on his own and in relation to his mother, in which both conscious and active motor and mental functions are brought into play. An infant can experience his mother as a good breast, and this experience is good, joyful and satisfying. The breast-mother can, on the other hand, become bad, an alien body to be rejected and fought with, with varying outcomes. A baby can feel that he and the breast-mother are at one and then he cannot distinguish between himself and the mother-breast—this experience may be the basis for the blissful phantasies developed later on.

If his experience of his mother is not satisfying but painful, he has a variety of ways of dealing with his bad breast-mother: he can eject the experience as if it were an object by vomiting, coughing, crying, screaming, defecating, alternately, because his physical and mental processes are so closely related, he can convert it into illness and finally he can defensively use his muscles to build up a 'body armour'. If, by reason of its absence, he experiences the breast as a bad breast inside him, he can hallucinate a good breast to offset the bad one or he can evacuate it, or he can convert it into thoughts. If none of these are effective, he can become depressed or he can collapse (depletion) or he can use splitting to isolate the bad breast from the rest of himself.

This account by no means exhausts the 'spectrum of experience'. I have made this list to indicate the impossibility of referring to a single state of affairs that persists in infancy. There are, however, stable elements which can be expressed by referring to an infant as being the same in the midst of change.

Later stages of the ego

In chapter 5 of *The Child* Neumann defines stages of the ego. Once again, evidence for them is drawn from ethnological material though there are occasional references to children: these are not very informative, and are often misleading. He asserts, for instance, that the child as a rule speaks of himself as a 'he' or 'she' and this is because of the dominance of the 'body self over the ego'. It is by no means 'the rule', though no serious study has been made on the frequency of such expressions. The use of the word 'I' has, however, been investigated. Gesell, for instance, finds it used regularly by 18 months and quite frequently earlier (Gesell n.d.). Would it not follow that, when an infant uses 'he' or 'she', he is referring to a state of depersonalization?

Then there is the assertion that consciousness is essentially phallic. If this be so, then to a small child his father's penis would be an expression of his mental life, of his ego. It is

true that father's penis is important in child development when it is the representative of sexual power (cf., for instance, Jacobson 1964). That is rejected by Neumann, who disallows the sexual meaning of the phallus. But even if Neumann is in some sense correct, there is no reason to support that it only represents transpersonal consciousness, as his thesis implies, unless rockets and space ships be interpreted as penises; but that, I think, is not what Neumann would mean.

Turning to the stages of ego development, they are said to be as follows: the passive (vegetative) and the active (animal) egos belonging to the matriarchal phase; the magical stage is divided up into the magic warlike and solar warlike egos. In addition, there is the stage of ego autonomy belonging to the solar patriarchy.

All that can be expressed much more simply as follows: there are passive, mainly perceptive but possibly reflective and active, mainly motor, stages of the ego to begin with; next, phantasies develop in which subject and object are not well defined and magic-like affects follow; that state may lead to manic (warlike) attempts to triumph over adversaries (parents and siblings) and later to battles in the realm of thought; finally, the ego develops, and activity that is relatively free from conflict. Put thus, the verbose picture which Neumann presents can be presented more simply.

A special feature of Neumann's interpretation is that the hero represents the ego. It is a thesis that Geigerich (1975) correctly criticizes on the basis that the hero is an archetypal image. The conclusion that the ego is an archetype thus seems to follow. That is difficult to swallow, since if it is an archetypal image and so reflects unconscious structures and functions, it cannot at the same time reflect the ego without upsetting the structural theory of polarities.

I ended chapter 5 amazed and rather horrified at what it does not contain. There is no reference to all the knowledge that has been accumulated about a child's cognitive development, his acquisition of mental and motor skills, his capacity for thought which enables him to draw conclusions and test them, the growth of self feeling and concurrent development of ego boundaries, the mastery of his inner and outer worlds, his sense of shame and all the achievements of his ego that come under those headings.

Guilt

There is, however, reference to guilt, but it is contained in chapter 4. On the one hand, Neumann conceives it as a product of Western culture; on the other, as a deviation from the ego-self axis. He could only believe the former if he were extrapolating adult guilt into childhood. Infantile guilt is the prototype of adult guilt and can become reparative. That sequence is not due to Western Christian culture, but is a possible experience during infancy long before a baby is aware of the Christian concept of sin and redemption: the Christian experience reflects and develops the infantile one. But there is another sort of guilt described by Neumann; it is condemning and persecutory. It leads to 'chaos and nothingness' (Neumann 1973:86) and to feelings of persecution by the mother (p. 87). This is all tied up with the belief that the mother is the child's self. It leads to 'an unanalysable element of the psyche [which] tends to resist all attempts to explain it or raise it to consciousness' (p. 88). All this is due to disturbances in the primary relationship. Thus, guilt is only a fault in development. It is true that during the

development of the group of feelings, sadness, grief, hopelessness and depression, there is a phase in infant development when they are persecutory, but they can develop into what is rather badly termed depressive guilt and from that stem feelings and desires to make reparation. In view of these findings, which indicate an important part for guilt in infant and child development (cf. Jacobson 1964 and elsewhere), it would appear that Neumann's view of guilt belongs to its psychopathology and not to healthy development.

Conclusions

I have made an assessment of Neumann's thesis. The parts of it that I have not gone into can, I believe, be considered in the same way. It must be remembered, however, that though the translation was published in 1973, the book was written some years earlier. It is also relevant that in 1959 he was calling for a new genetic theory to fill in the gap in analytical psychology, thus following my lead expressed in 1944. It may seem unfair to criticize in the light of later developments in a rapidly developing field, but if his system is well founded, it might be expected to accommodate such changes in knowledge. His vision was evidently important to him and to others as well for, as Geigerich says, his praises have resounded throughout the world of analytical psychology. What then are the features which seem to have permanent, if historical, value?

1 He clearly maintains that there are elements in a child that determine his development, and so he was one of those who were refuting the view that a child was only an extension of his mother or his parents. However true or false his theories of centroversion, automorphism and the ego-self axis be, they express the view that there are factors in a child that develop intrapsychically.
2 There are a host of analogies with myth and other ethnological material that can be worked on in relation to children's dreams and phantasies when they are old enough to construct comparable material. In this sense the system can act as a container, but of a passive sort—it must remain so till somebody can decode it into a form that small children can understand. It is true that the use of myths as therapeutic agents has not been worked on much, except in as much as the provision of toys and a sand-tray suggest phantasies and so myth-like patterns, though these are of doubtful significance.
3 There was a time when lack of a genetic theory was widely felt amongst analytical psychologists. Neumann responded to that need. If he failed in ways that have been indicated, that does not detract from the historical value of his essay.

Geigerich (1975) concludes that Neumann's achievement was to have produced a novel creation myth and that the genetic aspect of his work is of no service to analytical psychology. Though there is substance in that view, I think it was important that Neumann introduced genetic considerations. His approach was not that of a scientist but of an ingenious thinker who combines poetic and symbolic insights with a degree of logical thinking. Consequently, he creates contradictions and confusions; that is to be expected. It does not lead to knowledge about children, as one is supposed to believe from the title of his book, but to an amalgam of myth and thoughts into which bits of experience about children can be fitted.

In saying this about Neumann's work, I do not wish it to be thought that he is unique in the field of child psychology, though he is more extravagant than anybody else. It is quite characteristic that the less students of the subject know in experience, the more they resort to theory and jargon (that is, power words). I have noted this in relation to Mahler (Fordham 1977). The combination can be dropped as knowledge accumulates.

The state of knowledge about children and infants is still in an introductory phase among analytical psychologists, and there is a tendency to conceive that childhood is irrelevant to mature individuation studies. Neumann presented childhood in a way that links up with the state of relative ignorance.

When in difficulty, a mother may resort to a book on the management of children; it does not much matter whether what is said is right or wrong, so long as she gets something to start from in managing her child. If Neumann's volume can be used in that way, making it safer for analytical psychologists to interest themselves in infancy and childhood, then it will have performed a useful function. But if it be taken as talking about real children, then it will interfere in the next stage of feeling confident in relating to them as ordinary parents do in their daily lives, or in the more sophisticated forms of relating which child analysts have developed. In writing this essay, I have been acutely aware of the danger that Neumann's work will support many current illusions about childhood by using adult analogies to amplify data the therapist does not understand. Thus he could obstruct the development of knowledge of real children. It is this concern which has made me spell out in some detail what is false in his thesis: what remains is very little that has not long since been known and better expressed.

There has been a personal aspect to my views which I will mention in conclusion. The study of archetypal processes by using mythological parallels and other ethnological material was how I began my work with children. I also experimented with Dr Margaret Lowenfeld's sand-tray method and was indeed at one time an external examiner of her students' qualifying examinations. What I say about the pitfalls of those methods is thus born out of an experience which led me eventually to the rich fields of child analysis and infant-mother observation.

Part III
Reviews and short articles

10
Articles on psychoanalysis

ON MELANIE KLEIN

The following two reviews, written in the mid-1950s, were amongst the first written comparisons between the work of Jung and Klein, but they did not arise in a vacuum. The medical section of the British Psychological Society had provided a forum where Freudians, Kleinians and Jungians could meet on neutral territory outside the settings of their respective institutions. At first these meetings were rather chaotic, until Rickman and Fordham introduced order by focusing attention on set topics such as projective identification and counter-transference.

I*n these reviews, Fordham tried to represent to a Jungian audience the way Kleinians approached an area that Jung had studied in adults: Klein from the position of unconscious phantasy, Jung from undirected thinking and archetypal images.*

M*ichael Fordham was eager to emphasize, in the review of* New Directions, *the growing acknowledgement of counter-transference amongst psychoanalysts since it involved the unconscious psychic activity of the analyst, something that Jung had been writing about for many years.* (*See the review of Langs'* The Therapeutic Interaction.) *Another noteworthy point is Fordham's 'supervisory' remarks about the case of Rosenfeld which, although brief, put forward a viable formulation of psychosis from the position of analytical psychology. Fordham has written very little on psychotic states but not, he says, for any reason other than in his practice he has not had enough experience of them except in children.*

T*he review of* Envy and Gratitude *contained a large input from Rosemary Gordon, and it therefore appeared above both their names. It is interesting to note that in 1958 they wisely expressed caution about the timing of the origin of the ego in childhood. Infant observation is filling in some of the gaps. (See Chapter 3 on 'The model'.) R.H.*

Review of *New Directions in Psychoanalysis*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 2(1) (1957)

This volume contains twenty-one papers by fifteen psychoanalysts and one artist. The analysts are mostly members of the Kleinian school; all of them are sympathetic to Mrs Klein's researches. The book is divided into two parts: the first containing 'Papers in clinical psycho-analysis', the second, 'Papers in applied psycho-analysis'. It is an important publication which contains the more recent developments in Kleinian theory and practice; it will, I hope, receive close attention from analytical psychologists because of the links which are developing between the two schools. I shall point to some of them in the course of this review.

A book of collected papers by different authors is always liable to develop defects,

something gets left out, or an important principle gets elaborated too late. This is true of the present volume, which leaves the reader too frequently at a loss because the theory of counter-transference, first elaborated by Paula Heimann in 1950, is not at least in my view, given sufficient prominence early on. I would therefore suggest that before reading the child analyses the reader should look up the brief account of Paula Heimann's view which appears in the articles by Rosenfeld and Bion.

Mrs Klein's play technique has been much criticized on grounds that need not be gone into here, and it is therefore valuable to have a clear exposition of it by her in her opening paper, 'The psycho-analytic play technique: its history and significance'. This gives an outline of her method of child analysis, and shows how she developed it and where it has led her. The cautious, modest style carries conviction of the genuine pioneering that she has done which has led to a substantial gain in knowledge of the unconscious processes operating in child development.

Since I do not read books of this kind straight through I turned, after perusing the first paper, to the two on the analyses of small children, one by Lois Munro, 'Steps in ego-integration observed in a play-analysis', and the other by Emilio Rodrigue, 'The analysis of a three-year-old mute schizophrenic'. I was soon at sea, being somewhat astonished at the way in which brief episodes in a play series are submitted to very elaborate interpretations. I believe that many readers will be put off by this and, though they may admire the imaginative insight of the analysts, they will also be led to try to assess how much of the interpretation is due to the projection of theoretical preconceptions into the child's material. Those familiar with the technique may well be able to follow with reasonable ease, but the essays will do little to dispel the concern of those critics who believe there is inadequate control exercised over interpretative enthusiasm.

I think that Mrs Klein's application of the interpretative method to play material is on the right lines, but have reservations about the way it is often employed. I was therefore particularly interested in the reference to counter- transference in the two papers on child analysis. It occurred to me that this might well provide a clue to the assurance these analysts evidently feel in their manner of treating the material. The brief references are, however, too short to see what is meant, and it is not until the papers by Rosenfeld and Bion that a slightly more adequate definition is given. Rosenfeld expresses the theory all too concisely in 'Notes on the psycho-analysis of the superego conflict in an acute schizophrenic patient'. There, on p. 193, he quotes Paula Heimann as follows: analysis 'depends on the analyst's capacity to use his counter-transference as a kind of sensitive "receiving set"', and Bion illustrates and discusses the thesis in his 'Language and the schizophrenic', starting from the following striking example in which the theory is pushed to its extreme (p. 224):

> The patient had been lying on the couch, silent, for some twenty minutes. During this time I had become aware of a growing sense of anxiety and tension which I associated with facts about the patient which were already known to me from work done with him in the six months he had already been with me. As the silence continued I became aware of a fear that the patient was meditating a physical attack upon me, though I could see no outward change in his posture. As the tension grew I felt increasingly sure that this was so. Then, and only

> then, I said to him, 'You have been pushing into my insides your fear that you will murder me.' There was no change in the patient's position but I noticed that he clenched his fists till the skin over the knuckles became white. The silence was unbroken. At the same time I felt that the tension in the room, presumably in the relationship between him and me, had decreased. I said to him, 'When I spoke to you, you took your fear that you would murder me back into your-self; you are now feeling afraid you will make a murderous attack upon me.' I followed the same method throughout the session, waiting for impressions to pile up until I felt I was in a position to make my interpretation.

This theory makes the interpretative techniques used in the earlier accounts much more intelligible, for if the counter-transference is really such a reliable instrument then it is justifiable for the analyst to rely on unconscious psychic activity within himself to an extent which had heretofore been recognized only in analytical psychology and not in psychoanalysis. Bion's startling applications combined with a passage which needs quoting because it shows that he is conscious of the dangers of this innovation. He says (p. 224):

> The objection that I project my conflicts and phantasies on to the patient cannot and should not be easily dismissed. The defence must lie in the hard facts of the analytic situation, namely that in the present state of psycho-analytic knowledge the analyst cannot rely on a body of well-authenticated knowledge. Further, he must assume that his own analysis has gone far enough to make disastrous misinterpretation unlikely. Finally, I think there are signs that as experience accumulates it may be possible to detect and present facts which exist, but at present elude clinical acumen; they become observable, at second hand, through the pressure they exert to produce what I am aware of as counter-transference. I would not have it thought that I advocate this use of counter-transference as a final solution; rather it is an expedient to which we must resort until something better presents itself.

I think he is more cautious than many analytical psychologists would be who are familiar with comparable practices and can understand why they work. The concepts of the archetypes and primitive identity explain it. This thesis has not yet been sufficiently worked out by analytical psychologists and these papers should challenge them to do so: two publications in the first number of the *Journal of Analytical Psychology* (1955), one by Moody and the other by Stein, together with Meier's theoretical paper, 'Projektion, Ubertragung und Subjekt-Objekt-relation', make a beginning.

Following Mrs Klein's essay is Paula Heimann's 'A contribution to the re-evaluation of the Oedipus conflict: the early stages'. It is a good theoretical paper and gives the best short account of Mrs Klein's contribution that I have met: it is clear, and incisive, and leaves the reader in no doubt as to what is new and how it interdigitates with classical psychoanalysis.

Taken as a whole, Mrs Klein's research has led her to investigate the pre-Oedipal sphere in great detail and so to approach the psychoses with more adequate instruments than Freud. She has developed a theory of the unconscious perceptibly closer to Jung's,

since the inner objects have been given a quite new emphasis as part of a complex inner world; the Kleinian trend has thus been to lay emphasis on the introverted aspects of psychology which Jung was the first to open up, though in a different way.

Kleinian psychoanalytic studies have led to the conclusion that the infant's psyche is much more complex than earlier writers believed, much more is also innate, and in her paper Paula Heimann states (p. 24):

> By the term unconscious phantasies we mean the most primitive psychic formations, inherent in the operation of the instinctual urges; and because these are inborn, we attribute unconscious phantasies to the infant from the beginning of his life. Unconscious phantasies occur not only in the infant, they are part of the unconscious mind at any time, and form the matrix from which the preconscious and conscious processes develop.

This clear identification with the view Jung held till recently when, under pressure from biologists, he abandoned the heredity of archetypal images, together with the new view of counter-transference already described, led me to consider how much further the Kleinian school has approached analytical psychology and what differences remained. I was soon struck by the increasing use of the term 'self'. It is not explicitly defined but seems to indicate a concept of wholeness which embraces the ego, superego and id, and is even perhaps something more as well. Then, in a very interesting paper, 'A combination of defence mechanisms in paranoid states', Paula Heimann refers to cohering and disruptive forces within the psyche apart, it seems, from any of the previously known institutions. Here she also refers to split-off ego fragments which lose the 'me'-quality (p. 253); they are not to be classed as part of the superego. If they lose their 'me'-quality, then they could be regarded as the origin of a non-ego, and would possibly make a link with the concept of the objective psyche.

This theory would seem to be of use when Rosenfeld describes a disintegration in a schizophrenic who says (p. 196): 'It is all broadened out, what are all the men going to feel?', to which Rosenfeld replies, and here he builds on other material which cannot be quoted here, 'that *he* [the patient] could no longer stand the guilt and anxiety inside *himself* and had put *his* depression, anxiety, and feelings and also *himself* into the outer world' (italics mine). The verbal ambiguity here displayed (for he himself cannot be anywhere but in the outer world if I understand Rosenfeld's terms correctly) would not arise if the theory of the archetypes and the objective psyche were accepted. Then the analyst would be able to follow the experience of the patient more closely without inferring, as is done here and elsewhere, not once, but over and over again, that the ego is expelled from the archetypal inner world which remains relatively intact, but at the same time there is a deintegration of the self ('it is all broadening out'), felt by the ego as disintegration. We may now return to the verbal problem by considering the words I have italicized: 'he' would be the ego with a reference to the self; the first 'himself' refers to the inner world; 'his' refers more to the self than to the ego, which is almost completely separated from the self in the second 'himself'.

I next turn to Marion Milner's 'The role of illusion in symbol formation', for this is a sphere in which there has always been marked conflict between psychoanalysis and

analytical psychology. Here I read that a symbol 'keeps the individual together as a whole' (p. 82). The term is used in two senses; first to indicate a content which refers to or hides an objectionable idea in the unconscious, and second it refers to an archaism which is part of pre-logical thinking. This falls into line with Jung's distinction between sign and symbol or Stein's more recent one between metabole and symbol. Discussing the uniting function of the symbol and the energies involved, Mrs Milner goes on (p. 83):

> Do we really mean that it is only the desire for ease and pleasure, and not necessity, that drives us to identify one thing with another which is in fact not the same? Are we not rather driven by the internal necessity for inner organization, pattern, coherence, the basic need to discover identity in difference without which experience becomes chaos?

I can scarcely believe that a psychoanalyst could have written this ten years ago; *On Not Being Able to Paint* (1950) contained a first indication of it. All this is familiar ground to analytical psychologists, but the word 'illusion' in the title has led me to expect passages with which I could not agree. Consideration of this disagreement leads to the heart of one difference between the two schools and so is worth discussing, even though Mrs Milner is not representative of psychoanalysis as a whole.

Mrs Milner wants to employ a new way of thinking about symbols from that of classical psychoanalysis, and she looks for words to use. 'The word illusion is…needed because this word does imply that there is a relation to an external object of feeling, even though a phantastic one, since the person producing the fusion [between feeling and object] believes that the secondary object *is* the primary one' (p. 86). The primary objects are presumably defined as mouth, penis, vagina, faeces, breast, and symbol formation arises from the 'frustrated mouth, penis, vagina and their retaliatory counterparts' (p. 82).

But why are the primary objects less symbolic than the secondary ones? This is not at all clear, for on p. 87 we find 'the concept of fusion is present, both in the primary situation, between self and object, and in the secondary one, between the new situation and the old one'. Is it not like saying that the first rung of a ladder is the primary one and is real, and subsequent rungs, all essentially like the first, have a quotient of illusion in them for some unknown reason? It seemed to me clear that the reason for the odd differentiation lies in the essentially genetic nature of psychoanalysis. The present formulation seems to imply a naïve theory of reality which is no longer tenable, but is adhered to because, if it were dropped, the genetic assumption would have to be revised. This it is which highlights convincingly the superiority of Jung's concept of the symbol over those here expressed and which gives a much better understanding of its relation to past and future.

I hope that these comments will indicate why I suggest that this volume will repay attention from analytical psychologists. For those unfamiliar with the terminology there will be difficulties. The introduction of terms derived from psychiatry is not altogether satisfactory, but nobody has so far invented better ones.

There are many other papers of considerable interest in the second part of the book; mention must clearly be made of Mrs Klein's 'On identification'. In a beautiful way she illustrates her concept of projec-tive identification using a French novel *If I Were You* for

her purpose. The hero is here tempted by the devil who reveals a formula whereby the hero can discard his own identity and, adopting the body and psychology of numerous persons in series, can live as if he were not himself but them. This article has a highly original content; so also has Bion's 'Group dynamics: a review', but it would expand this review beyond all reason to discuss it here. Part II contains, besides these, two papers on literature, one on aesthetics, and one on art; of these, 'A psycho-analytical approach to aesthetics' by Hanna Segal is the best. Elliott Jaques discusses the structure and dynamics of social systems, and Roger Money-Kyrle, having already written on 'Psycho-analysis and ethic', ends the volume with 'An inconclusive contribution to the theory of the death instinct'.

Money-Kyrle's crisp thinking led me to reflect on how a book of this kind, covering such a wide variety of subjects, could have any coherence. I concluded that it is because of the basis of technical and theoretical agreements and because, where disagreement is to be found, it is stated and discussed in such a way that the reader knows where the author stands in relation to others. The emphasis on mythology and symbolic realization and thinking has often led analytical psychologists to neglect this discipline and to shun defining disagreement—this is to be regretted. As an example of how to handle such issues the volume can be read with profit, particularly the final discussion by Money-Kyrle, which was particularly interesting to me because the concept of the death instinct which it discusses is so fascinating and yet improbable.

Mrs Klein's wholehearted acceptance of this instinct is the one serious drawback to her conceptual framework, and Money-Kyrle's open-minded discussion of the subject is highly significant. He points out the incompatibility of the concept with the general theory of instincts which contains within it the proviso that the behaviour in question contributes to the preservation of the species, and he ends up as follows: 'It can therefore hardly be conceived except as a kind of psychic correlate of entropy—something prior to the instincts proper which were presumably evolved to counteract it' (p. 509).

I have laid stress on those parts of this book which I thought were conceptually nearest to analytical psychology. This I have done because I think that it is useful to compare notes constructively with psychoanalysts from time to time. Looking back over twenty-five years' work in the field of dynamic psychology, I am far more impressed by the gradual changes which bring the two schools nearer, than by those which increase the gap between them. It would almost seem as if the Kleinian school of psychoanalysis is getting closer to analytical psychology than to classical psychoanalysis. It is to be remarked, in conclusion, that there is no mention of the word 'mythology' in any essay!

Review of *Envy and Gratitude*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 3(2) (1958)

This small, brilliant and challenging volume of ninety-one pages contains Mrs Klein's most recent conclusions on the early development of the infant's emotional life and the deviations which give rise to psychopathology. It is divided into two parts: the first is theoretical, while the second contains a number of case studies illustrating how the theories are applied in psychoanalytic practice.

Envy is conceived as a primary affect springing from, or clearly related to, the death

instinct; it is ‘an oral-sadistic and anal-sadistic expression of destructive impulses operative from the beginning of life and has a constitutional basis’; it is closely allied to greed but differs from it in seeking to spoil and rob the mother with the aim of destroying her creativeness. All this is based upon the fantasy that the breast is mean and grudging, it would rather enjoy itself than satisfy the infant. The theme of the infant’s destructive attacks on the mother is one with which Mrs Klein has made us familiar over the years; what is new is the central part that envy plays in them.

Gratitude, on the contrary, is the feeling which springs from a good feed and from a good breast; it leads to a sense of being full of good objects, to generosity, and is closely related to the process of restitution; it springs from an alliance of the ego with the life instinct.

In accordance with the early origin of envy the ego is postulated as present at birth; it is likewise constitutional or innate. This conclusion is inevitable because envy presupposes that what the late Dr John Rickman taught us to call a ‘two-body relationship’ is a primary state of all infants in relation to the mothers.

The application of this theory in the second part will be of great interest to analysts. The case material is clearly set out, and Mrs Klein describes with precision what she does and how she interprets; it is much the best account of her technique in adult psychoanalysis which has so far appeared. Perhaps the most striking contribution is her new and illuminating interpretation of the negative therapeutic reaction, in which the patient will accept nothing from the analyst but spends his whole time undermining, criticizing, and otherwise rendering ineffective all analytic efforts. Mrs Klein gives several examples of how she is able to overcome this apparently insuperable quandary within the transference.

Another contribution which seemed to us of interest is the role of envy in premature genital excitement in infancy and childhood—since it is a theme to which Jung long ago drew attention, conceiving it as a symptom of deprivation. The phenomena are understood by Mrs Klein from a different angle, though a rejecting mother is a potent element of the result; the symptoms, she says, originate from failure to work through the depressive position owing to excess of envy; the oral phase being unresolved, the infant or child attempts to find substitute gratification in premature genital satisfactions which then have compulsive characteristics.

This short account of the theory, with two excerpts of the way in which it applies, can only and is only intended to whet the reader’s appetite.

In making a critical assessment of this important volume we may start by saying that it would be easy enough to sweep incredulously aside some of Mrs Klein’s contentions. She makes no attempt to meet criticisms of the death instinct, but has evidently decided that destructive processes are so obvious in infancy that theoretical objections are not important. Yet criticisms of it might surely lead to further understanding of the psychology of infants, and it seems a pity that she does not consider the many doubts that have been voiced about this strange topic: the thesis is so presented as to leave out the positive content of aggression to which many psychoanalysts, but particularly Helene Deutsch and more recently Marion Milner, have drawn attention. Aggression and apparently destructive impulses and fantasies can surely serve the maturation process and so the life instinct, if not from the very beginning, at least soon after birth. The infant’s

aggressive, greedy attack on the breast can certainly result in a good feed, and part of the fantasy that the breast is eaten and incorporated as a good object. Further, in later development the archetypal conflict with the parents leads, we know, to greater maturity through separation from the parents and is not only destructive and actuated by envy. It may be, however, that the brevity of the exposition has led Mrs Klein to assume knowledge of the many manifestations of positive aggression, for in the course of her extensive experience she must surely have come to know about them.

The other theoretical issue is one of dating: when does envy, and so the ego, start to function? How can it be determined whether the ego is innate or not? The classical theory of analytical psychology has put the appearance of the ego comparatively late, round about the third year; there are good grounds, however, for assuming that this is too late. Jung suggested that the use of the words 'I' and 'me' give an indication of when the ego is formed, but these words appear regularly as early as 18 months. It appears to us that even on the basis of our definition of the ego as the centre of consciousness a considerably earlier date can be given for the ego's emergence. Memory—another of Jung's criteria—can, for instance, be observed at 8 months. Even this would be much too late for Mrs Klein's thesis to stand.

If these facts seem to speak against the early origin of envy, it must be realized that their interpretation depends on theoretical assumptions. Psychoanalysts, for instance, conceive the ego as reaching into the unconscious, and they would not agree that observations about the infant's consciousness are the sole evidence of the ego's presence. The dates we have instanced, taken as they are from Gesell and Piaget, cannot, therefore, be conclusive.

The idea of an unconscious ego like that found in psychoanalysis is not absent in analytical psychology, but it is found under a different heading. Since parts of the shadow can be assimilated into the ego, they are therefore of the same essential nature. In considering what corresponds to the psychic components covered by the term 'ego' in psychoanalysis we need also to consider the relevance of the self. Jung himself has suggested that the ego and the self are closely related to each other, and it has been put forward by one of us that the self is the original archetype of the ego from which deintegrates arise very early on; these, as the basis from which bits of ego form, might provide conditions under which transitory very intense envy might arise over short periods of time. They would be interspersed with longer periods of integration in which the experience is absent.

The speculative ideas are put forward only to show how difficult it is to be sure that Mrs Klein is wrong, though it cannot be said that she is right, and secondly to point out how confusion will inevitably arise if we start thinking about psychoanalysis in our own terminology. It is just as precarious to reverse the process. We need, in short, to find terms which mean the same to both schools.

It will probably be agreed by all that the experience of envy inevitably presupposes boundaries between infant and mother; it is these that Mrs Klein assumes from birth, and it is here that criticism may be focused to see where it leads. It is usual to postulate the gradual development of boundaries, and for this there is observational and experimental evidence. The work of Piaget, for instance, clearly indicates the absence of space-time constructs and you-me differentiates shortly after birth, and he dates clear signs of the

infant's knowing the difference between himself (ego) and the external world at one year. Piaget's observations easily fall into line with the view of analytical psychologists as a whole, who have assumed a primary state of primitive identity or *participation mystique* from which the boundaries are gradually differentiated. It must, however, be realized that this assumption has no more been established than has Mrs Klein's thesis.

The issues, at present inconclusive, can, in our view, only be decided by a combination of observation and experiment with infants. Analytic experiences must inevitably be content with giving indications of what to look for and when to look for it. Here Mrs Klein is good because she gives definite dates at which the processes she is describing occur; it is therefore particularly to be regretted that she relegates observational data on infants to a footnote. Without checking her theories by this difficult type of research, her estimate of envy as chronologically primary must remain dubious, and most analysts will probably prefer to reserve judgement upon the matter.

Yet whatever be the outcome, and whether Mrs Klein's theory be accepted or rejected, the importance of the relation of envy and gratitude to schizoid, depressive and paranoid reaction patterns, to idealized processes and to the growth of the ego, cannot be gainsaid.

Rightly or wrongly, analytical psychologists will probably be more interested in the patterns she describes than in chronological dating. Here Mrs Klein has much that can assist us in understanding the interrelation of the shadow and the ego and the assimilation of the former. The relation between guilt and restitution seems crucial, as Jung has so cogently pointed out in *Answer to Job.* There he describes in different terms what appear to be the same themes: the relation between unconscious persecution, guilt, restitution and idealization, followed by what is historically speaking the problem of our era—how to assimilate evil in a mature way.

The two descriptions are on very different planes, yet they both involved understanding of the part played in it by the ego. This is another reason which should stimulate us to study Mrs Klein's interesting and original achievements.

(with Rosemary Gordon)

REVIEW OF EDITH JACOBSON'S *THE SELF AND THE OBJECT WORLD*

Source: International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 46(4) (1965)

Jacobson was one of the first psychoanalysts to clarify their ideas of the self. Fordham chose to review this book for the International Journal of Psycho-Analysis *because he wanted to know what psychoanalysts' views of the self were, though he knew he disagreed with them.*

The review begins with his agreements with Jacobson, especially that there is a total psycho-physiological self out of which psychic structures emerge. It moves on to disagreements with her and then gives Fordham an opportunity to explore his own thoughts on the self and individuation. He was familiar with the problems Jacobson tackles because he had worked over them in his studies of Jung. Also, from his early observations of children he had recognized that self representations occur very early in life. He was in a position therefore to see that Jacobson's self representations are partial

and include only a bit of the total self. She then gets into difficulties where the self (whole, prime-mover) is controlled by the super-ego (part). Fordham had at this stage (1965) already gone beyond Jacobson's thinking, and the disappointment at the end of the review refers to the fact that she was unable to shed any light on his researches into the primary self. R.H.

My first impression of this book was exciting. Jacobson's subject features prominently in analytical psychology, for Jung had studied and defined a symbolism of the self in increasing detail over the last forty or so years. An additional predisposition to be interested derived from my application of Jung's thesis to childhood and to the origins and development of the ego; here was evidence that psychoanalysts were taking up the subject, bringing their greater resources in manpower and disciplined analytical method to unravel a difficult field of study which I had found extremely rewarding.

The volume, however, soon caused me considerable difficulty for two reasons: first, though many of the concepts were understandable, others needed translating to fit the frame of reference with which I was more familiar; secondly, there was a complete absence of the kind of empirical symbolic data which Jung had taken to represent the self.

This made me decide to start this review as if Jung's observations had not taken place, and to proceed as if I knew enough of psychoanalysis to make myself comprehensible. As occasion arises I can then introduce ideas current in analytical psychology. In this project I have been much helped by Jacobson's lucidity, which makes me confident that if I blunder it will not be her fault.

I shall start by recording *first impressions* and shall say how this book stimulated me on a first reading.

First, it is a good book, well set out, persuasively written, and well arranged.

Second, the book contains the kind of psychoanalytic metapsychology which I have thought too often becomes so remote from everyday analytical work as to make it a special discipline of its own. Reading on made me revise my attitude and led me to study quite a lot of her references, particularly those in *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child.* Some of what I read was valuable, and I began to reflect actively about the place and use of theory (metapsychology?).

Third, the book showed in a very clear way, which I had not met elsewhere, how the relation between pre-Oedipal, Oedipal and post-Oedipal developments of the child are conceived. This helped me to understand: (1) Freud's theories of primary narcissism and primary masochism. Both ideas had been impossible for me to assimilate before, and I can now see why: I had arrived at an idea of the primal self, and this blocked my understanding. Jacobson spelled out my quandary, and now I can grasp what is meant and where to place the two concepts. And (2) why there has been so much conflict over the data and theories described and elaborated by Melanie Klein. It still seems to me fussy to bother so much about whether the 'precursors' of the superego are to be called superego or not, and I very much missed any discussion of the transition which Klein discovered between the early splitting process and the depressive position. This is surely relevant to the emergence of symbol formation and object constancy. There were clear statements of the importance of accumulating enough good internal objects for a firm sense of self-esteem to develop, but the account of how this comes about is thin.

Fourth, the book contains an illuminating discussion of the ideas about the self and

identity in psychoanalysis. I was interested to find reference to Erikson's thesis, because it comes near to Jung. I learned that from a sociological and historical angle, realization of the self could be 'caused by the breakdown of the value systems of the past' (p. 25), an idea long current in analytical psychology.

Fifth, the author's use of the term 'self representations' left me puzzled; several times I could not understand to what they referred, nor what was the relation to the primal self.

Sixth, the book contains many points with which I found myself in close agreement. Let me set down some of them and my rather immediate comments.

1 *There is the idea of a primal psychosomatic unity from which psychic structures develop.* The importance of this idea, which can only be supported by Inference, since the physical pole of this unity is not and cannot be represented, is two-fold: first, it defines the self as more than a psychological entity; second, it gives a theoretical basis for possible later whole self representation. I could not find the second idea developed in Jacobson's volume.
2 *Out of the primal self, whose energy is neutral, two drives—libidinal and aggressive—are differentiated.* The drive theory involves an abstraction from empirical observation—a point which I felt was not made clearly enough—and I did not feel certain whether Jacobson intended to dissociate these drives from vestigial structures or not. Empirically, drives are built in right from the start with patterns of behaviour in which an object is implicated.
3 *The necessity to differentiate between the self and its representations is evident if confusion is to be avoided.* A comparable distinction is found in analytical psychology between the archetype and its image. Unlike its psychic representation (image) the archetypal substratum to the self is only accessible indirectly to perception by the ego.
4 *The acceptance of individuation as a part of child development.* This conclusion I had been reaching with trepidation. I am quite sure from the way it is discussed that Jacobson had not any idea of the difficulties I had encountered. She simply did not know that in analytical psychology individuation was supposed to occur when 'the usefulness of identification ends' (p. 28).

So much for the first impressions. There are rather close agreements which encourage me to embark on a more critical discussion.

I am not convinced that Jacobson has succeeded in making her terminology consistent, though she assures us that she has made every effort to do so (p. 62). She says, and I agreed after much trouble, that her usage is mostly understandable, but some good will and mental ingenuity are required rather too often. As the difficulties cannot be due to negligence, therefore, they may be due to the theory's not being worked out sufficiently to accommodate the data to which she is referring.

It is possible, though I could not decide, that her tendency to confusion arises because she operates with hypostatized concepts: the self, the superego, the ego, and so on. This might have been why she sometimes equates the concept self with the actual self representation. Whilst I agree with using hypostatized concepts as abbreviations, there are well-known pitfalls in doing so, and I am not convinced that Jacobson exercises sufficient care in an area where it is of particular importance.

Returning to the main issue: Jacobson's distinctions between wishful and realistic,

bodily and mental self representations are certainly clarifying, but she does not seem to understand that a self representation is a perception by the ego of those *parts* of the total self which are accessible to internal observation. This comes out clearly if we consider those self perceptions that come into prominence in states of stress and crisis and in relation to demands being made on the child. It makes a great deal of difference how a child estimates his capabilities in relation to frustrations imposed by his parents. He must rely on a partial self representation which will give the relevant internal data to the central ego. ('Central ego' is here used to meet the idea of the self representation being *part* of the system ego—p. 29.) This representation is very incomplete and varies according to the child's situation. During development an agglomeration (pooling) of such data results in a sufficiently reliable self representation being laid down for the person to develop a sense of identity, self-reliance, self-confidence and continuity of personality. This increasingly complex organization must include bits of id or superego being organized into a special part of the ego.

It is evident that most self representations are hardly related to the primal self at all. Put in this way—that is, that Jacobson's self representations are partial and contain only a bit of the total self—we can understand many of the contradictions in her exposition—for example, 'physiological discharge…on the self' (p. 9), or the self being dominated and controlled by the superego (p. 54), and so on, both of which are out of the question if the self is the total psychosomatic unity.

A similar quandary is met in analytical psychology, and it led Jung to formulate different and incompatible definitions of the self: the totality definition in which the self comprises the 'ego and the unconscious', and another later one in which the self is defined as the central archetype of order, that is, an unconscious datum. It is of interest that the later definition correlates rather closely with Jacobson's reference to 'the centralized, regulating power of the superego' which 'may be properly called an indicator and regulator of the entire ego state' (p. 133). It is of further interest that Jacobson thinks that the functions of the superego are increasingly taken over by the ego, just as Jung contends that the ego increasingly mirrors and approximates to the self.

But, even though Jung himself thought that the superego was the closest of Freud's concepts to the self, this does not mean that they can be identified. It would go beyond the scope of this review to discuss this rather fascinating subject, but I can perhaps make a brief comment on it by introducing some more critical ideas on Jacobson's thesis which will reveal something of the theoretical ideas which Jung's work has made possible for me.

Jacobson does not spell out sufficiently the theoretical consequences of postulating a total psycho-physiological self from which psychic structures, each becoming gradually autonomous, emerge. Clifford Scott started to develop them when he defined his idea of the body scheme. He clearly understood that the self was a transcendent postulate of which the mental apparatus was a part only.

Except where she refers to psychosomatic disorders, Jacobson studies psychic aspects (self representation) *in,* not *of,* the total self; she does not press home the inevitable conclusion that each psychic structure, whether it be the ego, id, superego, or reality principle is part of the total self. If the self is the total organism (including the body), clearly it will be necessary to include the ego, and the reality principle is designed to

record the activity of external, not internal, objects. Jacobson seems to have been led astray here by Hartmann's distinction between the external object representation and the internal object representation. This point seems to be at the juncture of clarification through Sandler's work on object representations.

The perception of objects as internal or external is a complex and very considerable achievement. It did not exist at the start in infancy, and was not to be discerned in the primal psychosomatic self. Indeed, only when psychic representations are established can we begin to consider the question of whether they refer to internal and external objects. Further, what is internal and what is external is at first vague and is used confusingly in the literature, as Jacobson has observed. However, much unnecessary vagueness can be dissipated if we ask a rather specific question on each occasion: to what is any particular datum internal or external? It is only too easy to assume that the primal self pattern is translated directly to the growing organism, which consequently develops into having an inside and outside like a bag, with objects inside and outside it having no insides and outsides of their own. This is fallacious, for each object will have been experienced as having an inside and an outside. First, there are part objects; later, whole objects; the breast out of which comes milk can be emptied and objects like faeces can in feeling be put into it. Only when the whole body image is complete is the ground laid for considering what is inside it and what is outside the ego system as a unit. Only when the whole body image is experienced can we get clearly defined whole self representations expressed in symbolic imagery based on the existence of a surface structure with the objects external or internal to it. I did not succeed in discovering any reference to such imagery. Without it we can only observe a group of self representations, changing during development, referring more and more to the sense of individual identity, in which the person is felt to be continually separate and distinct from others. These may be conceived to draw on one or all the psychic structures; each is a part of the self, and varies according to which separate structure is most relevant or which combination is most appropriate to the situation in which the growing child finds himself.

To make my meaning clearer, suppose we construct a working classification of self representations in a fairly well developed person. They would be divided as follows:

1 data which are not felt to refer to the subjective self at all but to external objects;
2 those *felt* to refer to 'the self'—i.e. that refer to the inner world of internal objects. Many of these feelings are derived from the ego, others from the id, others from the superego and again others combine elements of each;
3 those that refer to the total integrate derived from the primal self, but are represented to the ego indirectly or felt as a kind of nucleus standing firm and giving rise to the feeling of being 'the same in the midst of change'. If Jung is right, this feeling can be represented symbolically and the symbol refers to the total self.

I would now like to consider Jacobson's discussion of Erikson's idea that 'identity formation begins where the usefulness of identity ends'. This was certainly the content of Jung's idea, and is remarkably close to his concept of individuation. Jung observed individuation in older people (though he seems also to have concluded, without publishing this conclusion, that children individuate also) where identification with social groups or culture patterns no longer gives sufficient meaning to their existence. The

answer was found by the adults' re-evaluating their lives by each one's finding the meaning of it within himself. This might be expressed by saying that each one needed to relate his previous partial self estimation to a more and more total self representation.

Jacobson goes rather further into adulthood than is usual in psychoanalysis, and so somewhere towards meeting Jung. Her researches can be taken to suggest that the individuation process which Jung described is continuous throughout the life of an individual. Her formulation clarified for me an idea that though identifications are essential, should they exclude individuation the result can only be an automaton made up of numerous identifications without individuality. According to the age of the person, the form of individuation must be different, and the methods used to foster it correspondingly variable. In some people it is certain that individuation can best be initiated by techniques which lay bare the infantile roots of their disorder, and so go on to make possible a more true or more realistic assessment of their whole self. This is only hinted at by Jung, though he contended that individuation is an ongoing process in adults and a continuing process throughout life.

The high expectation with which I started out to read this very condensed and stimulating book ended with a sense of disappointment. I had learned a lot about a part of the ego called 'self' by psychoanalysts; little about the self as understood in analytical psychology. It may be that such attempts to make occasional links between the two is all that can be done now, but it would be sad if that turned out to be all that was possible. There are trends in analytical psychology which want to construct a special relation between the ego and the self. They can be formulated in this way: the ego reflects the self. If this be so, Jacobson must be on the way to illuminating the nature of the self as well as the ego and we may therefore expect further developments from clarifications of this fascinating topic.

REVIEW OF HEINRICH RACKER'S *TRANSFERENCE AND COUNTERTRANSFERENCE*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 14(2) (1969)

Michael Fordham was attracted to this volume because the presentation was clinical and he wished to point out to a wider audience of analytical psychologists how far the psychoanalysts had progressed with the understanding of transference/counter-transference. The review was therefore a continuation of his reviews of Klein and would develop into the series of reviews on Meltzer and the one on Longs. He hoped, and still hopes, that by broadcasting the work of the psychoanalysts, their advances can be absorbed by analytical psychologists. R.H.

In the last twenty years there has been a growing interest in the psychoanalyst's part in his relation to patients. Counter-transference, in particular, has developed from being considered a hindrance to psychoanalytic technique into a far more embracing concept used to cover all a psychoanalyst's responses to his patient's transference. In this they approach Jung's concept of the dialectical process.

Against this wide view, the classical one which recognizes the relevance of counter-transference but seeks to reassert the original use of the word, has been vigorously

defended, and other terms for the psychoanalyst's interaction with his patient are then introduced to cover what is not conceived to be counter-transference.

The controversy here runs into the dangers of verbal hair-splitting, which, indeed, can only be avoided by spelling out in clinical practice just what constitutes counter-transference. Racker's understanding of this has led him to fill his book with clear 'descriptive generalizations' and illustrate examples of how the counter-transference neurosis, without denying its negative consequences, can be used to detect the patient's transference. He emphasizes the reciprocal dialect between the patient's transference and the analyst's counter-transference, the one stimulating the other to provide the basis for therapeutic action in the analytic situation. Thus, the patient's passivity, which has played such an important part in discussion of psychoanalytic technique, can be scrutinized again from this far more active position.

It is apparent from all that he says about his practice that psychoanalysis has, for him, become essentially a dialectical procedure; there is no attempt to ward off the transference and there is no balking the fact that the analyst as well as the patient has and uses defences against libidinal drives. Though it has always been implied that in the counter-transference the patient, in the unconscious, represents parental images to the analyst, this has not been spelt out with such a compelling accumulation of evidence before. How, then, can any therapy, or for that matter any valid analysis, take place?

Here lies the fascination of this remarkable book. It is the analyst's consciousness of what goes on that makes the difference. The situation that can and often does lead to stalemate in a circular relation can be converted by consciousness into an instrument of far-reaching importance. Through consciousness, the analyst's neurosis, though not dissolved, is made flexible and usable.

Early chapters review Freud's position in relation to these developments, and Racker shows in a most interesting way how Freud was by no means the passive projection screen imparting 'objective' interpretations and that the far simpler account of the analytic situation, as developed, for instance, by the ego psychologists, cannot be justified by reference to him.

It is not possible in this relatively short review to go into details of this volume; indeed, it is only by reading it that the build-up of his thesis can be grasped. In part, what Racker says is familiar: the analyst's passivity easily becomes masochistic and destructive to his patients; interpretations are themselves liable to become the subject matter of projection and, under the sway of the projection, the analyst can start formulating so as to fix the projection; that the boredom and sleepiness of the analyst indicates the patient's lack of relationship to him.

Besides what is known, there is much that states what may be half-known, known but surrounded by anxiety, and much also that is altogether new. It is not easy to admit to oneself that irritation with a patient at his constant depredation of your interpretative efforts to be helpful is because you feel condemned, helpless and infantile. But, once admitted, it becomes much easier to trace its roots in yourself and so in your patients. To have all this formulated so well has been helpful to me, and I venture to suggest it will help others as well.

Many of Racker's examples are taken from his experience in analysing and supervising candidates. Over and over again in training analysis, candidates will talk about their

patients as if the patients were their parents. In translating this into a transference phenomenon of their own analysis, it is easy to overlook the structure of the anxiety they experience in relation to their patients.

In supervision, the importance of showing up the counter-transference gets renewed importance from Racker's book and a way of approaching it in a positive light is opened up. Counter-transference is first a matter for the candidate's own analysis, but once conscious its use can be worked out in supervision.

In welcoming this volume, which is essential reading for those analytical psychologists who have a clear enough grasp of Kleinian psychoanalysis and its derivatives to profit from it, I should like to end by observing that the South American psychoanalysts seem to be particularly productive. To have a book in the English language making available advances, many of which have previously only been published in Spanish, gives especial value to this publication.

REVIEW OF BRUNO BETTELHEIM'S *THE EMPTY FORTRESS: INFANTILE AUTISM AND THE BIRTH OF THE SELF*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 14(2) (1969)

By the time of this review, Fordham had already published a paper called 'A theory of infantile autism' (1965) to be revised later in The Self and Autism *(1976b). Bettelheim's approach was Freudian and made from observations on children taken in a residential setting. Fordham's and Bettelheim's ideas are congruent on several points, including the following:*

1. *There are variable degrees of autism.*
2. *It is a result of failure of development of the self, more from environmental reasons than hereditary ones. Fordham sees this as the primary integrate failing to deintegrate, to a greater or lesser extent.*
3. *Some cases can recover, with treatment.*
4. *The study of autism reveals general information about infant development.*

In the light of the above, it is interesting that Bettelheim observes that the recovering autistic child develops self representation. Bettelheim's title, The Empty Fortress, *is one of the most dramatic in the literature. R.H.*

T*he Empty Fortress* contains a theory of the infant-mother relationship, three long and detailed case studies, a discussion of the relevant literature on infantile autism, and a fascinating analysis of the myth of feral children. It is a landmark in the study of a subject whose significance far outweighs its rarity.

Between 1932 and 1938 Bettelheim took first one and then two autistic children to live with him in his home. Then the disorder had not been recognized, for Kanner had not yet published his first paper on the subject. Later Bettelheim was interned in a concentration camp, from which he was liberated in 1944; there he witnessed many features of autism develop before his eyes amongst the inmates of the camp. It was this, he claims, that motivated him strongly to further his study.

He next worked with schizophrenic children, getting unexpectedly good results in the

Orthogenic School in Chicago. His investigations led him to think that a more intensive study into the most intractable of all the psychoses of childhood would be worth while, and, supported by the Ford Foundation, he expanded his school and studied forty autistic children over prolonged periods—up to ten years. The length of time became significant, and he makes the point that only by prolonged care could good therapeutic results be achieved.

He did not undertake treatment himself, but assembled a number of skilled assistants who devoted themselves day and night to living with children who 'subject [adults] to far-reaching isolation, and to systematic efforts at personality destruction' (p. 8). How these children were managed can be adequately grasped only from reading the book—the demands made on the staff were enormous and one can only admire the extent of their devotion which has produced such rich dividends.

The therapeutic results are impressive compared with Eisenberg's follow-up studies of autistic children. The figures are not analysed in detail, but in relatively untreated cases under Eisenberg's supervision the recovery rate was 5 per cent. Bettelheim's series shows 42 per cent good recovery.

Perhaps it may be argued that such intensive care would improve anybody, but the fact that some children did not recover, while others regressed to their original state when the therapeutic process was interrupted, disposes of this argument. Yet, even so, the results would be unconvincing if there were not a basic attitude related to a theory supporting it.

Autism, as conceived by Bettelheim, is not primarily a retreat but rather a failure of the mother to meet the active approaches that a baby makes: 'when the infant is kept from being active in the relation [to his mother] on his own terms, or when his actions evoke no response, he becomes flooded with impotent rage, a helpless victim of inner tensions.' Persistence of this state constitutes autism, which is conceived as an environmental fault based on the mother's wish to be rid of her baby.

In the Orthogenic School the object is to meet the child's activity at the stage in development at which it was not met before. The case histories show best how this was done and the amount of skill and endurance that is required. They also show how, step by step, the children develop a self representation. It is this achievement that constitutes the basis for recovery.

The book's main importance is that it fills in and organizes a picture of autism that has been developing gradually from many sources, and drives it home with compelling force. After this nobody will be able to say either that there is no firmly established outline of knowledge about the origin of autism, nor that it is untreatable.

Those working in this field must be overwhelmingly grateful to Bettelheim for this massive study and for the detailed way in which he rebuts the exaggerated importance given to heredity by detailed and perspicacious analysis of the data and the construction of a theory of early ego development which reverses the idea of an infant's passivity, throws into relief his initial independence of his mother, and the violence with which he can mobilize, or rather which takes hold of him, when his approaches are not met.

This book is valuable not only as a study of autism but also as a contribution to the early stages in the mother-infant relationship.

A TRIBUTE TO D.W.WINNICOTT

Source: The Scientific Bulletin of the British Psychoanalytical Society (1972)

This address, which I have left unaltered, was given to the British PsychoAnalytical Society and appeared in their Bulletin *in 1972. Fordham and Winnicott were colleagues and friends for many years; they thus became a foil for each other's ideas. Fordham greatly admired Winnicott's ability to describe his clinical experiences. R.H.*

Donald Winnicott was the one of your most lovable members, whom I held in great esteem; indeed, after Jung there is nobody who has been so personally and scientifically important to me. I am therefore grateful for the invitation, and in this my wife Frieda Fordham joins, to be present at this meeting held in his honour.

In talking to him, reading what he wrote and listening to him lecture, one never lost sight of the people he was talking about; there was always room for fantasies about them and so for integrating his ideas and developing one's own as well. Their characteristics were well expressed in his *Therapeutic Consultations,* but they were also to be found in all his writings and even in the construction of his sentences.

His attitude made him seem open-minded in a personal way and sensitive to genuine endeavour, never mind whether he agreed with it or no; there were very clear limits to it, however, and they were valuable because it was easy to know where he stood and that there were convictions from which he would not budge.

Pursuing this line of thought, it seems right that he should have developed concepts of the true self and the false self, which Winnicott also displayed in his self-protective manoeuvres. He defined the false self but left the former because he recognized it as a state that could be known but not put into abstractions or directly described.

A striking feature of his long and fertile life of research was his great descriptive ability—I might almost say genius; for what he observed had an extraordinary familiarity so that one seems to have known what he reports all along. This applies especially to transitional objects which I suppose anybody working in the field of child therapy had come across and accepted as something to hear about, observe and respect, but it took Donald Winnicott to describe them and then work out their natural history. Having done so, he could construct a theory of their meaning and place in Infant and child maturation; in this way his theory is closely related to observational data; and this applies to others of his formulations as well: to primary maternal preoccupation, the good-enough mother holding the situation and so on: and they all enliven and enrich one's own knowledge. He was a great clinician, going on making discoveries and keeping clear of that use of abstraction that becomes sterile or loses sight of people as they are.

I do not need to take up your time by entering into details of the use analytical psychologists have made of his ideas, which have fallen on fertile soil in so many fields outside psychoanalysis itself. The number of references to his work in the *Journal of Analytical Psychology* is some indication of it, but perhaps more Importantly he has influenced the analyses that are being undertaken by Members of the London Society.

There is one further reflection which indeed made me want to contribute most to this discussion and which I would like to end up on. It may seem as if by adding it I am introducing a political tone to this meeting—that is far from my Intention.

In his review of Jung's *Memories, Dreams, Reflections,* Donald Winnicott made an analysis of Jung's childhood memories which was close to my own understanding of them; I discussed my ideas with Jung himself and he did not dissent. In his review Winnicott also said: 'If we [psychoanalysts] fail to come to terms with Jung we are self-proclaimed partisans, partisans in a false cause.' I believe he went a long way towards 'coming to terms' with Jung in his views on the relation between transitional objects, play and cultural experience. Jung never put this relation into his theories, but it is quite clear that transitional objects were of crucial importance to him personally and it was play with stones that initiated the cultural experiences which he expressed in the rather cumbersome phrase 'confrontation with the unconscious'. *Fordham's understanding of Jung's childhood memories is that they reveal obsessional symptoms that were hiding a childhood psychosis but 'had I been asked what the prognosis was, I would have said it was good!' R.H.*

REVIEW OF MARGARET MAHLER'S *ON HUMAN SYMBIOSIS AND THE VICISSITUDES OF HUMAN INDIVIDUATION*

Source: Journal of Analytic Psychology, 17(2) (1972)

Fordham was attracted to the work of Mahler, for she also considered that individuation began in infancy. He found her observations useful and her ideas stimulating and he still feels that her work was an important influence on the study of children. One of her students was Daniel Stern, author of The Interpersonal World of the Infant. *However, as Fordham does not accept primary narcissism (which he felt Mahler had simply adopted from Freud), he considers she made many erroneous statements about the first four months of life. The evidence is that infants do make object relationships beginning immediately after birth* (*probably in ways whose characteristics originated* in utero), *as shown by observations both at home and in experimental studies. He criticized her along those lines when speaking in the United States.*

T*hese two reviews express his dislike of the terms 'symbiosis' and 'fusion' applied to early stages of infant maturation. As he says, this is a time when infant and mother spend many hours apart, though there are periods of intimacy between them, and there is no observable 'membrane' around the mother-infant couple.*

P*upil influenced teacher, and, eventually, under the influence of Daniel Stern, Margaret Mahler showing her stature, changed her position on primary narcissism before she died. R.H.*

Margaret Mahler conceives that individuation takes place in childhood. She has defined a number of interlacing but none the less distinct stages in maturation culminating in the separation-individuation phase.

Her primary assumption is this: an infant's life at first 'centres round continuous attempts to achieve homeostasis'; consequently a baby attempts to discharge tensions by 'urinating, defecating, coughing, sneezing, spitting, regurgitating, vomiting'; and because of his inability to record anything but visceral release of tension and because there are no representational objects and no boundaries to the self, he cannot distinguish his own activities from the 'mother's ministrations in reducing the pangs of need-hunger'. This

phase is called normal autism.

From the second month onwards and culminating at around 4 to 5 months the baby develops some 'dim awareness of the need satisfying object' and so he behaves and functions as though he and his mother were an omnipotent system—'a dual unity within one common boundary'. This is the symbiotic phase which is a creation of the baby and is a 'hallucinatory somatopsychic omnipotent fusion with the representation of the mother and in particular the delusion of a common boundary of the two actually and physically separate individuals'.

The separation-individuation phase culminates at the toddler stage at about two-and-a-half years. It takes place when the infant detaches himself from his mother, and is a landmark in the development of identity experience based on the self.

> The infant's inner sensations form the *core* of the self. They seem to remain the central, the crystallization point of the 'feeling of self' round which the sense of identity will become established…. The sensori-perceptive organ—the peripheral 'end of the ego', as Freud called it—contributes mainly to the self's demarcation from the object world. The two kinds of intrapsychic structures form the framework for self-orientation.

These conclusions are based on studies of child psychoses, of infant observation and longitudinal studies of healthy infants and mothers in 'well baby clinics, etc.'. Mahler's working out of phases in development has therefore gone beyond uninformed speculation, and even if they be later modified, as no doubt they will be, they yet have a degree of reliability that can be made use of. It is interesting to note that her observations show changes at 3 to 4 weeks, 2 months, 4 to 5 months, 7 months and 10 to 16 months, and so on. These orientating dates help in mapping out the extraordinarily rapid changes that are taking place in maturation.

Mahler's work started from observations on a group of psychotic children; she pioneered in this field, bringing into it a degree of order which others have failed to achieve. She distinguished autistic from symbiotic psychoses though she had modified her initial view that each could be clearly differentiated. She now holds that the two psychoses may interlace, but with one form predominant.

The two psychotic constructions employ definable defence processes—de-animation, dedifferentiation, devitalization and drive fusion and defusion; in the aggregate they are called 'maintenance mechanisms' conceived as 'restitutive attempts of a rudimentary or fragmentary ego which serve the process of survival'.

There are many points of agreement in these findings with my own constructions, but I regret her use of the term 'symbiosis' which is liable to produce unnecessary confusion. It gives the impression that she is discussing the mutual advantages that the two parties gain from each other in their interaction. Mahler adequately explains that she is not using it in this sense but as a metaphor; yet all the same the term will give a wrong impression to anybody familiar with biological usage which can be and has been usefully employed by Pollock in the description of mother-infant interaction.

Then there is her assumption that the infant 'attempts to achieve homeostasis'; this leaves out his part in actively establishing breast feeding. As she 'finds it most useful' to

adhere to Freud's speculations about primary narcissism, her idea is presumably a biological version of that psychological concept. She believes that it is physiology and not psychology that will contribute most to our understanding of early infant behaviour; but if it is to be physiology, to introduce a word like 'attempts' (which is surely a psychological idea) seems inappropriate. In addition, physiologically an infant surely functions not only in terms of homeostatic equilibria but also through disturbances of them followed by their reestablishment. In the very early period of infancy she also accepts the idea of a stimulus barrier introduced by Spitz; this seems to derive from the 'bird's egg' metaphor of autism introduced by Freud, which lacks evidence and seems unnecessary; it leads to therapeutic practices to be considered later.

With these reservations, there are many useful and revealing formulations in the first chapter. The second is on 'infantile psychoses', in which she introduces the part mothers play in the symbiotic phase, and there is a later chapter on 'Prototypes of mother-child interaction'. There are numerous clinical examples. Some of the accounts are extremely moving, especially in the case of Violet, a musically gifted autistic child.

Mahler's ingenious therapeutic practices are based on her conception of two kinds of psychoses and are the logical outcome of her thesis. Treatment in groups, special nursery schools or centres of education, is undesirable at first; intensive and long personal treatment is needed before any attempt be made to introduce a child into a group.

In the autistic psychosis the child must be lured out of his state (autistic shell) with the help of inanimate objects because he is intolerant of direct human contact, especially physical touching, cuddling, and so on. The objective is to lead him on into the symbiotic phase.

Once this has been reached the objective changes: the therapist must fit the child's hallucinatory and delusional system in any manner prescribed by the child. In this stage verbal interchange, music, feeding, bodily contact, feature amongst the wide variety of approaches that may be indicated. An especially interesting technique developed out of the observation that there comes a stage when the child goes to seek his mother whilst in a nursery school or when a treatment session is in progress; so Mahler decided to include the mother in the therapeutic situation when the child gave indications of needing it: she found that the mother could help the therapist by informing him about features of the child's behaviour and particularly his sign language which is often very difficult to decode; in return, the therapist could help mother to understand the nature of her child's needs and instruct her in how to manage the symbiotic phase.

The third stage in treatment consists of reliving traumatic experiences which can only take place when individuation is far advanced. There are no follow-up studies, but these will be included in the second forthcoming volume. I would have liked, however, some longer case studies so that the changes that took place could be seen in more detail.

Today what Mahler says is not new because so many of her findings have been integrated into common knowledge and have been confirmed and developed by others. My own much more (numerically) limited studies lead to conclusions that often correspond rather closely with hers; in particular I have worked for years in the belief that child psychoses are best treated in the first place at home, even though there is a risk that the whole process will be interrupted by the child's parents; *Dialogue with Sammy* is an excellent example of how this takes place—Sammy's mother replaced her son in therapy.

Then came Bettelheim with his striking results from the institutional treatment of autistic children. His cases, however, received an unusual amount of skilled personal care, but even under these circumstances parents would interrupt treatment by removing them from his institution. I regret that Mahler uses educative procedures so much and lays such emphasis on luring the primary autistic children out of their supposed shell. It blurs her thesis, and the alternative that they might come out of it given good conditions and analysis of the psychotic superstructure is not considered. However, it has yet to be demonstrated convincingly, though Bettelheim suggests it.

The field of child psychosis is still wide open to further study: Mahler has worked out a model and so has furthered capacity to define the area and to conduct treatment with more precision—there are clear examples of how her frame of reference makes otherwise daring manoeuvres quite simple and straightforward.

This is a rich, thought-provoking, scholarly book. Its good bibliography gives access to the growing literature on individuation in small children in a way that will, I hope, engage the interest of all analytical psychologists.

REVIEW OF MAHLER, PINE AND BERGMAN'S *THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BIRTH OF THE HUMAN INFANT*

Source: London, Hutchinson (1975)

This account of infant observations on 'average mothers and normal babies' is a companion volume to *On Symbiosis and the Vicissitudes of Individuation.* It studies mother-infant interaction when the children are between 4 to 5 months and three years old, and contains a wealth of information which repays study. It has been heralded as a milestone in psychoanalytic literature, so it challenges an assessment of this assertion.

Mahler's research was conducted in a small building and mothers brought their babies to it over prolonged periods (up to three years). The couples were relatively unselected and the project developed by 'letting the mothers and babies show us the paths that research should follow', so there was minimal research design. Nevertheless, observation rooms and one-way screens were used while the number of rooms increased as time went on because it seemed desirable to add a separate toddler room.

The volume describes clearly the progressive separation of mother and infant under these conditions. There is a wealth of examples to illustrate the stages which have been distinguished with sufficient clarity to give dates for when they begin or end.

In addition, longitudinal studies are also presented, which show in fascinating detail the individual variations that can take place: Donna experienced an almost perfect start which led to difficulties in separation—she compensated in later development. Bruce started off less well, having been separated earlier than would seem desirable, but he made up for the defect later on to emerge as a well-developed child by the age of three years. Wendy did not do so well because of her inherent sensitivity. These vignettes indicate the rich material presented. It would be out of place to go into many, but here is one more for special mention: the description of Wendy's castration feelings, her depression and subsequent conflict with her mother during the *rapprochement* phase, which is beautifully and movingly described.

The study of infants by direct observation either alone or combined with experiment has a distinguished history. Charlotte Bühler, Gesell and Piaget are names that come to mind, and one recalls that they all studied characteristics of children and showed how these developed from the first months onwards. Of course Spitz, and to some extent Winnicott, did this too, though the latter expanded what he observed in penetrating insights; he is also more personal. Middlemore's studies in the *Nursing Couple,* now almost forgotten, was pioneering in this respect. She observed infants as persons and was the first, as far as I know, to draw attention to individual differences in brilliant clinical observations.

Another line of approach was initiated by Kris in 'well baby clinics'. He was stimulating by the originality of his approach, for he made predictions about how an infant would develop and then followed up his mothers and babies to see whether the prediction had validity. His was one of the early longitudinal studies that observed mother and babies as a whole. Mahler, then, is not the first to bring together the results of a long-term study of mothers and infants, nor was she the originator of a method which takes self theory thoroughly into account. It will be noted that her observations are incomplete in that she does not take the first four months into consideration because the conditions under which she observed did not include home life. It is a gap that has largely been filled in by Escalona in *The Roots of Individuality.*

In assessing the value of Mahler's work, one needs to remember also that she is one of those who have established beyond doubt the value of infant observation. This was not easy, because psychoanalysts in particular doubted the reliability of such procedures, and there were those who thought it better to wait until verbal communications made it possible to obtain reliable information from which constructions could be made about infancy, an objection which now seems strange. In addition, there was anxiety about the tendency of observations to stimulate projections and fantasies about infants which could only be checked by analysis.

Mahler's book has gone far to eliminate both anxieties and objections, and she recognizes that observation does not give reliable information about internal psychodynamic processes. They can, however, be inferred and checked against other observations. Though inferences are made, I thought that Mahler had been rather too cautious and laid excessive stress on objective description. No doubt this is desirable in underlining what observation can establish and what it cannot.

Turning to Mahler's theoretical constructions, one is struck by the fact that theory abounds most where observation is least. For instance, the 'autistic phase', being outside the period of her observation, is entirely theoretical. In contrast, the concept of 'separation-individuation' and its phases accords well with the descriptive content. But there are what seem like unnecessary accretions such as 'symbiotic fusion' within a single 'membrane' which serve little purpose since neither the fusion nor the membrane can be observed, whilst symbiosis, if it has to be used, applies to the whole relation between parents and children, and even later on into adulthood. So why pick out this period as symbiotic when it really refers to the periods of intimacy between mother and infant? Does it not tend to blur the fact that most of the time an infant is separate from his mother in a cot, either sleeping or playing on his own, and so developing his motor and perceptual skills. These objections may seem trivial, however, for any research worker

wants a dramatic and forceful metaphor or theory which will provide him with a tool to further his aims. If the theory or metaphor proves inadequate it can be dropped, and I hope that the 'accretions', as I have called them, will in time wither away.

What, then, is infant observation achieving, and so to what does this book contribute? Along with child analysis, infant observation gives us a much more realistic picture of what children and babies are like. It shows up how much an infant can do in relation to his mother, and is constructing a timetable for changes in the infant self as distinct from the parts about which so much has been accumulated before. It is this transformation to which Mahler's work has greatly contributed; her book is indeed a milestone, an important indication of the change that is and has been taking place in psychoanalysis.

I have said nothing about the quality of the volume because its high standard may be assumed: it is well constructed, readable, stimulating, and will no doubt be a reference book for some time to come.

REVIEW OF *THE FREUD/JUNG LETTERS: THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SIGMUND FREUD AND C.G. JUNG*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 20(1) (1975)

As an editor of the Collected Works *of Jung, Michael Fordham was unable to review those volumes as they appeared. He therefore enjoyed the opportunity to review Jung's work in which he was not involved, including* Answer to Job (vide infra), The Transcendent Function, The Undiscovered Self, *and here in* The Freud/Jung Letters. *R.H.*

The relationship between Jung and Freud developed mythological characteristics and is still embellished with stories told in secret amongst initiates. This correspondence brings more reality and detail to balance the myth-making without detracting from the drama of mutual love that moved on to hesitations and deceptions gradually to turn step by step into disillusionment, hatred and bitterness.

Jung did not favour the publication of these letters: he did not think that there was much of interest in them, and his secretary, Mrs Jaffe, to whom he deferred, expected 'pearls of wisdom' and was disappointed. But here there is wisdom, and folly too, in a combination which seems richly appropriate to the father-son myth in which the relationship was set. Yet Jung was right in saying that there is not much of scientific importance in the letters because most of the matter is already known and fully documented so that new content is only in matters of detail: but he greatly underestimated their literary and dramatic content. Both he and Freud developed letter-writing into an art which played an essential part in their lives: therefore this correspondence makes a book that can be enjoyed as a story, and as such it will be widely read. The parts that become too technical for this purpose and the dull passages, when official letters are recorded, can both be skipped without breaking up the continuity.

After Freud had first written 'Dear friend', having dropped the additional 'and colleague', Jung replied on 28 February 1908: 'I thank you with all my heart for this token of your confidence. The undeserved gift of your friendship is one of the high points of my life…let me enjoy your friendship not as one between equals but as that between father and son' (p. 122). So Jung expressed the myth first. Freud did not reply directly but

developed the theme in considerable detail later and, as might have been expected of the older of the two, displayed more wisdom and tact, restraining Jung's more impetuous nature, and helping him in his relationships, especially with Bleuler. There is profuse discussion of numerous personalities, often aggressive and sometimes abusive: indeed, if the opponents of psychoanalysis were rude in public, there can be no doubt that both, but Jung more than Freud, let fly in private.

Much as I struggled to take an overall view of the whole relationship, I found my interest gravitating towards the end, inquisitive to see just how it took place in more detail. Here special thanks are due to the editor for including letters from Emma Jung to Freud. They were written at the time when her husband was exercised about the effect that *Transformation of Symbols* would have. It was she who went straight to the point and defined the true situation, thus giving orientation to the reader which would otherwise be lacking. 'Do not think of Carl', she wrote 'with a father's feelings: "He will grow but I must dwindle": but rather as one human being thinks of another who, like you, has his own law to fulfil' (p. 457). At that time Freud had already received part one of Jung's great research; was it as a result of her letter, written on 6 November 1911, that Freud made an additional effort to meet Jung?

On 12 November he wrote a long letter in which the following passage occurs:

> The reading for my psychology and religion is going slowly. One of the nicest works I have read (again) is that of the well-known author of *The Transformation of Symbols and of the Libido*. In it many things are so well expressed that they seem to have taken on definitive form and in this form impress themselves on the memory. Sometimes I have the feeling that his horizon has been too restricted by Christianity. And sometimes he seems to be more above the material than in it…. Probably my tunnels will be far more subterranean than your shafts and we shall pass each other by, but every time I rise to the surface I shall be able to greet you. 'Greetings' is a good cue on which to end this long letter. I need only add a 'heartfelt' addressed also to your wife and children.
>
> (P. 459)

The warm, appreciative tone, though qualified, is still there but the end was not far off. Jung took the occasion of Freud admitting to 'a bit of neurosis' to criticize him at some length; he headed this with a peculiar caption which he called 'a brazen attempt to accustom you to my style'. Freud did not seem to take all this very seriously. 'You must not think I take your "new style amiss,"' he wrote (p. 529), but he did not reply at length and so Jung 'tuned his lyre a few tones lower for the present' (p. 530). Then Freud tactlessly pointed out a slip in a letter from Jung: if he had wanted to provoke an outburst he could not have chosen a better moment.

I find it surprising, even allowing for the efforts at frankness that Freud fostered between analysts, that though provoked, Jung should have asked Freud to take his neurosis seriously, almost threatening him with the consequences of not doing so! How could he have forgotten that it was Freud who had embarked on the first self-analysis in history and that it had not ended at the time of writing? And I find that Jung's claim to

have been analysed and not be neurotic equally sad, even though, in those days, to be analysed was a remarkably informal and unsystematic procedure. Freud's dignity through this period is impressive, but it is clear that he had decided to end his personal relation with Jung. His authority remained shaken but essentially intact.

There is a story that, when Jung sent the whole volume of *Symbols of Transformation and of the Libido* to Freud, he received it back with a note inside saying, 'This is nothing but a resistance against the father.' Was this invented, or did Jung throw it in the wastepaper basket, or have I missed it in the commentary, in a footnote or even in the text? Whichever be the truth, reading Freud's letters makes such a note possible; it could well have been a calculated and deliberate act on his part to finalize the separation. It would have been sent in the same spirit that had showed when, with reference to *Totem and Taboo,* he wrote: 'In the dispute with Zurich it comes at the right time to divide us as an acid does salt' (E. Jones, *Life of Freud,* Part I, p. 396).

In the past I have felt that the breakdown of the Freud-Jung axis—so effective for many years—was a tragedy, and I still believe it to have been so for the development of analytic disciplines. These letters, however, remove the feeling that it was a personal one, especially as we know that it opened new vistas for Jung. As for psychoanalysis, which the Zurich school had done so much to get recognized, it no longer needed support; the period of Freud's splendid isolation, dissolving when Jung arrived on the scene, was over.

William McGuire's editing is very elaborate and detailed, almost a book in itself There are lengthy footnotes, background information, short biographical notes on the many personalities mentioned in the text and a lengthy 'Introduction' of fourteen pages. He has made the volume into a useful source-book for study of the early history of psychoanalysis.

A DISCURSIVE REVIEW OF ROBERT LANGS' *THE THERAPEUTIC INTERACTION*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 23(2) (1978)

From the founding of the Society of Analytical Psychology in London in 1946, Fordham was in the forefront of London Jungians who started to provide a couch for the patient and to increase the classical frequency of interviews from one or two per week to four or five per week. This created a common ground with the Freudians, now called 'the analytic frame'. Once it was set up, comparisons and discussions could occur between Freudians and Jungians because the phenomena observed were roughly similar. From this experience, Fordham was therefore well placed to review this exceptionally thorough book, but as usual with his longer reviews, he uses the occasion to explore around the theme. Here, he looks at six of Jung's original but brief formulations that were developed more by psychoanalysts than analytical psychologists. R.H.

Robert Langs' two massive volumes are the most remarkable that have been produced from the pen of a classical psychoanalyst for many years. They represent the labours of a man who has had the time and the capacity to study, reflect upon and synthesize the literature on the psychoanalytic situation from Freud's essays at the beginning of the new

century up to 1976.

The scope of the inquiry is wide. This may be illustrated by the fact that up to now Kleinian innovations have mostly been given scant, and destructive, critical attention in the United States—Jungians have been ignored. Langs considers the Kleinian literature sympathetically and at length and mention is made of two Jungian authors: Plaut and myself.

The conclusions are astonishingly in line with many of Jung's formulations, as I shall show later on in this review. This made me sad. Despite the fact that a handful of analytical psychologists have embarked on the attempt to develop Jung's ideas in this area, the result is puny, compared with what is collected together here. It seemed as if we had squandered our birthright.

The two volumes are essentially different. The first contains abstracts of some 500 papers. They are well made and, as far as I could assess them, they grasp accurately the main points in each author's contribution; no doubt for reasons of space no clinical material is included. Volume II contains Langs' reflections and synthesis on the basis of his own views. My following assessment of his work will be made on my reading of Volume II, in which the analytic situation is viewed from a number of different angles. There is, inevitably, a great deal of repetition and, as with much American psychoanalytic literature, it is wordy; but I never found it dull. It has to be read slowly, and, in the case of Volume I, I found it profitable to refer from time to time to the original paper that was being abstracted. I do not pretend to have digested more than a fragment of its contents; indeed its use as a reference book will remain one of its main functions.

Langs was trained as a classical psychoanalyst and the value of his well-learned discipline percolates the whole of his research. At the risk of unwarranted repetition, I will outline the conception. The psychoanalyst provides a warm room, a couch, requires frequent attendance by the patient four or five times a week; the analyst will be there and will maintain a consistently analytic attitude: a financial arrangement will be arrived at. That constitutes the frame in which the psychoanalyst works. Within it the patient is enjoined to free associate and the psychoanalyst then explores and interprets his patient's material, giving time for working through the results of his interventions. The picture is idealistic, and can easily become unreal if that were all that could be said about it, but it provides a formula to which reference can be made when considering the events that take place within the total situation.

From this basis Langs investigates the features of psychoanalytic transactions: the therapeutic alliance and misalliance, transference and counter-transference, non-transference and non-counter-transference, empathy, acting out, parameters, deviations in technique and the analyst's errors to which specific reactions of the patient can be identified.

It would be impossible, even if it were desirable in a review, to cover this wide field, so I propose to select one segment of it which introduces the idea of analytic interaction well and then go on to consider the effect of interactional theory on our conception of transference and counter-transference. These two aspects of the whole argument will, I hope, adequately illustrate the cogency of Langs' thinking.

Langs always proceeds historically when developing his conceptions, and so when considering deviations in technique he studies them as they have arisen. First there are

those introduced by Ferenczi (active therapy) and later by Alexander (corrective emotional experience), though there are many other less dramatic alterations, all of which Langs considers in detail. Mostly he rejects them on the grounds that they are insufficiently validated, and especially that there is not enough evidence to show that they result in benefit to the patient. There is an assumption here which needs noting: classical method has proved itself useful and valid, with which there are of course those who do not agree.

Validation—which plays an essential part in Langs' argument here and elsewhere—is a subject that has especially engaged my interest and is one which has proved difficult to introduce to analytical psychologists. I once tried to do so in a short paper that was never published because of the cool response that it received from my audience. There I tried to show that many interpretations that had overwhelming evidence in their favour might produce no change in the patient, while others that were dramatically effective had little to be said in their favour; so how do we decide whether an interpretation is correct or not? In all his work, but especially in the area of deviations and mistakes, the grounds on which Langs assesses them are spelt out in the most interesting way. He starts from the analyst's attitude of open-mindedness, his capacity to listen objectively and to empathize with his patient. When he (the analyst) has collected enough information he will develop a 'silent hypothesis' which he then, continuing to listen, tests or modifies in relation to his patient's associations until a 'sense of fit' arises. He still remains silent, but has a budding interpretation in his mind. This he considers and assesses further till there is a subjective feeling of its correctness—then an interpretation can be made.

The first steps in validation are thus subjective, and it is judged that there is some validity in the analyst's deliberations—enough anyway to communicate to the patient. Once the intervention has been made its effect on the patient will need to be studied. The effects considered are interesting and introduce with particular clarity the nature of Langs' transactional idea. Optimally the patient will change and the alteration will be indicated by the emergence of new material: new associations are made possible and they will lead to behavioural alterations and symptom resolution.

Suppose that none of these criteria are adhered to so that nothing like all this takes place. Suppose the analyst does not prepare his intervention well and suppose there is no discernible effect on his patient, then the interpretation can clearly be considered invalid. In most cases a mistake is not so obvious; the analyst may think what he has communicated is correct, but the effect on the patient is not as he has expected. The question now arises: what is to be done about it? Langs' answer is as follows: the analyst needs to consider the patient's associations in three lights. There may be indications (1) that the patient recognizes the fault and is guiding the analyst to make a correction, (2) that the patient makes efforts to metabolize the analyst's psychopathology which has been introjected and then makes an effort to reproject it back to the analyst, (3) that the patient exploits the error so as to perpetuate his psychopathology. From these interactions it is clear that neither the analyst's nor the patient's part in them are just cognitive and insightful, but they are also projective, introjective, identificatory.

An implication of these ideas is that a patient has a real need to understand not only himself but his analyst as well. How does he implement his need? The patient's cognitive information about his analyst is far less than his analyst's about him, so he develops an

unconscious but none the less 'exquisite sensitivity' to his analyst's conscious and unconscious states. It is this that gives rise to a shared experience within a bipersonal field, a concept introduced by the two Barangers, which Langs develops at some length. It is a state of affairs that influences the analyst as well as the patient, but the former is in a position to make better use of the latter's endeavours. A positive outcome can be hoped for, but there is a negative counterpart expressed in the sharing of blind spots, the formation of a therapeutic misalliance and the perpetuation of the patient's neurosis, not to mention also that of the analyst.

Nowadays we have become familiar with interaction through understanding that transference and counter-transference are part and parcel of each other. Sometimes it is essential to be conscious of the relations; sometimes it does not matter. Nevertheless it is interesting and instructive to follow the steps in the development of that position: Langs provides us with an opportunity to do so. It was begun, we learn, by Strachey in 1934, and then greatly developed by Heimann, Little, Winnicott and Bion in this country and by Searles, Racker, the Barangers and Langs in America. The change may be considered concisely by stating that the original classical technique thought of analyst and patient as essentially two persons, so that all the patient's associations were intrapsychic. As to the analyst, only the deleterious effect of a counter-transference neurosis was to be regularly taken into account. The change in viewpoint took place when counter-transference was seen as a cognitive agent, but a more significant development took place when much of the transference was taken to be reactive and related to how the analyst really behaved.

It might be thought that the classical psychoanalytic framework would break down under the stress of these new and developing conceptions. Langs undoubtedly claims that they do not and that they are still essential. They have indeed led to a view of the analytic situation which is subtle, complex and many-faceted, so I for my part agree with him. By adhering to the basic frame of reference, a language has been developed which has gone far in describing how analyst and patient not only should behave but also do behave in reality. So the tendency of supposedly descriptive systems to become idealistic is avoided and the analyst's shadow is given a prominent place alongside his virtues.

It is difficult to make many criticisms that are valid. There will be those who think that the attempt to divide up an essentially whole situation can only fail, and so it would if the various parts were not seen as interacting all the time. Langs makes this point again and again. I thought the account of validation was incomplete, for an interpretation can have validity though it is immediately rejected or seems not to have had any effect. This Langs does not make as clear as I would like, nor does he have enough to say about states of confusion in the analyst as part of arriving at a 'silent hypothesis'. I also felt unsatisfied with the term 'non-transference'. It is no doubt used to counteract the idea that everything that takes place, in the interactional setting, is to be understood as transference or counter-transference. As such the term is worthwhile, but it is essentially a negative word for a positive interchange. I would have thought that valid or real relationship might be better phrases to cover the analyst's and patient's valid attempts at understanding each other within the therapeutic and working alliances.

I remarked at the beginning of this review that analytical psychologists had squandered their birthright. It is not quite true, as *Technique in Jungian Analysis* demonstrates, but it is mortifying to find so many of Jung's views, often set down by him all too briefly,

being developed without any reference to him, and to find that only occasionally have they been worked out by any Jungian analyst. So here is a brief list of Jung's ideas that have been developed by psychoanalysts.

1 The concept of analysis as a dialectic procedure. This is the equivalent of the interactional hypothesis.
2 That the analysis is as much in the analyst as the patient. Psychoanalysts have denned when this proposition applies significantly and when it functions as a background principle that does not need to come into manifest operation.
3 That for changes to take place in a patient an analyst may need to change also (the stage of transformation). This proposition has been identified as the need for a willingness to change on the analyst's part, and it has been added that a patient will facilitate the change and bring about awareness in the analyst as to what is going on.
4 That resistances in the patient can be created by his analyst. The situations in which this takes place have been worked on.
5 The analyst introjects the patient's psychopathology. The conditions under which this occurs have been gone into, and it has been noted that the reverse takes place also.
6 It is the personal influence of the analyst which is the essential element in his producing a therapeutic effect. Psychoanalysts have investigated this at length using the concepts of introjection, identification and projective identification.

It is tempting to sit back and say, 'Well, have we not said so all along?' This stance will not do, for it is in the detailed development of general propositions that understanding is furthered, not the repetition of well-worn aphorisms. Good ideas left unconsidered can be and are put to all sorts of nefarious purposes, while, if developed, real and useful guidelines can be made available. I have little doubt that this observation will evoke the hackneyed retort that to have the subtle and complex relation between analyst and patient worked out in such detail denies personal individuality and puts both partners into a rigid cage which will destroy all desirable spontaneity. Fortunately, not all analysts suffer from the necessary obsessional character disorder which this proposition presupposes.

I would like, in conclusion, to introduce a favourite theme of mine. Langs' work demonstrates that psychoanalysis can no longer be identified with Freud any more than biology can be identified with Darwin or physics with Newton. Yet today there are still those who talk as if all issues were to be decided by citing Freud or Jung. Langs drives a nail into the coffin of that conception. Of course this does nothing to undermine Freud's extraordinary capacity to formulate essential nuclear concepts and rules of treatment, but these have been so greatly developed as to be scarcely recognizable. The germinative seeds have fallen on rich soil and have produced a flourishing tree.

It is unfortunate that *Therapeutic Interaction* costs £50, for this will put it beyond the means of many analysts. It is to be hoped, however, that the library copies will be extensively used and will not be just left on the shelf for their size to be contemplated with apprehension.

COMMENT ON CLIFFORD SCOTT'S PAPER 'COMMON PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE VIEWS OF FREUD AND JUNG'

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 23(4) (1978)

Clifford J.Scott worked in London between 1930 and 1954, when he returned to his native Canada. While in London he became a member of the British Psycho-Analytical Society and director of the London Clinic for Psycho-analysis. His view of Jungians, which appeared in the Journal of Analytical Psychology, *23(4) in 1978, is interesting as a record of what a well-informed psychoanalyst of that time knew about Jung and analytical psychology, though much is quoted from Fordham.*

I*n a stimulating section on the mandala, he relates the mandala to body images, saying that in his practice the images rarely remain as static as the ones he envisages being part of the analytical psychologists' experience. R.H.*

It gives me much pleasure to comment on Clifford Scott's paper because of its fine regard for essentials. I know of no other contribution like it, and so it requires special attention. It further revives memories of discussions held in London to which Scott contributed. What he said at them was invariably puzzling, interesting or stimulating. His departure to Canada was a loss to English psychology, so I am particularly glad to find a paper of his in our Journal.

Scott compares psychoanalysis and analytical psychology in relation to the detailed behaviour of analysts. This is essential because behaviour determines, to a large extent, both the data produced and the field of study in which analysts are engaged. Today, all these are in a state of flux and he recognizes that in his first paragraph: 'We try to understand the changing uses of such words as…', and follows this up with a list of them. In this sentence he introduces the difficulty in understanding what is being talked about as well as the way meanings change as developments take place. Later, the same topic is taken up when he points out how naïve many of the statements by Jung and Freud seem today. He also points out how important one study has become: that of gender identity. He could have mentioned many more, such as his own contribution, or emphasized the growth of interest in childhood amongst analytical psychologists, which has had so many repercussions.

Amongst the changes in behaviour is one not sufficiently appreciated in his paper. A good many analytical psychologists have found out that there are advantages to be gained by using the couch, and, while not making it conditional for analysis to take place, they use it more often than the chair. Again, though it still is current practice to 'ask patients to concentrate on an image and see what happens', or, for that matter, to concentrate on dreams by writing them down and reporting them in the session, a growing number of analytical psychologists follow a practice nearer to the one Scott indicates as characteristic of psychoanalysis: they do this because the dialectic between them and their patients is furthered and made more alive. Similarly, they have understood that the dream methods, used at one time, could lead to neglect of the patient as a whole and restrict the plastic systems we want to investigate, in which the 'somatic content can be seen', and related to. I would like to add here that the relation between dreams and day-dreams has not, in fact, passed unnoticed, for it has been recognized that the introduction

of active imagination has a marked effect on dreaming.

I believe that it would be quite possible to construct a list of quotations from Jung, and others, to show that the body is not neglected and even that its importance is insisted upon; but it is true that the study of archetypes has led to interest in psychic functions (thoughts, feelings and perceptions and so on) at the expense of impulse and drive. Scott's interesting comments on the mandala, however, illustrate the difference better than anything else, for I do not believe that his experience could have come from an analytical psychologist.

Then there is the subject of mourning and grief which may be approached through considering the collective unconscious. If we study Jung's writings or the account of his development in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections,* there can be no doubt that he was predominantly concerned with the effect of the ruthless archetypes related to the similarly ruthless, amoral, collective unconscious which is liable to be overwhelming. Two relatively short papers, 'The child archetype' and 'The visions of Zosimos', illustrate this very well. Further, Jung's concern was less for persons than for society, and analytical psychologists have often followed up his theme.

It would be interesting to work on the question of how much Jung grasped the interrelation between guilt, sadness, pining, grief, mourning and reparation. He wrote one paper on guilt and there are indications that he himself knew about the importance of the reparative needs of a mourning person: his grief at the loss of his wife was moving and it led on to creative work, as did the death of his mother. This does not, however, appear much in his scientific writings, though the subject of guilt features prominently in *Answer to Job.* I cannot recollect any significant contribution to the subject by any other analytical psychologist.

It would be interesting to go into this and relate it to the tendency of analytical psychologists to treat one another ruthlessly and to treat patients in whom ruthlessness is a prominent feature. I believe that this is changing. In London there is a tendency to become interested in the importance of separation and to consider it in relation to anger and grief, when separation from the analyst occurs. This development has taken place as the advantages of seeing patients often has been recognized.

So far I have made it look as if there is a one-way traffic: that analytical psychologists are learning from psychoanalysts, and that, if I understand it correctly, is implied in Scott's theme. There are, however, a number of features of psychoanalysis which make it look as if they are, without recognition, learning from analytical psychologists. Thus there is Glover's theory of ego nuclei, the introduction of self theory, developments in the theory of bisexuality and the understanding of the analytical situation as the interaction between two persons. So one cannot help thinking that the non-recognition is political rather than scientific.

To conclude: I hope that the kind of directness that Scott's paper exhibits, and hopefully that this comment also contains, may lead to a real procedure for problem-solving rather than scholastic interaction.

11
On Donald Meltzer and the Kleinian Development

Fordham's continuing interest in Meltzer and Bion centres on their application of Kleinian meta-psychology. He is also attracted to Meltzer's intensely clinical approach. These reviews are arranged chronologically, but probably the most important one is on The Kleinian Development, *where Fordham constructively compares Bion and Jung. Fordham's reading of Bion illuminates Jung, and vice versa. The review of* The Apprehension of Beauty *acknowledges Meltzer's major contribution to both analysis and aesthetics. R.H.*

REVIEW OF MELTZER'S *THE PSYCHOANALYTICAL PROCESS* AND WOLSTEIN'S *THEORY OF PSYCHOANALYTIC THERAPY*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 13(2) (1968)

These two books provide matter for reflection upon the interrelation between observation, theory and clinical understanding in psychoanalysis. One is written by a Kleinian, the other by a professor in the United States, where Klein's work has so far proved largely inimical to developments in ego psychology and the accommodation of psychoanalysis to 'scientific' disciplines. There the concept of the autonomous or conflict-free ego introduced by Hartmann has gained ground, thus inviting the criticism of erecting a split or false self to the status of respectability and supporting the schizoid depersonalizing element in science at the expense of the individual.

T*he Psychoanalytical Process* is the condensation of lectures and seminars for child psychotherapists being trained at the Tavistock Clinic, and though there is a chapter on adult treatment, those without analytic experience with children might find the whole exposition rather bewildering.

Apart from this, however, the book is difficult to grasp as a whole, partly through compression of content and partly, though less importantly, because the author repeatedly refers to technical matter 'as yet unpublished'. He provides notes on these in an Appendix, but they are not very helpful and are something of a distraction. None the less, the text compels careful reading and is full of matter which is at once striking, illuminating and original.

The theoretical introduction is short, and after it Meltzer launches into often brilliant clinical elaboration of psychoanalytic processes. Not the least interesting are his ideas about how an analyst functions. He discusses the interrelation between his clinical work, reflective life, scientific productivity, writing, and his meetings with colleagues. Like an athlete, a psychoanalyst needs to be kept at the top of his form by regular exercise of

interrelated activities, which keep him fit for the encounter with his patients. In his meeting with them he needs to become 'lost' in their inner worlds, at some danger to himself, if he is to deploy his analytic method with rigour, consistency and full effectiveness.

The most original part of the thesis is his detailed working out of a long, implied or discussed theme. Given a stable setting expressed not only in the analyst's personal qualities, his individual style and in his reliable method but also in regular daily interviews all at the same time, there is a natural evolution in the transference. That the analytic setting involves a series of meetings, communications and separations expressed daily, weekly, in holiday breaks and in the beginning and ending of analysis is so evident that it is surprising that apparently nobody has bothered to work out its significance in detail. Meltzer focuses upon them with often compelling insight, and he makes it seem astonishing that Kleinian metapsychology has not been applied thus before: the theory of projective identification, leading on to the depressive position and successful weaning seems so admirably suited to elucidating the 'natural history of the psychoanalytical processes'. His outline structure of this process is filled in with lucid descriptions of matter that must be familiar to child analysts and to adult analysts also but whose significance may have escaped them.

T*heory of Psychoanalytic Therapy* is at first sight a very different proposition. The thought processes give no difficulty, but they were spun out and often repetitive, and I was tempted to romp through the book without paying adequate attention.

The main thesis is subsumed under the title of two long chapters: 'The structure of psychoanalytic enquiry, I and II'. This rather formidable phrase means that there is a structural relation between theory and observation, and Wolstein elucidates it by studying the degrees of abstraction used by psychoanalysts. He starts from the hard data of psychoanalytic observation, then generalizes and abstracts the experience in a number of definitions elaborated in terms of interaction: transference-counter-transference, resistance-counter-resistance, anxiety-counter-anxiety. Further abstractions lead to transformation of the definitions into general propositions and so on till he reaches metapsychology. Wolstein develops a simple notation in which to organize this argument. Thus the operational definition of transference runs like this: tnt G.S.D.I.R. U [Mn].

1 tn refers to n observations of behaviour
2 t is the definition which can be abstracted from stated observations.
3 G to R refer to postulates used to analyse the content of t, as follows:

G is the postulate of genesis, S of structure
D of dynamism, I of immediacy and R of reflection.

4 U is the explanatory theory of the unconscious.
5 Mn refers to n metapsychologies.

Using this notation, which can be applied to any kind of worthwhile observations, it is possible to assess the nature of statements made by psychoanalysts; namely, are they observational only or are they combined with definitions, how far are these analysed,

explained, and what metapsychology do they fit into? He considers that differences between the schools start at M, and that though metapsychology comes into the conduct of any analysis—indeed, it must do in a complete analytic interpretation—it is still not part of the essential core of agreement between psychoanalysts.

The notation can be used to set out data in tables, formulae and geometrical arrangements. They give the impression of being convenient units that can be played around with to arrive at new combinations of data that could eventually, perhaps, lead on to mathematical treatment and be fed into computers. Wolstein claims that his system can be translated into case studies and with a bit of imagination (the book lacks clinical matter) this could be done. It proved quite fruitful when applied to Meltzer's data. Wolstein understands that psychoanalytic experience is individual and so beyond quantification and essentially not the formulation of regularities such as he elaborates and organizes. Therefore the autonomous ego activity in the book is not likely to apply directly in practice.

Whereas both books are about the same subject, they could scarcely be more different: one is directly clinical and descriptive and the other almost exclusively theoretical. The contrast led me to ask: what is the case for taking leave of the clinical situation to set up a frame of reference which brings an essentially illusory order into the analytic setting?

Five questions suggest themselves here as useful when considering the issues raised by the two volumes:

1 Are the constructs capable of being used in the meeting between patient and psychoanalyst?
2 Do they facilitate communication between colleagues?
3 Do they further understanding between psychoanalysis and other interrelated disciplines?
4 Are they of use in training analysts?
5 Do they further discovery?

Considering Meltzer's book first. The answer to (1) is emphatically 'yes'; to (2) 'yes', but less emphatically since experience of child analysis and a knowledge of Kleinian metapsychology is required; to (3) the answer is: to some psychoanalysts 'yes', to other disciplines 'no'; to (4) 'yes', since his book is based on training seminars; and to (5) it is 'yes'.

In contrast, the value of Wolstein's work is almost the reverse. I cannot imagine anybody using his schema during an analytic session. Whether the contents facilitate communication between colleagues depends on the analysts' mode of thought: some would like it, others would hope that one day this kind of thinking would be useful, still others would ignore it and be none the worse for it. It could be useful in furthering mutual understanding but much more to interrelated disciplines than analysts interested in people. As a scheme for trainees in how to think and organize their work it could be of value but only if used *after* interviews with patients. Except in a theoretical sense it discovers nothing at all.

It may be that these two books are facets of a unitary methodology, but I doubt it. Meltzer claims that Kleinian concepts nearly all apply directly to psychoanalytic work, overlooking, however, that Bion abstracts to something like the extent of Wolstein. It

could not be said that Wolstein's selected data lack application, but the result leads away from the day-to-day clinical setting. This may be why the method does not result in discovery. The strongest point, not so far mentioned, of his notation is that it provides a means of checking analytic exuberance and muddle, not excluded from Meltzer's exposition! This alone is surely sufficient justification for its existence.

REVIEW OF MELTZER'S *SEXUAL STATES OF MIND*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 19(2) (1974)

Melanie Klein explored the fantasy life of children in exciting fashion. However, in reporting what she found, she introduced a number of vigorous, sometimes unlikely, ideas that made what she said provocative and led on the one hand to uncritical acceptance, on the other to violent objections, or total rejection. Now that the noise of the resulting battle has somewhat, though not entirely, abated, it is interesting to see where those who are following up her investigations stand. Meltzer is one of them: he succeeds in preserving what is essential in her work, without engaging in some of her extravagances, and develops it in suggestive ways.

Sexual States of Mind is divided into three parts. The first is a clear and altogether admirable account of how Freud's discoveries and meta-psychology developed and how they were elaborated by Abraham, who opened the way for Melanie Klein to add her own perspective. A prominent feature of Part Two is the differentiation of adult from infantile and adolescent sexuality, and a clear line of demarcation is also arrived at between normal and pathological forms of each. This is helpful, and Meltzer has much to say that is original. Part Three applies his thesis to such features of society as tyranny, pornography, abortion, education and so on.

Yet *Sexual States of Mind* is not easy to read, and presupposes a good grasp not only of Klein's work but also that of Segal, Bion and Rosenfeld. In addition, it does not give much indication as to when Meltzer is introducing an opinion, discovery or theory of his own, while his illustrative clinical material is often insufficiently explicit: it requires several readings and some imaginative inference before sense can be made of it. Additional difficulties are that some references are not included in the bibliography, and there is no index for those that like to use one for cross-reference purposes. Finally, though the wide range of its appeal provides part of its stimulus, it also makes for difficulty; it is sometimes hard to know whether one is being addressed as a research worker, a candidate for analysis, or even, in the last part of the book, a teacher or a member of the general public.

Meltzer would, no doubt, reply that his frame of reference is to clinical experience, and so what he says must be judged by whether it be relevant and useful or no: it does not much matter whether it be new or original, and his 'Appendix of central ideas' is intended to do better than the index he compiled and discarded. Perhaps he is right, but by pursuing this line he makes large demands on his reader and I am afraid that many will be tempted to put this book on one side until more time and energy are available. The result may unfortunately be that it is not picked up again.

This might easily have happened to me, had not the stimulus of having to write a

review made me persist; it has been a rich harvest. The essays are crammed full of ideas and observations refreshingly close to analytical experience. They provoke thought so that a kind of conversation can be held with him through the book, and gradually it becomes apparent how much light he sheds on subjects that have cried out for further illumination. For instance, it has always been known that the primal scene is of crucial importance in both the development of sexuality and its perversions, but I have not before found the implications of this spelt out so vividly, enrichingly and digestibly. But Meltzer does not only develop old themes, he presents new ideas surprisingly: work, he says, is no longer to be thought of as a sublimation product but as a much more directly sexual activity; or again there is an imaginative account of making love which is, if somewhat ideal, unique in the literature of psychoanalysis.

This is an excellent book for advanced students, but it also contains much that could be usefully used in seminars for candidates. I would be surprised if it had much impact on the other disciplines which he evidently wants to reach in Part Three.

REVIEW OF MELTZER (ed.) *EXPLORATIONS IN AUTISM—A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 22(2) (1977)

It has long been my hope that Kleinian psychoanalysts would investigate autism. In 1955 Rodrigue published a pioneering paper and promised more, but nothing has appeared until now—twenty years later. It was therefore with high expectations that I approached this volume.

Autistic children stir people with a mixture of feelings that are difficult to contain, and this makes it necessary, when entering into a therapeutic relation with them, to include the affect produced. Kleinians, it seemed to me, would have the capacity through their imaginative insights, their disciplined theory and their views on the part played by counter-transference to organize and communicate with these children in a unique way. Their openness to unconscious influence, the despair of those who follow the perversely objective approach, would be likely to produce innovative information. I was not disappointed.

In this book there is a wealth of clinical material, with detailed accounts of single interviews combined with summaries of longer periods of therapy. Thus one can get a good impression of autism itself, of post-autistic states, and of the impact which the cases make on their analysts. There is much absorbing if often difficult reading which requires a rather good understanding of Kleinian methods and theory.

It can be hard to describe and record the autistic state proper. John Bremner expresses this beautifully, and at the end of his first interview he describes how he is made to feel 'non-existent' and continues: 'I have to struggle to record the session, knowing that, if I delay, it will slip through the interstices of my memory leaving only an inchoate sadness' (p. 38). But the recording was made and gives a vivid impression of the essence of the condition.

Though divided up in a conventional way—preliminary theoretical framework in Section A; detailed description of four cases compared to show analysts at work with the

autistic state proper and post-autistic developments (in Section B); ending with a third section headed 'Theoretical implications'—this is not a conventional book. It builds on earlier work besides Klein's, especially that of Bion and Bick, but is largely original in its formulations, so that there is much to digest.

The main thesis is as follows. Autism has characteristics of obsessional states and is nearer to these in its psychopathology than the psychoses. It results from a special sort of management of massive depressive anxiety: attention is withdrawn totally and mental life systematically dismantled. Objects lack three-dimensional characteristics to become 'paper-thin'; thus no containment is possible and mental life disappears. Only isolated motor and sensory modalities remain, so that the child presents the pattern of a ruin which the therapist can only handle like an archaeologist who confines his activities to observing bits and pieces which he can grow to recognize as isolated bits of a structure that is no more.

In the case studies the various authors make it clear how difficult they found it to develop adequate formulations which only gradually give sufficient shape to what went on. Again and again they tell how their conclusions were almost of necessity retrospective: it is only by following up the children's behaviour month after month, year after year, that it can be seen in some measure what went on long before.

Tempting as it might be to enter into a detailed discussion of this rich book, it would be unsuitable for a review or even a critical notice. There are many parts of it that I found extraordinarily revealing, and I do not know another document that conveys the nature of autism quite so well, even if, as happened to me after a first reading, one ends up confused and bewildered. It was worth continuing the study of it if only to understand how essential such feelings are to the nature of the subject matter. Once the need to be confused was tolerated then the coherence of the theories and their relevance to the clinical material started to crystallize out. I was left unsure whether the coherence was made by the analyst, but this does not, I believe, matter. The handling of autism requires a piecing together of the dismantled ego and the arrival at the mindless state of the primary self out of which it can be hoped that sufficient organization can develop.

As to technique in management, interpretation has little place in the autistic state proper, and all that can be done is to provide space in which some degree of organization can take place; only then, in post-autistic states, can interpretative work begin, so it is necessary for the analyst to maintain an observant and sensitive activity to meet any emerging deintegration, for it was very easy—using my own ideas—for the defences of the self to come into operation so that the child seemed to slip away from any contact with a human object. I have introduced my own formulation and, to follow it up briefly, it is that the dismantling and bringing into operation of single sensory-motor modalities, and the surface nature of object relation, though well described as the expression of a ruin, may express a distorted attempt of the self to arrive at sufficiently simple operational units to begin developments. I must agree, however, that this is hard to bring about because, though the simple operational units can often seem to show developments and so raise hope, they only too often dissolve into thin air and one is back at the starting point. Thus months of work are nullified, and this is what makes it so disheartening to treat severely autistic children. Not all is hopeless, however, and there is a growing understanding that the analytic study of autism is not only scientifically absorbing, but

also may be therapeutically helpful. No such claim is made in this book, I hasten to add. I hope I have conveyed in this all-too-brief statement, the depth of penetration that has gone into a research which not only advances our understanding of autism, but is rich in ideas to be worked on and tested in further investigations.

CRITICAL NOTE OF MELTZER'S *THE KLEINIAN DEVELOPMENT*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 25(2) (1980)

Donald Meltzer has composed a book made up of his lectures given to students and guests of the Child Therapy course at the Tavistock Clinic. It is divided into three parts. I found the third part, about Bion, particularly interesting and it stimulated me to relate many of his ideas to Jung's formulations.

The first part covers the clinical aspects of Freud's writings and reflects on the development of psychoanalysis as a method. Theory is included only in so far as it influences clinical practice, because Meltzer conceives that Freud's efforts to construct an explanatory system were unsatisfactory. As a scientist Freud is not to his liking, because of the mechanistic nature of his metapsychology, which considered emotion as so much 'noise in the machine'. But this does not prevent him enjoying Freud as an interpreter and artist.

Meltzer is the first psychoanalyst I have come across with Kleinian training to embark on criticism of Freud. Most of them, Melanie Klein included (Racker also), have been at pains to show that their findings are strictly in line with Freud's practice and theoretical orientation. Not so Meltzer. He dislikes libido theory and the theory of impulses against which the ego erects defences. Amongst his rather drastic appraisals is the criticism that the efforts of psychoanalysts to enter into the motives of artists makes nonsense of art. Freud began this with his essay on Leonardo da Vinci which, surprisingly, Meltzer goes into at some length. That, however, is only because it introduces the concepts of narcissism (important for Kleinian developments), projective identification and the epistemophilic instinct. Finally, Meltzer deplores the decreasing emphasis, during the 'last years', on economic factors in the neuroses because it led to pessimism and to a clinging to 'orthodoxy'. He asserts that the emphasis was used to make a rubbish bin into which analytic failures could be dumped. Concurrently the term 'unanalysable' emerged, which led to 'a sort of political conviction, a relegation to a psychoanalytic Siberia'. I quote this statement because it gives an impression of the trenchant, often metaphorical, use of language and conveys his refreshing, though not always advisable, downrightness. It applies from time to time throughout the book.

Part Two consists of an outline description and discussion of the *Narrative of a Child Analysis* considered week by week. This is, in many ways, the best part of the book because Meltzer seems at home in the material and because he helps the reader to arrive at a perspective, both on how Klein worked and how her ideas developed. It is helpful when Meltzer points out her faults. Her analysis is often so brilliant that it takes one's breath away and Meltzer does not fail to rub that in! But when he records how Mrs Klein played the piano at Richard's request and so provoked unnecessary envy, or when she showed counter-transference responses inappropriate to Richard's needs, or could not

deal with material because she had not the equipment for doing so, she becomes fallible like the rest of us.

The bridge between Klein and Bion, whose primary interest is in learning (see p. 223), is neatly made by taking up the idea of the 'epistemophilic instinct' of which Klein had made use. Because Bion's ideas have been less assimilated than the others, I propose to spend the rest of this review in considering Meltzer's estimate of his work; this will also give me the opportunity to consider some aspects of Bion's writings which seem to bear on analytical psychology and so, I hope, stimulate interest in a psychoanalyst who may have much to say to our own discipline.

Bion started by pioneering group analysis in this country and was then the first to devise strictly psychoanalytic techniques for the investigation of schizophrenia. In these counter-transference featured prominently. He made, as a result of his study, a number of postulates, amongst which 'attacks on linking' is the best known. There followed the grid, and such intriguing ideas as reversal of alpha function—a theory of how bizarre objects are constructed. In line with others before him, and especially Freud and those who have developed his metapsychology, Bion went on to construct what looks like a system of his own; it is not however a metapsychology, but a theory of analytical practice. Meltzer is at pains-to show, however, that to estimate him as a system-builder on his own would be untrue: he built heavily on Klein and accepted the death instinct, oral envy, the paranoid-schizoid and the depressive position, though he seems to have considered the last two as a single system which he indicated by the formula Ps<=>D.

Prominent among the products of Bion's thinking is the grid which, before reading Meltzer, I had despaired of understanding. It has two axes, one vertical, the other horizontal. The vertical one shows a sequence of characteristics: beta elements, alpha elements, myths, dreams and so on, preconception, conception, concept, followed by the scientific deductive system and ending with algebraic calculus. In the other, horizontal, axis are found: definitory hypothesis, psi, notation, attention, inquiry, action…. At first these items are bewildering, but I do not think that the horizontal column is arbitrary, as Meltzer asserts. Some of its contents derive from Freud (notation, attention and action particularly), but even if they were it does not matter unless the items prove useless. Bion's use of the grid suggests that they are not.

Another method that Bion presents is to use initials like L, H and K (L=love, H=hate, K=knowledge). At first sight this is simply a method of abbreviating a title, just as the Society of Analytical Psychology can be abbreviated SAP. But it is more than that, inasmuch as one abbreviation can be combined with others to form a further notation such as xLy, which can represent a class of behaviours such as: a man loves a woman, a woman loves a man, an infant loves his mother, a mother loves her baby, a man loves a man or a woman loves a woman and so forth, and these evident relationships can also refer to narcissistic situations within the internal world. Whether anything is gained by this remains an open question, especially when the notation becomes multiplied and increasingly complex as in 'Transformations'. I did not, however, object to it on principle as Meltzer appears to do.

Bion's extraordinarily rich but difficult thought has a curious familiarity, which I believe derives from a similarity with many of Jung's formations. His authorities are different, though both Kant and Eckhart are referred to for comparable reasons. It is

Bion's style of thought that is so radically different in that he is far more 'mathematical' (I could not help wondering whether he had mastered the *Principia Mathematica,* which he cites).

I doubt, however, whether the notation could be considered really mathematical. It seems to me too analogical or amplificatory. In spite of this I thought that many of his ideas could be related to Jung's, so here is a list of the ones that readily spring to mind:

1 Both criticize causality and lay emphasis on meaning.
2 Both lay emphasis on growth and the here and now, rather than the past.
3 Both were interested in what Bion well calls the religious vertex.
4 Corresponding to Bion's use of a grid one might somewhat more remotely draw an analogy with typology, taking as one vertex the attitude and as the other the function types, the two combining in various ways. One might also consider Jung's notion that archetypes can express themselves in varying ways. The instinctual or spiritual components are combined in different quantities so that it would, in principle, be possible to construct a scale indicating their content. Jung sought to illustrate this by drawing the analogy with a spectrum, there being non-psychological unconscious elements at each end corresponding to the infra-red and ultra violet rays. These he called psychoid, and they seem to correspond with Bion's beta elements. Bion considers those as a matter for projective identification, while Jung frequently asserts that the unconscious is to be found in projection—hence his interest in alchemy.

   It is also possible to note that some of Jung's ideas about archetypes—for instance, that they are organs of perception—compare with Bion's notations of alpha functions and alpha elements.
5 Then there is the notion of container and contained. This subject is developed by Bion in varying contexts. It was first used by Jung to elucidate aspects of the marriage relationship; it is implied in his discussion of empathy where projective identification is described but not named, runs as a central motif through the whole alchemical *opus* and used as an analogy to the transference relationship as depicting the patient's interaction with his therapist.
6 Then there is the theory of transformations, which is all too familiar. Though Bion wrote a book on the subject, Jung wrote specifically only about its clinical significance in one essay where he defined the stage of transformation: during that stage both patients and analyst were transformed. But, inasmuch as it is a major theme of alchemy, it is a crucial one of his own.

   I have, from time to time, reflected on the need for a more detailed theoretical framework in Jung's presentations. It is especially evident in *Psychology and Alchemy,* 'Psychology of the transference' and *Mysterium Coniunctionis,* for in all of these Jung prefers to rely on a mythological framework. Could it be that Bion is providing what we require? So far I have not been able to digest this part of his thought, so that question cannot be answered by me.
7 Another idea of Bion's which seems to have caused difficulties in some quarters is where he refers to a thought seeking a thinker. This is very much like Jung's notion that thoughts are not created by the thinker but come into his mind. They can be fruitfully compared with God needing man to realize himself.
8 There are two aspects of Bion's thinking which had a more personal interest. First, his

> notion of 'O', which seems to correspond to the primary self concept. It later becomes ultimate truth or God, as in Jung's thesis. Secondly, there is his application of that idea to analytic sessions in which the analyst needs to be without desire or preconception so that the interview can grow out of 'O'. I had come to a similar conclusion by a different route: Jung frequently referred to and deplored the doctor's trick of 'knowing beforehand', and from this derived the idea of trying to start any particular session without knowing what would emerge.

Meltzer's assessment of Bion's thesis is most thought-provoking because he is ambivalent and not unlike Jung in his relation to theoretical abstraction. On the one hand he is admiring and enthusiastic; on the other, he is driven to exasperation and despair. He believes that Bion really hoped to construct an abstract, mathematical system which could be applied in detail to analytic practice—Bion never says this. Assuming, however, that this was his intention, each attempt has, according to Meltzer, been a failure and the end is a use of a religious vertex as a means of expressing his views.

But all is not hopeless, for out of the seeming carnage of abstract ideas used by Freud, by classical metapsychologists and by Bion, Meltzer extracts some ideas that he can use. He gives special attention to alpha function in reverse, producing bizarre objects which he illustrates with a dream image of 'extremely long finger-nails, extending not only outwards but also up her (the patient's) fingers and under the skin of the arm. These seemed to have been struck and driven up her arms so that their ends stuck out near her elbows' (Meltzer 1978: vol. 3, 122). The image is striking and the discussion persuasive. The other stimulus has been to find that Bion's model of mind opens up to observation and study

> an area of conflict previously not noted or attended to but relegated to the category of acting out. Seen as a model superimposed upon those of Freud and Klein, Bion's model would seem to open a vast area of (mindless) phenomena to the psychoanalyst which he has not yet previously had the conceptual tools to observe and consider.
>
> (1978: vol. 3, 118)

From this idea derived Meltzer's interest in autism.

Meltzer ends up with:

> These elevations of Freud's work to third power, so to speak, have enabled psychoanalysis to grow from a narrow therapy of the neuroses and perversions marred by overweening ambitions to explain everything, to a scientific method which may prove to be adequate to investigate and describe everything and to explain nothing.
>
> (1978: vol. 3, 118)

But what of his critical assessment of theory and metapsychology as a whole? It seems excessive to discard the lot, which I gather, perhaps wrongly, Meltzer wants to do. After all, without his theoretical bias and his firm adherence to it, it is most unlikely that Freud would have invented psychoanalysis. And without that the innovations of neither Klein

nor Bion would have taken place. It is evident that Bion, faced with his investigations of groups and his analysis of schizophrenic patients, needed to construct a theory of thinking and knowledge (see p. 223) even though his thought was not logically consistent.

Such reflections suggest a revision of ideals. The idea of producing a self-consistent system which even Jung seems to have hankered after can be thought of as one of them. It can be replaced by the need to make abstract systems, not necessarily consistent with others, to contain 'realizations' made in the field of analytical experience. If the 'bipersonal field', to borrow a term from Langs, changes or develops, a different set of abstractions may be needed. Freud studied (mainly) the psychoneuroses and speculated about society—I cannot see that he confined himself to the narrow field of the neuroses as Meltzer (and Jung also) says—and from this he ended up with a metapsychology of psychic structures cathected or decathected with energy. This has been extensively developed, particularly in the States under the leadership of Hartmann, Rapaport and others who wanted to construct a metapsychology that could be related to 'scientific psychology' and biology. Recently it has come under attack, and there are those such as Schaffer who regard the whole effort as fruitless: Meltzer appears to agree.

Klein studied children in depth and tried to fit her findings into structural theory. She was hurt (Meltzer reports) when criticized. Bion studied groups and schizophrenia and its social (group) implications. When his abstractions did not fit together, or if they did not apply to the field to which they were not intended to apply in the first place, or if they collapsed and became redundant, as Meltzer claims, it is still wrong to discard them as useless, because they were, and still may be, instruments in discovery: containers which need modification or even transformation through 'catastrophic change'.

Jung was interested in the nature of theories. His often-quoted passage beginning 'Theories are the very devil…' has never been expanded, though he evidently meant that they became instruments of repression or means for the exclusion of unwelcome data (realizations, according to Bion). This scepticism about theories led him to collect amplifications exhaustively. Bion virtually does the reverse; he seeks a notation whereby the 'penumbra of associations' cannot be made and the notation can then be manipulated in the interests of discovery; that, if I have understood him correctly, is his aim. In this way, abstraction would not lead to the consequences Jung sought to avoid.

Abstractions are needed to organize, orientate and explain; the conception of them as containers is a valuable addition: a theory must be sufficiently strong to sustain itself in the face of new experience and then react to it and perhaps change so as to continue as container. This leads to new discovery. Without the containing theory nothing is discovered, it is merely recorded. Thus a theory may be seen as a reactive system and hopefully, but never realizably, an indestructible framework.

T*he Kleinian Development* is valuable reading for anyone interested in that creative school of psychoanalytic investigation. It presupposes considerable knowledge of this field, and any reader will need to refer to the relevant parts of Freud, have Klein's *Narrative* beside him, and he will have to study Bion with considerable care, if he is not already familiar with his thesis.

Meltzer's style is lively and it makes this thought-provoking book eminently readable.

REVIEW OF MELTZER'S *DREAM LIFE*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 29(4) (1984)

The importance of dreams in the analytic process was historically paramount. But, as time went on, some analysts began to discover that the transference-counter-transference set-up could be equally, if not more, important, and as a result dream analysis sank into second place; the transference was a dream enacted in the analytic interviews and so had greater impact, and could be more easily elucidated. Jungians have by and large, stuck to the dream, so that it can even be asked: how can you analyse a patient who does not remember his dreams? Yet, though they were central, very little has been written about their nature; they are recorded but not much has been discovered about them—except for their frequently compensating nature. Otherwise they are taken to be messages from the unconscious, personal and collective, or set in their mythological matrix.

A feature of the reports from Jungian sources is that the patient's work on his dream is seldom given much notice, and though Jung gave vivid accounts of his relation to his own, most records are embellished with amplifications or fitted into the nexus of mythology with which the analyst is familiar.

As a psychoanalyst Meltzer had a method which differs from the one I have just outlined. His point of departure is a critical estimation of Freud's theory: he considers that Freud trivialized the dream by calling it the guardian of sleep, and that the censor and the mechanisms of condensation, displacement and symbolization, making possible the disguised fulfilment of a wish, were concepts far too much influenced by the topographical model derived from neurophysiological thinking. The theory was not, Meltzer says, sufficiently reconsidered when the structural model was developed. Nor has the metapsychology of dreaming received enough revision in the light of Melanie Klein's innovations, followed by Bion with his studies of how thinking develops into the establishment of knowledge.

Meltzer's small book is divided into three parts: 'Theoretical background', 'A revised theory of dream life' and 'The practice of dream investigation'. Each part is full of interesting matter written in a distinctive literary style, so it is difficult to convey its contents, let alone give a critical assessment, within the scope of a review, that does justice to the rich material and the ingenious and original thought. Furthermore, the study covers a wide field; it leads us into epistemology on the one hand and into the precursors of thought in infancy on the other—there is a fascinating account of the treatment of an infant of 18 months who emerges from an autistic-like state.

It will be helpful to keep in mind the sub-title, 'A re-examination of the psychoanalytic theory and technique', and to remember that this is a book about dream-life and not just dreams of the night, for, while actual dreams feature prominently, material is given from other sources from infancy onwards to old age. There can be no mistaking the thesis that dream-life percolates through the daytime life of the person, as well as at night, and also is most explicitly expressed in the interactional field of analytic interviews.

In my first enthusiastic feeling for Meltzer's book I thought: this is the first book about dreams that I have read! It is true that Freud opened up the field, but the dream seems to disappear in the wealth of analysis: he had used the dream to construct a theory, which

was of course Jung's reproach. It had consequently a constricting character which Jung broke through and he widened the understanding to good effect: 'dreams have a very definite as if purposeful structure indicating the underlying thought or intention' (*Collected Works,* 18:89). That could be the leitmotif of Meltzer's essay. But Jung wrote most about unusual dreams and very little about the sort one meets in everyday analytical practice.

Since the time of the two great innovators very little has been said to remark upon. There has been Ella Sharp, who had such a vivid feeling for the beauty and poetry in dreams; there has more recently been Hall's large volume which, however informative, was disappointing; and Rycroft seemed to lack depth. So what is it about Meltzer's book that has proved so satisfying?

It will be well known that Meltzer has been profoundly influenced by Bion; that influence percolates through what he writes and especially in the way he makes good use of Bion's theory of thinking: dreams do not just facilitate wish fulfilment; they contain thought and the rudiments of thought.

It is somewhat startling to find a psychoanalyst writing in that way, since one has got the impression that they believe that nothing further can be said about dreams, Freud having had the last word. That is not so for Meltzer.

But all that seems beside the point. Meltzer writes about dreams as an inherent part of analytic work woven into the interactional matrix and expanded from there, as I have already indicated. This interweaving is graphically indicated by his method of describing work on a dream: he continues to use the two-column form of expression which he first introduced in *The Psychoanalytic Process:* the page is divided into two columns; on one side is the patient's dream together with his reflections, and Meltzer's part in their development; in the other column are Meltzer's private reflections showing why he contributes to the dialectic and why he does not. In that way a rounded impression is given of the interview, which springs to life before our eyes: Eros and logos combined.

From our Jungian standpoint I think the most important thesis is an understanding of how symbols are brought into being through the growth of emotion. That is done by using Bion's notion of beta and alpha elements and the transforming effect of alpha function. It is in this elucidation that the child cases and infant observations are particularly effective. Jung had defined a symbol as the best possible expression of an otherwise unknown datum. Meltzer has elucidated that unknown datum by recognizing that it is capable of experience.

Freud was led away from the dream by his over-use of association and his brilliant mind, and Jung was led away by mythology. Meltzer has brought the dream alive in personal interaction. I do not recollect anybody who has done that so effectively. The only criticism that I can muster is that Meltzer's intuitive penetration, though often brilliant and enlightening, is sometimes so difficult to follow that one is left gasping or incredulous.

REVIEW OF MELTZER AND WILLIAMS' *THE APPREHENSION OF BEAUTY*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 34(3) (1989)

After seven years' analysis in which the patient divested herself of much of her falsity and perversion, she developed multiple sclerosis, still in its early stages. Of her state Meltzer writes:

> The theory of a punitive super-ego merely gives voice to the patient's own religious and moralistic phantasy and expectation, even in a sense her wish to be punished with death, rather than to have to experience the powerful emotions of fear and love, hate and dependence, ignorance and the yearning to understand, life at the passionate level of aesthetic conflict, clinging to the rock, ravished by the beauty of the sea, terrified of being swept away. Swept away by what? The material says it clearly: swept away by the preference for mindlessness, cocooned in quiet submission to the demands of the culture of the family, seasoned by secret perversity.
>
> (1988:177)

This evocative passage illustrates Meltzer's style. That is relevant to consider because of the aesthetic colouring to this book. His writing, though sometimes difficult to follow, especially when he interprets dreams (though his skill and virtuosity in that direction is remarkable) is well adapted to his subject matter. This is an original and creative volume illustrating what a long way psychoanalysts have come since Freud's early drive theories, through object relations and Klein, to Bion and now Meltzer, who has digested his psychoanalytic gods in earlier volumes: *The Kleinian Development* and *Extended Metapsychology.* How thoroughly he has done that is illustrated by my quotation: its raw materials are the aesthetic object (his own addition) giving rise to+L.H.K. and then reversing to—L.H.K., or using Bion's grid, going up to the level of fantasy, dream and myth, then reversing towards beta elements—all digested and put into pulsating English (there is only one technical term—'superego'—unless 'aesthetic object' be classed as another).

After reading this book once I was reminded of Helen of Troy and how her beauty led to devastating consequences: the death of heroes, the destruction of Troy and the decimation of the Greek host; also of Eros the mighty Demon mediating, as Diotoma says to Socrates, between man and the gods the overwhelming elements in the Greek psyche. These amplifications from literature helped me to grasp something of what Meltzer means by the tremendous impact of the mother's beauty on the baby and that of the baby on the mother. In adding that important dimension to object relations theory, Meltzer enriches it and gives space for emotion, passion and depth so that the object becomes alive and freed from the restraints of abstraction and mechanization in which it only too easily becomes enmeshed and so destroyed as a living entity. It is a most remarkable achievement.

I do not mean to say that he abandons model-making, but the importance he gives to

description and to story-telling (incorporating the aesthetic object in his text) keeps his account alive. There are frequent displays of case material—we are never far from another case—and many allusions to and quotations from literature, especially poets (Keats, Blake, Milton, Hazlitt, Flaubert, Wordsworth, Milton); there is also a long chapter on *Hamlet,* which I include amongst case studies, headed 'The undiscovered country' (I understand it was especially influenced by Meg Harris Williams).

It is this chapter which encouraged me to think that the study of the aesthetic object was related to Jung's discovery of the self. The play *Hamlet* is investigated not as a tragedy but as a dream of Hamlet's search for his self (the true prince), in the sense of his real nature, and the failure of that attempt. I deliberately use the phrase 'his self' rather than 'himself' because Meltzer conveys a real understanding of the real self, though he does not so define it. That understanding is rare. The debauching of Jung's knowledge by making the self a department of the ego is all too frequent and deplorable. It sometimes comes about because of fears of being condemned for mysticism, a term which likewise becomes smeared.

To find the self in Jung's sense being rediscovered by a Kleinian is not altogether unexpected and it is gratifying, for in 1950 I suggested that Klein's model was congested and required a concept of the self. Jung used to remark that if what he discovered was passed over, somebody else would rediscover it. He did not add, as he might have done, in a different way, and even using a different language, but that is what I hold is happening.

The title, *The Apprehension of Beauty,* suggests that we are going to be subjected to an account of beauty and probably good taste, which is what aesthetics is all about, or so I used to think. Quite wrongly, it seems, for according to Meltzer, and I agree with him. the aesthetic object, the purveyor of beauty, evokes conflicts full of pain, violence and suffering. Hamlet depicts that very well, and it is when his struggle is given up and Ophelia commits suicide that the stage soon becomes full of corpses.

One can take this chapter as a centre-piece to the whole book with smaller contributions on either side of it, thus gaining an impression of its rich content: earlier chapters are headed 'The apprehension of beauty'; 'Aesthetic conflict: its place in development'; 'On first impressions'; 'On aesthetic reciprocity'; 'The role of the father in early development'; 'Aesthetic conflict' and 'The problem of violence', leading up to the chapter on *Hamlet,* after which come, 'The place of aesthetic conflict in the analytic process'; 'The retreat from aesthetic conflict: cynicism, perversity and the vulgarisation of taste'; 'Recovery of the aesthetic object'; 'Holding the dream: the nature of aesthetic appreciation'; 'The shadows on the cave and the writing on the wall', followed by a dialogue with Adrian Stokes and a second Addendum headed 'Mindlessness—the developmental relation of psychosomatics, hyperactivity and hallucinosis'. The list displays well the richness of his subject matter. There is no balking at the shadow.

Meltzer's book is extremely moving and adds a dimension to Bion's model building in that the aesthetic object is given a primacy along with 'O'; this is a further confirmation that he is referring to the self. If further evidence be needed, he has come to understand that the whole object and the depressive position precede the paranoid-schizoid position, a conclusion I had arrived at by a different route when considering the development of mental life in the infant.

The mode whereby the object is perceived is projective identification. Some years back, in 1969, Gianna Henry wrote a paper, ‘Some aspects of projective mechanisms in Jungian theory’—published in the *Journal of Child Psychotherapy,* 2(3)—in which she showed how Jung had described projective identification in chapter 7 of *Psychological Types* (‘The type problem in aesthetics’). I looked up the subject and found out how much Jung had worked in the same field. Much of its essence was described, from a different vertex, it is true, but there can be no doubt that Meltzer’s aesthetic object is discernible in what Jung said. Jung does not relate it to the self as I am doing; none the less he introduced the self in the chapter headed, ‘The type problem in poetry’. That makes surprising his vigorous resistance to the assertions of the anima (who probably turned out to be a real woman) that he was constructing an art. None the less, I think he was right. So is Meltzer when he says that the practice of psychoanalysis is an art which produces data having scientific validity. That is a formulation which gets nicely round a quandary which has puzzled a great many people: the nature of psychoanalysis. In his dis-cussion Jung does not use the term ‘projective identification’, but he considers projection inadequate and therefore prefers *participation mystique.* After all, there can be little doubt that the alchemical experience was more than projection, for out of it came chemistry on the one hand and the basis for creating a psychology of the unconscious on the other.

Meltzer’s book is important and will influence analytic practice. It has shed light on two of my cases already and will I believe enrich my practice as a whole. Furthermore, it could do much to rescue analysts from the sterility of relying on theoretical abstraction and model-building at the expense of experience as recorded in narrative.

REVIEW OF MELTZER’S *THE CLAUSTRUM: AN INVESTIGATION OF CLAUSTROPHOBIC PHENOMENA*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 38(4) (1993)

There was a time when it was all fairly simple. Those were the days of symptom analysis. All that was necessary was to lift repressions, reveal the fixation points in infancy or childhood and that was the end of the analysis. The paradigm was the dream, and the method appears as early as ‘Dora’, in which it is to be found: for though Dora ended her analysis one-sidedly, the analysis of her dream is said to be complete when both the exciting cause and the infantile root had been unearthed. Then the picture changed: psychoanalysts started to investigate the patients whom Freud thought were not suitable for psychoanalysis. Klein, in particular, thought she had discovered the fixation points for schizophrenia and the manic depressive psychoses; the simple view of the perversions disappeared and psychoanalysts started to embark on much more extensive analysis of character, as Jung had done many years back. In ‘Symptomatology and characterology’ (Chapter 10) there is an interesting discussion of the two modes. It was Bion who initiated the most radical departures with his analysis of thought processes and their origins in pre-verbal mentality. Added to the analysis of adult patients came child analysis, infant-mother observation and ultrasound observations on infants *in utero.*

Meltzer uses all these sources for his conclusions, which he also derives from the

analyses of borderline patients, children, especially autistic ones who either are psychotic or become so; and finally there are the intuitive insights of artists. He draws on numerous experiences in supervising analyses conducted by others in a great number of countries: Europe, the United States, South America and India. His experience is therefore unique, and by now he has made his developing views known in a growing number of volumes of which *The Claustrum* is the latest.

It was his paper on anal masturbation which registered a starting point for his present thesis, and I will consider that one mostly, and the others more briefly. I do so for another reason as well: the subjects of anal erotism and sadism are very little considered amongst analytical psychologists; there are some passages in *Symbols of Transformation,* but they stem from Jung's earlier days when under the influence of Freud and do not go into character structure as Meltzer does. I can only remember one Jungian who ever approached the matter and that was Abenheimer. Meltzer develops the simpler constructions of Freud, Abraham, Jones and Heimann into a complex and comprehensive thesis. He lays emphasis on the pseudo-maturity that characterizes his patients, who can none the less develop a capacity for adaptation; pseudo-maturity is equated with Winnicott's false self and Deutsch's 'as if personality'; he might have mentioned Jung's persona as well. He says in that 1966 paper: 'clinical material and theoretical discussion will bind together the three concepts: anal masturbation, projective identification, pseudo-maturity' (p. 15). That I think he does with great skill.

Here is the early account of the syndrome.

> In childhood this situation [consequent to anal masturbation] encourages a pre-oedipal (ages 2–3) crystallisation of character manifest by docility, helpfulness, preference to adult companionship, aloofness or bossiness with other children, intolerance of criticism and high verbal capacity. When this characterological crust is broken momentarily by frustration or anxiety, outcrops of hair-raising virulence are laid bare—tantrums, faecal smearing, suicidal attempts, vicious assaults on other children, lying to strangers about parental maltreatment, cruelty to animals, etc.
>
> This structure bypasses the Oedipal complex and seems to equip a child reasonably well superficially for academic and social life and may carry through into adulthood relatively unruffled by the adolescent upheaval. But the 'pseudo' nature of the adjustment is apparent in adult life even where the perverse tendencies have not led to obviously perverse sexual activities.
>
> (1966:15)

One might add that it continues till it can again be threatened by the mid-life crisis.

As to the origins of the anal claustrum, Meltzer gives an imaginative construction presumably based on infant observation: after a feed the mother lays her baby down in his cot and walks away; the baby observes her bottom and equates her buttocks with her breasts. He then explores his own buttocks equating them with his mother's; his activity is contributed to by the epistemophilic instinct, intrusive identification (the infant's intrusion into its mother's and its own body), which leads on to intense masturbatory excitement and the unconscious phantasies associated with it.

Though such an imaginary construction may seem extravagant I find it clear and cogent, but I think that is largely due to having worked in the same field as Meltzer. But it is not so clear how the claustrophobic trap develops, nor is it clear how the infant, child or adult gets out of it, though chapter 7 is devoted to that subject and it seems that psychoanalysis can sometimes bring it about.

Projective identification plays a central role in the whole of this volume; it has a wide use and covers primitive means of communication (not investigated in this book) to intrusive and adhesive identification; it takes place between the objects of the internal world as well as between the ego and external objects. This is an elaboration of the notion that the internal objects (archetypes) tended to merge the one with the other, as a structural feature of unconscious processes. They appear as 'zonal confusions' and so on. In my view these are not, to the infant, nor in the unconscious, confusions at all: they only appear as such when looked at from a more mature position.

There are three claustra described in chapter 5, 'Life in the claustrum'; 'Life inside the head/breast': 'Life in the genital compartment'; and 'Life in the maternal rectum'. Each, and the characterological features to which they give rise, is described in considerable detail—a very considerable achievement. I can best introduce them together as follows:

> Life in the claustrum has many pleasures, but what it certainly lacks is *joie de vivre:* happiness that comes from the experience of development, hopefulness that comes from direct—not second hand or once removed—contact with the beauty of the world. The head/breast has the pleasure of complacency, of elitism, of a delusion of security; the genital compartment has its erotic pleasure and 'satisfaction', meaning exhaustion; the rectum offers variously the pleasures of sadism, masochism, power, wiliness, deception.
>
> (1992:150)

These three claustra are conceived to be the result of a process called 'compartmentalization'. It may be incomplete and so there is movement between each of them.

His views illuminated my clinical experience. That is the case especially in his chapter 'Technical problems of the claustrum', where he expands and develops what I had outlined in my paper 'Defences of the self'. I think that his ideas on the compartmentalizing of the internal mother and the geographic dimensions of the mental apparatus are cogent. He attributes them to Klein and Bion.

The subject matter of this volume does not apply only to borderline cases but also to adolescence, the perversions/addictions, and indicates its relation to schizophrenia and to politics (mostly that of the psychoanalytic institutes). It ends with a fascinating study by Meg Harris Williams, on 'Macbeth's equivocation, Shakespeare's ambiguity'.

I think that this book is one to study at length. It is important, will repay that effort and promote discussion. I have indicated in this review two points at which the latter might take place. For example, the idea of pseudo-maturation might be considered in relation to the persona. I do not think that Jungians think of the persona like that, for though it masks the 'true' self and has a psychopathology, it is not a fault in maturation but rather a means of adaptation in our society which can, so to speak, be put on or taken off as occasion

arises. Similarly, a defence of the self indicates something more positive than the false self as a mask; it suggests that the condition is the result of threatened violation of the self (in my sense) and so that preserving false self is then a 'life and death' matter—recognized at one point by Meltzer.

The use of the term 'self is tantalizing. Sometimes it is used for the whole organism but stripped of its psychodynamic properties. The whole theory of splitting hangs in the air without something (namely, the self) to split. Then reference is made to insufficient splitting and idealization in which the two processes are conceived to be desirable states in the course of growth. Is it not tidier and more interesting to differentiate the desirable from its pathological equivalent and call its desirable form 'deintegration'? It is true that Klein had differentiated 'normal splitting' which can lead onwards and is not fixed as in the claustrum. From my position the therapeutic problem is how to convert a split into a deintegrate. One other point: Meltzer refers to the 'Mysterious process of introjection'—it is quite straightforward if there is a primary integrate which exercises a periodic influence in that direction.

These theoretical reflections may seem relatively unimportant in view of the apparent identity of the problems arising in the analytic set-up, but I suspect they do alter, in subtle ways, the analyst's attitude to his patient: my position certainly reflects, if it does not influence, my capacity to tolerate and enter the claustrum as a 'visitor' (Meltzer's term).

12
On analytical psychologists

AN APPRECIATION OF C.G.JUNG'S *ANSWER TO JOB*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 28(4) (1955)

When asked why he had decided to review this book, Fordham said he was 'just enthusiastic—with all my other work, I haven't lost interest in Jung and Jungians. I thought it a marvellous book.' The review appeared in 1955, and I will append some thoughts at the end of it. R.H.

Since Freud's *Moses and Monotheism* no comparable work on the Bible has been published by an analyst of any persuasion [that is, up to 1955]. Freud's short volume did not create the disturbance of his earlier essay *The Future of an Illusion,* partly because the public had sufficiently assimilated his view of religion and partly because the capacity of mankind to react openly to shocking views had considerably diminished. If Freud saw the need to work out the religious implications of psychoanalysis from time to time, Jung has done so continuously, but not heretofore with the ruthless logic of *Answer to Job,* which consequently has the shocking character of Freud's works, though for different reasons. I do not hesitate to compare *Answer to Job* with Freud's researches both in importance and power, though the method of approach is different.

The increasing tendency of psychology to become a technology has probably been one of the reasons why books of this kind are not frequent, but analytical psychology more than any other psychology cannot, by its very nature, remain simply a technical scientific exercise. Like psychoanalysis, its implications for various other disciplines have never been comfortable, though on the whole they have caused less disturbance in religion than might have been expected. The reason for this is not far to seek; it arises from Jung's assertion that there is a God archetype within psyche. From this it is only a short step to assume that, though he is not one of the faithful, his ideas can be used to support theological orthodoxy.

A*nswer to Job* will go far to demolish this view; indeed it appears liable to disturb orthodoxy of any kind. Its ideas are sufficiently out of keeping with, and in my view ahead of, most contemporary thought, for the reader to be tempted to throw the volume aside as too outrageous; it will be a pity if he does so, for it is a well worked-out and coherent thesis that will repay careful study. Not only is it technically interesting but it also has bearing on numerous disciplines, such as the history of problems of biblical tradition. It is a volume with many facets, all of which cannot be considered here. For analysts it will be interesting because of the light it throws not only on much of Jung's less downright publications but also on his own nature, for he writes:

> Since I shall be dealing with numinous factors, my feeling is challenged quite as much as my intellect. I cannot, therefore, write in a coolly objective manner, but

> must allow my emotional subjectivity to speak if I want to describe what I feel when I read certain books of the Bible, or when I remember the impressions I have received from the doctrines of our faith. I do not write as a biblical scholar (which I am not) but as a layman and physician who has been privileged to see deeply into the psychic life of many people. What I am expressing is first of all my own personal view, but I know that I also speak in the name of many who have had similar experiences.

That Jung speaks with logic, intuition, feeling and emotion is clearly not only because he deals with 'numinous factors', for he has done this elsewhere in an objective manner. We have to go towards the end of the book to find that this volume is also inspired by the state of the world today, and Jung clearly believes that his ideas are important in this context. This consideration brings the book into the realm of a philosophy of life, for it is concerned with his valuation of those parts of the Bible and theology that he regards as important in relation to contemporary events. In stating that the volume is his personal view he follows his contention, which will probably find wide acceptance, that the individual is the main carrier of values and so of a philosophy of life; and the expression of these must consequently be essentially personal and individual. It follows that Jung's book is a total reaction of his whole personality, and this is further justified on the grounds that religion deals with manifestations of the self. Religion can thus only be handled scientifically up to a point; after this it needs the whole man.

The book is small: only 180 pages in length. It starts with a discussion of the Book of Job and later considers the Epistle of John and the Book of Revelation. Less well-known and apocryphal texts such as the Book of Enoch also come under scrutiny, and finally the recent dogma of the Assumption of the Virgin is evaluated by him.

The argument runs as follows. The God of the Old Testament, Yahweh, starting from a primal unity, has gained a clear 'personality' and had become more or less separated into parts by the time of the Book of Job. Some of these are manifestly distinct and have become personified as Sophia (wisdom) or as the angels, amongst whom is Satan; others are less clearly distinguished and appear not as personifications but as attributes of God termed his omnipotence, his omniscience, his justice, his wrath, which get sufficiently dissociated to be 'mislaid' or 'forgotten' from time to time!

God's behaviour to Job is at the outset morally dubious, but it becomes increasingly so as the drama evolves, until by the end it is clear that God has suffered a severe moral defeat at Job's hands. It is so obvious that Jung assumes that God noticed it and decided to become man. It is God's guilt that is therefore the point of departure for the subsequent thesis:

> The victory of the vanquished and oppressed is obvious: Job stands morally higher than Yahweh. In this respect the creature has surpassed the creator…. Hence a situation arises in which real reflection is needed. That is why Sophia steps in. She reinforces the much needed self-reflection and thus makes possible Yahweh's decision to become man. It is a decision fraught with consequences: he raises himself above his earlier primitive level of consciousness by indirectly acknowledging that the man Job is morally superior to him and that therefore he

> has to catch up and become human himself.… Because his creature has surpassed him he must regenerate himself.

The débâcle of Job was caused by Satan, and this is why the incarnation *(in Jesus)* was surrounded by elaborate precautions against him, involving, amongst other things, the virtual elevation of the Virgin to the status of a divinity through the dogma of the immaculate conception.

These precautions to keep Satan out of the incarnation therefore resulted in the production of a perfect and good being, Jesus, who was still, however, not so much man as God. As a consequence of the precautions, the incarnation was therefore not complete, though the defect was partly remedied by the sending of the Paraclete (the Holy Ghost) which could enter into purely mortal man. The precautions had a second consequence; namely, an increase in the partition of God whose transformation from a relatively unconscious and instinctual dynamism into a God of Love was unstable presumably, though Jung does not say so explicitly, because it was brought about by guilt. The instability is hinted at even in the Lord's Prayer as the phrase 'lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil' indicates; but it becomes absolutely obvious in the Apocalyptic visions in the Book of Revelation. Here is portrayed a veritable blood bath of sadistic wrath besides which the Job incident is a mere flea-bite. These Jung regards as a compensatory phenomenon originating from the one-sided goodness of a Christian bishop. In the middle of the visions, however, appears a 'woman clothed in the Sun' having quite a different and somewhat pagan character. The woman gives birth to a child (the anima mediating the self).

Whilst Jung argues that the bulk of the visions are personal, this last vision is a true collective expression wrongly interpreted in the Bible in Christian terms. The general failure to assimilate the content of the collective unconscious which this vision expressed would seem to account for the persistent regression of the God imago to his wrathful and legalistic aspect. This explains a condition which has always fascinated me: in the Middle Ages there was a pagan religion of the people running side by side with a Christianity ruled by an increasingly revengeful and legalistic Trinity whose intolerable edicts made it virtually impossible at one period for anybody to be saved at all (cf. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion,* vol. 1). At this period there also occurred numerous legends of the Virgin who took on the role of mediator between man and God.

Man tended to be sunk in guilt and evil, and this carried on especially into Protestantism. To this Jung gives the meaning that it is all part of a further but secret attempt of the dark, so-called evil aspect of God to regain in man that unit which had become lost when he divided himself up into good and evil parts.

Enough has been said to indicate the originality of Jung's argument, which is, however, much more subtle and penetrating than this note can indicate. The whole volume is rendered especially striking by its form of presentation. Jung has indeed let himself go in the most energetic, witty and, perhaps I may say, also refreshing manner. Some of his caustic remarks about God remind one of, and even outclass, Bertrand Russell's comments upon the behaviour of religious personalities. The book has at the same time the same deep seriousness as that which underlies Russell's writing.

It will be clear from what has been said that Jung treats the texts animistically. God has

a 'personality' throughout. It is probably for this reason that he does not want this book to be regarded as scientific, and in this he may be correct, but it would expand this review too far to go into such a vexed topic. To me, whether it be scientific or no is less interesting than my surmise that we are witnessing by proxy something of what Jung means by active imagination. This he has defined as an activity on two sides, an activity of the archetypal images regarded as real and an activity of the unconscious mind *vis-à-vis* these images. It is a concealed example because these are not the creation of Jung's unconscious; but we may safely assume that he is in this volume repeating his own experience and, as he says, the experience of his patients. We are also witnessing something of the transforming consequences of taking the image as a symbol (cf. 'Definition symbol' in *Psychological Types*).

When the fascination of the presentation has diminished and when the shock of the surprising interpretation of texts we have grown up with and whose classical interpretation has almost become part of our bones has subsided, it becomes quite clear that the argument is not so new as it appears at first. It is indeed an account of the phenomena of individuation, which, and this is I think new, clearly starts from the unconscious realization of guilt or, to keep to the animistic frame of reference, it starts with God's realization of his own shortcomings *vis-à-vis* man.

What has this to do with medical psychology? It has been pointed out by Zilboorg, and no doubt by others as well, that the subject matter of psychopathology was long since delineated in such books at the *Malleus Maleficarum,* and this is enough to make one stop and think. Further, the concept of the unconscious has led to the discovery of guilt-laden material which is designated evil in religion. The assimilation of this material is the task of analytical, though not always other forms of, psychotherapy, and it is done by studying the material in terms of the child! This leads to a kind of human being who is both good and bad, but whose view of good and evil has undergone changes in essential respects because he is, if not a whole individual yet, more integrated than before.

The moral and so social implications of our work cannot be overlooked in the long run, though there are various means of taking shelter from its consequences. It takes greatness to set them out adequately and therefore we should be more than grateful to Jung for pushing his ideas to a logical conclusion. Since I am one of those who experiences events much like Jung, I cannot criticize this book which I find highly courageous and rewarding. For this reason if for no other, *Answer to Job* will, I hope, be read by everyone engaged in medical psychology.

N*early forty years after Fordham wrote this piece, it is possible, I believe, to see what might have been in his mind, though it is not spelled out. While abstracting the argument about Jung's Job (para 6) Fordham achieves a working definition of the development of the God-self in four stages, though not necessarily distinct ones.*

1 The Old Testament Yahweh is a primal unity. Growth results in God becoming a 'personality'.

2 By the time of Job, God has separated into parts, i.e. Sophia, Satan, etc., but has also developed attributes: omniscience, omnipotence, justice and wrath which are sometimes 'mislaid' or 'forgotten'.

3 God sadistically attacks Job, which Job endures and does not retaliate but even retains his faith in God.

4 God feels guilt at his treatment of Job.

Yahweh would appear to be a primary integrate that deintegrates in the course of which an ego ('personality') appears. Stage 2 above would be a paranoid-schizoid state with splitting (for example, Satan) and denial (mislaid and forgotten). Jung points out that God hides Satan unconsciously in his bosom (Collected Works, 11: *para 594*). *In this paranoidschizoid state God attacks Job into whom he has projected his bad objects—causing Job to suffer depression, skin disorders and so on. In stage 3, Job, however, does not behave as a split-off bad object of God, unlike Satan. Instead, Job is more like a facilitating deintegrate of God. He does not rival God's omnipotence, reject it or defeat it. On the other hand, he is not defeated by it. He is reality-based and able to say to God he (Job) is not omnipotent. God experiences this as moral superiority. In stage 4, God reaches the depressive position, in which as Fordham says later in the review, God's individuation can occur. For this he needs the help of Sophia (self-reflection). It is possible also to see Jesus as another deintegrate of God. R.H.*

REVIEW OF ESTHER HARDING'S *THE PARENTAL IMAGE: ITS INJURY AND RECONSTRUCTION*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 11(1) (1966)

By 1965, when this review was written, Fordham had become critical of traditional Jungian procedure. He much appreciated Esther Hording saying honestly what she did and how she thought about it, for this allowed him to understand her kind of Jungian practice and in what way he disagreed with it. In particular in this review, he emphasizes the basic fallacies to which the use of myth may lead, both in theory and method. He also stresses the importance of analysing the negative transference which allows the patient to achieve a usable depressive position rather than being stranded with an unprofitable illusion of good mothering.

'Genetic psychology', which is mentioned twice in the review, was a term current at the time which would now be replaced by developmental psychology (cf. Fordham's 'The importance of analysing childhood for the assimilation of the shadow', 1965). R.H.

Much research has gone into studying the damage to and reconstruction of the parental images. The subject has engaged my attention over the last thirty years, and so I looked forward to reading Harding's book with special interest.

Her volume has a short introduction, in which it is stated that some knowledge of analytical psychology is required, but I believe that a glossary of terms would have made it easily understandable by most interested persons. There follows a chapter on 'The parental image as source of life', and then an account of the Babylonian creation myth, which fills two chapters and is most enjoyable. The narration is good and the extracts well chosen; the myth lends itself to understanding with minimal comment, and Harding's intellectual grasp of her subject comes over well.

After showing that there is a normal damage to the archetypal image inherent in the transformation processes underlying the growth of consciousness, we are introduced, in chapters 5 and 6, to the author's theory of its pathological variant. Her thesis here appears to follow the rather overworked concept of a 'generation of "mixed up" kids, brought up

without religion or recognized moral background, who consequently can hardly be expected to solve unaided the unresolved problems their parents bequeathed to them' (p. 155). She also mentions those unfortunate children who have 'never known mother love' at all (p. 10). Both these groups are not able to fit into society and become alienated from others. Some of them voluntarily subject themselves to a therapeutic analysis and can be taken as a sample of the large group which they consequently represent.

Since the personal parents are deemed less important than the non-personal archetypal images, Harding maintains that the therapy of individuals must logically consist in evoking dreams and fantasies which will heal the damage. This argument is illustrated by a case study in which the thesis is sustained. It describes the treatment of a woman in middle life who shows capacity to produce dreams and fantasies. They develop to good effect, the parental images are reconstructed, and a symbol of the self emerges. A second case ends with a gratifying communication from an ex-patient which shows that the 'dream series that started six years before with a promise was now fulfilled' (p. 234). We may reflect that nothing succeeds like success!

This book has much that is useful to recommend it; besides the mythology there are well-described and, with reservations which will be made below, well-understood case studies. Another commendable feature is that the text is relatively clear of footnotes and of the rather tiresome defensive qualifications with which much of the literature abounds. This makes critical assessment of it possible, though the rather loose structure of argument almost invites the critic to hang himself. Somewhat daringly, however, I propose to spend the rest of this review in stating why I consider that *The Parental Image* fails in its objectives.

First of all, the thesis is not stated with adequate care and the depreciatory references to the 'rational world of the ego' seem like an attempt to justify unnecessary lack of precision. To illustrate: sometimes the impression is given that Harding is describing the emergence of the near-normal, open hostility to parents common in our increasingly tolerant society. But she also includes, as we have seen, the children who receive 'no mother love'—we are told too little about them, and so we are left to assume that she refers to the institutionalized cases first described by Spitz. However, between these two extremes there are known to be a large number of different disorders which can be well understood by applying genetic concepts. Harding does not mention them, but she sketches the outlines of a theory of development in various places; if we summate these separated contributions the result is dated, and I have to add with regret, dreadfully inadequate to the theme. In particular, the argument makes no room for description of the early split between love and hate of the parental images which, when reinforced and stabilized by collective (social) pressures, gives rise to the really difficult core of the problem which Harding appears to be attacking.

Turning to the case studies for enlightenment as to what groups engage her special interest, we are told, with reference to a woman, that 'The dreamer's relation to her analyst had been quite ambivalent at first; sometimes it was positive, at others distrustful, suspicious and even hostile' (p. 187). Contrary to Harding's intentions, this statement proves conclusively that the parental images were not basically damaged, that they were not wholly negative, and that the patient was not alienated from others about whom she certainly had human (though infantile) feelings. All this implies that well-established

reparative trends must have been there long before the analysis started—they are clearly recorded in the dreams and fantasies—and that the damage occurred comparatively late in development. Indeed, we learn that the cause of the condition was the patient's 'own inner insecurity [an inner world had therefore developed] augmented by her unconscious sense of guilt resulting from the childish sex play' (p. 186). The content of the sex play is not stated, but the guilt, which according to the records was *conscious,* was felt when the child was four years old.

If these conclusions are correct the case is that of one of the less severely disturbed patients in the class of disorders which Harding is seeking to illustrate. But she would surely not have picked this example unless she considered it representative.

In my view the trouble arises because of insufficient understanding of what genetic psychology can contribute. This is a general feature of our discipline, and a comment upon it may not be out of place. Many analytical psychologists have ceased to follow the extensive researches into child psychology by students in various disciplines, and have omitted to notice the revolution that has occurred in our understanding of real children and of the infantile component in mature people. It is, perhaps, a consequence that much of their work reads as though they actively prevent patients from revealing urgent infantile needs to them, so giving rise to the suspicion that they side with repressive agents. In so doing they detract from the validity of their claim to lead patients to real wholeness and individuation.

References to Harding's account of her therapy are not reassuring in these respects. We are told that it resulted in a realization that 'involved her [the patient's] whole being' (p. 186), but according to my reading of the text the healing occurred through Harding's skilful care and frequently admonitory guidance through the maze of dreams and fantasies. Almost every one of them is ingeniously capped with a mythological analogy from a formidable intellectual storehouse. Apart from this, which makes it look as if the patient's ideas are being blocked by foregone conclusions, it taxes my credulity to believe that 'the whole being' of the patient consists of dreams and fantasies. In parenthesis it is necessary to add that there was a second analyst in the case. There is no mention of what he did, so maybe he dealt with the patient's personal life, her relation to reality, her early history, and the elucidation of any repressed affects that became unconscious in the course of her development.

By now it becomes increasingly clear as we read on that, whatever the male analyst did, Harding bypasses many of the problems of infancy in her cases. Two passages struck me as particularly revealing in showing how this happens. She says: 'When we realize that' the Babylonian creation 'myth expresses the ancient conception of the origin of life, it is not hard to understand the overwhelming power the human parents have for a child' (p. 31); and in another place: 'When the child frees himself from the paradise of the home sufficiently to support himself and marry, he becomes a man' (pp. 28–9).

Each passage applies the myth to the situations of childhood and adolescence, and so real people, infants, mothers, children and adolescents are not indicated. This method, which can be so illuminating in other contexts where it amplifies the collective matrix in which the fantasies of individuals are embedded, becomes, unfortunately, a positive obstruction when studying the psychology of infancy and childhood. In the quotation cited above, the use of myth easily leads to basic fallacies, for it is not the myth that

makes understandable the overwhelming power of the parents for the child; it is the simple realities of the infant's dependence on his parents for his continued existence. Further, the idea of home as a paradise is not the child's fantasy of it—quite the reverse: his parents and not himself live in paradise because in the child's fantasy they are freed from all the restrictions he suffers daily. Such confusions arise because it is not understood that the developing psyche of the infant only gradually gets embedded in the collective forms exhibited in myths. These he may be expected to use, as part of maturation, to express his own inner psychic life and to relate it to the adult world.

I suspect that Neumann—who is frequently cited by Harding—grasped what was required when he called for a Jungian genetic psychology, but his ideas, also arrived at by using myths, have not yet done much to redeem the situation.

The rather catchy phrase 'personal evocation of the archetype' gets used to set on one side the mass of data and theories originating early in the century on infantile fantasy, which develops as part of the infant's relation to his mother and father. The Uroboros-like systems which children develop are, further, most unlikely to be primary, and not only my own work but also a considerable number of independent studies in the United States and Great Britain have shown that the self is best conceived as the basic unity of the infant himself which becomes conscious during separation from his mother, especially at the toddler stage. Neumann had arrived near this concept, but his idea of the mother as carrier of the self, which has gained currency, seems a rather crude combination of a projection back into infancy of myths of the divine mother goddess (developed by adults) and the fact that a mother carries the baby in her womb and holds him in her arms.

Turning now to an apparently different theme: Harding provides quite a long appreciation of the value of transference, the ruling idea being that the positive transference can cure the patient. But this is feasible only in the class of patients which the case study illustrates. In those cases where a really 'deep' split in the images has occurred, the negative transference becomes all-important; if not elicited and worked through the patient is able to arrive only at the *illusion* of having had a mother who was good, and this must be reflected in all personal relationships. I could have wished that Harding had described work with the really hard core of the problem of her choosing. As it stands, the impression is given of an unbalanced reliance on love that leads to idealization of the self and overestimation of what religion can do.

In this review I have tried to shed some light on the difficult topics raised. I ended the volume with a disappointment tempered by memories of its core of useful descriptive work.

COMMENT ON LEOPOLD STEIN'S 'IN PURSUIT OF FIRST PRINCIPLES'

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 11(1) (1966)

Stein (1895–1969) and his wife Mary Williams were important early members of the Society of Analytical Psychology, and through their teaching and analyses influenced many analysts. He began his paper with definitions of a priori and a posteriori. Fordham

takes him to task, preferring instead 'useful propositions', which are more responsive to the growth of understanding. The review contains one of the most succinct explanations of the nature of deintegration and disintegration. R.H.

Stein's invigorating paper revived memories of my university days when I toyed with philosophy—Plato, Thomas Aquinas, Berkeley, Broad, Russell, Wittgenstein. The philosophers are different, Spinoza, Aristotle and Spencer, but the game is the same. Stein contends that we must all play it because it is necessary for analytical psychology; I play it less and less. Yet I agree well enough with what he says about empiricism, and it is only when he uses the terms 'a priori' and 'a posteriori', that I begin to kick. These terms easily become more confusing than useful because of the numerous associations that cling to them. That we have bright ideas which lead to useful conclusions seems to me a preferable statement. To say that some of the bright ideas are axioms is an elegant way of saying that they seem self-evident and so do not need testing for the time being; the primary self is such an idea.

There is nothing absolute about these useful propositions, and those of Euclid prove that when criticized new developments result. But 'axiom' can easily be used to suggest an immutable system, and if Jung's statement that the archetypes are 'universally valid and true and will in all eternity be true' is taken as any more than a metaphor I should think he had forsaken psychology and branched off into theology.

Stein has done us a service by discussing the idea of self-limiting structures. Archetypes are clearly conceived to be such, though, when so thought of, the idea of their mutual contamination is usually added because their boundaries cannot always be defined with clarity.

I felt sorry to hear of the 'archetype of negation', because it is slipped in suddenly without notice. There is a tendency for the archetypes to proliferate without adequate justification, and I think Stein's proposition fallacious. In 'our terminology' Mephistopheles is a representation of the shadow—there is no archetype of negation; rather is negation an attribute of the shadow.

Stein has also done us a service in stating so clearly that the data of treatment are 'prejudiced' and that there is no such thing as the 'unprejudiced' observation of facts in our or any other scientific procedure. The tendency amongst us to conceive that the concept of the objective psyche is made up of such observations or that dreams or fantasies (active imagination) give us an 'unprejudiced' picture of ourselves or even of the unconscious background seems to me plainly fallacious.

Stein has taken up the theory of deintegration and disintegration in a manner which makes sense. He has discussed it mainly in relation to anthropology, and I am grateful to him for doing so because I have not so applied it.

He has done justice to the theory that deintegration and disintegration are essentially different. Deintegration is part of a dynamic process that leads to organized states in infancy. The complete cycle of deintegration and integration operates in phases which lead to the establishment of increasingly elaborate structures, brought about partly by the release of archetypal patterns and partly by their integration through organization on two planes: that of the self and that of the ego. In infancy and childhood disintegration may occur and lead to secondary autism, infantile schizophrenia or the organic disintegrations.

I want once again to emphasize that very soon after birth it can be shown that infants

operate on the basis of elaborate and increasingly organized structures. By two years of age a child is a basically viable individual though needing external control and educative help before adapting these structures to the requirements of social living outside the family in nursery schools, elementary, and secondary or public (in the English sense) schools.

It is enlightening to distinguish deintegration as an ongoing process forming interacting structures, and disintegration as a process which dis-rupts already-formed structures, but especially interesting is the notion that primitive is not identical with simple, and this also applies to infants and children who, structurally speaking, are complex.

Finally, I should like to consider briefly the theory of the splitting of the mother imago into two objects. Stein inquires: 'What evidence is there that the infant has primarily ambivalent objects? Is there not better evidence to suggest that he has two objects, a good one and a bad one?'

I doubt whether anybody familiar with infant psychology supposes that there are primarily ambivalent objects which split into two. However, since primary ambivalence is a possible inference from the splitting hypothesis, we may look at this question more closely. It can be shown that in very early infancy (say about 3 months) there are two kinds of object, one good and satisfying, the other bad and frustrating. To analytical psychologists this is pleasing, because the evidence confirms the theory of opposites. But to state that there are good and bad objects does not tell us anything about their origin. Here our theory can help because the opposites are parts of the self and we can assume a primary unity or self, out of which two kinds of pre-patterned drive develop, libidinal and aggressive in character.

By postulating a primary unity that deintegrates into opposites the question, which Stein rightly highlights, can I believe, be solved. Ambivalent objects gradually come into existence only later as the infant begins to understand that the same object can be good *and* bad.

Now it is this development from self to ambivalent object which is frequently said to involve splitting without considering what, if anything, is split. Stein's criticism is valuable because splitting implies a destructive act for which there is, as he says, no evidence in the first place. Later on, however, there is reason to suppose that, in the face of overwhelming affects, the ego does truly split defensively, producing 'schizoid' and 'paranoid' defence systems.

REVIEW OF JOSEPH HENDERSON'S *THRESHOLDS OF INITIATION*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 13(2) (1968)

Joseph Henderson, Joseph Wheelwright and Michael Fordham became friends in London before the Second World War. They all knew Jung and shared a mutual interest in his work. Henderson and Wheelwright went on to found the C.G.Jung Institute of San Francisco. Fordham likes and admires Henderson, but he did not allow his friendship to obstruct a fairly severe criticism of the book under review.

W*hile accepting some of Henderson's observations, Fordham is unable to accept Henderson's idea of an archetype of initiation or of the self. He feels he expands the idea*

of an archetype too far but he could see initiation arising out of the interplay of archetypal experiences and cultural forms.

H*enderson was apparently hurt by the criticism, and there is a moving account of his reaction and his acceptance of the correctness of Fordham's position in the* Journal of Analytical Psychology, *31(3). Fordham for his part showed his appreciation in his review of* The Shaman from Elko *(1980), a collection of papers in honour of Henderson's seventy-fifth birthday, in which he mentions that Henderson's quiet authority and good judgement had done much for analytical psychology in the United States. R.H.*

Henderson has already introduced readers to his work on initiation in *The Wisdom of the Serpent,* which he published in collaboration with Maud Oakes. There he formulated his ideas under the headings of 'Initiation as a spiritual education' and 'Initiation as liberation'; here he gives a more complete account of his views.

In his early days, when in London, he was much influenced by Jane Harrison and his father-in-law, Professor Cornford, in Cambridge, and many of his parallels with Greek myth and ritual are derived from their publications—a major source of inspiration to him. This starting point has now been greatly enriched from many other sources.

Henderson's careful, scholarly approach is displayed to good effect in this wide-ranging volume, which bears the stamp of his authority and contains the support of long experience. He develops the provocative theory that there is an archetype of initiation and has assembled comparative material brought into relation with dreams from patients to expound its implications.

It seems unnecessary, in view of the weight of his material, to start off on a defensive note: 'After thirty years of testing this theory and using it in my analytic practice, I am sure of its validity; but I am well aware that in trying to convey this to others, I shall receive responses varying from bland, unquestioning acceptance to stubborn scepticism' (p. 3).

His certainty, let it be said, is serious because it derives from long and painstaking research, well and clearly organized in this book; but there are other interpretations of his data, having substantial backing. In particular, it is usual in evolutionary theory to point to man's capacity to accumulate and transmit experience as a prominent, if not the only, factor that has given him pre-eminence over his animal ancestry. This thesis can be combined well with the view that it is creative archetypal imagination which provides the dynamism for cultural development. But then initiation would be the result of interaction between the archetypes and the culture pattern and would not in itself be an archetype.

It may be because of the biological theory, not seriously discussed, that Henderson attempts to ward off critical assessment. All the same, if he wants to avoid the danger that his thesis will be treated as a dogma to be accepted outright or rejected with 'stubborn scepticism', discussion is inevitable and desirable.

Taking evolutionary theory as a basis, then, it could be that Henderson is expanding the term 'archetype' to cover typical patterns of behaviour as a whole having some relation to archetypal imagery, and so I shall consider this possibility first.

In an important but neglected 'Critical notice' on Volume 9, Part 1, of the *Collected Works* in the *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6(1), Hobson made a comprehensive review of the ways Jung used the term 'archetype' and made it clear that there is room for variation. He showed, however, that when using it in a scientific sense Jung is precise;

indeed, so much so that his formulation is difficult or impossible to apply. The need to lower our standards, however, ought not to lead to unlimited extension in meaning; indeed, if the term is to remain useful its essential content must be sufficiently preserved.

There are several indications, besides his concept of the archetype of initiation which I find questionable, that Henderson expands and varies his usage. For instance, he states that there is an 'archetype of the group' (p. 128) and a 'social archetype' (p. 113), and at the second International Congress for Analytical Psychology he tentatively introduced the idea that there was an 'archetype of culture'.

All these formulations expand the concept and with it archetypal experience. On the other hand, somewhat confusingly he refers to the archetype of the self. Here, though he could quote Jung to support him (cf. Fordham, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 8(1)) the usage goes far to reduce the usefulness of the term and also the meaningfulness of the self as the psychosomatic wholeness of ego and archetypes.

In his 'Foreword' Henderson gives a clear but rather open-ended sketch of the development of the concept in Jung's writings. There he lays stress on the importance of experience in understanding their nature. Relevant as this is, it applies to all analytic data that have been abstracted by Jung and others so as to form a theoretical model claiming to have scientific validity.

I found the introduction familiar but not very useful; it was later (p. 13) that Henderson went to the core of the matter, as I see it, albeit in a metaphorical statement. He refers to the 'undifferentiated materia of the archetypal world of prehistory' which reaches expression in 'the fresh and timeless phenomena of a ritual, dancing, drama or painting which serves the function of providing religious, aesthetic, social and philosophical experiences all at once'. But 'whether the cultural forms originally took a religious, or social or philosophical *direction seems to have depended upon the psychological differences among native types of men in response to the exigences of history, climate and geography'* [my italics].

I understand this to mean that the structures of differing societies derive from interactions, graphically postulated by Henderson, giving rise to initiation, a social and religious form designed to assist in transmuting the archetypal world into cultural life. The view that this process is general and results in types of behaviour that essentially follow a single significant pattern is in line with evolutionary theory but it does not make the pattern archetypal.

After the Foreword and an introductory chapter, 'The rediscovery of initiation', Henderson introduces the reader to 'The uninitiated'. The main feature of his discussion here turns on the subject of the *puer aeternus* and its female equivalent, archetypal figures presented in Jung's commentary on Radin's essay on the Trickster Cycle, also worked on by Layard, Metman, Plaut and von Franz. Clinically he relates the imagery to patients who show ingenuity in evading issues and this includes delinquent or near-criminal behaviour and so on. In this chapter Henderson briefly introduces the identity crises to which Erikson has drawn attention, relating them to the need for adolescent boys and girls to find their place in society. Lacking a socially established containing ritual, they seem at a loss as to where they belong and at the same time their individual identity feelings do not or have not developed.

Next follow typical patterns of initiation: 'The return to the mother', 'Remaking a

man', 'The trial of strength', 'The rite of vision'. Each has its place in the total pattern of initiation which, always social and religious, can lead on to individuation. A chapter 'Thresholds of initiation' treats the sequences of the total initiatory process as observed in comparative religious and *rites de passage:* it is shown that they have both an emergent sequence and a repetitive pattern. Henderson gives much space to linking the archetypal images in dreams with mythological material, on the basis that one is something like the other. Here his aim is to fill out a pattern indicated in the dream in the light of the theory of archetypes; for this purpose amplification rather than analysis can be held relevant.

It would require a separate essay to enter into the complex issues which the use of amplification raises in this context. Jung's criteria for identifying an archetype are very exacting—cf. Hobson, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6(2)—and the accumulation of parallels is one of them, but the strength or weakness and significance of the analogy are also important. Henderson's collection is impressive and shows beyond reasonable doubt the existence of archetypal images and processes. But, in order to work out the problem of the nature of patterns of initiation, how they arise, and then demonstrate the place of consciousness in them, it would have been necessary to investigate in parallel how different kinds of initiation relate to the customs of differing culture patterns starting from infancy onwards, as Erikson and others have done. In this way it is possible to show clearly how initiation fits into the conscious life of the society and the patterns of infant care and child-rearing as much as to the spontaneous activity of the archetypal forms as one element in the pattern of initiation.

The fact that Henderson says he aims to demonstrate an archetype of which he is already convinced must slant his whole investigation, and I could not therefore follow his idea that he was open-minded. The slant needs no justification, and that it will influence his choice of parallels is inevitable. Furthermore, it cannot fail to affect his choice of dream material and unconsciously the actual dreams of his patients. All this is quite in order so long as systematic elucidation of the transference situation has been used. Only then can the patient's material be rid largely, though not completely, of the introjective and identificatory consequences of incompletely analysed transference. It must be conceded that Henderson refers to the importance of transference and cites examples of how dreams refer to it, but the too frequent short, or even absent associations and the information that in at least one case there was a change of analyst make me doubt whether he has used modern techniques to elucidate it sufficiently.

The special chapter devoted to the psychology of ego development is justified, if I understand it correctly, because there is an 'archetype' (the self) lying behind ego development. Here he draws mainly on the work on identity in which Erikson has taken a prominent place, and he finds much support in his work for Erikson's findings. He includes my own contribution to the study of early ego development, combining it with those of Neumann and Edinger on the ego-self axis, applying the concepts to adolescence. As far as my ideas are concerned, he gives insufficient weight to the ego and, though he realizes the value of regression which runs alongside the ongoing movement in the unconscious towards establishing the social identity of the individual, his recognition does not go to the lengths of grasping that, without the regression, continuity of being cannot be ensured.

The section in which he applies the ideas developed to psychotherapy in adolescence

was especially interesting to me. Henderson contends that 'one cannot…rely upon the adolescent's ability to see a problem as a sickness', and further, 'Initially one cannot talk to a young person at all about transference and resistance, nor count on his acquiring the insights to be derived from such interaction' (p. 190). Positive procedures entail cradling or cherishing the patient and then criticizing him: the therapist 'must have the capacity to make his young patient feel cherished long enough and in such a way that he later can accept that very personal and painful type of criticism that will plunge him into his initiatory ordeal in a wholesomely unprovisional manner' (pp. 191 f.).

Next, the therapist must 'wish to convince him of his latent capacity to realise himself as a person and then, when true resistance or opposition to cradling appears, the therapist must be the one who in some way actively pushes the patient out of this state over the next threshold' (p. 192).

It is evident that Henderson, in spite of his desire to avoid it ('no rules can be made') is well on the way to constructing a technique of therapy adapted from the conclusions he might have drawn from his study, and we can look forward to more examples of how it works in detail. I see nothing to regret in his method because initiation necessarily involves rules and regulations within which the adolescent can transform himself and become formally a member of society. The point of not applying rules is, he says, to constellate the individuating process. But these can be given freer scope than he believes since other approaches find that the adolescent is not only ready to see when he is sick, but is also able to use interpretations of transference and resistance and is well able to end therapy without being pushed out.

In my view his conception of the needs of adolescent patients is rendered vulnerable by overlooking the degree of independence and individuation and so the degree of ego strength already achieved in infancy and early childhood. I was grateful for his reference to my work on individuation here, and can understand that its full implications cannot be grasped from a preliminary report on which he is dependent. But the importance of separation from the parents, though relevant, is in my view also overestimated. Optimally, the relation to the parents gains in reality and durability at this time and is denuded of the unreal and no longer relevant components of the parent-*infant* relation. It is these, developed by initiation, that become a basis for social identity formation, and Henderson's material frequently gives indications of what is taking place.

The book ends with a chapter on 'The process of individuation', on which much could be said but space will not allow, and an interesting chapter, 'The bear as an archetypal image'.

To return to the ego and its social equivalent the culture pattern. It appears to me that Henderson goes far to undermine his thesis when he lays stress on the part of the ego in relation to the self. It is surely, as his statement on page 13 implies, the interaction between the ego and the deintegrates of the self (the unconscious 'timeless' archetypes) in relation to the environment, in which tradition must be included, which leads to the structured cultural forms of which initiation is one. To call these processes archetypal is to my mind not only a question of the use to which a term is put, but also to depreciate the cultural achievement of mankind. Reference to the question of transmitted tradition, the migration of knowledge, can be found, but he underestimates it and so ends up by giving a one-sided picture, just as he gives a biased picture of therapy.

In his last paragraph, he questions: 'Why need there be an initiation at all?' and starts his next sentence with 'Perhaps', and so he takes the essential step from 'certainty' to recognizing that his book defines further and so raises crucial issues relevant to the structure of society and of the individual in relation to it. He convincingly shows that the archetypal forms contribute to the initiation process, but I could not convince myself that he has shown more.

REVIEW OF C.A.MEIER'S *ANCIENT INCUBATION AND MODERN PSYCHOTHERAPY*

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 15(2) (1970)

Fordham liked Meier. When he went to Zurich with Frieda Fordham, Meier and his wife would take them to restaurants that the Meiers had discovered in the mountains. One of these inns had chickens running in and out of it.

M*eier was closely identified with Jung. (Apparently his diction was similar and he smoked his pipe the same way.) A more serious side of this identification meant that* Ancient Incubation and Modern Psychotherapy *contained a statement of the Zurich position in the 1940s and is therefore important.*

A*fter admiring Meier's fascinating explorations of historic origins of analytic work, it is perhaps unsurprising that Fordham's main criticism is of the neglect of an aspect of transference analysis. Thus, although Meier shows how the Greeks dealt with pathogenic archetypal forms, an avoidance of the transference psychosis in his clinical examples results in his resorting to final (theological) causes. R.H.*

Many years ago Meier read a paper on the Greek therapeutic cults to the small group of analysts then starting the Society of Analytical Psychology in London. We listened fascinated to his vivid account of the rituals enacted at Epidaurus and Pergamon. Each reflected a process with which Jung had made us familiar: the inductions of regression (catabasis) leading to the emergence of a vision or dream which was held to be healing in itself because it represented a dialectic with the god. The whole process relied on experience rather than interpretations, and resulted in rebirth or 'putting on the new man' which could be understood as further self-realization and a step towards individuation.

The translation of this book, originally published in Switzerland in 1949, provides a developed version of what he then said. Meier gives a kind of natural history of Asclepius showing how he follows the nature of heroes: his divine origins, miraculous birth, his hubris, death at the hand of Zeus and eventual instatement amongst the Olympians: chthonic in origin, he retains prophetic and mantic characteristics, and can only be met in his cultic centres situated in groves and at springs; he is the sun (and moon) god; exhibiting opposites in himself, he is evidently a symbol of the self.

Together with Serapis, he was the god who survived longest into Christian civilization—until indeed Christian saints could outdo him in miraculous cures free of charge! Though supplanted, the essentials of his religious healing continued on into Christianity and survive today at Lourdes and, in Meier's view, in psychotherapy as well.

There is much that is illuminating in this volume but the spell that Meier cast years ago seems to have gone. It may be because the book is so loaded with scholarly matter and

excerpts of patient's dreams or fantasies. But it is, I believe, mainly that its contents are no longer surprising and can be taken for granted. Whichever the cause, the change makes critical estimation very much easier.

There is an interesting chapter on 'The divine sickness', which has two aspects: (1) the illness cured by the god was also sent by him; (2) the healer is himself sick—usually wounded or killed (cf. Asclepius himself). The oracle had to be kept ritually clean and so 'If…patients were on the point of death or if they were women near to childbirth, they were ordered to remain outside the sanctuary' (p. 53). There seem to have been other tests of suitability, in that every man who entered the temple should have 'none but holy thoughts in his mind' (p. 54) and again the *abaton* means 'place not to be entered unbidden', which suggests that a dream or other oracle had to be consulted first. It looks, therefore, since 'therapeutic optimism was unbounded and was never disappointed' (p. 53), as if only patients on the way to recovery were admitted. Yet, on the other hand, sick people were welcomed 'especially if medical skill had proved unavailing or held out no hope' (ibid.), and in view of the limited therapeutic means at the disposal of Hippocratic medicine, the number and variety of diseases treated must have been considerable. Having fulfilled what may have been rather stringent conditions the patient lay on a couch and waited for the 'right dreams'.

The oracle of Trophonius was more dramatic in that the initiant was made to forget, by drinking the waters of Lethe and Mnemosyne, 'everything that had been on his mind until then'; at the same time he 'received the power to remember what he was about to see when he made his descent' (catabasis). He next climbed down a ladder and had 'to creep feet foremost into a hole…he was then sucked right in as if by a mighty whirlpool' (p. 100), after which 'he heard or saw the oracle' (p. 101). Eventually he was pulled out feet foremost and gradually recovered. A graphic account by Timarchus gives a good idea of the experience.

It is clear that these rites were mixed up with the mystery cults and especially those of Eleusis, and that the god was consulted frequently. For instance, we are told that Aristides, who 'was quite as much a "confirmed neurotic" as a famous rhetorician…spent fourteen years of his life, all told, in various Asclepieia, principally the one at Pergamon…and even his choice of the profession of rhetorician was the work of Asclepius. He regarded his numerous illnesses as providential because they enabled him to make further progress in his intercourse with the god' (p. 63). Thus the incubant came to 'know god' and was reborn.

A final 'Epilogue' on the psychology of cure covers the author's devel-opment of Jung's belief that to cure neuroses in the second half of life a religious solution is required. This proposition is generalized and explained by the theory of final causes.

Meier is very much against his conclusions being applied rigorously, and proclaims himself absolutely against using it as 'a panacea'. Indeed, the patient must discover all for himself 'and the analyst may do no more than cautiously accompany the patient or, at most, guide him' (p. 126).

Having said this, he paradoxically continues: 'In a successful cure the system *must* [italics mine] have undergone a transformation of meaning during the process of the illness and the treatment; that is the religious element was not an original component of the illness but a product of it, and eventually of the treatment as well.'

I have said enough to indicate that Meier goes somewhat further than Jung or rather, perhaps, makes explicit what Jung implied, but resisted. Especially the possibility that if final causes are inevitable in understanding the meaning of mental disorders, then we arrive at ‘the divine’. Meier is somewhat obscure here, but he says, ‘the secret remains a secret; for where does man stand in relation to the problem of meaning?’ (p. 134), and when he ends, ‘If the facts that have been described are taken seriously, every physician must also be a metaphysician.’ But is the question about meaning so difficult? I for one cannot see the point, neither does the question necessarily lead to metaphysics. It almost seems as if Meier despairs of finding a solution and prefers to rely on the sense of mystery as an essential component of a cure. Yet the experience of incubation leads to definite knowledge—an experience of wholeness.

My first interest in this book was the author’s account of research into incubation rites, applying his knowledge of the unconscious to them. As such it gives a historical perspective to analytic work and adds to the knowledge which Jung found essential. It shows how the Greeks dealt with the archetypal forms when they produced disease and how a ‘cure’ took place. Looked at thus, the study is a one-way traffic—that is, from psychology to the history of religion; this is, in itself, sufficient justification for the book. But it gradually seemed to me, as I thought and read further, that Meier’s study had led him in the direction of religion proper—namely, not just the psychology of religion but into the metaphysics of religion itself.

I shall, I think, be open to reproach in criticizing this book, since Meier may no longer hold the views that he did when it was published in 1949—twenty years ago. But I cannot end without making some remarks which I must add have already been partly answered by Meier in his paper on the transference published in the *Journal of Analytical Psychology* (1959), 4(1).

A merit of Jung was to discover ways and means of managing the ‘psychotic’ parts of the personality by providing a method for experiencing non-ego, split-off or unintegrated parts of the self. He also showed that by experiencing them through dreams, visions and starting a dialectic between ego and non-ego, individuation took place. In laying emphasis on experience rather than interpretation, his method was like the Greek incubation rites but not identical with them.

Like Jung, Meier reiterates that his study is a circumambulation and amplification, hence the numerous paradoxes which abound. Nevertheless, the tendency to embark on religion proper and metaphysics seems to me the result of avoiding the transference psychosis. No doubt Meier will retort that I am an empirically minded physician who is ‘antimetaphysical’ (p. 134). It is true that I am not much impressed with ‘absolute knowledge’, and when it comes to analytical therapy I find too often that it becomes either a way of preventing further inquiry or of embarking on profitless intellectual speculation—that is, speculation directed away from the matter in hand.

Considering the book from this angle it becomes apparent that the firm data about the cultic practices are thin and there is only one good account of what takes place and that is given by the patient himself. Is this enough? I think not—any experience also requires assessment by one outside it. In religious healing it would have been the priests, but their records seem to have been brief in the extreme. Meier’s clinical examples have similar characteristics—what patients record, it seems, is enough in itself: yet how unreliable

they can be he must know very well. If, however, the process is referred to the transference, then two people are involved in it all. The involvement is asymmetrical, in that the analyst keeps his own identity and boundaries where the patient cannot. In consequence, the transference relation gives a different dimension to the investigation and makes direct observation possible. That it ensures the integration of the experience is a collateral but none the less important consideration.

This is no place to enter into discussion of the two methods of analysis and therapy, but it is surprising that Meier makes no mention of the view that cure takes place by personal interaction though Jung himself gave it considerable emphasis.

‘ACTIVE IMAGINATION AND IMAGINATIVE ACTIVITY’

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 1(2) (1956)

‘Active imagination’ is a term used by Jung to describe the procedure whereby the images of the archetypes can be formed by bringing the ego into relation with the ‘inner world’ of archetypes. He calls it (1947:412) ‘the task of elaborating or developing’ fantasy by giving ‘free rein’ to it.

The concept of *Auseinandersetzung* is allied to this conception, for the ego is conceived as meeting the ‘unconscious’ and as a result an inner drama is developed. Active imagination, says Kirsch (1955:324), is ‘a sequence of images actively produced or incubated by the ego’. This idea is evident in the work which has clearly been put into the pictures published by numerous analytical psychologists; they could never be mistaken for the spontaneous fantasy products.

The term ‘active imagination’ has, however, always tended to have a wider application: indeed, in his paper Kirsch uses it to cover the production of a story in which the ego is not meeting the images nor interacting consciously with them. He recognizes that this is not (p. 324) ‘active imagination in the strictest sense of the word’, but is not deterred from using it. He claims (p. 324) that ‘an *“Auseinandersetzung”* takes place within this intense concentration on the inner process. This concentration is characterized by a keen perception of the images as well as the thoughts which arise in her [the patient], accompanied by a warm affectionate participation of the conscious ego.’

Yet if the term is used too loosely it only leads to confusion. This occurs, for instance, if it be applied to the play and fantasy of a child, as Zueblin (1955) does in his recent paper, ‘Die aktive Imagination in der Kinder-Psychotherapie’.

In childhood the archetypal images are indeed active, and children play and dream in them, they ‘swim’ in them and, even if they seemingly ‘confront’ them, this is not a true *Auseinandersetzung.* They fear them, attack them, and enjoy their activity, so that it is easy to assume when watching children playing that this is the same process as Jung described.

Those who have practised active imagination in its classical sense will at once realize, however, that there is an essential difference. The play of children is altogether more plastic; its emphasis is upon the *imaginative activity* and little, if any, on the active induction of the imagination by the ego.

For these reasons it is better to say that children experience *imaginative activity,* whilst

only adults to whom individuation is an issue induce active imagination. By making this distinction the terminology is kept definite enough to avoid danger of it being thought that painting pictures or modelling objects *ipso facto* means a manifestation of the individuation process. Zueblin appears to make this assumption, which I have contested elsewhere (e.g. Fordham 1955,), when he says (1955:317): 'This story patently represents a process of individuation.' Painting pictures, fantasying and so on may just as well be imaginative activity as active imagination, the distinction depending upon the activity of the ego. In favourable circumstances imaginative activity leads to growth of the ego, active imagination to the consciousness of the self. Therefore each form of imagination leads to different conclusions and to different treatment of material.

LETTER ON 'EGO AND SELF: TERMINOLOGY'

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 28(4) (1983)

Commenting on a paper by Joseph Redfearn 'Ego and self: terminology' (Journal of Analytical Psychology, 28(2)), *Schwartz-Salant says that Redfearn, by attempting to separate ego and self, 'violates the mystery of their identity and difference'. It is to this that Fordham addresses himself in the following letter. R.H.*

May I comment on the discussion of Redfearn's paper, 'Ego and self: terminology' which appeared in this journal (*Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 28(2))?

If Schwartz-Salant wants to assert that there is a spirit of Jung that Redfearn violates, we can consider whether that is true and whether the violation is worthwhile or not. First of all, Jung claimed that analytical psychology is a science and Redfearn's procedure could not be called unscientific. Also, to separate ego from self is to follow Jung, who did just that when he wrote a separate definition of the self for the *Collected Works,* while earlier editions of *Psychological Types* did not contain one.

Jacoby's contribution is of a different and more reflective kind. I think that he is right to find that 'one can not see Kohut's self as simply analogous with the Jungian concept of the ego'. That was my impression when I took part in a symposium of the self in San Francisco when a Kohutian psychoanalyst was also speaking.

The importance of Schwartz-Salant's contribution is that he uses symbolic forms which express the self, whereas Redfearn seeks to define the self clearly. To do so he uses a comparative method which one could call horizontal. I cannot find that he is muddled.

I am struck by the neglect, in the discussion, of Jung's distinction between directed and undirected thinking (primary and secondary process or didactic and metaphorical-symbolic thinking in psychoanalysis). Definition belongs to the former and does not seek to express the self, but by setting boundaries to the meaning of words is essentially excluding. It contrasts with symbolic expressions which draw together disparate elements; that is, which are synthetic. Each 'system' has its best expression in society: one in science and logical thinking, the other in art and religion; each has its psychopathology in the obsessional disorders on the one hand and in the psychoses on the other. It is from the interaction of these two systems that quandaries can arise.

For my part I am quite glad if my definitions of the ego and self are not always

consistent—though I am not sure whether that is true about them—for it means that I am looking at data and varying the definition as occasion arises. None the less I try to be as consistent as possible. My paper on defences of the self, being descriptive, did not go into the definition of the self.

As a contribution to elucidating the relation between Jungian and psychoanalytic views of the self I wish to contribute a historical note. As far as I know the first psychoanalyst to introduce the self was Federn. He did not call what he was defining the 'self' but 'Ich Gefuhl' (often translated as 'self-feeling'), and he kept close to that class of experience. His emphasis on feeling experience has occupied psychoanalysts, but they show no recognition of the symbolically experienced inner world as a means of penetrating into and ultimately reaching the transcendent self. The inner world did not gain expression in Federn's work, nor did it appear in Hartmann's explorations of the ego, a psychology of the surface mental phenomena, nor, in spite of their revolutionary nature, in Kohut's writings: he belongs to the same vertex.

The psychoanalyst who uncovered the inner world and what Jungians should call manifestations of the self, was Melanie Klein. It is apparent that all she says implies the self but, though she uses the term from time to time, she does not make use of the concept. She illustrates the fact that if we keep too close to terminology then a lot and even the most important work may get overlooked.

A final remark. The self was not capitalized in the *Collected Works,* with Jung's agreement. My reasons for being glad of that may be of interest. First, the capital lays too much emphasis on undirected symbolical expressions owing to its association with religious forms, especially Eastern mysticism; secondly, it tends to aggrandize a set of experiences and foster their narcissistic elaborations; thirdly, it gives a false sense of knowing what is referred to; and finally, it appears to exclude those ordinary people whose sense of self is well established so that the self does not need discovering. But whatever way you look at it the self is a mystery—a mystical fact—even when the ego expresses it as completely as in individuation.

In conclusion, I believe that Redfearn's attempt at seeking clarity is valuable so long as it is kept in mind that the definition of terms cannot express the self. A solution to that quandary cannot be looked for either by clearer definition or by symbolic expression, but by waiting till a new formulation emerges. In my estimation we are looking for a new way of expressing the two kinds of mental functioning. We are often able to do that with our patients but not, as yet, in a reliable conceptual form. That, it seems to me, is what Redfearn demonstrates with admirable clarity.

LETTER IN REPLY TO JAMES HILLMAN

Source: Journal of Analytical Psychology, 22(2) (1977)

James Hillman's letter in the Journal of Analytic Psychology, 22(1), *quotes T.S.Eliot: 'There is a logic of the imagination as with a logic of concepts.' This short reply by Fordham is included for those interested in T.S.Eliot and the editing of the* Collected Works *In his biography of T.S.Eliot, Peter Ackroyd says Eliot never read Jung, but Fordham is*

surely right in suggesting a diffusion of Jung's ideas through Herbert Read to Eliot. R.H.

Dear Sir

Hillman's letter in the last issue of the *Journal* raises a number of reflections which may be of interest.

In 1911 Jung wrote chapter 2 in *The Psychology of the Unconscious.* There he differentiated directed from undirected thinking. Much of his later work was, as Hillman correctly implies, an investigation of the latter and pervades his writing. Now Hillman has discovered a number of 'Imagist' writers who know about it too—somewhat belatedly it seems. Amongst them is T.S.Eliot, who writes lucidly on the matter. I would only like to add this: it may be of interest that Eliot was a close friend of Herbert Read. Did Eliot derive his formulations from what he heard about Jung in private discussion? That is a matter which we may hope that Hillman's interest will illuminate.

Then there is the subject of the footnote in *Psychology and Alchemy.* It will be recollected that this was the first volume of the *Collected Works* to be published in English, and so it was in this issue that editorial policy was being defined. One of the considerations was Jung's view about the text and his attitude to possible editorial revisions. I brought forward the footnote to test Jung's position, for I knew he was concerned about the editors altering the Swiss edition. There was, besides the official editors, a powerful team in New York reputed to be longing to lay their hands on the *Collected Works.* Read in particular had no love for American methods of editing, and I recollect him once wryly remarking that one of his carefully constructed metaphors had been 'corrected'. Jung's refusal to have anything altered, except at his instigation, was well tested on this and on other occasions, and he understood my approaches in this light. His position was wise and his firmness contributed to the edition's becoming definitive. Only in a very few instances (the article on synchronicity, for instance) were any alterations made, though there were occasional energetic efforts on the part of R.F.C.Hull to tidy matters up. This he attempted especially in 'The type problem and poetry' (chapter 5 of *Psychological Types*), and it fell to me to convince him that his more logical arrangement detracted from the cogency of Jung's which followed the logic of images.

I would like to conclude with a disclaimer: it is not my intention to suggest that the team at the Bollingen Foundation (amongst whom was William McGuire whose careful, discriminating work was to become of inestimable value) were 'American' editors!

A bibliography of the writings of Michael Fordham

1932 ‘Lumbar puncture and the subarachnoid haemorrhage’, *St Bartholomew’s Hospital Journal* (Dec.).

1937 ‘The psychological approach to functional disorders of childhood’, *St Bartholomew’s Hospital Journal,* XLIV (5).

‘What parent and teacher expect of the child guidance clinic’, *The New Era,* 18(8).

‘Are parents or children to blame?’ *The Psychologist* (Aug.).

‘How children learn to grow up’, *The Psychologist* (Sept.).

‘Psychological types in children’, *The Psychologist* (Oct.).

1938 ‘Children and fairy stories’, *The Psychologist* (Jan.).

1939 *The Analysis of Children,* Guild Lecture No. 4, London: Guild of Pastoral Psychology.

1942 ‘Jung’s psychology’, Letter to the *British Medical Journal,* 29 Aug.

‘The meaning of children’s pictures’, *Apropos.*

1943 ‘Psychiatry of children’, Letter to the Medical Officer. Contribution to the *Proceedings of the Child Guidance Interclinic Conference* (Oct.), published by the Provisional National Council for Mental Health.

1944 *The Life of Childhood: a Contribution to Analytical Psychology,* Foreword by H. G.Baynes, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co (revised as *Children as Individuals,* 1969).

1945 ‘The analytical approach to mysticism’, *Revue Suisse de Psychologie et de Psychologie appliquée,* 4(3–4).

‘Discoverer of the complex’, *The Leader.*

‘Professor C.G.Jung’ (written in honour of his seventieth birthday), *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 20(3) (revised and expanded as ‘The development and status of Jung’s researches’ in *The Objective Psyche,* 1958).

1946 ‘Psychology in the child’s education’. Letters to the *British Medical Journal,* 13 and 27(July).

‘A comparative study between the effects of analysis and electrical convulsive therapy in a case of schizophrenia’, *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 20(412).

‘Analytical psychology applied to children’, *The Nervous Child,* 5(2) (revised and expanded as ‘Child analysis’ in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* 1957).

1947 ‘Integration, disintegration and early ego development’, *The Nervous Child,* 6(3) (incorporated into ‘Some observations on the self and ego in childhood’, in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* 1957).

‘Physical therapy of mental disorders’, *British Medical Journal,* 2(72).

Analytical Psychology and Religious Experience, Guild Lecture No. 46, London Guild of Pastoral Psychology (revised as ‘Analytical psychology and religious experience’, in *The Objective Psyche,* 1958).

‘Psychological methods of treament’, *The Medical Press,* 217:5634.

‘The modern treatment of behaviour disorders in childhood’, *The Medical Press,* 218:5669.

1948 *Vom Seelenleben des Kindes,* trans. by H.Basch-Leichts of *The Life of Childhood,* Zurich: Rascher.

'C.G.Jung', Observer Profiles, London: *Observer* Newspaper.

'The individual and collective psychology', *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 21 (2).

1949 'The contribution of analytical psychology to psychotherapy', Contribution to a symposium on mental health, *British Medical Bulletin,* 6(1–2) (revised as 'Analytical psychology and psychotherapy', in *The Objective Psyche,* 1958).

'On the reality of archetypes', Contribution to a 'Discussion on archetypes and internal objects', *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 22(1 and 2) (developed into 'Biological theory and the concept of the archetypes', in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* 1957).

1951 'The concept of the objective psyche', *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 14(4) (reprinted in *The Objective Psyche,* 1958).

'Some observations on the self in childhood', *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 24 (2) (material incorporated into the chapter of the same title in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* 1957).

Review of E.Ziman, *Jealousy in Children: a Guide for Parents, The Listener* (March), 29.

1952 'Psychotherapy in schizophrenia', *The Medical Press,* 228(26).

'Reflections on the control and discipline of children', Read to the Analytical Psychology Club of Los Angeles, on 16 May (Unpublished).

1953 'A child guidance approach to marriage', Contribution to 'Clinical studies in marriage and the family: a symposium on methods', *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 26(3 and 4).

Critical notice of Victor White, *God and the Unconscious,* and Père Bruno (ed.), *Conflict and Light, British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 26(3 and 4).

1954 Review of L.Jackson, *Aggression and its Interpretation, The New Era,* 35(8).

1955 'Editorial note', *Journal of Analytical Psychology.* 1(1).

'On Jung's contribution to social psychiatry', *International Journal of Social Psychiatry* 1(1).

'An appreciation of *Answer to Job', British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 28(4).

'The origins of the ego in childhood', in *Studien zur analytischen Psychologie C. G.Jungs,* vol. 1, Zurich: Rascher; trans. by Bader and Hastern as 'Uber die Entwicklung des Ichs in der Kindheit' in *Zeitschrift für Analytische Psychologie,* 2(4) (1971) (reprinted in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* 1957).

'A note on the significance of archetypes for the transference in childhood', *Acta Psychotherapeutica,* Supplementary vol. 3, Basel and New York.

'Reflections on the archetypes and synchronicity', *Harvest,* 2.

1956 'Active imagination and imaginative activity', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 1 (2).

Review of J.Goldbrunner, *Individuation: a Study of the Depth Psychology of C. G.Jung, Mental Health,* 25(3).

'The evolution of Jung's researches', *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 29(1) (read to the British Psychological Society on 26 Oct., Jung's 80th birthday, as part of a symposium on Jung's contribution to analytical thought and practice).

Obituary: Emma Jung, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 1(2).

1957 *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* Foreword by C.G.Jung, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

‘Reflections on image and symbol’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 2(1).

Critical notice of M.Klein, P.Heimann, R.Money-Kyrle (eds), *New Directions in Psycho-Analysis, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 2(2).

1958 *The Objective Psyche,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. Review of C.G.Jung. *The Transcendent Function, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 3(1).

Review of D.Richter (ed.), *Schizophrenia: Somatic Aspects, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 3(1).

‘Individuation and ego development’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 3(2).

Critical notice of M.Klein, *Envy and Gratitude, a Study of Unconscious Sources, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 3(2).

1959 Critical notice of C.G.Jung, *The Undiscovered Self, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 4(1).

‘Dynamic psychology and the care of patients’, *The Medical Press,* 242(26).

Review of E.Bertine, *Human Relationships. Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 4(2).

1960 ‘Counter-transference’, *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 33(1) (reprinted in *Technique in Jungian Analysis,* Library of Analytical Psychology, vol. 2, 1974).

‘A case for the razor’, *The Times Literary Supplement,* 12 Feb.

Review of J.Jacobi, *Complex, Archetype, and Symbol in the Psychology of C.G. Jung, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 5(1).

Review of L.Stein, *Loathsome Women, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 5(1).

Review of H.B. & A.C.English (eds), *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psycho-analytical terms, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 5(1).

‘The development of analytical psychology in Great Britain’, *Harvest,* 6.

‘Ego, self and mental health’, *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 33:249.

‘The emergence of a symbol in a five-year old child’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 5 (1).

‘The relevance of analytical theory to alchemy, mysticism and theology’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 5(2).

Critical notice of D.Cox, *Jung and St Paul, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 5(2).

1961 ‘Comment on the theory of the original self’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6 (1).

Obituary: Eva Metman, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6(1).

‘Psychotherapy and care of patients: out-patient psychotherapy’, Symposium report, Department of Psychological Medicine, University of Edinburgh.

Obituary: C.G.Jung, *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 34(3 and 4).

‘Symposium on training—editorial introduction’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6(2).

Review of J.M.Turner and Barbel Inhelder (eds), *Discussion on Child Development,* vol. 4, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6(2).

Review of W.M.Watt, *The Cure for Human Troubles, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6(2).

Review of M.Capes (ed.), *Communication or Conflict, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6(2).

‘Suggestions towards a theory of supervision’, in a ‘Symposium on training’, and a ‘Reply to Dr Edinger’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6(2).

Obituary: M.Rosenthall, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6(2).

‘Analytic observations on patients using hallucinogenic drugs’, *Proceedings of the Quarterly Meeting of the Royal Medico-Psychological Association.*

1962 *The Self in Jung’s Writings,* Guild Lecture No. 117, Guild of Pastoral Psychology.

An Evaluation of Jung’s Work, Guild Lecture No. 119, Guild of Pastoral Psychology.

‘The theory of archetypes as applied to child development with particular reference to the self’, in G.Adler (ed.), *The Archetype* (Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Analytical Psychology), Basel and New York: Karger.

Comment on James Hillman’s paper in ‘The Symposium on Training’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 7(1).

‘An interpretation of Jung’s thesis about synchronicity’, *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 35(3).

Review of K.R.Eissler, *Leonardo da Vinci, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 7(2).

Obituary: F.M.Greenbaum, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 7(2).

1963 ‘The empirical foundation and theories of the self in Jung’s works’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 8(1) (reprinted in *Analytical Psychology: a Modern Science,* The Library of Analytical Psychology, vol. 1, 1974).

Editorial for M.Fordham (ed.), *Contact with Jung,* London: Tavistock Publications.

‘Notes on the transference and its management in a schizoid child’, *Journal of Child Psychotherapy,* 1(1).

Review of A.des Lauriers, *The Experience of Reality in Childhood Schizophrenia, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 8(2).

Review of E.Lewis, *Children and their Religion, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 8(2).

‘Myths, archetypes and patterns of childhood’, *Harvest,* 9.

‘Psychology and the supernatural’, *New Society,* 75(5 March).

‘The relation of the ego to the self’, *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 37.

‘The ego and the self in analytic practice’, *Journal of Psychology,* 1(1), Lahore, India: Government House.

‘Notes on Mr O’Regan’s poem from the point of view of analytical psychology’, in ‘Visions: a symposium’, *Broadway,* 19:16 *(The Westminster Hospital Gazette).*

‘Well-motivated parents: the importance of the environment in the therapy of a schizophrenic child’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 9(2).

Review of J.L.Henderson and M.Oakes, *The Wisdom of the Serpent, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 9(2).

Review of D.H.Malan, *A Study of Brief Psychotherapy, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 9(2).

1965 ‘Editorial note’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 10(1).

‘The self in childhood’ (Sixth International Congress of Psychotherapy, 1964), *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatic Medicine,* 13(1965).

‘Contribution à une théorie de l’autisme infantile’, in *La Psychiatrie de l’Enfant,* Paris: PUF (revised for chapter 7 of *The Self and Autism,* 1976).

Review of E.Jacobsen, *The Self and the Object World, International Journal of Psycho-Analysis,* 46(4).

‘The importance of analysing childhood for assimilation of the shadow’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 10(1) (reprinted in *Analytical Psychology: a Modern Science,* The Library of Analytical Psychology, vol. 1, 1974).

Combined review of D.Rosenthal (ed.), *The Genain Quadruplets;* R.D.Laing and A.Esterson, *Sanity, Madness and the Family,* vol. 1; M.Rokeach, *Three Christs of Ypsilanti, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 10(2).

1966 ‘Notes on the psychotherapy of infantile autism’, *British Journal of Medical Psychology,* 39(4).

‘The social and psychological relevance of myths’, *Clare Market Review* (Lent term), London School of Economics.

‘A comment on “In pursuit of first principles” by L.Stein’, *Journal of Analytical*

Psychology, 11(1).
Review of E.M.Harding, *The Parental Image: its Injury and Reconstruction, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 11(1).
Review of J.Arlow and C.Brenner, *Psychoanalytic Concepts and the Structural Theory, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 11(1).
'Is God supernatural?', *Theology,* 69:555.
1967 'Editorial' (on experimental studies), *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 12(1).
'Active imagination—deintegration or disintegration?', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 12(1) (incorporated into chapter 14 of *Jungian Psychotherapy,* 1978).
Review of R.Litman (ed.), *Psychoanalysis in the Americas, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 12(2).
Review of W.Muensterberger and S.Axelrad (eds), *The Psychoanalytic Study of Society III, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 12(1).
Review of A.U.Vasavada, *Tripura-Rahasaya (Jnanakhanda)* (translated, and with a study of the process of individuation), *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 12(1).
Review of E.H.Erikson, *Insight and Responsibility, Theology,* 70:561.
Review of H.Kimball-Jones, *Towards a Christian Understanding of the Homosexual, Theology,* 70:570.
1968 *Psychiatry: its Definition and its Practice,* Guild Lecture No. 140, London Guild of Pastoral Psychology.
'Reflections on training analysis', in (ed.) J.B.Wheelwright, *The Analytic Process: Aims, Analysis, Training,* New York: Putnam Sons (reprinted in the *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 15(1)).
Review of D.Wyss, *Depth of Psychology: a Critical History, British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* (Feb.).
Review of D.Morris, *The Naked Ape,* and *Primate Ethology, British Journal of Psychiatry,* 114.
Review of D.Meltzer, *The Psychoanalytic Process,* and B.Wolstein, *Theory of Psychoanalytic Therapy, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 13(2).
Review of J.L.Henderson, *Thresholds of Initiation, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 13 (2).
Review of E.Bertine, *Jung's Contribution to our Time, The Guardian,* 6 Sept.
Obituary: Culver M.Barker, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 13(2).
'Individuation in childhood', in J.B.Wheelwright (ed.) *The Reality of the Psyche,* New York: Putnam Sons (revised for chapter 4 of *The Self and Autism,* 1976).
1969 *Children as Individuals,* London: Hodder & Stoughton (2nd, revised edn of *The Life of Childhood,* 1944).
'Theorie und Praxis der Kinderanalyse aus der Sicht der analytischen Psychologie C.G.Jung', in (ed.) G.Biermann, *Handbuch der Kinderpsychotherapie,* Munich & Basel: Reinhardt.
Obituary: Frances E.Smart, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 14(1).
'Technique and counter-transference', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 14(2).
Review of H.Racker, *Transference and Counter-transference, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 14(2).
Review of B.Bettelheim, *The Empty Fortress, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 14(2).
Review of P.Roazen, *Freud: Political and Social Thought, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 14(2).
1970 'Reflections on training analysis', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 15(1).
Review of I.Maybaum, *Creation and Guilt, Theology,* 73:599.

'Note sul transfert', *Rivista di psicologia analitica,* 1(1) (chapter 4 of *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* 1957, trans. by Aldo Carotenuto).

'Reply to Plaut's "Comment"', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 15(2).

Review of C.A.Meier, *Ancient Incubation and Modem Psychotherapy, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 15(2).

Review of J.Hillmann (ed.), *Timeless Documents of the Soul, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 15(2).

Review of J.M.Tanner and B.Inhelder (eds), *Discussions on Child Development, British Journal of Psychiatry,* 117.

1971 'Editorial notice', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 16(1).

Review of A.Freud, H.Hartmann *et al., The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child,* vol. XXIV, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 16(1).

'Primary self, primary narcissism and related concepts', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 16(2) (published in translation in the *Zeitschrift für Analytische Psychologie,* 3, 4, and revised for chapter 5 of *The Self and Autism,* 1976).

'Reply to comments' [on the above paper], *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 16(2).

'Religious experience in childhood', in H.Kirsch (ed.), *The Well-tended Tree: Essays into the Spirit of our Time,* New York: Putnam Sons (revised for chapter 3 of *The Self and Autism,* 1976).

1972 Review of E.James (ed.), *The Child in his Family, British Journal of Psychiatry,* 120.

'Il successo ed il falimento della psicoterapa visto attraverso la sua falsa conclusiva', *Revista di psicologia analitica,* 3(1).

Critical notice of M.M.Mahler, *On Human Symbiosis and the Vicissitudes of Individuation,* vol. 1, *Infantile Psychosis, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 17(2).

'Note on psychological types', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 17(2).

'Tribute to D.W.Winnicott', *Scientific Bulletin of the British Psycho-Analytical Society and Institute of Psycho-Analysis,* No. 57.

'The interrelation between patient and therapist', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 17 (2).

'A theory of maturation', in B.B.Woolman (ed.), *Handbook of Psychoanalysis,* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

1973 'Rifflessioni sull'analisi infantile', *Rivista di psicologia analitica,* 4(2) (delivered at the Rome Conference, 'Jung e la cultura Europea'; also in *Enciclopedia 1974,* Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana—both translations of the English original, 'Reflections on child analysis' (revised for chapter 8 of *The Self and Autism,* 1976)).

'Editorial preface' to C.G.Jung, *Synchronicity,* Bollingen Paperback edition.

'Maturation of the self in infancy', in *Analytical Psychology: a Modern Science,* The Library of Analytical Psychology, vol. 1(1974).

Review of P.Lomas, *True and False Experience, British Journal of Psychiatry,* 123.

1974 'Jung's conception of the transference', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 19(1).

'Family interviews in a child guidance setting', An abstract in the *Bulletin of the British Psychological Society,* 27.

'Jungian views of the body-mind relationship', Spring.

'Simbolismo nella prima e seconda infanzia', *Rivista de psicologia analitica,* 5(2).

Das Kind wie Individuum, Munich and Basel: Ernst (translation of *Children as Individuals,* 1969).

'Defences of the self', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 19(2).

Review of D.Meltzer, *Sexual States of Mind, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 19(2).

'On terminating analysis', in *Technique in Jungian Analysis,* The Library of Analytical Psychology, vol. 2. (first published in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* 1957).

'Ending phase as an indicator of the success or failure of psychotherapy', in *Success and Failure in Analysis,* Gerhard Adler (ed.), New York: Putnams for the C.G. Jung Foundation.

1975 Review of W.McGuire (ed.), *The Freud/Jung Letters: the Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C.G.Jung, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 20(1).

Letter to the Editor in reply to N.A.Trahms, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 20(1).

'On interpretation', *Zeitschrift für Analytische Psychologic,* 7 (revised for chapter 12 of *Jungian Psychotherapy,* 1978).

'Memories and thoughts about C.G.Jung', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 20(2).

Obituary: John Layard, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 20(2).

1976 *The Self and Autism,* Library of Analytical Psychology, vol. 3, London: Academic Press.

Obituary: R.F.C.Hull, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 21(1).

'Discussion of T.B.Kirsch's 'The practice of multiple analysis in analytical psychology', *Contemporary Psychoanalysis,* 12(2).

'Analytical Psychology', in Stephen Krauss (ed.), *Encyclopedic Handbook of Medical Psychology,* London: Butterworth.

1977 Review of M.S.Mahler, F.Pine, A.Bergman, *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 22(1).

Obituary: E.A.Bennett, *The Lancet,* 2 April.

'Maturation of a child within the family', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 22(2).

Letter to the Editor (on directed and undirected thinking, and the editing of the *Collected Works,* of C.G.Jung), *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 22(2).

Review of D.Meltzer *et al., Explorations in Autism—a Psychoanalytic Study, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 22(2).

'A possible root of active imagination', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 22(4) (incorporated in chapter 14 of *Jungian Psychotherapy,* 1978).

'Die analytische (komplex) psychologie in England', in *Die Psychologie des 20 Jahrhunderts,* Zurich: Kinder Verlag (English version in *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 24(4)).

1978 *Jungian Psychotherapy: a Study in Analytical Psychology,* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

'Some idiosyncratic behaviour of therapists', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 23(2) (incorporated as chapter 11 in *Jungian Psychotherapy,* 1978).

'A discursive review' of R.Langs, *The Therapeutic Interaction, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 23(2).

'Carl Gustav Jung', in *An Encyclopedic Dictionary,* Milan: Unedi.

'Comment on Clifford Scott's paper', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 23(4).

Review of D.W.Winnicott, *The Piggle, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 23(4).

'Principia della psicoterapia analitica infantile', *Revista di psicologia analitica,* 9.

1979 'The self as an imaginative construct', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 24(1).

'Analytical psychology in England', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 24(4).

'Analytical psychology and counter-transference', *Contemporary Psychoanalysis,* 15(4); also in L.Epstein and A.H.Feiner (eds), *Counter-transference: the Therapist's Contribution to Treatment,* New York: Jason Aronson.

1980 Letter to the Editor (replying to G.Adler), *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 25(2).

Critical notice of D.Meltzer, *The Kleinian Development, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 25(2).

Review of W.McGuire, V.Kirsch *et al.* (eds), *The Shaman from Elko* (Papers in honour of Joseph Henderson's 75th birthday), *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 25(2).

Review of J.Lacan, *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis, British Journal of Psychiatry,* 136.

'The emergence of child analysis', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 25(4).

'Principles of analytic psychotherapy in childhood', in I.F.Baker (ed.), *Methods of Treatment in Analytical Psychology.*

1981 'Actions of the self', ch. 16 in *The Book of the Self,* P.Young Eisendrath and J. Hall (eds), New York: New York University Press.

'Neumann and childhood', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 26(2).

'Reply to "Comment" by K.Newton', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 26(2).

Obituary: Jess C.Guthrie, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 26(2).

1982 Contribution to a symposium, 'How do I assess progress in supervision?', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 27(2).

Review of J.B.Pontalis, *Frontiers in Psychoanalysis—Between the Dream and Psychic Pain, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 27(2).

Obituary: Bernice Rothwell, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 27(2).

Obituary: John D.Barrett, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 27(2).

1983 'Letter to the Editor' (on ego-self terminology), *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 28(4).

1984 Review of J.Klauber, *Difficulties in the Analytic Encounter, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 29(1).

Review of D.Meltzer, *Dream-life, a Re-examination of Psychoanalytic Theory and Technique, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 29(4).

1985 'Explorations into the self', *Chiron,* 1(1).

1986 *Explorations into the Self,* The Library of Analytical Psychology, vol. 7, London: Academic Press.

1987 Obituary: Kenneth Lambert, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 32(2).

1988 'The androgyne: some inconclusive reflections on sexual perversions', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 33(3).

'Principles of child analysis', chapter 2 in *Jungian Child Psychotherapy,* London: Karnac Books.

'Acting out', chapter 7 in *Jungian Child Psychotherapy,* London: Karnac Books.

'How I do analysis', chapter in book of same name, J.M.Spiegelman (ed.), Phoenix, Az: Falcon Press.

'In discussion with Karl Figlio', *Free Association,* 12(1988), London: Free Association Books.

1989 'The infant's reach', *Psychological Perspectives,* 21.

Review: *The Apprehension of Beauty,* D.Meltzer, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 34 (3).

'Some historical reflections', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 34(3).

Review: C.Socarides, *'The Pre-Oedipal Origin and Psychoanalytic Therapy of Sexual Perversions,* Madison, WI: International Universities Press; *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 34(2).

1990 'Riflezzioni sull maturazione nell'eta del lattante e nella prima infanzia', Analysis: *Rivista Internazionale di Psicoterapia Clinica,* 1(2).

Rejoinder to N.Schwartz-Salant on 'Vision, interpretation, and the interactive field',

Journal of Analytical Psychology, 36(3).
1991 ‘The supposed limits of interpretation’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 36(2).
1992 ‘Reflectioni personali sul osservazione infantile’, in ‘Osservare il bambino’, *Revista di psicologia analitica,* 45.
1993 ‘Notes for the formation of a model of infant development’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 38(1).
‘On not knowing beforehand’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 38(2).
‘Donald Meltzer, *The Claustrum: an investigation of claustrophobic phenomena,* Perthshire, Clunie Press, 1992’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 38(4).
The Making of an Analyst: a Memoir, London: Free Association Books.

Bibliography

Ackroyd, Peter (1984) *T.S.Eliot,* London: Hamish Hamilton.

Adler, G. (1961) 'Obituary notice to Eric Neumann', *Journal of Analytical Psychologie,* 6(1).

Aigrisse, G. (1962) 'Character re-education and professional readaptation in a man aged forty-five', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 7(2).

Baynes, H.G. (1923) 'Translators' preface' to *Psychological Types,* London: Routledge.

——(1950) 'Freud versus Jung', in *Analytical Psychology and the English Mind,* London: Routledge.

Bettelheim, B. (1967) *The Empty Fortress,* New York: Free Press; London: Collier-Macmillan.

Bick, E. (1946) 'Notes on infant observation in psychoanalytic training', *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis,* 45(4).

Bion, W. (1962) *Learning from Experience,* London: Heinemann.

——(1965) *Transformations,* London: Heinemann.

Bower, T.G.R. (1976) *Development in Infancy,* San Francisco: Freeman.

——(1977) *The Perceptual World of the Child,* London: Fontana.

Breuer, J. and Freud, S. (1893–95) *Studies on Hysteria,* in the *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (SE), London: Hogarth Press; SE2.

Bühler, C. (1930) *The First Year of Life,* New York: Day.

Eder, M.D. (1918) 'Translator's preface' to *Studies in Word Association;* reprinted by Routledge, 1969.

Erikson, E.H. (1963) *Childhood and Society,* New York: Norton.

Escalona, S.K. (1968) *The Roots of Individuality,* London: Tavistock.

Fairbairn, W.R.D. (1952) *Psychoanalytic Studies of the Personality,* London: Tavistock.

Fordham, F. (1964) 'The care of regressed patients and the child archetype', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 6(1).

Fordham, M. (1944) *The Life of Childhood,* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

——(1947) 'Integration, disintegration and early ego development', *The Nervous Child,* 6(3).

——(1955) 'Note on the significance of archetypes for the transference in childhood', in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

——(1955a) 'On the origins of the ego in childhood', *Studien zur analytischen Psychologie C.J.Jungs,* vol. 1, Zurich: Rascher.

——(1957) 'Origins of the ego in childhood', in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

——(1957a) 'Biological theory and the concept of archetypes', in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

——(1957b) 'Notes on the transference', in *Technique in Jungian Analysis* (1974), London: Heinemann.

——(1957c) 'Some observations on the self and ego in childhood', in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* London: Routledge.

——(1957d) 'Child analysis', in *New Developments in Analytical Psychology,* London:

Routledge.
——(1957e) ‘Reflections on image and symbol’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 2(1).
——(1958) ‘Abandonment in infancy’, in *Chiron: a Review of Jungian Analysis.*
——(1958a) ‘A suggested centre for analytical psychology’, in *The Objective Psyche,* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
——(1960) ‘Counter-transference’, in *Technique in Jungian Analysis,* London: Heinemann.
——(1965) ‘The importance of analysing childhood for the assimilation of the shadow’, in *Analytical Psychology: a Modern Science,* London: Heinemann.
——(1969) *Children as Individuals,* 2nd edn of *The Life of Childhood,* London: Hodder & Stoughton.
——(1969a) ‘Technique and counter-transference’, in *Technique in Jungian Analysis,* London: Heinemann.
——(1971) ‘Primary self, primary narcissism and related concepts’, in *The Self and Autism,* London: Academic Press.
——(1974) ‘Jung’s concept of the transference’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 2(1).
——(1976) ‘The theory of the archetypes and the self’, in *The Self and Autism,* London: Heinemann.
——(1976a) ‘Child analytic psychotherapy’, in *The Self and Autism,* London: Heinemann.
——(1976b) *The Self and Autism,* London: Heinemann.
——(1977) Review of M.S.Mahler, F.Pine, A.Bergman, *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant, Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 22(1).
——(1978) *Jungian Psychotherapy,* London: Karnac.
——(1979) ‘The self as an imaginative construct’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 24 (3).
——(1979a) ‘Analytical psychology and counter-transference’, in *Contemporary Psychoanalysis,* 15(4).
——(1980) ‘The emergence of child analysis’, *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 25(4).
——(1987) ‘Actions of the Self’, in *The Book of the Self,* P.Young-Eisendrath and J.A.Hall (eds), New York: New York University Press.
——(1992) *Children as Individuals,* London: Free Association Books.
Freud, S. (1900) *The Interpretation of Dreams,* SE 4 and 5.
——(1905) [1901] ‘Fragment of an analysis of a case of hysteria’, SE 7.
——(1905/24) *Three Essays on Sexuality,* SE 7.
——(1909) ‘Notes on the case of an obsessional neurosis’, SE 10.
——(1909a) ‘Analysis of a phobia in a five year old boy’, SE 10.
——(1910) ‘Leonardo da Vinci and a memory of his childhood,’ SE 11.
——(1911) ‘Psycho-analytic notes on an autobiographic account of a case of paranoia’, SE 12.
——(1911a) ‘Formulations on two principles of mental functioning’, SE 12.
——(1914) ‘On narcissism: an introduction’, SE 14.
——(1917) [1915] ‘Mourning and melancholia’, SE 14.
——(1918) [1914] ‘From the history of an infantile neurosis’, SE 17.
——(1919) ‘A Child is being beaten’, SE 17.
——(1920) ‘Beyond the pleasure principle’, SE 18.
——(1921) *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego,* Leipzig: Internationaler Psycho-analytische Verlag: SE 18.
——(1923) ‘The ego and the id’, SE 19.

Gardiner, M. (ed.) (1972) *The Wolf Man and Sigmund Freud,* London: Hogarth.
Geigerich, W.(1975) 'Ontology-phylogeny', *Spring,* New York: Spring Publishers.
Gesell, A. (n.d.) *The First Five Years of Life,* London: Methuen.
Gesell, A. and Frances, L. (1943), *Infant and Child in the Culture of Today,* New York: Harper.
Glover, E. (1968) *The Birth of the Ego,* London: Allen and Unwin.
Harding, E.M. (1965) (Foreword by Franz Riklin) *The Parental Image: its Injury and Reconstruction,* New York: Putnam for the C.G.Jung Foundation of Analytical Psychology .
Harris, M. (1975) *Thinking about Infants and Young Children,* Strath Tay, Perthshire: Clunie Press.
Henderson, J.L. (1967) *Thresholds of Initiation,* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
Henderson, J.L. and Oakes, M. (1963) *The Wisdom of the Serpent,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Hubback, J. (1980) 'Developments and similarities', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 25(3).
Jacobi, J. (1942) *The Psychology of C.G.Jung,* London: Routledge.
Jacobson, E. (1964) *The Self and the Object World,* New York: International Universities Press; London: Hogarth, 1965.
Jung, C.G. (1896–98) *Zofingia Lectures, Collected Works,* 1953–79, Supplementary Vol A.
——(1902) 'On the psychology and pathology of so-called occult phenomena', *Collected Works,* 1.
——(1906) 'Psychoanalysis and association experiment', *Collected Works,* 2.
——(1907) 'The psychology of dementia praecox', *Collected Works,* 3.
——(1909) 'Association, dream and hysterical symptoms', *Collected Works,* 2.
——(1909a) 'On the significance of number dreams', *Collected Works,* 4.
——(1909b) 'On the significance of the father in the destiny of the individual', *Collected Works,* 4.
——(1910) 'The family constellation', *Collected Works,* 2.
——(1910a) 'A contribution to the psychology of rumour', *Collected Works,* 4.
——(1910b) 'Experiences concerning the psychic life of a child', *Collected Works,* 17.
——(1910c [1946]) 'Psychic conflicts in a child', *Collected Works,* 17.
——(1912a) *The Psychology of the Unconscious,* revised as *Symbols of Transformation, Collected Works,* 5.
——(1912b) 'New paths in psychology', *Collected Works,* 7.
——(1913) 'A contribution to the study of psychological types', *Collected Works,* 6.
——(1913a) 'Some crucial points in psychoanalysis', *Collected Works,* 4.
——(1913b) 'The theory of psychoanalysis', *Collected Works,* 4.
——(1914) 'The content of the psychoses', *Collected Works,* 3.
——(1914a) 'On psychological understanding', *Collected Works,* 3.
——(1914b) 'On the importance of the unconscious in psychopathology', *Collected Works,* 3.
——(1916a) 'The structure of the unconscious', *Collected Works,* 7.
——(1916b) 'The association method', *Collected Papers on Analytical Psychology,*
Constance Long (ed.), London: Baillière Tindall & Cox. (These essays will be found in *Collected Works,* 2, 10 and 11, also 17.)
——(1917) Preface to the second edition of *Collected Papers on Analytical Psychology,*

C.Long (ed.), *Collected Works,* 4.
——(1917 [1943]) ‘The problem of the attitude-type’, *Collected Works,* 7.
——(1919) ‘On the problem of psychogenesis in mental disease’, *Collected Works,* 3.
——(1921) *Psychologishe Typen, Collected Works,* 6.
——(1923) ‘The problem of typical attitudes in aesthetics’, *Collected Works,* 6.
——(1923a) *Psychological Types, Collected Works,* 6.
——(1928) The relations between the ego and the unconscious’, in *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, Collected Works,* 7.
——(1928a) ‘Child development and education’, *Collected Works,* 17.
——(1928b) ‘On psychic energy’, *Collected Works,* 8.
——(1928c) *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, Collected Works,* 7.
——(1929) ‘Problems of modern psychotherapy’, *Collected Works,* 16.
——(1931) ‘A psychological theory of types’, in Appendix to *Collected Works,* 6.
——(1935) ‘The Tavistock lectures’, *Collected Works,* 18.
——(1936) ‘The concept of the collective unconscious’, *Collected Works,* 9, Part 1.
——(1936–37) ‘A seminar with C.G.Jung: comments on a child’s dream’, *Spring* (1974).
——(1939) ‘On the psychogenesis of schizophrenia’, *Collected Works,* 3.
——(1946) ‘The Psychology of the transference’, *Collected Works,* 16.
——(1946a) ‘Psychic conflicts in a child’, *Collected Works,* 17.
——(1947) ‘Der Geist der Psychologie’, *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 1946, Zurich: Rhein; trans. ‘The spirit of psychology’, in *Spirit and Nature,* R.F.C.Hull, New York: Pantheon, 1954, *Collected Works,* 8.
——(1948) ‘On psychic energy’, *Collected Works,* 8.
——(1951) ‘The psychology of the child archetype’, *Collected Works,* 9, Part 1.
——(1952) *Symbols of Transformation, Collected Works,* 5.
——(1954) ‘The development of personality’, *Collected Works,* 17.
——(1954a) ‘Psychological aspects of the mother archetype’, *Collected Works,* 9, Part 1.
——(1955) *Answer to Job, Collected Works,* 11.
——(1955–56) *Mysterium Coniunctionis, Collected Works,* 14.
——(1962) *Symbols of Transformation, Collected Works,* 5.
——(1963) *Memories, Dreams, Reflections,* London: Collins, and Routledge and Kegan Paul.
——(1968) *The Tavistock Lectures,* delivered in 1935, *Collected Works,* 18.
——(1976) *The Vision Seminars,* given in 1930–34, Books 1 and 2, Zurich: Spring Publications.
——(1984) *Dream Analysis: Notes on the Seminar given in 1928–30,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press..
Jung, C.G. and Riklin, F. (1904) ‘Associations of normal subjects’, *Studies in Word Association,* trans. M.D.Eder, London: Heinemann, 1918; reprinted, Routledge, 1969.
Jung, C.G. and Wilhelm, R. (1931) *The Secret of the Golden Flower,* London: Routledge.
Kalff, D. (1964) ‘Archetypus als heilender Factor’, in *The Archetype,* Basel: Klarger.
Kirsch, J. (1955) ‘Journey to the moon’, *Studien zur analytischen Psychologie C. G.Jung,* vol. 1, Zurich: Rascher.
Klaus, M.H. and Kennell J.H. (1976) *Maternal-infant Bonding,* St Louis: Mosby.
Klein, M. (1932 [1980]) *The Psychoanalysis of Children,* in *The Writings of Melanie Klein 2,* London: Hogarth.
——(1937 [1980]) *The Psychoanalysis of Children,* London: Hogarth.
——(1955 [1980]) ‘On identification’, in *Envy and Gratitude etc.,* London: Hogarth.
——(1961 [1980]) *The Narrative of a Child Analysis,* in *The Writings of Melanie Klein,*

London: Hogarth.
——(1975) *Envy and Gratitude and other Works 1946–1963,* London: Hogarth; 1980, 2nd edn.
Kohut, H. (1971) *The Analysis of the Self,* New York: International Universities Press.
Langs, R. (1976) *The Therapeutic Interaction,* New York: Jason Aronson.
Laplanche, J. and Pontalis, J.B. (1983) *The Language of Psychoanalysis,* London: Hogarth.
Lefort, T. (1978) 'The psychoanalysis of a thirteen-months-old child', *Contemporary Psychoanalysis,* 14(3).
Lewis, A. (1957) 'Jung's early work', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 2(2).
Lyard, D. (1969) 'Le modèle théoretique d'Erich Neumann', *Cahiers de Psychologie Jungienne.*
MacDougall, J. and Leborici, S. (1969) *Dialogue with Sammy,* London: Hogarth.
Mahler, M., Pine, F. and Bergman, A. (1975), *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant,* London: Hutchinson.
Meier, C.A. (1967) *Ancient Incubation and Modern Psychotherapy,* trans. Monica Curtis, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
——(1970) 'Individuation and Psychologische Typen', *Zeitschrift für Analytische Psychologie,* 1(2).
Meltzer, D. (1967) *The Psychoanalytical Process,* London: Heinemann Medical Books.
——(1973) *Sexual States of Mind,* Ballinlin: Clunie Press.
——(1978) *The Kleinian Development,* Strath Tay, Perthshire: Clunie Press.
——(1984) *Dream Life: a Re-examination of the Psychoanalytic Theory and Technique,* Strath Tay, Perthshire: Clunie Press.
——(1986) *Extended Metapsychology,* Strath Tay, Perthshire: Clunie Press.
——(1992) *The Claustrum: an Investigation of Claustrophobic Phenomena,* with an essay by Meg Harris Williams, Strath Tay, Perthshire: Clunie Press.
Meltzer, D., Bremner, J., Hoxter, S., Weddell, D. and Wittenberg, I. (1975) *Explorations in Autism—a Psychoanalytic Study,* Strath Tay, Perthshire: Clunie Press.
Meltzer, D. and Williams, M.H. (1988) *The Apprehension of Beauty,* Strath Tay, Perthshire: Clunie Press.
Moody, R. (1955) 'On the function of counter-transference: a case study', *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 1(1).
Neumann, E. (1949) *The Origins and History of Consciousness,* London: Routledge, 1954.
——(1959) 'The significance of the genetic aspect for analytic psychology', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 4(2).
——(1973) *The Child,* London: Hodder and Stoughton.
Newton, K. (1965) 'Mediation of the image of infant-mother togetherness', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 10(2).
Pauli, W. (1955) 'The influence of archetypal ideas on the scientific theories of Kepler.' In C.G.Jung and W.Pauli *The Interpretation of Nature and the Psyche,* London: Routledge.
Piaget, J. (1928) *Judgement and Reasoning of the Child,* London: Routledge.
——(1929) *The Child's Conception of the World,* London: Routledge.
——(1953) *The Origins of Intelligence in the Child,* London: Routledge.
Pollock, G.H. (1964) 'On symbiosis and symbolic neurosis', *Journal of Psycho-Analysis,* 45(1).
Polanyi,—(1956) 'Passion and controversy in science', *Lancet,* 1.

Prince, G. (1963) 'Jung's psychology in Britain', in M.Fordham (ed.), *Contact with Jung,* London: Tavistock.

Racker, H. (1968) *Transference and Counter-transference,* London: Hogarth.

Rado, S. (n.d.) Personal communication by Ruth Strauss.

Schaffer, H.R. (1975) *Studies in Mother-Infant Interaction,* London: Academic Press.

Segal, H. (1957) 'Notes on symbol formation', *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis,* 38(6).

Searles, H.F. (1965) *Collected Papers on Schizophrenia and Related Topics,* London: Hogarth.

Spiegelman, J.M. (1988) *Jungian Analysts: Their Visions and Vulnerabilities,* Arizona: Falcon.

Stein, L. (1958) 'Analytical psychology: a modern science', *Analytical Psychology: a Modern Science,* London: Heinemann, 1973.

——(1966) 'In pursuit of first principles', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 11(1).

Stern, D.W. (1985) *The Interpersonal World of the Infant,* New York: Basic Books.

Tinbergen, N. (1951) *The Study of Instinct,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wickes, F.G. (1966) *The Inner World of Childhood,* New York: Appleton Press.

Wilhelm, R. (1923) *I Ching,* trans. into German, 'Rendered into English' by C. F.Baynes, London: Routledge, 1951.

——(1931) *The Secret of the Golden Flower,* London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Trubner.

Winnicott, D.W. (1951) 'Transitional objects and transitional phenomena', in *Collected Papers: Through Paediatrics to Psychoanalysis,* London: Tavistock.

——(1977) *The Piggle,* New York: International Universities Press.

Wolstein, B. (1967) *Theory of Psychoanalytic Therapy,* New York and London: Grune and Stratton.

Woodger,—(1957) *Physics, Psychology and Medicine,* Cambridge.

Ziehen, T. (1908) References in E.Jones, *Sigmund Freud, Life and Work,* vol. 2, London: Hogarth.

Zilboorg, G. (1941) *A History of Medical Psychology,* New York: W.W.Norton and Co. Inc .

Zinkin, L. (1979) 'The collective and the personal', *Journal of Analytical Psychology,* 24 (3).

Zueblin, W. (1955) 'Die aktive Imagination in der Kinder-Psychotherapie', *Studien zur analytischen Psychologie C.G.Jungs,* vol. 1, Zurich: Rascher.

Index

abstract propositions 135–136, 194
abstracting type 53
active imagination 26, 36–37, 206;
  and imaginative activity 219 –220
'actual situation' 71
Adler, Alfred 121
Adler, Gerhard 107, 115, 132
adolescence 11, 215 –216
adultomorphic speculation 136 –136
aesthetic conflict 197 –232
alchemy 54–54, 89, 118
alimentary model 133;
  insufficiency 143
Allenby, Amy 114
alpha function, reversal of 191, 193
ambivalent objects 212
amplification 27, 46, 74
anal masturbation 232 –200
analysts, therapists and 111 –112
analytic attitude 126 –127
analytic frame 177 –177
analytic interaction 177–181;
  see also counter-transference, negative therapeutic reaction, transference
analytic technique 48 –49
analytical psychology:
  claim to be a science 79–82;
  comparison with psychoanalysis 181–183;
  development in England 104–118;
  and psychoanalysis 115;
  status of 116 –118
Analytical Psychology Club 94, 97, 104, 106
'Anna' 13, 14 –16
aphonia 9
archetypal images 26, 73–73, 81–81, 155;
  active imagination 219–220;
  identification 53;
  parental images 207–208;
  projective identification 60–61;
  unconscious 33, 35
archetypal matrix 139 –141

archetype of initiation 213 –217
archetype of negation 211
Aschaffenberg 69
Asclepius 217 –217
Association of Child Psychotherapists 128
association method 7, 20, 69
association tests 69 –69
attitude, analytic 126 –127
Auseinandersetzung 220 –220
autism 188–189;
  infantile and birth of the self 166–168;
  normal 170;
  and symbiosis 171 –172
automorphism 138
autonomous ego 184

Barker, Culver 107
Baynes, H.G. 90, 93, 106–106
beauty 196 –232
bed-wetting 8
Bennett, E.A. 108
Bergman, A.:
  review of *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant* 172 –175
Bertine, Eleanor 106
Bettelheim, Bruno 173;
  review of *The Empty Fortress* 166 –168
Bick, Esther 50, 55
biochemistry 10
Bion, W. 47, 61, 194, 195, 196, 232;
  comparison with Jung 191–192;
  counter-transference 153–154;
  Meltzer's perspective 190–193;
  object relations 59;
  vertex 43
birth:
  child's curiosity about 15–15;
  psychological 172–175;
  of sibling 11;
  trauma 59
Bleuler, Eugen 67, 70, 176
body images 182
body scheme 163
Bosanquet, Camilla 117
Bower, T.G.R. 125, 143
breast 59;
  envy and gratitude 157, 158
breast-mother 146
breast-penis 40

Bremner, John 188
British Association of Psychotherapy 116
British Psychological Society:
  Medical Section 115, 117
Bühler, Charlotte 173

castration complex 22, 133
causality, relativization of 25, 73
centrifugal identification 49
centripetal identification 49
centroversion 138, 139
Champernowne, Irene 117 –117
chemistry 10
child analysis 49–51, 120–129;
  analytic attitude 126–127;
  autistic and symbiotic psychoses 171–172;
  Freud 11–14;
  fusion hypothesis 124;
  and infant-mother observations 49–50, 133–134;
  intra-uterine life and attachment to mother 124–125;
  Jung 14–16, 109–110, 120–121;
  Klein 39–43;
  mother 125–126;
  parents' role 12, 113, 127–128;
  play technique 152–153;
  primary self 122–124;
  social factor 128–129;
  testing Jung's theories 122;
  training 113, 126
child maturation *see* maturation
childhood:
  Jung and 98–99, 109–110;
  Neumann and 131–149;
  parental images 207–210;
  see also infancy
claustrophobic phenomena 232 –201
collective influences 139 –140
collective unconscious 33, 72, 73
compartmentalization 201
complexes 20
concept building 15 –15
conception, curiosity about 15 –15
conflict-free ego 184
conscience 28
consciousness 68–68;
  and conscious mind 73–74, 84;
  ego and 73–74, 140, 145–146, 158–159;
  islands of 145–146;

Neumann's theory of stages 138, 140;
phallus and 146
containers 194
'cook' 24 –24
cosmology 21
counter-transference 48–49, 152, 153–154;
Bion 153–154;
Freud 18–19;
positive element 48–49;
syntonic 48–48;
transference and 110–110, 165–166, 179 –180
Cox, David 118
creation myth 136
cultural forms 213–214, 216
cure, psychology of 217–218, 219

death instinct 157, 158
deintegration 59–59, 60, 124;
disintegration and 201, 211 –212
dementia praecox 23, 25, 69
depersonalization 146
depth interpretations 41 –41
depressive position 51–51, 60, 191
destructive instinct 62
Deutsch, Helene 158
directed thinking 138
disintegration 78, 155;
deintegration and 201, 211 –212
'distortion by ellipsis' 20
divine sickness 217
'Dora' 6 –9
dreams:
and day-dreams 182;
'Dora' 7–8;
father transference 35–36;
Fordham's 'Herakles' dream 100–101;
Gorbachev 56–57;
review of Meltzer's *Dream Life* 194–196;
'Richard' 44–46;
'Wolf Man' 29
'dressmaker' 24
drives 162

early man 136 –138
Eastern mysticism 75
Eder, M.D. 88 –88
editing 222
Edwards, Alan 108

ego 158;
autonomous 184;
consciousness and 73–74, 140, 145–146, 158–159;
development of 61, 120, 138, 140–141–141, 145–146, 215;
dualistic theory 133;
identification 53;
mourning and melancholia 28;
narcissism 27;
and self 49, 159, 162–163, 165, 216, 221–222;
splitting 212
ego nuclei 133, 145 –146
ego-self axis 138, 139, 144
egocentric types 88 –88
Eisenberg 168
eliciting active phantasies 74
Eliot, T.S. 222 –222
empathic type 53
envy 157 –160
epistomephilic instinct 11, 13, 16–16, 40, 190
Erikson, E.H. 215
erogenous zones 11, 62–62, 133
Eros 197
Escalona, S.K. 174
evil 205–205, 206
extraversion 75, 88
Eysenck, H.W. 117

Fairbairn, W.R.D. 133
family therapy 127
fantasies:
see phantasies
father transference 36 –36
female narcissism 27
female sexuality 10
feminization 22 –22
fire making 35
Fordham, Frieda 106
'foreign anthropologist' 24
free association 7, 20, 69
free-floating attention 49
Freud, Anna 14
Freud, Sigmund 3, 166, 181, 194, 195;
'Analysis of a phobia in a five year old boy' 11–14;
'Beyond the pleasure principle' 29;
castration complex 133;
criticism of Jung 31–32;
'The ego and the id' 29;
'Fragment of an analysis of a case of hysteria' 6–9;

free-floating attention 48;
'From the history of an infantile neurosis' 29–32;
Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego 52;
identification 54–55;
Jung's perception of Freud's obsession with sexual theory 33;
Kleinian psychoanalysts and 189;
'Leonardo da Vinci' 25–26, 52;
Meltzer 189, 194;
Moses and Monotheism 203;
'Mourning and melancholia' 28–29, 52;
narcissism 25–27, 28–32;
'Notes upon a case of obsessional neurosis' 16–20;
'On narcissism:
an introduction' 27;
primary process and secondary process 137;
'Psycho-analytic notes on an autobiographic account of a case of paranoia' 20–23;
relationship with Jung 69, 70–72, 99;
review of *The Freud/Jung Letters* 175–176;
review of Scott's 'Common problems concerning the views of Freud and Jung' 181–183;
Three essays on sexuality 9 –11
fusion 51, 124, 126, 133, 141;
primary relationship and 141–143;
symbols 156

Galton 244
Gardiner, M. 32
Geigerich, W. 131, 132, 147 –148
genetic psychology 207, 208
Gesell, A. 136, 146, 174
Glover, Edward 115, 133
God:
Jung's *Answer to Job* 203–204, 205, 206–207;
Schreber case 20 –21
Gordon, R. 152
gratitude 157 –160
Great Mother 132
'great obsessive fear' 17–17, 19
Greek therapeutic cults 217 –219
grid, the 190–191 –192
grief 183;
see also mourning
Guild of Pastoral Psychology 105, 117
Guild of Psychotherapy 117
guilt 160, 183, 206;
Jung's *Answer to Job* 204–205;
Neumann 146 –147

Hamlet 198

'Hans' 11 –14
Harding, Esther 106;
  review of *The Parental Image* 207 –210
Harris, Martha 50, 145
Heimann, Paula 49, 115, 153, 154, 155
Helen of Troy 197
Henderson, Joseph:
  review of *Thresholds of Initiation* 212 –217
Henry, Gianna 50, 126, 199
heredity 31
hero 147
heteropathic identification 49
Hillman, James 222 –222
history 76–77;
  psycho-history 134 –135
Hobson, Robert 107, 114, 116, 213
homeostasis 171
homosexuality 21, 22
Hostie, R. 86
Howe, Graham 118
Hubback, Judith 114, 121
Hull, R.F.C. 223
hypnosis 4
hysteria 3, 6–9, 89

id 27
identification 28, 52–60;
  projective *see* projective identification
identity 54–55, 57;
  Jacobson 161, 164–165;
  primitive *(participation mystique)* 50, 53, 54, 113, 159
identity crises 214
idiopathic identification 49
illusion 155 –156
imaginative activity 220 –220
incarnation 205
incubation 217 –219
individuation 50, 62–62, 78;
  Jacobson 161, 164–165;
  Jung 46–39, 54, 73, 164–165, 205–206;
  psychological types and 88–89;
  symbiosis and 170 –172
infancy 50–51, 61, 112–113, 136;
  autism 166–168;
  consciousness 145–146;
  envy and gratitude 157–159;
  fusion hypothesis 124;
  and mother *see* mother-infant relationship;

object relations 55, 59, 212;
observations of mothers and babies 49–50, 133–134, 173–174;
psychological birth 172–175;
symbiosis and individuation 170–172;
unconscious phantasies 154;
see also child analysis, childhood
infantile neuroses 29–32, 35 –35
infantile sexuality 10, 12, 14–16, 20, 71
initials, Bion's use of 191
initiation 212 –217
innate release mechanisms 124
inner world 24–25, 29, 40 –40
instinct theory 123
interaction, therapeutic 177–181;
see also counter-transference, negative therapeutic reaction, transference
International Association for Analytical Psychology 114 –115
International Medical Congress for Psychotherapy 95
International Psycho-Analytical Association 69
interviews, Jung's 101 –102
intra-uterine life 124–125, 141 –142
introjection 53
introversion 25, 75, 88
introverting techniques 74
islands of consciousness 145 –146
isolation 19 –125

Jackson, Murray 108
Jacobson, Edith 133, 135;
review of *The Self and the Object World* 160 –165
Jacoby, Jolande 50, 221
Jacoby, Marianne 117
Jahrbuch für Psychoanalytische und Psychopathologische Forschungen 69
Janet, Pierre 68, 83
'Job' 203 –207
Journal of Analytical Psychology, The 113 –114
Jung, Carl Gustav 4, 46–39, 47, 67–67, 155, 213;
Answer to Job 160
(appreciation 203–207);
'The association method' 69;
attitude to SAP 97–97, 107;
'The battle for deliverance' 123;
Bion's ideas compared with 191–192;
child analysis 14–16, 109–110, 120–121;
'The child archetype' 98–99;
and childhood 98–99, 109–110;
childhood memories 169–170;
Collected Works 96–97;
comparison with Klein 43–44;

'The concept of the collective unconscious' 26;
'The content of the psychoses' 23–24, 69;
development of researches 67–78;
directed and undirected thinking 137;
dreams 195;
editing 222;
ego 158, 159;
'The family constellation' 120;
Fordham's memories and thoughts 93 –102
(first meeting 93–93;
Jung in London 94–95;
last meeting 102–102);
Freud's criticism of 31–32;
and Freud's sexual theory 14;
ideas developed by psychoanalysts 180–181;
identity 54;
incubation 218–219;
individuation 46–39, 54, 73, 164–165, 205–206;
interviews 101–102;
Memories, Dreams, Reflections 98;
mother and infant 142, 143–144;
narcissism 24–25;
nature of theories 194;
Nazi sympathies and anti-semitism 95–96;
Neumann and 131–132;
'not knowing beforehand' 48;
'On psychic energy' 58;
'On psychological understanding' 23, 24;
'On the psychology and pathology of so-called occult phenomena' 67;
'On the significance of number dreams' 69;
premature genital excitement 157;
'Psychic conflicts in a child' 14–16;
Psychological Types 52, 53, 74–75, 88–91, 107;
Psychology and Alchemy 222;
'The psychology of dementia praecox' 23, 69, 74;
'The psychology of the transference' 48–48;
The Psychology of the Unconscious 32–35, 71–72, 122, 222;
'The psychology of the unconscious processes' 73;
'The relation between the ego and the unconscious' 73;
relationship with Freud 69, 70–72, 99;
review of *The Freud/Jung Letters* 175–176;
review of Scott's 'Common problems concerning the views of Freud and Jung' 181–183;
and 'school' of analysts 104–104;
Secret of the Golden Flower 75;
self 49, 75, 78, 117, 159, 162, 198–232;
seminars on children's dreams 121;
seminars in Zurich 104–104;
'The significance of the father' 69, 120;

'Some crucial points in psychoanalysis' 69–70;
stages in psychotherapy 108–109, 110;
status of researches 78–82;
Symbols of Transformation 176, 200;
'Synchronicity' 96–97;
Tavistock lecture-seminars 120;
'The theory of psychoanalysis' 30, 35–35, 70, 121;
training 48, 69, 94, 104;
transference 100–101, 110–110;
transitional object 62;
Two Essays on Analytical Psychology 35–46;
visits to England 105
Jung, Emma 176
Jung (C.G.) Institute, Zurich 114 –115

'K, Herr' 7, 8, 9
Kalff, Dora 138
Kaye, Harold 116
Kirsch, J. 220
Kitchen, Kathleen 106
Klein, Melanie 4, 14, 47, 51, 122, 232;
comparison with Jung 43–44;
infant-mother relationship 50;
Meltzer 190, 194;
'Narrative of a child analysis' 39–43;
normal splitting 201;
phantasies 137, 186;
positions 58;
review of *Envy and Gratitude* 157–160;
review of *New Directions in Psychoanalysis* 152–157;
'Richard' 39–43, 44–47;
self 222
'knowing beforehand' 193
knowledge, search for *see* epistomephilic instinct
Kohut, H. 28, 135
Krafft-Ebing, R. 67 –67
Kris, E. 174

Langs, Robert:
review of *The Therapeutic Interaction* 176 –181
Laplanche, J. 52 –52
Layard, John 114, 117
Le Boyer method 59
Lefort, T. 126
Leonardo da Vinci 25 –26
libido 33, 132;
narcissism 27, 28–29;
transformation 35

literature 118
London Child Guidance Clinic 122
loss 28 –29
Lowenfeld, Margaret 138, 149
Lyard, D. 131, 135

Mack Brunswick, Ruth 32
Mahler, Margaret 133, 142, 143, 149;
  review of *Human Symbiosis and the Vicissitudes of Human Individuation* 170–172;
  review of *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant* 172–175;
  therapeutic practices 171 –172
maintenance mechanisms 171
mandala 75, 123, 182
Marduk and Tiamat 136
masturbation 8;
  anal 232 –200
matriarchal consciousness 138, 145 –146
maturation 113–113;
  pseudo-maturity 200, 201
Medical Society of Analytical Psychology 106
mediumistic phenomena 67 –68
Meier, C.A. 89, 90–91, 95;
  review of *Ancient Incubation and Modern Psychotherapy* 217 –219
melancholia 28 –29
Meltzer, Donald 7, 29, 39;
  critical note of *The Kleinian Development* 189–194;
  review of *The Apprehension of Beauty* 196–232;
  review of *The Claustrum* 232–201;
  review of *Dream Life* 194–196;
  review of *Explorations in Autism* 188–189;
  review of *The Psychoanalytical Process* 184–186;
  review of *Sexual States of Mind* 186 –188
mentality 137 –199
metaphysics 219 –219
metapsychology 193 –194
Metman, Philip 107
Middlemore 174
Milner, Marion 155–156, 158
mind, parts of 16
model 58 –63
'modern man' 77 –78
Money-Kyrle, Roger 157
monism 132
Moody, Robert 48, 107, 111, 114
mother 34, 40–40, 125–126;
  breast-mother 146;
  as child's self 143–145, 209–210;
  Great Mother 132;

infant psychoses and 167, 171–172;
observations of mothers and infants 49–50, 133–134, 173–174;
two-mother theme 26
mother archetype 72
mother fixation 72
mother-infant relationship 49–51, 59, 123–126, 139–146;
archetypal matrix 139–140;
fusion 124, 141–143;
infant's attachment to mother 124–125;
infant's psychological birth 172–175;
primary relationship 141 –143
mourning 28–29, 183
Munro, Lois 153
mutual unconsciousness 57
mysticism 75, 79
myths:
Harding 208–209;
Neumann 132, 136–136, 147 –148

Napsbury Hospital 116
narcissism 25–27, 89;
Freud 25–27, 28–32;
primary 170, 171
negation, archetype of 211
negative therapeutic reaction 158
Neumann, E. 124, 131–149, 210–210;
and Jung 131–132;
methodology 133 –139
(adultomorphic speculation 136–136;
child analysis 133–134;
child's and early man's mentality 136–138;
terminology 138–139;
value of abstract propositions 134–136);
and psychoanalysis 132–133;
style 131–131;
substance of thesis 139 –149
(archetypal matrix 139–140;
ego development 146–146;
guilt 146–147;
islands of consciousness 145–146;
mother as child's self 143–145;
primary relationship 141–143;
theory of stages 140–141)
neurones 4
neuroses:
economic factors 189;
infantile 29–32, 35–35;
Jung and 67–68, 70–71;

obsessional 16 –20
Newton, Kathleen 124
Nicoll, Maurice 106
non-transference 180
normal autism 171
'not knowing beforehand' 48
notation, Bion's 191

'O' 192
object representations 55, 59, 163–164;
ambivalent objects 212
objective level 36
objective types 88 –88
observations, infant-mother 50–50, 133–134, 173 –174
'obsessional deliria' 20
obsessional neuroses 16 –20
occultism 79 –79
Oedipal conflict 11, 35, 154 –156
ontology, phylogeny and 137 –235
oracle of Trophonius 218
Orthogenic School, Chicago 168 –168
Oxford Psychology and Religion Society 117

paranoia 20 –29
paranoid-schizoid position 40, 51–51, 60, 191
parents 120;
analysis of 'Richard' 41–42;
parental images 207–210;
role in child analysis 12, 113, 127–128;
see also mother
participation mystique 51, 54, 113, 160
partriarchal consciousness 145 –146
Pauli, W. 81
Paulsen, Lola 107
penis, breast- 40
personal unconscious 72
personality 80 –80
perversions 10 –10
phallus 147
phantasies 44;
children's 137–138, 154;
eliciting active 73;
fact and phantasy 13 –14
philosophy 79 –79
Philp, Howard 118
phobia 11 –29
phylogeny, ontology and 137 –235
Piaget, Jean 50, 124, 138, 159, 174

Pine, F.:
review of *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant* 172 –175
Plaut, Alfred 108, 112, 114
play 62
play technique 153 –153
Polanyi, M. 82 –82
'polymorphous perverse' 71
Pontalis, J.B. 52 –52
positions 51–51, 58, 60 –60
premature genital excitement 158 –158
Present Question Conference 118
Priestley, J.B. 118
primal scene 29–31, 41, 42
primary narcissism 170, 172
primary process 138
primary relationship 138, 141–143;
disturbances in 143;
and fusion 141–143;
see also mother-infant relationship
primary self 55, 58–58, 133, 142, 161;
development of theory 122–124, 135;
drives 161
primitive identity *(participation mystique)* 51, 53, 54, 113, 160
Prince, Gordon 108
projection 53
projective identification 46, 49, 55, 201;
aesthetic conflict 198–232;
deintegration and 60;
Jung 52–53;
Klein 156–157;
mother as child's self 144 –145
pseudo-maturity 200, 201
psychiatry 116 –156
psychic energy 70
psychoanalysis:
analytical psychology and 115;
developments since 1945 47–51;
Jung's impact on 117;
Neumann and 132 –133
psychoanalysts:
analysts and therapists 111–112;
behaviour compared with analytical psychologists 181–183;
Freud and 99 –100
psychoanalytical process 184 –195
'psycho-history' 134 –135
psychological types 73, 74, 88–91, 117;
development of theory 88–88;
and individuation 88–89;

nature of theory 89–90;
'neglect' of theory 90
psychology 117
psychoses, content of 23 –24
psychotherapy, stages in development 108–109, 110
puberty 10, 253 –253

Racker, Heinrich 190;
review of *Transference and Counter-transference* 165 –166
Rado, S. 133, 144
Raine, Kathleen 118
Read, Herbert 99, 118, 223
reality principle 163
Redfearn, Joseph 108, 117;
comment on 'Ego and Self' 221 –222
religion:
incubation 217–219;
Jung's *Answer to Job* 203 –207
repressed unconscious 72
repression 23, 35
resistance 18, 41
restitution 160
Revelation, Book of 204
reversal of alpha function 191, 193
'Richard' 39–43, 45 –47
Rickman, John 115, 158
Rodrigue, Emilio 153, 188
Rosenbaum, Erne 107
Rosenfeld, R. 153, 155
Royal Medico-Psychological Association (later Royal College of Psychiatry) 116
Russell, Bertrand 205

'S.W.' 67
sand-tray technique 138
Schaffer, H.R. 125, 143, 194
schizophrenia 89
'Schreber case' 20 –23
Schwartz-Salant, N. 221
science, analytical psychology as 79 –82
Scott, Clifford J. 115, 163;
review of 'Common problems concerning the views of Freud and Jung' 181 –183
Scott, Dennis 108
Searles, H.F. 133, 142
secondary process 138
Segal, H. 61
self 155;
birth and 59
(and autism 166–168);

deintegration 51, 201;
ego and 49, 159, 162–163, 165, 216, 221–222;
ego-self axis 138, 139, 144;
identity 54–55;
individuation 62;
Jung 49, 75, 78, 117, 159, 162, 198–232;
Meltzer 198, 201;
mother as child's self 143–145, 209–210;
Neumann 131–131, 141, 143–145, 209–210;
and the object world 160–165;
original self 58;
primary *see* primary self;
transcendent 46–47, 58;
true and false 169
self-limiting structures 211
self-love *see* narcissism
self representations 139, 161, 162, 164
separation 173;
see also individuation
sexual aberrations 10 –10
sexuality:
Freud 9–11, 22, 27;
Jung 35;
Meltzer 186 –188
Sharp, Ella 196
'silent hypothesis' 179
Society of Analytical Psychology (SAP) 49, 50, 104, 106–118, 126, 133;
Children's Section and child analysis training 112–113;
clinical orientation 106–107;
early developments 107–108;
genetic interest 109–110;
Jung's attitude to 97–97, 107;
Library of Analytical Psychology 114;
and psychoanalysis 115;
Psychotherapy Section 112;
publications 113–114;
relations with C.G.Jung Institute 114–115;
scientific meetings 109;
status of analytical psychology 116–118;
training 48, 108–109, 110 –112
Spiegelman, J.M. 49
spiritual problem 76 –78
splitting 202;
see also disintegration
stages, theory of 138, 140 –141
Stein, Leopold 59, 108, 114;
comment on 'In pursuit of first principles' 210 –212
Stern, Daniel 63, 170

stimulus barrier 172
'stork box' 13
Storr, Anthony 108, 114
subjective level 36
superego 27, 162 –163
symbiosis 170–173, 174
symbols 44, 61, 156–156, 196 –196
synthetic method 25, 31, 73
syntonic counter-transference 48 –48

tabula rasa ('blank slate') 31, 136
Tao 46
Tavistock Clinic 47, 49 –50
technique, analytic 48 –49
theory 67, 193 –194
therapeutic cults 217 –225
therapeutic interaction 177–181;
  see also counter-transference, negative therapeutic reaction;
  transference
therapists, analysts and 111 –112
thinking 138
thoughts 192
Tiamat and Marduk 136
Tinbergen, N. 123
Toynbee, Arnold 118
training:
  analysis in 48, 69, 94, 108–109, 166;
  analytical psychologists 47–48;
  child analysis 113, 126;
  Jung's views 48, 69, 94, 104;
  pre-World War II 106;
  psychoanalysts 47;
  SAP 48, 108–109, 110 –112
transcendent self 46–47, 58
transference:
  counter- *see* counter-transference;
  father transference 35–36;
  Freud 8–9, 18–19;
  Harding 210;
  Henderson 215;
  incubation 218–219;
  Jung 100–101, 110–110;
  non-transference 180;
  operational definition 185;
  parents' role in child analysis 128
transformations, theory of 192
transitional objects 62, 169
Trophonius, oracle of 218

two-mother theme 26
types, psychological *see* psychological types

unconscious 32–46–39, 71–72, 159;
  child's 120–121, 145;
  collective 33, 72, 73;
  Klein 154;
  mutual unconsciousness 57;
  occult phenomena 67–68;
  personal 72;
  phantasies 154;
  religion 204–205, 206
undirected thinking 138
undoing 20
useful propositions 210 –211
uterus:
  intra-uterine life 124–125, 141 –142

validation 179 –180
vertex 44
visions 38–38;
  see also active imagination
'vulture' phantasy 26

Welch, Marged 107
'well baby clinics' 173
Westmann, Heinz 118
Wheelwright, Joseph 212
White, Victor 117 –154
Wickes, Frances G. 110, 121
Wilhelm, Richard 75, 85 –85
Williams, Meg Harris 201;
  review of *The Appreciation of Beauty* 196 –232
Winnicott, D.W. 62, 117;
  tribute to 168 –169
'Wolf Man' 29 –31
Wolff, Antonia 104
Wolstein, B.:
  review of *Theory of Psychoanalytic Therapy* 184 –186

Zilboorg, G. 206
Zueblin, W. 220