ABDICATION OF A FATHER: SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE FREUD–JUNG CORRESPONDENCE[1]

James V. Fisher

ABSTRACT This paper explores one dimension of the complex relationship linking Freud and Jung as revealed in their correspondence between 1906 and 1912. It focuses on Freud's adoption of Jung as his heir, particularly in terms of his repeated proposal to Jung 'to continue and complete my work by applying to psychoses what I have begun with neuroses'. The paper tracks the fate of this proposal in the words of these two men and suggests that the ambivalence of both can be seen as an expression of an unconscious dynamic portrayed in Shakespeare's *King Lear*, a dynamic characterized by the author as the developmental task of 'heriting'. Emma Jung captured the heart of the dilemma of 'heriting' in her question to Freud: 'Doesn't one often give much because one wants to keep much?' Although the trajectory of the heritage Freud sought for his 'adopted eldest son', 'crown prince' and 'successor' was not the same as that of the tragedy of Lear, it was no less poignant in its tensions and disappointments – even for a time in its reversal of the 'heriting' – and finally in the disintegration of the relationship.

Key words: psychoses, dementia praecox, 'heriting', King Lear, Sigmund Freud, C.G. Jung, Emma Jung

Introduction

My experience of reading the correspondence between Freud and Jung proved to be unexpectedly unsettling. One could reasonably imagine that anyone involved in one of the analytic traditions linked with these two remarkable men would be affected by tensions, so obvious in the letters, which still resonate in the analytic community today.

While I do not see myself as particularly interested in trying either to understand or resolve these tensions, I am curious about them. In this paper I want to share some reflections on just one dimension of the complex dynamics of the relationship between Freud and Jung that is revealed in their correspondence. I am characterizing it as the *abdication of a father*. I suspect that this 'abdication' plays some role in my sense of being unsettled, even disturbed in reading the private, often very candid exchanges between these two extraordinary men.

As I read through the letters in sequence, the characters and the dynamics of their relationships began to become so familiar that I began to care about them. I realized just how much I had become lost in the story. An important

---

JAMES FISHER is a member of the psychoanalytic section of the British Association of Psychotherapists and in full-time private practice in South London. Address for correspondence: [jvfisher@btinternet.com]

aspect of this engaging quality was the sense of being invited behind the scenes to hear some of the 'off-the-record' exchanges between Freud and Jung. Listening to them discussing ideas gives us something analogous to differential diagnoses, what we might think of as *differential interpretations* of critical concepts. Having access to these concepts as they emerge gives us a better picture of the phenomena these two men were trying to understand and describe.

At times I felt that this access was almost too personal, revealing more than the writer might have wanted to have publicly exposed. My impression is that this candour was initiated by Jung's striking personal openness, Freud responding for the most part in kind. Inevitably the reader of these letters today is faced with the difficulty of making sense of complex emotional dynamics that seemed to be shaping the story. After a long period in which I felt overwhelmed by the chaos of detail, I gradually became aware that there was indeed a picture or an image which was giving shape to what I was reading. Bion chose to call such pictures or images *selected facts*, not an entirely happy choice since the term 'fact' can be misleading. Furthermore it is not selected, not consciously at any rate. It emerges. Perhaps we should call them *emergent images*. Whatever we call them, the *idea* which Bion took from Poincaré is helpful: 'The only facts worthy of our attention are those which introduce order into this complexity and so make it accessible to us' (Bion 1962, p. 72).

But what was the picture or 'fact' that began to give me 'the emotional experience of a sense of discovery of coherence' (as Bion describes a 'selected fact')? I realized that I was hearing an uncanny echo of the story of a Lear full of unconscious ambivalence about the process I have described as *heriting*[2] (Fisher 2000). This is the picture I explore in this paper, a picture of what might be seen as the final developmental challenge. It is also, of course, the story of an heir struggling with his ambivalence about that heritage.

In order to appreciate this *Lear-story* with its ambivalence on both sides, I want to call attention to the specific heritage that Freud had in mind for Jung as his heir. It was this, as we shall see, that shaped the dynamics of the relationship between these two extraordinary men. Freud is very explicit:

> My selfish purpose, which I frankly confess, is to persuade you to continue and complete my work by applying to psychoses what I have begun with neuroses. (106F 13.8.08[3])

This *investiture* of Jung, this *adoption* of him as *eldest son* and *anointment* as *successor and crown prince* (Freud's terms, 139F 16.04.09) was to be focused on the task of applying to psychoses what Freud had begun with neuroses. We will follow the fate of this heritage, noting in the process how the image of heriting, with its attendant dilemmas, helps us to understand the story unfolding in these letters.

Heriting and In-heriting

It is important to emphasize that there were a number of factors in the relationship between Freud and Jung that influenced in critical ways the dynamics of what happened in the events these letters describe. Many of these factors have been explored by other commentators (see, for example, James Astor's account in this issue). I am highlighting only one dimension of this story.

Three elements came together at the time the correspondence began in 1906 to help create this dynamic of Freud's struggle to *herit* or endow a successor. In brief they were:

1. Freud's *old age complex* (to borrow Karl Abraham's expression);
2. Freud's view of the importance of understanding the nature of psychotic disturbances[4] for the future development of psychoanalysis;
3. Jung's unique position, his writings and experience with psychotic patients, and, most importantly, his response to the heritage Freud intended for him.

The latter two will become evident in what follows. But the first, so critical to setting the stage for this intriguing story, calls for some explanation.

Freud initiated this correspondence with a letter in response to Jung's sending him a copy of *Studies in Word-Association*.[5] This letter was written less than a month before Freud celebrated his 50th birthday, something that might at first glance seem insignificant. After all Freud lived another 33 years and was productive right up to his death. However, reading these letters confirms Karl Abraham's impression in 1907 that Freud was haunted by a sense of being near the end of his life. Following his visit to Freud in Vienna in December 1907, Abraham wrote to Max Eitington about his experience of meeting Freud:

> There is no need for me to describe Freud's personality to you. I now admire him even more than before. Unfortunately, *he seems to be worried by his old age complex*. He is very pleased with any collaboration; the formerly suppressed wish for recognition is now clearly apparent. (Abraham 1974, p. 35, my italics)

Abraham goes on to explain that one can hear this 'old age complex' only too clearly from the manner in which Freud spoke (ibid. p. 38). And it is striking how often in Freud's letters we hear comments that must be the kind of thing to which Abraham was referring. For example, in his second letter to Jung, Freud concludes by saying:

> I am eagerly awaiting your forthcoming book on Dem. praecox. I must own that whenever a work such as yours or Bleuler's appears it gives me the great and to me indispensable satisfaction of knowing that *the hard work of a lifetime has not been entirely in vain*. (3F 07.10.06, my italics)

Just before this startling remark about the work of a lifetime not being entirely in vain, Freud had commented about the long struggle ahead, the end of which he could hardly expect to see given his age (50). We will see that remarks like these appear in Freud's letters to Jung with surprising frequency. It is not entirely unreasonable, I am suggesting, to hear in them echoes of that marvellous opening scene of Shakespeare's *King Lear*:

> 'tis our fast intent
> To shake all cares and business from our age,
> Conferring them on younger strengths, while we
> Unburdened crawl toward death. (I. i. 37–40)[6]

While Lear's words might exaggerate Freud's mood in 1906, these letters betray more of a *Lear-state-of-mind* in him than we might have expected. Approaching this correspondence with an awareness of how much Freud contributed to the discipline of psychoanalysis after turning 50, it is disconcerting to find him in his early fifties feeling he is near the end.[7]

One thing that is critical to this *Lear-state-of-mind* is that, like Shakespeare himself who went to great lengths in his own will, Lear's aim was to try to control as much as he could the fate of his endowment (Fisher 2000, p. 965). It betrays an inability to herit the next generation and results in a pretence of handing over disfigured by a persistent reluctance to let go. Emma Jung articulates it very nicely, in a bold, even impertinent, letter to Freud near the end of 1909 in which she challenges his determination to make Jung his son and heir:

> You may imagine how overjoyed and honoured I am by the confidence you have in Carl, but it almost seems to me as though you were sometimes giving too much – do you not see in him the follower and fulfiller more than you need? *Doesn't one often give much because one wants to keep much*? (Emma Jung, letter 06.11.11, in McGuire 1974, p. 456, my italics)

One could hardly find a more apt summary of the Lear dilemma. In what follows I sketch out the trajectory of what we might call Freud's Lear dilemma. One effect of this was his anointing Jung at their very first meeting in March 1907 as the one to *continue and complete* his work. I have chosen to focus on one aspect of this heriting, the investigation of psychosis, leaving other issues, and particularly the organizational dynamics, to one side.

We will also trace Jung's consistently ambivalent response from the beginning, perhaps reflecting Freud's unconscious ambivalence about handing over to his heir. The ambivalence of both men is evident in the two letters that immediately follow their first meeting. To make it easier to follow the process I will orient the discussion around three critical private meetings: their *first* in *March 1907*, the *second* enthusiastic one in *September 1908*, and that fateful *third* meeting in *March 1909* just after Jung had resigned from the Burghölzli Hospital. There was one final visit of Freud to Jung in

September 1911 that played a critical role in the sad epilogue to this story which I will touch on briefly in the concluding section.

We will follow some of the difficulties that emerge in that critical period that stretches from their first 1907 meeting to the crisis at the end of 1909. The story then reaches its climax with a consideration of the startling turn the heriting process takes at the end of 1909 following Jung's explicit rejection of the heritage Freud sought for him. We find ourselves caught up in the complex emotions of a development that could be described as a reversal of the heriting process in 1910–1911. This agonizing emotional climax, beginning with the exchanges at the end of 1909 and the early part of 1910, makes painfully clear the impossibility of the heriting and inheriting as Freud had pictured it. From that point the process begins to degenerate into the unhappy and unedifying political conflicts ending with the bitter personal exchanges three years later at the end of 1912.

Freud's Proposal to Jung – March 1907

It is striking that at their very first meeting Freud proposes to Jung that he is to be his successor, continuing and completing his work. At the heart of this proposal, as we shall see, is the intense interest in psychosis and Jung's experience with *dementia praecox* patients. Freud's interest in psychosis at this time is reflected in some remarkable comments in Section VII of his 1915 essay, 'The unconscious', which I suggest elsewhere was a key impetus for Bion's work on differentiating the psychotic from the non-psychotic[8] (Bion 1957). In that paper Freud makes an unexpected claim, a claim related to this investiture of Jung as the successor who will complete his work:

> What we have put together in the preceding discussions is probably as much as we can say about the Ucs. so long as we only draw upon our knowledge of dream-life and the transference neuroses. It is certainly not much, and at some points it gives an impression of obscurity and confusion; and above all it offers us no possibility of co-ordinating or subsuming the Ucs. into any context with which we are already familiar. It is only the analysis of one of the affections which we call narcissistic psychoneuroses [Kraepelin's '*dementia praecox*' or Bleuler's 'schizophrenia'] that promises to furnish us with conceptions through which the enigmatic Ucs. will be brought more within our reach and, as it were, made tangible. (Freud 1915, p. 196)

With his study of dream-life and the neuroses Freud proposes that he has taken the exploration of the unconscious as far as he can go. Now here in 1915 it seems only the analysis of the psychoses promises a way forward in further development of our understanding the unconscious. This Section VII had always puzzled me. How did Freud think this would be possible if analysis of psychotic patients were held to be impossible?

In reading the early years of the correspondence between Freud and Jung two things leapt out for me. One was Freud's excitement at his discovery of

the work with *dementia praecox* patients going on under Bleuler at the Burghölzli, especially as reported in the writings of Jung. When Jung sends him a copy of *Studies in Word-Association* which included his paper on 'Psychoanalysis and association' (Jung 1906), Freud responds that in his excitement he had already purchased Jung's book for himself. The second is the explicit hope that Jung would be able to take the work on *dementia praecox* forward and thus continue and complete Freud's work. This hope shapes much of Freud's side of the correspondence for the first three years up until the end of 1909. Immediately following that first visit of Jung to Vienna in March 1907, Freud wrote:

> Your visit was most delightful and gratifying; I should like to repeat in writing various things that I confided to you by word of mouth, in particular, that you have inspired me with confidence for the future, that I now realize that I am as replaceable as everyone else and that I could hope for no one better than yourself, as I have come to know you, *to continue and complete my work*. I am sure you will not abandon the work, you have gone into it too deeply and seen for yourself how exciting, how far-reaching, and how beautiful our subject is. (18F 7.4.07, my italics)

As we have seen in the quotation I cited above from a letter written in anticipation of their second meeting in September 1908, Freud there makes it explicit that he hoped Jung would *continue and complete* his work *by applying to psychoses what he had begun with neuroses*. This is clearly what they discussed in that first meeting as can be seen in these excerpts from their letters in April 1907 following that first meeting. Moreover we also see the first indications of Freud's ambivalence:

> In regard to Dem. pr. I have a proposal to make to you. Since your departure I have jotted down *a few ideas on the subject we discussed*. I should like to let you have them *unless* – for two reasons – *you would prefer not to see them*. First, because you might hit on them yourself, and second because it may be distasteful to you to accept anything whatsoever. I must say that I regard a kind of intellectual communism, in which neither party takes anxious note of what he has given and what received, as a highly estimable arrangement. (18F 7.4.07, my italics)

It is as if Freud already pictures Jung as an heir who is already anxious for the heritage that is now his, reluctant to accept anything that might be seen as undermining his carrying out his new responsibilities. Freud's somewhat disingenuous comment about 'intellectual communism' seems to reflect his ambivalence about handing on this heritage. The picture of Lear charging around with his 100 knights playing king would be an unreasonable caricature of this ambivalence. However it may not be so far-fetched as a picture of how Freud imagined, or at least feared, it might feel to Jung.

Ignoring Freud's concerns, Jung responds by suggesting that Freud has overestimated him and his powers and that he is still far from seeing things

clearly (19J 11.4.07). Although Jung was trying to apply Freud's theories in analysing *dementia praecox* patients at the Burghölzli, he still had many questions, many of which fill the next few letters. One area of concern was how to differentiate hysteria from *dementia praecox*. For example, Jung notes that '. . . the differences between D. pr. and hysteria are becoming suspiciously blurred since I have started analysing them' (29J 04.06.07). There were also extended exchanges about how, or whether, to differentiate paranoia and *dementia praecox*. One exchange is of particular interest. Noting that in paranoid *dementia praecox* wish-fulfilment was certainly very much more frequent, Jung goes on to offer his version of Freud's theory:

> When you say that the libido withdraws from the object, you mean, I think, that it withdraws from the real object for normal reasons of repression (obstacles, unattainability, etc.) and throws itself on a fantasy copy of the real one, with which it then proceeds to play its classic autoerotic game. The projection towards the perception end springs from the original wish for reality, which, if unattainable, creates its own reality by hallucination. But in psychosis everything goes askew because only the conflict is experienced as objectively real. (24J 13.05.07)

At that point he gets stuck and asks for help:

> I should be extremely grateful for any correction you can make of my views. My one hope is that it will bring me closer to you. (24J 13.05.07)

Freud responds detailed comments, grumbling that Jung has failed to write for a while (a common complaint throughout the first three or four years of the correspondence) and adding, somewhat disingenuously, that the delay must be due to his involvement with his *dementia praecox* cases. For example, in response to Jung's version of his theory of psychotic withdrawal from the object, he writes:

> I do not think that the libido withdraws from the real object to throw itself on the mental representation of the object, with which fantasy it proceeds to play its autoerotic game. *By definition*, the libido is not autoerotic as long as it has an object, real or imagined. I believe, rather, that the libido departs from the object-image, which is thereby divested of the cathexis that has characterized it as internal and can now be projected outward and, as it were, perceived. Then for a moment it can be perceived calmly as it were and subjected to the usual reality-testing. (25F 23.05.07)

It is interesting to wonder about the link between Jung's formulation and Freud's discussion in that Section VII of 'The unconscious'. There Freud suggests a schizophrenic cathexis of a *Wortverstellung*, a 'verbal-idea', or 'verbal image', or 'word-presentation'. It is a hypothesis which might allow for the analysis of schizophrenic patients despite the assertion that in narcissistic disorders there is a return to an objectless state and thus transference is impossible.[9] It is interesting to wonder about a further link between

these ideas and Hanna Segal's early observation that Melanie Klein's work on internal objects makes narcissism 'a complex phenomenon' (Segal 1950, pp. 114–15). Her suggestion that schizophrenic patients can be seen as relating to internal objects seems related both to Jung's formulation as well as to Freud's notion in 'The unconscious' of a 'verbal idea' or 'verbal image' to which the schizophrenic patient relates.

One of the many things that disturbed me in my reading of the Freud–Jung correspondence was a sense of the loss to psychoanalysis by the failure of these two men to be able to pursue the study of psychotic states in the way hinted at in their early exchanges. It was nearly 40 years later that some associates of Melanie Klein took up this heritage of applying to the psychoses what Freud had begun with the neuroses in a way that seems to follow on directly from these early explorations.

At times in those first two or three years Freud notes the problem of his lack of sufficient experience in analysing schizophrenic patients. In comments typical of what he repeatedly says, he writes:

> I really sweated blood over the two theoretical constructions I sent you recently. I am not used to working in that way, without direct observation. And I am sure you are not taken in by such theorems. *If only I were younger or wealthier or more frivolous, any of the three, I would spend a few months at your clinic; together we would certainly work our way through the problem*. (27F 26.05.07, my italics)

Here Freud talks as if he were a collaborator, not one who is handing over to his successor. He often thanks Jung for 'enriching his knowledge' by communicating his *dementia praecox* cases (32F 14.06.07), at one time even suggesting that Jung's work on *dementia praecox* makes him feel quite impoverished (30F 06.06.07).

In these exchanges there is evidence of a shared assumption that *dementia praecox* patients can be analysed, albeit with great difficulty and only if the patient is educated. For example, Jung writes:

> It may interest you to know that the D. pr. patient with the transference to her brother has suddenly started having delusions of grandeur . . . (33J 28.06.07)

Freud responds:

> The further development of the dementia patient who finds her brother in the doctor is a splendid example of paranoid transference. (34F 01.07.07)

Later Jung describes something 'giving him much enjoyment', that is:

> . . . the analysis of a young woman with Dementia praecox. Every properly analysable case has something aesthetically beautiful about it, particularly this one, which is an exact copy of Ibsen's *Lady from the Sea* . . . At times profoundly depressed, at others serene, with transference to me because of my brown eyes and tall figure. (48J 10.10.07)

Of course there was always the question of whether these were genuine cases of *dementia praecox*, and there were persistent questions about what constituted *dementia praecox*.

What was not in doubt was the evidence of an increasingly intense emotional tie between these two men. The idea of someone who would continue and complete his work was taking a personal dimension that would give substance to his addressing Jung in letters a year later as 'friend and heir' and two years later as 'son and heir'. In July he writes:

> I should not like to be without news of you all this time – I shall not be coming back until the end of September – *your letters have become a necessity for me*. So I shall keep you informed of my movements. (36F 10.07.07, my italics)

After a month of silence from Jung has just come to an end, Freud reveals its impact:

> *My personality was impoverished* by the interruption in our correspondence. Fortunately that has now come to an end. (38F 18.08.07, my italics)

Jung's ambivalence about the role Freud intended for him can be seen in his persistent questions which, although doubtless genuine attempts to understand Freud's thinking more fully, betray fundamental differences. On the other hand there were frequent expressions of devotion to 'the cause' and to Freud himself. In that state of mind Freud's insights could be experienced as a revelation:

> Anyone who knows your science has veritably eaten of the tree of paradise and become clairvoyant. (28J 30.5.07)

However, we find Jung at the end of that first summer struggling to say something obviously difficult to Freud at which he can only hint:

> As usual you have hit the nail on the head with your accusation that my ambition is the agent provocateur of my fits of despair. But this I must say in my own defence: it is my honest enthusiasm for the truth that impels me to find some way of presenting your teachings that would best bring about a breakthrough. Otherwise *my unconditional devotion to the defence and propagation of your ideas*, as well as my *equally unconditional veneration of your personality*, would be bound to *appear in an extremely peculiar light* – something I would gladly avoid even though the element of self-interest could be denied only by the very obtuse. (39J 19.08.07, my italics)

In September Jung gave a major lecture on 'The Freudian theory of hysteria' at an Amsterdam International Psychiatric Congress, as it turns out in Freud's place, Freud having turned down the invitation to defend his ideas (19J 11.04.07; 20F 14.04.07). Jung was understandably anxious while Freud offered encouragement from the sidelines:

> I know you are now in Amsterdam, just before or after your perilous lecture, engaged in the defence of my cause, and it strikes me as almost cowardly that I should meanwhile be looking for mushrooms in the woods or bathing in this peaceful Carinthian lake instead of fighting for my own cause or at least standing by your side. (42F 04.09.07)

This was followed by an exchange of photographs and Jung finally making clear the depth of his emotional attachment. After commenting on Freud's having reproached him for his 'laziness in writing', Jung suggests that it is due in part to his work-load. The other reason, he says, 'is to be found in the realm of affect'. I quote it at length since it helps to explain an important dimension of Jung's response to the heritage sought for him:

> [It is to be found] in what you have termed my 'self-preservation complex' – marvellous expression! And indeed you know that this complex has played many a trick on me, not least in my Dem. praec. book. I honestly [slip of the pen here] do try, but the evil spirit that (as you see) bedevils my pen often prevents me from writing. Actually – and I confess this to you with a struggle – I have a boundless admiration for you both as a man and a researcher, and I bear you no conscious grudge. So the self-preservation complex does not come from there; it is rather that my veneration for you has something of the character of a 'religious' crush. Though it does not really bother me, I still feel it is disgusting and ridiculous because of its undeniable erotic undertone. This abominable feeling comes from the fact that as a boy I was the victim of a sexual assault by a man I once worshipped. Even in Vienna the remarks of the ladies ('enfin seuls', etc.) sickened me, although the reason for it was not clear to me at the time . . .
>
> This feeling, which I still have not quite got rid of, hampers me considerably. Another manifestation of it is that I find psychological insight makes relations with colleagues who have a strong transference to me downright disgusting. I therefore fear your confidence. I also fear the same reaction from you when I speak of my intimate affairs . . .
>
> I think I owe you this explanation. I would rather not have said it. (49J 28.10.07)

Although Jung had been remarkably open with Freud almost from the beginning, this candour leaves us in no doubt about the intensity of the emotional bond that had developed between them. While waiting anxiously for a response to these revelations, Jung writes again recalling a short dream which he had when visiting Freud in Vienna. In the dream Jung saw Freud walking beside him as a very, very frail old man. Freud had interpreted it in terms of a rivalry complex. It is not clear whether Jung is disputing this interpretation but it obviously did not satisfy him:

> Ever since then the dream has been preying on my mind, but to no purpose. The solution came (as usual) only after I had confessed my worries to you. The dream sets my mind at rest about your + + + dangerousness! This idea couldn't

> have occurred to me at the time, obviously not! I hope to goodness the subterranean gods will now desist from their chicaneries and leave me in peace. (50J 02.11.07)

While Freud's initial response is missing, we know from Jung's account of it that he extolled humour 'as the only decent reaction to the inevitable' (51J 08.11.07). In Freud's next letter he focused on the religious aspect, observing that (an unresolved) transference on a religious basis would be disastrous as it could only end in apostasy (52F 15.11.07). It is in this letter that Freud first addresses Jung as 'My dear friend and colleague' instead of just 'Dear colleague'. In February 1908 he drops the 'colleague', addressing Jung simply as 'Dear friend'.

Freud's Investiture of his Heir – September 1908

Almost from their first meeting there had been pressure from Jung for Freud to make a return visit to him in Zürich, something Freud had said numerous times that he wanted to do. During that year and a half between that first meeting and September 1908 when the meeting in Zürich finally took place there were increasingly explicit tensions between Jung and Freud to do with their differing ideas about *dementia praecox*. They seemed especially acute in the months following the Salzburg Congress, the first psychoanalytic congress, in April 1908.

A particularly telling example of these tensions appeared in discussion over Jung's analysis of Otto Gross, a brilliant but very disturbed psychiatrist and would-be psychoanalyst. Freud's comments are in some ways quite extraordinary:

> Now I have no reason to doubt your diagnosis, inherently because of your great experience of D. Pr., but also because D. Pr. is often not a real diagnosis. We seem to be in agreement about the impossibility of influencing his condition and about its ultimate development. But couldn't his condition be another (obsessional) psychoneurosis, with negative transference caused by his hostility to his father, which presents the appearance of absence or impairment of transference? Unfortunately I know too little about the mechanism of Dem. pr. Or paranoia as compared with hysteria or obsessional neurosis. *I have long wished for a strong impression in this field. The need to make a living and the requirements of therapy stand in the way.* (99F 21.6.08, my italics)

Again these do not sound like the comments of someone who has handed the project over to his heir and successor. And Jung, I imagine, did not think so either. When Jung writes a few days later his ambivalence is obvious. He begins by thanking Freud for his letter 'with all my heart'. Needing some personal contact with Freud to help resolve his persistent doubts he writes:

> If I can possibly manage it during the coming year I shall visit you again for a few days. I see no other way of discussing the concept of D. pr. *sive* schizophre-

> nia *sive* paranoia that is weighing on my mind. In my opinion the negative father transference explains nothing, firstly because it is not absolute in Gross's case and secondly because in most other cases of D. pr. we have the exact opposite, as also in hysteria. The only differences, I find, are the infantile fixation, the infantile associations and the absolute but long-drawn-out incurability – the permanent exclusion of sizeable chunks of reality. I am now treating a large number of highly educated hysterics and can see the absolute difference between D. pr. and hysteria in these cases, and *can only marvel at the profundity of your views*. (100J 26.06.08, my italics)

This letter of Jung's epitomizes the ambivalence we have seen since their first exchanges. This first part of the letter seems to articulate the admiration, though it feels ambiguous. In suggesting that he go to Freud, Jung seems to have given up on persistent efforts over more than a year to get Freud to visit him in Zürich. And in the conclusion to this letter Jung gives voice to the frustration which will escalate throughout 1909 until it reaches the crisis at the end of that year:

> I wish Gross could go back to you, this time as a patient, not that I want to inflict a Gross episode on you too, but simply for the sake of comparison. That would be a gain for science, because with the D. Pr. Problem 9/10 of the psychiatric problems would be solved. (Slip in this peculiar sentence?) *Probably because I am angry that you see my efforts to solve the D. Pr. Problem in a different light*. (100J 26.06.08, my italics)

We have the impression here of Jung having tried to take on his heritage, which is what makes him so angry. Freud's confession that he has long wished to make a strong impression in this field clearly infuriated Jung, something Freud could not fail to be aware of as his response about the idea of a visit suggests:

> Why, of course! We're not living in different centuries, not even on different continents. Why shouldn't we get together to discuss *a matter of such importance to both of us*? The only question is when would be the best time and whether I should go to see you or you come to see me. (101F 30.06.08, my italics)

At last Freud realizes he must make an effort to fulfil his intention (first articulated after their first meeting) to visit Zürich and have Jung demonstrate his 'famous' *dementia praecox* patient (18F 07.04.07). At the end of the summer of 1908 when they are making final plans for the long delayed visit, Freud clearly feels he needs to reinforce what he had proposed in that first meeting. As we have seen Freud is explicit about his (conscious) intention:

> My selfish purpose, which I frankly confess, is to persuade you to continue and complete my work by applying to psychoses what I have begun with neuroses. (106F 13.8.08)

We might imagine that at some level Jung was becoming increasingly frustrated having to deal with Freud's Lear-like ambivalence about his clearly

stated intention that Jung should complete his work by applying his (Freud's) theories to the psychoses. Would we also imagine Jung, were the occasion to arise, feeling some sympathy for Lear's daughters, Goneril and Regan?

Nevertheless the meeting in September appears to have been another intense emotional experience for both to judge by the letters which followed. In his first letter Freud addresses Jung as 'My dear friend and heir' (110F 15.10.08), while Jung reciprocates by addressing Freud as 'Dear [*lieber*] Professor' instead of the formal greeting he had used up to this point, 'Very esteemed Professor' [*Hochverehrter Herr Professor*] (111J 21.10.08).

We note, however, that Freud's letter continues in a provocative tone, describing a patient of his, 'the anxiety man, a classic case, now well on his way to being cured, very intelligent, *in every way the contrary of Dem. pr.*' (my italics). He then points to an expression this patient uses which sounds exactly like one used by one of Jung's *dementia praecox* patients.

> Doesn't that sound exactly like the formulas of your woman patient [a Dem. pr. patient] which, as recently as Salzburg, you declared to be fundamentally different from those of a hysteria or obsessional neurosis case? (110F 15.10.08)

This rather provocative challenge is followed by a surprising announcement. Freud announces that he himself has begun the analysis of a 'true case of Dem. pr.':

> I also have an opportunity at present to study a *true case of Dem. pr.*, a very intelligent young lady; *so far the transference is still enormous*. (110F 15.10.08, my italics)

The dynamics on the surface remain relatively positive throughout the winter, although Freud seems to betray some awareness of the continuing tensions between them regarding the work on *dementia praecox* as his New Year greetings suggest: 'May we remain close together in 1909' (123F 30.12.08). Ironically, 1909 is the year in which Jung explicitly rejects the heritage Freud had in mind, making the final break, I suggest, inevitable.

The Crisis of 'Anointment' and 'Adoption' – March 1909

The fateful third meeting took place when Jung visited Freud again in Vienna at the end of March 1909 immediately following his resignation from the Burghölzli. Both men had betrayed some presentiment of what was to come. Freud writes at the beginning of March after a silence from Jung which only lasted just over two weeks:

> Many thanks for your telegram and letter, which (the telegram in itself did the trick) put an end to my anxiety. I evidently still have a traumatic hyperaesthesia toward dwindling correspondence. I remember its genesis well (Fliess) and should not like to repeat such an experience unawares. (134F 09.03.09)

In this letter Freud also announces his acceptance of the invitation to Clark University in Massachusetts and offers some reassurance to Jung about a patient who introduced herself to a colleague of Freud's in Vienna as Jung's mistress, assuming this analyst would be impressed by Jung's having retained so much freedom.

Jung's response is telling, just two weeks before his visit to Freud:

> Your kind words have relieved and comforted me. You may rest assured, not only now but for the future, that nothing Fliess-like is going to happen. I have experienced so much of that sort of thing; it has taught me to do the contrary at all times. Except for moments of infatuation my affection is lasting and reliable. It's just that for the past fortnight the devil has been tormenting me in the shape of *neurotic ingratitude*. But I shall not be unfaithful to you on that account. (135J 11.03.09, my italics)

What would this neurotic ingratitude be about? There are two hints in the letter. The first suggests that there may be something in him accusing himself of ingratitude for what he is about to say to Freud:

> Altogether, I have endless plans for work next year, and I look forward so much to the new era of outer (and inner) independence that is so important for me.

The second could have to do with the invitation to America which Freud had originally some months before turned down:

> If you are going to America in September, I earnestly hope that you will put in a week with us here as a way-station. You will have all the holiday peace and quiet that could be wished for, and we'll then be living *procul negotiis* ['far from business worries'] in the country. We are boldly taking it for granted that you will come. After all, the road to America runs through Zürich too. (This piece of impudence was only half-intentional, otherwise I would have deleted the sentence.)

Perhaps if the road to America runs through Zürich, there might be a road from Zürich to America, especially for the heir apparent!

Again we have to depend on the letters to gain a sense of what happened at this meeting. But there can be little doubt given the candour of the exchanges. Jung writes first, only days after returning to Zürich, talking about being 'afflicted with some *sentiments d'incomplétude*' after leaving Vienna. He attributes this to his fear that Freud had found his 'spookery' stupid and unpleasant. (This was the occasion of the creaking bookcase which Jung foretold, as Freud describes in detail in his next letter.) Jung also mentions his idea that, if there is a 'psychoanalysis', there must also be a 'psychosynthesis', which self-disparagingly he characterizes as a kind of flight of ideas.

But his most important comment is about his new sense of freedom:

> That last evening with you has, most happily, freed me inwardly from the oppressive sense of your paternal authority. My unconscious celebrated this

> impression with a great dream which has preoccupied me for some days and which I have just finished analysing. I hope I am now rid of all unnecessary encumbrances. Your cause must and will prosper, so my pregnancy fantasies tell me, which luckily you caught in the end. (138J 02.04.09)

Jung only found some real sense of independence after the bitter attacks which he levels against Freud at the very end, for example, in December 1912, just prior to the final break. Even then it did not really sound as though Jung had found a genuine sense of independence, as we will see when we get to the end of our story.

Freud seems somewhat taken aback by Jung's letter given that he delays two weeks before responding. It is difficult to tell whether he feels sad or puzzled:

> It is strange that on the very same evening when I formally adopted you as eldest son and anointed you – *in partibus infidelium* – as my successor and crown prince, you should have divested me of my paternal dignity, which divesting seems to have given you as much pleasure as I, on the contrary, derived from the investiture of your person. (139F 16.04.09)

However, Freud seems to be preoccupied with what Jung calls his 'spookery' and gives a long and detailed account of the episode of the creaking oaken bookcase as well as his analysis of it. This prompts some paternal observations:

> Now I am afraid of falling back into the father role with you if I tell you how I feel about the poltergeist business . . . [Nevertheless] I put my fatherly horned-rimmed spectacles on again and warn my dear son to keep a cool head, for it is better not to understand something than make such great sacrifices to understanding. I also shake my wise head over psychosynthesis and think: Yes, that's how the young people are, the only places they really enjoy visiting are those they can visit without us, *to which we with our short breath and weary legs cannot follow them*. (139F 16.04.09, my italics)

This characterization of himself as an old man with short breath and weary legs once again takes us back to that picture of Lear with which we began. Interestingly, Freud then goes on to give a very detailed account of the fantasy that he would die at 61 or 62 as well as his analysis of the origin of this feeling:

> I have since attempted an analysis of this belief, and here it is. It made its appearance in 1899. At that time two events occurred. First I wrote *The Interpretation of Dreams* (which appeared postdated 1900), second, I received a new telephone number, which I still have today: 14362. It is easy to find a factor common to these two events. In 1899 when I wrote *The Interpretation of Dreams* I was 43 years old. Thus it was plausible to suppose that the other figures signified the end of my life, hence 61 or 62. Suddenly method entered into my madness. The superstitious notion that I would die between the ages of 61 and

> 62 proves to coincide with the conviction that with *The Interpretation of Dreams* I had completed my life-work, that there was nothing more for me to do and that I might just as well lie down and die. (139F 16.04.09)

It is not clear when Freud made this analysis of his picture of dying at 61 or 62, but I suspect that it may have been in response to this difficult third private meeting with Jung. Whatever the case, there is a dramatic shift at work in Jung's mind for the rest of 1909. One important factor was his invitation from Clark University to join Freud in lecturing on psychoanalysis there in September. Freud was very aware of the significance of this invitation for his 'heir':

> Your being invited to America is the best thing that has happened to us since Salzburg; it gives me enormous pleasure *for the most selfish reasons*, though also, to be sure, because it shows what prestige you have already gained at your age. Such a beginning will take you far, and a certain amount of favour on the part of men and fate is a very good thing for one who aspires to perform great deeds. (147F 18.06.09, my italics)

Freud here again uses the term 'selfish' as he did in that letter prior to their second meeting when he repeated that his *selfish purpose* was to persuade Jung to continue and complete his work by applying to psychoses what he had begun with neuroses. Does this suggest an awareness (perhaps unconscious) that what he was trying to do was not a genuine heriting in which the next generation could be given its freedom but rather an attempt to control the heritage? Again it seems to be an enactment of the Lear story.

Jung for his part seemed increasingly able to recognize that he needed to find his own way. Freud had just finished the Rat Man and sent a copy to Jung for his comments:

> Your Rat Man has filled me with delight, it is written with awesome intelligence and full of the most subtle reality. Most people, though, will be too dumb to understand it in depth. Splendid ingenuities! *I regret from the bottom of my heart that I didn't write it*. (In the revised proofs there are a number of misprints which presumably won't escape your eye.) (157J 14.10.09, my italics)

Jung also says that he has been reading a book on pagan and Christian symbolism, another indication of what would happen at the end of the year when he explicitly rejects the heritage Freud had in mind for him, the work on the psychoses. Instead he proposes to hand on this heritage to a successor he has chosen and set a new course for himself.

Rejection of the Heritage and Reversal of the Heriting

During November there were numerous further signs of what was to come. In a letter which begins '*Pater, peccavi*' [Father, I have sinned], Jung describes why he has been 'lazy' in writing. He mentions his young assistant Johann

Jakob Honegger, 'so intelligent and subtle-minded' that 'hardly a day goes by without an exchange of ideas'. But, most importantly, he goes into some detail about his studies of mythology (162J 15.11.09). Freud responds with reports of his own reading and thinking about various themes in ancient mythology. There is one sharp exchange in which Jung proposes to adapt Freud's formula for obsessional ideas – '*regressive substitutes for action*' – to create a formula for *dementia praecox* ideas – 'regressive substitutes for *reality*' (168J 14.12.09).[10]

Freud's letter a few days later is the immediate trigger for Jung's Christmas Day letter rejecting his heritage. For one thing Freud summarily rejects Jung's formulation of the nature of *dementia praecox* ideas with a somewhat tendentious comment:

> I am troubled by the fact that reality is not, like action, a Ψ factor; or do you mean 'recognition of reality'? (169F 19.12.09)

Not only is Jung's attempt to make sense of *dementia praecox* brushed aside again, Freud, fatefully as it turns out, expresses his hopes in the area he and Jung had been discussing for the past couple of months:

> I long for mythologists, linguists, and historians of religions; if they won't come to our help, we shall have to do all that ourselves. (169F 19.12.09)

Jung's Christmas Day letter suggests that this remark of Freud's was a trigger for what he has to say to Freud. He begins by pointing to the problem of working on *dementia praecox* alongside the one who had apparently entrusted this work to him, referring to one of their recent differences and the impact on him:

> My attempt at criticism, though it looked like an attack, was actually a defence, which is why I apparently had to tilt at the 'omnipotence of thoughts'. Of course the term is dead right as well as elegantly concise and trenchant, for that's how it is, especially in D. pr. where new fundamentals are constantly being uncovered by it. All this has shaken me very much, in particular my faith in my own capacities . . . *It is a hard lot to have to work alongside the father creator*. Hence my attacks on 'clinical terminology'. (170J 25.12.09, my italics)

Jung could not be more explicit, although he might have said that they would have to decide whether it was to be working alongside or whether the project of understand psychosis had genuinely been handed on to him. The comment about shaking his confidence was, I think, Jung's way of setting the stage for what was to follow, although there was doubtless some truth in it:

> But most of all I was struck by your remark that you longed for archaeologists, philologists, etc. By this, I told myself, you probably meant that I was unfit for such work. However, *it is in precisely these fields that I now have a passionate interest, as before only in Dem. pr.* And I have the most marvellous visions,

> glimpses of far-ranging interconnections which I am at present incapable of grasping, for the subject really is too big and I hate impotent bungling . . . It has become quite clear to me that *we shall not solve the ultimate secrets of neurosis and psychosis without mythology and the history of civilization* . . . (170J 25.12.09, my italics)

Jung is proposing that he follow his passionate interest, now not in understanding *dementia praecox*, or at least not directly. His passion is for the study of mythology and the history of civilization wherein, he feels, lies the solution to understanding both psychosis and neurosis. But what then is to happen with the project Freud seemed to entrust to him? 'Who then is to do this work?' Jung asks:

> Surely it must be someone who knows the psyche and has the passion for it. D. pr. will not be the loser. Honegger, who has already introduced himself to you, is now working with me with great understanding, and I shall entrust to him everything I know so that something good may come of it. (170J 25.12.09)

So Honegger, one of Jung's analysands and now one of his most talented assistants, is to take on the heritage Freud had intended for Jung. A few months later Jung makes even clearer the extent of his devotion to his new passion which has replaced that for the work on *dementia praecox*:

> I often feel I am wandering alone through a strange country, seeing wonderful things that *no one has seen before* and no one needs to see. *It was like that when the psychology of Dementia praecox dawned upon me*. Only, I don't yet know what will come of it. I must just let myself be carried along, trusting to God that in the end I shall make a landfall somewhere. (186J 17.4.10, my italics)

How did Freud respond to his protégé's explicit rejection of what had been pictured for him? He tries to see it as Jung taking up the heritage he had secretly hoped he would. He even suggests that he had a presentiment of it (which he indeed may have) and therefore tried to keep the field clear for Jung. He approves of Honegger (a complex story in itself) but has reservations about Jung being over-ambitious in his new enthusiasm:

> Your displeasure at my longing for an army of philosophical collaborators is music to my ears. I am delighted that you yourself take this interest so seriously, that you yourself wish to be this army; *I could have dreamed of nothing better* but simply did not suspect that mythology and archaeology had taken such a powerful hold on you. But I must have hoped as much, for *since October something has diverted me from working in those fields*, though I have never for a moment doubted their importance for our purposes. I have an excellent opinion of Honegger, who probably offers the best prospects. But may I confide a source of misgiving? I don't think it would be a good idea to plunge directly into the general problem of ancient mythology; it strikes me as preferable to approach it in a series of detailed studies. Perhaps you have had the same idea. What I have valued in the specialists was simply the sheer knowledge that is so hard for us to acquire. But that after all is not an impossible task. (171F 2.1.10, my italics)

Not only did Freud feel that what Jung proposed to do was *not* an impossible task, we soon discover that he feels he is following Jung into this new field. It seems like a reversal of the heriting Freud had proposed. It also gives us an insight into the tensions at play in Freud that turns his wish that Jung continue and complete his work into what can be described as a Lear-like-dilemma. On the one hand, we are aware of that persistent fantasy (often more like an unconscious phantasy) that he is near death and his contributions are at an end. But, on the other hand, we see the irrepressible researcher and explorer, ever ready for a new challenge.

Of course this trajectory of the story of Freud's picture of Jung as the person who would *continue and complete his work by applying to psychoses what he had begun with neuroses* was not finished. There was, moreover, a tragic dimension to this handing on the work of understanding psychotic disorders to Jung's assistant, Honegger. Freud seemed to welcome this new role for Honegger for whom he had great respect and affection. However, over the ensuing year and a half, young Honegger became extremely disturbed, caught up in the *dementia praecox* they were all trying to understand, and committed suicide.

Sadly, Honegger's death was one of the many occasions over the next two years when Freud and Jung were to continue to exchange, often acrimonious, ideas about psychotic disorders. Rather than focus on some of those well-known differences, such as the role of the regression of the libido, I want to call attention to another sad moment in which the damaging effects of this miscarried process of heriting led to a failure to make progress in understanding the nature of psychosis.

The following observations from Jung after the death of Honegger give some idea of what potential was lost to psychoanalysis and yet at the same time, in my judgement anyway, reveals how Jung's new passion took him as much away as towards an understanding of psychotic states of mind:

> Everything I am doing now revolves round the contents and forms of unconscious fantasies. I think I've already got some really fine results. You will see that this investigation is the necessary preliminary work for the psychology of Dem. praec. Spielrein's case is proof of that (it's in the *Jahrbuch*). Often I longed for you to be here so that I could discuss an extremely difficult case: Dem. praec. with, one can well say, a tremendous unconscious fantasy system which I have to drag into the light of day with unspeakable effort and patience. On top of that, constant danger of suicide. A really devilish case, but extraordinarily interesting and instructive. The case is particularly painful because I am now beginning to see what I did not see with Honegger. It seems that in Dem. praec. you have at all costs to bring to light the inner world produced by the introversion of libido, which in paranoiacs suddenly appears in distorted form as a delusional system (Schreber), as I have apparently succeeded in doing in the present case but failed to do with Honegger because I had no inkling of it. I tell myself that this lack of knowledge of mine led to his death. What if this view should be confirmed? I have the feeling that I am practising vivisection on human beings with

> intense inner resistance. It seems that introversion leads not only, as in hysteria, to a recrudescence of infantile memories but also to a loosening up of the historical layers of the unconscious, thus giving rise to perilous formations which come to light only in exceptional cases. (259J 12.06.11)

Freud had little real understanding of what Jung was saying as shown by the fact he identifies these unconscious phantasies with the conscious day-dreams of his hysterics and obsessionals:

> I am very much interested in what you tell me about the system of ucs. fantasies in a case of D. pr. These constructions are known to me from hysteria and obsessional neurosis; they are nothing other than carefully cultivated day-dreams. I took them into account by saying that the symptoms spring not directly from the memories but from the fantasies built on them . . . But I don't think you could have saved Honegger by revealing this system [of fantasies] – if he had one. Where I have found one, its production was no more important than were the aetiology and the motives and the rewards held out by real life . . . On the role of fantasies – your introversion of the libido – I am mulling over a few fundamental ideas. Here's to better days. (260F 15.6.11)

The misunderstandings here are profound and it is very sad for the development of a psychoanalytic understanding of psychotic states of mind that this potential dialogue was not pursued by these two men despite Freud's 'here's to better days'.

There is much more one could say about these later exchanges. But, in thinking about this Lear dilemma, one of the most tragic aspects is the link between Honegger's suicide after Jung had appointed him to this task of understanding *dementia praecox* in his Christmas Day letter of 1909 and the death on Christmas Day 1925 of the other person who saw himself as Freud's heir in this respect, Karl Abraham. Abraham had written to Eitington on 1 January 1908:

> The work on the borderlines between dementia praecox and hysteria and on the concept of dementia has taken more tangible shape in Vienna. Freud very much wants me to deal with this subject very soon. (Abraham 1974, p. 35)

Without Jung, Honegger, or Abraham, Freud could make only desultory progress in any fundamental clinical understanding of psychotic states aside from his schematic outline of the differentiation between neurosis and psychosis based on his structural theory in *The Ego and the Id* in 1923 and the two 1924 papers that followed it, 'Neurosis and psychosis' and 'The loss of reality in neurosis and psychosis' (Freud 1923, 1924a, 1924b).

Why in God's Name Did I Allow Myself to Follow You!

All that is left to our sad Lear story is to note that strange twist in which Freud thinks of himself as following Jung, almost as if struggling to be his

heir. After a period in which Freud seems to be coming to terms with Jung's decision to pursue his interest in mythology and related subjects, he writes enigmatically:

> Since my mental powers revived, I have been working in a field where you will be surprised to meet me. I have unearthed strange and uncanny things and will *almost feel obliged not to discuss them with you*. But you are too shrewd not to guess what I am up to when I add that I am dying to read your 'Transformations and Symb. of the Lib.' (268F 20.08.11, my italics)

Again Freud feels an inhibition about talking about his work with Jung as if fearful of getting ahead of him. Jung for his part reports that both he and his wife were mystified, on tenterhooks because they cannot make out what is going on 'so enigmatically behind the scenes'. Nevertheless, he appears to warm to this role of leading the way:

> [I] would only counsel you (very immodestly) to let my 'Transf. and Symb. of the Lib.' unleash your associations and/or fantasies: I am sure you will hit upon strange things if you do. (269J 29.08.11)

Freud responds immediately, saying that his work in the past few weeks has dealt with the same theme as Jung's, the origin of religion,[11] noting that he wasn't going to speak of it out of a 'fear of confusing' Jung (270F 01.09.11).

Freud's delight that he can now speak openly of his project soon turns to despair. Two months later we again encounter the Lear who wants to convince Jung that old age is not a delusion:

> My psychology of religion is giving me a good deal of trouble; I have little pleasure in working and constant *douleurs d'enfantement* [labour pains]; in short, I feel rather gloomy and I am not quite well physically either. Old age is not an empty delusion. A morose senex deserves to be shot without remorse. (278F 02.11.11)

The *old age complex* is back with a vengeance. *A morose senex deserves to be shot without remorse.* But why? Just a couple of days before he had unexpectedly had a letter from Emma Jung, a letter reflecting on Freud's visit to the Jungs for four days in September 1911 prior to the Third Psychoanalytic Congress in Weimar:

> I don't really know how I am summoning the courage to write to you this letter . . . Since your visit I have been tormented by the idea that your relation to my husband is not altogether as it should be . . . I do not know whether I am deceiving myself when I think you are somehow not quite in agreement with 'Transformations of Libido'. You didn't speak of it at all and yet I think it would do you both so much good if you got down to a thorough discussion of it . . . Please do not take my action as officiousness and do not count me among the women who, you once told me, always spoil your friendships. My husband naturally knows nothing of this letter and I beg you not to hold him responsible

> for it or let any kind of unpleasant effects it may have on you glance off on him. (Emma Jung letter 30.10.11, in *The Freud–Jung Letters*, McGuire 1974, pp. 452–3)

She also comments that she can't bear to see Freud so resigned, a resignation she links to his sons, both 'real' and 'spiritual'.

This letter, which Freud would have received just before his 2 November 'morose senex' letter, seems to have had an effect on Freud, who appears even more resigned when he writes some ten days later. Here he appears to make an effort with Jung's 'Transformations', doubtless as a result of Emma Jung's letter:

> The reading for my psychology of religion is going slowly. One of the nicest works I have read (again) is that of a well-known author on the 'Transformations and Symbols 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 a feeling that his horizon has been too narrowed by Christianity. And sometimes he seems to be more above the material than in it. But it is the best thing this promising author has written, up to now, though he will do still better. (280F 12.11.11)

But his mood becomes painfully evident as he carries on:

> . . . it is a torment to me to think, when I conceive an idea now and then, that I may be taking something away from you or appropriating something that might just as well have been acquired by you. When this happens, I feel at a loss; I have begun several letters offering you various ideas and observations for your own use, but I never finish them because this strikes me as even more indiscreet and undesirable than the contrary procedure. (280F 12.11.11)

We see here the unconscious power of this image, Freud having to hold back because, as the one struggling to herit his successor, he needs to leave his heir free to take up his heritage in his own way. However, this impulse to hold back is now confused by his sense that he is the one following. His next sentence is slipped in almost as if to hide the poignancy of a terribly painful cry:

> Why in God's name did I allow myself to follow you into this field? (280F 12.11.11)

Emma Jung seems to have had a glimmer of insight into how the relationship with Jung was fatally flawed by this unconscious Lear story. Freud would have received her second, even bolder, letter (written on 6 November) just prior to his writing his *why in God's name* letter:

> Another thing I must mention is your resignation in science, if one can call it that. You may imagine how overjoyed and honoured I am by the confidence you have in Carl, but it almost seems to me as though you were sometimes giving too

> much – do you not see in him the follower and fulfiller more than you need? Doesn't one often give much because one wants to keep much?
>
> Why are you thinking of giving up already instead of enjoying your well-earned fame and success? Perhaps for fear of letting the right moment for it pass you by? Surely this will never happen to you. After all, you are not so old that you could speak now of the 'way of regression', what with all these splendid and fruitful ideas you have in your head! Besides, the man who has discovered the living fountain of ps. a. (or don't you believe it is one?) will not grow old so quickly.
>
> No, you should rejoice and drink to the full the happiness of victory after having struggled for so long. And do not think of Carl with a father's feeling: '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.
>
> Don't be angry with me.
>
> With warm love and veneration, EMMA JUNG
>
> (06.11.11 letter in McGuire 1974, pp. 456–7)

We might remind ourselves that it is in *Totem and Taboo* that Freud articulates his hypothesis regarding the process of inheriting the father's strength. Here we see that it is not just that the son will grow and the father must *dwindle*. The fate of the primitive father is direr than that:

> There is, of course, no place for the beginnings of totemism in Darwin's primal horde. All that we find there is a violent and jealous father who keeps all the females for himself and drives away his sons as they grow up . . . If we call the celebration of the totem meal to our help, we shall be able to find an answer. One day the brothers who had been driven out came together, killed and devoured their father and so made an end of the patriarchal horde. United, they had the courage to do and succeeded in doing what would have been impossible for them individually . . . Cannibal savages as they were, it goes without saying that they devoured their victim as well as killing him. The violent primal father had doubtless been the feared and envied model of each one of the company of brothers: and in the act of devouring him they accomplished their identification with him, and each one of them acquired a portion of his strength. (Freud 1913, p. 141)

We could describe this as an oral theory of the acquisition of the good internal penis. While the little girl has a clear and unambiguous phantasy route to the acquiring of the good internal penis, the situation with the little boy would seem to be ambiguous. Clearly Freud is convinced that he has the answer, perhaps a conviction linked with the fact that his theory grows out of his emotional experience with Jung. Nevertheless, I think this is a psychoanalytic question yet to be answered adequately.

One can almost hear Lear shouting in a similar mood: these ungrateful daughters, they prosper as I diminish – I am devoured by them! Perhaps Shakespeare agreed with Freud. But then again perhaps he did not. The story of Lear and his daughters is only one dimension of the play. The story

of Gloucester and his two sons, Edgar and Edmund, one a legitimate son, the other a bastard, is perhaps the essential counterpoint that gives a picture of heriting gone wrong and then redeemed. It is only at the end of the play that Edgar has become able to take on his heritage.

> The weight of this sad time we must obey,
> Speak what we feel, not what we ought to say.
> The oldest hath borne most, we that are young
> Shall never see so much, nor live so long.
> (V. iii. 322–25)

This is a very different view from that of Freud's. And what of Jung as the eldest son, crown prince and heir? Throughout these letters he never really escapes what he and Freud refer to as his 'father complex'. Even in what is effectively his last personal communication with Freud a year after the 'morose senex' letter, he seems more trapped in that role as a son than ever:

> May I say a few words to you in earnest? I admit the ambivalence of my feelings towards you, but am inclined to take an honest and absolutely straightforward view of the situation. If you doubt my word, so much the worse for you. I would, however, point out that your technique of treating your pupils like patients is a blunder. In that way you produce either slavish sons or impudent puppies . . . I am objective enough to see through your little trick. You go around sniffing out all the symptomatic actions in your vicinity, thus reducing everyone to the level of sons and daughters who blushingly admit the existence of their faults. Meanwhile you remain on top as the father, sitting pretty. (338J 18.12.12)

Jung's view here of heriting and inheriting is not essentially different from the view Freud puts forward in *Totem and Taboo*. In Freud's oral theory of the relationship between fathers and sons one ends up either with *slavish sons*, inheriting by imitation, or *impudent puppies*, inheriting by biting and trying to swallow, unless of course the puppies grow up and devour the father. It only reinforces my conviction that there must be another route in the unconscious phantasy life of boys to the acquisition of the good internal penis.

Notes

1. This paper was first presented at The Freud–Jung Letters Conference in Oxford on 29 September 2007 co-sponsored by the British Association of Psychotherapists and the Society of Analytical Psychology.

2. I introduced this term 'heriting' or 'to herit' in this paper on Lear (Fisher 2000) as a parallel to the concept of inheriting since the word 'endow' does not convey the idea I develop in that paper.

3. Numbered references to letters are from *The Freud-Jung Letters* (McGuire 1974).

4. Freud eventually settled on the terms *narcissistic psychoneuroses* or simply *psychoses*, though in these early letters both he and Jung use Kraepelin's term *dementia praecox* since it had gained some ascendancy at this time in psychiatric clinics. Jung's director at the Burghölzli Hospital, Eugen Bleuler, introduced the term *schizophrenia* a few years later.

5. *Diagnostische Assoziationsstudien: Beiträge zur experimentellen Psychopathologie*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1906) was edited by Jung and contained six studies by Jung and other doctors at the psychiatric clinical of the University of Zürich at the Burghölzli Hospital, including especially Jung's paper on 'Psychoanalysis and association'.

6. References to Shakespeare's *King Lear* are to the Arden Shakespeare, third series, edited by R.A. Foakes (1997).

7. Some readers may wonder about the contribution of Freud's cancer to his 'old age complex'. However, he first discovered a leucoplastic growth on his jaw and palate in February 1923, several months before his 67th birthday. Jones reports: 'He had often imagined that his days were numbered, but now at last the dread reality came in sight' (Jones 1957, p. 94).

8. I explore this suggestion in a book I am working on entitled *Bion and Beyond: A Dialogue with the Early Writings of W.R. Bion*.

9. This is to be distinguished from a hope Freud had entertained a few years earlier about a 'change in method' that might make possible a therapy of the psychoses: 'Psychoses, states of confusion and deeply-rooted (I might say toxic) depression are therefore not suitable for psycho-analysis; at least not for the method as it has been practised up to the present. I do not regard it as by any means impossible that by suitable changes in the method we may succeed in overcoming this contra indication – and so be able to initiate a psychotherapy of the psychoses' (Freud 1905 [1904]).

10. There are several key issues of difference regarding *dementia praecox* between Jung and Freud that are discussed in this and surrounding letters. Though important I will bypass them to focus on this representative disagreement.

11. This work on the origin of religion was Freud's *Totem and Taboo*, Parts I and II of which were published in 1912 and Parts II and IV in 1913.

References

Abraham, H.C. (1974) Karl Abraham: an unfinished biography. *International Review of Psychoanalysis* 1: 17–72.

Bion, W.R. (1957) Differentiation of the psychotic from the non-psychotic personalities. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 38: 266–75. Reprinted in *Second Thoughts*. London: Karnac, 1967, pp. 43–64.

Bion, W.R. (1962) *Learning from Experience*. London: Karnac.

Fisher, J.V. (2000) A father's abdication: Lear's retreat from 'aesthetic conflict'. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 81: 963–82. Reprinted in the *IJPA* Key Papers Series, *Key Papers in Literature and Psychoanalysis*, P. Williams and G.O. Gabbard (eds), pp. 15–48. London: Karnac, 2007.

Foakes, R.A. (ed.) (1997) Shakespeare's *King Lear*. The Arden Shakespeare. Walton-on-Thames, Surrey: Thomas Nelson.

Freud, S. (1905 [1904]) On psychotherapy. In: *SE* 7, pp. 255–68. London: Hogarth.

Freud, S. (1913) *Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. In: *SE* 13, pp. 1–161. London: Hogarth.

Freud, S. (1915) The unconscious. In: *SE* 14, pp. 159–216. London: Hogarth.
Freud, S. (1923) *The Ego and the Id*. In: *SE* 19, pp. 12–68. London: Hogarth.
Freud, S. (1924a) Neurosis and psychosis. In: *SE* 19, pp. 149–56. London: Hogarth.
Freud, S. (1924b) The loss of reality in neurosis and psychosis. In: *SE* 19, pp. 183–90. London: Hogarth.
Jones, E. (1957) *Sigmund Freud, Life and Work, vol. 3, The Last Phase 1919–1939*. London: Hogarth.
Jung, C.G. (1906) Psychoanalysis and association experiments, originally in *Diagnostische Assoziationsstudien: Beiträge zur experimentellen Psychopathologie*, vol. 1. Leipzig: Bart. Reprinted in: *Collected Works* 2.
McGuire, W. (ed.) (1974) *The Freud–Jung Letters: The Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C.G. Jung*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Segal, H. (1950) Some aspects of the analysis of a schizophrenic. In: *The Work of Hanna Segal*, pp. 101–20. New York: Aronson, 1981.