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ABSTRACT

EDITING THE SANDOR FERENCZI-GEORG GRODDECK CORRESPONDENCE

1921-1933: A WORK IN PROGRESS

by CHRISTOPHER JOHN FORTUNE

Abstract for a thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education, Graduate Department of Education, University of Toronto, 1996.

Of the early psychoanalysts, Sandor Ferenczi (1873-1933) was considered the most brilliant therapist -- acknowledged by Freud to be a "master of analysis." Georg Groddeck (1866-1934), a German physician, was the source for Freud's concept of the "Id" and is sometimes referred to as the "father of psychosomatic medicine."

The correspondence, which is primarily Ferenczi's letters to Groddeck, provides important new insights into Ferenczi's professional and personal life, including:

- Ferenczi's radical clinical and theoretical experiments and his reconsideration of the importance of early trauma.
- Ferenczi's challenge to the traditional limits of the doctor-patient and analyst-analysand relationship.

- ii -
- the complex emotional triangle involving his wife and step-daughter.
- the impact of his own early traumas.
- Ferenczi as a chronic patient, plagued by physical ailments.

Ferenczi's determination to understand his personal history and heal himself led him to critique fundamental aspects of classical psychoanalysis. These letters illuminate the personal roots of his professional drive. A historical perspective on the evolution of Ferenczi's ideas is critical since it reveals the origins of basic structures of present-day psychoanalysis including: object relations -- intersubjectivity and mutuality, analyst subjectivity -- the use of countertransference, and the role of childhood trauma in later mental, emotional and physical life.

Different than his letters to Freud, whom he saw as a father figure, Ferenczi pursued a more open friendship with Groddeck, as though he were a favourite older brother. They explored ideas including: self-analysis, mutual analysis, the body-mind relationship and wrestled with the question of whether psychoanalysis could be a science. The letters resonate with critical theoretical and clinical issues today.

- iii -

Chapter IV is a Commentary evaluating the significance of the correspondence for the history of psychoanalysis. It includes a discussion of the key letter of the correspondence, and addresses themes of Ferenczi's personal and professional life, including: recognition of childhood traumas, drive for relationship, regression, identification with the child, body, health and psycho-somatics, and disclosure of negative feelings.

The Commentary also explores a number of ideas between Groddeck and Ferenczi, including: Groddeck's influence and importance, the child and the significance of the mother, how Groddeck inspired Ferenczi, writer's block, Thalassa, and the courage to create, and the body between Ferenczi and Groddeck.

Appendices include a chronology of the letters, and a note on method and sources.

************************************

- iv -
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Editing the Sandor Ferenczi/Georg Groddeck Correspondence  
1921-1933: A WORK IN PROGRESS  

Sandor Ferenczi 1873-1933  Georg Groddeck 1866-1934  

By Christopher John Fortune  

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO (O.I.S.E.)  
Department of Applied Psychology  

I have been researching and writing about Sandor Ferenczi for the past ten years, with a focus on his last work (1924-1933) which parallels the period of the Ferenczi-Groddeck correspondence. This research has led to a number of publications and invitations for papers, including reviews of Ferenczi’s Clinical Diary (1932), and papers on the clinical relationship with his important patient, Elizabeth Severn ("R.N."). As well, I have presented papers at international conferences in Budapest, Geneva, London and Italy.
In 1991, the psychoanalytic historian, Paul Roazen, approached me with the idea of editing an English edition of the correspondence. In the spring of 1993, I was appointed by the Ferenczi Estate as editor. Shortly after, Canadian translator, Norbert Ruebsaat was appointed. Since that time, I have been searching for all existing letters, particularly for any of the missing Groddeck letters. My search for letters has taken me to archives in Europe and North America, including Ferenczi archives in Paris and Budapest, Groddeck archives in Frankfurt (Groddeck Society) and Freiburg, the Balint archives in Geneva, the British Psycho-Analytical Society in London, contact with the Fromm archive in Tubingen, the Fromm-Reichman group at Chestnut Lodge in Baltimore, the Library of Congress in Washington, and the Payne-Whitney Clinic in New York.

Assisted in my research by Ferenczi's executor, Paris psychoanalyst Dr. Judith Dupont, and by the Georg Groddeck Society, fourteen of Ferenczi's unpublished letters and cards have come to light. As well, three new letters and five unpublished postscripts by Ferenczi's wife, Gizella, have been located. However, sadly, up until now, the search for Groddeck letters has uncovered only one new letter.

This new English edition surpasses the existing German, French and Italian editions.¹ As a new work, this edition will be the most accurate and complete rendering of the
Ferenczi-Groddeck letters in any language, not only due to the incorporation of the new letters, but also because copies of the original handwritten letters were used in preparing this edition. The earlier editions were translated and edited from a typescript of the letters.

In comparing the earlier editions to these originals, mistakes and missing details were found, such as:

1) misdated letters
2) mistranscribed words
3) whole passages and words left out (intentionally and by mistake).
4) Ferenczi's frequent underlining of words for emphasis were missed.

In one case, I found a significant misinterpretation in the earlier French and German editions based on Ferenczi's supposed misspelling of Freud's name as "Seigmund." A careful examination of the original showed the transcription to be in error and that Ferenczi had consciously misspelled Freud's name to make a play on words. (See note 25 December 1921).

In editing the letters I followed the style of the major psychoanalytic correspondences -- notably, the Freud/Jung and Freud/Ferenczi letters. However, I amplified my
notations to include more speculation, interpretation, and contextualization.

To date, I have expanded the notations from 54 notes in the French/German publications, to a total of 450 notes. I realize this is too many notes for a published volume, however for this thesis, a work in progress, I decided to be exhaustive. I will edit the notes for publication.

Span of the Correspondence: 1921-1933

The volume includes:

- 53 letters (and cards) Ferenczi to Groddeck
- 3 letters Groddeck to Ferenczi
- 1 letter Groddeck to Gizella Ferenczi (Ferenczi's wife)
- 4 letters Gizella Ferenczi to Grodecks

* See Chronology in appendix.

INTRODUCTION

In September 1920, at the Sixth International Psychoanalytic Association Congress in the Hague, Sandor Ferenczi, the famous Hungarian analyst and founding member of Freud's "secret committee" delivered his paper "The Further Development of an Active Therapy in Psycho-Analysis" (1921). At the same meeting, Georg Groddeck, a German doctor and director of a sanitorium in Baden-Baden, presented his paper "On Psychoanalyzing the Organic in Human Beings"
A specialist in psychosomatics, Groddeck caused a stir by defiantly introducing himself to Freud and the assembled analysts as a "wild analyst." Thus Ferenczi met his future physician and friend for the first time. Previously, in 1917, Ferenczi had reviewed Groddeck's brief paper, "Psychic Conditioning and the Psychoanalytic Treatment of Organic Disorders."

The Ferenczi-Groddeck correspondence began on the 26 April 1921, and spanned twelve years. In the first letter, Ferenczi, 48-years-old, wrote to the 55-year-old Groddeck to refer a young patient for treatment. That summer, Ferenczi and his wife, Gizella, visited Groddeck's sanitorium for ten days, marking the beginning of a close friendship between the two men and their wives. The relationship between Groddeck and Ferenczi lasted until Ferenczi's death in May, 1933. Groddeck died just one year later, in June, 1934.

THE CORRESPONDENTS
Sándor Ferenczi (1873-1933) was considered the most brilliant of the early psychoanalysts -- acknowledged by Freud to be a "master of analysis." A Hungarian doctor, Ferenczi met Freud in 1908, and became his very close friend and collaborator for the next twenty-five years. Ferenczi left a rich psychoanalytic legacy -- from his early
contributions towards founding the young "science," to his last radical, theoretical and technical challenges to Freud and classical psychoanalysis.

Georg Groddeck (1866-1934), was a German physician drawn to Freud and psychoanalysis in 1917. Freud assured Groddeck's psychoanalytic renown when he acknowledged in The Ego and the Id (1923) that he had borrowed the term "Id" (Das Es) from Groddeck. As an early psychoanalytic explorer of the relationship between organic and mental illness, Groddeck established a sanitorium in Baden-Baden in 1900, and has been championed by some as the "father of psychosomatic medicine." He produced a prolific body of writing, much of which remains untranslated. His Book of the It (Das Buch vom Es) (1923/1961) is a psychoanalytic classic. Groddeck is noted for being the author of the first psychoanalytical novel, The Soulsearcher (Der Seelensucher), published in 1921 (unpublished in English). The Meaning of Illness (1977), a collection of Groddeck's papers, contains his correspondence with Freud.

THE CONTENT OF THE CORRESPONDENCE:

A) FERENCZI, GRODDECK AND THE HISTORY OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

The Ferenczi-Groddeck correspondence provides important new insights into Sandor Ferenczi's personal and professional life. In these letters, Ferenczi writes candidly of his complex and enduring feelings for Elma, his wife's daughter
by a first marriage. He blames Freud for influencing his choice to marry the mother, Gizella, over the daughter. He writes that he loves Elma, but feels guilty because he also cares deeply for Gizella. The origins of this complex emotional triangle is a major theme of vol. I of the Freud-Ferenczi correspondence. In fragments of disarming self-analysis, Ferenczi also explores childhood memories and the impact of his early traumas. In a more sanguine tone than his letters to Freud, whom he saw as a father figure, Ferenczi addresses Groddeck as if he were an older brother: "I have never spoken so openly and freely to a man, not even to Siegmund [sic]" (Christmas 1921).

The letters show Ferenczi's determination to challenge the traditional limits of the doctor-patient and analyst-analysand relationship. He pursued a much more open professional friendship with Groddeck. Seeking help from his confidant and trusted physician, in these letters he reveals himself as a chronic patient and likely hypochondriac, plagued by a myriad of physical ailments, including breathing problems, sensitivity to cold and insomnia. Through the letters, as well as during Ferenczi's yearly "therapeutic holidays" to Groddeck's sanitorium in Baden-Baden, the two men engaged in an open dialogue and frequently a vigorous debate of shared scientific interests, including: self-analysis, mutual analysis and an exploration of the body-mind relationship. At times, Groddeck could not
follow Ferenczi's irrepressible spirit of scientific investigation. Groddeck saw in Ferenczi's passionate thirst for psychological knowledge a dangerous desire to "atomize the soul," which Groddeck believed could only lead to Ferenczi's self-destruction. In a moving last letter to Gizella, written after Ferenczi's death, he remarked: "It would have been as hard to help Sandor as it would be to hold back a raging torrent with the hollow of one's hand."

The letters also illuminate Ferenczi's pivotal role as mediator between Freud and Groddeck, and his attempt to keep them and their theoretical and clinical positions united and in harmony. Like Freud, Ferenczi was intent on putting psychoanalysis upon a scientific footing. Yet, he also responded deeply to Groddeck's unorthodox physical approaches and his intuitive exploration of the relationship between mind and body. Throughout their dialogue, Ferenczi and Groddeck wrestled with the question of whether psychoanalysis was a science or not.

Ferenczi also talks of the hopes, struggles and successes of his clinical work. Spanning the twenties and early thirties, this correspondence marks the period during which Ferenczi mounted his most daring technical and theoretical experiments -- including the notorious "grand experiment" of mutual analysis, whereby he was analyzed by a patient. These experiments, which radically challenged Freud and
psychoanalysis, led Ferenczi to reconsider the importance of early trauma. As a companion to Ferenczi's Clinical Diary (1988) and the Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi: Volume I (1993), these letters contribute to a greater understanding of the relationship between Ferenczi and Freud.

**Ferenczi: A Seeker of Theoretical and Clinical Balance**

Ferenczi was a dialectical and empirical thinker who frequently sought to re-balance extremes of classical psychoanalysis.

Ferenczi is generally portrayed in the psychoanalytic literature as being lovable, intuitive, inspired, chaotic, childlike, childish, and a gifted therapist. However, other sides of Ferenczi which surprise and challenge this view emerge in these letters. More accurately, the Ferenczi-Groddeck letters show that Ferenczi was a dialectical and empirical thinker and practitioner at heart, and a relentless researcher who raised new issues and perspectives in his work. As a part of his research, he frequently sought to re-balance areas in psychoanalysis which he felt had been overemphasized. He was ever alert to unexamined dogma in classical psychoanalysis and allowed himself the freedom to pursue questions to their farthest point, often in contradictory directions. This led Ferenczi to clinical technical experiments which were at times extreme, and
which he frequently self-critically modified. For example, he conducted a mutual analysis with a patient -- an experiment which, needless to say, had practical difficulties and which he later abandoned as "only a last resort!" (1932, p.115). Ferenczi's therapeutic enthusiasm -- or "furor sanandi" -- usually served him well. Through his tendency to move back and forth between extremes, he "discovered the underlying assumptions and limitations of any idea....[He] let himself go before returning to a more cautious and balanced position" (Aron & Harris, 1993, p.24).

If, from the beginning, Ferenczi had been more cautious, and tried to maintain a balanced and self-critical clinical approach, he would not likely have made the discoveries that he made (pp.24-25).

In tracking and amplifying Ferenczi's empiricism, we are led from his letters to Groddeck to his letters to Freud:

On 15 September 1931, Ferenczi wrote to Freud of his "scientific" work into questions of technique and theory:

"In my usual manner, I do not shy away from drawing out their conclusions to the furthest extent possible -- often to the point where I lead myself 'ad absurdum.' But this doesn't discourage me. I seek advances by new routes, often radically opposed, and I still hope that one day I shall end up finding the true path...All this sounds very mystical: please don't be alarmed by this...It's true that I'm often wrong, but I'm not rigid in my prejudices. (quoted in Dupont, 1988, pp. xiv-v)"
What may be described as Ferenczi's attempts at balance may simply be an expression of his inherent and relentless empiricism, driven, at its heart, by his commitment to therapeutic "healing."

In a 10 October 1931 letter, Ferenczi confessed to Freud that he knew in the past "subjective factors" had influenced him to make "exaggerations:"

I finally was able to recognize where and how I went too far. Besides, even these excursions into uncertainty have always brought me significant benefits...the value of what has been produced in this state will, first of all, have to be assessed objectively...My more recent insights are first grasped 'in statu nascendi... I am, above all, an empiricist...Ideas are always closely linked with the vicissitudes in the treatment of patients, and by these are either repudiated or confirmed." (Cited in Dupont, 1988, p.xv)

Ferenczi's propensity to explore contradictions is evidenced by the range of his technical experiments during the 1920s and early 1930s in search of effective clinical approaches -- from the control and intrusion of the active technique, through elasticity, and finally to his highly receptive techniques of indulgence and relaxation.

Haynal (1988) writes:

Ferenczi spoke as if there were two techniques -- one that he termed 'classical' and another that he developed in his 'technical experiments.' It should be considered a possibility that if Ferenczi's views before and after 1926 were regarded as contradictory,
it might be a function of experimentation, i.e. exploration in different directions. (p.129)

Even then, as he forged his own path and defined a new theoretical-clinical amalgam, Ferenczi attempted to reconcile the polarities embodied by Groddeck and Freud. In 1930, he wrote:

The relaxation-technique... assuredly obliterates even more completely the distinction between the analysis of children and that of adults -- a distinction hitherto too sharply drawn. In making the two types of treatment more like one another I was undoubtedly influenced by what I saw of the work of Georg Groddeck, the courageous champion of the psycho-analysis of organic diseases. (1930b, pp.122-123)

At the same time, Ferenczi wrote that he attempted to remain faithful to Freud's "well-tried analytical method of frustration as well, and [to] attain [his] aim by the tactful and understanding application of both forms of technique" (pp.122-3). (See note, 1927-1933).

B) RELEVANCE OF THE CORRESPONDENCE BEYOND PSYCHOANALYTIC HISTORY

Ferenczi's letters to Groddeck make substantive contributions to questions still debated in present-day psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. A number of the letters also address broader issues in the philosophy of science.

In 1949, Michael Balint, Ferenczi's literary executor, alluded to Ferenczi's later ideas, particularly his
technical experiments: "The day will come when analysts will begin to study them again, not in order to criticize them but to learn from them" (p.215). Balint (1958) later added: "Ferenczi's last writings not only anticipated the development of psycho-analytic technique and theory by fifteen to twenty years, but still contain many ideas that may shed light on problems of the present or even of the future" (p. 68). Balint's view has been confirmed. More recently, for example, object relations theorist Mitchell (1993) writes: "[Ferenczi] anticipated in the early 1930s, many of the most important analytic concepts of the past two or three decades" (p.190).

Ferenczi and Present-Day Debates in Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy

Ferenczi's work addresses the central debates in present-day psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. Although it isn't possible to explore these debates in any depth here, a number of them are alluded to by Ferenczi in his letters to Groddeck, including:

1. The question of whether the aetiology of neurosis is based in fantasy or reality.
2. The therapeutic relationship and its corrective emotional experience as opposed to insight through interpretation.
3. Listening to one's patients as opposed to theoretical imposition on patients.
4. Science as opposed to intuition: Romanticism, mysticism, and the metaphysical as against logic, rationality and science.

Briefly, to explore each of these areas in turn:

1. The question of whether the etiology of neurosis is based in fantasy or reality.

The classical Freudian position emphasized fantasy, whereas Ferenczi explored the impact of early traumatic reality. In this thesis, I will argue that Ferenczi's impetus to explore the significance of early trauma can be traced to the recognition of his own childhood trauma, which he revealed to Groddeck in the key letter of Christmas 1921. (See Commentary).

From the mid-1920s, Ferenczi increasingly became convinced that the significance of actual external trauma had been neglected in psychoanalysis. In 1930, nine years after the Christmas letter, Ferenczi wrote to Groddeck that his patients, particularly Elizabeth Severn, had convinced him of the "need to return to a proper discussion of the origin of trauma" (21.12.30).
By 1932, in his "Confusion of Tongues" paper, Ferenczi (1933) reported the results of his technical experiments: 
"[the] new ideas which my more intimate relation to my patients helped me to reach." Through this research, he continued: "[He] obtained, above all, new corroborative evidence for my supposition that the trauma, especially the sexual trauma, as the pathogenic factor cannot be valued highly enough" (p.161).

Sixty years later, Modell (1991) summed up the current state of the fantasy-reality debate acknowledging Ferenczi's seminal role:

Whether to believe in the environmental or in the intrapsychic origin of the neuroses, which in part formed the content of Freud's controversy with Ferenczi, has been a continuing dialectic since the beginning of psychoanalysis. Currently the balance is tipping in the direction of a traumatic etiology... Ferenczi's paper ["Confusion of Tongues"] was several generations ahead of its time, in that it proposed a constructionist view of reality. Such ideas were not systematically recognized in psychology until the monumental researches of Piaget. (p.229)

The question has been asked: Have Ferenczi and his ideas been "captured" by those who today champion the influence of the environment over classical Freudian theory -- based on instinct, fantasy and infantile sexuality -- in the aetiology of mental disturbance? How would Ferenczi respond if he knew that he had become the historical touchstone for the advocates of an exclusively "environmental-relational-
interpersonal" position in present-day psychoanalysis?
Loosely, this group could be seen to include some object relations theorists and practitioners, for example, followers of Bowlby's attachment theory, but also the fashionable therapists of "recovered memory" of child abuse.

One can speculate that Ferenczi, who arguably never completely broke with Freud or psychoanalysis, would probably be uncomfortable with any absolute theoretical position which completely eliminated fantasy as a factor in the complex interaction of reality and fantasy involved in psychological disturbance. He didn't simply propose the relational and abandon fantasy altogether, but seemed to believe, at least in the late 1920s, that he was applying a corrective to what he saw as an extreme theoretical and clinical imbalance in the Freudian position.

In his 25 December 1929 letter to Freud, he declares:

*Psychoanalysis deals far too one-sidedly with obsessive neurosis and character analysis -- that is, ego psychology -- while neglecting the organic-hysterical basis of the analysis. This results from overestimating the role of fantasy, and understimating that of traumatic reality, in pathogenesis.*

(Cited in Dupont, 1988, pxi) [my italics]

This does not preclude that over the next years, leading to his 1933 "Confusion of Tongues" paper and his clinical
diary, that Ferenczi's convictions about the significance of the environment became even stronger.

2. The therapeutic relationship and its corrective emotional experience as opposed to insight through interpretation. This juxtaposition has also been characterized as direct experience versus insight, process versus content, patient subjectivity versus "scientific" theory, and empathy versus interpretation.

Identifying a number of critical therapeutic factors in psychoanalytic treatment, Eagle (1984) writes: "In addition to the traditional stress on insight and interpretation, one can observe in more recent descriptions of the psychoanalytic process frequent reference to such factors as the 'real relationship' between patient and therapist and the therapeutic potential of identification with the therapist" (p.83). In large part, these more recently identified factors in psychoanalytic treatment can be traced back to Ferenczi's influence.

Aron and Harris (1993) write that "the subjectivity of the analyst and the intersubjective construction of experience have emerged as powerful contemporary questions" (p.200).

Stolorow (1992) specifically enlarges this contemporary field:
There has been long-standing debate within psychoanalysis over the role of cognitive insight versus affective attachment in the process of therapeutic change. During the past decade the pendulum seems to have swung in the direction of affective attachment...for example, [the following have framed the issues:] Kohut (1984), in terms of the disruption and repair of selfobject transference ties; Modell (1984), the holding functions of the analytic setting; Emde (1988), the emotional availability of the analyst correcting for early deficits; and Gill (1984) and Weiss, Sampson and the Mount Zion Psychotherapy Research Group (1986), the new interpersonal experiences with the analyst disconfirming transference expectations. (p.164)

The formulations of all the authors listed in the above quote, as well as numerous others, were anticipated over half-a-century earlier by Ferenczi's clinical and theoretical explorations. It is shocking and disturbing, at least unfortunate, -- and whether by ignorance or not, a slap at any semblance of historical debt -- that Ferenczi has, up until most recently, gone unnamed as the progenitor of so much of what today are considered cutting-edge questions in psychoanalysis.  

Ferenczi's letters to Groddeck don't specifically engage the issues of the therapeutic relationship, interpretation and insight in analysis, but allude to an intense and exploratory involvement in his clinical relationships, and raise issues of countertransference. For example, on 28 October 1929, he writes: "I fear the patients (the former ones) are literally trying to overwhelm me; not one of them wants to interrupt treatment. I cannot even think about
accepting new ones." And, on 21 December 1930, he writes: "[The] patients act out and are energetic....Analysis, meanwhile, as the practice is developing with me, requires greater self-sacrifice than we had previously been accustomed to."

Ferenczi's elevation of the patient's emotional experience as central to treatment dates particularly to his 1924 book with Rank, *The Development of Psychoanalysis* -- written during the early period of his letters to Groddeck -- but can also be found in earlier papers, for example, Ferenczi (1909).

If Ferenczi (1928) himself didn't anticipate the burial of his radical ideas, he did at least predict that the complexity of his work would be over-simplified, distorted and misused:

> There is no doubt that many...will seize on what I have said about the importance of empathy to lay the chief emphasis in their handling of patients on the subjective factor, i.e. on intuition, and will disregard what I stated to be the all-important factor, the conscious assessment of the dynamic situation. (pp.99-100)

Again, anticipating a more contemporary view of the analyst's behaviour, Ferenczi (1928) wrote that the analyst's mind "swings continuously between empathy, self-observation and making judgments" (p.96).
Ferenczi never abandoned the concept of insight. In 1926, he wrote that for some patients "activity is only a prelude to interpretation" (p.217).

As Aron and Harris (1993) state: The "active technique was always a strategic move to permit the revelation of repressed material and to promote the transference. Conditions were being created, Ferenczi believed, to enable deeper and more trenchant interpretations, not to substitute for interpretation" (p.202).

That said, however, Ferenczi increasingly moved his clinical focus towards the patient's genuine experience. This led to his later technical developments such as elasticity (Ferenczi, 1928), passivity and relaxation (1930b, 1933).

Confirming Ferenczi's historic shift towards experience, Eagle (1984) defined a number of basic treatment assumptions of present-day psychoanalysis. He writes: "A more intellectualized understanding or insight...does not often produce major changes. It is the phenomena of 'transference' and transference neurosis and the use of transference interpretation which...mitigate against an excessive intellectuality in psychoanalytic therapy" (p.83).

Later, moving even further into object relations theory and again typifying Ferenczi's stance, Eagle writes: "[There is]...
a greater stress on the therapeutic relationship beyond a concern with transference and transference interpretations" (p.90). In this context, the therapeutic relationship can be viewed as providing what Winnicott (1958) termed a "holding" environment.

In his 1932 Clinical Diary, Ferenczi suggested that a new context was necessary for the patient's experience in analysis in order to lead to a therapeutic outcome: "An abreaction of quantities of the trauma is not enough; the situation must be different from the actually traumatic one in order to make possible a different, favorable outcome" (p.108).

Ferenczi set about creating those conditions which would lead to what would later be called "corrective emotional experience."6 In 1933, he wrote that it was the patient's confidence in the analyst that "establishes the contrast between the present and the unbearable traumatogenic past" (p.160).

Haynal (1988), in summing up what may appear to be the contradictions in Ferenczi's work, wrote:

The research underlying [Ferenczi's directions] was absolutely coherent: he was seeking to understand the analyst's role and its implications in the analytic process...His intention was to determine the consequences of his different attitudes, of his verbal and non-verbal behaviour, the common ground on which analysis of himself and of his analysand meet. (p.26)
Through modifications made to analytic listening, Haynal wrote:

[Ferenczi]...expanded its focus to include not only what the analysand expresses, but also what the analyst feels, to include the role of the analyst and the analytic setting, and the understanding of regression as an opportunity for a "new beginning" -- a more ambitious objective than mere reconstruction of the past. (p.26)

In a reference to Ferenczi, Haynal suggested that there were two types of psychoanalysis: "the first, paternal, rational, based on memory and insight -- the classical one; the other more maternal, regressive, based on interaction, experience, the non-verbal -- more 'profound'" (p.129).

3. Listening to one's patients as opposed to theoretical imposition on patients:
Ferenczi overwhelmingly embodied a clinical approach based on listening to patients, which is particularly evident from the mid-1920s through the early 1930s. In his later papers (1929, 1930, 1933), and in his diary, he was critical, at times scathing, of theoretical imposition on patients: "[The analyst is] levitating like some kind of divinity above the poor patient, reduced to the status of a child, unsuspecting that a large share of what is described as transference is artificially provoked by this kind of behaviour. [The analyst] postulates that transference is created by the patient" (1932, p.93).
However, judging from his 21 December 1930 letter to Groddeck, in his determination to prove his developing theory of trauma, in part by completing his analysis of Elizabeth Severn, Ferenczi himself may have been guilty of "suggesting" to his patients:

My principal patient, "the Queen," [Severn] takes up four, sometimes five hours of my time daily. Exhausting, but worth while. I believe I will shortly, or in the not too distant future, be in a position, finally, to announce what it means to complete an analysis. (See note # 78, pp.206-207).

There is something strongly akin to Freud's (1896) clinical "observations" leading to his formulation of the seduction theory in Ferenczi's opening remarks of the "Confusion of Tongues" paper: "The -- I should like to say imposing -- phenomena, the almost hallucinatory repetitions of traumatic experiences which began to accumulate in my daily practice...." (p.156). Ferenczi's words likewise echo the testimonials of present-day therapists of victims of "recovered memory" of child abuse.

Along these lines, Ferenczi (1930b) wrote that Severn confronted the nature and quality of his listening in analysis. Ferenczi writes: "I should like at this point to confess to you an error in tactics...how far my method with my patients may be called hypnosis or suggestion."

Severn had pointed out to Ferenczi that he "sometimes disturbed the
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spontaneity of the fantasy-production with [his] questions and answers." After considering her comments, he concluded: "Suggestion, which is legitimate even in analysis, should be of the nature of general encouragement rather than special direction" (p.133).

4. Science as opposed to intuition: Romanticism, mysticism, and the metaphysical as against logic, rationality and science.

In the German Romantic tradition, Georg Groddeck rejects science and Ferenczi's "understanding" in his letter of 12 November 1922. He writes to Ferenczi: "You are forced to want to understand things, and I am forced to want not to understand them." Ironically, since he is normally characterized as the intuitive, poetic analyst, Ferenczi in his letter of 11 October 1922, defends science against Groddeck's Romantic claim for the irrational: 9

I believe, however, that it can do no harm, for the time being, to rein in youth's desire to discover-the-new at all costs. It's important to allow that which is correct in Freud's work to gain strength first. It would be terrible if the pain and effort involved in laying out a usable orderliness were phantasmagorically torn apart by scientific Hattinbergs. Without orderliness of thought one cannot, after all, achieve even an inkling of understanding. Of course there are also poets and founders of religions, prophets; these people do not require an orderly system of knowledge and yet stumble upon much (which is mixed in with as much falsehood). We don't object to their presence; we even admit that we can learn many things from them. But, my god, why should these people, with their quaint manner of working, be allowed to weave their
techniques in with ours until the tapestries are indistinguishable? We renounce prophesy and gladly (and without envy) leave it to those poets, while acknowledging that there are exceptions (to wit Freud) who are able very well to combine the prophetic with the critical and theoretical. (See note, 1921-1922)

Ferenczi then goes on to expand his view beyond the scientific, probably alluding to the metaphysical, while still holding to the base of science. It is an articulate example of Ferenczi's attempt to hold the tension of seemingly opposite pulls -- Freud's project for psychoanalysis as science, and Ferenczi's inclination to explore the beyond:

Thus I (although by nature myself a revolutionary) maintain that we must hold onto the braids which you denounce. There will come a time when these braids separate one from the other, and begin to circle around something else. Give science a bit of time and protection! -- is my desire.

On 11 December 1922, Ferenczi writes to Groddeck:

I think I have quite a clear idea about the limitedness of our achievable knowledge; I also believe that I am very strict in my consideration of the grounds on which I am forced to come to an opinion; and I am always, as you know, prepared to relearn. I do not deny, though, that my inclination is towards wanting to understand, whereby I admit that complete understanding is infinitely distant and probably unachievable. Your interests also incline in this direction, although you always emphasize the unachievability, whereas I content myself with acknowledgement of the latter, but do not allow myself thereby to be prevented from ordering and grouping the small things that are achievable, and whose recognition brings pleasure. And experience shows that this activity is not useless....

You are working with the same instrument that I am, namely logic. It's unjust of you, therefore, to deny
your method of work and to pretend that you are working with some mythical incomprehensible daimon, or, more correctly, with an instrument that has nothing to do with logic. Even when you unconsciously come upon something, you cannot escape the (albeit differently structured) logic of the unconscious.

Ferenczi continues -- providing another example of his combining the intuitive, and even fantasy, with the rational -- and anticipates Popper's (1989) views on the growth of scientific knowledge:

I admit that every scientist in fact works with fantasy, that is, with the logic of the unconscious; i.e., he is initially a poet or artist. Why should he not attempt, though, to weave that which fantasy achieves into a world view; i.e., to compare it to experience; in other words to order, measure and classify experience as far as this is possible. Poets, too, classify -- if only with the help of symbolic (i.e., inexact) units of measure. The poetic, intuitive desire to understand is still a desire to understand. Only he who treats himself as an automatic instrument (as, incidentally, we all do), but who forbids himself to take account of events in and around him, can speak of not wanting to understand. No "normal" being does this, however; it seems, therefore, that man, along with other drives, also holds that one which compels him to try to understand himself and the world. To a certain extent this is already present in animals,--is not, therefore, a disreputable "human invention."

Carrying on, Ferenczi again demonstrates his attempt to balance, or at least to challenge extreme positions. He confronts Groddeck's romantic "not knowing" and "not wanting to know" position:

Let us therefore be just and not fall into the other extreme, that of declaring the previously too-highly-touted logic to be useless. Otherwise we would have to forfeit not only science, not only all conscious
tendency, but also, and especially, speech and script, those carriers of conscious knowledge.

Here, Ferenczi articulates Roustang's (1982) view of Groddeck's embrace of the Mother as a profound challenge to Freud and psychoanalysis (See Commentary): "If Groddeck believed neither in words nor in science, it was because he placed himself in the mother's position" (p.129).

Regardless of Ferenczi's stance in this letter, and his early skepticism of Groddeck's "mysticism" (Freud-Ferenczi, 15 June 1917, unpublished), he and Groddeck shared an enthusiasm for what could loosely be described as the mystical, or metaphysical, dimensions. For example, in his 3 March 1932 letter to Groddeck, Ferenczi describes his "well-disciplined" and "scientific imagination" that "takes [him] on flights beyond the unconscious and occasionally into the metaphysical." Again, Ferenczi attempts to balance opposing pulls by both locating himself as grounded in his "well-disciplined" technique, and, at the same time, flying into metaphysical regions.

Georg Groddeck, the German Romantic Tradition and the Nazis French psychoanalyst, Janine Chasseguet-Smirgel's 1985 book, The Ego-Ideal, contains a number of relevant passages which provide a way of understanding elements which may underly Groddeck's championing of the Mother.
In his letter of 12 November 1922, Groddeck appeals to Ferenczi to consider the mother transference, not simply the father transference:

I feel fine in the Imago of the womb with my darkness, and you want to escape from it...Thus you, for example, suppose that a successful analysis necessarily involves Father transference. But why should the Mother transference...be less useful?

Groddeck continues, characterizing them both as children:

The large hat which the adult wears on his godforsaken head, to ensure that nothing enters or exits, is for us children nothing but a game.

Groddeck's comments are reflected in Chasseguet-Smirgel's view of certain group phenomena:

The father figure is in fact chased away, excluded from the group, as is the superego. It is as if the group formation represented of itself the hallucinatory realization of the wish to take possession of the mother by sibship, through a very regressive mode, that of primary fusion. (p.83)

Chasseguet-Smirgel goes on to identify the perversion inherent in the extreme fusion with the mother, which found its expression in the dark philosophy of the Nazis:

Nazism has often been compared to a religion....In fact such a cult takes as its object the mother-goddess 'Blut und Boden' [Blood and Earth] rather than the father. In this kind of group one is witness to a real eradication of the father and the paternal world as well as of all oedipal derivatives. [Roustang again] As far as Nazism is concerned, the return to nature, to ancient German mythology represents an aspiration to fusion with the omnipotent mother. (p.83)
There is an eerie resonance here to the tenor of Groddeck's own views on the father transference and mother adulation.

The question has been asked: To what extent do Groddeck's concerns regarding science -- and his championing of the irrational -- lead to his apparent, yet confused, later relationship to Nazism?

To answer this question, Groddeck's views -- uncomfortably similar in some respects to Aryan and Nazi ideology -- must be considered within the tradition of German Romantic thought.12

Groddeck's skeptical view of science and conscious knowledge is deeply rooted in the German Romantic tradition of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. This Romantic tradition, often considered a cultural reaction against the values of reason, rationality and society of the Enlightenment, championed the irrational and the individual. Romanticism was characterized by the "scientific," philosophical and literary tradition of Goethe (1749-1832), and later, the literature of Dostoevsky (1821-1881), and the philosophy of Nietzsche (1844-1900), and much later, Heidegger (1889-1976).

Groddeck, as historian Geoffrey Cocks wrote in his 1985 *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich*, was one of a "great number
of German physicians who were evolving their own versions of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy from a rich nineteenth-century heritage that had been brought to startlingly new and fruitful life by Freud and his followers" (p.39).13

Romantic natural philosophy derived from Friedrich von Schelling's (1775-1854) mysticism, pantheism, and monism, celebrated the holistic tradition, and stressed the basic unity of all life.14 Early nineteenth-century physicians had become attracted to, and even obsessed with, the realms of the irrational and the emotional (Cocks, p.39).

These physicians resurrected the vitalist tradition -- directly echoing Groddeck's conception of the "It," outlined in his letter (12 November 1922) to Ferenczi -- that within every living system there exists a vital, basic and irreducible force that could not be understood in mechanical terms, or be verified by science (Cocks, pp.40-41).

Goethe emphasized the sovereign and all-encompassing realm of Nature. Physician and painter, Carl Gustav Carus (1789-1869) wrote in the 1840s that: "The unconscious itself is the subjective expression of that which we must objectively recognize as nature."15

Again, evoking comparisons with Groddeck's formulation of the "It," as opposed to Freud's "Id," Carus wrote that the
unconscious "is at a deeper level and at its core not influenced by instinctual drives" (cited in Cocks, p.41).

It followed that this philosophy, embodied in Groddeck's psychosomatic approach, emphasized that to cure mental illness one must cure the whole individual, not a particular part or organ.

"For all the inheritors of the German Romantic ethos in the field of psychology, the fate of humanity and civilization rested in the diagnosis and treatment of modern ills to free latent creative and assertive energies, a perspective very different from Freud's stoic resignation in the face of what he saw, unromantically, as inherent conflict within and between the individual and civilization" (p.61-2). 16

Based on this formulation, the Ferenczi-Groddeck letters show that Ferenczi could generally be located as oscillating between Groddeck's Romantic tradition and Freud's more pessimistic, or at least limited, world view. Ferenczi certainly reflected aspects of Romantic thought, but a number of his views had an affinity with Enlightenment ideas such as the original innocence of the child. Ellenberger (1970) could have been writing about Ferenczi when he wrote: "The antagonism and the interplay between the Enlightenment and Romanticism [can] be followed throughout the history of dynamic psychiatry" (Ellenberger, 1970, p.199).
The Romantic heritage paved the way, not only for advances in medical psychology, but eventually for philosophical and practical harmony with the dark period of German National Socialism (Cocks, p.39).

Novalis (1722-1801), Schopenhauer (1788-1860), Carus, Goethe, and Nietzsche were all seen as Aryan German creators of depth psychology by the Nazis (p.88). In fact, this heritage can be traced back to sixteenth-century Swiss physician Paracelsus (c.1493-1541), who "envisioned the human personality as a whole, as made up of spiritual and corporeal parts intimately connected with the soul" (p.88). Paracelsus was a legendary figure to the Nazis. As Cocks writes:

Paracelsus's notion of each individual as a microcosm mirroring the macrocosm was also implicit in the monadology of Leibniz (1646-1716), who conceived of an irreducible entity of life force....The figure of Leibniz extends in a direct line to the efforts of those psychotherapists in Germany after 1933 who attempted to fabricate an exclusive German tradition of discovering, exploring, and analyzing the human unconscious. (p.40)

Cocks writes that: "The early enthusiasms -- and, in some cases, lasting allegiances -- which blinded many [German psychotherapists] to the true nature of Hitler and the Nazis stemmed partly from a Romantic cultural and intellectual tradition which placed the irrational and ineffable above the rational and the prosaic" (p.248).
"Even those who were willing to act on their grave doubts about Hitler and the Nazis lived with laming illusion. Perhaps people who were dedicated by their profession to the treatment of mental illness were even more susceptible to such desperate hope" (Cocks, p.52).

For example, until his death in 1934, Georg Groddeck entertained the belief that if he could just talk to Hitler he could effect some change in the Fuhrer (Grossman & Grossman, 1965).

Despite Groddeck's debt to German Romantic thought, and his seeming naivete regarding Hitler, it would be a mistake to simply characterize him as a misguided follower of Nazi ideology. The reality was undoubtedly more complex -- and more curious. Groddeck was not a Nazi favourite; from 1938 the Nazis singled him out as an "especially distressing example of 'psychological gangsterism'" (Cocks, p.88).

Ferenczi on self-analysis (especially the analyst's self-analysis):
In his 11 October 1922 letter, Ferenczi writes of being against self-analysis in principle, and for "social" analysis, i.e. with an analyst, while conducting his own exquisite self-analysis in his early letters to Groddeck.
What follows are excerpts on self-analysis from his 11 October 1922 letter. Ferenczi writes:

I don't believe in self-analysis. The unconscious is tricky enough to lead one astray at precisely the important points...To achieve vital new insights about oneself...the boiling heat [Siedehitze] of transference is required.

Analysis is, in my opinion, a social phenomena. It requires (at least) two people. It is, after all, only an improved repetition of one's upbringing, or rather, the completion of the emotional business with one's parents.

The key objection to this argument will I suppose be that Freud himself conducts self-analysis.18

That self-analysis indeed breaks the rule of "the social"....There are clearly countless ways in which self-analysis can become derailed.

The analyst needn't necessarily have superior capabilities; he can be stupider than the analysand and still discover in him things which the latter was blind to.

It is ironic that in these letters, even as Ferenczi declares the impossibility of self-analysis, he offers up endless self-analytical insights to Groddeck. (Ten years later, in 1932, Ferenczi similarly filled his Clinical Diary with remarkable self-analytical insights.)19 It could be argued that in writing his insights to Groddeck, they are less self-analysis than attempts to make Groddeck his analyst. (I agree with Brink, however, that: "Confessional letters are at least adjuncts to self-analysis.")20

Clearly, Ferenczi is providing Groddeck with personal material to aid him in helping him -- particularly with his health concerns: "I am postponing for now my plan to "begin
from the beginning" in telling you the story of my personal development. Let's begin rather with the immediate facts" (25 Dec. 1921). Later, on 27 February 1922, it appears that Groddeck has been acting as his analyst when Ferenczi writes: "I do want to refer back, though, to a few points in your letter. You ask: 'toward whom is the coldness directed; someone else, or oneself -- your own sensuality?" Ferenczi continues: "You guessed right about the garrison town." He concludes: "I won't continue the analysis now: I plan, however, to torture you with it the next time we meet."

Since Ferenczi subsequently invites Groddeck to Budapest to continue his analysis with him (11 October 1922), his argument against self-analysis may also be an attempt to dissuade Groddeck from self-analysis, and engage him in mutual analysis.

Groddeck's response to Ferenczi on the question of self-analysis is rather shallow and disappointing:

Life itself is the main analyst, and what we doctors have to add to that is largely pathetic presumption. We are willless instruments which life uses to achieve some never-to-be deciphered ends...Now, I don't see why life would not use me for the purpose of achieving my own analysis as it would for conducting another's. (12 November 1922)

THE RELEVANCE OF THE CORRESPONDENCE FOR TODAY:
The publication of this correspondence in English is long overdue. Its proven importance to English-speaking scholars is confirmed by the fact that the French and German editions are regularly cited in English-language psychoanalytic literature. In addition, the French and German volumes were published with little detailed commentary or annotation. Sabourin, the French biographer of Ferenczi, noted this scholarly absence in his Introduction to the earlier volumes: "This exceptional document should have been accompanied by a detailed commentary of the context of the events." This thesis will, for the first time in any language, provide comprehensive editorial annotations — many based on new research, which give the necessary background and context to the correspondence. In editing this new volume the annotations of the earlier editions were used as resource material and, where appropriate, incorporated into the new notes. The thesis will also correct a number of mistakes found in the earlier French and German editions.

The literature on Sandor Ferenczi's work and life is rapidly growing as many of his controversial ideas on the analytic relationship, early trauma, and countertransference are enthusiastically rediscovered and debated after being suspended, and in some cases, repressed, by the psychoanalytic establishment for more than sixty years.
The recent publication of his 1932 Clinical Diary, and the long-awaited three-volume Freud-Ferenczi correspondence (Vol. I was published in 1993) -- confirms Ferenczi's significance to Freud and reveals his innovative contributions central to present-day psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. Ferenczi's 1933 paper, "Confusion of Tongues", which has long been recognized as an underground classic on child sexual abuse, is finally being accorded the historical recognition it deserves, both within and beyond psychoanalysis.

In 1993, on the 120th anniversary of his birth and 60th anniversary of his death, Ferenczi was celebrated by major international conferences in Budapest, London, and Geneva. The proceedings of these conferences are being published as books. In 1993, the first collection of papers devoted solely to Ferenczi and his work, The Legacy of Sandor Ferenczi, was also published. This volume includes my chapter, "The Case of 'RN': Sandor Ferenczi's Radical Experiment in Psychoanalysis," the first detailed biographical study of Ferenczi's critical patient "R.N.," and the story of their mutual analysis.

My thesis not only provides an important and missing piece of Sandor Ferenczi scholarship, but will re-introduce Georg Groddeck, a fascinating and timely medical figure, to an English-speaking audience. Widely published in German and
French, Georg Groddeck's work is also attracting increasing interest. Negotiations are presently under way for a number of his works to be published in English.

These letters offer a unique historical perspective on psychoanalysis, beyond Ernest Jones's orthodox views of Ferenczi, Groddeck, and even Freud. As a record of an intimate friendship between two passionate and original thinkers -- at times Freud's followers, at other times, analytic dissidents -- these letters capture the adventurous spirit of the early years of the psychoanalytic movement and will resonate with readers both inside and outside psychoanalysis.
FOOTNOTES

1. These editions are different only in the translation; the editing and notations are the same.

2. Brink suggests another view of Ferenczi's process: "The idea that in forming theory Ferenczi was striving for some sort of 'balance.'...Perhaps Ferenczi was looking for balance between Freudian drive theory and the half-realized object relational theory he was committed to by the end of his career. Yet when clinical experience taught Ferenczi about disturbance of the self-regulating function that normally results in mother-infant attachment, he wasn't hesitant about saying so...Ferenczi had to risk imbalance in theory to re-introduce trauma theory in a form workable for analysts. This came of a powerful apprehension of the place of trauma in his own childhood (age about 6, and earlier), and after the revelation by mutual analysis it became impossible for Ferenczi to dissemble any further among Freudians. He brought about a radical imbalance from which we benefit in having gained a sort of balanced view of the aetiology of emotional disorders that was impossible for Freudians" (personal communication, 30 January 1996).
3. Groddeck, who disapproved of Ferenczi's approach, would have agreed with Ferenczi's view of himself here (19 February 1934 letter to Gizella).

4. Ferenczi's position reflects very closely Popper's (1989) views on "the growth of scientific knowledge."

5. The only explanation for this, beyond the long-standing historical suppression of Ferenczi's ideas and character assassination by Jones (1957) could be the argument that much of his thought was contained in his unpublished Clinical Diary and letters to Freud. However, this excuse has not been valid since the diary's publication in the mid-1980's and it's hard to reconcile this with the fact that, for example, in the 1992 Stolorow paper above, there is absolutely no mention of Ferenczi in the text or even in the references. To reiterate, this has until recently been the norm, not the exception! This argument also ignores the unconscionable fact that Ferenczi's last three critical papers (1929, 1930b, 1933) -- published over half a century ago -- contain most of the same ideas as those elaborated in the diary.

6. Usually attributed to Franz Alexander (1861-1964). Bergmann & Hartman (1976) write: "The historical origin of this concept is found in 'A metapsychological description of the process of cure' (Alexander, 1925)" (p.63). Bergmann and Hartman later suggest (p.302) that Ferenczi is the true originator of the idea in his 1930 paper, "The principle of relaxation and neocatharsis" -- strangely, since Ferenczi's
paper is later than Alexander's. It is beyond the scope of this introduction, but see Eagle (1984, p.102), for a more detailed and critical examination of the implications of the notion of "corrective emotional experience" set within the context of the question: Why should the patient-therapist relationship be an important therapeutic factor?

7. To illustrate the above point regarding Ferenczi's being uncredited for his early insights, here is Kohut (1984) writing sixty years after Ferenczi's comments: "[Traditional analysis] sees the analyst only as the observer and the analysand only as the field that the observer-analyst surveys." He continues, "[self psychology] acknowledges and then examines the analyst's influence...as an intrinsically significant human presence" (p.37). Schwaber (1983) "regards this proposed change in the analyst's listening stance as Kohut's most creative contribution." (Cited in Stolorow, 1992, p.163, emphasis added).

8. See Schimek (1987) for his views on what Freud did and didn't hear from his patients regarding reports of "seduction" and Freud's ultimate formulation of the seduction theory.

9. What we see in his debate with Groddeck over science may in part be a case of emphasizing different sides of oneself depending on the position of the person one is talking to, i.e. with Freud, Ferenczi counters what he sees as overemphasized science and education, whereas with the Romantic and irrational Groddeck, he champions the
"scientific-rational-logical" side of the equation. Given his strong propensity to relatedness, this dialectical style seems to have been fairly well-developed in Ferenczi.

10. The spirit of Ferenczi's remarks evoke Albert Einstein's comment: "There could be no fairer destiny for any...theory than that it should point the way to a more comprehensive theory in which it lives on, as a limiting case." (Cited in Popper, 1989, p.32)

11. Popper (1989) certainly seems to capture the spirit of Ferenczi's approach to clinical and theoretical research when he writes:

The way in which knowledge progresses, and especially our scientific knowledge, is by unjustified (and unjustifiable) anticipations, by guesses, by tentative solutions to our problems, by conjectures. These conjectures are controlled by criticism; that is, by attempted refutations, which include severely critical tests....Criticism of our conjectures is of decisive importance: by bringing out our mistakes it makes us understand the difficulties of the problem which we are trying to solve...and able to propose more mature solutions: the very refutation of a theory -- that is, of any serious tentative solution to our problem -- is always a step forward that takes us nearer to the truth. And this is how we can learn from our mistakes. (p.vii)


14. The "cognitive categories of the human mind were in some sense the ontological categories of the universe -- i.e., that knowledge did not point to a divine reality but was itself that reality -- and on that basis constructed a

15. Quoted in Cocks, p.41.

16. The first Congress of the German Medical Society for Psychotherapy took place in April 1926 -- the year which marked Groddeck's shift from psychoanalysis to psychotherapy. The German Medical Society for Psychotherapy, to which Groddeck, Reich and Horney belonged, was not recognized by the German Psychoanalytic Society.

17. "It is an irony that this German Romantic tradition was also one of the vital philosophical bases for their professional campaign against 'medicine without a soul,' the phrase they used to characterize the practice of doctors and psychiatrists who were imbued with materialism" (Cocks, 1985, p.248).

18. Exactly ten years later in his 1932 clinical diary, Ferenczi is much more critical of Freud's self-analysis for not going deep enough. He suggests that Freud was afraid of allowing himself to be analyzed because it would reveal that he unconsciously wanted to kill his own father -- a notion that Ferenczi says Freud couldn't accept. Ferenczi sums up the situation:

Instead of admitting this, [Freud] founded the theory of the parricidal Oedipus, but obviously applied only to others, not to himself....Thus the antitraumatic in Fr[eud] is a protective device against insight into his own weaknesses....In his conduct Fr[eud] plays only the role of the castrating god, he wants to ignore the
traumatic moment of his own castration in childhood; he is the only one who does not have to be analyzed.

See also note § 123, 1921-22 letters.

19. Ferenczi's relentless self-scrutiny in this context anticipates his analysis of, and use of, countertransference in his evolving technical experiments of the 1920's.


***************************************************************************
Letterhead: Magyarorszagi Pszichoanalitikai Egyesulet
(Freud-Tarsasag)¹
Budapest, 26. April 1921.

Herr Dr. Georg Groddeck
Baden-Baden

Miss Ilona von Szabo,² 17 years old, suffers, (as a consequence of a cerebral complication of the Spanish influenza 2 years ago)³ from spastic paresis⁴ (but she can walk briskly). She is also subject to catatonic⁵ muscular paralysis and sometimes violent trembling. Lately, she also has the urge to tear everything up. Mentally she is approachable. In my opinion she needs a combination of psychological and physiological treatment. For this reason your institute was recommended to the family.

With reverent greetings
Dr. S. Ferenczi.
Garmisch-Partenkirchen

Rest home [Kurheim] Wigger

17 Aug. 1921

Dear Colleague,

I am staying at the above spa for a period of rest and I am to meet Professor Freud somewhere in Germany toward the middle of September. This raises the question, however, of where I am to spend the first two weeks of September (from, possibly, 27-28 Aug. onwards). Thus it came to me to combine business with pleasure and inquire whether you might be able to secure appropriate lodgings for us (my wife and myself) in your sanatorium. Should you be able to arrange this, I should like, herewith, to request that you inform me also about current prices for lodging and board.

Our holiday destination choice was influenced above all by the hope that I might, with your permission, study more closely the most interesting manner in which you are utilizing psychoanalysis to treat organic illnesses.

I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your "Soul Searcher" [Der Seelensucher] -- which I shall be reviewing in the upcoming issue of Imago.
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I understand, incidentally, from Professor Freud that we must expect something unusual and interesting from you in the near future.  

I await your early response, and remain

Your humble,

S. Ferenczi

G. Partenkirchen
Kurheim Wigger
d.24. 8. 21

Dear Colleague,

After some hesitation I decided to accept your kind invitation without further ado.  

According to our most recent plans, we shall not be arriving until about the 5. Sept. In the meantime we hope to have a few meetings with Professor Freud, who happens to have taken lodgings in the near vicinity (Seefeld, in Tyrolia). I will give you ample notice of our exact arrival date.

With best regards, also from my wife

your humble

S. Ferenczi
Dear Dr. Groddeck!

I cannot leave without expressing my sincere gratitude or, -- if you prefer, my expression of heartfelt feelings of friendship! Goodbye!

Ferenczi

[Committee letter]  
Hildesheim, 23.9.1921

Hope you were pleased with substitute. Freud

Were you? Ferenczi

Best regards, Dr. Rank

Ditto  Abraham Ernest Jones
Hanns Sachs  Eitingon

Budapest, Christmas Day 1921.

I.

Dear Friend,
I admit that I had to overcome a certain amount -- perhaps no trifling amount -- of resistance in writing this address to you. For a very long time, you see, I have enjoyed maintaining a proud reserve, and hide my feelings even from those closest to me. I needn't mention that this is a carry-over from infancy. Was I demanding, or was my mother -- the mother of 11 living children,\(^{20}\) of which I was the 8th -- too harsh: so far as I can remember it's very clear that I received too little love and too much discipline from her as a child.\(^{21}\) Sentimentalities, physical affection were unknowns in our family. Feelings of fearful respect for parents, etc., were correspondingly encouraged. What else but hypocrisy could be the outcome of such an upbringing. Keeping up appearances, concealing all that was "unseemly" were the order of the day. Thus I became the model student and secret masturbator;\(^{22}\) shy, reluctant to utter an obscene word--and using stolen money to visit prostitutes. Now and again I would make cautious attempts to reveal myself. Once, for example, I "accidentally" let my list of all the obscene words I knew fall into the hands of my mother. Instead of enlightenment and support I was given moral reprimands.\(^{23}\)

It is therefore no small admission to say that, given this background, I am overcome by your natural kindness, warmth and friendliness. I have never before spoken so openly and freely to a man, not even to "Siegmund" (Freud), whose name brought about my misspelling of the word overcome
I have, from time to time, allowed myself to be analyzed by him (once for 3, once for 4-5 weeks) for years we travelled together every summer: I could never be completely free and open with him; there was too much of this "fearful respect"; he was too large for me, too much the father. The result was that in Palermo, where he was planning to work with me on the famous paranoia text (Schreber), I jumped up in a sudden fit of rebellion immediately on the first evening when he began to dictate something to me, and exclaimed that this was not working together, this type of dictation. "So this is the way you are?" he said, astonished. "It appears you want it all." Having said this, he proceeded, on subsequent evenings, to work alone, leaving me with nothing to do but check the proofs. The bitter feeling almost choked me. (Of course I know now what the significance of this "working alone in the evenings" and this "bitterness choking me" was: I wanted Freud to love me.)

Had I your writerly talents I would write -- as I began to do above -- straight from the heart about my physical and mental ailments. (Stop: I was being dishonest! I believe that I do have writerly talents. I recall how much a disparaging judgement on a piece of work, or before that a poem, hurt me.)

II.
In any event, I am postponing for now my plan to "begin from the beginning" in telling you the story of my personal development. Let's begin rather with the immediate facts. Thus:

Your letter came at a crucial moment. After one of those many many bad nights where I awoke almost breathless, with clammy skin, heart pains, very slow pulse, (sometimes, though, with my heart pounding) seeing no hope for the future or trust in Groddeck, and looking doom in the face. Your letter spurred me to renewed effort; it helped me to reveal myself -- albeit not all of myself -- to my wife. I spoke with her again about my dissatisfaction, about my suppressed love for her daughter (who was to be my bride -- who was my bride until a somewhat disparaging remark of Freud's convinced me to resolutely combat this love -- to literally push the girl away from me).

Such confessions between us usually result, oddly enough, in my being overwhelmed by her goodness and generosity, and moving closer to her again. Was it this, or was it the hot baths I have been taking again--at any rate the nightly chills are a little less deathlike than before. I'm also busily doing gymnastics and the stomach kicks (up to 40!) again. I am by no means feeling well, however. I will recount the symptoms:
The first thing I think of is my resistance to work. (What occurs to me: I'm not allowed to surpass the father.) In 1915/16 when I was garrisoned (for 1 year) with little to do in a small Hungarian town, I developed a great, a "grand" theory of the genital development of animals as being a reaction to the threat of dehydration associated with adaptation to terrestrial life. I could never bring myself to commit this valuable, and up to now most important idea, to paper. The data lies buried in great disorder in my desk. I frequently and joyfully expound the theory orally; once, no twice, I laid it out before Freud, Rank, Jones, Abraham, etc., most recently here in Hildesheim. When I want to write, however, I develop back pains, to do with my aorta, of course, which, as the X-rays show, is distended. A few weeks ago I developed arthritic swellings in my right wrist; this also kept me from writing, of course. The joint is now freed up again.

At that time also (no, it was still in 1914, in Munich) I expounded my philosophical opinions to Lou Salome, which correspond more or less to those of the "beyond" [Jenseits], although they end somewhat differently. I also told them to Anna Freud at one time. I never plucked up my courage to write them down, however. I always allowed myself to be sidetracked into writing small improvisations instead of the main one, so that I would not be forgotten. The American doctors who are now studying with Freud invited me to give
two lectures in Vienna on metapsychology. I said yes, and am to speak on 6 January [6/I]. And I haven't written or prepared a word.

III. I often think when I consider this symptom (fear of work): it's pointless. Meaning: the world does not offer enough in return to warrant these "gifts" from me. Anal eroticism, I suspect: I won't let anything go until I receive something in return. What is this something, however? Nothing other than the child which a woman [die Frau] should give to me, or, conversely, which I wish to offer to the world (to father, to mother).

The evil part of this is that my erotic self is apparently not satisfied with these revelations. I, my "It"[Es], doesn't want analytical insights, it wants something real; a young woman, a child!

(By the way, do you not suspect that the famous phrase about the "cry for the child" [Schrei nach dem Kinde] is simply the inversion of the desire to hear children crying?)

I notice that in spicing this letter with such bon mots I am imitating your "Letters to a Woman Friend." Are you perhaps the woman-friend, or is your friendship a homosexual replacement for it?--
Maybe I'd better tell you the dream I had last night: difficult to write about, since it was a pure "Hungarian" dream:

So in the dream I am singing a funny Hungarian folksong, of which, on awakening, I remember two verses in particular. They go (in rough translation)

"So the old Jew said to me, carry her from my abode; I want naught from your abode, don't need you, you dirty old Jew."

"Fay Gyula says to me (Gyula, the name of an elegant handsome man) I'll buy you sashes, clothes, my love; I want not your clothes, your sashes, I want only Fay Gyula."

(Literally translated:

"So the old Jew says to me, I'll give you rouge and lipstick red; don't need lipstick, rouge from you, don't need you, you dirty old Jew.

----------

Fay Gyula says to me, have clothes and cloths for you; I want only Fay Gyula."

What occurs to me: yesterday, Christmas Eve with immediate family.\footnote{I ended up "overeating." I've often expressed the opinion that it's silly to stage such formal meals when only the family is present. Occasionally, I glanced into the kitchen, where friends of our two maids were enjoying}
themselves and singing. The two maids are sisters. The younger one is 16 years old, quite nice, an innocent recently taken up by us from the farm. She has noticeably red lips (yes, make-up -- but her lips are naturally red).

IV. The elder one, the cook, is also only 19-20 years old. She has, as I convinced myself in the course of a medical examination, noticeably firm hard breasts, and enormous nipples, which distended during the examination.

Interpretation: these pretty girls don't want an old Jew like me! N.B: Yesterday I said to a friend who, although older than I, is still completely without grey [trans?TR]: "Your vitality astonishes me. Look how old and grey I am." I think I've grown old, I thought to myself, in order to adapt to my wife, who is older than I. My friend is married to a young blond.

I learned the folksong as a child from the farm women who worked in our vineyard. I also heard father and mother sing it; they had learned it from the farm women as well. In the vineyard I often yearned for the firm breasts of the young farm girls; "amor ancillaris" in general played a large role in my life. It's the place I escaped to with my suppressed desires.
When I awoke I lay on my left side and my heart—as a result of having been compressed—was pounding. I could not go back to sleep.

Postscript: In the dream the song was somehow "bisexual." It occurred to me that this "Fay Gyula" was also some beautiful woman named Fay.

"Fay" is a surname. And then the word "Fay" [Hungarian] = it hurts. I don't know if my heart ached—physically or figuratively.

2nd postscript: Yesterday I had a bout of conscience because I had been so cheerful, even though only the day before I had received notice that a nephew of mine (albeit a useless one) had committed suicide. This nephew wanted to be a doctor, a psychoanalyst, even; I opposed the plan, however, in view of his character flaws. Was I responsible for his death? I might ask myself.

You're quite right in saying that at least a part of my fear of death has to do with wishing death towards the woman [die Frau]. A little while ago in a dream I was busily treating a deep headwound on her temple. I don't want to hurt her, so I don't tell her, or tell her very little about my thoughts of betrayal. Instead, I give myself heart pains.
Now you know enough! I also know that one normally tells one's wife everything. However, I must admit to being somewhat self-conscious in your wife's presence. It was, as I said, no small matter, either, for me to overcome my scholarly reserve and present myself not as the superior one, the competitor, but rather as naive, childish -- what comes to mind is the word "humble." So, now make of this letter what you will!

Your friendly servant,

Ferenczi

3rd postscript: My conscience compelled me to show this letter to my wife. I use the occasion now to write a third postscript. For I wish to let you know what a primary role my profound sensitivity to cold plays in my life. While I was writing this letter to you it was somewhat colder than normal in the room. (Outside the weather is not cold: 4 - 5 degrees above 0.) When I finished the letter I was very cooled down, my pulse was tight; backache and headache strongly intensified, probably due to peripheral vascular collapse and intense stress reaction. I've often thought that I regress during the night into the thermal domain of the fishes; I also think that all human beings do this to
a greater or lesser extent—which is why they need greater protection from cold at night. In my case, however, warmth production ceases completely, aided, perhaps, by my difficulties in breathing, and I shiver even when wrapped in 2-3 woollen blankets. Am I trying to become a fish, or do I wish to activate my piscean genital theory, which I won't write down? Perhaps I'm experiencing a latent case of uraemia. I don't know. When I walk I warm up quickly, even when it's very cold.

My wife sends her fondest regards.

1922

Budapest, 27.II.22

Dear Grodeck,

How shall I begin? We have not had news from one another (the fault being mine) for such a long time. The letter which I wrote then, your answer, which I read through today: all old material. I think it is better to start fresh. My condition has markedly improved since the beginning of January. The visit to Vienna, where I delivered two lectures to Americans and Englishmen, was still marred by ill health, but shortly afterwards my mood as well as my physical state improved noticeably. I cannot
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give you a firm explanation for this. Pr. Fr. [Freud] busied himself with my varying conditions for 1-2 hours; he stands by his previous opinion that my main concern is my hate for him—he who (as my father before him) prevented my marriage to the younger bride (now my stepdaughter). Hence my murderous intentions toward him, which express themselves in nightly death scenes (heat loss; throat rattling). These symptoms are exacerbated by memories of observing parental coitus. I must admit that it was a great relief to be able to speak to the beloved father about these hate impulses.

My heart condition has also improved, thanks, I believe, to the "[Bauchtreten]", which my wife administers twice daily. We (my wife and I) are loudly spreading the word in Budapest about this, as well as the "Nasamecu" procedure. I have persuaded a few people to order your book from Hirzel. The fact is I am now able to climb the steep 100 metre hill in Budapest in a quarter of an hour.

I no longer experience the nightly chills, albeit since the cold season began I have been wrapping myself in wool blankets (the swaddled child). I am ashamed to admit that I (1) still take 1/4 S. Medinal every night, (2) have to prop my nose open with wire, (3) stuff cotton wads into my auditory channels so that I can sleep. A recent recurring symptom I have to report is a fluttering of the eyes, a
condition which can be partially relieved by a lowering of
the head. A new method for eyelid autoscopy, which I
developed myself, has allowed me to discover small Skotome,
as well as Glaskorpertrubung in the fovea contralis, which I
connected, of course, to the kidneys. 88

I am also mentally and emotionally more productive. I have
completed the piece on paralysis, which should be published
shortly. 89

I have not, however, begun the large historical development
work yet. 90

I do want to refer back, though, to a few points in your
letter. 91

You ask: "toward whom is the coldness directed; someone
else, or oneself--your own sensuality?" 92 If I think about
this I have to admit to both possibilities. Denial of one's
own sensuality because one feels cold toward the other's. In
the last little while I have been toying with the idea of
aging (which in fact "terrifies" me). 93

You guessed right about the garrison town, that something
was wrong there. The town was called Pasa (Pabst); 94 I was
contained in my father's stomach the whole time I was
there. 95
I won't continue the analysis now: I plan, however, to torture you with it the next time we meet.96

I would like (as would my wife) to come to see you now, in the Spring. Unfortunately one cannot grant oneself such extra holidays unless one is feeling ill. We won't let anything prevent us, though, from spending the next summer holidays in Baden Baden. But what is the weather like there, in the merry month of August?97 Whatever it is, a cool person like myself will not be dissuaded by heat.98

We could go together then from B.B. [Baden-Baden] to the Congress in Berlin.99 It will be a high time there, I expect. Newly represented countries include India, Peru--and France.100

It all sounds wonderful and promising.

Please prepare something interesting for the Congress: say, your experiences with Ps.An. [psychoanalysis] in relation to heart and lung disease. Your theory of the psychic origins of Incompensations [Inkompensationen]101 will make a strong impression.102

Now you have left the lonely House of Zink,103 and are reinstated in the beautiful Villa Marienhöhe.104 Our
thoughts are very often pointed in that same direction. It’s hard to believe, for my wife and myself, that we spent merely ten days there with you. The impressions gained on that visit have stayed with us to the extent that it seems to me we have known each other intimately for years. The intensity of your and Frau von Voigt’s kindness extends itself through time.

No, it’s impossible to say all this in letters. We have to come there and sit together again on the beautiful veranda and talk.

So I’ll stop here, and close with fondest greetings from my wife and myself to you both.

Please write soon!

Your
Ferenczi

Budapest, 2 May 1922.

Dear Groddeck,
We fear that the letter in which my wife inquired about the possibility of her daughter staying with you (in August) has been lost. Also, your response to the mile-long
letter of mine is a long time in coming. Thus I would ask that you give yourself a jolt and overcome your resistance to answering. Especially in view of the fact that we (my wife and I) are partially dependent upon you: we had intended, you see, to spend a part of the summer as your guests and/or patients.

Please send speedy comfort to your humble friend, who hereby heartily greets yourself and Frau Voigt.

Ferenczi

Budapest, 8. May 1922

Dear Groddeck,
Now everything is in order. My wife's daughter (her name is Elma Laurvik) will arrive at the beginning of August. She will be coming from San Francisco, where she is currently living. It is not clear whether she will return there, as her marriage situation is quite unsteady. She is not financially in a strong position, but will have the funds necessary for a stay at the sanitarium at her disposal. She is not disposed toward a particularly luxurious room. I am convinced she will be comfortable with you, and find recovery.
You say one should be straightforward in money matters. That is also my opinion, and so I will add here that I have saved enough in the preceding work year to be able—in keeping with a psychoanalytic rule—to continue my treatment in Baden Baden as a regular patient. My wife seems not to require special treatment.

We plan to arrive at the end of August or early September, and to stay with you until the Berlin Congress.

Until we meet and talk again [without talking back] I remain

Your

Ferenczi

Heartfelt greetings to Miss. v. Voigt!

Baden-Baden 9.5.1922

Dear Ferenczi:

First to let you know that we sent letters to you and your wife 10 days ago. In them we expressed our joy at seeing you again and our hope about the successful treatment of your stepdaughter. I hope that both letters, which crossed yours, have arrived.
A few words about the resistance to writing. In your last letter you wrote about your stay in Vienna and your treatment by Freud. The letter arrived just at the time when I was having many difficulties with my book. The coincidence of your letter about "the resistance to writing" with a friendly but firm letter from Rank gave me the initiative to work on my complex and I found the solution. This happened a few months ago. Referring to my "letters to a woman friend," Freud wrote that the way I was proceeding was in his opinion misleading me. It would easily lead to unrestrained and unfaithful behaviour. As a warning he gave me the name Stekel. I know little about Stekel. I only read his "language of dreams" and some other articles in the "Zentralblatt".

However, I knew that Freud was suspicious of Stekel's character and I heard from you that Stekel had the habit of proclaiming opinions he had heard from Freud and others, as his own.

In the letters "to a woman friend" I have frequently done the same and I maintained this practice as my perogative. There were also some of Stekel's opinions, especially the "Numbers Symbols" which I took over, even in a pretty silly fashion. All in all, I am not very happy with my book. This Theory of Numbers Symbols, or at least the way I presented it, met with opposition in Vienna. I felt hurt and I
growled and barked against Freud, Rank, the publisher, the psychoanalysts in Vienna etc. I refused to talk to you. Now it is over, I am in line again and thank you for guiding me on to the right road.

[Note by Groddeck's executor, Margretha Henegger, along with transcription of the letter: "The above is a draft of a letter to Ferenczi. Whether it was sent in this form is not known."]

Budapest. d. 8 July 1922.

Dear Groddeck,

It is no one's fault but your own that I have been unable to recommend a better spa or resort than Marienhohe to my people.114 My wife's daughter, whose arrival I announced in previous letters, will arrive the 1st of August.115 My sister-in-law, Frau Otto Morando,116 writes from Hamburg that she will meet us in Baden-Baden. I trust you will be so kind as to take her into your care as well; she is strongly in need of it. At the end of August my wife and I will arrive there, and we will stay until the Congress.117 I will be spending the month of August in Tyrolia with the Ranks.118 I will be taking an English woman colleague, who has no other time available to her, there with me.119 I am hugely excited about our reunion and conversation.
Please write by return post (without fail!) even if it's only a card, to confirm receipt of this letter.

Warm greetings to Frau v. Voigt; from my wife as well, of course.

Your,
Ferenczi
Bpest, VII Nagydiofa utca 3

Budapest, on 11 October 1922
11+10+19+22=62:2=31.120

Dear friend,
I am not surprised that—as you write—the analytical result of materials that spring forth from arousal and agitation are so minimal. I don't believe in self analysis. The unconscious is tricky enough to lead one astray at precisely the important points. Analysis requires a degree of self-disclosure [selbst-entauberung] which is not possible when a large part of ones psychic capabilities are engaged in the critical mode. And that is the case in self analysis, where one wants, simultaneously, to be father and son. Partial analyses are perhaps possible via this route, but will serve, at most, to deepen or widen that which is already known. One does not achieve vital new insights about oneself.
in this way. For this, the boiling heat [siedehitze] of transference is required, which is lacking in self analysis.

The apparently striking numerical analyses [zahlenanalysen] have two possible explanations: 1.) The unconscious searches through the biography to find the important dates which correspond to the suggested number; 2.) once it seizes on such a number, it can indeed correlate important events with the corresponding calendar date. Other events, equally important, which do not correspond to the number in question, are simply left out of the account.\footnote{121}

Analysis is, in my opinion, a social phenomena. It requires (at least) two people. It is, after all, only an improved repetition of one's upbringing, or rather, the completion of the emotional business with one's parents.\footnote{122}

The key objection to this argument will I suppose be that \textit{Freud} himself conducts self analysis. The response to this is: 1) that it is simply an argument about authority, or one that is "ad hominem";\footnote{123} 2) that we know the materials of \textit{Freud's} self analysis from \textit{The Interpretation of Dreams}; we know how profoundly deeply he went into himself; yet we cannot judge the completeness or evenness of his self-knowledge; 3) it is possible to imagine that self analysis is possible among extremely rare individuals who are prepared to go to court with themselves. It changes nothing,
however, about the general truth of the rule regarding Freudian analysis.

That self analysis indeed breaks the rule of "the social" can also be proven by the following facts: 1.) The mentally ill who, as a result of a change in their spiritual make-up, split themselves off from society (become asocial) can truly analyze themselves, that is, empty the contents of their unconscious without effort or the help of a midwife. 2.) Even a person who hasn't been, or has only been partially analyzed, can analyze another in this projective manner, he analyses himself (as does the not totally demented paranoid); 3.) Similarly, many persons project (as has been diagnosed in my case!) their own complexes into scientific discoveries. There are clearly countless ways in which self analysis can become derailed.

Thus someone (like yourself) who is conducting such an intense self analysis must at least follow it up with a regular analysis, which should show him the points at which he went astray. Otherwise he will move forth in his perhaps partially vicious circle and mix his truthful insights with falsehoods. The analyst needn't necessarily have superior capabilities; he can be stupider than the analysand and still discover in him things which the latter was blind to.
I write you all this by way of inviting and urging you again to come to Budapest to continue the analysis you began here. We will see then if and how far this will harmonize and agree with the concurrent analysis of my own person.

I'm pleased about your opinion of my Budapesters. Hollos is a pleasant person. He wants "something grand," but is very scattered; when left to his own resources he is completely helpless.

Say hello to Frau Emmy from us--and accept these greetings for your own birthday on the 13th.

Your
Ferenczi

When I finished this letter I realized I had written a scientific tract rather than a letter, and I had forgotten to respond to many of your comments.

"The tangled braids" is not a bad image. I believe, however, that it can do no harm, for the time being, to rein in youth's desire to discover-the-new at all costs. It's important to allow that which is correct in Freud's work to gain strength first. It would be terrible if the pain and effort involved in laying out a usable orderliness were
phantasmagorically torn apart by scientific Hattinbergs. Without orderliness of thought one cannot, after all, achieve even an inkling of understanding. Of course there are also poets and founders of religions, prophets; these people do not require an orderly system of knowledge and nevertheless stumble upon much (which is mixed in with as much falsehood). We don't object to their presence; we even admit that we can learn many things from them. But, my god, why should these people, with their quaint manner of working, be allowed to weave their techniques in with ours until the tapestries are indistinguishable? We renounce prophesy and gladly (and without envy) leave it to those poets, while acknowledging that there are exceptions (to wit Freud) who are able very well to combine the prophetic with the critical and theoretical.

Thus I (although by nature myself a revolutionary) maintain that we must hold onto the braids which you denounce. There will come a time when these braids separate one from the other, and begin to circle around something else. Give science a bit of time and protection!—is my desire.

Now a few things about myself. In Baden-Baden we were (in my opinion much too intensely) concerned with my kidneys, and greatly neglected the odd breathing problems which I am still experiencing. (During the night: Cheyne-Stockerscher
or very superficial breathing with corresponding after effects the next day.)

My hours are gradually filling up--for the time being only with crown patients; the English woman who announced herself has not yet appeared. We read with horror of the sinking of your Valuta. What will happen?!

Your
F.

GRODDECK TO FERENCZI

Baden-Baden Nov. 12, 1922

Dear Sandor,
I'm only now answering your treatise of October 11th; thus I am at an advantage because you have forgotten what you wrote. I will bypass the question of self analysis and its results, for I have little to say about this, and cannot do much with the term. In my opinion, life itself is the main analyst, and what we doctors have to add to that is largely pathetic presumption. We are willless instruments which life uses to achieve some never-to-be-deciphered ends. Every time a benign fate sends me this insight for a short moment I am happy and well, no matter what is going on in me or around
me. Now I don't see why life would not use me for the purpose of achieving my own analysis as it would for conducting another's. If you wait, you see the results.\textsuperscript{140} My most recent illness, which initially seemed so barren of materials, has suddenly overwhelmed me with a flood of memories, meaning, and so-called interpretations. I am quite satisfied with it.

I think the difference between us two is that you are forced to want to understand things, and I am forced to want not to understand them.\textsuperscript{141} In other words--gleaned from thought processes of the psychoanalytic method--I feel fine in the Imago of the womb with my darkness, and you want to escape from it. With such opposing drives, materials for conversation will never be lacking, and this is a guarantee for a lasting friendship. There will always be areas of dispute. Thus you, for example, suppose that a successful analysis necessarily involves Father transference. But why should the Mother transference, or playmate transference, or transference to the milk bottle, or rhythm or a rubber doll or the rattle be less useful?\textsuperscript{142} I enjoy the ambiguous, would rather doubt, and enjoy above all things being cared for.\textsuperscript{143} That is why the discovery of the It is such a comfort for me. I feel you like to laugh; I enjoy this as well. Why should we therefore take that which calls itself science so seriously. It appears to me that science ends at that moment where it is transformed into a rule or a law.
The process of making laws is, to my mind, already so advanced in our specialty that vital elements can no longer be discovered by engaged analysts, but only by skeptics, among which I count Freud, yourself, and myself. Freud is bound by his unfortunate belief in the absolute necessity of baptism, name-giving; he overcomes this, however, via his genius. You also have had enough of it, but are in search of approval, and so you don't see that the large hat which the adult wears on his godforsaken head, to ensure that nothing enters or exits, is for us children nothing but a game, and thank god for it. And I, finally, produce nothing myself: am overwhelmingly motherly, bent on receptivity and a desire for growth. The games I played with my sister, who by the way is older than me, were called, Mother and Child, and I was almost always the mother. Or, to put it another way, I am a digestion machine which takes in strangers' thoughts and, after thorough processing, releases them in sausage form, so that it requires a fair amount of work and knowledge to decipher the appearance of this or that element before the process began.

You do not like the number analyses; perhaps they are faulty; but what's the harm in it, if they are useful. And you cannot for your life convince me that you haven't experienced their usefulness.
And now I come to a troublesome sentence: "Analysis is a social process, the repetition of ones erstwhile upbringing." Yes, that's what it comes to amount to, but we don't do it because it is a good thing, but because we are vain, and we often do damage with our upbringing procedures. Do not make me or anyone else any better: the man who could do that would truly be a Messiah.

That we project our own complexes into scientific discoveries is self-evident. How else could we possibly discover anything?

Now to the end of your letter: Nobody will approach the continuation of my analysis with more anticipation than I myself. You presumably don't even know yourself what my expectations are in this regard. But it's something personal: the fact that our braided colleagues insist that every aspirant undergo analysis is only there to state that we, the smart ones, don't need it. None of them have undergone analysis. But you are dumb, they say, so come and listen please to what wise men have to say about Oedipus, totem and taboo, theories of child sexuality, anal and castration complexes, parroting Freud without understanding him. "The earth is round, and I am at its centre," Tante Anna liked to say, and I presume this is the standpoint of all people. Freud called it Narcissism. I hope he has not forgotten how to laugh.147
Will Budapest become a reality? I don't know. It's in the lap of the gods. Currently there is much evidence suggesting I will not receive any holidays. A man from my immediate circle has gotten it into his head that he has a theratoma\(^{148}\) that is inoperable, and claims now that he wants to be treated by me. Presumably he has gotten wind that it's easier to die in Marienhohe than elsewhere.

Say hello to Gizella, and tell her that her child and her sister are pleasant people,\(^{149}\) whom one is glad to treat. You will soon find out for yourselves that Elma has not gotten worse here. But where has your memory gone? We spoke often about your breathing difficulties,\(^{150}\) but unfortunately you kept a lot hidden. But that is life, isn't it; repression [Verdrangen] is its substance.

Emmy is brilliant; I wish you could see her now.

With best greetings from both of us. In loyal friendship,

Budapest, 11. XII. 22.

Dear Georg,
The contrast between our opinions begins already with our differing notions about the usefulness of debate. You find debate at worst amusing, and hope that we will live long lives so that we can spend a long time fighting one another. I, on the other hand, find that opposition does not lead in the least to clarification of the problems under discussion. The contestants usually stick obstinately to their opinions, become unapproachable, and hear only themselves. In analysis as well it is a tried and true precept that debate is to be avoided. When one does not oppose the opposing voice, the completed utterance, insofar as it has value or usefulness at all, works in retrospect, by itself. I feel we have mistakenly strayed into this terrain, so foreign to psychoanalysis, by attempting to persuade each other with "arguments." Even Master Freud occasionally cites the phrase: Arguments are as cheap as blackberries! Don't you think it would be better if we hold our fire and, after listening to each other's opinions about certain psychological questions, wait until the mounting of experience declares one or the other of us correct? I believe I have proven that I am not a stickler for principles, but always prepared to relearn. You can trust, therefore, that I will not allow any dogma to prevent me from declaring you right when a conviction matures in me again to the point where it declares you right.
I will release one statement, however, from this ruling about debate. You write, "I think the difference between us two is that you are forced to want to understand things, and I am forced to want not to understand them." This statement contains a whole lot of double meanings. If you mean that I am compelled to want to understand before I have a right to, then I must energetically oppose this notion. I think I have quite a clear idea about the limitedness of our achievable knowledge; I also believe that I am very strict in my consideration of the grounds on which I am forced to come to an opinion; and I am always, as you know, prepared to relearn. I do not deny, though, that my inclination is towards wanting to understand, whereby I admit that complete understanding is infinitely distant and probably unachievable. Your interests also incline in this direction, although you always emphasize the unachievability, whereas I content myself with acknowledgement of the latter, but do not allow myself thereby to be prevented from ordering and grouping the small things that are achievable, and whose recognition brings pleasure. And experience shows that this activity is not useless. Were you correct in your characterization of your scientific method or method of knowing, you would have to content yourself with repetition of this single phrase (about the unachievability of knowledge about the It [Es]), which, incidentally, has already been articulated by many philosophers. You don't do that, however; rather, you busy yourself, just as we
disreputable "scholars" do, understanding people, bodies and souls, and trying to heal them with the help of that understanding. You are working with the same instrument that I am, namely logic. It's unjust of you, therefore, to deny your method of work and to pretend that you are working with some mythical incomprehensible daimon, or, more correctly, with an instrument that has nothing to do with logic. Even when you unconsciously come upon something, you cannot escape the (albeit differently structured) logic of the unconscious. I admit that every scientist in fact works with fantasy, that is, with the logic of the unconscious; ie. he is initially a poet or artist. Why should he not attempt, though, to weave that which fantasy achieves into a world view; ie., to compare it to experience; in other words to order, measure and classify experience as far as this is possible. Poets, too, classify--if only with the help of symbolic (ie. inexact) units of measure. The poetic, intuitive desire to understand is still a desire to understand. Only he who treats himself as an automatic instrument (as, incidentally, we all do), but who forbids himself to take account of events in and around him, can speak of not wanting to understand. No "normal" being does this, however; it seems, therefore, that man, along with other drives, also holds that one which compels him to try to understand himself and the world. To a certain extent this is already present in animals,—is not, therefore, a disreputable "human invention."
Let us therefore be just and not fall into the other extreme, that of declaring the previously too-highly-touted logic to be useless. Otherwise we would have to forfeit not only science, not only all conscious tendency, but also, and especially, speech and script, those carriers of conscious knowledge.\textsuperscript{152}

The main point in your letter was the lamentable fact that your holidays were ruined by the arrival of the seriously ill patient. But before you begin work again, though, it would be important for you to rest and take a short trip—and I have still not given up the hope of seeing you here.

Elma and Sarolta\textsuperscript{153} write wonderful things about you. We envy you for the pleasant and childish atmosphere which you have been able to create around yourself.\textsuperscript{154} Out here in the world things are more prosaic.

Many hearty Christmas and New Years Greetings,

from your
Sandor Ferenczi

Best wishes for the New Year also from me! Elma is coming in a few days and will be able to tell us many nice things about you—to which we are already looking forward.
I hope your next letter will contain more personal news. It would be much more pleasant than these boring discussions. Please write in detail about your family affairs, about the sanatorium, about your financial difficulties, etc.

your
S.

END OF 1921-1922 LETTERS

ANNOTATIONS

1. Hungarian Psychoanalytic Clinic/Association (Freud-Society).

2. Seemingly a patient of Ferenczi's. No information is available on this patient.

3. After World War I (1918-19) a Spanish Influenza epidemic swept through Europe. A large number of people died and those who survived the initial infection at times were left with after-effects. While not proven, the onset of
Parkinson's Disease in later life has been linked to this influenza.

4. Spastic -- the inability to relax specific muscles which inhibits normal muscle action. Paresis -- partial paralysis or weakness of muscle.

5. Catatonic -- Intermittent uncontrolled muscle contractions.

6. Small town in the German Bavarian Alps, just over the Austrian border.

7. The German original: "Sehr geehrter Herr Kollege" is even more formal and translates as "Very honoured Colleague."

8. The Secret Committee was to meet in the Harz Mountains of Germany. See Committee letter 23.9.1921.


10. Amplifying the standard account, this seems to indicate that Ferenczi's initial visit to Groddeck was for more than simply to seek treatment as Groddeck's patient, but that he was interested in learning more about his work. See introduction for more on Groddeck's approaches.

11. Groddeck's Der Seelensucher (can also be translated as "Searcher for Souls") -- was the first psychoanalytic novel. Ferenczi's review appeared in German in Imago (1921), 7, 356. In English, Fin., p.344-348.

Ferenczi-Groddeck Letters 1921-22

1923, by the Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag (Vienna/Leipzig). The book is in the form of letters written to a woman friend -- his future wife, Emmy -- and signed as "Patrik Troll." (Groddeck's childhood nickname was "Pat", and his affectionate name for his wife was "Troll" -- after the character in Henrik Ibsen's (1828-1906) Peer Gynt (1867), a play Groddeck loved). In early 1921, Groddeck sent the first five "Letters" to Freud. In his letter of April 17th 1921 letter to Groddeck, Freud responded by calling the letters "charming." However, Groddeck didn't feel encouraged by Freud's later letters. Despite Freud's reticence, Groddeck continued to regularly send him the "Letters," which he then tried to write to conform to his conception of what Freud wanted (Groddeck, Meaning of Illness, pp.58-82).

13. As mentioned earlier most of Groddeck's letters have not survived, including the one Groddeck must have sent between Ferenczi's letters of the 17th and the 24th August. Only three of Groddeck's letters to Ferenczi (and one to Gizella) have been preserved. Gizella Ferenczi wrote to Margaretha Honegger (Honegger to Michael Balint, 24 January 1968) that, once read, Ferenczi destroyed letters as a matter of course. However, because of their highly personal nature, it is very probable that Ferenczi destroyed Groddeck's letters intentionally. Furthermore, it wouldn't be unreasonable to speculate that, given the very personal content, Gizella
herself may have been less than enthusiastic about their preservation.

14. In fact, Sandor and Gizella Ferenczi signed into the guestbook on 8th and stayed until the 17 of September. In guestbook: "Dr. Sandor Ferenczi" & "Frau Gisela Ferenczi" 8/17-Sept. address: Budapest VII Nagydiofa u.3.

15. Like most bourgeois Viennese, Freud spent holidays in the country. Freud had a long history with the Tyrol region of Northern Italy.

16. Although undated, Ferenczi's salutation and letterhead suggests that this letter be placed here.

17. In September 1921, the Secret Committee met in Hildesheim, a large medieval town in Lower Saxony, north of the Harz Mountains. This letter was sent to Groddeck and signed by the Committee. The letter was previously published as part of the Freud-Groddeck correspondence in Groddeck's The Meaning of Illness: Selected Psychoanalytic Writings, Selected with Introduction by Lore Schacht [London: Hogarth Press and Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1977; reprint ed., London: Karnac, 1988], p.66).

18. Freud is referring to Ferenczi's recent visit to Groddeck at the sanitorium just prior to the Committee meeting. For a number of years, Groddeck had been enthusiastically inviting Freud to come and visit him in Baden-Baden; Freud repeatedly turned Groddeck down, and never did visit him in Baden-Baden.

19. First letter with this informal salutation.
20. Rosa Ferenczi (1840-1921), nee Eibenschutz, gave birth to twelve children. However, the tenth, a daughter named Vilma Ferenczi, died in the same year as her birth (1878) from diphtheria. Ferenczi's use of the phrase "11 living children" confirms Judith Dupont's comment that Ferenczi, who was almost five years old at the time, did not forget this sister. In fact, Ferenczi mentions his guilt as a child at the death of Vilma (uncovered through his mutual analysis) in *The Clinical Diary of Sándor Ferenczi*, ed. Judith Dupont (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1988), p.121.

21. For more on Ferenczi's view of his treatment by his mother see his *Clinical Diary*, pp. 45,86,99.

22. In a 19 January 1932 entry in the *Clinical Diary*, Ferenczi writes: "[I] compensated in [my] youth by endless masturbatory activity, the peculiarity of which can be gauged by the ejaculation up to the sky [Ejakulatio usque ad coleum]" (p15). Cf. pp. 89,134. In his paper (1919) "Technical difficulties in the analysis of a case of hysteria" (Ferenczi, p.205), Ferenczi writes of a patient who, in exhibiting "onania perpetua (incompleta)," reminds him of his own case.

23. Ferenczi briefly refers to this event in his 1911 paper "On obscene words," In Č. pp. 142-3.

24. Earlier editions (French/German) have cited this "misspelling" as a double mistake -- since, in fact, Ferenczi mispells Sigmund as "Siegmund (Freud)," not
"besi(e)gt" = "overcome." However, on careful examination of the original handwritten text, it appears that Ferenczi in beginning to write the word "besiegt" wrote "besig..." (putting the "g" before the "e" ...ie. as in "Sigmund"). Catching his mistake, he then corrected it by writing the missing "e" over top of the already written "g" and completing the word correctly spelled. Hence Ferenczi was not mistaken about which word he had mispelled. Therefore his spelling of Sigmund as "Siegmund" (Freud) can be considered as conscious and, as Ferenczi often did in his letters, was a clever play on words -- ie. "Siegmund": lit: "sieg"=victory and "mund"=mouth, suggesting verbal conquest/verbal victory.

25. Ferenczi's words: "I have...allowed myself to be analyzed by him [Zeitweise liess ich mich durch ihn analysieren]," imply a passive acquiescence to Freud's analysis. However, this belies what appears to have been Ferenczi's most determined pursuit of Freud for analysis. See Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence, Vol I (1993), Vol.II (forthcoming) and J. Dupont, "Freud's analysis of Ferenczi as revealed by their correspondence," Int. J. Psycho-Anal., 75, 301-320.

26. There were three periods of analysis: a few weeks in October, 1914 (interrupted by Ferenczi being called into military service); three more weeks from 14 June to 5 July 1916; and, finally, two weeks from 26 September until 9 October 1916.
27. The first of these trips was in 1908, only months after they met, when Ferenczi accompanied Freud and his family on a holiday to Berchtesgaden, Germany -- a regular holiday resort for the Freuds -- just south of Salzburg over the Austrian border.


30. This incident in Palermo in 1910 was the first open disagreement between Freud and Ferenczi. In a letter to Jung, 24 September 1910, from Rome, Freud wrote: "My travelling companion is a dear fellow, but dreamy in a disturbing kind of way, and his attitude towards me is infantile. He never stops admiring me, which I don't like, and is probably sharply critical of me in his unconscious when I am taking it easy. He has been too passive and receptive, letting everything be done for him like a woman, and I really haven't got enough homosexuality in me to accept him as one" (The Freud-Jung Letters, ed. William McGuire [Princeton: Princeton University Press, Bollingen, 1974], p.353). See also Ernest Jones, Sigmund Freud: Life and Work, 3 vols. (London: Hogarth Press, 1955), 2:90-93.
After this confession to Groddeck, Ferenczi spoke quite openly with Freud about the incident in Palermo (Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence, forthcoming). However, Ferenczi's feeling that Freud didn't love him enough seemed to remain with him until the end. In a 29 May 1933 letter to Jones after Ferenczi's death, Freud wrote: "Central to this [Ferenczi's paranoia] was the conviction that I did not love him [Ferenczi] enough, did not want to acknowledge his work, and also that I had analyzed him badly" (p.721), The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones 1908-1939. Ed. R.A. Paskauskas. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press.

31. Groddeck was an accomplished writer and essayist and had published a number of works of literature, including poetry.

32. In a statement solicited by Michael Balint, Zsofia (nicknamed Zsuka) Ferenczi (1883-n.d.), Sandor's youngest sister, and the last of the twelve Ferenczi children, said: "When he (Sandor) was 24-years-old, he wrote the following poem for my mother:

"On the threshold of new life " An der Schwelle neuen Lebens

I greet you
mother mine.
No one else, you alone,
Will understand me,
when I weep.
And today I'm sorely weeping

Grusse ich Dich,
Mutter meine.
Niemand andere, Du alleine,
Du verstehst mich,
wenn ich weine.
Und ich weine heute innig
Burning tears, burning offerings
Borne to you on this bier
Are these my twenty-four years!"

I can't remember anymore. But he often wrote to my mother from Vienna, lovely poems reminiscent of Heine."

(Heinrich Heine (1797-1856), German lyric poet, best known for the Buch der Lieder (q.v. 1827), made up of dream poetry and the Romantic gesture of self-conscious and studied melancholy.)

33. Phrase in Latin -- "ab ovo" (from the egg) -- in original. Ferenczi appears to confirm his desire to initiate a kind of analysis with Groddeck. This desire is realized and soon turns into a form of mutual analysis, as in the next year, 1922, Ferenczi was again treated by Groddeck at his sanitorium, but on this visit he also analyzed Groddeck for about six or seven sessions (Groddeck to Freud, 31 May 1923, Groddeck, The Meaning of Illness, p. 82).

34. Letter unpreserved, date unknown.

35. Earlier in September, at his Baden-Baden sanitorium, Groddeck, as Ferenczi's physician, had some success in alleviating Ferenczi's chronic symptoms. Groddeck's treatments included hot baths, personal massage and vigorous
pounding, special diets, fasting and reduced intake of liquids, breathing and physical exercises. Groddeck frequently inspired great confidence in his patients and admirers. Given the nature of his unorthodox regimen -- often physically painful -- his patients would have to trust him to submit to it.

37. Ferenczi had a complex triangular relationship with Gizella and her daughter, Elma. This episode is extensively recounted in the Ferenczi literature and is a recurring theme in *The Freud Ferenczi Correspondence, Vol. I.* (1993). See A. Haynal's Introduction to Volume I for background on the relationship. For the pivotal role played by Freud, see A. Haynal & E. Falzeder, "Healing through love? A unique dialogue in the history of psychoanalysis," *Free Associations, Part I, 2 (21), 1-20.*
39. Papa, about 130 kilometres south-west of Budapest. In October 1914, Ferenczi was conscripted and posted to Papa as the chief medical officer in the Hungarian Hussars until the spring of 1916. At the beginning of October 1915, Freud visited Ferenczi there.
In *Thalassa*, Ferenczi expounds an almost cosmic theory, that "the whole of life is determined by a tendency to return to the womb, equating the process of birth with the phylogenetic transition of animal life from water to land, and linking coitus to the idea of 'thalassal regression: the longing for the sea-life from which man emerged in primeval times'" (*Thalassa*). It's noteworthy that *Thalassa* has probably become the best known of Ferenczi's works, and is widely cited, often in non-psychoanalytic literature.


42. See earlier note. Ferenczi first presented his ideas on this genital theory to the Committee in 1919.

43. Ferenczi is probably referring to the 4th Congress of the International Psycho-Analytical Association held in Munich in September 1913.

44. Lou Andreas-Salome (1861-1937), German writer, perhaps best known for her famous friendships with the philosopher, Nietzsche and the poet, Rilke, came to Freud and
psychoanalysis in 1911. In 1913, Salome (1987) writes of her conversations with Ferenczi in her journal (p.170-172), Salome, L. *The Freud Journal*. London: Quartet Books. Salome, who held Freud's affection and admiration, respected both Ferenczi and Groddeck. As early as 1913 Salome sensed Ferenczi's place in relation to Freud: "I am passionately interested in [Ferenczi's] work and in his method of working. Perhaps publication of Ferenczi's ideas is premature with respect to Freud's present and next endeavors, but they really are complementary. So Ferenczi's time *must* come" (p.137), *The Freud Journal*. After Ferenczi's death Salome wrote to Gizella that it was unfortunate that Ferenczi wasn't able to be cared for by Groddeck: "Groddeck would have saved him," she said. (Gizella Ferenczi to Groddeck, 26 February 1934, this collection).

45. It's not exactly clear to what Ferenczi is referring here, but it seems likely that it is the philosophical thoughts which he would come to express in *Thalassa*, his imaginative theoretical flight (see note above). From early on, Ferenczi had an interest in the spiritual, metaphysical and occult. His first published paper in 1899, was the pre-analytic "Spiritismus," *Gyogyaszat*, Budapest (untrans.), p. 477. See also Claude Lorin, *Le Jeune Ferenczi: Premiers Ecrits 1899-1906* (Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 1983).

46. Anna Freud (1895-1982). In their long-standing relationship, Freud's daughter, Anna, held a great deal of
respect for Ferenczi and this included his later controversial technical innovations (Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence Vol. III, forthcoming). Also, it is not well known, but Anna is said to have participated with her father and Ferenczi in their early experiments in thought transference (G. Hidas, "Flowing Over-Transference, Countertransference, Telepathy: Subjective Dimensions of the Psychoanalytic Relationship in Ferenczi's Thinking," in Aron & Harris (1993), p. 209.

47. In 1921, the American doctors and members of the New York Psychoanalytic Society were Abram Kardiner, M.D. (1891-1981), Leonard Blumgart, M.D. (n.d.), Clarence Oberndorf, M.D. (1882-1954), Monroe A. Meyer, M.D. (1892-1939) and Albert Polon, M.D. (1882-1926). In those early days, it was customary for Americans, particularly New Yorkers, interested in becoming analysts, to travel to Vienna to have an analysis, usually with Freud. See Kardiner, My Analysis With Freud: Reminiscences (New York: Norton, 1977) and Oberndorf (1953).

48. Although the distinction is not critical in this context, Ferenczi's use of "das Es", would suggest translation as Groddeck's "It", not Freud's "Id".

Groddeck used the term "das Es" (which he is commonly thought to have borrowed from Nietzsche) as early as 1912 in his book Towards God Nature (Hin zu Gottnatur), (Leipzig). In 1923 in "The Ego and the Id," (Standard Edition, 19
[1961]), Freud acknowledged that he owed his concept of "das Es" to Groddeck. Freud's English translators chose to use the Latin "Id" for his "Es," while translators of Groddeck's original "Es" used "It."

"[Freud's] "Id" constitutes the instinctual pole of the personality; its contents, as an expression of the instincts, are unconscious, a portion of them being hereditary and innate, a portion repressed and acquired" (Language of Psycho-Analysis, p.197). For Groddeck: "Man is animated by the Unknown, that there is within him an "Es", an "It", some wondrous force which directs both what he himself does, and what happens to him....Man is lived by the It" (The Book of the It, p.11). For a comprehensive comparison of the "It" and the "Id," see The Language of Psycho-Analysis, pp.197-99, and The Meaning of Illness, pp.11-17. Also see Bos (1992) on the difference between Groddeck's It & Freud's Id.

49. Ferenczi expresses frustration that having chosen to marry Gizella, an older woman beyond child-bearing age, instead of the younger Elma, he lost his chance to father a child. He is left only with the opportunity to "father" (or "mother") psychoanalytical insights. To some degree, Ferenczi held Freud responsible for his situation (See above). There is speculation that Freud's motive to support Gizella over Elma was influenced by his concern for the psychoanalytic movement; had Ferenczi started a young family
with Elma, his valuable energies would have been much less available for the development of psychoanalysis. See Freud-Ferenczi, Vol I. (1993).


51. Sandor, Gizella, Elma, and Magda Palos (married to Ferenczi's youngest brother, Lajos Ferenczi (1879-n.d.), Gizella's youngest daughter by her first marriage to Geza Palos.

52. Another interpretation of the dream, offered by Eva Brabent suggests that the "old jew" of the dream represents Freud (personal communication, March 1995). This interpretation is compelling since it could be seen to reflect Ferenczi's feelings towards Freud regarding his influencing Ferenczi to choose Gizella over Elma, but also that there is a sense of a homosexual component to the dream.

53. Gizella was eight years older than Sandor.

54. Ferenczi grew up in Miskolcz, a provincial town 150 Km. north-east of Budapest. The Ferenczis owned vineyards on the outskirts of the town.

55. Bernat Ferenczi (1830-1888), a bookseller and publisher. The elder Ferenczi was from a family of Polish Jews who had emigrated to Hungary. He died when Ferenczi was fifteen years old.

56. In latin in original. Lit: "maid-servant love." Ferenczi may be making a word-play, as it could also be read
as "handmaid love" -- possibly a reference to his self-described propensity for masturbation in his youth. 

57. In his Clinical Diary, Ferenczi recounts his memories of early (six-years-old) sexual traumas at the hands of a nurse, and a housemaid. He writes that it was his mutual analysis in the late 1920's-early 1930's that uncovered the roots of these traumas (p.60-61).

58. Medically, sleeping on the left side would not be sufficient to make one's heart pound.

59. It's curious that Ferenczi raises the dream as "bisexual" with reference to Fay Gyula "also" being a beautiful woman. It seems to take for granted the homosexual nature of his first description, the desire for Fay Gyula as the beautiful young man.

60. Ferenczi's raising of the "it hurts" in this context could be seen as a prefiguring of his later interest in real trauma. At this time, 1921, Ferenczi was not thinking about the issue of trauma (E. Brabent, personal communication, March 1995). Ferenczi would later delve deeply into this issue. It is also interesting that Ferenczi here raises the question, central to the later debate on trauma, as to whether his heartache was "real" and physical, or "fantasy" = figurative. Ferenczi later conceived that the action of trauma was complex since it involved the relationship between actual traumatic events and psychic fantasy (Ferenczi, 1932, 1933).
61. Presumably Ferenczi's wife. The letter containing Groddeck's interpretation has not survived.

62. Ferenczi seems to have harboured thoughts of a union with Elma well after his marriage to Gizella. There is the suggestion that later, given Ferenczi's feelings, Gizella offered to step aside and divorce Sandor so that he could marry Elma, (*Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence*, Vol I., 1993). See notes above.

63. At first, in 1917, Ferenczi was cool about Groddeck's approach to Freud and psychoanalysis. Quite possibly he was jealous of Groddeck since Freud was initially enthusiastic about Groddeck. Over time, however, the roles reversed and Ferenczi drew close to Groddeck, while Freud pulled away. Quite likely, Freud lost interest in Groddeck as his value to the psychoanalytic movement became questionable (Dupont, 1994).

64. "Humble" in English in original.

65. New page of paper with letterhead "Magyarorszagi Psychoanalitikai Egyesulet (Freud-Tarsasag)"= see note # 1.

66. Another allusion to *Thalassa* and his theory that certain human behaviour reflects a propensity to regress to an earlier evolutionary developmental stage. See notes above.

67. *Thalassa*. See notes re: *Thalassa* above. See also "The unwelcome child and his death instinct" for Ferenczi's note on his own case: "In one special case there was even a quite peculiar, intense cooling down at night, with sub-normal
temperatures, difficult to explain organically" (Ferenczi, 1929, p.104).

68. The clinical state which arises from renal failure i.e. an excess of waste-products (urea) in the blood. Some of Ferenczi's symptoms -- headache, insomnia, and breathing problems -- correspond to aspects of a clinical diagnosis of uraemia.

69. First letter using this salutation.

70. Presumably the Christmas 1921 letter.

71. Groddeck's letter unpreserved.

72. See Christmas 1921 letter.

73. First week of January (Jones, III, p.87).

74. Ferenczi delivered lecture 6 January. See previous letter Xmas 1921 & note on those in Vienna to work with Freud -- Kardiner, et al.

75. Apparently, Ferenczi had a good relationship with his father; his father's favourite according to Zsuka. See previous letter.

76. See Xmas 1921 letter re: Elma.

77. Echoes of this characterization of Ferenczi as "homicidal" by Jones in his Freud biog. vol.III. pp.188-191.

78. See Xmas 21 letter for symptoms.

79. Classical Freudian concept of the traumatic significance of witnessing the "primal scene" of parental intercourse.

80. See 1932 Clinical Diary for Ferenczi's views of Freud as father figure (pps. 184-185).

81. See note Xmas 21 letter.
82. **Nasamecu** (from NATura SANat, MEdicus CURat=nature heals, the doctor cures). Groddeck’s method, based on Schweninger, involved massages, hydrotherapy and diet. See Xmas 1921 letter.

83. Presumably **Nasamecu: Der gesunde und kranke Mensch** (The healthy and sick person), published in Leipzig, 1913. This book “marks the transition between two phases in Groddeck’s life, the phase during which he was Schweninger’s pupil, and the phase during which he tried to be Freud’s pupil...written on one hand, in homage to his teacher Schweninger whose therapeutic principles are commemorated in the title...[and] on the other hand, a criticism of psychoanalysis which Groddeck at the time knew by hearsay only” (*Meaning of Illness*, 1977, p.4).

84. S. Hirzel (n.d.), publisher in Leipzig. Hirzel was Groddeck’s publisher as well as his patient in Baden-Baden.

85. See previous letter.

86. Another of Ferenczi’s many references to the "child" = "wise baby," "unwelcome child," etc. Ferenczi himself was often referred to as the "enfant terrible of psychoanalysis" (Ferenczi, 1931).

87. Probably a sleeping pill.

88. Notes on autoscopy, Skotome, Glaskorpertrubung, fovea contralis, and Ferenczi’s kidneys. Ferenczi had a kidney ailment; referred to by Gizella in late letter to Groddeck (28 February 1934). "Would you not think that his diseased and with-time-destroyed kidney..." (Gizella to Groddeck) and
from a letter of Dr. Wm. Inman, a patient of Groddeck and analysand of Ferenczi: "In or about 1921 Ferenczi had been dangerously ill with nephritis. The physicians could do no more for him, so he packed off to Groddeck..." (p.155).


89. "Psycho-analysis and the mental disorders of general paralysis of the insane" (1922), Fin. pp. 351-370.


91. Letter not preserved.

92. This question clearly reflects Groddeck's attempt to bring a psychological perspective to the analysis and treatment of Ferenczi's physical symptoms -- and play the role of analyst.

93. Ferenczi is 49 years old when he writes this.

94. See note in Xmas 1921 letter.

95. Unclear what this alludes to, although clearly it is at least a play on the word "Papa." It probably refers to how he saw his relationship to Freud at the time. Ferenczi's analysis with Freud had been interrupted by his move to Papa. Freud visited Ferenczi in Papa and they did some analysis.

97. "Im wunderscho-nen Monat August?" is an allusion to Heinrich Heine's poem "Im Wunderschon-en Monat Mai," put to music by Schumann in the cycle of melodies, *The Loves of the Poet.*

98. See 7 July 1929 letter re: Ferenczi's deserting the heat of a Budapest summer for for the cool of the mountains in St. Moritz, Switzerland.

99. 7th IPA Congress in Berlin from 25 to 27 September.

100. Reference to the growth of the International Psychoanalytic Association.

101. This may mean the lack of the body to compensate when parts go wrong. This happens in heart disease.


103. The Groddecks had been on holiday in the mountains since the beginning of January in Murberg, near Sasbachwalden. His mailing address was c/o H. Zink.

104. The name of Groddeck's Sanitorium on the hill in Baden-Baden.

106. The sanitorium sits on the hillside overlooking the pleasant spa town of Baden-Baden.

107. Elma Laurvik. See note above.

108. Gizella did not write a P.S. in 27 Feb. letter above. Seemingly, there was another letter which is missing.


110. Elma had married an American, Herve Laurvik (n.d), a writer of Swedish-American extraction. Seemingly, the marriage was not happy and lasted only a matter of months before they separated in the summer of 1918. They never divorced. Interestingly, in her 7 May 1966 letter to Michael Balint, Elma wrote that of all the men in her life, "it is my husband I loved the best, but he was a kind of Peer Gynt, who brought our life to a disaster."

111. Fredric Kovacs's 8 January 1927 letter (Ferenczi-Groddeck Correspondence, Fr-Ger. eds., appendix) relates that Elma, according to Gizella, was "war nahe am Erloschen" (close to dying).

112. Over the next years, Ferenczi did regularly return to the Baden Baden sanitorium for Groddeck's treatments.

113. See earlier note re: Berlin Congress.

114. Ferenczi referred many of his patients to Groddeck's sanitorium over the years.

115. Elma signed into the sanitorium guestbook as arriving 31 July and departing 17 September 1922. Elma then later
returned signing into the guestbook 30 September and staying until 15 December 1922.

116. Frau Otto Morando (Sarolta), nee Altschul (n.d.). She signed into sanitorium guestbook 6 August and stayed until 17 September. Like Elma, she too returned to the sanitorium, staying from the 18 October until 20 December 1922.

117. The Ferenczis signed into the guestbook 25 August and stayed until 20 September 1922. The Berlin Congress was 25 to 27 September.

118. Otto and Beate (Tola), Otto's first wife. The Ferenczis and the Ranks stayed at Seefeld. Abraham and Sachs visited them during their stay.

119. Ferenczi, like other analysts at that time, would often see patients during holidays.

120. This sequence of numbers is obviously based on the date: 11/10/1922. However it is not clear on the significance of the 62 and the 31. Ferenczi does not allude to the number 31; but at the end of his letter he wishes Groddeck happy birthday for the 31st of the month. Could Ferenczi's number play have anything to do with Groddeck's explorations of numbers as symbols and his "zahlenanalyser" (number analyses)?

121. See number sequence under the date of this letter.

122. Ferenczi's approach was moving more towards this notion of therapy as a kind of re-parenting. Freud accused Ferenczi of trying to re-mother his patients: "He wanted to
show me how lovingly one has to treat one's patients in order to help them...so he himself became a better mother" (Freud-Jones Correspondence, 29 May 1933, p.721).

123. For Ferenczi's critical views of Freud's self-analysis see his 1932 Clinical Diary: Ferenczi writes of Freud's "fear of allowing himself to be analyzed" (p.185). See also Dupont's (1988) introduction (p.xxiii). Interestingly, for a very different perspective of Ferenczi's view of Freud's self-analysis which flatters Freud as the great man who is able to do self-analysis, see his 26 December 1912 letter to Freud (Freud-Ferenczi, Vol. I, 1993, p.449)

It is interesting to note in this discussion of the sociability of psychoanalysis, Freud's own comment in a 21 December 1924 letter to Groddeck: "It is difficult to practice analysis in isolation. It is an exquisitely sociable undertaking" (Meaning of Illness, p. 90)

124. This can be interpreted as an allusion to the kind of mutual analysis Ferenczi was later to engage in with one of his patients -- Elizabeth Severn -- code-named "R.N." in his diary. In fact, his statement seems to support a general notion of mutual analysis.

125. Ferenczi is likely referring to Freud's criticisms of his later work. For example, Freud wrote: "[Ferenczi had the] conviction that I did not love him enough, did not want to acknowledge his work, and also that I had analyzed him badly. His technical innovations were connected with
this....These were indeed regressions into his childhood complexes, the main grievance being that his mother had not loved him enough" (Freud-Jones Correspondence, 29 May 1933, p.721). Ferenczi may have wondered whether this view of his own work may have been valid.

126. Ferenczi is arguing that any kind of "social" analysis is preferable to a "self-analysis." His statements here specifically reflect Ferenczi's rationale for mutual analysis, even with a patient.

127. In a letter to Freud (31 May 1923) Groddeck says Ferenczi analyzed him "about six or seven times" in 1922 (Freud-Groddeck, p.82)

128. Specific allusion to the idea of some form of mutual analysis with Groddeck. In his 1932 Clinical Diary, Ferenczi writes at length about his experiment in mutual analysis with Elizabeth Severn.

129. The Hungarian Psychoanalytical Society. Founded by Ferenczi in 1913, some of the more notable members included Geza Roheim, Michael Balint, and Imre Hermann.

130. Istvan Hollos (Heszlein) (1872-1957). Psychiatrist, friend of Ferenczi and clinical director of the Budapest psychiatric hospital (asylum), Lipotmező (known as the "Yellow house." He was a founding member of the Hungarian Society (1913). Probably one of the first psychiatrists to use psychoanalysis to understand psychosis (Haynal, 1988). Introduced psychoanalytic treatment methods into institutional psychiatry. In 1926, he published a novel

131. Groddeck was 56 years old on 13th October 1922.

132. This must be a reference to something in Groddeck's last letter, which again, was not preserved.

133. Dr. Hans Ritter von Hattingberg (1879-1944). German Doctor of Laws and Medicine and psychoanalyst member of the Munich Branch Society. Hattingberg later became a member of the Aryanized German General Medical Society for Psychotherapy and the German Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy in Berlin. Hattingberg's name is mentioned disparagingly in a few letters between Groddeck and Freud, 1922-25 (*Meaning of Illness*, pps. 76-93). It is not exactly clear what Ferenczi means by the term "scientific Hattingsburgs" -- but it doesn't seem to be a compliment.

134. This section reflects Ferenczi's non-scientific interests, yet affirms his commitment to putting psychoanalysis on a "scientific" footing.
135. Ferenczi may here be alluding to his long standing interest and hope for the development of the metaphysical dimensions in psychoanalysis.

136. Ferenczi is committed to "science" whereas Groddeck does not trust "science" and actively intends to cultivate his not knowing of some things. This opposition around the "scientific" is an ongoing point of contention between them.

137. Ferenczi had been referred to Groddeck for nephrosclerosis. Re: Ferenczi's kidneys, see above note 27 February 1922 letter.

138. Ferenczi writes of this particular breathing pattern in his Clinical Diary (pps. 6, 133, 134). The Cheyne-Stokes respiratory pattern is an abnormal pattern of respiration that occurs in cases of severe uraemia. Periods of apnea alternating with periods of deep, rapid breathing. The respiratory cycle, which begins with slow, shallow breaths, increases to abnormal depth and rapidity, then subsides, climaxing in a period of ten to twenty seconds without respiration, before the cycle is resumed.

139. Obviously a devaluation of the currency.

140. Essentially these lines encapsulate Groddeck's "It" philosophy. Groddeck's belief in a guiding life force and a fate ["schiksal"] seems to be in contrast to Freud's conflict model of the psyche.

Groddeck's faith was in the "It/Id" whereas Freud emphasized the strengthening of the ego. Freud developed "an increasingy firm stance in favor of the intellect, the
expression of [his] hostility toward the 'Id'?" (Sabourin, 1985, p.167)

141. Here Groddeck defines what he sees as the differences between himself and Ferenczi, yet he acknowledges the attraction and the promise that these differences provide for an enduring friendship. Groddeck's sentiment is similar to that which he expressed in his letter to Gizella after Ferenczi's death (see Groddeck letter, 1 February 1934).

142. Groddeck's idea here marks an early suggestion of what we have come to know, as defined by Winnicott, as the "transitional object." (Thanks to Eva Brabant, Paris analyst and co-editor of the Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence, for drawing this to my attention.)

143. A graphic description of Groddeck's desire and propensity to be cared for -- "mothered" -- in the most direct, and some might say "regressed" form, can be found in his own words in his 23 November 1922 letter to Freud (unpublished).

144. Lina Groddeck (1864-1904). She was frail and always sickly. In 1900, she and Georg opened the sanitarium in Baden-Baden.

145. In a fascinating portrait of Groddeck, which includes an analysis and interpretation of these comments, Roustang (1982) sums up Groddeck's position: "[Groddeck] could not position himself within the logic of the paternal transference... [but] instead, he remained within the indeterminate area of the maternal transference" (p.128).
146. See above Ferenczi letter of 11 October 1922.
147. This sentence, slightly changed to "Has he Forgotten How to Laugh?", is the title of Francois Roustang's chapter on Groddeck in his book Dile Mastery (1982) which explores the theme of discipleship in psychoanalysis.
148. Teratoma = a tumor, made up of various types of tissue, including tissues not usually found in the organ in which the tumor arises including the three embryonic germ layers. It may or may not be malignant. Ferenczi makes extensive use of this term, medically and metaphorically. See Stanton (1991) for a detailed description of Ferenczi's and Groddeck's use of the term, teratoma.
150. See Ferenczi's Christmas 1921 letter to Groddeck.
151. The source for this notion of "das es" (It/Id) is still under debate. The usual understanding is that Groddeck borrowed the concept and term from Nietzsche. However, the various arguments for the genesis of this term in psychoanalysis are discussed in Bos (1992). It is interesting that Ferenczi here seems to be trying to score a point in his debate with Groddeck by pointing out that his concept of the "It" is not original.
152. This is a strong statement of Ferenczi's position regarding Groddeck's view of "science", knowledge, and the intellect. It is interesting to see Ferenczi, who is usually characterized as a romantic, rail against the romance of the instinctual. However, here we see the Ferenczi who would defend Freud's position...i.e. a suspicion of the instinctual. Here, one can also see Ferenczi's tendency to balance positions -- sensing Groddeck is too far towards the instinct. Generally, Ferenczi tends to challenge extremes (also in himself) and to suggest the dangers in overemphasizing any position. He does this in his later critique of psychoanalysis as overemphasizing fantasy at the expense of the traumatic reality in work with patients.

153. See reference to Elma and Sarolta's stay at Groddeck's sanitorium in Groddeck's letter of 12 November 1922.

154. Life at Groddeck's sanitorium included regular celebrations, birthday parties, and dressing up in costumes for impromptu theatrical stagings.

END OF NOTES FOR 1921-22 LETTERS
Budapest, am 19. Febr. 1923

Dear Georg,

If I recall correctly you will be opening the doors to Marienhohe on precisely this day. This is what you wrote, I think, in your last letter to Elma. I use this occasion to express my sympathies to you, although I know for myself that after a certain period of vacationing even the desire to work can show its face again.

The latter is not very strong with me and is limited to the 8-9 analytic hours required to put bread (and cake) on the table. These hours are quite interesting, however. — The rest of my time is taken up with being sick; albeit, in fact only after one of my patients (Frau Dr. Rado, whom you know) while in the middle of analysis, succumbed to progressive Pernicious Anemia, contracted in response to the death of her beloved-hated father, and subsequently died. (Her husband, who is in analysis in Berlin, did not know about his wife's analysis.) The patient was incidentally in her 6-7th month of pregnancy. When her blood count was down to 600,000 and was edematous. The doctors
conducted a caesarean section, which she only survived by two days, and the child survived by eight.⁶

Immediately after her parting I experienced renewed heart symptoms (lack of pulse), recurrence of my old insomnia, nightly apneustic⁷ attacks, with body cooling,⁸ etc. --in a word, the death wish.⁹ In this state I nevertheless made a trip to Kaschau¹⁰ (previously in Hungary, now in Slovakia), where I gave two lectures. On my return I continued with my illnesses, experimented with head baths, resumed the tried and true Bauchdrucken¹¹ and even abandoned myself to Chinin-Strychnin pills.

I finally pulled myself together, though, and made a bit of self-discovary, establishing a clear parallel between my current position in the triangle [Ferenczi has drawn a triangle with block letters S-E-G written at each of the corners],¹² and my physical state. This resulted in a small improvement and a calming effect--conversely, in a new scientific theory which I will not keep from you.

I believe that so-called bronchial asthma should simply be termed, Angstasthma¹³ (of course this is only a joke). Anxiety [Angst] prevents expiration by contracting the exhalation passages. The compression of the capillaries of the lung leads to greater/lesser blockages in the small blood vessels and to a lack of blood¹⁴ in the large circulatory system, leading to heart complications.
This isn't the new discovery, however. What's new is my contention that an epileptic fit, in all likelihood, does not originate in the brain, but is rather to be seen as an exceptionally strong asthma attack, at least so far as the mechanics are concerned. Popular wisdom therefore has the last word again, in that it usually describes epilepsy as heart seizure. The functioning of the brain is only drawn in as a secondary complication. The sequential symptomatology would thus go as follows: 1. Paroxysms of wheezing 2. blockage of the lungs, with edema; 3. blackouts; 4. seizures.

So much for the physiological. What, however, does the whole thing mean, what is its psychic content? This may be strongly "over determined." But at least one of the preconditions (as has been suspected, of course, for a long time) for such an attack is the depiction and experience of coitus in the penis role. The whole body becomes a penis; it becomes erect (stiffening) + (becoming engorged with blood). It's thrown back and forth: after ejaculation (lung edema) it goes slack.

The nightly asthma attacks may be similarly interpreted. As may many diurne or lasting asthmatic conditions. The lung seizure causes the blackout, which then brings the unconscious to the fore.
Best regards, Sandor

I almost forgot to draw the therapeutic conclusions. To halt an epileptic attack one could apply your stomach kneeling [Bauch-Kneeling] technique, rather than holding the nose, as I have been attempting.¹⁸

Budapest, 4 May 1923

Dear Georg,

Now I write on a professional matter. Ever since her son was killed in the war, a 47 year old lady, wife of a Count has been suffering from symptoms of...(Shaking, stiff posture, stiff walk, frozen facial expression etc.)¹⁹ Therapy until now unsuccessful. I want to ask you whether, in such cases, you would recommend a combined treatment of psychological and physiological therapy,²⁰ and whether you have had some experience in this kind of thing. Perhaps the lady would agree to go to Baden-Baden.²¹ Please let me know soon!

I am just reading your letters about the Es.²² It is much more pleasant to read it in book form than as a manuscript. I might review it for the journal but that means that I have to defend my point of view!²³
Dear Georg,

This time I have an odd excuse for my long silence: I had too much to say; furthermore, something quite painful. I'll begin with that. Our Professor Freud is ill. He discovered by chance that his palate felt rough. It was diagnosed as a Leukoplakia, that is, a flat growth which took in the whole back left half of the palate and extended over into the cleft of the upper jaw. The doctors and specialists (from whom neither the professor nor Rank were able to receive an entirely clear diagnosis) suggested that an immediate operation was called for. They (that is, Prof. Hayer, a famous Viennese Stomata-Laryngologist) cut out the growth, but retained a part in the jaw, and treated this with Radiation [Radium-Bestrahlung].

Whit Sunday I was in Vienna, and found the Prof. mentally alert, but very anaemic. He did not speak pessimistically about his situation, but he counted on the fact that the doctors were keeping an epithelium diagnosis from him. Nevertheless he hoped for a positive outcome. -- My own estimation of the case changes according to my moods. Today,
for example, I see things very darkly. --I beg you to pass this on to no one (Frau Emmy excluded).

My own Struma (which is probably substernal) has become larger and causes distress nightly; which leaves me with just sufficient energy to put in my nine daily working hours (which I require for my daily bread). There is little space left for literature. --But soon I will stop working, and then pursue in greater earnest the plans on which I have been holding back, (continuation of the genital theory).

Since the other project on which I am working with Rank, however, requires that I stay in direct touch with him, I must put out of my mind the wonderful thought of visiting you again, at least this year; all the more so since I plan, after completing the time with Rank, to meet with the Prof. (probably in South Tyrolia).

As I expected, the role of reviewer for your Book of the It fell to me. I'll save this piece of work for the holidays as well. I can tell you right now, though, that I am inclined to highlight what I consider the special achievement of your outlook: the fact that you have never ceased emphasizing, along with the role of the father, the pivotal role of the mother. Recent observations all point in this direction; albeit, it was no mean achievement on the part of the scientific viewpoint (which you disdain) that the history of parental importance also turned up--in reverse order--in psychoanalysis.
Very little else to report from us. My wife is diligent and happy, as always. Elma is a bit bored, and comforts herself with occasional attacks of stomach ache. Sarolta has recovered from her eye problems, which plagued her for some time.

Foreigners are rarer here than in Baden-Baden.\(^3^8\) The International Psychology Congress has invited me to Oxford, but forgot to send along the necessary Pounds.

Fondest greetings from both of us to you and Frau Emmy,

Your

Sandor

Klobenstein by Bozen,\(^3^9\) (now Italy). 5 Aug. 1923.

Dear Georg,

We received worthwhile news from the Professor--although we are by no means over our anxiety about him.\(^4^0\) I plan to meet him this summer near his current place of residence (Lavarone, Trentino)\(^4^1\); perhaps I will find out more detail then.

Baden-Baden as a site for the Congress seems less and less likely, given the prevailing political conditions.\(^4^2\) People
are mentioning Salzburg. But it's all still very much up in the air. 

I am using my stay in the beautiful but hot Klobenstein to complete the draft of my Genital theory. It will be a book of about 100 pages.

I think you will be very pleased with it, as with a new book of Rank's.

A technical, scientifically political work (together with Rank) has a similar purpose of restoration, like the one you demand. I am giving daily hours to an American woman I have brought along; otherwise I could not afford all the Lire I am spending.

Today an interesting old Englishman consulted me. I will send him to you. I hope he will come.

My wife feels well. She helps eagerly with my writing. I have been of better health recently. At times I have (and feel) an "Extrasystole" of the heart. I sleep better, but not well.

From here we are going to the mountains (Dolomites).
We often speak about Baden-Baden, about you and Frau Emmy and all who we came to cherish there. We send fondest greetings,

Your
Sandor

Klobenstein, 20. VIII. 23.

Dear Georg:
Enclosed is the address of Reverend Arthur Meyrick, a 72-year-old Eng. parson who suffers from fistulation disturbances. His father did the same. His wife broke her arm recently but it mended well. Soon afterwards her knee joint swelled up, but it receded spontaneously. I urged them to see you; would you tell them through me, what they would have to pay for board and treatment.

Also our joint work is finished. I am convinced it will find your approval. At the end of the month we will visit the Professor in Lavarone, then I will come back and pick up my wife. (She sends greetings.) and then I will journey home. I hope to be in Budapest around the 5 - 7 Sept.
Greetings from both of us.

Your
Sandor


Dear Georg:
Thank you for your congratulations. This celebration was premature. The impatient crowd was determined to turn me into a Nobel Prize winner and Freud and Rank into this extravagance. Nevertheless it was a good opportunity to recollect and realize the shabbiness of the product. I hear that Zsuka, instead of getting better decided to become a psychoanalyst. She certainly cannot count on my support in this extraordinary undertaking.

Mrs. F. Revesz came home quite excited: "What is this about the English pastor"?

I am horribly busy (9-10 hours daily) earning the necessities.

Best wishes to Grodla [name unclear], Mrs Emmy and to you.
Yours Sandor Ferenczi.

Budapest, 8. 10. 1923
Dear Georg,

It just came to me that I am able, on the occasion of your upcoming birthday, to revenge myself for your congratulations on my fiftieth birthday. I needn't wish you a long life, since you may, if you wish it, live forever; the same goes for good health, fortune, and all those things for which we other mortals so often yearn in vain. I'll therefore restrict myself to expressing my joy that your It saw fit to maintain you so well and keep you in such good spirits. We are also pleased to know you are in the vicinity of another sympathetic It, whom we find so charming, and who may claim at least partial responsibility for the fact that, after all, you remain physically and mentally the person that you are.

Unfortunately, I must write some bad news regarding the Prof. The radical operation must be carried out after all, in fact it is imminent. The immediate prospects are supposedly good. I visited the Prof. a few days ago in Vienna, and found him collected and in good spirits.

The editorial work on the Genital Theory and the work with Rank has begun.

Best regards to the both of you,

Your
Prof. spoke with great friendliness about you. Nonetheless, it is perhaps wise if you don't write him until after the operation. ----

Budapest, 25/X/23

Dear Georg,

I can say the following regarding the Prof.'s condition: they conducted a preoperation (ligating the external carotid artery). Three or four days later they removed 1/3 of the right maxillary and a lamina of the inferior maxillary. They immediately inserted a prosthesis and covered the defect with a skin transplant. The second operation lasted three hours. Prof. is taking everything heroically. After a few days of fever he recovered and is to return home from the sanatorium by the end of the week. He is said to be well. The piece which they removed shows that all that was diseased has been dealt with. All of us hope for the best.

I'm deeply immersed in work. In order to live decently I have to work ten hours a day. But it is going smoothly and interests me as it did 17 years ago when I began with analysis.
We often think of you, especially in view of the difficult struggles which are engaging your homeland, with which we strongly empathize. Here the hate for the French is great, but the large political forces seem to want to come to terms with those bandits.\textsuperscript{63}

Please let me read something humorous of yours again.
Greetings to you and Frau Emmy.

Your
Sandor

\textsuperscript{63} Note: Possibly missing letters because of large gap: Oct.-June. Although next letter does begin with acknowledgement of long gap. Also, it appears that the Ferenczi did not visit the Groddeck sanatorium in 1923 at all.

1924

Bpest, 30 June 1924

Dear Georg,

Now there's no doubt it's my turn. I haven't written to you for a long time because I didn't know what my summer would look like. The plan was to follow an American invitation, but the latter shriveled into a "future possibility."\textsuperscript{64} Now we plan to spend the month of July in a pension near...
Budapest (I will be working half days). Then we are likely
going to Switzerland, and finally home again, via Baden-
Baden, where we would like to spend at least two weeks.66

The Congress in Salzburg was indeed uninvigorating; it
turned out relatively peaceful, though.67

Last Sunday I was in Vienna. Prof. Freud is able to work. No
trace of relapse, but he is thin and weak. He's going
somewhere into the Semmering district (imminently).68

It would make me very happy if your friend Roeder would
decide to point out to me the most glaring mistakes in the
"Genital Theory."

I am pleased to hear about your "Elasticity" and hope to
discover it in person this summer. I am doing passably
well. In these holidays I want to write about 1.) new
approaches to, and possibilities for, technical aid, and
2.) the connection between practical analysis and the
genital theory.

Gisella, Elma, Sarolta, Zsuka, are well and send their
warmest greetings. We often speak about Frau Emmy, and all
of us in sympathy with her.

Greetings from your
Sandor
Budapest 11 Oct 1924

Dear Georg,

I am at work again and it feels as if I had never been in your woods house. It is sad that work and pleasure have to be so extremely separated. How much nicer it would be if we could [unclear...?] our work with the exchange of our feelings of friendship. The affair R continues, -- he does not respond anymore, at least he has not answered me until now.

I would love to be with you today amongst all your celebrants. Maybe next year--in July--we will again really be together. Say hello to all the friends in Baden.

Love to you and Emmy.

** Letter includes a P.S. from Zsuka, Ferenczi's sister, who was at the sanitorium as a patient of Groddeck's.

1. Dear Doctor,

My congratulations on your birthday--I am thinking with lots of love of Marionhohe and 13 October of last year--a wonderful day--It is as if I had lived through a beautiful fairy tale. I would like to go back to the doctor for months so as to gain a lot of benefit from him to improve my
life. Unfortunately, I cannot think about it for the time being because of finances. Hopefully, in 1-2 years. My best wishes to Mrs. Dr. Groddek [sic], to Eva and my friend Miss Spalding. I think about you all very often, especially the Doctor whom I embrace with lots of love and admiration and gratitude. If I may.

yours

Zsuka

1925

[date not clear] Budapest 1925

Dear Georg,

Mr von Bakrup arrived today accompanied by Hofrat Dr. Bovos (hospital director). Dr Bovos is a clever but unimposing physician which you will confirm when you speak to him.

Please write soon.

Your

Sandor F.

26.3.25
Dear Georg and dear Mrs Emmy,

We want to let you know that after a short visit with the professor at Semmering on August 5th, we will probably arrive in Baden-Baden in the afternoon or evening.

To a happy reunion,

Your Sandor F

Budapest, 18 April 1925

Dear Georg

All those to whom you sent greetings via me, return these greetings heartily.

I have very little news about myself.

My practice is expanding to the extent that the number of Americans who are coming to see me is increasing slowly but surely. Cases of neurosis, though, are more interesting to me than self-analyses of so-called healthy persons, or of students. Nevertheless, I have ample opportunity to reach new insights, and these form the main pleasures of my otherwise monotonous and tiring life. In one of my newest surprises I argued for the tremendous importance of the
foreskin, which has been previously so neglected. I want to present these things to the Homburg Congress, so I won't explain them to you here. Indeed, I ask you to not raise the issue for the time being with anyone. Why? I will tell you that personally when the time comes.

The situation with Rank has taken a turn for the worse. He returned from America a fallen General, his teaching post in Vienna having been given to others. The fact that we are on the verge of writing a book together is causing much gossip about my relationship to the Prof. (with whom I continue to be on the best possible footing). Rank is deeply depressed. Berlin is in vogue.

One of my American women has a friend who I think belongs in Marienhohe. She wrote him about this already. How is Mr. von Bakonyi? He didn't write me, although he said he would. Would you be able to take in a Hungarian publicist with kidney problems? And if so, what would be the minimal daily rate?

I think we lost Iceland, in view of the fact you could say nothing definite about it. These things have to be planned long in advance. Our holiday months are August and September, the Congress will take up the break. During the first holiday month I will work half time; in the second not at all.
Best wishes to you and dear Emmy,

from your
Sandor

Bpest 26.VII.25

Dear Georg and dear Mrs Emmy,
We want to let you know that after a short visit with the Prof. at the Semmering on August 5th, we will probably arrive in Baden-Baden in the afternoon or evening.83

To a happy reunion,

Your Sandor Ferenczi

Frankfurt 5/IX 1925

Dear Friends,
Greetings to you. The congress is over, fortunately.
Sandor, Gizella
See you soon!

[Also writing on card: someone else, can't make out who. Could be Elma signing her name as Mrs. Laurvik]
...[grusse], Meng.84

CARD: [Card is picture of a ship "Conte Rosso"]

[Handwritten at top of card] Address: Dr. S. Ferenczi Hotel Quisisana, Capri (Italy) via Naples.

Genova [Italy], 10.9.25
Dear Friends,
I write to you to give you a taste of Italy. Yesterday, we flew to Meren[?], went swimming in the sea, got 7 thorns of a sea urchin in my hand and foot. A beautiful Italian lady helped me to pull them out--isn't it wonderful! Beautiful weather! Today we will go on board.

Greetings and kisses to you both,

Your Gizella.

Sorrento,85 Hotel Vittoria 13/IX 1925

Dear Friends!
What a surprise to open the "Arc"86 today and have my name jump out at us. And how proud I was to have my birthday87 provide the occasion for you, dear friend--how shall I call
you? Can't say Georg, don't want to say Pat—either to send such interesting thoughts to your readers. It makes one want to have a birthday every day, when such wonderful things happen.

We arrived in Sorrento after much back and forth. We don't regret our decision up to now, despite the bad weather. Every day we think about your love and gratitude—and are happy that the second of October will see us reunited, if only for one day--And then comes the reunion in Budapest! What joy!

I embrace you,
Gizella

I wasn't mentioned in the "Arc", but am still happy to be able to write you again. The fact is, I have almost forgotten how to write, that is how far everything that has to do with knowledge is now removed from me. I'm living an animal existence, bathing many times a day, sometimes in saltwater, sometimes in fresh; I eat and drink, very moderately, that is, which in view of the menu, is no mean feat; I also sleep fairly well and mostly without complaints. My other functions are also in order.

Now it occurs to me that all this is nothing but a lie, for yesterday I read something of Freud's and discovered, I
think, a cute addition to his explanation about the functioning of judgment. 90

With fondest greetings, and in expectation of an early reunion.

Your
Sandor

After your departure I heard many positive opinions about your lecture in Homburg. 91

[It. Insert: 24 October 1925: Ferenczi presented a lecture to Hungarian Society titled "How to know when active psycho-analytic technique should or should not be used." ]

Bpest, 6. December 1925

Dear Friend,
The day before yesterday I received a letter from Freud in which he wrote of the great discomforts this otherwise small operation caused him. 92 It was for this reason therefore that he was unable to speak to you for longer than an hour. 93 He said he was generally quite exhausted which interfered with his work. He wrote about his personal sympathies toward you, his esteem for your discovery of the influence of psychoanalysis on the organic realm, your
discovery of the "It/Id" [das "Es"]:^94: can't distinguish your role in organic matters. He was less content, though, with your manner of *presenting* your ideas.^95

Nothing new to report from here. Over Christmas we will probably go to Vienna, where I will have to negotiate with Rado^96 and others about the celebratory [Fest]-issue of the journal. My mood and my state of health--*fluctuat nec mergitur*.^97 Generally rather an improvement.

Kovacs^98 seems to be suffering more now than before. He cannot walk more than ten minutes without falling victim to an attack of pain. I expect you will see him again soon.

I am enjoying my work. I believe my technique, and thereby my insight into the workings of the healthy and the diseased soul is crystallizing as if by itself.

I experience little good news from my colleagues, albeit, not much that would cause embarrassment either. I tend to be indifferent.

Regarding the family circumstances, I am struggling for outer and inner clarity. I realize I must make a beginning and recognize and acknowledge certain indispensable things which every woman, from the depths of her psyche, counts on. I mean of course the "narcissistic" desires of women.^99
Too bad you live so far away. It was nice to have a friend nearby.

Although the Baden-Baden air was somehow more enlivening than our intimacy was.\textsuperscript{100}

Greetings to my dear Emke, your loyal house and battle comrade. She left a strong impression here.

Your
Sandor

\textbf{1926}

Budapest, 7. January 1926

Dear Georg, -- Dear Emke!
I have in the meantime been in your homeland, where I represented the Professor at Abraham's funeral.\textsuperscript{101} In Berlin a friend of A's [Abraham] (an analyst) told me that A. had almost fearfully withdrawn from all analytic influences and delivered himself almost willingly to the surgeon's death blows. He had--in partial agony--apparently an unnecessary
laparotomy; the day after, his stomach wound burst open during a cough (Peritonitis).\textsuperscript{102}

He was very well liked in Berlin. Eitingon,\textsuperscript{103} who will take up his position, will only be able to replace him on the organizational level. Professor uttered the wish that I move to Berlin,\textsuperscript{104} a few of the younger Berliners (Simmel,\textsuperscript{105} Alexander\textsuperscript{106}) seem supportive of this idea. The plan does not agree with my passive disposition.

Nothing special is going on here. Christmas we were in Vienna, where the news of A.'s [Abraham's] death surprised me. My wife traveled to Budapest and Zurich, I to Berlin.

It was nice that we could see each other again in the fall this time.\textsuperscript{107} But you will not escape my summer visit this year either--we don't plan to make things that easy for you.

Sarolta is here. She makes a much more positive impression than in Rome;\textsuperscript{108} it appears the situation with the avvocato is not malignant. She won't accept your invitation, and she doesn't have money. So although she would like nothing more than to come there, she does not feel in a position to allow herself this pleasure.
Kovacs\textsuperscript{109} too, will not permit himself the long absence from home and business. He might content himself with a request for analytical help from Dr. Deutsch\textsuperscript{110} in Vienna.

I'm working diligently on my cases. Am always learning more. The development of plans, though, is still hindered by lack of desire.

We are very happy that you had a good time here--and trust that the experience will mature into a repeat visit.

Thank you for the New Year's telegram!

Your
Sandor

[\textit{Ed. Note}: 13 March 1926: Ferenczi gave a lecture to the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Society "The problem of the acceptance of unpleasant ideas."

\begin{flushright}
LETTERHEAD: Dr. Ferenczi Sandor \\
Budapest, VII, NagyDiofa-u.3
\end{flushright}

1926, III/27 [\textsuperscript{*} incorrectly dated as March 6, 1927 in French and German editions]

Dear Friends,
I'll start with a few announcements:

1.) Freud felt badly a few weeks ago: heart disturbances. Dr. Levy from Budapest, and Prof. Braun (Vienna) sent him to the Cottage sanatorium where he recovered well, as he writes. Dr. Levy says the disturbances are not of great significance.

2.) My former students and patients from America invited me to do a series of lectures there under the auspices of the "New School for Social Research." I accepted in principle, and if sufficient private lessons are forthcoming, I will be (or rather: we will be) travelling there the end of September and staying for the whole Fall, Winter and Spring. In September we will be travelling through Baden-Baden, this time without patients. We would enjoy stopping over with you, at least for a short time.

3.) My health was unsteady until recently. At the moment I seem to have found the right doses of self-knowledge and other therapy.

Now to you!

Let us hear from you. We know this and that through the Arc, but it's not enough--not nearly so. I find something of interest in each issue of the Arc--even a few small barbs here and there aimed at analysts of my stripe and against the active little experiments [Kunstuckchen].
How are Miss Collins and Mrs. Inman? Dr. Inman wrote me at New Years, but didn't mention his wife.

And how are you? Were you at the hut in the woods [Waldhauschen] already?

I enclose the flower seed from California which my wife promised you. I hope they bloom by the cottage.

And now: best wishes and friendly kisses (or vice versa) from your Sandor

Budapest, 26. VI, 1926

Dear Friend,
I haven't written for a long time. I have in the meantime been subjected to strong influences which wanted to persuade me to give up my America trip and relocate to Vienna to take over the Presidency. Prof. Freud was especially strongly for Vienna and against America. I vacillated for a long time, but decided finally to go through with the America plan. I don't foresee a great income coming from there, but I do hope to strengthen my connections abroad. I don't know
yet what will come of it. We will in any event be travelling via Baden-Baden to the port in France where we are to embark. We are eagerly looking forward to the togetherness. Our arrival there should fall toward the end of August, or, more likely, the beginning of September.

We are currently, until the middle of August, living in a villa-pension just outside Budapest. (Address: Budapest, I. Martonhegyi ut 45, Villa Montana.) The weather is miserable, but it's nicer here than in the dark apartment in Nagydiofa u, 3.125

Many heartfelt greetings from both of us to you and dear Emke

Your
Sandor

Budapest, 26 July, 1926

Dear Georg,

It is more and more likely that we will stay 8 days in Semmering,126 and then for the same length of time in Munich, where I will be having an intense discussion and a few days in the mountains with Lou Salome.127 Thus we would arrive in Baden-Baden around the 6th-8th of September and
stay 8-10 days. The further trip to the port is not settled yet (Hamburg or Cherbourg); depends on political conditions in Paris. 128

Best greetings to you all.

from Ferenczis


Dear Friends,

We celebrated Gizella's birthday here in Munich, where we met with Frau Lou Salome. Before that we spent a week in the Semmering with Prof. Freud. 129 *very probably* we will take Frau Salome with us to Baden-Baden as our guest; she will likely stay 2-3 days. Our arrival time is not yet set; it could be as early as this Thursday. We will in any event telegraph you. We *very much* look forward to seeing you. 130 Please inform my sister-in-law also, if she is still there. 131

Fondly,

Your Sandor and Gizella
P.S. If at all possible we would ask that you reserve rooms for us and Salome at Marienhohe; if there is no room for Frau Lou, we would like to put her up close by.

[signed] S.

Still in Baden-Baden,
13. October 1926.132

Dear George Groddeck,
I congratulate you from the bottom of my heart on the 60th anniversary of your birthday. If I take this opportunity to look back at the history of our friendship, I can establish that it began on purely scientific, impersonal grounds as a correspondence between you, Freud and myself about the possibilities of applying psychoanalysis to organic medicine.133 Then, when I myself became organically ill, I became acquainted with you as a physician and a human being, and after this, scarcely a year went by which did not contain a few weeks of relaxation, refreshment and intimate conversations in your trusting abode in Baden-Baden. There exist marked differences between us vis-a-vis the scientific method which we apply; yet it was always possible, by the application of good will, to bridge these formal differences and bring our opinions into unity and harmony. I learned
much from the unencumbered courage with which you "cut through to the bone" on the question of the psychomorphology of the organic. I also flatter myself into thinking I have had a small influence on your development. Psychoanalysis, at any rate, is beholden to you for significant insights; the best heads from our ranks know this very well, even if your priority rights are sometimes handled in a cavalier fashion by the literature.\(^{134}\) Since you don't put a high priority on priority rights, this lack of attention doesn't greatly bother you.\(^{135}\) You are assured recognition by your friends and your patients.

Heartfelt greetings until the next anniversary.

from your

Sandor Ferenczi

---

END OF 1923-1926 LETTERS
FERENCZI-GRODDECK LETTERS 1923-26

ANNOTATIONS

1. Erzsebet Rado, nee Revesz (1887-1923), Hungarian Neurologist and wife of psychoanalyst, Sandor Rado. She was first analysed by Freud in 1918, then by Ferenczi. See note below.

2. A blood disease. Ironically, this was the illness that would kill Ferenczi himself almost exactly ten years later in May 1933.

3. Interesting that here Ferenczi attributes a psycho-somatic cause to the disease. He also ascribed at least a partial psycho-somatic cause in the onset of his own Pernicious Anemia in his letter of 20 March 1933 to Groddeck only months before his death: he wrote that the disease was brought on in part by his "disappointment with Freud." He alludes to Freud's rejection of him and his paper "Confusion of Tongues" in August 1932.

4. Sandor Rado (1890-1972). Hungarian psychoanalyst, a lawyer and physician, former pupil of Ferenczi and first Secretary of the Hungarian Society (1913). In 1922, Rado went to Berlin and into analysis with Abraham. Rado had a falling out with Ferenczi at some point (possibly over the move to Berlin? Or Rado's position on lay analysis?). Ferenczi wrote that he felt "abandoned by colleagues (Rado, etc.) who are all too afraid of Freud to behave objectively or even sympathetically toward me, in the case of a dispute
between Freud and me" (Clinical Diary, p.212). Rado became editor of the Zeitschrift after Rank resigned and emigrated to New York in the 1930's to became a prominent member of the New York psychoanalytic community, organizing an analytic institute at Columbia University. His paper "Das Problem der Melancholie" (1927) became a classic. For more on Rado, see Roazen and Swerdloff (1995).

5. Odermatos=edematous—in the form of an edema. Pernicious Anemia is a blood disease which today is curable through massive doses of vitamin B12. At the time the treatment consisted of subcutaneous injections of liver extract.

6. The death of this child, whose gestation occurred at the same time as the mother's analysis with Ferenczi, deeply touched Ferenczi, who often alluded to his wish for children and fantasies of pregnancy.

7. Probably something to do with "apnea" which is periodic cessation of breathing.

8. See Xmas 1921 letter for more detail on Ferenczi's symptoms.

9. A remarkable statement given Ferenczi's own death by Pernicious Anaemia ten years later. While Ferenczi was known to be very concerned about his health -- frequently portrayed in this correspondence -- this reaction to Frau Rado's death is uncanny and telling. Later, in a letter to Freud (20 July 1930), and in his Clinical Diary (2 Oct 1932), Ferenczi was preoccupied with his death. Although he was a probably a hypochondriac, his symptoms were also real.
Ferenczi seemed so immersed in the psychological interpretation of symptoms, that he may have overemphasized a psychological etiology in his search for root causes, downplaying what may have simply been his own weak physical constitution.

10. Kaschau (aka Kassa) is a small town in Northern Hungary about 200 Km. from Budapest. From 1919 Kaschau was a part of Slovakia.


12. Ferenczi's drawing of the triangle confirms that he is referring to his complicated emotional relationship with his wife and her daughter, Elma. Without the drawing of the triangle -- it was not included in the earlier French and German publications -- a first assumption might have been that a triangle existed between Rado, his wife and Ferenczi, given that Rado did not know that his wife was in analysis with Ferenczi, and that Ferenczi and Rado were not on good terms. However, it is possible that the sense of the triangular in the Rado situation evoked the situation in his domestic life. Also, the death of Frau Rado's child was quite possibly a stimulating factor, since Ferenczi's own desire for children was frustrated by his choice of marriage partners -- the older mother over the younger daughter. See Christmas 1921 letter.

13. Condensation of "angst" and "asthma".
"Blutarmut" = anaemia -- diminishing of the amount of haemoglobin, and/or the diminishing of the number of red blood cells to below normal, thereby reducing the transport of oxygen.

Ferenczi wrote of these ideas in a posthumously published article "On epileptic fits: observations and reflections" (written about 1921). Fin., pp. 197-204.

Ferenczi's theory on the relationship between asthma and epilepsy is not supported by present day medicine. Today, epilepsy is characterized by a disturbance of cerebral activity which can be detected by methods such as encephalograms.

This is Ferenczi at his imaginative best, taking an unusual notion and exploring it with great flair. See Ferenczi's Thalassa, for a whole book based on such creative leaps.

Ferenczi's idea of using the "stomach kneeling" for treating an asthma attack would probably facilitate the present day technique of diaphragmatic breathing emphasizing expiration of the breath.

These symptoms fit a rough diagnosis of Parkinson's Disease. The "frozen facial expression" characterizes the "Parkinsonian Mask" when the muscles go into a spasm, expression is lost, and the face becomes like a mask. The shaking in Parkinson's usually starts with a fine tremor -- often a "pill rolling" action involving the thumb and first finger. The co-ordination of normal movement is also lost.
20. Ferenczi was on the right track with his thinking. If the patient in fact had Parkinson's Disease it would be appropriate for her to have a combination of physical and psychological treatment. Parkinson's is a neurological condition where the patient can get very depressed and psychological treatment can help.

21. Ferenczi regularly sent patients, as well as family members, for treatment at Groddeck's sanitorium.

22. *The Book of the It* (1923), subtitled as "Letters to an unknown woman."


24. A hyperkeratinization of the oral mucosa, with circumscribed, yellowish-white, leathery areas, possibly pre-cancerous.

25. As well as being in Vienna, Otto Rank was very close to the Freud family -- at this time probably even closer than Ferenczi (E. Falzeder, personal communication, Salsburg, February, 1995).

26. "Leukoplakia' was a diagnosis made by Felix Deutsch, an internist who was to become an analyst, and Maxim Steiner, an early member of the Vienna Psychoanalytic society. Deutsch had immediately recognized that Freud had a more advanced cancer, but, for whatever reasons, he withheld this information from Freud and pronounced the growth as a pre-cancerous Leukoplakia.
27. If the name is correctly transcribed then Ferenczi has the name of the surgeon wrong. The surgeon was Prof. Hajek (1861-1941), Professor of Laryngology in Vienna.


29. Freud had lost a lot of blood due to a number of hemorrhages associated with the surgery.

30. Epithelioma -- a tumor in the skin epithelium, but not cancerous.

31. A form of goitre -- an enlargement of the thyroid gland presumably due to insufficient thyroid hormone production. It is normally found in the region of the throat, but here Ferenczi suggests it may be below his sternum.

32. Ferenczi frequently remarks about having little time left to write.


35. This meeting between Ferenczi and Freud did not happen. Ferenczi (and Gizella) and Rank were in Klobenstein writing their book and they had hoped to visit Freud for a few days in Lavaronne before the committee meeting (the first meeting to be held without Freud). However, they decided against a visit because they thought it might make the other committee members jealous. (ref: E. Falzeder, personal communication, March, 1995 and Grosskurth, 1991, *The Secret Ring*, p.131).


37. Ferenczi's acknowledgement of Groddeck's recognition of the mother parallels Ferenczi's own influential views along these lines. In fact, Ferenczi, and the Hungarian school generally, is now recognized as a primary source for today's object relations theories. Since the development of the object relations perspective has emerged from taking seriously the central emphasis of the relationship with the mother, Ferenczi may here be attributing Groddeck with a significant role in the development of his own thought, which to some extent opposes Freud's paternal centric views. Karen Horney also acknowledged Groddeck's influence in her
critical work on the mother, gender and sex differences (Quinn, 1988, pp. 216-218).

38. Baden-Baden was internationally famous not only for its spa, but also its casino. Over the years it attracted a number of notable foreigners including the Russian writer Turgenev and French writer, Flaubert.

39. Klobenstein (by Bozen) -- now called Collalbo (by Bolzano) -- is a small village in the Dolomite mountains of Trentino-Sudtirol, Northern Italy, about 11 km. from Bolzano. The region had been a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, but at the end of World War I came under Italian rule. The names were changed during Mussolini's efforts to Italianize the region.

40. Still referring to Freud's ongoing battle with cancer.

41. Lavaronne is a small town in the Trentino, Italy which was a favourite place of Freud's. In late August, the Committee met at Castel Toblino between Lake Garda and Trento and travelled together to San Cristoforo at the foot of the mountain where Freud was staying in Lavaronne. After their stormy meeting, the first without Freud present, they went on to pay a last visit to Freud in Lavarone (Grosskurth, 1991, p.131-133).

42. The political conditions to which Ferenczi is referring, and the question of Baden-Baden as site for the IPA Congress could have a few explanations: a number of the Committee members had problems with Groddeck, and since to some degree Groddeck would be a host in Baden-Baden, they may have been
reluctant to choose it as a site. More likely, these were hard times politically and economically in Germany. There had been a communist uprising in Hamburg, a socialist cabinet minister had been killed in Saxony, Hitler was in jail, and there was bad inflation.

The 1924 Eight International Psycho-Analytical Congress did finally take place 21-23 April 1924 in Salzburg, Austria the site of the first Congress sixteen years earlier. Since Freud was not able to attend, due to is health, Groddeck lost interest in going to the Congress.

See previous notes re: Thalassa. Ferenczi's guess on length turned out to be close, as it was published in English translation at 107 pages. Freud also spent time writing in Klobenstein, apparently writing Totem and Taboo (1913) there ten years earlier in 1912-1913.


The Development of Psycho-Analysis (1925). See above note.

Ferenczi, like other analysts in that time, saw patients during his holidays.

Reverend Arthur Meyrick, a 72 year old English parson. See next letter 20 August 1923. Ferenczi had a number of English patients, as did Groddeck.
49. An extra heartbeat. A heartbeat consists of the "systole" when the ventricle contracts and "diastole" when it relaxes.

50. A reference to the book with Rank. See above.

51. A reference to Ferenczi's 50th birthday on 7 July. The event was commemorated by a festschrift in the *Internationale Zeitschrift fur Psychoanalyse*, Vol. 9.

52. Nickname of Ferenczi's youngest sibling, Zsofia Ferenczi (married name Erdos) (1883-n.d.). See note above, 1921-22 letters. The tone suggests Ferenczi is playing the older brother here.

53. Flora Revesz (n.d.), wife of Budapest physician and psychoanalyst, Dr. Laszlo Revesz, Secretary of the Hungarian Society. Mrs. Revesz had been at Groddeck's sanitorium (guestbook shows 6 Aug. - 9.IX). She, her husband, and their daughter were all shot by Hungarian fascists in the 1940's.

54. The English pastor was in all likelyhood, Reverend Arthur Meyrick the 72 year old English parson whom Ferenczi referred to Groddeck in the letter of 20 August (See note above). He also may have been staying at the sanitorium although his name does not appear in the sanitorium guestbook for 1923.

55. 13 October.

56. Allusion to Groddeck's wife Emmy.

57. See earlier notes re: Ferenczi and Rank collaboration on book.
58. Artery which normally carries blood to nourish the head and face but is not indispensable if tied off.

59. On 4 October, Freud had a pre-operation and on 11 October the radical surgery was carried out. Freud was fitted for a wooden jaw prosthesis. For more on Freud's cancer see: Romm, S. (1983). The Unwelcome Intruder: Freud's Struggle with Cancer. New York: Praeger Pub.

60. Both operations were performed by Hans Pichler (1877-1949) at the Sanitorium Auersperg in Vienna. Pichler, a successful physician specializing in dentistry, was to attend to Freud and his cancer for the next sixteen years until Freud's death.

61. This, in fact, turned out not to be true. On 12 November, Pichler had to further remove some cancer. This set of operations were the first in a long series of operations to come over the years.

62. It is interesting to note that by Ferenczi's calculation he began to practice analysis in 1906, when supposedly he began in 1908 when he met Freud for the first time.

63. Ferenczi is probably referring to the struggles of the German Rhineland, bordering France, to split off from Germany. Hungarians "hated" the French because at the end of the WWI, they were the hardliners of the treaty of Versailles who, by taking great pieces of their land (approximately two-thirds) and changing boundaries, crushed Hungary. (Thanks to Ernst Falseder)
64. A plan to join Otto Rank in working in America had just collapsed. Rank was at first enthusiastic about the opportunities for Ferenczi, but then cabled Ferenczi that the situation was "uncertain." Ferenczi was very disappointed since he had been making preparations to go to America (Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, 30 June 1924, unpublished). Ferenczi eventually did go to the United States in the fall of 1926 and returned in the spring of 1927.

65. The "Sanitorium Siesta" in Budapest I at Rath Georg-str. # 5.

66. The Ferenczis names don't appear in the sanitorium guestbook for 1924. Ferenczi wrote to Freud from Baden-Baden the 21 September. Freud-Ferenczi letters show that on 27 September, Ferenczi was in Vienna and back in Budapest on 10 October.

67. The eight Congress of International Psychoanalytical Association was held in Salzburg 21-23 April. Ferenczi did not present a paper at the conference, however, there was a seminar on psychoanalytic theory and technique responding to Ferenczi's (and Rank's) ideas.

68. Freud stayed at the "Villa Schuller" in the Semmering -- an area of many hotels approximately 100 km. southwest of Vienna.

69. E. Roeder (n.d.). This name appears in the guestbook for 1923.
70. Allusion to Ferenczi's idea which he develops in his 1928 paper, "The elasticity of psycho-analytic technique."
71. The Ferenczis did go to Baden-Baden in 1924, however their names do not appear in the sanitorium guestbook.
72. Throughout the second half of the 1920's Ferenczi devoted much of his clinical and theoretical work to an exploration of experiments in technique.
73. This probably means the small cottage Groddeck had in the woods near Baden-Baden where he would write. It was here he wrote The Book of the It.
74. In all likelihood "R" refers to Otto Rank and his break with Freud and the Committee. See above note re: Ferenczi's dashed hopes to join Rank in America. Rank had recently cabled Ferenczi this news.
75. Groddeck's birthday on the 13th.
76. The ninth IPA Congress was held in Bad Homburg, Germany 3-5 September 1925. Ferenczi (1926) presented his paper "Contra-indications to the 'active' psycho-analytical technique" (Further, p.217-230). For Ferenczi's thoughts on the foreskin, see pp. 227-8.
77. The Development of Psychoanalysis. See earlier note.
78. Allusion to Karl Abraham and the Berlin psychoanalytic group. Ferenczi is being ironic in that he had a great antipathy towards this group. There was, at least from Ferenczi's perspective, a rivalry between the Budapest group and the Berlin group. This rivalry was based in differences
in direction in psychoanalytic theory, practice and training.

79. As Ferenczi alluded to earlier, his caseload now included a growing number of Americans, particularly women. Among the group was Elizabeth Severn, later code-named in Ferenczi's 1932 *Clinical Diary* as "R.N." See Fortune (1993, 1994).

80. Karl von Bakonyi (n.d.) of Budapest was a patient at Groddeck's sanitorium 8 March-27 July 1925 (noted in the sanitorium guestbook). He was likely a patient of Ferenczi who was referred to Groddeck for treatment.

81. Obviously, thoughts about a trip to Iceland. Groddeck had also planned a trip to Sweden where his wife, Emmy, was born.

82. Bad Homburg in September. See above note.

83. The Ferenczis signed into the sanitorium guestbook on the 5th August and stayed until the 31 August.

84. In all likelyhood, Heinrich Meng (n.d.) who was friendly with Ferenczi and possibly Groddeck. In fact, Heinrich Meng of Stuttgart, visited Groddeck's sanitorium for two days 16-18 April 1926. Freud thought, along with Franz Alexander, Meng was one of the brightest young analysts (Jones, 1957).

85. Sorrento, Italy. Small town south of Naples towards the tip of a peninsula on the Bay of Napoli.

86. Groddeck had published a notice of Gizella Ferenczi's birthday in *The Arc* (Die Arche), a bi-monthly journal
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published by Groddeck, predominantly for those at his sanitarium. Groddeck communicated his particular view as an "organic" analyst through articles such as "resistance," "breathing," "psychoanalysis and the it," "the thick neck." The journal had three volumes from 1925-1927.

87. Birthdays were a big occasion for celebrations at Groddeck's sanitorium.

88. Groddeck's longtime nickname from childhood. From Patrik Troll, the pen-name Groddeck used to write the letters to a friend of The Book of the It. The derivation of "Pat" appears to have sprung from Groddeck's love of Peer Gynt in which there are "trolls." Groddeck had bemoaned the fact that "after the death of the last Groddeck" (his brother, Hans, in 1914) there would be nobody left to call him by this name.

89. The Ferencsis had planned to meet the Groddecks in Venice, where they spent two days, on their way back from Naples and Rome (4 days). (E. Falseder personal communication, Feb. 1995).

90. Freud's paper titled, "Negation" (S.E., XIX).


92. See earlier notes above re: Freud's cancer and operation.
On 24 November 1925, the Groddeck family paid a visit to Freud in Vienna shortly after one of Freud's cancer related operations. Freud was tired. The visit to Vienna was on the return to Baden-Baden from the Groddeck trip to Budapest. For their own words see Freud-Groddeck letters (Meaning of Illness, 1977, p.94).

Ferencti refers "das 'Es'." Since "das Es" can be translated as Freud's "Id" or Groddeck's "It", we can only guess that Freud was probably referring to the general idea denoted by the term (i.e. it stands for both the "It" and the "Id".

Ferencti seems to be playing the go-between here. He addresses what he either imagines, or knows from Groddeck, that Freud making only an hour for a meeting with Groddeck needs an explanation. He knows how much the meeting with Freud would mean to Groddeck. Also, Ferencti had asked Freud in his letter 28 November (written on the eve of the meeting) for his opinion of Groddeck.

[Id. Note: "Something in this triangular relationship is curious. Is there something in Ferencti's own mind that makes him unsure of Groddeck? Freud's opinion would still be important to him. Ferencti defended Groddeck to the Committee in the roundbrieft.


Latin = "It is tossed by the waves, but does not sink." See Freud, "On the history of the psycho-analytic movement," Collected Works, &E, VOL. XIV.

Frederic Kovacs (1882/3?-1944), architect, and husband of Vilma Kovacs (1883-1940), Budapest psychoanalyst, and
close colleague of Ferenczi. The Kovacs family was close to the Ferenczis. Ferenczi would have referred Kovacs to Groddeck. Frederic and Vilma Kovacs are Dr. Judith Dupont's, Ferenczi's literary executor, grandparents.

99. Not clear what Ferenczi is referring to here, probably vis-a-vis Ferenczi-Gizella-Elma triangle, or Ferenczi's general problem with women.

100. A reference to the nature of Ferenczi and Groddeck's contact on Groddeck's two week visit (with his wife) to Budapest in November 1925. On 14 November, Groddeck gave a lecture, "Psycho-analytic therapy of internal diseases," to the Hungarian Psycho-Analytical Society. Ferenczi mentioned Groddeck's visit in a rundbriefe, 28 November 1925.

101. Karl Abraham (1877-1925), member of the Committee and founder of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society. Abraham died Christmas day. In fact, Ferenczi was not supportive of Abraham's style and direction with psychoanalysis.

102. Abraham seemingly died from lung cancer which was not diagnosed. Ferenczi is here referring to an operation Abraham had for what was thought to be gall bladder trouble in October -- the lung cancer was not detected. (It is interesting to note that Wilhelm Fliess, Freud's former friend, at a point during this time, was Abraham's doctor.)

103. Max Eitingon. See earlier note.

104. This becomes an issue for a period of time between Freud and Ferenczi. See Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence, 3.I.26 and 18.I.26, unpublished.
105. Ernst Simmel (1882-1947), Berlin psychoanalyst, and a founder of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute. Simmel opened a psychoanalytic sanatorium near Berlin called Tegelsee which Freud took great interest in, and on occasion stayed there. Simmel became a supporter of Groddeck (see his testimonial for Groddeck's 60th birthday in Int. Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse, 1926, 12: 591-595).

106. Franz Alexander (1891-1964), Hungarian psychoanalyst; trained with Sachs and Abraham in Berlin. He liked Ferenczi's work and wrote a positive review of Thalassa and an important paper on Ferenczi's relaxation technique. Alexander emigrated to Chicago and is particularly known for his contributions to brief psychotherapy and psychosomatic medicine and particularly in relation to Ferenczi's work, the concept of "corrective emotional experience." It is interesting that younger analysts such as Simmel and Alexander were very interested in psychosomatics.

107. A reference to the Groddecks Budapest visit, November 1925. See above note, 6 December 1925.

108. Sarolta Morando, nee Altschul, who spent time at Groddeck's sanatorium, lived in Rome. See earlier notes.


110. Probably Dr. Felix Deutsch (1884-1964). Deutsch was a Viennese physician and psychoanalyst who specialized in applying psychoanalysis to organically ill patients. He likely referred Ferenczi to consult Groddeck in the first place. (The Wild Analyst & Meaning of Illness).
In mid-February 1926 Freud suffered mild attacks of angina pectoris. See Freud-Ferenczi letters.

Dr. Lajos Levy (1875-1961), Hungarian physician and founding member of Hungarian Psychoanalytic Society in 1913 (Treasurer). He was Ferenczi's friend and personal physician and was often consulted by Freud between 1923 and 1928 (Schur, 1972, p. 407).

Professor Ludwig Braun (1881-1936). Well known Viennese cardiologist, Freud's doctor and friend.

Freud went to the Cottage Sanitorium 5 March and stayed for about a month at this immense and luxurious sanitorium founded in 1908 on the outskirts of Vienna. Freud referred to the sanitorium as "my Riviera" (Schur, 1972, p.396).

Ferenczi actually believed Freud's heart condition was psychological and offered to come to Vienna for a few months to analyze him. Freud turned him down. See Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, 27 February 1926 and 3 March 1926, unpublished.

As mentioned above, Ferenczi regularly saw patients while on holidays. Specifically, he worked with patients while he was in Baden-Baden at Groddeck's sanitorium.

Ferenczi was constantly trying other methods of "therapy" (E. Falzedec, personal communication, Feb. 1995).

Sanitorium journal/newsletter. See earlier notes.

Ferenczi is probably referring to Groddeck's teasing him about his "active technique."
Two regular and longtime English patients at Groddeck's sanitorium. M.V.E. (Mollie) Collins (n.d.-1956) was introduced to Groddeck at the 1925 Bad Homburg conference by Dr. William Inman. Collins had a neurological illness and was treated for a number of years by Groddeck. She was an enthusiastic supporter and translated a number of his works into English. Mrs. Inman (n.d.), wife of Dr. William Inman -- a physician and an analysand of Ferenczi, became a patient of Groddeck's about the same time. Their names regularly appear in the sanitorium guestbook.

Dr. William Inman (n.d.), British ophthalmic surgeon, who claimed that the majority of patients who consult an ophthalmologist are emotionally disturbed. Analyzed by Ferenczi in the 1920's, who introduced Inman to Groddeck. Inman regularly came to Baden-Baden when Ferenczi was there to continue his analysis, and came to admire Groddeck (The Wild Analyst).

Groddeck's secluded writing studio in the woods near Baden-Baden.

Seemingly, Freud and the other committee members had concerns about Ferenczi's trip to America. For example, that he might decide to stay there, or, that there would be a negative influence on him, as had been interpreted in Jung's and Rank's case. Rank had recently left Vienna and appeared to be settling in America. See Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence, 27.2.26.
124. Ferenczi had an increasing number of patients from the United States.

125. Martonhegyi ut is in the hills on the Buda side of the Danube. The Ferenczis' apartment on Nagydiofa u. was in the busy, more commercial Pest side, just off the bustling main street, Rakoczi utca. The Nagydiofa u. apartment was his first with Gizella, where they lived until 1930.


127. See earlier note, Christmas Day 1921 letter, re: Lou Salome.

128. Probably a reference to the trouble surrounding the collapse of the French franc, and Poincaré's recall to the Presidency of the Council, supported by the large banking interests attempting to restore the franc. This trouble, although relatively moderate, was enough to scare those who had recently experienced the inflation in Central Europe.

129. Beginning 22/23 August, the Ferenczis stayed in a hotel (probably the "Suedbahn Hotel") near the villa where Freud was holidaying. See Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, 26 July 1926, unpublished.

130. The Ferenczis, along with Lou Salome, arrived at the sanitorium Thursday, 2 September. Lou Salome left four days later, on the 6th, and the Ferenczis left for France on the 18th of September. The Ferenczis sailed for New York 23 September 1926 on the "Adania" (Cunard line) from Cherbourg, France.
131. Vilma Ferenczi (n.d.), was married to Ferenczi's brother. She was at Groddeck's sanitorium for two months from late July until late September, 1926. Interesting to note that Walter Schmiedeberg, husband of Melanie Klein's daughter, Melitta Schmiedeberg, was also at the sanitorium.

132. This letter, for Groddeck's 60th birthday, was written by Ferenczi before he left for North America.

133. Interesting that Ferenczi frames their beginning as a triangle which includes Freud. In fact, Freud sent the first letter he received from Groddeck to Ferenczi for advice (J. Dupont, personal communication, April 1995). See Freud-Groddeck Correspondence (The Meaning of Illness) and Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence, Vol.II, forthcoming.


135. Ferenczi seems to flatter Groddeck by saying he is above these considerations of priority. This is ironic, in that Ferenczi later runs into his own problems with Groddeck about his priority. See later letter of Groddeck (13 June 1929) and the immediately following letters of Ferenczi.

END OF NOTES FOR 1923-26 LETTERS
Dear Georg and dear Emmy

Gizella went to visit her sister (Mrs. Morando) in Los Angeles; she has been gone for almost two weeks. In the middle of May my regular work here will be over; I only have to fulfill final commitments, travel to Washington, etc. On June 2nd we will be traveling--sailing--away from here (ship "New York" from the Hamburg-America Line), arriving about 10 June in London, and plan, after a short visit in Paris, to arrive in Baden-Baden about the 20-25 of June, should you have room for us.

My intention is to rest for about three weeks and to then continue the work there with you in Baden Baden.

I am hugely eager to see you and to present myself again after the quite chaotic American campaign.
I never tire, in my lectures, of presenting and praising Georg as the representative of psychoanalysis in the organic realm.

I could say a few things about my personal state—but I'll wait until I arrive there. In a word: I'm passably well.

Total income from my stay here: 2-2 1/2 times greater than my earnings at home; numerous "honours," and some work in the service of psychoanalysis. -- Cost me a huge amount of work, and I am very tired.

I will try, in a final effort, to raise some money for the publishing company. Doubt I will be successful.

Many heartfelt greetings! I am almost yearning for the peace I find in your company.

Sandor

Letterhead: Dr. Ferenczi Sandor

25 October 1927

Dear Pat and Patin,
We were very happy to receive your news. They [letters] always carry with them an air of wonderful harmony and happiness—in the face of life’s many unpleasantnesses. I, too, cannot really complain—although the decision Vienna-Budapest, which still has not been fully made continues to keep calmness somewhat at bay.\textsuperscript{10} The social and political situation here is also still not completely consolidated, although conditions have improved markedly during our absence.\textsuperscript{11} There is something tragic about the experience of having one’s membership in a national community contested after fifty years of feeling and thinking one is at home there.\textsuperscript{12} Were this not the case I would have chosen Budapest without hesitation.

I’m not working much now—5–6 hours per day; yet, counter to my expectations, I don’t accomplish much in my free time. I loaf.

It’s funny how quickly and completely I let go of America. The whole thing appears to me now like a dream.

Now and again, my dear Pat, I refer a patient to you. But you know how rarely "they reach you!"

Elma is in Rome with Sarolta. Zsuka is...[unclear]. Heartfelt greetings to both of you.
Dear Friends,

How can I thank you for your generosity! The best course is probably to declare myself incapable of being worthy of your kindness. At any rate I lack a ready expression for it. So best to drop this.

To celebrate and graciously give and receive is simply a specialty of Marienhohe. Here in Budapest it was different. There was a formal table at a restaurant, without real spirit. The members of our group were unsuccessful in
their attempts to utter a kind word to me, or to squeeze one out of me. I was happy when the whole thing was over.¹⁵

A particularly difficult case which could not follow me to Germany was the main obstacle which prevented us from visiting you this time.¹⁶ Besides this it's possible the "shedding" to which you allude, and which I perhaps do not wish to interrupt was also responsible. I think my own development is not standing still, and I have doubts that our opinions will eventually concur on all points. Be that as it may: as human beings we will always remain close. I think that we disclose to each other the honesty of our intentions.

Our Fall plan for the time being is Spain.¹⁷ Wouldn't it be fine if we could combine our plans somehow, or do you feel, dear Georg, that isolation is currently preferable? Occasionally I think of seeking quiet and solitude in order to pull together certain things that occupy me.

Emke's dear lines bear witness to inextinguishable joyfulness and enthusiasm which we so dearly love in her. For a few moments, while reading her letter, the lovely picture of your home and the small hut appeared as if alive before our eyes.
Heartfelt greetings to you from both of us and to all good friends,

Your

Sandor

Granada [Spain]  Hotel Casino
Alhambra Palace


Dear Friends,
We couldn't even congratulate Pat on his birthday\(^{18}\)--didn't know where you were! So: all the best for the future! May the Doctor retain his everlasting youth, to the great joy of all who are in his vicinity. I curiously await the results of his more recent developments.

I'm resting in Spain. You must come here some time: the mood, colours, people are incomparable. Freud's Madrid translator wants me to do a lecture (on the way back). I'll talk French; he'll translate into Spanish.\(^{19}\)

Other than that, the doctors here are still half Breuerite,\(^{20}\) already half Jungian, without ever having been Freudian.
Dear Friend,

The enclosed letter is intended to explain my telegram\textsuperscript{21} from yesterday in more detail. In addition to putting my signature to the lines written by Frau v. Tesrys,\textsuperscript{22} or rather, requesting that the wish contained therein be granted (if possible), I would add that Frau v. T is a highly intelligent morally upstanding woman, the widow of our history museum Director. She is herself a first rate journalist. (She writes for the Frankfurter Zeitung, Pester Lloyd, New York Times, etc.)

\textbf{1929}

Budapest 12/II 1929

I'm doing passably well. I am coping with my symptoms and symptomlets\textsuperscript{23} in different ways--trying this, then trying that. On the whole: so-so!
I'm making noticeable advances in my insight into the nature of neurosis—and it is having no small beneficial effect on the therapy. Perhaps I can get up the energy at one point to share those insights with others. 24

I hear little about the Association.25 Last week I was in Vienna for a stay. Prof. is feeling much better, following the correction on his prosthesis.26

How was England?27 And Berlin?

Please write some time. We often think of you.

Your
Sandor

[Typed letter]
Letterhead: Dr. med. G. Groddeck

Dear Sandor,
Chance, or rather my bookseller, brought me the news of your willful leap from the psychic to the organic28 and now I don't know what to do with you. Maybe you can find a way out; it would be good for both of us.29
First of all, we can't really speak about a willful leap: you were very gently and carefully led by me into this way of thinking. I needed to be this careful because you yourself had told me how you had fared with my first communication with Freud.\textsuperscript{30} In order to achieve a result with you I had to treat you with kid gloves.

Beyond this, I'm reclaiming my property.\textsuperscript{31} I never considered this property a discovery, however. In order to do that I would have had to destroy my knowledge of the thinking of those who are long gone,\textsuperscript{32} and I could never have done that, because that knowledge is great. But it is still my property, for I have earned it through years of work. From the point of view of the wording, you can of course claim that you have arranged matters in the essay in an interesting fashion; for no one else can claim the Genital Theory,\textsuperscript{33} nor the unfortunate label, Bioanalysis.\textsuperscript{34} But for the intervening material, this is not the case.

I understand that it is difficult, in such circumstances, to retreat. However, it is necessary. Please consider the matter!—We will not be going to Oxford.\textsuperscript{35}

In continuing friendship and with heartfelt greetings from both of us to you and yours\textsuperscript{36}
7. July 1929
St. Moritz Village (Switzerland) Hotel Schweizerhof.

Dear Friend,
The above date\textsuperscript{37} is occasion for me to assure you and Emke of my unalterable tender feelings toward you.

My telegram,\textsuperscript{38} and the request for quick clarification, was in reference to the spot where--at the instigation of your bookseller--you were reminded of your copyright ownership. I would be thankful if you could answer me. I would also like detailed information about all your reproaches so that I am in a position to double check the material, and--insofar as my conscience allows it (and as I allow it)--give you satisfaction.\textsuperscript{39}

I'm working here, rather than in Budapest, escaping the tropical Hungarian heat of last year. Instead I encountered too much cold, but also much sunshine.

With fondest greetings from house to house
Dear Friend,

Although you interrupted the continuation of our discussion regarding certain misunderstandings between us—misunderstandings whose details are not clear to me—and this does not prevent me from pursuing our friendly relations.

Today I have a question, or rather a request: I've been here in St. Moritz (Hotel Schweizerhof) since July, accompanied as usual by patients and students, whom I did not want to treat in the great heat of Budapest. Now I find that the extreme elevation here is too much for me. My heart condition is causing me more than the usual amount of morning distress in breathing, etc. So naturally I am thinking of visiting you in order to recuperate. I would therefore like to ask whether you have room for us, including (as on previous occasions) a place for me to work. I would also like you to put up one of my students (Severn)
whom you know, if that is possible, for she is in a critical phase. 45

I'm counting on you to respond with your usual openness and tell me whether this plan is agreeable to you, or whether you would prefer that I work outside the sanatorium—-which would be acceptable to me, although not as comfortable as before. 46

With my and Gizella's fond greetings to you and Emke, 47

Your old Sandor Ferenczi

Monday, 28 October 1929 [Location not written]

Dear Pat, Dear Emke,
Many thanks, once again, for everything! This year it was complete "relaxation" for me,—thanks to you! 48

The trip went passably well—even Gr. 49 tried hard to be not too unpleasant. We arrived without clashes. The family was waiting at home. It was very homey. Everyone asked about you—especially Zsuka. 50 Elma arrives in 2-3 days.
I fear the patients (the former ones) are literally trying to overwhelm me; not one of them wants to interrupt treatment. I cannot even think about accepting new ones.51

I plan to slough responsibility for the affairs of the Society off onto the younger ones.52

Please give our best to the hut, the house, and all inhabitants of your island kingdom.

I kiss your hand,
Sandor

1930

Budapest, 15 June 1930

Dear Pat and dear Patin,53
The laziest correspondent in the world finally decided after all to send you some signs of life.54 Oh, were it only true, this thing about telepathy!55 You would be informed about everything, would already know how often we think of you and speak of you.

A short report on the passed or passing year (quoad [lat=as regards] me): almost continual bad nights, with headaches
and breathing difficulties. After many attempts, have perhaps thought up a possible relief--so I feel a bit better.

And now the actual news: we have purchased a multi-story villa with a garden over on the Buda hill and will be moving there at the end of this month. So we became homeowners at the same time as you. A second apartment on the first floor will be rented out. The price was good (approximately 70,000 Marks) but the necessary renovations will be costly (around 30,000!). I am glad to be able to have fresh air and sunshine, which I very much lacked here. Perhaps I can persist for a while, given these circumstances.

With respect to intellectual development the year was very successful. My thoughts are beginning to crystallize around a few key themes. In the end, it will be a book: I understand much more, at any rate, than before.

We won't be taking holidays until October; perhaps we will find you somewhere--or we will end up coming there?

We are always happy when we see Emmy's handwriting. Nobody writes as kindly and full of life.

In tried and true friendship
Your
Sandor

P.S. I just returned from Kovacs.61 Herr K. is not entirely well; his symptoms persist.62 I advised him to seek you out again,63 and agreed to act as emissary, i.e. to write you (upon his wish) and inquire if you advise continuation of his treatment. I know, of course, what you like to say in such circumstances (come if you wish to) but am keeping my promise and hereby writing you. I believe the stay with you will do him good once again. Please take him into your care again and let me know by return post if there is room for him, and when.64

Letterhead: Dr. S. FERENCZI

BUDAPEST, I. LISZNYAI U.11
TELEPHONE: 53-87

Budapest, 21.12.1930

Dear Pat and dear Emke,
I use this desire to write, which usually passes quickly, to send you my Christmas greetings. Emke's lively and detailed accounts of your houses and their inhabitants provides the continuity which was so drastically broken by our sudden departure.65 It feels as if we are participating in all the
birthday parties you are celebrating, as if we were attentively listening to Pat's interesting lectures, and to Emke's pleasantly mocking, "unbelievable" and enthusiastic tales. I hope my wife's responses are ample compensation for my stubborn silence.

The trip to Vienna was good for me. It became clear that all the differences of opinion are superficial; in fact, I experienced a greater readiness to compromise than during previous altercations.

I'm deeply, up to my neck, in work; confirmations are mounting and consolidating themselves, but my fits of exhaustion at the end of the day's work still prevent me from formulating anything in writing. Also, I still haven't learned how to sleep; only very recently has this condition shown any signs of improvement.

Interest in the Association, dormant for so long, is slowly reawakening. With some stimulation from influential quarters, my intentions regarding the presidency are beginning to interest me again.

I'm pleased to hear, dear Pat, that the Berliners have roused themselves to the point of wanting to listen to you. I would appreciate it if you could fill me in a bit on the
apparently somewhat confused personal conflicts among the Berliners. 76

My principal patient, "the Queen," 77 takes up four, sometimes five hours of my time daily. Exhausting, but worth while. I believe I will shortly, or in the not too distant future, be in a position, finally, to announce what it means to complete an analysis. 78 The other patients 79 are lively and act out 80 as well, and remind me daily of what I wrote regarding the need to return to a proper discussion of the origin of trauma. 81 Analysis, meanwhile, as the practice is developing with me, requires greater self-sacrifice than we had previously been accustomed to. 82

But enough shoptalk. Today is Sunday, it's sunny, cool and healthy; the small garden is a playground for finches, robins, woodpeckers, crows and sparrows attracted by the good food that is hung out everywhere. 83 On days like this even I am able to say to hell with melancholy, and my first step in said direction is this letter.

In expectation of your hopefully good news, regards from Your Sandor.

1931
Dear Friend,

Hearty greetings from this hearty land. It is too bad I cannot congratulate you in this sun and sea resort. Do not pass up the chance, when you have gathered enough Pounds, to arrange a stay here. It is too beautiful! -- and no more expensive than Germany.

I am making great efforts to recover from the quite pronounced mental and physical fatigue. This time, for the first time in years, I am on holidays without patients. ---

Quoad [lat] science: I am flailing around tormented by the problem of trauma itself: the splitting [Spaltungen], indeed, atomizing of the personality, sets the stage for an exciting but complicated guessing game [Ratsel-Lose-Spiel]. One arrives dangerously close, thereby, to the problem of death. (Mentally ill persons are in fact half dead persons).

Gizella wants to congratulate you as well, so I end with greetings to you and all the friends.
Capri 17.Oct.1931

Dear Pat, dear Emke,
This is how it looked a few days ago. Now we have been freezing for 3 days, in the unheated rooms at the Hotel Quisisana. It is raining and blowing steadily. I am sorry to hear, through Mrs Kovacs, that you have not been well. I hope that you are feeling better now. We will be in Budapest on the 1st.

Your Sandor.

17/X [Gizella writes on other side of card]
We are sorry to hear that Pat has been ill. We only hope that you will be able to start your journey healthy and in good spirits. We are already thinking about the journey home and we are looking forward to a well heated house.

I embrace you in loving friendship,
Yours Gizella.
Dear Pat,
I just learned from Sarlota that you could not reach a decision regarding a place to go this winter.

In my opinion, only two locations are worth considering: 
Palermo or Algiers. The latter is climatically probably superior, but the sea journey is a little too long when the weather is bad. Palermo will undoubtedly be very beautiful, except for occasional Scirocco days. It, like Algiers, has good hotels and baths. Around Palermo, the spread-out hinterland offers ample opportunity for excursions of the greatest variety; you can go everywhere by automobile. When I was in P. [Palermo] with Professor Freud we lived in the Hotel de France and had a well-functioning bath. We were very satisfied. The price was approximately half that of Hotel-Villa Igila.

Capri is not worth considering. The island is nice, but its possibilities are soon exhausted. The weather is not reliable. We froze for days here with no heating. On nice days, though, it is indescribably beautiful.
I'm happy when I think of the possibility of your ambling through the gardens of Palermo while we in the rest of Europe freeze. I'm convinced it's the only ideal place for you.

Taormina\textsuperscript{96} is, so I've heard, wonderful, but not as exciting as Palermo. It's too small for a longer stay. For complete rest, though, the place might be suitable. I've never been there.

I would like to hear soon what your choice is. In the meantime, greetings from your Sandor

We will be home the 31st of Oct. (Lisznyai u. 11. Budapest).

[Postcard: Photo of Piazza San Marco, Venice, on reverse]

Piazza San Marco [Venice, Italy] 26. X. 1931
[No salutation]

We are sitting here as we did before with you, in the Cafe Florian, -- we could not pass Venice without stopping here, of course we are always thinking of you and wish you a good holiday.
Sandor

[Gizella writes:] We expect news from you--how you are and when you are going on your winter holiday. Please write Bpt. [Budapest] soon.

Yours Gizella.

[Letter typed]
Letterhead: DR. S. FERENCZI BUDAPEST I. LISZNYAI U. 11 XI. 3, 1931

Dear Pat,
Just a few lines about your winter plans. We hear wonderful things about the amenities, warmth and freshness of the winter climate in Meran.97 (Now in Italy.) Natural beauty combined with highly developed cuisine and accommodation. Baths and central heating everywhere. We heard from someone that even in the last weeks of October, when it was stormy all over Europe, it was mild and pleasant in Meran.

We are happy to hear of your improvement.98
I started work today.

Greetings to you from all of us.

Your,
Sandor
Dear Friends,

Thank you for your extensive reports, which this time, thank God, sounded positive. I don't know what to admire more: Emke's or Pat's unshakably optimistic spirit, which triumphs over all tendencies to illness.

Concerning myself, I cannot express in a word what is happening. Physically I'm doing quite well; mentally I am alternately lively and extremely tired. The things with which I am dealing intellectually have still not matured to the point where I could share them. My "scientific imagination," ["wissenschaftliche Phantasie"] which is, however, "well-disciplined," (Freud) takes me on flights beyond the unconscious and occasionally into the metaphysical, at least insofar as this pattern repeats itself in the productions of the patients. Through dreams, I can see a path opening which leads to a deeper understanding of personality splits, also in psychosis. I have technical advances to thank for the insights patients give me via their resistances.
The newest development here is the establishment of a psychoanalytic clinic, upon which the Kovacs family is actively working. The Congress has been postponed to the end of August, but will--I believe--not be held then either.

I confess I sometimes envy you, dear Pat, for your illness. It must be very nice to rest in your cottage and your garden. I hope that these few lines will still be enough to remind you of us. I hope we shall soon receive pleasant news.

Financially I am not doing wonderfully either; I am only earning about half of what I took in in recent years. In view of the general collapse, however, this is not so bad.

All the best and love from both of us
Your
Sandor

[ED. NOTE: Long gap between letters of one year. In fact, generally in the 1930's there is more space between letters. There are many more letters by Ferenczi to Freud than Groddeck, but even then, during Ferenczi's more isolated period there are less to Freud as well.]
Dear Friends!

It is obviously not possible to sin without retribution, especially not for so many years. My illness in Baden-Baden was the beginning of a quite dangerous anemia, which almost overwhelmed me in France, so that I could barely and only with great effort drag myself home prematurely. Since then I have been working at half steam, and am given liver subcutaneously. Since then my condition has been satisfactory, with minimal changes. The psychic cause of the collapse was, in addition to the exhaustion, the disappointment with Freud, with which you are familiar. Our correspondence has been interrupted, although we are both making an effort to salvage that which can be salvaged. I believe we will, in the end, be partially successful. I am, as always, full of ideas, but the desire to write them down is zero. A short complete rest should revive me somewhat. But where to go in these depressing times?

I admire your perseverance and your enthusiasm in having not abandoned your courage despite sickness and difficulties. Your new book, whose contents were quite familiar to me,
is generating great interest among all those to whom I have
given it to read. I am beginning to believe that your will
power will conquer all difficulties. N.B. "The Countess" is
no longer with me. 113

My wife is feeling well and assists me loyally. Sarolta is
here now; this week and next is the time that her cataracts
will be operated on. She's very brave. Elma is proving
herself in her job as secretary to the American
Consulate. 114 Magda 115 has recovered well from her appendix
operation.

In adding that this letter is the first communication I have
had in a long time with the outside world I'm signaling that
our friendship remains unbreakable, and remain, with thanks
for your news.

Your old Sandor

[ED. NOTE: This was the last letter Ferenczi wrote to Groddeck. Ferenczi died 22 May 1933 (at 2:30
P.M.).]

END OF 1927-1933 LETTERS

ANNOTATIONS
1. Ferenczi misdates letter as 1926.

2. Sarolta Morando. See earlier notes. This name, as with other family names, did not appear in the earlier published editions. Gizella returned 10-15 May 1927 (Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, unpublished).

3. In Washington, Ferenczi gave a talk at the St. Elizabeth's Asylum. (Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, unpublished).

4. Ferenczi landed in Southampton and went up to London where he gave talks, including his 1926 paper, "Gulliver Phantasies" (Ferenczi, 1926a).

5. Ferenczi signed into the sanitorium guestbook on the 26 June and signed out 28 August. Strangely, Gizella has not signed in as well. However there is no indication of any separation of the Ferenczis on this trip.

6. Ferenczi gave a number of honorary lectures. (See Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, unpublished).

7. The psychoanalytic press was in financial trouble. (See Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, unpublished).

8. First time Ferenczi begins using his own letterhead stationary.

9. Ferenczi's female form for Groddeck's nickname, Pat. It also means "godmother" in German.

10. See earlier note re: pressures on Ferenczi to move to Vienna.
11. A reference to the continuing anti-semitism in Hungary under Admiral Horthy (n.d.) regime -- a combination of traditional conservatism and right wing radicalism. Horthy seized power from Bela Kun's Communist government in the early 1920's. The Horthy regime gave rise to a violent anti-communist and anti-semitic period known as the "white terror." Ferenczi was stripped of his short-lived professorship of psychoanalysis (1919) and was thrown out of the Hungarian Medical Society. How had the conditions improved in 1927? Throughout the 1920's Ferenczi felt persecuted as a Jew -- his freedoms had been severely restricted, for example, he had been forced to resign from the Hungarian Medical Society.

12. In a 28 August 1919 letter to Freud, Ferenczi wrote prophetically, "we Hungarian Jews are now facing a period of brutal persecution of Jews. They will, I think, have cured us in a very short time of the illusion with which we were brought up, namely that we are "Hungarians of the Jewish faith."" (Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, unpublished).

13. **1928 HEADNOTE:**

Groddeck presented a paper, "Clinical reports from a psychotherapeutic practice of 20 years standing" at the 3rd Congress of Psychotherapy at Baden-Baden, 20-22 April 1928.

14. First typed letter; all others handwritten.

15. Probably a reference to a disappointing celebration of Ferenczi's fifty-fifth birthday in Budapest.
16. The "difficult case" was Elizabeth Severn (1879-1959), an American "psycho-therapist," patient, and pupil of Ferenczi's, later code-named in his diary as "R.N." Severn worked with Ferenczi from 1924 until a few months before his death in 1933. Severn had had a major breakthrough in her treatment earlier in 1928, which had left her somewhat desperate emotionally and psychologically dependent on Ferenczi. Obviously Ferenczi didn't want to interrupt her treatment at this critical point. Although little known, she was an important influence on Ferenczi in his last years, and initiated Ferenczi's experiment in mutual analysis (Ferenczi, 1932). Ferenczi acknowledged her influence in two of his last papers "The principle of relaxation and neocatharsis," Fin. (1930b), pp.121-22, and "Child analysis in the analysis of adults," Fin. (1931), pp.133-34. As the case of "R.N.," Severn played a large role in Ferenczi's Clinical Diary (1932). For more on Severn and Ferenczi, see Fortune (1993) "The case of RN: Sandor Ferenczi's radical experiment in psychoanalysis," in The Legacy of Sandor Ferenczi. Eds. L. Aron and A. Harris, Hillsdale, N.J.: The Analytic Press, pp.101-120. See also Fortune (1994).

ED. NOTE: This certainly seems to confirm Severn's importance to Ferenczi. That he would give up his yearly trip to Groddeck in BB because of her is significant. At
this point he doesn't mention Severn by name, as he will do in a later letter (16 August 1929). 1928 was a critical point in Ferenczi's work with Severn (Fortune, 1993). Also, I think that Ferenczi was drawn to the work at this point because, with this breakthrough -- the memories, the techniques being employed, etc. Ferenczi, as can be seen by a later statement to Groddeck, is starting to see that Severn's case is not only a critically important development in his own work, but that he must see it through as it may be a key to a new development in psychoanalysis, vis a vis his work with technique and now trauma. I get the feeling Ferenczi is going through some big changes this year on all fronts. Implications? Severn is also possibly becoming more of an influence generally -- the mutual analysis looms ahead. Ferenczi is shifting, changing some things -- some opening up to new directions. The influence of the homelife situation on all this?

Also, interesting that this is the first reference to Severn in letter to Groddeck. (Severn began with Ferenczi in 1924). Except for the initial letter of introduction in 1925, Ferenczi, to my knowledge, never mentions Severn specifically in a letter to Freud. Ferenczi obviously feels more comfortable mentioning Severn at all to Groddeck than
to Freud at this point (even though Ferenczi writes more to Freud). Ferenczi looks to Groddeck as a sympathetic spirit. Ferenczi knows from his discussions with Freud that he doesn't approve of his work directions.

17. The Ferenczis were planning a holiday to Spain. They left 30 September and the trip included Madrid, Sevilla, Granada. Elizabeth Severn accompanied them.

18. Groddeck was 62 years old on 13 October 1928.


20. Influenced by Josef Breuer (1842-1925), Viennese physiologist and internist, whom Freud credited with playing a critical part in the development of psychoanalysis. A pioneer in the use of hypnotism in the cathartic treatment of hysteria, a method which formed the basis for his collaboration with Freud in the early 1890's and led to their joint publication of *Studies on Hysteria* (1895).

21. Telegram not preserved.

22. No information on this person.

23. See earlier letters for the array of Ferenczi's symptoms.

24. Probably an indication of the new intensity with which Ferenczi is pursuing his clinical work with patients (like Elizabeth Severn). Ferenczi was aware that this work with recovered memories of early trauma would not be met with
favour by most of the psychoanalytic community, including Freud.


26. Over the years Freud was constantly bothered by his wooden jaw prosthesis which precipitated a number of different versions and many adjustments to the fit.

27. Groddeck (1929) had presented a paper "Psychical Treatment of Organic Disease" to the Medical Section of the British Psychological Society, 28 November 1928. Groddeck had just given a paper "Organic affection specialized as a form of sexual expression" in London at the "Congress for Sex Research." This paper could be considered to be more directed towards psychotherapy than psychoanalysis. Groddeck seemed to be moving away from psychoanalysis and towards the broader psychotherapeutic world.

28. In all likelihood a reference to Ferenczi's shift in theoretical and clinical emphasis as expressed in his 1929 paper "Masculine and Feminine," The Psychoanalytic Review, 17 (1930): 105-113. In it, Ferenczi wrote: "I have simply transferred purely psychological conceptions such as repression and symbol formation to organic processes, but I am not at all certain that this bold leap from the psychic to the organic was really only an error and not rather a successful coup: a discovery. I believe the latter, and regard these ideas as the beginning of a new method of investigation... 'Biocanalysis'" (my italics) (p.109).
29. It is not completely clear, nor was it clear to Ferenczi (see following letters, 7 July and 16 August), but Groddeck appears to be upset over what he sees as Ferenczi's appropriation of Groddeck's ideas without proper attribution of their source.

30. Initially, Ferenczi was suspicious of Groddeck's "mysticism" and likely jealous of Freud's enthusiasm for Groddeck. See note above, Christmas Day, 1921 letter.

31. Groddeck's original work championing the application of psychoanalysis to organic illness, and the exploration of the psycho-physical relationship.

32. For Groddeck, the most significant influence on the development of his ideas was the well-known German physician, Ernst Schweninger, M.D. (1850-1924). Groddeck had been Schweninger's student and assistant.

"Schweninger ... had achieved fame as Bismarck's personal physician and held a teaching post at the Kaiser Wilhelm Universität in Berlin from 1894. His method of treatment was based on the idea that the doctor was merely the catalyst who starts off the therapeutic process. He was opposed to the use of drugs and [like Groddeck] specially favoured diet, hydrotherapy, and massage" (Meaning of Illness, Introduction, p.3).


34. See note above.

At the Congress, six weeks after Groddeck's critical letter, Ferenczi presented his paper "Progresses in psycho-analytic technique" (later expanded and published as "The principle of relaxation and neocatharsis," *Fin.* (1930) pp.108-125). In his paper, Ferenczi made a diplomatic gesture to credit Groddeck's influence. He wrote:

The relaxation-technique which I am suggesting to you assuredly obliterates even more completely the distinction between the analysis of children and that of adults -- a distinction hitherto too sharply drawn. In making the two types of treatment more like one another I was undoubtedly influenced by what I saw of the work of Georg Groddeck, the courageous champion of the psycho-analysis of organic diseases, whom I consulted about an organic illness. I felt that he was right in trying to encourage his patients to a childlike naivete, and I saw the success thus achieved....(p.122-123) (my italics)

At the same time, however, Ferenczi did not capitulate to Groddeck's demands to retreat, since in the last part of the paragraph he attempts to define his own new path (which also held to Freud's ideas):

But, for my own part, I have remained faithful to the well-tried analytical method of frustration as well, and I try to attain my aim by the tactful and
understanding application of both forms of technique.
(p.122-3) (my italics)

36. Grodeck did not sign the letter.

37. Ferenczi's birthday: 7 July. In 1929 Ferenczi turned 56 years old. Somehow the attempt at a reassuring tone in Ferenczi's words indicates the recognition of some potential strain in the relationship.

38. As mentioned above, the telegram was not preserved.

39. See preceeding letter, 13 June 1929, of Grodeck. While Ferenczi conveys his willingness to respond to Grodeck's complaint, he isn't leaping to either defend against, or accept the criticism.

40. See above, Grodeck's letter of 13 June 1929 which initiated an exchange of letters dealing with Grodeck's charge that Ferenczi misappropriated his intellectual "property" -- the psychoanalysis of organically based symptoms.

41. Ferenczi stayed in St. Moritz from early July to late August.

42. Among these were a number of notable Americans including Elizabeth Severn, Clara Thompson, M.D. (1893-1958) and Isette de Forest (n.d.) -- patients mentioned by code-name in Ferenczi's Clinical Diary. The best known was Clara Thompson, who worked with Ferenczi during the summers from 1928 until his death in 1933. She co-founded the William Alanson White Institute in New York with Harry Stack Sullivan (1892-1949) and Erich Fromm (1900-1980). Isette de

43. As surprising as this practice might sound by today's standards, according to psychoanalyst, Dr. Clifford Scott, who saw Melanie Klein for analytical sessions during her holiday in the early 1930's, the practice of continuing analyses while on holiday, or in retreat settings such as sanitoriums, or resorts during the summer months was not unusual in those days (C. Scott, personal communication, 6 April 1991).

44. St. Moritz elevation: 1,856 metres (6,089 feet).

45. Elizabeth Severn ("R.N."). More to come on the "critical phase." See above notes for more on Severn.

46. Groddeck obviously made room for the Ferenczis, as Sandor and Gizella signed their arrival and departure dates into the sanitorium guestbook: "27/VIII to 27/X" (2 months).


48. See above letter. The Ferenczis stayed for two months at the sanitorium. Ferenczi's use of the word "relaxation" in this way is probably also a play on the name he has given to a new aspect of his clinical method, the "relaxation technique" which he presented to the Oxford Congress in July (Ferenczi, 1930).
49. Quite possibly "Gr." is short for the german "Grafen" = "countess," (or at times "queen") and a reference to Elizabeth Severn. Ferenczi later (20 March 1933) uses the whole word "Grafen" to denote Severn. Severn was living in Budapest at this time and, given her critical condition, quite likely would have travelled back to Budapest from Baden-Baden with the Ferencsis. See above letter, 16 August 1929.

50. Zsuka, Ferenczi's youngest sister, had been a patient of Groddeck's at the sanitorium in the 1920s. See earlier references, Christmas Day 1921.

51. Since Ferenczi was often referred the most difficult patients, his caseload was by now heavy with these, often long-term, cases. This sense of being overwhelmed by his demanding patients, coupled with his self-sacrificing therapeutic style, quite possibly contributed to his exhaustion and illness a few years later.

52. Ferenczi here is probably referring to the Hungarian Psycho-Analytical Society.


54. There seems to have been a gap of almost eight months in their correspondence.

55. Ferenczi had a long standing interest in telepathy; while sympathetic to the possibility -- he participated in thought transference experiments (with Freud and Anna Freud) -- he still remained to be convinced by scientific evidence (Ferenczi, 1932, pp. 33, 85). (Ferenczi had delivered a
lecture on thought transference to the Vienna Psycho-Analytical Association, 19 November 1913). At this time, the 1920s-early 30s, Ferenczi was also being exposed to the strongly held ideas of thought transference by his analysand, Elizabeth Severn (Ferenczi, 1932, p. 158). See also, Fortune (1993, p.115).

56. Specifically, a neighbourhood called Naphegy ("Sun hill"), one of the hills on the Buda side of Budapest, on the north side and overlooking the Danube. The Ferenczi's villa was at 11 Lissnyai street near the top of Naphegy, and perpendicular to Orvos (Doctor) street, where Frederic and Vilma Kovacs lived. A small number of the close Hungarian analysts lived here. At the bottom of the hill, ten minutes walk, at 12 Messaros street, the first psychoanalytic clinic was opened in a house lived in by Michael and Alice Balint and owned and built by the Kovacs. Ferenczi's house, which was greatly damaged during the war, has been reconstructed and in 1983 a plaque commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of Ferenczi's death was placed on the outside stone wall facing Lissnyai street.

57. The dark apartment of 3 Nagy diefa street in a busy section of downtown Pest, just one street off Rakoczi street.

58. Ferenczi's tone of pessimism about his physical condition is borne out by his death three years later.

59. Ferenczi never did write a book on these themes. However, he published a number of his most important papers
between 1930 and 1933 (Ferenczi, 1930, 1931, 1933). He also wrote many notes during this period which were published posthumously as "Notes and fragments" (1930-32). In 1932 Ferenczi wrote his important Clinical Diary (1932) which contained many ideas, explorations, disclosures, etc. about his work and himself. Elizabeth Severn claimed that she and Ferenczi had planned to write a book together about their clinical work, instead she published her own book (Severn, 1933) in the fall shortly after Ferenczi's death.

60. The Ferenczis did end up in Baden-Baden at the sanitorium -- 2-14 October (sanitorium guestbook).

61. Vilma and Frederic Kovacs and family. See earlier references.

62. See earlier references re: Frederic Kovacs' symptoms.

63. Frederic Kovacs was treated by Groddeck in early 1927: his stay is recorded as 6 January-3 March 1927 in the sanitorium guestbook.

64. Not clear if Kovacs returned to Groddeck for treatment. The sanitorium guestbook shows no entry for him in 1930 or 1931. Dupont thinks there was more than one visit (personal communication, May 1995).

65. Seemingly a reference to the Ferenczis last visit to the sanitorium which concluded after twelve days on 14 October.

66. At Groddeck's sanitorium, birthdays were important celebrations and cause for a party involving all the guests-patients.
67. Groddeck regularly gave extemporaneous lectures and discussed dreams at the sanitarium.

68. A "stubborn" silence seems to imply a tone for which, to this point, there is no explanation.

69. Ferenczi visited Freud in Vienna on 21 April 1930 and discussed the direction of his clinical work (Ferenczi to Freud, 30 April 1930). Differences had been growing between them on technical and theoretical issues since the mid-1920's (clearly evident from 1928). Their letters through the late 1920's and early 1930's chronicle the growing strain this placed on their relationship. See Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence, Vol. II/III, forthcoming.

70. Through his clinical work, Ferenczi was becoming convinced that psychoanalysis was "overestimating the role of fantasy, and underestimating that of traumatic reality, in pathogenesis" (Ferenczi to Freud, 25 December 1929, cited in Clinical Diary, p. xii). The "confirmations" to which he alludes were probably the clinical experiences with patients which seemed to support his views on the significance of an early external trauma.

[AN. NOTE: On 10 October 1931 Ferenczi wrote to Freud: "I am, above all, an empiricist...Ideas are always closely linked with the vicissitudes in the treatment of patients, and by these are either repudiated or confirmed" (in Clinical Diary, p.xv). On 17 January 1930 he wrote to Freud: "...a whole new series of questions have now come into a new, a sharper focus, perhaps even the problem of regression" (in Clinical Diary, p.xiii). On 20 July 1930 Ferenczi wrote to Freud that he has been led to "revive the theory of traumatism, apparently obsolete (or at least temporarily pushed aside)" (in]
Clinical Diary, p. xiv). Ferenczi's final papers, and letters to Freud, focused on this work. See Introduction, Clinical Diary (pp. xii-xz) for more on Ferenczi's developing thoughts (includes sections of letters to Freud).

71. Ferenczi's patient, Elizabeth Severn, in whom he was investing a great deal of energy, had suffered a major breakdown during the summer of 1930 and continued to cause Ferenczi a great deal of worry. On 20 July, Ferenczi wrote to Freud: "[I] am preoccupied with the problem of death" (cited in Clinical Diary, p.xiv). Despite his exhaustion, in August and September 1930, Ferenczi did write some short clinical thoughts, later published as "Notes and fragments," Fin., pp. 219-231).

72. Likely related to his diagnosis of Uraemia. See note, Christmas Day 1921.

73. International Psycho-Analytic Association. It was at Freud's request, and on Ferenczi's initiative, that the organization was founded in 1910. See Ferenczi's (1911) paper "On the organization of the psycho-analytic movement."

74. Freud. Regarding the presidency, see Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, unpublished.

75. Ferenczi had two times of dealing with the presidency in the 1930s. The first time he wanted it and didn't get it, and the second was in 1932. Ferenczi had an on-again, off-again interest in taking on the presidency of the IPA at this time. Freud seemed to be using the idea of the presidency to coax Ferenczi out of his growing isolation in Budapest. Ferenczi was tempted, but finally rejected the
idea in a letter to Freud, 21 August 1932, cited in Clinical Diary, p. xvi.

76. The Berlin Psychoanalytic Society, of which Groddeck was a member. There was competition and tensions between the Berlin Institute and the Budapest analytical group; for example, Ferenczi criticized the Berlin group for their emphasis on theory over technique.

77. Elizabeth Severn.

78. Severn was Ferenczi's most demanding and difficult patient. Driven by what Freud called his "furor sanandi" (rage to cure), Ferenczi was regularly seeing her twice a day, as well as on weekends and, if necessary, at night. Ferenczi's statement here confirms that Severn is central to his developing technical and theoretical ideas, which led to his challenge to Freud and his reconsideration of a theory of trauma.

There has been debate as to whether Ferenczi "returned" to Freud's trauma theory (Fortune, 1993), or whether he developed his own new theory different than Freud's (Haynal & Falseder, 1991). There could be multiple readings of the nature of Ferenczi's trauma theory in that there may be a discrepancy between what Ferenczi thought he was doing, and what he was doing. There are clear indications Ferenczi thought he was reviving Freud's earlier theory (Ferenczi-Freud, 20 July 1930, unpublished). Haynal and Falseder
believe Ferenczi's trauma theory was not a "return" to Freud's.

In his desire to "complete an analysis" -- as elusive a challenge then, as now -- did Ferenczi hope to "cure" Severn to prove to Freud and the psychoanalytic community that his new techniques were effective, and to convince them that actual trauma was the critical aetiological factor in neurosis? Ferenczi's comment conveys an ambition and a specific hoped for outcome from this concentrated period of radical therapeutic exploration.

Ferenczi doesn't mention it here, but at some point he begins a "mutual analysis" with Severn (Ferenczi, 1932). With the number of hours he indicates here, one can't help but wonder if some form of mutual analysis is already taking place.

79. Other patients at the time included Americans, Clara Thompson and Izette de Forest.
80. Strachey's translation of "Agieren" as "acting out" is presently being challenged by Hoffer (in press, p.32), who prefers "enact" or "enactment".
81. See note above.
82. Ferenczi's attempt to cure -- a "healing through love" -- seemed to involve, at great physical and mental cost to himself, an endless reaching out to patients. In his Clinical Diary (1932) and his last papers, particularly
"Confusion of tongues between adults and the child" (1933), Ferenczi criticized the neutrality, abstinence, and authority of classical technique as reabusive to patients, in some cases at the level of the "basic fault."

83. Ferenczi was obviously delighted by the garden at the back of his new house.

84. Capri, Italy is a small island, popular with tourists, outside the bay of Naples and just beyond the peninsula of the Amalfi coast.

85. In all likelihood Ferenczi is alluding to Groddeck's birthday on the 13th of October.

86. Probably an allusion to Groddeck having a number of patients and guests at the sanitorium from Britain. Groddeck was invited to Britain. The Book of the It, which was in its second edition, had given him some reputation in England.

87. Fatigue seems to be one of the early signs prefiguring Ferenczi's symptoms of Pernicious Anaemia in the Fall of 1932, and from which he would die in May 1933.

88. This same day, 10 October, Ferenczi writes to Freud that he has wanted to have a holiday without patients for years (Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, unpublished).

89. In his 1930 paper "The principle of relaxation and neocatharsis" Ferenczi credits Elisabeth Severn's "discoveries" for his understanding of this notion of splitting (Finn, p.121-122).
90. For further thoughts on this process and its relationship to death see Clinical Diary, particularly pp.8-10 (Case of R.N.) and pp.130-1.
91. Postcard is a photo of Sandor and Gizella on donkeys in Capri.
92. Vilma Kovacs, close analytical associate and family friend. See earlier references to Vilma Kovacs's husband, Frederic Kovacs.
93. Groddeck's illness is not clear: it may have been a stroke, but was called a heart attack (The Wild Analyst, p.180).
95. Regarding Ferenczi's time with Freud in Palermo, see earlier note, Christmas 1921 letter.
96. Small town on the East coast of Sicily, below Messina.
97. Merano, a small town in the Trentino-Alto Adige just south of the Austrian border and north of Bolzano in Northern Italy.
98. See note re: Groddeck's illness, 17 October 1931
99. Ferenczi addressed the letter to Groddeck to Hans Thoma Strasse 8, Baden-Baden but it was re-directed to Groddeck:
   c/o Ms. von Ergehen Boissevaine,
   Naarden, Muntweg 5, Holland.
100. Ferenczi is alluding to a very intense period of work. It was in 1932 -- from January until October -- that he wrote his Clinical Diary (1932) which conveys in great detail the vicissitudes of his clinical, and at times
intensely personal, explorations. One of the "technical advances" he was involved with at the time was a mutual analysis with his patient and pupil, Elizabeth Severn (see above notes). His reference to the metaphysical certainly would, to some degree at least, refer to the domain both Severn and Ferenczi felt they were exploring (for example, Severn felt she could do "telepathic healing" [Ferenczi, 1932, p.158]). On 1 May 1932 Ferenczi writes to Freud that he is "immersing [himself] in a kind of scientific 'poetry and truth'" (cited in Introduction, p.xvi).

While much of his work remained in the diary, Ferenczi does share some of his thinking at this time in his final paper, "Confusion of tongues between adults and the child" (1933).

Speculation: Is it possible that Ferenczi's comment about the "productions of the patients" repeating his own flights into the metaphysical suggests that he may have realized that he was exploring areas of mutuality in which he was influencing the patients productions? Aspects of suggestion?

101. At the bottom of Lisznyai street, on which the Ferenczis lived, this first psychoanalytic clinic was opened at 12 Messaros street.

102. An International Psycho-Analytical Congress was to be held in September 1931 at Interlaken, Switzerland. However, a number of factors including the world economic crisis,
the grave political situation with the rise of national socialism in Germany, and the collapse of the Vienna Creditanstalt Bank, led to it being cancelled. In 1932, the Congress was changed to Wiesbaden, Germany because the Germans couldn't obtain funds to travel outside their country. As it turned out, Ferenczi was overly pessimistic as the Congress was, in fact, held 4-7 September 1932. Ominously, the Congress was held under the surveillance of German police.

103. It is uncanny to hear Ferenczi "envy" Groddeck's illness, given that Ferenczi became fatally ill with pernicious anaemia six months later. Quite possibly, being ill would have meant he could stop working so hard.

104. This theme of Ferenczi's fatigue has been evident in his letters for the last few years.

105. The tone of this sentence reminds one of the last lines of Ferenczi's (1932) Clinical Diary: "CATALOGUE OF SINS...

Sin
Confession
Forgiveness

There must be punishment. (Contrition)" (p.215).

106. The Ferenczis went to the sanitorium for a short stay after the September Wiesbaden Congress. However, there is no record in the sanitorium guestbook of Ferenczi signing in. (The Ferenczis were not in the guestbook for 1931 or 1932.)
After Baden-Baden the Ferenczsis went to Biarritz in the south-west of France. However, due to his illness they cut short their stay and returned home.

Pernicious Anaemia is a deficiency in vitamin B-12 and the treatment constituted massive doses of the vitamin. At that time liver, which is high in vitamin B-12, was used. Today the disease can be easily treated and is generally not life threatening.

Ferenczi's relations with Freud were strained during the last years, mainly due to their differences regarding Ferenczi's work directions and his withdrawal from Freud and the larger psychoanalytic community. This situation came to a head in late August when Ferenczi, on the way to the Wiesbaden Congress (4-7 September), visited Freud in Vienna to read him his "Confusion of tongues" (1933), the paper he would present at the Congress. The charged meeting -- Freud told Ferenczi he should not publish the paper -- ended with Freud refusing to shake Ferenczi's outstretched hand (Jones, 1957, also confirmed by Thompson, de Forest and Fromm).

Sadly, this was to be the last meeting of these two long-time friends, and the encounter left Ferenczi feeling discouraged and depressed.

Ferenczi and Freud resumed some correspondence over the next months. It seems that Freud and Ferenczi never did make a complete break, and, in fact, in the letters they made a mutual attempt to put their differences aside since
they were both dealing with other important issues, including their health.

111. A reference to the rise of National Socialism in Europe -- specifically the Nazis in Germany. It was 10 May 1933 in Berlin, that the Nazi book burnings -- including psychoanalytic texts, Ferenczi's included -- took place. Ferenczi was very sensitive to these developments and, in fact, warned Freud in his letter of 29 March 1933 to leave Vienna for his safety. Groddeck's sympathies regarding the rise of Hitler are cloudy and troubling. Stories about him trying to contact Hitler to tell him that he was being misled by advisors have been passed on for decades (Grossman & Grossman, 1965, pp.195-6). New work has been done on this question -- "Was Groddeck a Nazi?" by Groddeck biographer, Dr. Herbert Will. See Commentary.

112. *Der Mensch als Symbol: Unmassgebliche Meinungen ber Sprache und Kunst* (Man as Symbol: Unauthoritative Views on Language and Art). Leipzig/Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1933. Partially reprinted in *Psychoanalytische Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst*. Re-issued by Limes Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1973, (no English translation). The book was sent to Freud who confirmed to Groddeck the permanence of his esteem. This book was to have been completed by a second person who was to have analyzed humankind according to the body's different organs. This section was never written.
In all likelyhood, the "Countess" refers to Elizabeth Severn, who ended her work with Ferenczi and left Budapest in late February, 1933 (Fortune, 1993). (In above letter of 21 December 1930, Ferenczi had referred to Severn as the "Queen.")

Elma was living at home with Gizella and Sandor. Elma's job with the American Consulate led to a posting in Berne, Switzerland.

Magda Ferenczi, nee Palos, Gizella's other daughter. See note Christmas Day 1921 letter.

END OF NOTES FOR 1927-1933 LETTERS
My dear Friends,
In my sorrow I come to you again today. I am so unfathomably sad. I cannot adjust to life without Sandor. I miss him from morning to night. Every thought belongs to him, everything is unimportant - senseless, if I cannot share it with him, when he does not hear it or see it. I feel like crying all day, but I cannot do this because of the others. So many old people live, so many of them sick. Why did Sandor have to leave the world he so loved. It is incomprehensible. I thought that I would visit you in July but I have to
consider Magda and her husband. They can only go in August. It will be very difficult for me to travel to B.B.- to you- where Sandor and I spent so many happy days. I don't know whether I can do it the way I am feeling now. Everything hurts too much. A few days ago I heard from Erdos Pista\textsuperscript{3} that you are in Switzerland. Is one of you ill? Or was it an invitation? You have to write to me, my beloved friends. I am worried. Please forgive me that I don't write any more. It is so difficult for me.

With unending love and friendship

Yours Gizella.

GIZELLA FERENCZI TO GRODDECKS

[No location written] 2/XI 1933

My dear, dear Friends!
What should I tell you - what should I write you? I don't know. You must know how I feel. I cannot accept that Sandor is not with me anymore, that I will not see him again, not take care of him any more, that he left life, this earth to which he belonged so much. He never wanted to die because he loved life. Remember, Pat, how often he said "when I die I would like to be with you," and during his serious illness I
often wished to be with you. I wrote you how sick Sandor was when he returned home from his fall journey, yet he recovered quite quickly, and the four winter months passed carefree with lots of work and harmony. However, in March, Sandor became so weak that he had to stop giving analytic sessions -- and we thought a long rest until September would restore him. Unfortunately, his illness, pernicious anaemia, had no mercy. He became weaker and weaker. He had to be carried to bed because his feet would not carry him anymore -- his mind became weaker. He spent four weeks in bed. On 22nd May, the day of his death, he spoke to us, read the newspaper/journal [zeitung] (which dropped out of his hands) and called Sarolta to tell her there will be "revisions." Then we saw that he suddenly became very weak. All three of us wanted to have a cup of black coffee; Sandor wanted it cold, when we returned to his bed we saw that the end was very near. Since that moment I cannot control myself. I don't know how I will be able to live with my great longing for him. I thank you for your kind words and for loving Sandor -- I know you are with me in my sorrow. We intended to visit you in the summer, only Sandor thought your circumstances did not allow it. It is possible that I might see you in the summer because I have to make a small journey.

With a heavy heart and deeply sad I embrace you.

Yours Gizella
P.S. (Sarolta) I am very grateful that I had my eye operation before Sandor's illness; therefore I could spend my time at his bedside.

1934

[Black border around edges of letter]

GIZELELA FERENCZI TO GRODDECKS

[No location written] 9/1/1934

My dear Friends,

I can count your letters written in friendship and love among the few joys I received this Christmas. I am very grateful to count you as my friends. I know that our thoughts and feelings are on the same wavelength. It would have hurt Sandor and me if it had not been this way. However, I cannot agree with you Emke, that Sandor intuitively chose to die. He loved life, he wanted to enjoy it, he wanted to live everything, good, evil, beautiful, ugly—just live—live in this world. Every day it becomes more puzzling — why this death? I cannot accept it. Since 22nd of May I feel I am saying goodbye to everything and anything. Only when I think of my children do I feel connected to life.
Ms. Lou Salome writes once in a while. She asks whether Groddeck, who knew Sandor’s body so **thoroughly**, could not have done something. She writes: are you still in “contact with the Groddecks?” Then again [Salome writes]: “I think a lot about the events and how Ferenczi would have perceived it. He who looked at death and life so differently from the rest of us. His way and his wonderful temperament refused to acknowledge any suggestion of death, even urged life out of the moment of death”. I quote this to show that it was incomprehensible even for her.

I never hear anything from the Freuds. My letters and New Years greeting remain unanswered —why?— I don’t know. Perhaps I did something wrong, or maybe the family does not want to know anything more about me and Sandor. However that may be, my great love for the Professor is only going to die with me.⁶

I hear that Jones, in London, wrote an article in the "Journal"⁷ disagreeing with Sandor, especially his genital theory. Perhaps Miss Collins knows something about it; say hello to her. Baroness ["Baronin"] Severn supposedly published a book—-it will not be received with joy by the orthodox Freudsians.⁸
I would have liked to have heard your lecture in London, dear Pat. How and where can I get it? I am very sorry to hear that you are not well; please get well and stay well for our sake. Dear Emke does not write about you, but in between the lines I feel that your spirits are high. You take life as it is. How wise!!

2) I read everything you write with interest, my dearest friend and cannot get enough of it. I am glad that Britta is happy in her job and that she can spend the long holidays with you. How beautiful it must be right now in the middle of the forest.

Sarolta, Elma and I live au trois—only Sandor with his magnificent personality is missing—the beloved. -- Sarolta has been suffering for weeks with boils. She takes Sitz baths, light treatment—is on a diet, but everything is healing very slowly.

Elma is going to America in April to see friends and Elsie --but mainly to have three months holidays which she needs very badly. She wants me to come, but it costs too much money in my present state. Also Moran...11 are not too well off.
Thank you, dear Emke, for your invitation. The journey to Switzerland, which was unnecessary last year, has to take place this year--then I will come. I long for you!

Embrace you
Gizella.

GRODDECK TO GIZELLA FERENCZI

[No location written] 19. February, 1934

Dear Gizella,

I deliberated for a long time whether to write you this letter or not, but I have now decided to do so. I'm writing it on the typewriter because it is the only way I can clearly state what I have to say.

In all these recent years I have only been able to think with a heavy heart about Sandor's life. He fell victim to his drive for discovery, and it's a fate which I was only spared because of my lacking thirst for knowledge. I want to speak about myself first. Even before I went over to psychoanalysis a cornerstone of my medical thinking was the conviction that within the human individual there exist, in addition to the psyche with which science concerns itself, thousands and millions of independent spiritual lives which
group themselves together in this way, then in that, which work together, or in opposition to each other, and which at times can lead quasi independent existences. I was satisfied with this insight; I never tried to study this cosmos, for it is not in my nature to immerse myself in things which I don't consider knowable.  

In my close friendship with Sandor I noticed relatively early that he shared these conclusions. But then I noticed with terror that he was bent on exploring the world of the human ["Welt Mensch"] scientifically, to depict it where possible, so that others might take part in this, one can say, overwhelming drama. This ambition got the better of him. He used the expression with me: I want to atomize the soul. Such atomization, though, if it is seriously undertaken, can only lead to the dissolution of the self, for the Other is and remains a mystery to us; we can only atomize our own souls, and this will destroy us. The form in which Sandor, whose genius and bravery I have always admired, was finally relieved of the strain of carrying out a superhuman effort, is of secondary importance. I tried here and there to point out to him the danger involved in his chosen path; but as little as one can hold back a raging torrent with the hollow of one's hand, so little could one help Sandor. When people say I might have been able to do it, they are wrong.  

Close as we were, and despite our close friendship, he was already far off on his journey to
the stars, a journey on which I could not and did not want to accompany him. I can't tell you any more. The outward circumstances of the life of this uncommon individual had meaning only insofar as to show he was one of the givers, who will give again and again. 15

[NO SIGNATURE ]

GIZELLA FERENCZI TO GEORG GRODDECK
[still black border of mourning around letter, nine months after Ferenczi's death]

28/II/1934

[No salutation]
Your letter dear Pat excited and disturbed me. I can see that you too, needed some time to reflect before you could answer me and make your position clear. Perhaps it was rash to cite Lou Salome's words to you. I never thought that you could interpret them other than expressing the great confidence we had in your abilities. I was very happy that she believed in you and I wanted to convey that message.

The experiences in the last years showed me that nobody, not even you, could help him. 16 The change in him that was taking place not only slowly destroyed his body, but influenced his spiritual life immensely. His "flight to the
"stars," [Sternesflag] as you called it, took him so far ahead that he himself lost the final goal. This desperate brooding, his battle with his knowledge and his conscience, his constant doubt about the results of his research, all undermined his health. Do you believe that his sick kidney contributed to his death? If anyone, it was you who helped him in his battle as long as he was still master of himself. You remember how rejuvenated he always was on his return from you, how he loved to be with you. Nobody had as profound an influence over him as you, Pat. Never for a moment believe that I wanted to accuse you. I have only love and gratitude in my heart for you. Not only did you treat Sandor medically, but you, as no other, loved, acknowledged, and honoured him. They were happy and successful days we spent in your midst. It has been almost a year since Sandor left us, but it seems only yesterday.

I embrace you my beloved Emke, and hope to see you this year. Then we will talk.

Yours

Gizella

END OF LETTERS
ANNOTATIONS

1. Written exactly one week after what would have been Sandor's 60th birthday -- 7 July 1933.
2. Probably Gizella's daughters, Elma and Magda, and her sister Sarolta.
3. Zsofia Ferenczi's husband.
4. Interesting to note that this line was excised from the version published in The Wild Analyst, (p.191). This may have been done to avoid fuelling the notion, presented by Jones (1957) in the Freud biography, that Ferenczi had gone crazy.
5. Balint (1949), who was near Ferenczi during the weeks before his death, wrote that Ferenczi had intended to modify or "revise" the controversial views he put forward in "Confusion of Tongues." This comment of "revisions" could be a reference to this.
6. We must remember the long-standing connection Gizella had with the professor herself: he had enthusiastically encouraged Ferenczi to marry her; Freud had special feelings for Gizella reflected by personal greetings in letters to Ferenczi, and in his own letters to Gizella.
8. In the Fall of 1933, Elizabeth Severn published *The Discovery of the Self*. London: Rider. Severn's accumulated regal names: "the queen, the countess, the baroness" resonate with Ferenczi's description of her in his *Clinical Diary*: "a somewhat sovereign, majestic superiority of a queen, or even the royal imperiousness of a king" (p. 97).


10. Possibly a reference to Baden-Baden which is in the Black Forest region of Germany, or specifically to Groddeck's writing hut in the woods near Baden-Baden. The spot where Groddeck's hut stood is now called the "It point" ["Es-punkt"] by the present Groddeck Society. Groddeck wrote his *Book of the It* there.

11. Morandos -- Sarolta Morando, as noted earlier, was Gizella's sister.

12. Groddeck encapsulates the basic difference between himself and Sandor -- a difference they had noted time and again in their letters.

13. This paragraph summarizes aspects of Groddeck's philosophy -- one in which he feels we are lived by the "It."

14. A reference to Lou Salome's view expressed in Gizella's letter above, that had Groddeck had the chance he might have saved Ferenczi's life.

15. The only existing copy of the letter ends here.
Ed. NOTE:
This letter, Groddeck's final analysis of his friend Sandor, is poetic, and probably a quite accurate depiction of an essence of Ferenczi -- his personality, illness and death. Groddeck's view is an insightful addition to other obituaries of Ferenczi by Freud, et al. (including Freud's description of Ferenczi in "Analysis terminable and interminable" (1937)).

It is notable that Groddeck never mentions Freud as a factor in Ferenczi's demise (as Ferenczi himself had done in his last letter), just Sandor's unbounded spirit of inquiry, adventure and his nature to keep giving, and so deplete himself. Ferenczi's relentless work with Severn tends to support Groddeck's view.

16. Freud passed on Gizella's view of Ferenczi to Jones: "His [Ferenczi's] clever and good wife conveyed to me that I should think of him as a sick child" (Freud to Jones, 12 Sept. 1932, Freud-Jones Correspondence).

17. It has been suggested that Ferenczi, on a referral from Felix Deutsch, first consulted Groddeck for nephrosclerosis (The Wild Analyst & The Meaning of Illness).

END OF NOTES
IV. COMMENTARY

For Ferenczi scholars and psychoanalytic historians, the Ferenczi-Groddeck correspondence, as a part of the growing body of literature on Ferenczi, is very valuable. It offers up some gems, notably Ferenczi's Christmas 1921 letter and Groddeck's few letters, including his exchange with Gizella after Ferenczi's death. The Ferenczi-Groddeck correspondence will take its place alongside Ferenczi's 1932 Clinical Diary, his last papers, and his letters to Freud, as critical primary materials in understanding Ferenczi.

However, while the letters are valuable, one aspect that is surprising about the correspondence is what is missing, what we would have expected to be present but isn't. The issues of Ferenczi's work during the critical period of the 1920s and early 1930s, and his difficult relationship with Freud, are really only alluded to in this correspondence. After reading these letters carefully, one comes to ask the question whether, despite Ferenczi's affections and suggestions of deep confidences, the friendship between Ferenczi and Groddeck may not have been so close as we have been led to believe.

The beginning of their friendship was passionate and open-hearted, as evidenced by Ferenczi's letter of Christmas 1921. And the letters of 1921-23 are interesting, and
certainly contain substantive material. But after these first years, the correspondence becomes prosaic. It's mostly day to day life, family news, back and forth between Budapest and Baden-Baden. It shifts from an intimate, or at least probing, discourse on ideas between the two men, to newsy and polite greetings between the married couples and households. The edges become smoother, Ferenczi's risky personal confidences fade, and much of the challenging exploration of ideas disappears. In March 1933, however, with Ferenczi critically ill, in his last letter to Groddeck we glimpse his final broken state, his spirit exhausted, in part an outcome of the upset with Freud regarding his final work (see annotations, 20 March 1933). Following Ferenczi's death, we see a thought-provoking exchange of letters between the grief-stricken Gizella, and the brutally honest assessments of Sandor by both Georg and his wife, Emmy. In sum, the early and late letters of the correspondence serve as book ends between the banal and mundane human affairs of Ferenczi's and Groddeck's lives.

As a window into Ferenczi's important life and work in the 1920s and early 1930s the correspondence is thin where one would expect substance. After the rich promise of 1921 we encounter the outline of a friendship; a mere map, or footprints, little in which to sink one's teeth. One longs for more.
For instance, the letters do not, or only vaguely, mention Ferenczi's struggles with Freud, his work with Elizabeth Severn, and the technical experiments moving towards mutual analysis. His developing views on trauma are only sketchily alluded to. Even the early domestic tensions of the Gizella and Elma triangle fade.

Given the significance for Ferenczi of Elizabeth Severn's presence in Budapest (Fortune, 1993, 1994), there is remarkably little comment on her. We are left to wonder, since Severn was a regular visitor to Baden-Baden, where she continued her analysis with Ferenczi, what her relationship was like with Groddeck?

Where are Ferenczi's passions and why isn't he talking to Groddeck about them? What happened to Ferenczi's "boiling heat of transference?" (Ferenczi, 11 October 1922). Why did Ferenczi stop sharing his clinical insights with Groddeck? Did his experimental work drive him into silence? Or was Groddeck disinterested? Did Freud's loss of interest in Groddeck as useful to the movement influence Ferenczi? Did Freud disapprove of their friendship?

To the best of our knowledge, Groddeck did not respond in kind to Ferenczi's outpouring in the Christmas 1921 letter. In his letters he was personally taciturn and circumscribed.
Over time, Groddeck's reticence may have led Ferenczi to withdraw his more intensely personal revelations.

Yet, from the beginning, Groddeck's stance was as a notorious outsider to mainstream psychoanalysis. While initially enamoured with Groddeck's panache and originality, Ferenczi may have lost interest in engaging Groddeck, whose attentions were moving away from a particular concern with psychoanalysis, towards psychotherapy in general. Groddeck may have become limited and held less value for Ferenczi as an intellectual and professional sounding board. To some degree, Groddeck was a thinker with one idea -- the "IT" -- which defined his view of phenomena. Ferenczi may have valued his friendship, but, as opposed to his continuing discourse -- through letters -- with Freud, no longer looked to Groddeck to explore work and ideas. This connected with the fact that Groddeck wasn't interested in Ferenczi's quest for "science." He defined this basic gulf between them 12 November 1922: "I think the difference between us two is that you are forced to want to understand things, and I am forced to want not to understand them." Groddeck didn't wish to accompany Ferenczi on his researches into psychoanalysis, clinical work with patients, and himself.

By the mid-1920s Groddeck's relationship with Freud had essentially petered out. After his early enthusiasm, Freud made a number of uncomplimentary remarks about Groddeck.
For example, Freud wrote to Ferenczi: "Personally I like him very much, but scientifically he is not very useful with the influence on the organic; he wears himself out about the Es [Id/It] and he is not the right man for the completion of an idea" (Freud-Ferenczi, 1 December 1925, unpublished). Ferenczi had also been forced to defend Groddeck against attacks by members of the committee, such as Abraham and Eitingon, who were frequently scandalized by Groddeck's extemporaneous and rambling "lectures." To this degree at least, Ferenczi was more engaged with psychoanalytic politics.

As well, his clinical work on trauma, and his technical experiments in the later 1920's may have moved beyond Groddeck.

As Ferenczi's doctor, Groddeck may have also felt the necessity to maintain a professional distance in their friendship.

At the same time, during these years Ferenczi's confidence and independence grew. His successful trip to America in 1926-7 led to an influx of new patients, more money and boosted his reputation. His international renown for treating the most difficult patients flourished. During this period, Ferenczi also published his most daring and challenging papers (Ferenczi, 1929, 1930b, 1931, 1933).
As their friendship developed to include their wives, the correspondence also changed. The discourse and exploration of personal and professional ideas shifted and settled into a comfortable rhythm of family news. At times, Ferenczi's politeness, which may have been an appropriate cultural nicety of the time, is, to our ears, somewhat flowery.

Whatever significant discussions they might have had during this period probably occurred at the hillside sanatorium, or Groddeck's little writing hut in the woods near Baden-Baden. The correspondence may have simply become signals to maintain the friendship between visits.

Ferenczi was also very busy, and would have been hard pressed to find more time to write Groddeck. In the course of twenty-five years he exchanged more than 1,200 letters with Freud and regularly wrote committee rundbriefe. Clinically, he worked 8-9 hours a day, had family responsibilities, wrote and lectured extensively, and was the President of the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Society. As the letters detail, Ferenczi complained of fatigue, overwork, and exhaustion.

By the mid-1920s, Ferenczi devoted more energies (in addition to his own self-analysis) to his demanding patients, including Elizabeth Severn. Judging from
Groddeck's last letter to Gisella (19 February 1934), Ferenczi's exertions, particularly towards Severn, may have been a problem for Groddeck. As Ferenczi wrote 28 October 1929: "I fear the patients...are literally trying to overwhelm me; not one of them wants to interrupt treatment."

In this period of growing isolation, Ferenczi, while not completely eschewing letters, seemed to have confided his most trenchant and penetrating explorations in his own diary ("Notes and fragments" [1930-32] and Clinical Diary) and distilled them into his published papers.

The problem is not so much that the material is missing from this correspondence, but that, given the received view of the closeness of the Ferenczi-Groddeck friendship, we simply would have expected more. The fact that it is not there forces us to reassess the friendship. This gap in the correspondence notwithstanding, the letters are a valuable jumping-off point for discussion of Ferenczi's work and thoughts of the period.¹

Much of my detailed commentary can be found in the extensive annotations which accompany the letters. Among the themes discussed in these annotations are: Ferenczi's domestic triangle with his wife and her daughter, the important dream of Fay Gyula; Ferenczi's exhaustion and illness, fragments of his allusions to his clinical work, the 1929 conflict with Groddeck over his intellectual priority, and the
exchange of letters between Gizella and the Groddecks after Ferenczi's death.

These themes are not included in this commentary in order to avoid repetition and to enable me to concentrate on two key chapters:

1) The Christmas 1921 letter, and
2) The question of Grodeck's influence on Ferenczi and their shared interests.

Some background information on my process may help the reader understand the reasons for organizing the thesis in this manner.

When I began my commentary on the letters I tried to prove the thesis that by using the Christmas 1921 letter, one could link the early roots of Ferenczi's personality with the development of his later ideas challenging psychoanalysis. However, I quickly realized that, while I still believed this idea to be true -- that the personal influences the professional -- in Ferenczi's case, the rest of the correspondence itself could not provide the evidence to support my thesis. All I had was one letter, in fact, one paragraph, as evidence. Once I perceived and accepted this difficult truth, I expanded my focus to address the nature of the correspondence generally -- including the
absences, while at the same time maintaining this emphasis on the significance of Ferenczi's key Christmas 1921 letter.

Ferenczi's stature is now such that any material which bears on his life and work has become worthy of consideration, especially when it regards the primary friendship of the last decade of his life. As Ferenczi's significance extends, more critical perspectives must emerge. Access to, and contextualizing, these letters is certainly important in the writing of future Ferenczi biographies.

Letters and diaries, as less self-consciousness productions, give us the unvarnished, unfiltered, and unmediated voice of the person. Unlike even autobiography, they are invaluable in providing an intimacy and immediacy to the biographical subject.

1921-1933, the span of the correspondence, were the critical years of Ferenczi's final phase of work and lasting contributions to psychoanalysis -- including his challenges to Freud. Other than the Freud-Ferenczi letters, and his ten month clinical diary of 1932 (and the 1930-32 "Notes and fragments"), these letters, as slim as they are at times, are the only direct access we have to Ferenczi's voice -- his moods, thoughts, health, life and work.
The letters serve as a springboard to examine and amplify aspects of his work and life. This perspective has informed my editorial work and led to the extensive annotations and present Commentary.

Ferenczi is now of significant historical stature -- "he was known as the 'Hungarian Freud'" (E. Federn, personal communication, May 1986) -- that, like Freud, he too is being re-invented and re-imagined by a new generation.

Groddeck remained Ferenczi's close friend until the end. Ultimately, for Ferenczi, it may be that this was all they shared. From the tone of Goddeck's last letter, that too may have been all he felt he could be for Ferenczi.
THE KEY LETTER

Freud: "The best way of understanding psychoanalysis is still by tracing its origin and development" (Freud, 1923b, p. 235).

Overview
Classical psychoanalysis is in many respects an expression of Freud's personality. The evolution and incorporation of Ferenczi's ideas reinforces the notion that psychoanalytic theory and practice is often constructed by subjective personal forces, not by objective "scientific" principles as Freud would have wished. Ferenczi's drive to understand his personal history and heal himself led him to criticize fundamental aspects of Freudian psychoanalysis. The "personal" is a central motivating force in the development of psychoanalytic theory and practice, and the Christmas 1921 letter illuminates important aspects of the personal roots of Ferenczi's professional drive.

Seen in this light, Ferenczi's childhood history, as revealed in this letter, is pivotal to understanding his later radical ideas which challenged Freud and expanded psychoanalysis to include: object relations, the use of countertransference, and the role of childhood trauma in later mental, emotional and physical life (Aron and Harris, 1993; Haynal, 1993). Ferenczi's challenges are most
particularly expressed in his 1932 Clinical Diary and his last paper, the "Confusion of Tongues" (1933).

**KEY LETTER**

**Christmas 1921** -- The most important letter of the correspondence is Ferenczi's compelling hand-written nine page letter from Budapest on Christmas Day 1921. It is the heart of the unfolding analytical friendship between Ferenczi and Groddeck. The letter is exceptional in the correspondence in its personal exploration and self-analysis.

The letter is a unique document because it reveals Ferenczi's deepest thoughts and feelings like no other of his writings until his final diary. This 1921 letter and his 1932 diary are bookends for his life and work during this period.

In the letter, a number of themes of Ferenczi's personality which became central to his later challenges to classical psychoanalysis are vividly illustrated. Ferenczi bares his soul to Groddeck four months after spending ten days in his care in Baden-Baden. "Overcome by [Groddeck's] natural kindness, warmth and friendliness," Ferenczi opens his heart, combining self-analysis with the almost revelatory spirit of a love letter. Flushed by the heady and unlimited possibility of early infatuation, Ferenczi writes as someone
Ferenczi has finally found a soulmate. He falls in love with the Groddeck of his imagination. And anything is possible at the beginning of a relationship, its promise not yet grounded by reality and limitation.

Ferenczi unburdens long withheld fears, anxieties, and yearnings to his newly-discovered confidant. Groddeck held not only promise as a friend, like an older brother (Dupont, 1994a), but also as a good mother who would witness, contain and reciprocate Ferenczi's desire for an intimate healing relationship. As his doctor, Groddeck, a pioneer of psychosomatics, could make sense of his myriad chronic symptoms.

Groddeck was a robust man in the world, so different from Freud who was now old and completely married to the psychoanalytic movement. Ferenczi was a Hungarian, culturally and personally different from the bourgeois Viennese Freud, who, although a devoted family man, appeared removed from real women and children. In contrast, Groddeck related in a vibrant, imaginative, and inspired way. His ideas on the body-mind were fresh and relevant to Ferenczi both personally and professionally. Groddeck was doubly valuable because as a "physician of the soul" he might actually be able to help Ferenczi.
Frustrated in his desire for an intimate relationship with Freud, Ferenczi turned to Groddeck. Comparing his long correspondence and relationship with Freud, Ferenczi writes to Groddeck that his "openness" with him is unique:

I have never before spoken so openly and freely to a man, not even to 'Siegmund' [sic] (Freud). I could never be completely free and open with him; there was too much of this "fearful respect"; he was too large for me, too much the father...I wanted Freud to love me. [italics added]

Ferenczi wanted Groddeck to be his analyst and he wanted equality and mutuality. Ferenczi presented endless psychosomatic symptoms for Groddeck to interpret. This was in the spirit of those patients who produce symptoms to fit the expertise and orientation of the therapist. For example, Freud's and Charcot's, "hysterics."

In the letters which follow, Ferenczi never repeats this depth of self-revelation and self-analysis. In this letter, Ferenczi is in full flight and implicitly seems to invite Groddeck to respond in kind. He may have felt that the time was right for his ideal of a mutual analysis.

Ferenczi's letter was never matched by Groddeck, at least in his extant letters, and the correspondence settled into a far less intense exchange. And so, even though Ferenczi did analyze Groddeck for six or seven sessions, probably in 1922 (Freud-Groddeck, 1977, p.82), Ferenczi's hoped-for "mutual
"analysis" did not take place. His desire for an equal, egalitarian, analytic relationship lay dormant until his experiment with Elizabeth Severn in the early 1930s.

In a 14 February 1930 letter to Freud, Ferenczi wrote:

[My] hope goes in the direction that an analytically free talk can even be possible between proven friends. I have to admit that I would not feel well in the one-sided role of the one being analyzed any more. Do you think such a reciprocal openness is possible though? (Freud-Ferenczi, unpublished).

CONTENT OF THE LETTER
What does the key letter reveal about Ferenczi, the so-called "enfant terrible" of psychoanalysis?

Recognition of His Childhood Traumas
The Christmas 1921 letter reveals the effects of Ferenczi's childhood traumas -- specifically the perception of his mother as critical and unloving. In it he explores the psychological, emotional and physical effects of his childhood. Ferenczi's emotional account of his painful childhood is critical to an understanding of his motivation to challenge psychoanalysis. Using Groddeck as a sounding-board and a kind of analyst, Ferenczi attempted to work through his early traumas and integrate them into his evolving ideas on theory and practice. He struggled to find answers to his own childhood "terrorism of suffering"
(Ferenczi, 1932, p.211). This search led to many of his innovations in psychoanalysis.

My argument here is based upon a close reading of the Christmas 1921 letter, particularly the critical paragraph which begins the letter. In it Ferenczi confesses:

For a very long time, you see, I have enjoyed maintaining a proud reserve, and hid my feelings from those closest to me. I needn't mention that this is a carry-over from infancy. Was I demanding, or was my mother -- the mother of 11 living children, of which I was the 8th -- too harsh: so far as I can remember it's very clear that I received too little love and too much discipline from her as a child. Sentimentalities, physical affection were unknowns in our family. Feelings of fearful respect for parents, etc., were correspondingly encouraged. What else but hypocrisy could be the outcome of such an upbringing. Keeping up appearances, concealing all that was "unseemly" [trans?] were the order of the day. Thus I became the model student and secret masturbator; shy, reluctant to utter an obscene word--and using stolen money to visit prostitutes. Now and again I would make cautious attempts to reveal myself. Once, for example, I "accidentally" let my list of all the obscene words I knew fall into the hands of my mother. Instead of enlightenment and support I was given moral reprimands.

The paragraph describes his painful and repressed childhood, one in which there was too little love and too much discipline. There was no physical affection, and keeping up appearances regardless of inner feelings was paramount.

In response to his treatment in the family, Ferenczi suppressed his true feelings and cultivated what Winnicott
would later call a "false self." Ferenczi's attempts to reveal himself were met with "moral reprimands."

The paragraph states that he maintained a troubling secrecy, concealed "unseemly" truths, and kept up appearances which led to "hypocrisy" and further secret sexual behaviour. These behaviours seem to be the source for a number of critical themes which Ferenczi explored in his work, for example in his early papers, "On obscene words" (1911a) and "On the ontogenesis of an interest in money" (1914).

Ferenczi rebelled and attempted to heal himself by creating conditions which were completely different than he had experienced in childhood. The "model student" became the "enfant terrible" (Ferenczi, 1931). As he later wrote in his diary on 30 June 1932, "Hypocrisy and the 'enfant terrible': Good children have become hypocrites themselves." And, in a sentence that could sum up a central thrust of Ferenczi's life, he continued, "'Enfants terribles' are in revolt (perhaps to an extreme) against hypocrites, and exaggerate simplicity and democracy" (p.149).

It is noteworthy that the innovations to psychoanalysis he would later espouse promoted precisely the opposite values he experienced in childhood: self-expression, love openly expressed, honesty and a genuine relationship between two
equal human beings. Relationship in fact became the most important feature of Ferenczi's style.

Ferenczi not only sought answers to his own suffering, but also attempted to find methods, structures, and approaches to better help his patients. In directly using himself in his work he embodied the traditional idea of the wounded healer (Whan, 1987). Ferenczi found that prevailing psychoanalytic theory and technique was inadequate to deal with his most difficult patients. For this reason, he pushed the boundaries of psychoanalysis, went deeper, to seek a framework of understanding beyond the classical Freudian view (Fortune, in press).

Freud himself viewed Ferenczi's innovations in technique as "regressions to his childhood complexes." On 29 May 1933, a week after Ferenczi's death, in a letter to Jones, Freud analyzed and disparaged his longtime friend, Ferenczi, as a weak, misguided child who suffered from paranoia. Freud wrote:

Central to [the paranoia] was the conviction that I did not love him enough, did not want to acknowledge his work, and also that I had analyzed him badly. His technical innovations were connected with this, as he wanted to show me how lovingly one has to treat one's patients in order to help them. These were indeed regressions to his childhood complexes, the main grievance being that his mother had not loved him -- a middle child among 11 or 13 -- passionately or exclusively enough. So he himself became a better mother, even found the children he needed (Freud-Jones, 1993, p.721).
Ferenczi attempted to repair his childhood wounds by seeking a healing-loving relationship in which he could honestly and completely express himself. To counteract his childhood suppression of feelings and development of a "false self" he strongly desired to reveal his true self with another person.

"Attempts to reveal [him]self"
Throughout his life Ferenczi was driven to "reveal" himself -- in his relationship and analysis with Freud, in his friendship with Groddeck, and finally in his mutual analysis with Severn.4 Ferenczi's longstanding desire for mutuality and equality in his relationships, including the analytical, led to this extreme experiment of "mutual analysis" in which he recognized his subjectivity and countertransference as analyst, and came to view extreme objectivity (framed as neutrality, the blank screen, etc.) by the analyst in classical analysis as abusive (Ferenczi, 1932, 1933).

Ferenczi's personal quest for a healing relationship overarches his life and work and entwines all of his technical and theoretical innovations in psychoanalysis. This belief that relationship itself heals, including the analytical relationship, in part led him to develop ideas
which contributed to the object relations paradigm in psychoanalysis (Aron & Harris, 1993).

Ferenczi's intense self-disclosure in this Christmas 1921 letter reflects the manner in which he believed one could create a healing relationship. This theme appears in his later clinical work.

Why self-disclosure in itself should be therapeutic, Ferenczi does not answer; he seems to think that honest communication -- even expressing negative feelings leads to a positive outcome. He thought analyst self-disclosure gave the patient the parts of the analyst on which the patient could count (Dupont, 1988). The patient could evaluate the analyst; had access to his flaws and complexes. By opening himself, the analyst allowed for greater equality, no longer unilaterally deciding what was true. Ferenczi had a long-standing interest in democratizing analysis.

**REGRESSION**

In the letter, Ferenczi analyzes himself and regresses, reflecting another theme found in his later work -- the value of clinical regression.

While Ferenczi engaged in a lifelong struggle to repair and rework his treatment as a child, he also repeated toxic elements from his early experience. For example:
1. While he strove to be open, in the letter Ferenczi wrote: "I have enjoyed maintaining a proud reserve, and hide my feelings even from those closest to me. I needn't mention that this is a carry-over from infancy."

2. His early reaction to become a "model student" and false self repeats later as "emotional superperformances" and "exaggerated friendliness" as an analyst which he described in his Clinical Diary (p.99).

3. In his search for intimate relationships he found dominating mother figures, including Freud and Elizabeth Severn, the patient whom he referred to in the letters as the "Queen."

"Fearful Respect" is another striking phrase in the letter. Ferenczi uses the term "fearful respect" to characterise how, as a child, he was to treat his parents. Later in the letter, Ferenczi uses "fearful respect" to describe his attitude towards Freud. Ten years later in his Clinical Diary, Ferenczi described Elizabeth Severn ("R.N.") in similar terms. He found Severn, who reminded him of his overly stern mother, to be unpleasant and admitted being anxious and in awe of her. Ferenczi wrote: "[She had] excessive independence and self-assurance, [and] immensely strong willpower" (p.97) and later, "I have retained from my childhood a specific anxiety with regard to strong females of her kind" (p.99).
MOTIF OF IDENTIFICATION WITH THE CHILD

On 12 November 1922, Groddeck wrote to Ferenczi: "The large hat which the adult wears on his godforsaken head, to ensure that nothing enters or exits, is for us children nothing but a game, and thank god for it."

The perspective of the child dominated Ferenczi's writings in the 1920's-early 30's.

Ferenczi had long privileged the truth, honesty and innocence of children, and the hypocrisy of adults. In 1910, he had written to Freud:

There is certainly much that is infantile in my yearning for honesty -- but...not everything that is infantile should be abhorred; for example, the child's urge for truth, which is only dammed up by false educational influences...I still hold firm to the conviction that it is not honesty but superfluous secrecy that is abnormal (Freud-Ferenczi, 1993, p.224).

Ferenczi believed that psychoanalysis should pay attention to children. He wrote to Freud in 1910:

We stand in debt to children for the light they have thrown on psychology, and the best and most logical way of repaying that debt...is to strive to improve our understanding of them through psycho-analytical studies (Freud-Ferenczi, 1993, p.-).
This comment is ironic since Ferenczi, like Freud, saw few children as patients, and they both reconstructed the child perspective through their own, and patients', recollections of childhood. Nevertheless, Ferenczi, who first advocated child analysis in his 1913 paper, "A little chanticleer," influenced a number of the most important early child analysts, including Melanie Klein, to work directly with children.

It wasn't until the late 1920's-early 30's that Ferenczi (1931) wrote specifically from the perspective of the child in the adult. For Ferenczi, childhood innocence was subverted and traumatized by dominating and abusive parents. The result was later adult psychopathology.

In his attempt to treat the "child" in the adult, Ferenczi (1931), in certain cases, conducted analysis in a consulting room that resembled the secure and "comforting" atmosphere of a "nursery". This loosely presages the approaches of Winnicott and Bowlby who focused on the child-mother relationship.

Ferenczi's view of the honesty and perception of the innocent child led him to develop a concept such as the "wise baby" -- that a precocious maturity and wisdom can result from early trauma. In his 1923 paper "The dream of the wise baby," Ferenczi wrote of a typical dream in which a
"very young infant in the cradle suddenly begins to talk and
to give wise advice to its parents or other grown-ups"
(1931, p.136). Ferenczi's idealized concept could be viewed
as a naive fantasy of childhood innocence.

In his 31 November 1932 "Notes and Fragments" (1930-32) (a
continuation his diary) entry, Ferenczi made the idea
personal: "The idea of the wise baby could only be
discovered by a wise baby" (p.274).

As the wise child and the "enfant terrible of
psychoanalysis" -- a title given to him by an unnamed person
at the 1929 Oxford Congress -- Ferenczi (1933) translated
the personal into the professional and told the "truth"
about the limits, problems and hypocrisy of psychoanalysis.

"Hypocrisy"
In his 1931 paper "Child analysis in the analysis of
adults," Ferenczi again transparently evoked his own
childhood. He encouraged the analytical patient to
discover:

The insincerity and hypocrisy which [the patient]
often could not fail to observe in the display or
assertions of love made by those around him in his
childhood, though he hid his criticism from everyone,
and, later, even from himself.(p.133) [my italics]

In "Confusion of Tongues" Ferenczi (1933) drew a parallel
between the child's criticism of parents and the situation
in analysis: "[The] repressed criticism felt by our patients is directed towards what might be called professional hypocrisy" (p.158).

BODY, HEALTH AND PSYCHO-SOMATIC

Ferenczi recognized the child body, frequently wounded and traumatized, in his adult patients.

Through the recovery, recognition and understanding of his childhood experience and his lifelong chronic physical symptoms, frequently characterized as hypochondriasis, Ferenczi identified with the traumatized/abused child in himself, and by extension, in his patients. He embodied the physically weak, frail and "sickly" child. In his letters to Groddeck, Ferenczi struggled to understand the psychological basis of his maladies. He was impressed by the therapeutic value of disclosing suppressed negative feelings.

Ferenczi's identification with the wounded child could be viewed as overdeveloped narcissism and self-absorption. Regardless, it led him to formulate important new perspectives in his later papers.

Ferenczi's own health probably influenced his ideas on "physical memories" (1930b, p.123). He attempted to access pre-verbal infant and early childhood experience through the
body and was the first to speak of body "memory" in childhood sexual trauma. To do this he was forced to experiment with new techniques such as relaxation, regression and trance states. Many of Ferenczi's technical explorations were necessary because his caseload consisted of many difficult patients who today would be diagnosed as borderline, or even psychotic.

Ferenczi's identification with the child led him to:

1. Challenge the emphasis in psychoanalysis on childhood fantasy, and, in turn, reconsider the neglected significance of childhood trauma from the child's perspective. He essentially returned to a position similar to Freud's (1896) earlier trauma theory. Furthermore, Ferenczi formulated an early understanding of the dynamics of sexual trauma -- initial shock, denial (by adults), identification with the aggressor, fragmentation, amnesia, and body memory -- which have only in recent years been recognized by the profession.

2. Ferenczi equated the power imbalance of the parent-child relationship and its potential for abuse, with the analyst-patient relationship. In this conflation, Ferenczi identified strongly with the child-patient. His own experience as Freud's patient had probably sensitized him to this position. Ferenczi (1932) was frustrated by what he saw as the limitations of psychoanalysis and by his relationship and analysis with Freud himself. (This also
raises the theme, which cannot be dealt with here, of the differences between them as to what was therapeutic [and when] regarding the gratification or frustration of desires.)

Through his analysis with Freud (and his work with his own patients), Ferenczi came to realize that in order to avoid a repetition of his trauma, he desired an equal and mutual relationship in which the other would also reveal himself. His self-disclosure as an analyst was probably an attempt to rebalance the power in the analytical situation.

**DISCLOSURE OF NEGATIVE FEELINGS**

As a development from his childhood suppression of feelings, Ferenczi discovered the value of expressing honest negative feelings, both personally and professionally.

For example, in the Christmas 1921 letter, Ferenczi links his physical symptoms and emotional state to withholding and then disclosing his feelings about his wife, Gizella, that he perceives as threatening to their relationship and that he is afraid to express to her:

> Your letter spurred me to renewed effort; it helped me to reveal myself -- albeit not all of myself -- to my wife. I spoke with her again about my dissatisfaction, about my suppressed love for her daughter.
Ferenczi was surprised to discover that his disclosure, which he believed would hurt his wife, had a positive effect on their relationship. He was also amazed when his physical symptoms were alleviated.

Such confessions between us [Gizella and Sandor] usually result, oddly enough, in my being overwhelmed by her goodness and generosity, and moving closer to her again. Was it this, or was it the hot baths I have been taking again--at any rate the nightly chills are a little less deathlike than before.

In contrast, later in the letter he writes of the physical effects of withholding his negative thoughts and feelings from Gizella:

You're quite right in saying that at least a part of my fear of death has to do with wishing death towards the woman [die Frau]. A little while ago in a dream I was busily treating a deep headwound on her temple. I don't want to hurt her, so I don't tell her, or tell her very little about my thoughts of betrayal. Instead, I give myself heart pains.

Discovering the value of countertransference disclosure through Mutual Analysis

Ten years later, in January 1932, in the clinical context with Elizabeth Severn, Ferenczi (1932) again was surprised at the intimacy created by disclosing suppressed feelings -- even of hate (p.99).

Clinical experiences such as this atuned Ferenczi to the positive effects of analyst authenticity and the potential
negative impact of withholding critical pieces of information.

In summary, two themes encountered in the letter(s) that broadly inform Ferenczi's evolving psychoanalytic critique are:

1. His emphasis on the personal as healing and therapeutic.
2. His extension of the therapeutic value of the parent-child relationship to the analyst-patient relationship.

This has led to a plethora of relational theories under the umbrella term of object relations, including mutuality and intersubjectivity.

As Ferenczi wrote in his 11 October 1922 letter to Groddeck:

I don't believe in self-analysis....Analysis is, in my opinion, a social phenomena. It requires (at least) two people. It is, after all, only an improved repetition of one's upbringing, or rather, the completion of the emotional business with one's parents.

Ferenczi gained new technical perspectives, many of which are currently the subject of lively debate within psychoanalysis. He stressed re-living, not just remembering, the early trauma within the analytical relationship. As a result, he raised the critical importance of this relationship and its potential to promote therapeutic change. Ferenczi addressed the significance of the analyst's personality in treatment. As well, he
highlighted the idea that patient resistance and analytical impasses could be a function of countertransference. He anticipated the current study of the role of analyst subjectivity, and the benefits and risks in countertransference interpretations and disclosures (Fortune, 1993).
"Make up your mind once and for all not to search in my letters for the things your conscious 'I' will value, but to read them as though they were travel books or detective stories. Life is already serious enough without making it worse by taking too seriously one's studies, or lectures, or work, or anything else at all" (from Introduction, Book of the It).

A correspondence requires two people to write back and forth, yet only three of Groddeck's letters to Ferenczi (and one to Gizella) have survived. The correspondence obviously suffers from having too little of Groddeck's voice. The letters of Groddeck which have survived are from a book of carbon copies he made, and not from the originals sent to Ferenczi. The Ferenczi estate has no Groddeck letters. Gizella Ferenczi wrote to Margaretha Honegger (Honegger to Michael Balint, 24 January 1968) that once read, Ferenczi destroyed letters as a matter of course. And because of their highly personal nature, it is very probable that Ferenczi destroyed Groddeck's letters intentionally. Furthermore, it wouldn't be unreasonable to speculate that, given their very personal content, Gizella herself may have been less than enthusiastic about their preservation.
As Ferenczi's doctor, Groddeck may have written many of his letters to him from his office (not in the sanitorium) and had copies in his medical files. But Groddeck's records were destroyed, along with many of his other papers, during the war.7

Groddeck is often referred to as the "father of psychosomatic medicine" and we are tantalized by the intelligence, freshness and rebelliousness of the bits of Groddeck we do have. His few letters are better written and, in many ways, more interesting than Ferenczi's, but while Groddeck produced rich ideas, by 1925, Freud observed what he saw as Groddeck's limitation -- a fatal flaw. Freud wrote to Ferenczi that: "[Groddeck was] not the man to complete an idea" (Freud-Ferenczi, 1 December 1925, unpublished). Freud was probably right; Groddeck was not particularly interested in completion and would rather leave his playful, chastising sparks of ideas for others to elaborate.

The letters serve to tweak our interest in him and to re-examine his role in originating creative ideas within the psychoanalytic domain, including: the body-mind relationship, the mother transference, and the transitional object.
GRODDECK'S INFLUENCE AND IMPORTANCE

"The idea of the wise baby could only be discovered by a wise baby" (Ferenczi, 1930-32, p.274).

To what extent did Groddeck influence Ferenczi and his ideas? Ferenczi wrote to Groddeck on 13 October 1926, "I learned much from the unencumbered courage with which you 'cut through to the bone' on the question of the psychomorphology of the organic. I also flatter myself into thinking I have had a small influence on your development." Ferenczi probably admired Groddeck's free thinking spirit as much as any of his specific ideas. Yet, who influenced who remains entangled and unanswerable. What they shared was a passionate interest in the relationship between body and mind. (In fact, Ferenczi wrote about the body-mind relationship before he knew of Groddeck (Dupont, personal communication, March 1995)). In his first letter to Groddeck on 5 June 1917 (Freud-Groddeck, 1977, p.36), Freud attempted to connect the two men by mentioning Ferenczi's recent paper, "Disease-or patho-neuroses" (1916/17). As well as his jealousy over Freud's enthusiasm for Groddeck, this parallel interest, including the fact that Ferenczi was unable to finish a book (Thalassa) related to the subject, could have generated Ferenczi's early competition with Groddeck. Initially, in 1917, Ferenczi had told Freud he was suspicious of Groddeck's "mysticism." At that time,
Freud reproached Ferenczi for his "old characteristic tendency to leave the stranger outside the door" (15 June 1917, Freud-Ferenczi, cited in Dupont, 1994a).

Ferencri, in his 13 October 1926 letter on Groddeck's 60th birthday, reflects on the history of their friendship:

There exist marked differences between us vis-a-vis the scientific method which we apply; yet it was always possible, by the application of good will, to bridge these formal differences and bring our opinions into unity and harmony....

Psychoanalysis, at any rate, is beholden to you for significant insights; the best heads from our ranks know this very well, even if your priority rights are sometimes handled in a cavalier fashion by the literature.

**MOTHER AND CHILD: SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOTHER**

Groddeck's recognition of the significance of the mother probably parallels the development of Ferenczi's own influential views. In his 9 June 1923 letter, Ferenczi acknowledged: "I consider the special achievement of your outlook the fact that you have never ceased emphasising, along with the role of the father, the pivotal role of the mother."8

In fact, Ferenczi, and the Hungarian school generally, is now recognised as a primary source for today's object relations theories (Bowlby, 1988; Eagle, 1987). Since object relations emerged from acknowledging the central
relationship with the mother, Ferenczi may be attributing Groddeck with a significant role in the development of his own thought. This opposed Freud's writings which gave central importance to the father and the oedipus complex. Much of today's analytic literature focuses on the mother and pre-oedipal phases of development. Bowlby (1988) wrote: Ferenczi "saw the infant as striving from the first to relate to his mother, and his future mental health as turning on the success or failure of this first relationship. Thus was the object relations version of psychoanalysis born" (p.xvi).

Groddeck, who had an unusually strong identification with women, went so far as to declare that "[I] envy that I am not myself a woman and cannot be a mother" (1923a, p.21). In his 12 November 1922 letter to Ferenczi, he wrote:

[I] produce nothing myself; am overwhelmingly motherly, bent on receptivity and a letting grow.
(desire for growth.) The games I played with my sister, who by the way is older than me, were called, Mother and Child, and I was almost always the mother.

[furthermore]

I think the difference between us two is that you are forced to want to understand things, and I am forced to want not to understand them...I feel fine in the Imago of the womb with my darkness, and you want to escape from it. Thus you, for example, suppose that a successful analysis necessarily involves the Father transference (Vaterubertragung). But why should the Mother transference...be less useful?
Roustang (1982) cast Groddeck’s charge to confront the mother as a profound challenge to the foundations of psychoanalysis:

What proves that the insistence on the paternal transference and on the need for filiation in psychoanalysis is not a way to avoid facing up in the analysis to the more dangerous and more archaic relation with the mother and her language, which is in fact a mockery of language? If Groddeck believed neither in words nor in science, it was because he placed himself in the mother’s position. (p. 129)

Later, Ferenczi took Groddeck’s challenge to heart by addressing the mother transference in his mutual analysis with Elizabeth Severn. In mutual analysis, Ferenczi experienced a therapeutic shift in awareness and consciousness, in part due to Severn’s empathy. Possibly with Severn, Ferenczi approached his ideal of being "remothered." He may have felt he had the chance to work out his negative transference, which he had long criticized Freud for failing to analyze. In his diary, Ferenczi wrote:

In R.N. I find my mother again, namely the real one, who was hard and energetic and of whom I am afraid. R.N. knows this, and treats me with particular gentleness; the analysis even allows her to transform her own hardness into friendly softness, and here the question arises: should one not have, in spite of all, the courage to expose oneself to the danger of analytic transference and win out in the end. (p. 45)

Later, Ferenczi told Freud that Severn “analyzed him and thereby saved” him (Freud-Jones, 1993, p. 721).
The idea of "mother" seems to inform the relationships of both the figures in this correspondence. Ferenczi, and probably Groddeck, wanted Freud to be a mother, but Freud, as the father figure, ultimately refused both. So Ferenczi looked to Groddeck who "was now replacing Freud as the mother Ferenczi always wanted" (Grosskurth, 1991, opp.p.200). Later Severn re-played the role in mutual analysis, while Groddeck found his "mother" in a more traditional arrangement -- with his wife (Freud-Groddeck, 1977).

**GRODDECK INSPIRED FERENCZI**

Groddeck may have helped to light a spark under Ferenczi -- a "furor sanandi" (rage to cure), as Freud called it -- that propelled him into his radical technical experiments and writings of the 1920s.

Groddeck likely helped free Ferenczi to produce new work beyond the approved canon of classical psychoanalysis, braving to go beyond Freud, the master. In the Christmas 1921 letter, Ferenczi wrote: "I never plucked up my courage ...I always allowed myself to be sidetracked into writing small improvisations instead of the main one." Instead of continuing to produce the many small and imaginative papers of the previous decade, with quaint titles such as "Flatus as an adult prerogative" (1913b) and "Disgust for breakfast" (1919a), he finally found his backbone, overcame writer's

In *Thalassa*, Ferenczi expounds an almost cosmic theory, that "the whole of life is determined by a tendency to return to the womb, equating the process of birth with the phylogenetic transition of animal life from water to land, and linking coitus to the idea of 'thalassal regression: the longing for the sea-life from which man emerged in primeval times'" (*Thalassa*).

**Writer's Block, Thalassa, and the Courage to Create**

A key to Groddeck's influence on Ferenczi may be found in the inspiration to take the bold leap into the world of *Thalassa*. Perhaps Ferenczi became inspired to finish the book thanks to Groddeck's own highly original, even daring, writings of the period -- such as his psychoanalytical novel, *The Soulseeker* (1921a) and his *Book of the It* (1923a), (working title: "Letters to a Woman Friend.")

Ferenczi, who knew that Groddeck had long been a writer of literature, wrote in the Christmas 1921 letter: "I notice that in spicing this letter with such bon mots I am imitating your 'Letters to a Woman Friend.'"

Did Ferenczi look to Groddeck as an experienced writer, to inspire him to overcome his writer's block? His Christmas
1921 letter is full of references to his writing struggles, frequently linked to somatic symptoms. In it, he described his "fear of work," his difficulty in completing Thalassa:

Am I trying to become a fish, or do I wish to activate my piscean genital theory [Thalassa], which I won't write down?

Ferenczi linked this fear of work to criticisms in childhood:

Had I your writerly talents I would write -- as I began to do above -- straight from the heart about my physical and mental ailments. (Stop: I was being dishonest! I believe that I do have writerly talents. I recall how much a disparaging judgement on a piece of work, or before that a poem, hurt me.)

Or, was it also possibly a fear of Freud's reaction? Even though Freud apparently liked the book, he may not have been able to inspire Ferenczi, as Groddeck might -- being based in a body approach, to make the leaps of imagination necessary. Ferenczi writes:

I am by no means feeling well, however. I will recount the symptoms: The first thing I think of is my resistance to work. (What occurs to me: I'm not allowed to surpass the father.) In 1915/16 when I was garrisoned (for 1 year) with little to do in a small Hungarian town, I developed a great, a "grand" theory of the genital development of animals as being a reaction to the threat of dehydration associated with adaptation to terrestrial life. I could never bring myself to commit this valuable, and up to now most important idea, to paper. The data lies buried in great disorder in my desk. I frequently and joyfully expound the theory orally; once, no twice, I laid it out before Freud, Rank, Jones, Abraham, etc., most recently here in Hildesheim. When I want to write, however, I develop back pains, to do with my aorta, of course, which, as the X-rays show, is distended. A few weeks ago I developed arthritic swellings in my right wrist; this also kept me from writing, of course.

Or, his sense of unhappiness over not fathering a child:
I often think when I consider this symptom (fear of work): it's pointless. Meaning: the world does not offer enough in return to warrant these "gifts" from me. Anal eroticism, I suspect: I won't let anything go until I receive something in return. What is this something, however? Nothing other than the child which a woman [die Frau] should give to me, or, conversely, which I wish to offer to the world (to father, to mother).

The evil part of this is that my erotic self is apparently not satisfied with these revelations. I, my "It," doesn't want analytical insights, it wants something real; a young woman, a child!

1923 seems to have been the breakthrough year for Ferenczi to complete the writing projects he had procrastinated on, Thalassa (1924), and the collaboration with Rank: The Development of Psycho-Analysis (1924). Both were brave pieces of writing. His work mood improved after 1923. It may not be significant, but in this period he did not visit Groddeck, and there is a large gap of eight months in the letters, from October 1923 until June 1924. Did this begin to signal a change, a reduced intensity, in their relationship?

Perhaps coincidental, but the upturn in Ferenczi's creative energies in 1923 matched with the diagnosis of Freud's cancer (see letters and annotations beginning June 1923). I may be reading too much into too little, but it is uncanny that each time Ferenczi mentions Freud's cancer in subsequent letters (four from June to October 1923), he
follows with a report on his work progress, particularly mentioning *Thalassa*.

Groddeck may not have been the "right man for the completion of an idea" (Freud, see above), but his great contribution may have been to "remother" Ferenczi, and possibly to inspire Ferenczi's courage to follow his creative instincts. One might speculate that without Groddeck there may have been no later Ferenczi raising challenges to Freud and pushing the frontiers of psychoanalysis.

**The Body was Between Ferenczi and Groddeck.**

From the beginning, Ferenczi enjoyed a dialogue with Groddeck regarding the relationship of the body and mind. It would have been a discourse not found in classical psychoanalysis at the time.

In summing up Ferenczi after his death, Groddeck wrote that he had been on a "journey to the stars," but it is obvious from the letters that Ferenczi had also been on a descent into his body. At times Ferenczi sank into sleepless, sickly, melancholic and even depressed states. He was besieged by physical complaints. In his last letter to Gizella, Groddeck implied that Ferenczi refused to acknowledge his limitations -- physically, mentally and emotionally. Groddeck wrote that, in his desire to "atomize the soul," Ferenczi's "ambition got the better of him [and]
he fell victim to his drive for discovery." Groddeck seems to suggest that Ferenczi had betrayed his own body. That he had allowed it to be destroyed. By giving his passions and neurosis free rein, and not acknowledging his limitations, Ferenczi transgressed nature (the "It"?) and his own being. Groddeck almost accuses Ferenczi of his own demise. He failed by not surviving. This echoes Dupont's (1988) question regarding Ferenczi: "Hasn't it been said that the first task of the guerrilla fighter is to stay alive?" (p.xii).

Nevertheless, in Ferenczi's refusal to acknowledge his limits, he opened new horizons for psychoanalysis -- at the expense of his own well-being. At the end, Groddeck wrote: "The outward circumstances of the life of this uncommon individual had meaning only insofar as to show he was one of the givers, who will give again and again" (19 Feb. 1934).

THALASSA

A key to the deeper bodily Ferenczi may be found in his inspired and imaginative work, Thalassa. All his symptoms at that time could be seen as metaphors of the evolutionary movement from sea to land, and how this specifically related to his not writing his genital theory book: the complications and attention paid to his difficulty in breathing, to heat and cold, to sleep outside the womb of the oceanic, and to his blood problems.
Metaphorically, Ferenczi may not have made a successful adaptation from womb to the world, from childhood to adulthood. Hence the fantasy expressed in Thalassa, the desire throughout life to return -- particularly "the return" to the mother. Also, in his strong identification with the honesty, truth and innocence of the child, Ferenczi held up the child as a kind of god.

For Ferenczi the notion of return loomed large; to childhood, to the womb, and to the mother. Perhaps it wasn't so much a return -- did Ferenczi ever really leave childhood? -- as a deep respect for the child's perspective, which resonates with today's idealization of the child and notions of innocence.

Ferenczi's Failure. Ferenczi may have been caught in the child imago, unable to grow, develop, and in this sense to "endure," to survive, to stand up to Freud and become an adult. To some degree mutual analysis was also a fantasy of merging. In the end, in commenting on Ferenczi's clinical directions, Freud simply dismissed him as being stuck in childhood complexes (Freud-Jones, 29 May 1933, p.721).

Ferenczi and chaos. Ferenczi seems to have sought chaos, the destructive forces uncontained by the body. Overwhelmed with a sense of needing to indulge the child, he never learned to cope, to overcome, and so he suffered as if a
child still. Like another eternal child, Peter Pan, Ferenczi equated children with good and adults, including parents, with bad.

Ferenczi had to reconsider his views in Thalassa in light of his work on trauma in the later 1920s-30s. The significance of Thalassa as a reference point is confirmed by his note at the end of "Confusion of tongues," where he writes: "The 'Theory of Genitality' that tries to found the 'struggle of the sexes' on phylogenesis, will have to make clear this difference between the infantile-erotic gratifications and the hate-impregnated love of adult mating" (p.167). It is interesting to note Ferenczi's scathing view of adult sexuality. It fits with his idealization of the child perspective and experience.

Perhaps Groddeck's positive view of the body -- of the instinctual "IT" -- drew Ferenczi to him. Ferenczi recognized that the actual body had been neglected, and needed to be considered in psychoanalysis. For Groddeck, the "IT" was a positive natural force -- wise beyond all -- as compared to Freud's "ID" which was sexual, mistrusted, threatening, and needed to be controlled.

Groddeck's approach would resonate with the body-oriented therapies of today that espouse rhetoric such as "the body doesn't lie." He treated it with water therapy, diet,
exercise and massage. Hands on. Ferenczi is known for kissing and hugging his patients (letter Freud to Ferenczi, 13 December 1931, Jones, 1957). Groddeck's language -- coming from the body -- spoke to Ferenczi. And Ferenczi's symptoms, his psycho-pathological body, were Groddeck's language. All this was opposed to Freud's emphasis on language in analysis. And for all the importance given to sexuality, the body was absent from classical analysis.

For Ferenczi, this was the new frontier -- or possibly it was a return to his deeper nature, a return to himself, pathologized as "regression." Also a return to the mother -- the maternal body.

In the later 1920's, in his clinical work, Ferenczi investigated the embodiment of early trauma. This relationship to the body was a critical component in Ferenczi's return to a theory of trauma.

Freud saw Groddeck as a Rabelaisian figure—earthy, joyously coarse and gross. Ferenczi acted out his psycho-physical pathologies early on when he sought out prostitutes. Ferenczi was also hearty in his tastes. He wanted to marry the life of the mind with the body. Groddeck held this side of the equation for him after his long association with Freud.
Ferenczi was probably by nature more a poet and artist than a psychoanalyst. The spirit of Ferenczi embodied these realms more than as the bearer of the flag in the Freudian army. This may be why, in his very nature, he later bridled at the constraints of the movement.
1. While a much more extreme example, Molnar's (1992) editorial labours on The Diary of Sigmund Freud: 1929-1939 represent a recent work that has taken off and expanded on Freud's life, from very little -- essentially a list of dates and "telegraphic notes" -- of Freud. The resulting book is an invaluable resource and collection of disparate odds and ends of information -- but, all in all, something made out of little real Freud material.

2. Ferenczi's description of his childhood masturbation as being "secret" would seem to be redundant -- most childhood masturbation by nature is secret. His emphasis on the particular nature of his masturbation would more likely be reflected by his 19 January 1932 Clinical Diary entry in which he writes: "[I] compensated in [my] youth by endless masturbatory activity, the peculiarity of which can be gauged by the ejaculation up to the sky [Ejakulatio usque ad coleum]" (p.15). Cf. pp. 89,134.

3. Ferenczi's mother's response seems reasonably normal, even for today, and certainly for a mother in the 1870's-1880's. While in its specifics Ferenczi's description of his mother's behaviour doesn't seem unreasonable, his general tone reflects his sense of being unloved.

4. Ferenczi's drive to self-disclose to some degree calls into question his account of being bullied into mutual
analysis by Severn's relentless demands to analyze him (Ferenczi, 1932, pp.96-100).

5. Ferenczi's term "superfluous secrecy" could easily be reworded "hypocrisy," a key word of Ferenczi's to be discussed later.

6. This was in contrast to Freud who seems to have identified with the parent-analyst.

7. Luckily, the sanitorium guestbook, a valuable document, survived and I was able to use it for this work.

8. For example, Groddeck was an important influence on Karen Horney. She acknowledged Groddeck's influence in her critical work on the mother, gender and sex differences (Quinn, 1988, pp.216-218).
V. CONCLUSION TO THE NOTATIONS AND COMMENTARY

In this thesis, editing the Ferenczi-Groddeck correspondence, I have attempted to open up the letters to allow other readers and scholars to speculate, interpret and generally take the material further. To that end, and as a springboard to examine aspects of Sandor Ferenczi's life and work, I have provided extensive annotations. In my Commentary I have made provisional inferences and speculative conclusions, again, to open up a discourse on the letters -- and Ferenczi, not to provide closure. As a work-in-progress, I hope to gain new perspectives from the thesis and defense process.
**APPENDIX I**

**PERENCZI-GRODDECK CORRESPONDENCE/1921-1933**

**CHRONOLOGY OF LETTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERENCZI TO GRODDECK</th>
<th>GRODDECK TO PERENCZI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1921 (6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1922 (2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 April ** New letter**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 September (Committee to Groddeck) **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** New undated early letter.**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1922 (6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1922 (2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February</td>
<td>9 May ** New letter**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 July</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 October</td>
<td>12 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1923 (8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May <em>CARD</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 August</td>
<td>** New Letter**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16 September *CARD*
8 October
25 "

1924 (2)
30 June
11 October ** New letter

1925 (8)
* undated CARD* (1925?)
? March? *CARD*
18 April
26 July *CARD*
5 September *CARD* (Gizella writes on card)
10 " *CARD* (" " " ")
13 "
6 December

1926 (6)
7 January
27 March (mis-dated as 6 March 1927 in earlier editions)
26 June
26 July
30 August
13 October

1927 (2)
26 April
25 October

1928 (2)
27 July
17 October
1929 (4)  
12 February

1929 (1)  
13 June

7 July

16 August  *New Ferenczi postscript*

28 October

1930 (2)  
15 June

21 December

1931 (5)  
10 October
17 "  *CARD* (Gizella writes on card)
21 "  
26 "  *CARD* (Gizella writes on card)

3 November

1932 (1)  
3 March

1933 (1)  
20 March

1934 (1)  
19 February
(to Gizella)

TOTAL:
Ferenczi: 53 letters & cards  
Groddeck: 3 letters

(To Gizella: 1 letter)
GIZELLA FERENCZI LETTERS (To Groddecks) (4)

14 July 1933 (To Meine Lieben Freunde) **
2 November 1933
9 January 1934 **
28 (267) February 1934 (Gizella to Georg Groddeck)

TOTAL LETTERS (to date):

53 letters (and cards) Ferenczi to Groddeck
   [1 letter Committee (includes Ferenczi) to Groddeck]
3 letters Groddeck to Ferenczi
1 letter Groddeck to Gizella Ferenczi
4 letters Gizella Ferenczi to Groddecks

** -- new letters and cards.

§ There will quite possibly be changes to this list as a few of the dates on the new cards are unclear and will require further confirmation.
APPENDIX II

A NOTE ON METHOD:

In editing the Ferenczi-Groddeck correspondence, I have used historical, biographical and psychological research methods with published and unpublished sources, archival material, public records and documents, as well as interviews with those particularly involved in Ferenczi and Groddeck scholarship, and other experts in the field. I weighed the information obtained with reference to degrees of historical evidence (primary and secondary accounts, written and oral). I researched the editorial standards of previously published psychoanalytic correspondence. And, following the editorial guidelines set by the The Freud/Jung Letters (1974), accepted as the standard for psychoanalytic correspondence, I attempted to research and notate "parallel and related publications, and events, textual details, and cross-references...[and sought to] bridge discontinuities in the letters" (p.xxxvii).

As well:
1. Copies of the original letters were checked and corrected against existing German typescripts. (Errors were found in the German/French editions).
2. I worked with the translator, who has limited knowledge of psychoanalysis and its history, to assist in decisions on style, word choice, and meaning.

**SOURCES OF RESEARCH MATERIAL:**

**Primary: Ferenczi and Groddeck writings.**

a) Ferenczi's executor, Paris analyst Dr. Judith Dupont, made available unpublished materials -- letters and papers -- from the Ferenczi Archive. She has also acted as consultant for the project.

b) The Groddeck Society (Frankfurt) -- Groddeck's estate executors -- has supported my research and provided access to archival materials.

**RESEARCH FOR THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN CONDUCTED AT THE FOLLOWING ARCHIVES, MUSEUMS AND INSTITUTES:**

**ENGLAND**

Archives, British Psycho-Analytical Institute, London.


Sigmund Freud Copyrights, Wivenhoe.

**GERMANY**

Groddeck Archive, Freiburg.

Groddeck Society, Frankfurt.

Groddeck Sanitorium, Stadtbibliothek-Groddeck, Baden-Baden.

German National Archives (Zentral Kartei der autographen, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz), Berlin.

Erich Fromm Archive, Tubingen.
FRANCE

Ferenczi Estate Archive, Paris.

SWITZERLAND

Balint Archive, Dept. Psychiatry, University of Geneva.

HUNGARY

Semmelweis Library/Archives, Budapest.
Psychology Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
Archives, Sandor Ferenczi Society, Budapest.
Hungarian National Archives, Budapest.
Archives, Kiscelli Photo Museum, Budapest.
Budapest City Archives.

AUSTRIA

Werkstatt fur Gesellschafts-und Psychoanalyse, Vienna.

U.S.A.: (NEW YORK/WASHINGTON/BOSTON)

Sigmund Freud Archives, Library of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Archive, Payne-Whitney Clinic, Cornell Medical Center,
New York Hospital.

C.G. Jung Oral History Archive, Boston.

Secondary Sources: Psychoanalytic literature --
biographical, historical, theoretical, and clinical;
consultations with experts in the field, including:

RESOURCES ON FERENCZI:

The Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence editors: Prof. Andre
Haynal, Supervisor, (Head, Dept. Psychiatry, University of
Geneva), Dr. Ernst Falzeder (Salzburg), Mme. Eva Brabent (Paris); Dr. Axel Hoffer (Boston); Dr. Martin Stanton (Canterbury); Sandor Ferenczi Society (Budapest); Dr. Stephen Szekacs (Budapest); Dr. Clifford Scott (Montreal).

RESOURCES ON GRODDECK
Ms. Beate Schuh (Frankfurt), Secretary, Georg Groddeck Gesellschaft (Society); Mme. Margareta Honegger (Zurich) -- Groddeck's personal secretary and executor for over fifty years; Otto Jagersberg (Baden-Baden) -- Groddeck Archivist; Dr. Herbert Will (Munich) -- Groddeck biographer.

Scholars of the History of Psychoanalysis: Prof. Paul Roazen (York); Prof. Phyllis Grosskurth (Toronto); Dr. Patrick Mahony (Montreal); Dr. Andrew Paskauskas (Abu Dabi); Peter J. Swales (New York); Anthony Stadlen, (London); Sonu Shamdasani (London); Michael Molnar (Freud Museum, London); Ernst Federn (Vienna).

History of Medicine
Prof. Edward Shorter (University of Toronto) -- has contextualized Groddeck and his sanitorium treatment methods.
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